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A NOTE ON TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS

Latin texts are given with distinction between u and v but not i and j, with the exception of quotations from older editions such as PatLat. Latin text transcribed from manuscripts is generally given with abbreviations silently expanded, but is generally diplomatic with regard to spelling. Greek words and texts are given in transliteration according to the standards of the American Language Association, except where a standard liturgical transliteration is already established (e.g., eleison imas rather than eleēson hēmas for ελεησον ἡμας).

Translations are mine unless otherwise noted. Latin Biblical quotations, unless otherwise noted, are from the Vulgata Clementina, ed. A. Colunga and L. Turrado (Madrid: La Editorial Católica, 1946) as digitized in the opensource program VulSearch 4 (http://vulsearch.sourceforge.net/). English Biblical quotations, unless otherwise noted, are my translation from the aforesaid Latin version, although usually with reference to the Douay-Rheims version (Baltimore, MD: John Murphy, 1899), also as digitized in VulSearch 4. Text and translation of the Septuagint are from http://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/greek-texts/septuagint/, which digitizes the English translation of Lancelot Brenton (London: Bagster, 1844), with English modernized. References to the Psalms use the Septuagint and Vulgate numbering, which, in most cases, is one less than the Hebrew numbering.

All divine pronouns in this study, including those in cited translations, are presented uncapitalized 1) to accord with Chicago Style and 2) for the sake of consistency. Older translations of patristic works are occasionally lightly modernized in other ways as well (“you” for “thou,” “may” for “mayst,” and so forth).
“My People, What Have I Done to You?”
The Good Friday *Popule meus* Verses
in Chant and Exegesis, c. 380–880

Abstract

by

ARMIN KARIM

The Roman Catholic Good Friday liturgy includes a series of chants known today as the *Improperia* (“Reproaches”) beginning with the following text: *Popule meus, quid feci tibi? aut in quo contristavi te? responde mihi. Quia eduxi te de terra Egypti, parasti crucem Salvatori tuo* (“My people, what have I done to you, or in what have I grieved you? Answer me. Because I led you out of the land of Egypt, you prepared a cross for your Savior”). The earliest witness to the chants is a Carolingian liturgical book from around 880, but it is agreed among scholars that their history extends back farther than this.

Employing comparative analysis of Biblical exegesis, chant texts, and chant melodies, this study suggests that the initial chant verse, Micah 6:3–4a plus a Christianizing addendum (“My people... you prepared...”), originated in northwestern Italy between the end of the 4th century and the end of the 7th century and carried associations of the Last Judgment, the Passion, and Christian works, penitence, and
forgiveness. Although previous scholarship has sometimes pointed to the Reproaches as a key text of Christian anti-Jewish history, it is clear that the initial three verses, the *Popule meus* verses, originally held allegorical rather than literal meanings.

The fact that there are several preserved *Popule meus* chants across various liturgical repertoires and, moreover, several sets of *Popule meus* verses in a smaller subset of these repertoires—in northern Italy, southern France, and the Spanish March—bespeaks the pre-Carolingian origins of the *Popule meus* verses and raises the question of why the verses appear in the Carolingian liturgy when they do. This study proposes that the *Popule meus* verses were incorporated into the Carolingian liturgy at the Abbey of Saint-Denis under the abbacy of Charles the Bald (867–77). In the Adoration of the Cross ceremony adopted from Rome, paired with the Greek Trisagion, and carrying Gallican melody and meaning, the Carolingian *Popule meus* verses would have been an ecumenical declaration, as they spread, of the expediency of the crucified Christ and a penitent people, even in the face of impending political disintegration.
INTRODUCTION

The *Popule meus* verses are a series of chants found in the afternoon service of the Roman Catholic Good Friday liturgy.¹ They are commonly known, along with companion chants, as the *Improperia* (in Latin) or “Reproaches” (in English).² The *Popule meus* verses are three in number and are sung with the Trisagion, a chant originally from the Christian East, and then another series of nine chants, giving twelve “Reproaches” total. Because the term *Improperia* most accurately designates the latter series of these chants, which all begin with the word *Ego* (“I”), the first three chants are designated in this study as most chants are, that is, by their first words (*Popule meus*; “My people”); they are further designated with the word “verses” because that is how they are named in the earliest manuscripts.³

The Good Friday Reproaches—we will retain this terminology only to describe the modern liturgy here—are comprised of the *Popule meus* verses, the *Ego* verses, and the Trisagion, and are sung near the beginning of the Adoration of the Cross ceremony,

---

¹ The modern Roman Catholic Good Friday liturgy generally consists of a Matins service known as *Tenebrae*, a quiet Vespers at home, and, in between, the main public gathering that takes the place of Mass. This gathering is not a Mass proper, as there is no consecration of the Sacrament, but rather a partaking of the Sacrament consecrated the day before. Thus, this service is sometimes called the Liturgy of the Pre-Sanctified, with the practice and the term coming originally from the Byzantine rite. The service is held in the afternoon, and is thus referred to as “The Solemn Afternoon Liturgy.” For the sake of concision, when talking about this service in the Old Roman and Carolingian repertoires, this study will in general simply use the term “Good Friday liturgy.” See Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (Westminster, London: Dacre Press, 1945), 440–41, and, as a representative liturgical book, The Benedictines of Solesmes, eds., *The Liber usualis, with Introduction and Rubrics in English* (Tournai: Desclee, 1961), 720–51.

² In contrast to English-speaking custom, the Latin term serves as the base of the French and German designations: *les Improprères* and *die Improperien*.

³ Johann Drumbl, “Die Improperien der lateinischen Liturgie,” *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 15 (1973): 68–9. Because they first appear rubriccd as verses following the Trisagion chant, Johann Drumbl has suggested that the former of these be called the “Trisagion verses” (“Trisagion-verse”) (69). The *Popule meus* verses and the *Ego* verses are sometimes called the *Improperia maiora* and the *Improperia minora*, respectively (“Greater Reproaches” and “Lesser Reproaches”).
the third out of four segments of the afternoon liturgy.\(^4\) The text as found in modern chant books is as follows:\(^5\)

**The *Popule meus* Verses alternating with the Trisagion in Greek and Latin:**


\(V.\) *Quia eduxi te de terra Aegypti : parasti Crucem Salvatori tuo.*

*Agios o Theos.*

*Sanctus Deus.*

*Agios Ischyros.*

*Sanctus Fortis.*

*Agios Athanatos, eleison imas.*

*Sanctus Immortalis, miserere nobis.*

[1] *My people, what have I done to you? Or in what have I grieved you? Answer me.*

\(V.\) *Because I led you out of Egypt: you prepared a Cross for your Savior.*

*Holy God,*

*Holy Strong,*

*Holy Undying, have mercy on us.*


[2] *Because I led you through the desert for forty years, and fed you with manna, and brought you into a good and sufficient land: you prepared a Cross for your Savior.*

*Agios o Theos…*


[3] *What more should I have done for you that I did not do? I indeed planted you as my most splendid vine: and you have become exceedingly bitter to me: indeed you gave me vinegar for my thirst: and with a lance you pieced the side of your Savior.*

*Agios o Theos…*


\(^5\) Ibid., 737–42.
The *Ego Verses*: 6

1) *Ego propter te flagellavi Aegyptum cum primogenitis sui : et tu me flagellatum tradidisti.*

1) *I scourged Egypt with [the death of] its firstborn for your sake: and you delivered me to be scourged.*

2) *Ego te eduxi de Aegypto, demerso Pharaone in Mare Rubrum : et tu me tradidisti principibus sacerdotum.*

2) *I led you out of Egypt, plunging Pharaoh into the Red Sea: and you delivered me to the chief priests.*

3) *Ego ante te aperui mare : et tu aperuisti lancea latus meum.*

3) *I opened the sea before you: and you opened my side with a lance.*

4) *Ego ante te praeivi in columna nubis : et tu me duxisti ad praetorium Pilati.*

4) *I went before you in the pillar of cloud: and you guided me to Pilate’s court.*

5) *Ego te pavi manna per desertum : et tu me cecidisti alapis et flagellis.*

5) *I fed you manna in the desert: and you cut me down with blows and lashes.*

6) *Ego te potavi aqua salutis de petra : et tu me potasti felle et aceto.*

6) *I gave you saving water from the rock to drink: and you gave me gall and vinegar to drink.*

7) *Ego propter te Chananaeorum reges percussi : et tu percussisti arundine caput meum.*

7) *I struck the Canaanite kings for your sake: and you struck my head with a reed.*

8) *Ego dedi tibi sceptrum regale : et tu dedisti capiti meo spineam coronam.*

8) *I granted you a royal scepter: and you granted my head a crown of thorns.*

9) *Ego te exaltavi magna virtute : et tu me suspendisti in patibulo Crucis.*

9) *I raised you up in great power: and you hung me on the gibbet of the Cross.*

As these chants have been known in the modern liturgy, so they have been known in commentary and scholarship, that is, collectively as the “Reproaches.” This is a historiographical problem, not only for chant and liturgy historians, but for cultural historians and modern liturgical commentators as well, for example, when the latter invoke the chants as a historically-unified entity. Take the characterization of the

---

6 After each of the *Ego* verses, *Popule meus . . . responde mihi* is sung as a refrain.
Reproaches by Jules Isaac, the mid-20th-century historian of Christian-Jewish relations, in his *Genèse de l’antisémitisme* (“Genesis of Antisemitism”):

I find the best example of how far the liturgical imagination could go in this sense [of portraying the Jews generally as Christ-killers]—even up to the point of abuses of the figurative (or prefigurative) method, and combined with such poetic impulses as to ensure unparalleled efficacy—in the moving chant of the Reproaches. [Like the Good Friday prayers,] it also is of a very ancient origin. According to some, it is from the East, from Jerusalem, and was introduced in the West around the 8th century. According to others, it was born in the West itself and is first observed in the Mozarabic or Gothic liturgy. The Reproaches are sung on Good Friday, after the series of prayers, at the hour of the Adoration of the Cross. Having a poignant sadness and a beauty made to reach and pierce the heart, they give the indelible impression to the worshipping faithful that they hear the very voice of the Crucified and his agonizing and tender plaints. . . There is no doubt that the teaching of contempt found its most powerful reinforcement in the liturgy.7

I quote Jules Isaac here for several reasons. First, as noted, he erroneously treats the Reproaches as a unified historical entity. This need not be held against him; in the 1950s his summary of origins hypotheses for the Reproaches accurately represents the state of liturgical research. Second, he integrates in a single excerpt the various disciplines in which the Reproaches have typically been discussed: liturgical commentary, liturgical history, chant history, and history of Christian-Jewish relations. In terms of liturgical and chant scholarship he cites the work of early-20th-century scholars Anton Baumstark (for the Eastern origins hypothesis) and Louis Brou (for the

---

7 *Jusqu’où a pu aller l’imagination liturgique dans ce sens, jusqu’à quels abus du système figuratif (ou préfiguratif), joints à quels élans poétiques qui leur assurent une incomparable efficacité, j’en trouve le meilleur exemple dans le chant si émouvant des Impropères. Lui aussi est d’une origine très ancienne, venu d’Orient, de Jérusalem selon les uns, et introduit en Occident vers le VIIIe siècle, né en Occident même bien auparavant selon d’autres et connu d’abord de la liturgie mozarabe ou gothique. Les Impropères se chantent le vendredi saint, après la suite des oraisons, quand vient l’heure de l’Adoration de la Croix. D’une poignante tristesse, d’une beauté faite pour toucher et transpercer les cœurs, ils donnent aux fidèles prosternés l’impression inéfachable d’entendre la voix même du Crucifié, ses plaintes à la fois déchirantes et tendres... N’en doutons pas, l’enseignement du mépris a trouvé là, dans la liturgie, son plus puissant renfort.* Jules Isaac, *Genèse de l’antisémitisme* (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1956), 308–9, 312.
Western origins hypothesis). Third, he summarizes the most common objection to the Reproaches: that their literal reading inaccurately presents Jews as Christ-killers. Finally, and most importantly, he is associated with two monumental events of the 20th century that led to a surge in scholarship on and discussion of the Reproaches—the Holocaust and Vatican II—having lost most of his family to Auschwitz while completing his magnum opus, *Jesus and Israel*, and, after the war, meeting with two popes to discuss “cleans[ing] Christian teaching of falsehoods about Jews.”

Because the vast majority of scholarship on the Reproaches from the 20th and 21st centuries has been produced explicitly or implicitly against the backdrop of the Holocaust and Vatican II, it would be inadmissible to ignore this context in undertaking a study such as this one. In 1959, 1966, 1967, and 1984, for example, Eric Werner, “one of the generation of scholars that founded the discipline of musicology in the United States,” developed an argument that traced the Reproaches, again, as a group, back to the Passover text Dayenu (“It would have been enough”) and 2nd-century bishop Melito of Sardis, whom he termed the “first poet of deicide.” Another scholar, Werner Schütz, took a more cautious approach in 1968, tracing an “Improperia tradition”

---

8 Citations given below.


(Improperientradition) through history.11 This German tradition of philological work on the Reproaches dates back to the work of Anton Baumstark in his 1922 article on “The East and the Chants of the Adoration of the Cross” (“Der Orient und die Gesänge der Adoratio crucis”). In 1973, Johann Drumbl brought the Reproaches squarely into the purview of musicology with his thorough manuscript-based study of the Ego verses in the Latin liturgy.12 After forty years, his article remains the best scholarly contribution to the history of the Reproaches as a whole, for he engages musical, textual, and liturgical arguments to hypothesize both the origins and the original “piety-value” (Frömmigkeitswert) of the Ego verses—this study, of the Popule meus verses, in many ways takes its cue from that of Drumbl. Every one of the studies from the second half of the 20th century felt obliged to deal with the question of meaning.13

While these German articles fleshed out various possible histories of the Ego verses, however, no comparable post-war work was done on the Popule meus verses. One reason for this is probably the thorough comparative investigation of Louis Brou, Benedictine monk from the Isle of Wight, in his “Les impropères du Vendredi-Saint,”

13 One exception is Egon Wellesz, Eastern Elements in Western Chant: Studies in the Early History of Ecclesiastical Music (1947, repr. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1967), who treats the Byzantine troparion ὅτε τῷ σταυρῷ (Ote tō stauroś, “When on the Cross”) and its Latin translation, O quando in cruce, appearing in certain Italian liturgical books, throughout the study. Wellesz makes no direct contribution to the history of the Reproaches, but, since Ote tō stauroś—O quando in cruce is certainly part of the “Improperia tradition” and indeed quotes Micah 6:3, his work is basic reading here. He also does not engage with the meaning of the chants, and only references the war itself obliquely in the preface: “These studies, which I started in Vienna, were interrupted for a short time in 1938, and have since been continued in Oxford” (ix). Wellesz of course refers here to Hitler’s Anschluss with Austria in March 1938. It would take until after Vatican II for the question of anti-Judaism in the Reproaches to make its way from cultural history, such as the contributions of Jules Isaac, into chant history.
published in the mid-1930s. The details of Brou’s work will be engaged more
thoroughly in Chapter 2. For now, it is sufficient to note that he disagreed with the
German conclusion that the Reproaches had come from the East and seemed to prefer the
notion of a “Roman composer” of the chants. Although this study draws somewhat
different conclusions, and adds melodic analysis to his mostly-text-based analysis, it is
still heavily indebted to that of Brou.

We have looked at the *Popule meus* verses in their modern liturgical context and
in existing scholarship. The following section provides a historical introduction to the
chants, setting up the historical question to which the rest of the study provides an
answer.

* * *

The earliest document attesting to the *Popule meus* verses is an unannotated
liturgical book produced around the year 880 at the Abbey of Saint-Denis for the
cathedral of Senlis (4 and 25 miles north of Paris, respectively), in which one finds the
following plan for the chants of the Good Friday liturgy:

---


15 There is also a body of theological scholarship that looks at the Reproaches in their modern context and thus does not need to be directly engaged in this study. Representative are two articles of Marcel Poothuis: “The Improperia and Judaism.” *Questions liturgiques* 72 (1991): 1–24 and “The Improperia on Trial: On a Recent Debate in the Netherlands between Jews, Protestants and Roman-Catholics,” in *Religious Identity and the Problem of Historical Foundation*, ed. Judith Frishman et al. (Boston: Brill, 2004), 471–94. On the other hand, the liturgical work of Louis van Tongeren on the Adoration of the Cross—see his many publications listed in the bibliography—bridges the gap between historical work and treatments of modern liturgy and will be cited often in this study.

All of the chants indicated here were familiar items in the Good Friday liturgy at this time in the Carolingian era save three: the trio of chants Popule meus, Quia eduxi vos, and Quid ultra debui facere tibi (the Popule meus verses) were, as far as extant manuscripts indicate, novel additions to the developing Carolingian rite.  

Preexisting elements of the Carolingian Good Friday liturgy include, first, the rubric identifying the Roman stational church for the papal celebration, the Basilica Sanctae Crucis in Hierusalem (Basilica of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem), so called because it housed relics of the True Cross and because Helena, mother of Constantine, was supposed to have brought soil from the Holy City and spread it inside the church. This rubric is found in older writings describing the liturgy of the Roman church, but...
only appeared in a Carolingian mass antiphoner (such as the one for Senlis) around 850.\(^{18}\) Two tracts appear as the first musical items, the rubric for the first, “responsory gradual,” bespeaking the function of these solo chants, built as elaborate variations on a few simple formulae, to respond to the initial Scripture readings of the service.\(^{19}\) The reading of the Passion and the Solemn Prayers would follow. The Adoration of the Cross is a ceremony described at Rome as early as the 7th century, and may have been appropriated directly from Byzantium on the occasion of the recapture of the True Cross from the Persian army.\(^{20}\) This venerable tradition from the East, dating back to the 4th century as described by the pilgrim Egeria, seems to have been traditionally conducted in silence; however, in the first half of the 8th century, Psalm 118 and its associated antiphon \textit{Ecce lignum crucis} were appropriated from their former place in the processions to and from the church into the ceremony proper, with the instruction that the antiphon be sung continuously during the liturgical action.\(^{21}\) One of the Carolingian antiphoners makes

\(^{18}\) See the Good Friday liturgy transcribed from the “Corbie Antiphoner” in Hesbert, 95. The earlier liturgical writings include an ordo describing the Roman liturgy before 750, a copy of which ended up in Einsiedeln (central Switzerland), designated as OR 23 in Michel Andrieu, \textit{Les Ordines Romani du Haut Moyen-Âge} (Louvain, 1931–61), 3:271.


\(^{20}\) The “Old Gelasian Sacramentary” reads as follows: “And the priest comes in front of the altar, adoring the cross of the Lord and kissing it. And he says, “Let us pray.” ... After everything has been completed, everyone adores the holy cross and takes communion. (\textit{Et venit sacerdos ante altare, adorans crucem Domini et osculans. Et dicit: Oremus ... Haec omnia expleta, adorant omnes sanctam crucem, et communicant.}) Antoine Chavasee, \textit{Le sacramentaire Gélasien (Vaticanus Reginis 316): Sacramentaire presbytéral en usage dans les titres Romains au VIIe siècle} (Strasbourg, Université de Strasbourg, 1958), 89. On the appropriation of the Adoration of the Cross by Rome, see Louis van Tongeren, \textit{Exaltation of the Cross: Toward the Origins of the Feast of the Cross and the Meaning of the Cross in Early Medieval Liturgy} (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2000), 57.

\(^{21}\) H.A.P. Schmidt, \textit{Hebdomada sancta. Volumen alterum, Sectio II: Commentarius Historicus} (Rome: Herder, 1957), 796, summarizes the development in the Adoration of the Cross liturgy. For the relevant
explicit what must have been practiced in Rome as well: “[Sing] as much of the psalm as is necessary.”²² Psalm 118 is by far the longest psalm, with 176 epigrammatic verses, and so would be quite appropriate as accompaniment for a situation of uncertain length. Thus the first music associated with the Adoration of the Cross was variable in length, but highly consistent in textual content:

Ecce lignum crucis in quo salus mundi pependit. (Behold the wood of the cross on which hung the salvation of the world.)
Venite, adoremus. (Come, let us adore.)

Beati immaculati in via, qui ambulant in lege Domini. (Blessed are the blameless ones in the way, who walk in the law of the Lord.)

Ecce lignum crucis in quo salus mundi pependit. (Behold the wood of the cross on which hung the salvation of the world.)
Venite, adoremus. (Come, let us adore.)

Beati qui scrutantur testimonia ejus; in toto corde exquirunt eum. (Blessed are they who search his testimonies, who seek him with their whole heart.)

Ecce lignum crucis in quo salus mundi pependit. (Behold the wood of the cross on which hung the salvation of the world.)
Venite, adoremus. (Come, let us adore.)

Non enim qui operantur iniquitatem in viis ejus ambulaverunt. (Indeed, they who work iniquity have not walked in his ways.)
etc.

Both the antiphon and the psalm make reference to motion—ambulant (“walk”) and venite (“come”)—which would have been appropriate both for the procession to the ceremony and the actual ceremony of approaching and adoring the cross as well. The wood of the cross referenced in the antiphon was the relic of the True Cross, a mere splinter of wood carried in a reliquary by a deacon behind the pope in the procession, then inset into a large gem-covered cross for the Adoration.


texts, see Andrieu, Les ordines romani, 3:272, 294: “...canitur semper antiphona Ecce lignum crucis in quo salus mundi pependit. Venite, adoremus. Dicitur psalmus CXVIII.”
Added to all these Roman and Byzantine-Roman elements in the Carolingian book was the Gallican hymn *Pange lingua*—“Compose, tongue, on the glorious battle of battles, and concerning the victory of the Cross tell the noble triumph”—as well as the Greek-texted Byzantine-Gallican Trisagion—“Holy God, Holy Strong, Holy Undying, have mercy on us.” Finally, then, we come to the new *Popule meus* verses, absent from two previous Carolingian antiphoners (both c. 850) and now present in this antiphoner (c. 880).

The incipits reference texts from the Old Testament, in particular the Trial of Israel in the book of Micah and the Song of the Vineyard in the book of Isaiah. The two texts are given here, with italics indicating phrases and words brought into the chant text.

**The Trial of Israel (Micah 6:1–8)**

1 Audite quae Dominus loquitur:  
Surge, contende judicio adversum montes,  
et audiant colles vocem tuam.  
2 Audiant montes judicium Domini,  
et fortia fundamenta terrae;  
quia judicium Domini cum populo suo,  
et cum Israel dijudicabitur.  
3 *Popule meus, quid feci tibi?*  
aut quid molestus fui tibi? *Responde mihi.*  
4 *Quia eduxi te de terra Aegypti,*  
et de domo servientium liberavi te,  
et misi ante faciem tuam Moysen, et Aaron, et Mariam.  
5 *Popule meus, memento,*  
quid cogitaverit Balach, rex Moab,  
et quid responderit ei Balaam, filius Beor,  
de Setim usque ad Galgalam,  
et cognoscere justitias Domini.  
6 *Quid dignum offeram Domino?*  
curvabo genu Deo excelso?  
Numquid offeram ei holocausta et vitulos

---

23 The only text given is *Agios o theos,* although in comparison to other manuscripts it is relatively certain that the rest of the Trisagion in both Greek and Latin is meant to follow from this cue. The Trisagion up to its incorporation in the Carolingian liturgy is the subject of Chapter 4, while its performance and meaning at Saint-Denis will be addressed in Chapter 6.
anniculos?
7 numquid placari potest Dominus in millibus arietum,
aut in multis millibus hircorum pinguium?
numquid dabo primogenitum meum pro scelere meo,
fructum ventris mei pro peccato animae meae?
8 Indicabo tibi, o homo, quid sit bonum,
et quid Dominus requirat a te:
utique facere judicium,
et diligere misericordiam,
et sollicitum ambulare cum Deo tuo.

The Song of the Vineyard (Isaiah 5:1–7)

1 Cantabo dilecto meo
canticum patruelis mei vineae suae.
Vinea facta est dilecto meo
in cornu filio olei.
2 Et sepivit eam, et lapides elegit ex illa,
et plantavit eam electam;
et aedificavit turrim in medio ejus,
et torcular exstruxit in ea;
et exspectavit ut faceret uvas,
et fecit labruscas.
3 Nunc ergo, habitatores Jerusalem
et viri Juda,
judicate inter me
et vineam meam.
4 Quid est quod debui ultra facere vineae
meae,
et non feci ei?
an quod exspectavi ut faceret uvas,
et fecit labruscas?
5 Et nunc ostendam vobis
quid ego faciam vineae meae:
auferam sepem ejus,
et erit in direptionem;
diruum maceriam ejus,
et erit in conculcationem.
6 Et ponam eam desertam;
non putabitur et non fodietur:
et ascendent vepres et spinae,
et nubibus mandabo
ne pluant super eam imbrem.
7 Vinea enim Domini exercituum
domus Israël est;
et vir Juda
germen ejus delectabile:

a year old?
7 May the Lord be appeased with thousands of rams, or with many thousands of fat he goats? shall I give my firstborn for my wickedness, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?
8 I will shew you, O man, what is good, and what the Lord requires of you: Verily, to do judgment, and to love mercy, and to walk solicitous with your God.
et exspectavi ut faceret judicium,
et ecce iniquitas;
et justitiam, et ecce clamor.

Looking at full texts from later manuscripts, one sees that the chant texts include, besides quotations from the passages above,

1) text paraphrased generally from the Old Testament, listing benefactions of God to the people of Israel (e.g., *manna cibavi te*; “I fed you manna”) (cf. Deuteronomy 8:2, 3, 7);

2) other Old Testament quotations from Jeremiah 2:21 and Psalm 68:22; and

3) freely-composed (i.e., non-Biblical) text for the refrains (e.g., *parasti crucem Salvatori tuo*; “you prepared a cross for your Savior).

Here is a synopsis of these textual sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Scripture</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Popule meus, quid feci tibi? aut in quo contristavi te? responde michi. Quia eduxi te de terra Aegypti, parasti crucem Salvatori tuo.</em></td>
<td>Micah 6:3–4a</td>
<td>My people what have I done to you? or how have I grieved you? answer me. Because I led you out from the land of Egypt, <em>you prepared a cross for your Savior.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quia eduxi te per desertum quadraginta annis, et manna cibavi te, et introduxi in terram satis optimam, parasti crucem Salvatori tuo.</em></td>
<td>cf. Deuteronomy 8:2, 3, 8:7</td>
<td>Because I led you out through the desert for forty years, and fed you with manna, and led you into a land perfectly good, <em>you prepared a cross for your Savior.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quid ultra debui facere tibi, et non feci? Ego quidem plantavi te, vineam meam speciosissimam: et tu facta es mihi nimirum amara, aceto namque sitim meam potasti, et perforasti lancea latus Salvatori tuo.</em></td>
<td>Isaiah 5:4, Jeremiah 2:21, Psalm 68:22 (= John 19:28–9)</td>
<td>What more should I have done for you that I did not do? I indeed planted you as my most prized vine, and you have become exceeding bitter to me, indeed you gave me vinegar for my thirst, <em>and with a lance you pierced the side of your Savior.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The additions of Passion-related material (e.g., “you prepared a Cross for your Savior”) thus identify the speaker of the Old Testament passages retroactively as Christ, taking the union of Christ with the Old Testament God as a given.
One of the first liturgical books to transmit this full text is from Laon (about 80 miles northeast of Paris) from around the year 930, including semi-heighted neumes.²⁴ The melody is found with heighted neumes only slightly later in a manuscript from Limoges from 933–6, although with slight deviations from the more official books.²⁵ The chant study group Gregorianik has compared a number of early manuscripts and produced an edition of the text and melody, which is used in this study to represent the Carolingian version.²⁶ Looking at the first verse, one finds a neumatic style of text setting and four defined phrases, which we may call A, B, C, and D. Furthermore, there is a double cursus of these musical elements, with an additional repetition of C in the second cursus, giving A B C D A B C C D. In the following transcription, the various iterations of each element are given on top of each other to promote comparison. Note that phrase D in the second cursus is drastically altered to lead into the Trisagion, which, by the time of this manuscript, serves as a refrain in between the Popule meus verses.

²⁵ E.g., BnF lat. 1240. Date in Terence Bailey, *The Processions of Sarum and the Western Church* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1971), 83.
²⁶ *Beiträge zur Gregorianik* 48 (2009):11–16. Melodies are given in Solesmes square-note notation. Note that the melody as printed in the main staff is not the critical melody but rather the melody as found in modern chant books. In an auxiliary staff are given the Korrekturvorschläge, the suggestions for “restitution.” The critical melody (i.e., the modern melody with restitutions incorporated) is printed here with the kind permission of Franco Ackermans.
Example 0.1. The first verse of the Carolingian *Popule meus* verses

The progression of the four elements lends an arch-like shape to a cursus, with progressively higher notes being reached in elements A, B, and C. The modality is unclear, however. Modern chant books assign this verse to Mode 1 (D authentic),\textsuperscript{27} apparently due to the D cadence on *mihi*, but the rest of the melodic material is problematic if one is looking for markers of a D mode; indeed, most of the elements seem to be built on C, even though there is no C mode possible in the Carolingian eight-mode system. Modal ambiguity will play a key role in the analysis of Chapter 2, and we thus leave the modal question aside for now.

\textsuperscript{27} E.g., *Liber usualis*, 737.
The later verses employ these standard elements more or less faithfully, although sometimes with truncations, extensions, or melodic modifications. What follows are three analytical views of the entire Carolingian *Popule meus* verses: in full transcription, in text only, and in a chart with text incipits. Each of these views is useful for seeing various aspects of how the chant is constructed.
Example 0.2. The Carolingian *Popule meus* verses

\[ \text{A}\]
\[
\text{B}
\]
\[
\text{C}
\]
\[
\text{D}
\]
\[
\text{popule meus, quid fecisti bi?}
\]
\[
\text{aut in quo contrasti te? responde mihi.}
\]
\[
\text{qui aedu xi te de terra Aegypti:}
\]
\[
\text{para sti crucem Salvatori tuo.}
\]
\[
\text{qui aedu xi te}
\]
\[
\text{per desertum quadragintaannis, et manna civite,}
\]
\[
\text{et introdixi in terram salis optimam:}
\]
\[
\text{para sti crucem Salvatori tuo.}
\]
Quid ultra de bui facere ti-bi et non feci?

Ego quidem plantavi te

vi-ne-am me-am fructu deco-rum:

et tu facta es mi-li sa-tis a-ma-ra; ace-to nam-que si-timme-am po-ta-sti.

et lancea perfo-rasti la-tus Sal-va-to-ri tu-o.
Table 0.2. Text and full musical form of the Carolingian *Popule meus* verses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Syllables</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Popule meus, quid feci tibi? aut in quo contristavi te? responde michi.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>My people what have I done to you? or how have I grieved you? answer me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>Quia eduxi te de terra Aegypti, parasti crucem Salvatori tuo.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Because I led you out from the land of Egypt, you prepared a cross for your Savior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Quia eduxi te per desertum quadrqinta annis, et manna cibavi te, et introduxi in terram satis optimam, parasti crucem Salvatori tuo.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>[Agios. Sanctus.] Because I led you out through the desert for forty years, and fed you with manna, and led you into a land perfectly good, you prepared a cross for your Savior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D_1</td>
<td>Quid ultra debui facere tibi, et non feci?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>What more should I have done for you that I did not do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ego quidem plantavi te, vineam meam speciosissimam: et tu facta es mihi nimis amara, aceto namque sitim meam potasti, et perforasti lancea latus Salvatori tuo.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I indeed planted you as my most prized vine, and you have become exceeding bitter to me, indeed you gave me vinegar for my thirst, and with a lance you pierced the side of your Savior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A plus sign indicates an extension, while a minus sign indicates a truncation.
Table 0.3. Basic musical form of the Carolingian *Popule meus* verses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Popule meus</td>
<td>quid feci tibi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>aut in quo</td>
<td>responde mihi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quia</td>
<td>eduxi te</td>
<td>de terra egipti</td>
<td></td>
<td>parasti</td>
<td>salvatori tuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quid ultra</td>
<td>debui facere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego quidem</td>
<td>plantavi te</td>
<td>vineam meam</td>
<td></td>
<td>et tu facta es</td>
<td>et lancea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the Laon manuscript allows us to view a version of the melody about 50 years after it first appears in the liturgical record, it is reasonable to assume that we have the melody preserved for us near to the way that it was sung around 880. By the last quarter of the 9th century Carolingian modal theory was relatively solid. Why, then, would the modal character of the chant be so idiosyncratic in relation to the eight-mode system? Indeed it is reasonable to suggest from modal evidence alone that the Carolingian *Popule meus* verses were not newly composed at the time of their incorporation into the official liturgy as given witness by the Senlis Antiphoner.

If the Carolingian *Popule meus* verses were not newly composed, however, where did they come from? Were they part of one of the Gallican liturgies, and, if so, what was the reason for their incorporation into the official liturgy, with its Roman base, at this time? Why, also, would they be attached to the Trisagion, a chant already existing in the official Good Friday liturgy, with a storied history of its own? Finally, with the unique text of Christ reproaching “his people,” do the verses and their incorporation indicate anything about Christian-Jewish relations in the pre-Carolingian or Carolingian era? This study will provide answers to these questions through a combination of musical and cultural analysis.
The study begins in Chapter 1 with an investigation of patristic commentary on the main verse of the *Popule meus* chants, Micah 6:3. Approaching early chant history by way of patristic Biblical commentary offers several advantages. For one thing, it allows a means to deal with the text as it was perceived in the Late Roman Empire and Early Middle Ages prior to its accruing liturgical trappings. It also provides an entry point to three issues that will guide this and the following chapters: 1) cultural exchange between the Greek Christian East and the Latin Christian West, 2) variants in the *Popule meus* text as a clue to dating and transmission, and 3) understood identities of the speaker and intended recipient of the *Popule meus* text as a key to its cultural meaning. Perhaps the most practical reason for starting with the Church Fathers, however, is the benefit of a tractable starting point to discuss cultural developments which seem—from the liturgist’s perspective, and certainly from the musicologist’s—to emerge out of the mists of time. It is reasonable to assume—we cannot do much other!—that the interpretation of specific Scripture passages by the Church Fathers had a substantial influence on why and how these passages eventually ended up as liturgical texts.

---

28 In constructing a history of a liturgical element from before musical notation, as this and the next chapter propose to do, analysis of text and possibly-preserved melody must work together. The eminent chant scholar Michel Huglo suggested the approach we are taking to start in his *Les livres de chant liturgique* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1988), 53: “The critical study should thus begin with the search for Biblical and patristic sources. Are the chants taken from the Bible borrowed from the Old Latin versions or the Vulgate? Do the texts taken from the psalms come from the Roman psalter or the so-called “Gallican” psalter? Has the chant followed the order of the verses or disregarded it? The answer to these issues of textual criticism can sometimes help answer the question of a chant’s date or origin.” (*L’étude critique doit donc commencer par la recherche des sources bibliques et patristiques : les chants tirés de la Bible sont-ils empruntés aux anciennes versions latines ou à la Vulgate ? Les textes tirés des psaumes viennent-ils du psautier romain ou du psautier dit “gallican” ? Le chantre a-t-il suivi l’ordre numérique des versets ou bien n’en tient-il pas compte ? La réponse à ces problèmes de critique textuelle peut parfois permettre de répondre à la question de date ou d’origine des chants.*) While the examination of the content and meaning of patristic sources takes place in Chapter 1, the examination of textual variants in these sources and the *Popule meus* verses takes place most thoroughly in Chapter 2.

Chapter 1 shows that two Latin Church Fathers are responsible for two basic views of Micah 6:3 in the West that would precipitate the Popule meus chants. Jerome offers a basic allegorical interpretation, not connected explicitly to the Passion, that would lead to a “Roman” family of Popule meus chants. Ambrose offers much richer treatments of the verse, invoking both the Passion and the Last Judgment, that would lead to a “Gallican” family of Popule meus... parasti crucem chants including, eventually, the Carolingian Popule meus verses.

Chapter 2 provides the rationale for the hypothesis of these two families of chants through comparative melodic analysis and offers a working stemma that attempts to organize the history of the Western Popule meus chants. The Carolingian Popule meus verses are here suggested to descend from a hypothetical Gallican Popule meus chant that spawned a number of different Popule meus chants, including a set of verses in Aquitaine and a set of verses in the Narbonnaise / Provençal region.

Chapter 3 reconstructs the history of the first liturgical context for the Popule meus verses, the Ceremony of Indulgence, through an examination of legal material, the sermons of Ambrose and Caesarius of Arles, and the Old Hispanic liturgy. Commentary by Isidore of Seville additionally suggests that the Old Hispanic Popule meus verses were connected with the Last Judgment and the conversion of the Jews at the end of time. Comparison of Old Hispanic and Gallican liturgical texts, finally, lends support to a theory of a set of Gallican Popule meus verses within a ceremony similar to the Old Hispanic Ceremony of Indulgence on Good Friday or Holy Saturday morning in pre-Carolingian times.
Because the Carolingian *Popule meus* verses first appear paired with the Trisagion, Chapter 4 examines the transmission and meaning of this Eastern chant throughout the Christian world, including Spain, Gaul, and finally northern Francia under the Carolingians. It is shown that associations of the Trisagion with penitence and praise for an incarnated and crucified Christ were not unique to the Carolingian Good Friday service, but rather were culled from existing traditions.

Chapter 5 examines exegesis of Micah 6:3 in the Carolingian Empire, through the commentary of Haimo of Auxerre, to show how the verse could be used to support an ideal of properly ordered Christian hierarchy. The writings of Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims are examined next, paying particular attention to his quotation of the text of a *Popule meus* responsory from the Roman-based liturgical cycle, once addressed to the king, and once addressed to a subordinate bishop. Hincmar was also in charge of producing Carolingian coronation ceremonies, and his observed preference for using liturgy in order to create an image of a Christian ruler submissive to God is suggested as possibly precipitating the incorporation of the *Popule meus* verses into the official liturgy at Saint-Denis.

Chapter 6 reconstructs the action and meaning of the Good Friday liturgy at Saint-Denis under the abbacy of Charles the Bald through examination of extant poetry and visual art likely produced at the abbey. The paschal poetry of John Scottus Eriugena, the gold altar frontal of Saint-Denis, the Prayerbook of Charles the Bald, and contemporary and later liturgical records are analyzed in order to contextualize and re-imagine the ceremony of the Adoration of the Cross at the abbey. The chapter closes by considering late Carolingian views of the “others” outside and within their borders, that is, the
Northmen and the Jews, in order to gauge the possibility of anti-Jewish meaning in the 
*Popule meus* verses in the late 9th century. While the study as a whole finds the *Popule meus* chants of the Early Middle Ages not to be anti-Jewish, it is possible that the 
Carolingian *Popule meus* verses had a degree of anti-Jewish meaning, although one that 
would have paled in comparison to other meanings of penitence, Christendom, and 
salvation.
CHAPTER 1: “HE WHO TRIUMPHS WHEN HE IS JUDGED”:

AMBROSE AND THE OTHER CHURCH FATHERS ON MICAH 6:3

The historian Jaroslav Pelikan has defined Christian doctrine as “what the church of Jesus Christ believes, teaches, and confesses on the basis of the word of God.”1 The liturgy could be defined similarly, for the histories of doctrine and liturgy are parallel threads in the greater history of Christian exegesis. As has often been noted, “Christianity, like Judaism, is a religion of the Book.”2 And indeed, the starting point for both Christian doctrine and liturgy was the interpretation of the Jewish Scriptures, the precedent having been set by figures no less than Jesus, Peter, and Paul in the earliest Christian writings.3 By the 4th century, the widespread personal and corporate use of the Jewish psalms in Christian worship and the strong tradition of Christian exegesis of the Jewish Scriptures in sermons and doctrinal works were mutually complementary.4 Nearly as strong in the realm of exegesis, though not in the realm of liturgy, were the twelve Minor Prophets, including Micah.5 The bishops and scholars who taught this

3 E.g., Luke 4:16–21 (Isaiah 61:1–2), Matthew 10:34–36 (Micah 7:6); Acts 2:22–32 (Psalm 15:8–11), Acts 4:8–12 (Psalm 117:22); Romans 3:4 (Psalm 50:6). This last example, from the writings of Paul, influenced the Church Fathers’ interpretation of Micah 6:3, as this chapter will show. All references to Psalms in this dissertation will accord with the Septuagint and Vulgate numbering, which in most cases differs by one digit as compared to the Hebrew and Protestant numbering.
5 Megan Hale Williams summarizes: “Obscure and difficult as they are, these texts [of the twelve minor prophets] carried a disproportionate weight in early Christian messianic piety and anti-Jewish apologetics. The New Testament writers, especially Matthew and Paul, drew from them numerous proof-texts in support of their claims about Jesus. The critique of Israel and Judah advanced by prophets like Hosea, Amos, and Micah was a key element in early Christian anti-Jewish polemic.” Megan Hale Williams, The
exegesis of Scripture have been called the Church Fathers, and the period from 325 to 451 has been called the golden age of their writings. The focus of this period was that of defining doctrine, primarily that of the Father, the Spirit, and especially the Son. A small part of that grand project was providing a doctrinal exegesis of Micah 6:3:

My people, what have I done to you, or how have I wearied you? Answer me.

What the church of Jesus Christ believed and taught about this verse at this time would provide a foundation for what it would confess when the verse was incorporated into the liturgy.

Table 1.1. Quotations of Micah 6:3 by Christian Writers up to Isidore of Seville.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Greek Writers</th>
<th>Latin Writers</th>
<th>Quotations of Micah 6:3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 250</td>
<td>Origen of Alexandria</td>
<td></td>
<td>2–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 360</td>
<td>Didymus of Alexandria</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 370</td>
<td>Basil of Caesarea</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 370</td>
<td>Theodore of Mopsuestia</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 370</td>
<td>Gregory of Nazianzus</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 380</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ambrose of Milan</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 390</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 390</td>
<td>John Chrysostom</td>
<td></td>
<td>9–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 420</td>
<td>Cyril of Alexandria</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 440</td>
<td>Theodoret of Cyrus</td>
<td></td>
<td>2–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 450</td>
<td>Proclus of Constantinople</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 480</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vigilius of Tapsus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 500</td>
<td>Procopius of Gaza</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 540</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cassiodorus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 620</td>
<td></td>
<td>Isidore of Seville</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Johannes Quasten, The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature, from the Council of Nicaea to the Council of Chalcedon and The Golden Age of Latin Patristic Literature, from the Council of Nicaea to the Council of Chalcedon*, vols. 3 and 4 of *Patrology* (Utrecht: Spectrum and Westminster, MD: Newman, 1950–3). These years saw the Church councils of Nicaea and Chalcedon at their endpoints and have also been called the age of ecumenical church councils.
Table 1.1 indicates the early Christian writers who quoted Micah 6:3 and the number of these quotations, ordered chronologically according to a rough date of writing. Perhaps most striking is the fact that about half of the quotations occur in the writings of two Latin Fathers, Ambrose and Jerome, and one Greek Father, John Chrysostom, in the span of about two decades at the end of the 4th century. While these numbers are to some degree dependent on the size of the writers’ extant writings, it is noteworthy that there are no quotations of Micah 6:3, for example, in the works of Augustine. Also notable is the fact that Ambrose inaugurates the Latin interpretation of Micah 6:3 and contributes most prolifically to it.

As the following investigation will show, Ambrose is the first interpreter of the verse to connect it to issues of Christ’s identity, his Passion, and the Last Judgment, all major associations of the early non-Roman *Popule meus* chants (from which would come the Carolingian *Popule meus* verses). Jerome’s interpretation, in turn, with a more measured spiritual and moral interpretation centering on God’s benefits to Christians, seems to have most greatly influenced the early Roman *Popule meus* chants (preserved in the Gregorian Office). The interpretations of John Chrysostom, finally, are more literal in nature, focusing on the right of God or the Church’s spiritual leaders to chastise the people and, in one case, on the right of Jesus to chastise the Jews in the Gospel about his approaching Passion. This last interpretation most likely influenced a set of chants in the Byzantine repertory for Good Friday which are outside the bounds of this study.

---

7 Expanded from results of a query on the BIBLIndex website, which collates and augments the data from *Biblia Patristica: Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique*, 7 vols. (Editions du CNRS, 1975–82). Ranges of numbers of citations are based on either uncertainty of attribution (in most cases) or uncertainty of citation.

The purpose of this chapter is to preface our comparative examination of the texts and melodies of the *Popule meus* chants with a careful consideration of the writings that informed their origins and use. Because the Carolingian *Popule meus* verses are most readily traceable in terms of their hermeneutic lineage to Ambrose, he takes center stage in much of the chapter. His eight quotations will be discussed roughly chronologically, with the number of the quotation (1–8) listed in each subheading. Interspersed in the discussion of Ambrose’s eight quotations of Micah 6:3 are considerations of the Greek writers prior to and contemporary with him, with particular attention paid to how Ambrose both reaped from and diverged from the existing Greek tradition. The chapter closes with considerations of the interpretation of Ambrose’s slightly later contemporary, Jerome, and two later Latin writers, the exiled African bishop Vigilius of Tapsus and the retired Italian politician Cassiodorus.

**AMBROSE 1: ON THE FAITH**

In the Late Roman Empire, in the crucial decades of the late 4th century, an unbaptized governor of a region in northern Italy was thrust into the position of bishop by the acclamation of the populace of Milan.9 The son of the administrator of Gaul, educated in Rome, and then appointed governor of the region of Emilia-Liguria, Ambrose, although from a Christian Roman family, had no intentions of ever becoming a churchman.10 After being baptized and consecrated bishop, however, he took on his new

---

9 The general statements about Ambrose in this paragraph rely on Neil McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), PP.

10 For maps of this area in northwestern Italy, see McLynn, 283, and Chris Wickham, *Early Medieval Italy: Central Power and Local Society 400–1000* (London: MacMillan, 1981), xii.
office with the greatest zeal, learning even as he shepherded his new flock. Milan was then the second most important city in Italy, after Rome, and the frequent visits of the emperors to Milan allowed Ambrose to wield considerable power as a churchman adviser to the emperors. Ambrose also took up the pen and wrote on orthodox belief in opposition to various heresies for the benefit of both his local flock and Roman Christianity as a whole. Finally, his recorded homilies and his exegetical writings are concerned with revealing mystical and moral meaning in the Scriptures to the individual initiated Christian. Ambrose was a man involved in a broad swath of cultural activity in the Late Roman Empire, and his citations of Micah 6:3 occur across these various contexts.

The context which most strongly defined Ambrose’s early career as bishop, from the mid-370s to the mid-380s, was the Nicene-Arian conflict. Following Constantine’s Edict of Milan in 313, which granted religious tolerance within the Roman Empire to Christianity, a debate which had surfaced in the early years of the 4th century started becoming more and more divisive. The debate centered on the nature of Christ—it was accepted that he was the Son of God, and yet there was uncertainty over whether this meant that he had always existed, being equal to and “of the same substance” as Father

---

11 The following summary is culled from The Cambridge Ancient History, Second Series, ed. Averil Cameron et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970–2005). In the second half of the 3rd century, Milan first became an administrative center of the Roman Empire, “sub-capital” of northern Italy (12:64, 76, 172), and later was the actual imperial capital of the Western Empire (12:235). It was Milan’s choice location in the imperial network of roads that apparently led to its elevation in political status (12:235, 249). Milan’s political apogee, as Western imperial capital opposite Constantinople in the East, came in between the reigns of Constantine and Honorius, that is, in the mid-to-late 4th century, with Ambrose being the dominating churchman of this time (12:251). In 403–4, the exiled Eastern bishop John Chrysostom wrote to the bishops of Rome, Milan, and Aquileia to assist him in regaining the bishopric of Constantinople (13:563). In 402 Ravenna would become the capital of the Western Roman Empire through the time of Cassiodorus, who is the subject of the end of this chapter (13:120; 14:74, 82).

12 See section below on On the Offices (De fide).

God, or that he had a beginning, being in submission to and “of a similar substance” as Father God. Arius, a presbyter or leader in the church at Alexandria, was the primary codifier and spokesperson for the latter view, which came to be known as Arianism. Constantine called for a council of bishops which met in Nicaea in 325, which ruled in favor of the former view and produced a statement of belief, the Nicene Creed, which codified this anti-Arian, or Nicene, view. Constantine was not as concerned about orthodoxy as a unified Christian Church, but his involvement in this matter set a precedent which actually prolonged the conflict rather than ending it: emperors from this point on were generally Nicene or Arian and interested in promoting their version of the faith. Finally, the co-emperors Gratian and Theodosius issued the Edict of Thessalonica in 380 and the bishops of the Empire, at the Council of Constantinople in 381, issued an expanded version of the Nicene Creed; these two documents signal the end, or at least the waning, of the Nicene-Arian conflict.

Ambrose’s first recorded citation of Micah 6:3 occurs right around this time, either in 378 or 380. After his first few years as a bishop, focused on civil peacekeeping and personal study, he made his first bid for theological, political, and personal hegemony in the polemical tract De fide (“On the [Nicene] Faith”). It was a decisive move. The populace of Milan was made up of significant portions of both Arian and Nicene Christians, and his acclamation by the people as bishop back in 374 had come in the wake of the death of the previous (Arian) bishop of Milan as he was

---

14 The date of 380 is a more recent suggestion; see McLynn, 102, n.90. The traditional date of 378 is still supported by Daniel Williams, *Ambrose of Milan and the End of the Arian-Nicene Conflicts* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 140.
speaking to the restless crowd in his role as governor. Although Ambrose came from a Nicene Christian family, he had displayed tolerance when dealing with the debate in his political office and had made no sudden shift in his policy in his new ecclesiastical office—until now.

The intended recipient of the tract was the Western Emperor Gratian himself; Ambrose identifies his reason for writing in the prologue as a request from Gratian, who had apparently “commanded the setting forth of the Faith in a book” for his approval. The purpose of the tract is to incontrovertibly demonstrate the truth of the Nicene position, against those of pagans, Jews, and heretics; it is generally organized into heretical points and refutations, backed up by Scriptural prooftexts. Yet the style of the work is varied and dramatic, as might be preached aloud. Indeed, the climax of Book 2, where we find Ambrose’s first extant use of the verse Micah 6:3, is a dynamic depiction of Judgment Day, where Christ, as the supreme Judge appointed by the Father, hears the testimony of heretics and then responds to them in turn.

To provide a context for this climax, we must look at another imagined trial from near the beginning of Book 2. Ambrose plays the role of intermediary in both. In this first trial he takes as his point of departure the Arian interpretation of the statement by Jesus, “Why dost thou call me good? None is good but God alone.” To controvert the Arian claim that this verse proves the inequality of Jesus with God, Ambrose first points out that Jesus uses the term “God” in this verse and not “the Father,” thus, according to

---

16 Prologue to Book 1 of *On the Faith*, translated, under the title of *Exposition of the Christian Faith*, by H. de Romestin, in *St. Ambrose: Select Works and Letters*, vol. 10 of NPNF, Second Series (1896), 201. For more on this work in its historical context, see Williams, 128–153.
Ambrose, calling the entire Trinity “good.” To further prove the impugned goodness of the second member of the Trinity, Ambrose suggests that the Son be “submitted to our judgment”:

Let us not call him good, if he merit not the title; and if he merit not this by works, by acts of lovingkindness, let him waive the right he enjoys by virtue of his nature, and be submitted to our judgment. He who is to judge us disdains not to be brought to judgment, that he may be justified in his saying and triumph when he is judged [cf. Psalm 50:6].

This is the first of many times that we shall see Christ described as submitting to the judgment of humans, with Psalm 50:6 being used as a proof text. Upon this follows an enumeration by Ambrose, the fervid interlocutor, to his listeners of the good works of Christ to the Jewish people, taking Christ to be the author, and even the substance, of each of the major theophanies (appearances of God) in the Exodus story. For example:

Is he not good, at whose command the seas became firm ground for the feet of them that fled, and the rocks gave forth water for the thirsty? so that the handiwork of the true Creator might be known, when the fluid became solid, and the rock streamed with water? That we might acknowledge this as the handiwork of Christ, the Apostle said: “And that rock was Christ” [1 Corinthians 10:4].

In five total statements, each beginning with the words, “Is he not good,” Ambrose moves seamlessly through history, from the Jewish to the Christian story, at the climax changing his rhetorical structure:

Not only, then, is he good, but he is more. He is a good Shepherd, not only for himself, but to his sheep also, for the good shepherd lays down his life for his sheep. Aye, he laid down his life to exalt ours...

After thus proceeding from the redemption of Israel in the passage through the Red Sea to the redemption of Christian believers in the sacrifice of the Cross, having fully laid out

---

19 Ibid.
20 Ibid., 226–7.
his evidence, Ambrose begins wrapping up his argument in a form momentarily personal: “It is to my interest to esteem my Judge to be good.”\textsuperscript{21} Having submitted Christ to judgment, he reminds the jury that the defendant is only temporarily in that role. When the theme of judgment returns later in the chapter, Ambrose describes a second trial which occurs after the first one fails, with tables turned: “Howbeit, if our adversaries cannot be turned by kindness, let us summon them before the Judge.”\textsuperscript{22}

This second trial is set in Heaven and described in a mix of present and future tense, granting immediacy while yet warning of the future. Ambrose first invites the assembled crowd of heretics to present their “accusations” against the Judge to find out if their contempt will gain his favor; the sarcasm here is evident.\textsuperscript{23} A dialogue is then given between these heretics and Christ the Judge, with five “accusations” about the nature of Christ and five answers from the mouth of the Judge himself. These answers extend the accusers’ logic into self-damning outcomes. For example: “‘That you are Almighty, I hold not;’ and he will answer, in turn: ‘Then can I not forgive you your sins.’”\textsuperscript{24}

Ambrose steps in to advise the accusers, who have quickly become the defendants, of their best interests: “I see your accusation halt here. I press you not, forasmuch as I myself know my own sins. I grudge you not pardon, for I myself would obtain indulgence.”\textsuperscript{25} He asks them to present their prayers, rather than their accusations, to the Judge. They present heretical prayers, which engender a dialogue much as before, with similar damning outcomes. Finally, three groups of heretics, seemingly stalwart in

\begin{footnotes}
\item\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 227.
\item\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 237.
\item\textsuperscript{23} Also see, ibid., par. 102.
\item\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 238.
\item\textsuperscript{25} Ibid.
\end{footnotes}
their failing situation, come forward one last time to present their best accusation against
the Judge, with the Judge replying similarly to before, but with longer and more intense
replies.

Any other accusations can be set aside, Ambrose says; what will be the sentence
of the Judge? Heretofore, the Judge seems to have been stoically rational at best and
angry at worst, and the reply given is both surprising and laden with emotion. This is
Ambrose’s rhetorical lynchpin for the whole scene:

To all these he will, indeed, reply, rather in sorrow than in anger: “O my
people, what have I done unto you, wherein have I vexed you? Did I not
bring you up out of Egypt, and lead you out of the house of bondage into

Ambrose cannot help but join in, stimulating the extending of the Judge’s speech:

But it is not enough to have brought us out of Egypt into freedom, and to
have saved us from the house of bondage: a greater boon than this, you
have given yourself for us.27 You will say then: “Have I not borne all your
sufferings? Have I not given my body for you? Have I not sought death,
which had no part in my godhead, but was necessary for your redemption?
Are these the thanks I am to receive? Is it this that my blood has gained,
even as I spoke in times past by the mouth of the prophet: ‘What profit is
there in my blood, for that I have gone down to corruption?’ Is this the
profit, that you should wickedly deny me—you, for whom I endured those
things?”28

Ambrose himself passes over what the heretics might answer and instead
gives his own response to the Judge, the need for personal repentance overriding
the issue of others’ condemnation.

As for me, Lord Jesu, though I am conscious within myself of great sin,
yet will I say: “I have not denied you; you may pardon the infirmity of my
flesh. My transgression I confess; my sin I deny not. If you will you can

26 Ibid., 239.
27 It is interesting to note here the structural parallel with the Dayenu. See the discussion of Eric Werner’s
work in the Introduction.
28 Ibid., with some words, like “Body” and “Blood,” decapitalized.
make me clean. [Matthew 8:2] For this saying, the leper obtained his request. Enter not, I pray, into judgment with your servant. I ask, not that you may judge, but that you may forgive.”

The actual “verdict” is given in the next chapter, and it deals less with Ambrose, heretics, or any of humankind than it does with Christ himself. We do not need to await a verdict, Ambrose says, for it has already been given: “‘Let all,’ says he, ‘honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. He that honors not the Son, honors not the Father, who has sent him’” [John 5:23]. Ambrose invites the heretics to appeal to the Father to cancel this verdict. Again replies to heretical statement are given, this time from God the Father. The fourth and final of these has God the Father quoting himself from the Gospel scene of the Transfiguration:

Tell him that you owed no credence to the Son, whereto he will answer: “Did I not say to you, ‘This is my well-beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased: hear him’?” [Matt 17:5].

Ambrose reminds them that when the apostles heard these words of the Father, they “fell upon their faces” [Matt 17:6]. When the apostles had fallen down at these words, Ambrose concludes, Jesus put his hand on them and raised them up, but “you he will suffer to lie prone, that you may see not the glory you have denied.” The moral of the story could not be clearer:

Let us look to it, then, forasmuch as whom the Son condemns, the Father condemns also, and therefore let us honor the Son, even as we honor the Father, that by the Son we may be able to come to the Father.

---

29 Ibid.
30 Ibid.
31 Ibid., 240.
32 Ibid.
33 Ibid.
This is how the courtroom scene ends, with the heretics flat on their faces, and the Nicene plan of salvation ringing in the air. Ambrose finishes off the book with an afterword addressed directly to the emperor.34

Looking back now at the use of Micah 6:3 and 4, including Ambrose’s rhetorical extension, one may note several things. First and foremost, this verse from the Hebrew Scriptures proceeds unambiguously from the mouth of Christ. Every writer who had commented on these verses before Ambrose simply had them coming from the mouth of God or “the Lord.”35 Secondly, in the listing of benefactions, beginning with and then expanding on Micah 6:3 and 4, the events of the Exodus story lose their historical nature and acquire a spiritual sense, applied to the present-day Christian believer: “[You] brought us out of Egypt...”36 This is in contrast to the treatment of these events in the first trial, where, even though Christ is taken to be the author and even substance of the benefactions, they are still firmly historical: “Is he not good, who when six hundred thousand of the people of the Jews fled before their pursuers, suddenly opened the tide of the Red Sea...”37 Indeed, time is collapsed in this second trial, as the Exodus, the Crucifixion, the lifespan of the heretics and Ambrose, and the Last Judgment are combined. Finally, even though the verses Micah 6:3 and 4 are introduced as being directed at those Christians who have strayed egregiously, their immediate effect is

34 Ibid., 240–2.

35 Origen uses both; Didymus uses “God”; Basil uses “the Lord”; Theodore of Mopsuestia uses “God”; Gregory of Nazianzus uses “God.” This demarcation point is at once exact and inexact. It is exact because the speaker is, in Ambrose’s quotation, unambiguously Christ. It is inexact because the term “Lord” was intentionally used by Christians from at least the time of the writing of the New Testament to signify a shared identity between God and Christ. See Stanley Porter, “Images of Christ in Paul’s Letters,” in Images of Christ: Ancient and Modern, ed. Stanley Porter et al. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 101–5 and Pelikan, The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition, 175 and 177.

36 Trans. de Romestin, St. Ambrose, 239.

37 Ibid., 226.
personal, inward repentance by none other than the archbishop Ambrose, who had, up to that point, been serving as interlocutor. In fact, the Micah verses have no visible effect on the heretics; it is only a later verse, spoken not from the mouth of Christ but from the mouth of God the Father, that leaves the heretics on their faces.

All the material quoted here from Ambrose’s *On the Faith* sounds more like a sermon, in both structure and style, than a dogmatic or apologetic tract. Its appeal, built on the combined forces of Scripture, logic, drama, and emotion, seems designed, not just to persuade, but to convert. Perhaps most notable in this regard is the rhetorical device of stopping at a high point to address a personal prayer to Jesus, which is characteristic of Ambrose’s sermons and is something that we shall see again later. Christ here is a powerful but caring Judge, even sorrowful, to whom the orthodox Christian may freely pray so as to obtain salvation, with Ambrose himself setting the example. In short, Ambrose’s Christology is firmly connected here to soteriology.

In this tract, then, Ambrose certainly goes beyond an answer to Gratian’s call for “a book expounding the Faith”; he musters all his logical and homiletic might to make sure that the emperor and anyone else who heard the tract would be firmly committed to the Nicene-defined Christ.

GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS

To further contextualize Ambrose’s first recorded use of Micah 6:3 just outlined, let us cast a glance to the East to see how the verse was being used in the Greek language at this same time. The 33rd sermon of Gregory of Nazianzus, delivered in the summer of

---

38 See below, in Ambrose’s *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*.
39 The doctrine of salvation.
379, is also directed at heretics. Gregory, delivering one of several sermons in an attempt to win the city of Constantinople from Arianism back to the Nicene position, immediately singles out the Arians as he begins speaking and then seems to react to their uproar:

Where are they who reproach us with our poverty, and boast themselves of their own riches; who define the Church by numbers, and scorn the little flock; and who measure Godhead...? Are you again indignant? Do you again arm yourselves? Do you again insult us? Is this a new faith? Restrain your threats a little while that I may speak. We will not insult you, but we will convict you; we will not threaten, but we will reproach you; we will not strike, but we will heal. This too appears an insult! What pride! Do you here also regard your equal as your slave? If not, permit me to speak openly; for even a brother chides his brother if he has been defrauded by him.

Apparently feeling that his opening has made enough of an impact in subduing the crowd, Gregory uses Micah 6:3 as something of a thesis statement for all that follows in the sermon, traditionally entitled “On the Arians and concerning himself”:

Would you like me to utter to you the words of God to Israel, stiff-necked and hardened? “O my people what have I done unto thee, or wherein have I injured thee, or wherein have I troubled thee?” This language indeed is fitter from me to you who insult me.

In the Greek, the quoted part of Micah 6:3 is given as Laos mou, ti epoiesa soi, e ti edikesa se, e ti parenochlesa soi. Gregory’s citation is notable for using a word not found in the Septuagint for this verse: edikesa (“injured”) instead of the usual elupesa

---

40 Rosemary Ruether, *Gregory of Nazianzus: Rhetor and Philosopher* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969), 178. As was noted earlier, Ambrose’s *On the Faith* was written in either 378 or 380; thus, Gregory’s sermon may have been delivered before or after Ambrose’s tract was available, and, in the latter case, there is no evidence that Gregory knew Ambrose’s work.

41 Ibid., 42.


43 Ibid., 329. To accord with other translations in this chapter, I have replaced Browne and Swallow’s “wearied” with “troubled,” which is an acceptable rendering of the original text.

44 Ἀδός μου, τι ἐποίησά σοι, ἢ τι ἡδίκησά σε, ἢ τι παρηνώχλησά σοι (PatGraec 36 col 216).
This stronger word appears about 250 years later in Greek Good Friday chants of the 7th century mentioned in the Introduction, giving further evidence that, at least in the East, patristic commentary on Micah 6:3 contributed directly to liturgical chant.

It is noteworthy that Micah 6:3 is used by both Ambrose and Gregory of Nazianzus against Arian heretics, and in both cases, they rely on a comparison between the historical nation of Israel and present-day heretical Christians. In the next two passages to be examined, however, Ambrose provides additional options for the addressee of Micah 6:3. In one he generalizes the addressee to be simply the “wicked” of the psalms; in the other he implies that the addressee could be the Jews of the Passion. Both of these interpretations come from a single work: The Cry of Job and David (De interpellatione Job et David).

AMBROSE 2 AND 3: THE CRY OF JOB AND DAVID

The overall subject of The Cry of Job and David, written between 387 and 389, is the problem of evil and God’s salvation of the just, and, most importantly, how the just should pray in an evil world. In Book III, Ambrose works his way through Psalm 72, he uses Micah 6:3 in his exposition of verse 18: “But indeed for deceits you have put it to them [the wicked]: when they were lifted up you cast them down.” The first part of the

---

45 The construction *ti edikesa se* is used in the Septuagint version of Jeremiah 37:18, where it is translated as “What crime have I committed against you”: “Then Jeremiah said to King Zedekiah, ‘What crime have I committed against you or your attendants or this people, that you have put me in prison?’”

46 The word *edikesa* was also used by the later writers John Chrysostom and Proclus of Constantinople in Micah 6:3 in the meantime. Later in the sermon Gregory makes a parallel of his trial of trying to win over the Arian mob to the events of the Passion of Christ, saying that his current suffering is not worth “the spittings and blows,” “the one crown of thorns,” and so forth. This passage, while in the same sermon as his quotation of Micah 6:3, is so far removed from the actual quotation (separated by 11 sections) that I would be hesitant to connect the two.

47 Also known as Book III, including in PatLat 14, col. 845.
verse, he says, means that God gives generously to the wicked so that they cannot give any excuse—so that “complaining might be foreclosed and distress piled up.” Thus, though it may look like favor or grace for God to continually bless the unjust, it is actually a catastrophe, in view of the great fall that awaits them, the “distress piled up.”

And how is their complaining foreclosed? Through Micah 6:3:

> For what complaint carried greater weight than that divine complaint which you find in the book of the prophet Michea, “O my people, what have I done to you or wherein have I grieved you or how have I wearied you? Answer me. Did I not bring you up out of the land of Egypt and deliver you out of the house of bondage?”¹⁰⁸

Again Ambrose implies a judicial context: not only does God’s abundance acquit him of any charge, God’s complaint indicts perfectly, making any complaint of humankind invalid. Indeed, perhaps more than anything else, a judicial context tends to emerge each time Ambrose quotes Micah 6:3. His preoccupation with and seasoned understanding of judicial terms and issues undoubtedly reflect on his former occupation of governor: “I was snatched into the priesthood from a life spent at tribunals and amidst the paraphernalia of administrative office, and I began to teach you...”⁴⁹ More generally, though, in the Early Church, and especially in the 4th century, it was easy to see Christ as the ultimate imperator, whose heavenly court exhibited all the power and dread of that of the earthly emperor. This is perhaps why Ambrose suggested to the heretics in the second trial scene of On the Faith that he would be begging indulgence if he were in their

---

¹⁰⁸ Trans. Michael McHugh, Saint Ambrose: Seven Exegetical Works, vol. 65 of FCNT (1972), 381
⁴⁹ On the Offices, Book 1, Chapter 1. Égo enim raptus de tribunalibus atque administratiois infulis ad sacerdotium, docere vos coepi... Ivor Davidson, Ambrose: De Officiis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 118–19.
place; indulgence was something granted on occasion by emperors to criminals.\textsuperscript{50} This reading of Christ as highest \textit{imperator}, moreover, only emphasizes the paradox of Christ submitting himself for judgment in the first trial scene of \textit{On the Faith} and in this second citation of Micah 6:3 in \textit{The Cry of Job and David}.

In Book IV\textsuperscript{51} of the tract Ambrose works his way through Psalms 41 and 42, relatively short psalms that are linked together by similar phrases. Micah 6:3 is applied in a discussion of the opening of Psalm 42: “Judge me, O God, and distinguish my cause from the nation that is not holy.” On one hand, this verse could be interpreted from the mouth of David, which would be the literal or historical sense. On the other hand, Ambrose continues, a prophetic interpretation is perhaps more apt:

Many suppose that this sentiment [in Psalm 42:1] should be attributed to the Lord Jesus, because it belongs to him alone not to fear judgment, as the one who overcomes when he is judged [cf. Psalm 50:6]. Indeed, he has judgment from the unjust man, and into it Christ entered willingly, as you find it written, “O my people, what have I done to you? Or wherein have I grieved you?” [Micah 6:3].\textsuperscript{52}

This proof text Psalm 50:6, of course, is not new; it was used by Ambrose to inaugurate the first trial of \textit{On the Faith}. The verse comes from Psalm 50, a psalm which held a special place in Christianity early on.\textsuperscript{53} The verse reads in full: “To you only have I

\textsuperscript{50} The concept and practice of \textit{indulgentia} in court and liturgy will be examined in Chapter 3. Note that, since the Western imperial court was in Milan at the time of Ambrose, the bishop may have been more familiar than most with the practice of imperial \textit{indulgentia}. This too will be examined in Chapter 3.\textsuperscript{51} Identified as Book II by some, including in PatLat 14, col. 811.\textsuperscript{52} Trans. McHugh, 413–14.\textsuperscript{53} In the 4th-century \textit{Sayings of the Desert Fathers}, for example, Abba Lucius is quoted as saying that his normal existence consists of weaving palm leaves while quoting the first verse of Psalm 50: “Have mercy on me, O God, according to your great mercy: and according to the multitude of your mercies do away with my iniquity” (Psalm 50:3; verses 1 and 2 of the Vulgate numbering are the title of the psalm). \textit{Psalms 51–150}, ACCS (2007), 2. In early monasticism, Psalm 50 was chanted by the monks as they moved from one place to another, for example, from the refectory to the church. Joseph Dyer, “The Singing of Psalms in the Early-Medieval Office,” \textit{Speculum} 64, no. 3 (Jul. 1989):545. This psalm does not hold a comparable place in the Jewish liturgy. Susan Gillingham, \textit{Psalms Through the Centuries}, Blackwell Bible Commentaries (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2008), 71.
sinned, and have done evil before you: that you may be justified in your words, and may overcome when you are judged.” The final verb of the verse is rendered in this way, as passive, in the Septuagint, the New Testament (Romans 3:4), the Old Latin, and the Vulgate. The Hebrew text, and most modern English translations, have this verb in the active voice: “when you judge.” Paul (in Romans 3:4) and the Church Fathers all comment on the verse in the former rendering. Indeed, it is only this version that allows the interpretation we have seen Ambrose give it, which would come to be associated more and more with Micah 6:3 over the span of his writings.

So far, the meaning of Psalm 42:1 is relatively straightforward: the speaker, asking for his case to be separated from that of evil people, can be interpreted as Christ, as David, or, implicitly, as the righteous Christian, following in the path of David and Christ. As long as the evil ones of Psalm 42:1, the implied judges of the end of Psalm 50:6, and the addressees of Micah 6:3 are kept undefined, the listener can take the prerogative to “distinguish [his own] cause from the nation that is not holy.” If Christ is taken to be the speaker, however, Ambrose seems to warn, guilt falls squarely on two parties—the Christian and the Jews of the Passion:

But since the Father has given all judgment to him [cf. John 5:22], not indeed as if to one that was weak but as if to a Son, what judgment can he undergo? If they think that the Son must undergo the Father’s judgment, surely “the Father does not judge any man, but all judgment has been given to the Son, that all men may honor the Son even as they honor the Father” [John 5:22-23] The Father honors the Son, and do you put him to judgment? We have expressed this thought here, so that no one would think that we substituted the figure of the psalmist in the Lord’s place out of fear of inquiry. Holy David foresees in spirit that the Jews will rise up against the Lord in his passion. Since he [David] is not greatly afraid of the judgment upon his own faith, he beseeches that his own case be distinguished also from a nation of persecutors. Else, the stock of the
entire Jewish race could be implicated with those wicked heirs of his own race and posterity.  

Ambrose has again turned the tables. Whereas Christ enters into judgment willingly, the would-be judges end up condemned. It is made clear that, in a historical sense, these judges are none other than the Jews of the Passion; however, in a moral sense, these judges are Ambrose’s Christian listeners: “The Father honors the Son, and do you put him to judgment?” It is noteworthy the Ambrose does not use Psalm 42:1 to distinguish the cause of righteous Christians from unrighteous Jews. There are rather two groups of Jews identified—the righteous Jews, exemplified by David, and the unrighteous Jews, exemplified by the Jews of the Passion—and only one group of Christians. Are Christians righteous or unrighteous? The answer would seem to be both. In the overall arc of the treatise, which examines the prayers of righteous men of the Old Testament, Christians are certainly implied to be the righteous ones praying in the midst of evil. In this particular passage, however, Ambrose takes a pastoral detour, asking, “Do you put him to judgment?” Inasmuch as Micah 6:3, then, can be applied in a literal sense to the historical Jews of the Passion, it can be applied in a moral sense to the individual Christian. This is indeed the meaning found, in a more straightforward exposition, in the next passage.

AMBROSE 4: LETTER 41

This fourth passage of Ambrose is from a sermon he gave in the presence of the emperor, recorded in a letter he wrote to his sister. Here the connection between the Jews and the individual Christian is made explicit from the start:

---

54 Ibid., 414.
You see how ready to teach the Lord is, that he may by his own example provoke you to piety, for he is ready to teach when he rebukes. So when accusing the Jews, he says: “O my people, what have I done to you, or wherein have I troubled you, or wherein have I wearied you? Answer Me. [Micah 6:3] Is it because I brought you out of the land of Egypt, and delivered you from the house of bondage? [Micah 6:4a]” adding: “And I sent before your face Moses and Aaron and Miriam [Micah 6:4b]. Remember what Balaam conceived against you, [Micah 6:5], seeking the aid of magic art, but I suffered him not to hurt you. [cf. Numbers 23:2]”

Ambrose then reemphasizes the benefactions listed in the Micah verses and elaborates on them, chronologically following the story of the Israelites from their bondage in Egypt through their conquest of southern Canaan under Joshua; he concludes the passage with Micah 6:8: “And now what is required of you in return for all this, but to do judgment and justice, to love mercy, and to be ready to walk with the Lord your God?”

The context of this exposition was a sermon delivered in Milan, while the emperor Theodosius was present. Ambrose parallels the Micah list of benefactions by referencing and extending the list of benefactions cited by the prophet Nathan to David when David had had Uriah, the husband of Bathsheba, killed.

And what was his [the Lord’s] expostulation by Nathan the prophet to King David himself, that pious and gentle man? I, he said, chose you the youngest of your brethren, I filled you with the spirit of meekness, I

---

56 Recall that Micah 6 takes the story as far as Gilgal, where the Israelites camped after crossing the Jordan but before taking Jericho, the first city in Canaan to fall to them. (See, however, Jerome’s rival explanations of Gilgal below.)
57 This is the verse that would conclude the Micah pericope when it was incorporated into the Old Hispanic liturgy. The verse has for centuries been taken as emblematic of the substance of religion, from the writings of rabbis predicting Ambrose to the United States Library of Congress, where it is inscribed above the religion alcove. ‘‘This verse stands as the motto of the alcove of religion in the reading room of the Congressional Library in Washington.’ Politicians have quoted it often in their election campaigns... Numerous accolades have been showered on it. For example, von Rad says, ‘This is the quintessence of the commandments as the prophets understood them.’ J. M. P. Smith calls it ‘the finest summary of the content of practical religion to be found in the OT.’ And Boadt observes, ‘The rabbis who commented on this verse in the early centuries of the Christian era called it a one- line summary of the whole Law.’” Ken Barker and Waylon Bailey, *Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah*, vol. 20 of *The New American Commentary* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1998), 113. Here, and perhaps in the Old Hispanic liturgy as well, it gives an answer to the predicament of God’s righteous anger exemplified in Micah 6:3.
anointed you king by the hand of Samuel, in whom I and my Name dwelt. Having removed that former king, whom an evil spirit stirred up to persecute the priests of the Lord, I made you triumph after exile. I set upon your throne of your seed one not more an heir than a colleague. I made even strangers subject to you, that they who attacked might serve you, and will you deliver my servants into the power of my enemies, and will you take away that which was my servant’s [i.e., Uriah’s wife Bathsheba], whereby both yourself will be branded with sin, and my adversaries will have whereof to rejoice. [cf. 2 Samuel 12: 7-14] 58

Emperor Theodosius would have known by this time that Ambrose was using the entire sermon to demonstrate the bishop’s dissatisfaction with one of Theodosius’ decisions, for Ambrose had recently written him a letter including a parallel passage with the lives of David and Theodosius conflated.

And what will Christ say later to you? Do you not recall that he sent word to blessed David through Nathan the Prophet? I have chosen you, the youngest of your brethren, and have made you an emperor from a private individual. The fruits of your seed I have put upon the imperial throne. I have made barbarian nations subject to you; I have given you peace; I have brought your captive enemy into power... I, then, caused you to triumph over your enemy, and are you giving my enemies a triumph over my people?59

The issue at hand in both the letter and the sermon was Theodosius’ decision about the destruction of a synagogue in the easternmost realm of the Empire, in Callinicum, in the province of Mesopotamia. Ambrose accurately described what transpired in a letter to his sister: “It was reported by a count of military affairs in the East that a synagogue was burned, and this at the instigation of a bishop. You [Emperor Theodosius] gave the order for those who were involved to be punished and the synagogue rebuilt at the bishop’s expense.”60  

Ambrose’s objection to this decision

60 Ibid., 9. The entire situation, the sermon, and its ramifications are summarized in *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, s.v. “Ambrose” (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1901), 1:488–9, and examined more fully in McLynn, 298-309.
represented multiple larger issues, such as the relationship between Christian and Jews (“Will you grant the Jews this triumph over God’s Church?”61) and the Church and the State (“If you consult your officers on money matters, how much fairer is it to consult the Lord's priests on a religious matter!”62). He closes the letter with a warning, avowing his writing of this letter was done “honorably, that you might hear me in the palace rather than make it necessary to hear me in the Church.”63

The emperor did not rescind his decision and heard an earful in Ambrose’s church while he was staying in Milan. Ambrose’s themes of anti-Judaism and the emperor’s subjection to God by way of a bishop now make his preface to the Micah passage in his sermon somewhat more complicated: “You see how ready to teach the Lord is, that he may by his own example provoke you to piety, for he is ready to teach when he rebukes. So when accusing the Jews, he says: ‘O my people, what have I done to you...’” Even while most congregants were hearing a simple exhortation to piety, the emperor was receiving a refresher on not only his piety, but also relations between Jews and Christians and Church and State.

AMBROSE 5: DEFENSE OF THE PROPHET DAVID

Ambrose’s interchanges with the emperor certainly influenced the next, fifth, usage of Micah 6:3 in his writings. It is in a work entitled The Defense of the Prophet David (Apologia Prophetae David), written between 388 and 389, which pointed to

---

61 Ibid, 14.
62 Ibid., 17. Ambrose had long been a proponent of bishops’ power in relation to that of the emperor, as at the anti-Arian Council of Aquileia in 381, where he is recorded as saying, “This is what a Christian Emperor has ordained. He has not thought fit to do an injury to the Bishops: he has constituted the Bishops themselves Judges.” St. Ambrose of Milan, Letters, vol. 45 of A Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, Anterior to the Division of the East and West, ed. E.B. Pusey (Oxford: Parker, 1881), 34.
63 Ibid., 19.
David as a model of an ideal king and repentant sinner; unsurprisingly, it was dedicated to Emperor Theodosius. The usage of Micah 6:3 is located in a section of the treatise expositing Psalm 50, entitled “For the end, a Psalm of David, when Nathan the prophet came to him, when he had gone to Bersabee” and thus traditionally associated with David’s adultery with Bathsheba. This usage of Micah 6:3 brings together many of the themes we have seen developing in Ambrose’s treatment of the verse. Here, Psalm 50:6 and Micah 6:3 are treated as tandem verses.

How great, then, the crime, that a man denies that he is a sinner? For insofar as this claim is made, one sees the lie denounced and refuted by the most high God, he who is so restrained and long-suffering, that he may triumph when he is judged [cf. Psalm 50:6]. For God comes to judgment and says: “My people, what have I done to you, or how have I grieved you, or how have I troubled you? For I led you out of the land of Egypt, and from the house of servitude I liberated you, and sent before you Moses, Aaron, and Mariam. My people, bring to mind what Balak thought of you” [Micah 6:3–5]. One by one he places his benefits before your eyes, that you might judge what you owe, what a great debt you have, that you would not be able to stand by reason of the benefits.

What is most interesting about this passage is that the theme from Psalm 72—that the words of the wicked become irrelevant at God’s complaint—is now spun out in the context of the sinner who repents, with the model being no less a figure than King David. The passage can be recognized as parallel to ones already used by Ambrose in direct address to the emperor.

In this same trial consider how the Lord to David himself produces himself for judgment, that he might be victorious; for Nathan says, “Thus saith the Lord the God of Israel: ‘I anointed you king over Israel, and I delivered you from the hand of Saul, and gave you your master’s house and your master’s wives into your bosom, and gave you the house of Israel and Juda: and if these things be little, I shall add far greater things unto you. Why therefore have you despised the word of the Lord, to do evil in

---


65 My translation; cf. the French translation by Cordier in *Ambroise de Milan: Apologie de David*, 147.
my sight?’” [2 Kings 12:7–9]. Having arrived at the remembrance of these, when he saw how he came off worst when he was judging, he said, “I have sinned against the Lord” [2 Kings 12:13]. Thus the one who did not dare to deny his sin justified the Lord.66

The final step of penance justifies the sinner in addition to the Lord:

Indeed, in the Gospel, one sees that “the publicans justified God in receiving the baptism of John” [Luke 7:29]. And John the Baptist gave “a baptism of penitence.” And he who makes penance does not refuse to recognize his sins. Therefore, since David had his fault always before him, he also did not deny that of which he was shameful—he did not deny what he recognized. And, because he did not deny it, he made penitence [repented] of his error and thus, by the confession of his fault, he justified the Lord and was himself justified by the Lord.67

This detailed construction of a biblical soteriology relies much, not only on Psalm 50, but on Paul’s letter to the Romans, as well as its interpretation by Origen, the 3rd-century Alexandrian theologian. The next section thus examines the Greek tradition from which Ambrose drew his soteriological application of Micah 6:3.

ORIGEN, DIDYMUS, AND BASIL

Origen’s commentary on Romans, written at least a century before the work of Ambrose under discussion, has several lacunae at the point of interest for this discussion, but one can follow his train of thought:

Indeed, no item is left as an excuse for any man who has in his heart an innate knowledge of the law [cf. Romans 2:1, 15] [lacuna] When everyone’s mouth is closed [Romans 3:19b] and the world is liable to the condemnation of God [Romans 3:19c], then God is justified in his words and triumphs in his trial [Psalm 50:6b = Romans 3:4b] [lacuna] who indeed, when he understands things like “O my people, what have I done to you? How have I grieved you? How have I troubled you? Answer me” [Micah 6:3]—who would have the nerve to respond and escape the punishment to which the world is liable? [lacuna]68

66 Ibid., 149.
67 Ibid.
68 My translation of the French translation given alongside the Greek text in Jean Scherer, Le commentaire d’Origène sur Rom. III. 5-V. 7 : d’après les extraits du papyrus no 88748 du Musée du Caire et les
Another passage, possibly by Origen,

“And enter not into judgment with thy servant: for in thy sight no man living shall be justified” [Psalm 142:2]. When the Lord contends with man by trial, and will have said, “My people, what have I done to you, or how have I grieved you?” [Micah 6:3], no one living will be justified: for in the sight of the Lord none of all the living will be justified; and in the sight of men not only of the unjust, but also of the just and when he will be justified. Because he will not be justified, then, it will have agreed with this verse: “That you may be justified in your words, and triumph when you are judged” [Psalm 50:6].

The key point of these two passages of Origen is that, at the complaint of God, none is justified except for God, and all humans are condemned. Yet in a further passage, in a commentary on Job, Origen’s soteriology of Micah 6:3 takes a crucial step:

So great is the kindness of God, that he covers the person not with judging, but in speaking reason with man, which many Scriptures have shown. “Come, and let us settle the matter, says the Lord” [Isaiah 1:18]. And “my people,” God moreover disputes with his people, “my people, what have I done to you, or how have I dismayed you? Answer me.” and so forth.

The rest of Isaiah 1:18—“if your sins be as scarlet, they shall be made as white as snow: and if they be red as crimson, they shall be white as wool”—is not quoted by Origen, but seem to be implied by his adumbrated soteriology. Origen’s thoughts here seem to be the origin of the following passages by Didymus the Blind and Basil of Caesarea. Didymus was also commenting on Job when he wrote the following:

“Did you [God] not even notice him [short-lived man] and let him come to trial before you?” [Job 14:3] One can certainly say that this is consistent with the previous text by connecting them as follows: ‘When the one born
of woman is short-lived and full of misery, so that he resembles a fallen flower and a fleeting shadow, you have yet observed him and not overlooked him, so that he comes to trial before you’ [Job 14:1-3, altered]

This is proved by what God says: “My people, what have I done to you?” [Micah 6:3] and again, “Behold, I will contend with you” [Jeremiah 2:35] God, who exhibits such care for men, would then, not so unmoved and so implacable, require penance from men, which atones in the opinion of the friends of Job. Rather this is added to Job to prove that he is suffering for no other reason than that his righteousness is revealed, according to the word “Do you think that I have treated you for any other reason than that your righteousness be revealed?” [Job 40, 3b, Septuagint]71

Basil, in a commentary on Isaiah, written around 370, also followed and extended Origen, quoting Isaiah 1:18 in its entirety:

“And then come, and let us arbitrate, says the Lord. Though your sins were as purple, [they will be] cleansed like snow; and if they were like scarlet, [they will be] cleansed like wool” [Isaiah 1:18]. These types of statements we generally discover in Scripture, as though God would descend to judge equally with men. Of such kind is even this: “The very Lord will enter into judgment with the senior ones of his people and with its leading ones” [Isaiah 3:14]. Similarly this, which you find in Micah: “Hear now the word of the Lord, says the Lord: Arise to judge with the mountains, for the Lord will arbitrate with his people, and with two peoples. My people, what have I done to you, or how have I grieved you, or how have I troubled you? Answer me” [Micah 6:1-3]. And certainly it is fitting that the divine judgment not be tyrannical, but rather equitable among these, who are judges among men, rendering the places pure by judgment.72

One can see from this brief survey of predecessors to Ambrose that Micah 6:3 had been associated both with a blanket condemnation of humans by God and his saving of suffering individuals like Job and humankind in general. Scholars agree that Ambrose read Origen, Didymus, and Basil, moreover, in the original Greek.73 His developing

71 My translation of the German translation given alongside the Greek text in Ursula Hagedorn, Dieter Hagedorn, and Ludwig Koenen, Didymos der Blinde: Kommentar zu Hiob (Tura-Papyrus), Teil IV.1, Kommentar zu Hiob Kap. 12,1–16,8a (Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GMBH, 1985), 126–9.

72 My translation of the Latin text given alongside the Greek text in PatGraec 30 col. 199–202.

73 “In learning Christian theology Ambrose relied on his knowledge of Greek. His curriculum consisted of the Greek tradition—Origen, Basil, Hippolytus of Rome, Eusebius of Caesarea, Didymus the Blind, Gregory Nazianzus, and Athanasius, as well as Jewish writers such as Philo and Flavius Josephus.
interpretation of Micah 6:3 was undoubtedly influenced by his reading and re-reading of these authors.

AMBROSE 6: ON THE OFFICES

A sixth use of Micah 6:3, in the work On the Offices (De officiis) from the late 380s, seems at first to be simply a revisiting of the Psalm 72 usage, where the wicked are showered with seeming blessings so that they have no excuse against God’s judgment:

It may be said also to the man who has abundance of good things: I have blessed you with children and honours; I have granted you health of body; why did you not follow my commands? My servant, what have I done to you, or how have I grieved you? [cf. Micah 6:3] Was it not I that gave you children, bestowed honours, granted health to you? Why did you deny me? Why did you suppose that your actions would not come to my knowledge? Why did you accept my gifts, yet despise my commands? 74

Yet the replacing of the words “my people” with “my servant” recalls Jesus’ parables of the wicked servants who earn the Master’s judgment upon his return, thus implicating not the heathen, but Christians. 75 Furthermore, Ambrose gives the disciple Judas as an example of this situation:

We can gather the same from the example of the traitor Judas. He was chosen among the Twelve Apostles, and had charge of the money bag, to lay it out upon the poor, [John 12:6] that it might not seem as though he had betrayed the Lord because he was unhonoured or in want. Wherefore the Lord granted him this office, that he might also be justified in him; he would be guilty of a greater fault, not as one driven to it by wrong done to him, but as one misusing grace. 76

McLynn contends that Ambrose had to meet the standard set by Auxentius . . . in order to meet the expectations of the Milanese congregation. ... In addition to providing for his own theological training, knowledge of Greek enabled Ambrose to introduce much Eastern theology into the West...” Craig Satterlee, Ambrose of Milan’s Method of Mystagogical Preaching (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2002), 84.

74 Trans. de Romestin under the title The Duties of the Clergy, in St. Ambrose (1896), 12.
76 Trans. de Romestin, 12.
If the Christian listener had been smug at the start of this passage, he would be certainly worried at this point, for the charge of “misusing grace” (*praevaricatus gratiam*) was a serious one, even worse than the simple condemnation of the sinner.\textsuperscript{77} Indeed, one of Ambrose’s themes, in this work directed to the clergy of his metropolitan diocese, is that of increased responsibility and higher standards. This work, and this citation of Micah 6:3 was undoubtedly influential on the cadre of bishops Ambrose trained and sent out to various cities in northern Italy, cities in which the first *Popule meus* chant may have arisen. Its taking of the “other” as a mirror of “self” is a paradigm that Ambrose had been developing since *On the Faith*.

\textbf{AMBROSE 7: COMMENTARY ON LUKE}

A seventh use of the verse, in Ambrose’s *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*, returns to the heavenly courtroom, with Christ as Judge. This time, however, there are no heretics and no Jews to be seen; there are just Christians. Just as in the miracle of the feeding of the multitude,

\begin{quote}
So the Lord took pity on us, not wanting anyone to faint on the way [cf. Matthew 15:32]. But should anyone faint, it is not the fault of the Lord Jesus, but the person’s own fault. You cannot blame the Lord, who “triumphs when he is judged” [Psalm 50:6]. What will you have to say to him who did so much to strengthen and affirm you? Did he not create you? Did he not nourish you? His nourishment is strength, his nourishment is courage. But if you have, by your negligence, squandered the resources he gave you, you cannot complain that heavenly nourishment was wanting to you...
\end{quote}

Imagine for a moment that we are appearing before Christ’s Tribunal, and that, if our work burns [cf. 1 Corinthians 3:15] we shall have no excuse. For he shall say to us what the prophet said long ago: “My people, what

\textsuperscript{77} Ibid., 502. The word *praevaricatio* is used, for example, in an imperial law of 388, subsequently incorporated into the Theodosian Code, as a description of the activities of heretics, and is defined as “falsehood, treachery, apostasy” in an explanatory note to Constitution 16.5.15 in Clyde Pharr, *The Theodosian Code* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952), 453n41.
have I done? In what way have I been a burden on you? Answer Me’” [Micah 6:3]. He will say to the one who fell by the wayside: Why did you fall? Didn’t I give you bread? Didn’t I bless the bread? Didn’t I tell you to share it? Why then did you refuse to receive it?” Among you who are here present, how many will fall by the wayside? Yes, you will fall even after hearing my sermons... But supposing that someone were to fall, it is not the fault of Jesus that they fall: he distributes bread to all who follow him...78

We now have a combination of the heavenly courtroom and the judging of the wicked servant (from On the Faith and On the Offices, respectively). After fashioning his use of Psalm 50:6 and Micah 6:3 over the years, he has arrived at a usage that will strike fear into the hearts of his flock and thus motivate them to pursue the Christian life, relying on the nourishment of courage of their Savior.

AMBROSE 8: COMMENTARY ON TWELVE PSALMS

In his final use of Micah 6:3, in a commentary on Psalm 36, Ambrose puts all the pieces together and ends, after much warning and threatening, with the salvation of the Christian, simply by the grace of God. Commenting on Psalm 36:32 and 33—“The wicked watches the just person, and seeks to put him to death. But the Lord will not leave him in his hands, nor condemn him when he is judged”—Ambrose first allows the more straightforward reading of the last three words, with “he” representing the just person, but then explores the meaning if “he is judged” in the manner of Psalm 50:6, where he triumphs when he is judged.

Here [in Psalm 50:6] the Lord is giving us to understand that it is himself who is being judged and judged in order that he might be vindicated. In what way does he show that he is giving himself up to be judged? Listen to this: “My people, what have I done to you, in what ways have I saddened or offended you? Tell me. I brought you out from Egypt, and freed you from the house of slavery [Micah 6:3-4].” In another place the

Lord says: “I am he, I am he that blots out your iniquities for my own sake; and I will not remember your sins. Remember, and let us enter into judgment [Isaiah 43:25-26].”

A solemn judgment, indeed, when the Lord asks to be judged against man. For what witness could you give against one who has given you the universe; has set you over all things; subjected to you the Egyptians whose guest you were; and later drowned them in the sea? He slew your enemies and blotted them out; but you he created and made strong. With his own blood he redeemed you, and are you going to betray him and serve his enemy? He wiped out all your sins, and you propose to commit worse ones? He is calling you. When you come to judgment, what reply will you make to him, you who are as good as dead unless he pardons you yet again? ...What should be the punishment of one who has thrown away so much grace, so much done for him by the Lord, and the likeness to the divine beauty? Yet, so merciful is the Lord that he actually subjects himself to judgment; the just, however, he will not judge, but he will judge the unjust. The just he will spare, knowing that he sinned through the frailty of his human condition. The unjust he will punish, because God detests ingratitude.79

Having begun this examination of Ambrose’s use of Micah 6:3 more in the realm of Christology, we now end firmly in the realm of soteriology. The Lord, who here is understood to be Christ, given the reference to his Passion, “subjects himself to judgment” and mercifully spares from judgment the just, understood, also given the reference to the Passion, to be Christians. As in the previous passage, Christians are without excuse for despising the benefactions of Christ. These benefactions include a spiritual Exodus story and entry into the Promised Land, as well as the very real shedding of his blood for redemption and wiping away of sins. The rhetorical depiction of the despising approaches parallelism: “With his own blood he redeemed you, and are you going to betray him and serve his enemy? He wiped out all your sins, and you propose to commit worse ones?” Yet the initial terror experienced by the Christian at the pronunciation of Micah 6:3, guilty of despising, at least to some extent, his

benefactions, gives way to the relief of simple undeserved pardon. Micah 6:3, then, as the words of a Crucified Christ both terrifying and tender, is thus primed by Ambrose for use in the liturgy of Good Friday.

JEROME AND JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

Jerome’s primary interpretation of Micah 6:3 comes from his first major exegetical work, his Commentary on the Twelve Minor Prophets, of which the commentary on Micah was written around 393, six years after he had established himself in Bethlehem. Jerome’s exegetical work is more scholarly and systematic than Ambrose’s sermon-like exposition. Taking the scriptural text a few verses at a time, he first provides his own translation into Latin from the Hebrew, followed by a Latin version of the Septuagint, labeled “LXX.” His commentary is similarly bifurcated into, first, the literal and historical meaning of the text, using his translation from the Hebrew text and other Hebrew sources, and, second, the allegorical Christian meaning of the text. His allegorical interpretation is based primarily on that of Origen, and thus tends to follow the Latin version of the Septuagint; Jerome saw both versions of the text as having distinctive strengths, with a complex relationship between the two. Jerome’s reliance on Origen, as in the case of Ambrose, can be seen in his use of Psalm 50:6 directly before he quotes Micah 6:3. In contrast, although it is probable that Jerome had read some of Ambrose’s citations of Micah 6:3, his apparent ignoring of Ambrose’s approaches to the
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81 This latter text was taken to be the standard Old Latin version of Micah 6 by the 18th-century scholar Sabatier. Williams cites a different interpretation: that it is “a Latin version of Origen’s recension of the Septuagint” (119).
82 Williams, 114.
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pericope is not surprising, considering his disparaging of the bishop of Milan multiple times in his writings.84 His use of the spiritual method of interpretation is consistent with his general two-fold approach, and, in fact, seems to display mostly original interpretation on his part.

Verses 3 through 5 of Micah chapter 6 are treated as an interpretive unit. Jerome first gives the two versions of the text, marking with an obelus (⁺) the phrase aut quid contristavi te in the ‘LXX’ version, signaling it as an addition in comparison to the Hebrew text. After noting two other textual variants he proceeds to exposit the literal sense of the verses.

God, then, speaks to the people of Israel, provoking them to judgment, and presenting them with a license to argue against him. “My people, what have I done to you” that I should not have done? [cf. Isaiah 5:4?] “Or how have I grieved you?” (although this is not found in the Hebrew), whereas a father grieves a scourged son, and a shepherd visits the iniquities of the sheep with the rod. “How have I been troubling to you?” or, as the meaning is written in the Hebrew, “with what labor did I oppress you?”

Or will you take my benefactions as an insult, and, desiring the Egyptian melons and meat, will you suffer pain in being led from the land of Egypt, and also in being liberated through my aid from the house of servitude, because I gave you leaders—Moses my friend, and Aaron my priest, and Mariam my prophetess? But if this appears a small thing to you, call to mind those times when Balaak king of Moab contracted by bribe Balaam the prophet against you, and see how, against his will, the soothsayer, desiring to curse you, blessed you: from Settim until Galgal, beholding the whole army of Israel, and moving from place to place, just as I could not proceed with proceeding, and pass through with passing through: and this I did, that my mercy and justice might be known to you, and the extent of my love for you, that I daily with the mouth curse the blaspheming ones, that I would not leave you to be cursed by the enemy.

84 See Ivor Davidson, “Ambrose and Jerome,” in Elizabeth Livingstone, ed., Augustine and His Opponents: Jerome and Other Latin Fathers After Nicaea (Louvain: Peeters, 1997), 295–301. In 393, the very year that he was writing his commentary on Micah, Jerome catalogued Ambrose in his list of “illustrious men” with the following description: “Ambrose, bishop of Milan, continues writing down to the present day. Concerning him I postpone judgment in that he is still alive lest I get blamed for flattery, on the one hand, or, on the other, for telling the truth.” On Illustrious Men: Saint Jerome, trans. Thomas Halton, vol. 100 of FCNT (1999), 158.
In the Hebrew, this place where it says “from Settim until Galgal, that you may know the justice of the Lord,” is thus explained: From that time which you fornicated with [the women of] Midian [Numbers 25] until the time Saul was anointed king at Gilgal [1 Kings 10], recall the memory of the evil you worked, and how much good I did, that you might know my mercy among you. Taken as history, God is speaking this to the carnal Israel.85

The literal exposition thus bookended, Jerome proceeds to the spiritual exposition of the passage, the meaning for “us” Christians.86

But to us who desire to contemplate the unveiled glory of the face of the Lord [cf. 2 Corinthians 3:18], and who truly have father Abraham, we hear God disputing against us as we sin, and proving to us the magnitude of his benefactions. We were of course ever slaves of Pharaoh, and we made mud and bricks for the Egyptian people, and he redeemed us “who gave himself the redemption for all” [1 Timothy 2:6], that we who were redeemed by the Lord, who were redeemed from the hand of the enemy, and who were brought together out of the regions, might say “for his mercy endureth for ever” [Psalm 106:1]. He likewise sent before our face Moses the spiritual law, and Aaron the great priest, not bearing the typological ephod, but the true one, having in front the seal of sanctity that God the Father sealed. And he sent Mariam, the predictions of the prophets, and she not only made good on her promises; she liberated us from the hands of the enemies. We call to mind therefore what was plotted against us by he who wished to devour our congregation and lick it clean, the true Balaak, the devil.87

This continues with a complex exposition about what “from Settim to Gilgal” means for the Christian based on the Septuagint text, hinging on a word in the Septuagint that he had identified as a scribal error. The argument, which is more or less a string of etymologies, need not be reproduced here, yet the conclusion is worth noting: whereas the phrase “from Settim to Gilgal” is taken by Jerome to be a reminder to Israel of how
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85 PatLat 25, col. 1208. Jerome includes more definite citations of Isaiah 5:4 along with Micah 6:3; these are discussed as a group below.

86 A general of precedent of interpreting the Micah pericope allegorically was noted by Louis Brou; one who interprets the passage in this way is “following Jerome and so many mystics.” Louis Brou, “Les impropreurs du Vendredi-Saint,” Revue grégorienne 20 (1935):174; also see 172 and 172 n1.

87 PatLat 25, col. 1208–9.
they have failed to live up to God’s goodness, for the Christian it becomes a formula to be spoken in adversity:

If ever we should see any arising against us, and greedy jaws thirsty for our blood,.. we say, “Balaam from cords [funiculis, a Latin translation of the Greek scribal error schoinoi] comes to Galgal, that the justice of God might be made known.”

In his exposition of the next section of the pericope (“What shall I offer to the Lord that is worthy?”), Jerome contrasts the insufficiency of Israel’s sacrificial system and the redemption of humans by the death of the Son of God. We thus see that Jerome’s spiritual interpretation will often make reference to Christ’s death as a sine qua non of Christian experience; Micah 6:3 and the Passion of Christ are however not explicitly connected. Micah 6:3 still belongs in the mouth of God for Jerome, even though one of his benefits for us is the redemption accomplished by his Son. The distinction between the interpretation of Ambrose and Jerome can be roughly applied to the distinction in meaning between Popule meus chants with the Christian addition to Micah 6:3—“you prepared a cross for your Savior—and those without it, as Chapter 2 will suggest.

Jerome’s remaining citations of Micah 6:3, written between 406 and 415, display an increased recourse to Chrysostom and other 4th-century Greek Fathers. The primary reason for this, and for the attendant reduction in his use of allegory, was the controversy over the orthodoxy of Origen, which began just after his commentary on Micah was written. Prior to the controversy, Jerome had championed Origen; now he labored to disassociate himself from the erudite but perhaps heretical Alexandrian theologian.

Jerome’s second citation of Micah 6:3 occurs in his commentary on Hosea, dated to
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It is notable for using Isaiah 5:4, a verse first used with Micah 6:3 by Chrysostom, which would stand alongside Micah 6:3 in the Carolingian *Popule meus* verses as well.

More notable, perhaps, is the purely historical interpretation. When [the Lord] says, “What shall I do to thee, O Ephraim? What shall I do to thee, O Judah?” he shows the affection of a father towards his lost children, according to that which we read in the book of Isaiah: “What more should I do to my vineyard that I have not done to it?” [Isaiah 5:4]. And in Micah: “O my people, what have I done to you, or how have I troubled you? Answer me. For I brought you up out of the land of Egypt, and delivered you out of the house of slaves: and I sent before your face Moses, and Aaron, and Mariam [Micah 6:3–4].

Jerome’s depiction of the tender voice of the Lord toward the historical Jews, the voice of “a father towards his lost children,” is remarkable for its lack of censure. A similarly beneficent voice of the Lord speaks, with a recommended soteriology for the Jews, in Jerome’s third citation of Micah 6:3, from 408–10, commenting on Isaiah 43:24–6:

Your sins, Jacob and Israel, have been very wearisome to me, and I could hardly bear the burden of your iniquities [cf. Isaiah 43:24]; and if, instead of calling you my servants, I only give you the name Jacob and Israel, it is to show that I reprimand sinners. And yet, for my own sake—because I am kind and patient and my mercy is inexhaustible—I efface all your iniquities [cf. Isaiah 43:25a] in sprinkling and in the blood of the New Testament. I will destroy the old covenant, which was written against you, and I will not remember your sins [cf. Isaiah 43:25b], which I will forgive you in baptism, if you will wish to believe. “Put me in remembrance” [Isaiah 43:26a]: if you have anything of justice to respond to me I will gladly accept it: “and let us be judged at the same time” [Isaiah 43:26b]: and accuse me [cf. Isaiah 1:18] of not having done that which I should have done [cf. Isaiah 5:4]. We find this sense more fully developed in Micah: “O my people, what have I done to you, or how have I troubled you? Answer me. For I brought you up out of the land of Egypt, and delivered you out of the house of slaves: and I sent before your face Moses, and Aaron, and Mariam” [Micah 6:3–4]. And in the fiftieth psalm, David says to God: “That you may be justified in your words and triumph when you are judged” [Psalm 50:6].

---
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The use of Isaiah 1:18 here is probably taken most directly from Basil, from the quotation examined above, while the use of Isaiah 5:4 likely comes from Chrysostom. The use of these verses to explain the actual passage under discussion, Isaiah 43:24–6, however, is novel.

Jerome’s final citation of Micah 6:3 occurs in his commentary on Jeremiah, dated to 414, over two decades after his commentary on Micah.94 His use of the passage is literal and historical, with neither the allegory of his original commentary nor the recommendation for the salvation of the Jews of the second and third passages:

“Therefore the Lord, O house of Jacob, and all the families of the house of Israel. Thus says the Lord: ‘What wrong did your fathers find in me that they went far from me, and went after worthlessness, and became worthless?’” [Jeremiah 2:4-5] Another prophet also relates this idea: “O my people, what have I done to you? In what have I wearied you? Answer me! For I brought you up from the land of Egypt and redeemed you from the house of bondage” [Micah 6:3-4]. The names of both Jacob and Israel are used with reference not only to the twelve tribes but also to all the people, since it was Jacob himself who came to be known as Israel...95

Again, Jerome displays a reliance on Chrysostom, for Jeremiah 2:5 was used by Chrysostom, along with Isaiah 5:4, in the most distinctive of his passages citing Micah 6:3, in his 68th Homily on Matthew.

The context of Chrysostom’s quotation of Micah 6:3, Jeremiah 2:5, and Isaiah 5:4 in his homily is the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (or Tenants) (Matthew 21:33–44). In this parable, a landholder plants a vineyard and cares for it, as in the Parable of the Vineyard of Isaiah 5. He lets it out to tenants and then, at harvesttime, sends his servants to collect the produce. The tenants beat and kill the servants. The landholder
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then sends his son, whom the tenants also kill. The landholder comes and punishes the tenants and lets out the vineyard to other tenants that will be more faithful. The Jewish leaders who heard this parable “knew that he [Jesus] spoke of them” (Matthew 21:45). Chrysostom details the traditional interpretation of the parable, following this pronouncement of Matthew’s Gospel:

Many things does he [Jesus] intimate by this parable, God’s providence, which had been exercised towards them from the first; their murderous disposition from the beginning; that nothing had been omitted of whatever pertained to a heedful care of them; that even when prophets had been slain, he had not turned away from them, but had sent his very Son; that the God both of the New and of the Old Testament was one and the same; that his death should effect great blessings; that they were to endure extreme punishment for the crucifixion, and their crime; the calling of the Gentiles, the casting out of the Jews.96

He contrasts this vineyard parable to the vineyard parable of Isaiah 5, quoting Micah 6:3.

Whereas Isaiah 5:4, Micah 6:3, and Jeremiah 2:5 are a more sorrowful judging of the vineyard itself, representing the entire people of Israel, Jesus’s parable narrows the charge to those tending the vineyard, that is, the leaders of the people.

Now the Prophet Isaiah says that he blames the vineyard, but here he accuses in particular the rulers of the people. And there indeed he says, “What ought I to have done to my vineyard, that I did not” [Isaiah 5:4]; and elsewhere again, “What transgression have your fathers found in me?” [Jeremiah 2:5] And again, “O my people, what have I done unto you? And wherein have I grieved you?” [Micah 6:3], showing their thankless disposition, and that when in the enjoyment of all things, they requited it by the contraries; but here he expresses it with yet greater force. For he does not plead himself, saying, “What ought I to have done that I have not done?” but brings in themselves to judge, that nothing has been wanting, and to condemn themselves. For when they say, “He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out the vineyard to other husbandmen” [Matthew 21:41], they say nothing else than this, publishing their sentence with much greater force. With this Stephen also upbraids them [cf. Acts 7:52], which thing most of all stung them, that having enjoyed always much providential care, they requited their benefactor with

---

the contraries, which very thing itself was a very great sign, that not the punisher, but the punished, were the cause of the vengeance brought upon them.97

Micah 6:3 here is thus, on one hand, connected with Jesus’s foretelling of his Passion towards the end of his ministry.98 It also seems that Chrysostom, implicitly relying on the ambiguous title “Lord,” has allowed that the Son be the speaker of Micah 6:3 in the Old Testament. On the other hand, Chrysostom is careful to not collapse Bible history, and the Old Testament prophecies of Micah 6:3, Isaiah 5:4, and Jeremiah 2:5 are only compared to New Testament passages, not equated with them. Thus, although this homily of Chrysostom is anti-Jewish—if we take Jesus’ parables themselves and a firm Christian successionism to mark anti-Judaism—his milder explanation of Micah 6:3 is consistent with Jerome’s mild and even positive use of Micah 6:3 with respect to the Jews.

What is the contribution of Jerome, then, to Latin interpretation of Micah 6:3? In his primary interpretation, given in his commentary on the book of Micah itself, he expands upon the Greek tradition built on Origen to produce a standard allegorical reading without the flair and variability of Ambrose’s interpretations. This work would have been the defining interpretation of Micah 6:3 among his learned readership in Rome, where Jerome had influential connections.99 I thus suggest that this particular passage was the most instrumental in the formation of the Popule meus chants of the Roman and Gregorian Office; the passages of Ambrose, on the other hand, would be most instrumental in the formation of the Popule meus . . . parasti crucem chants, which

97 Ibid., 416 (italics mine).
99 Rebenich, Jerome, 41–2.
would become most closely associated with Good Friday in non-Roman liturgical traditions before the Carolingian reform. Jerome’s later interpretations add further elements to the Latin tradition by drawing on more recent Greek interpretation, not incorporated into Ambrose’s writings. Although Chrysostom did not hesitate in producing anti-Jewish rhetoric, most obviously in his collection of homilies “Against the Jews,” he (and Jerome after him) employs a literal approach to Micah 6:3 which keeps it firmly in the Old Testament. Jerome’s use of Micah 6:3 in this vein even mitigates against anti-Judaism by suggesting that the judgment of Micah 6:3 does for Jews what it does for Christians: convince them of their sinfulness and lead to their ultimate salvation. Finally, Jerome’s use of Isaiah 5:4 with Micah 6:3 in all but his last cursory quotation of Micah 6:3, one quoted exactly, and twice in paraphrase, is almost certainly behind the Quid ultra verse of the Carolingian Popule meus verses.

VIGILIUS

At this point we bypass the remaining Greek citations of Micah 6:3, as they, and the Greek Micah 6:3 chants of the 7th century, are outside the bounds of this study. The three remaining Latin uses of Micah 6:3 before Isidore’s (to be discussed in Chapter 3) come from the later 5th century and mid-6th century and offer no substantial new interpretation compared with that of Ambrose, Jerome, and the Greek Fathers. Indeed, all three of the excerpts were possibly written when the authors were in Constantinople, suggesting that Greek interpretations may have been more influential than Ambrose’s or Jerome’s for them. Vigilius of Tapsus, a North African bishop who went to Constantinople when Nicene bishops were expelled by the Arian Vandals, uses Micah 6:3 in a simple reductio ad absurdum to refute a familiar Arian claim.
If they [the Arians] say to you, “Thus the Son is lesser, since he is said to ask the Father”:  

Response. If you accept that he who asks is lesser than he who is asked, then God, who is said to have asked his people by means of the prophet, is proven below the people, saying, by Micah the prophet: “My people, what have I done to you, or in what have I been troubling to you? Answer me...”

Vigilius does not betray any sense that he is aware of a tradition of interpretation of Micah 6:3. That he, like Ambrose, uses the verse in the context of refuting Arian heresy is probably just a coincidence, since it is not Christ the Judge but simply God who addresses Vigilius’ literal though vaguely-defined audience of “the people.”

CASSIODORUS

In contrast, Cassiodorus, political leader in the Ostrogothic-Roman kingdom and later monastic and scholarly recluse, explicitly mentions interpretive tradition along with one of his two citations of Micah 6:3 in his *Exposition of the Psalter*, interpreting Psalm 50:6, a verse now well known to us:

Next comes: “And thou mayst overcome when thou art judged” [Psalm 50:6d]. God's justice is so great that he wishes to be judged in company with men. He himself says: “Judge between me and my vineyard” [Isaiah 5:3], and elsewhere: “My people, what have I done to thee, or in what have I molested thee? Answer thou me” [Micah 6:3]. This is why the prophet now confesses that the Lord has such justice on his side against him that he is totally victorious at the Judgment. As Jeremias says: “You shall say to the Lord our God: to you is justice, but to us confusion of our face” [Baruch 1:15]. David was reflecting that he had been made a king from being a shepherd, that he had received a people under his dominion, and that he had done wrong without thought for his honour. So it was inevitable that the prophet should be worsted in a judgment conducted by another, for he was seen to have been defeated by his own examination.

100 PatLat 62, col. 372.
He then adds, almost as an afterthought, this poignant summary of a further view held by “others” (*aliqui*)

Some commentators [*aliqui*] refer this to the Lord’s Passion, when he was judged and he prevailed, and after being condemned freed the world.¹⁰²

Cassiodorus’ work was designed to be a less bulky and more educational version of Augustine’s *Enarrationes*, and it would seem that Cassiodorus is most immediately referencing Augustine’s exposition of Psalm 50:6 from this work, which ends with an amplification of David’s words in the verse, addressed to “the future Judge,” “the God-Man”:

Thou alone justly judgest, having been unjustly judged, That hast power to lay down your life, and hast power again to take it. [John 10:18] Thou conquerest, then, when you are judged. All men Thou overcomest, because you are more than men, and by you were men made.¹⁰³

The passage by Augustine did not include Micah 6:3 or any similar verse. Yet Cassiodorus does include Micah 6:3, which strongly indicates that the second of his “others” is Ambrose: recall the latter’s commentary on Psalm 42:1 in *The Cry of Job and David*.

This type of application of the psalms to Christ’s Passion is certainly not beyond Cassiodorus, who gives as one of his twelve general subjects of the psalms “parables, tropes, and allegories, telling the story of the life of Christ.”¹⁰⁴ So why does he, on one hand, quote this Christological interpretation, yet, on the other hand, identify it as secondary?
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¹⁰² Ibid., 498.
The *Exposition of the Psalms* was listed by Cassiodorus later in life as the first work to be completed after his “conversion,” which O’Donnell characterizes as “a quiet and continuous process.” He began his journey toward writing the work in his study of the Psalter, “a honey for souls,” “to banish the aftertaste of bitter deeds” upon the end of his official duties. The purpose of the work itself was an accessible introduction to the psalter for “specifically monastic audiences” that would sing the Psalms on a daily basis, completing the cursus at least once a week.

In this context, then, commenting on the penitential Psalm 50, Cassiodorus acknowledges the Passion-related interpretations of Psalm 50:6 by Augustine and Ambrose, but just as well keeps this historically-grounded theme subservient to the weekly process of the *conversio*, the turning towards God, of the monastic novice. This hypothesis can be supported by the quotation by Cassiodorus of Baruch: “You shall say to the Lord our God: ‘To you is justice, but to us confusion of our face.’”

The second citation of Micah 6:3 by Cassiodorus employs a slightly different tack. Historical interpretation is still subservient to *conversio*, but here it is woven into the fabric of the overall interpretation of the psalm. Moreover, *conversio* is recommended for not only Christians, but also, as in Jerome’s commentary on Isaiah 43:25, the Jews. The context is again the *Exposition of the Psalms*, this time on Psalm 134. This psalm enumerates historical benefactions of God to Israel, from the choosing of the people (v. 4) to the plagues of Egypt (vv. 8–9) to the defeat of kings and nations in the wilderness and in Canaan (vv. 10–11) and the giving of the land to the people (v. 12).
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All of these benefactions are interpreted by Cassiodorus allegorically, that is, as benefitting the Christian. He even makes a special point of warning against the literal interpretation of verse 12. Verse 13 is an exclamation of praise after this listing of benefactions: “Thy name, O Lord, is for ever: thy memorial, O Lord, unto all generations.” Cassiodorus makes a comment about the first part of this verse, critical for the succeeding interpretation: David prays, he says, “that the Lord’s name may abide for ever among the human race, so that beginning with Christ’s coming they may be called perpetually and simply Christians.”

It is unclear which coming of Christ—the first or the second—is meant here, but what follows seems to presuppose at once historical ambiguity and a universality of salvation, for both Jews and Christians.

The reason for the previous praise [v. 13] is stated:

“For the Lord will judge his people” [Psalm 134:14a], that is, the Jewish people, to whom he revealed great miracles and assigned his prophets so that the people would not sin. He also sent to them his own Son, so that their accursed hardness could finally be melted. But because they persisted with accursed obstinacy, he will certainly judge them, because they were unwilling to be his though he had chosen them from all nations as his possession. To them he says: “Hear, O my people, and I will speak” [Psalm 49:7], and elsewhere: “My people, what have I done to you?” [Micah 6:3] So he will judge them.

But hear what follows as it concerns the faithful: “And he will comfort among his servants” [Psalm 134:14b]. He means when he will render their promised rewards to those on earth afflicted with harsh contempt on account of his name. Scripture says of them: “Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted” [Matthew 5:5], and in another place are the words: “He that believeth in me is not judged, but will pass from death to life: but he that doth not believe is already judged” [John 3:18].

He then summarizes the psalm so far, characterizing all that has come before as

“beneficial.”

You observe the benefit accruing from the progress which we have described, so that having recounted the Lord's great deeds he [David] has come all the way to his [the Lord’s] holy and awesome judgment.  

It is not hard to see how, in Cassiodorus’s estimation, this psalm is beneficial to Christians, but what about the Jews? Does Cassiodorus display a sadistic streak in including their judgment as part of “the progress which we have described”? The key, as noted, lies in the commentary on v. 13: “…so that beginning with Christ’s coming they [the human race] may be called perpetually and simply Christians.”

The idea that all Jews would eventually become Christians at the end of time was one variously put forth by the fathers, following, among other Scripture, Romans 11:24, “all Israel should be saved,” and most notably formulated by Augustine in his City of God: “in the last days before the judgment the Jews shall believe in the true Christ, that is, our Christ” (XX. 29). This idea emerges more clearly, in interpretation of Micah 6:3, in the writing of Isidore of Seville, discussed in Chapter 3.

It is appropriate that we have closed our chapter with an Exposition of the Psalms. The interpretations of Micah 6:3 that we have seen in this chapter, especially those of the Latin Fathers, were mainly developed in relation with and in the context of the psalms. The most notable exemplar of this is the concept of Christ triumphing when judged, coming from just a snippet of a psalm verse that was paired with Micah 6:3 in the writings of the Fathers more than any other verse. As we shall see, the triumph of the judged Christ in Micah 6:3 became the dominant association of the sung Popule meus. Indeed, the complex web of what the church of Jesus Christ believed and taught about
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this verse in its early centuries would provide a foundation for what it would confess when the verse was incorporated into the liturgy.
CHAPTER 2: MELODIC ANALYSIS OF THE POPULE MEUS CHANTS

The search for the origins of the Good Friday Popule meus verses points us back to some of the oldest extant music of the Church. It is clear that the verse Micah 6:3 was sung at an early stage of the development of Western chant, for there is a rich family of Popule meus chants dispersed throughout the various chant repertoires: Gregorian, Old Roman, Ambrosian, Old Hispanic, and (I will argue) Gallican.1 The simple antiphons are almost certainly the oldest, since the more prolix Popule meus chants can be shown to be embellished versions of the antiphons’ melodic material. One antiphon sets only the verse Micah 6:3; from this came a family of “Roman” chants. The other antiphon sets Micah 6:3–4a with a Christianizing addendum (beginning parasti crucem); from this came a family of chants that are “Gallican,” in the sense of being “non-Roman.”2 The antiphons are themselves in turn textually and melodically related, and thus we may posit an archetypal Popule meus antiphon rather than choosing one or the other as the first.

The comparative musical investigation contained in this chapter suggests relations summarized in the following working stemma:
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1 “The creation of new antiphons seems to have come to an end fairly early in the Ambrosian and Mozarabic liturgies.” Michel Huglo, “Antiphon,” NG.

2 Michel Huglo, “Gallican Chant,” NG. On the uses of the word “Gallican” to designate liturgical practices of Merovingian Gaul and northern Italy, as well as the potential danger of implying with it an unjustified unity, see Hornby and Maloy, Music and Meaning in Old Hispanic Lenten Chants, 245–6. Yitzhak Hen considers a general use of the word “Gallican” to be obfuscating, as it has belied the creativity and independent development of localized liturgies in previous scholarship. Yitzhak Hen, “The Liturgy of the Bobbio Missal,” in The Bobbio Missal: Liturgy and Religious Culture in Merovingian Gaul, ed. Yitzhak Hen and Rob Meens (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 140–1. For this study, a controlled blanket use of the word proves useful in this chapter, while later chapters will speak either of “Gallican liturgies” or the liturgy of a specific book—for example, the Bobbio Missal—and thence, insofar as is possible, of a specific place at a specific time.
THE SCRIPTURE-ONLY ANTIPHON

Example 2.1. The Gregorian *Popule meus* antiphon for Passion Sunday

```
```

The Scripture-only antiphon is the best known because it has been preserved in the Gregorian repertoire, as the fourth antiphon (out of five) for Lauds on the Fifth Sunday of Lent, Passion Sunday. Its melody is not unique but belongs to a family of antiphons with a melody that is, in the words of Michel Huglo, “one of the most common prototypes in the antiphoner.” While the shape of its melody is largely consistent within the Gregorian repertoire, its modality just as consistently posed a challenge to theorists. Indeed the antiphons of this melody type are frequently singled out in the earliest treatises as problematic, with various solutions being proposed to integrate them into the
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3 E.g., *Antiphonale monasticum pro diurnis horis* (Paris: Desclée, 1934), 389–90. An early witness is the late-9th-century “Antiphoner of Charles the Bald” (BnF lat. 17436, 52r).
4 Michel Huglo, “Antiphon,” NG.
crystallizing later-Carolingian modal framework. The treatise *De modis*, perhaps as early as the early 9th century, chooses to classify this melody type as a *parapter*, that is, an extra tone defined by a modally-divergent melodic formula, in this case, “related to the seventh tone but ending in the fourth.” Later, c. 900, Regino of Prüm would give this type of melody the disparaging descriptor *notha*—“illegitimate,” “cross-bred,” or “mongrel”—for its mode-mixing. Because the end of the melody was perceived to be in the fourth mode, tonaries, including Regino’s, generally assign this family of chants to Mode 4.

In the mid-to-late 9th century Aurelian of Réome also noted that the melody of *Gaude Maria*, a chant of the same prototypical melody as *Popule meus*, began in Mode 7 and ended in Mode 4. He nevertheless classified it overall as being in Mode 7, being

---


9 McAlpine, *Tonal Consciousness*, 307. The 9th-century Tonary of Metz, France, Metz, Bibliothèque-Médiathèque municipales 351, fol. 71r, assigns the *Popule meus* antiphon as “Plagis Deuterus Noeais, Diffinitio II” (i.e., Mode 4 with Differentia 2). In the 11th century, München Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Musikabteilung Clm 14965b, 49r, assigns the chant as “Hypate meson” (i.e., E mode). In the 13th century, the Worcester Antiphoner, Worcester F160, assigns *Popule meus* and *Gaude Maria* to Mode 4, Differentia 3. PalMus 12, 139. Regino does, however, assign one antiphon of the same family, *Ex Egypto*, to Mode 7, apparently due to its minor-third-plus-whole-tone intonation, A-C-D, which is characteristic of a Mode 7 intonation. McAlpine 307–8; cf. Huglo *Les tonaires*, 84. “Dobszay and Szendrei point out the formal fixity of the four-phrase construction of this group, and suggest that the first two cadences a fourth above the final . . . made psalmody in the fourth tone possible.” McAlpine, *Tonal Consciousness*, 308, referencing László Dobszay and Janka Szendrei, *Antiphonen*, vol. 5 of *Monumenta Monodica Medii Aevi* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1999), pt. 1:71*.

10 “Besides, it must be noted that an antiphon that has a beginning in the fourth authentic and an end in the second plagal, as does the Ant. *Gaude Maria*, will not be raised in the middle of the psalm-verses but will be sung on an even level.” Joseph Ponte, trans., *Aurelian of Réome (ca. 843) The Discipline of Music (Musica Disciplina)* (Colorado Springs: Colorado College Music Press, 1968), 41. Praeterea notandum, quia antiphona, quae initium habuerit authenti tetrardi, et desierit eius finis de plagis deuteri, veluti haec Antiphona Gaude Maria. non elevabitur in medio versus psalmi, sed in directum canetur. Latin text accessed January 11, 2014 from Indiana University’s Thesaurus Musicarum Latinarum at http://www.chmli.indiana.edu/tml/9th-11th/AURMUS_TEXT.html. The various datings of Aurelian’s treatise, from 840 to after 877, are discussed in Charles Atkinson, *The Critical Nexus* 93, 93n17.
more concerned about beginnings than endings in his analytical goals.\footnote{“Because he is trying to describe differentiae, [Aurelian] has an enormous interest in the beginnings of chants. . . There are a few hard cases where the antiphon appears to end in a different mode to the one it began in, and these hard cases he tends to put with the mode of their beginning, because beginnings are what he is describing.” Fiona McAlpine, “Beginnings and Endings: Defining the Mode in a Medieval Chant,” \textit{Studia Musicologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae} 45 no. 1/2, 17th International Congress of the International Musicological Society IMS Study Group Cantus Planus (2004):166–7. “We have known for a long time that the earliest approach to modality was primarily gestural.” Theodore Karp, \textit{Aspects of Orality and Formularity in Gregorian Chant} (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1998), 266.} In assigning \textit{Gaude Maria}—and, by extension, \textit{Popule meus}—to Mode 7, Aurelian emphasizes the similarity of these antiphons’ openings to certain openings of Mode 7 chants, rising quickly from G to D. This was also pointed out by later theorists, who suggested that the antiphon should continue in Mode 7 so as to be unified.\footnote{Hugo, “Antiphon,” NG, incl. Ex. 4.} In the 12th century, Cistercian reformers did just that, producing an antiphon that sounds like this:\footnote{Ibid. See Nicholas Bell, “Liturgy,” in \textit{The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order}, ed. Mette Birkedal Bruun (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013), 258–67 and Alicia Scarcez, \textit{L’Antiphonaire 12 A-B de Westmalle dans l’histoire du chant cistercien au XIIe siècle: Introduction historique, analyse, fac-similés, tableaux et index} (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011). The \textit{Popule meus} antiphon may be viewed in the facsimile portion of the latter volume at fol. 55v.}

Example 2.2. The Cistercian amended version of the Gregorian \textit{Popule meus} antiphon for Passion Sunday

![Example 2.2](example2.2)

CIST

Westmalle 12A–B (12th century), 55v.

Modern scholars have tended to decry such revisions by the Cistercians as without grounds; however, in comparing several versions of the \textit{Popule meus} antiphon across repertories, this G-mode revision appears less aberrant.\footnote{“Thanks to modern editions of several of the primary sources documenting the Cistercian reform, together with a number of studies of the reform itself, we are now able to view the Cistercians in a new light—one that shows them to have been among the most perceptive critics and analysts of plainchant in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.” Charles Atkinson, \textit{The Critical Nexus}, 245.}
Example 2.3. Comparison of the Milanese (first half), Old Roman, and Gregorian *Popule meus* antiphons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIL</th>
<th>ROM</th>
<th>GREG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Milanese and Old Roman versions of the chant indeed both have a final on G. While the Milanese version shows a consistent anchoring on G and D throughout the chant, the Old Roman version anchors itself to D and does not make it down to G until the very end.

The Roman version seems to bridge certain differences between MIL and GREG. The beginning of ROM accords with the high-low-high beginning of GREG, especially in a particular variant of the latter found in antiphoners from Meaux and Sens: 15

Example 2.4. A variant opening of the Gregorian *Popule meus* antiphon for Passion Sunday

The central role of D throughout the first three phrases is a trait shared by ROM and GREG. The endings of ROM’s second, third, and fourth phrases accord with MIL, with a descent in the second phrase, an ornamented resting place on C in the third, and a scalar cadential pattern to G in the fourth. The greatest divergences between the three versions occur in the beginning of the third phrase, which is not unexpected: beginnings and

---

15 BnF lat. 12035 (end of 12th to the 13th c., Meaux), 99v; BnF nouv. acq. lat. 1535 (13th c., Sens), 55r. In general, also compare the virga–punctum–virga openings in adiastematic manuscripts, e.g., St. Gall 390 (“Harter’s Antiphoner,” 10th c.), 167r.
endings are typically more consistent in oral transmission than are middles. One of the most notable functions of ROM, however, is as a bridge between MIL’s and GREG’s use of the sub-finalis, F, and triadic figures ascending from this note. The transition seems to be allowed by ROM’s use of the notes A and C rather than F, A, and C in these instances, marked in the example. The distinctive feature of a rising triad—in the final phrase of chants in the “Roman” branch of the stemma, and in the penultimate phrase of chants in the “Gallican” branch of the stemma—will become a marker of all the Popule meus chants from here onward.17

As has been described here, and as will be described shortly, both of these early antiphons—the Scripture-only antiphon and the parasti antiphon—are not melodically independent. They are both part of families of antiphon melodies within their respective repertoires (GREG and MIL). Huglo has stated, regarding the melody of Popule meus, Gaude Maria, etc., that “no similar melody occurs in the Ambrosian repertory.”18

Although it is certainly outside the bounds of this study to undertake a comparative

---

16 “In the recall of narratives, beginnings and ends especially provide those stand-out, persistent features that serve as the focal points of the reconstruction. Consequently it is beginnings and ends that tend to become most stereotyped in repeated recall.” Leo Treitler, “Homer and Gregory: The Transmission of Epic Poetry and Plainchant,” Musical Quarterly 60, no. 3 (Jul. 1974):345.

17 The possible exception, of course, is the Old Hispanic version, preserved only in notation which is not pitch-specific. The notation at the relevant points does allow for an ascending triadic figure, however. See León 8, fol. 166v.

18 Huglo, “Antiphon,” NG. Note that the terms “Ambrosian” and “Milanese” are used interchangeably in scholarly literature, with “Ambrosian” being the older but still acceptable term. I prefer the use of the term “Milanese” for the same reason that I prefer “Carolingian” over “Gregorian” when discussing the Popule meus verses: to provide a more objective localization of place and/or time. In the case of the Scripture-only antiphon, however, there is no easy way to forsake the term “Gregorian.” It is surely a part of the core of chants said to be transferred from Rome in the Carolingian reforms, the origins and nature of which, even with the expanding nature of chant scholarship, continue to be “the central problem of Gregorian chant” (as coined by Willi Apel in his article of that name, Journal of the American Musicological Society 9 (1956): 118-27. The Popule meus verses are certainly not part of this core of chants, and thus, for the purposes of this study, never need be identified as “Gregorian.”
investigation of the two melodic types, the comparison shown here may warrant such an investigation.\footnote{Charles Atkinson has offered a similar suggestion for the parapteres generally: “One cannot resist asking whether the parapteres might not be a remnant of an earlier, more flexible, and perhaps even non-Roman, practice.” “The Parapteres,” 51. He additionally notes that the concern of the early treatise De modis with a smooth connection between antiphon and psalm verse “calls strongly to mind the governing principles of Ambrosian psalmody,” 50.}

The question of general melodic differences between the chants of the “Roman” and “Gallican” repertoires is also raised by the modal instability in the above comparison. Certain scholars have proposed a theory of three fundamental “modes archaïques” (Do, Ré, Mi) in Western chant, with “Roman” chants based on “Do” and “Mi” and “Gallican” chants based on “Ré.”\footnote{Jean Claire, “Les répertoires liturgiques latins avant l’octoechos,” Études grégoriennes 15 (1975): 11–192, as summarized in Huglo, “Gallican Chant,” NG. See the assessment of this theory in László Dobszay, “Some Remarks on Jean Claire’s Octoechos,” in Cantus Planus: Papers Read at the Seventh Meeting Sopron, Hungary, 1995, ed. László Dobszay (Budapest: Hungarian Academy of Sciences Institute for Musicology, 2005), 179–94.} Again, this is not the place to deal with such theories globally; however, in both of the branches of the stemma, various chants across repertoires will be seen to be more “Do”-based in Roman and Milanese versions and more “Ré”-based in the Gallican or Frankish (Gregorian) versions, suggesting a process of “protus-ization”—that is, an inclination towards D and A modes—in transmission.\footnote{Questions of chronology and transmission between liturgical repertoires are perenially vexing to modern scholarship. See Rebecca Maloy, Inside the Offertory (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 182–207 for a recent summary and contribution. I speak of transmission from Italy to Gaul in the case of the Popule meus only because there is good reason to believe that this particular chant progressed that way.} This process may explain some of the differences between MIL, ROM, and GREG in the above comparison, including possible retroactive influence on ROM that might account for its insistence on D and A before the final descent to G—with A here exemplifying “Ré” and G “Do.” As for GREG, it is worth noting that the 9th-century tract Commemoratio brevis pitches the antiphon not with an A final (nor with an E final, as would sometimes happen later), but a D final, and proposes the use of the 2nd psalm tone instead of that of the 4th with
antiphons of the *Popule meus—Gaude Maria* type.\(^{22}\) A low Bb is possible through the use of Daseian notation, shown here above the transcription of the antiphon proper.\(^{23}\)

Example 2.5. The antiphon *Benedicta tu* in the *Commemoratio brevis*

```
\[ \text{GREG} \quad \text{Bailey, critical edition of *Commemoratio brevis*, 50–1.} \]
```

A long melisma follows, stabilizing the end of the antiphon in the 2nd mode:

Example 2.6. Melisma at the end of the antiphon *Benedicta tu* in the *Commemoratio brevis*

```
\[ \text{GREG} \quad \text{Bailey, critical edition of *Commemoratio brevis*, 50–1.} \]
```

It is clear that these antiphons, especially owing to their limited range, were characterized by 1) instability in melody and modality across repertoires and 2) instability in pitch level as systems of mode and notation were being developed, both contributing to 3) instability in associated psalm tone.\(^{24}\) Accordingly, the precise nature of the archetypal *Popule meus* antiphon at the head of the stemma must remain a chimera. It is possible, however, that the Milanese *Popule meus* antiphon represents a melody just as old or older than the Gregorian antiphon, and it is to this antiphon that we turn next.

---


\(^{24}\) See Hiley, *Western Plainchant*, 91 regarding the modal instability of the ferial (psalter) antiphons in general. He gives the caveat that the very chant family we have been discussing, despite its “tonal difficulty,” is “relatively stable” (92); this is, however, only taking into account the Gregorian version. The three possible pitch levels of the Gregorian version are discussed, with three incipit-length transcriptions, in Terence Bailey, “De modis musicis: A New Edition and Explanation.” *Kirchenmusikalisches Jahrbuch* 61–2 (1977–8):58.
THE MILANESE *PARASTI CRUCEM* ANTIPHON

Example 2.7. The Milanese *Popule meus antiphona dupla* for Holy Saturday.

\[
\text{MIL} \quad \text{London, British Library, Add. 34209 (12th c.), p. 255.}
\]

The Milanese *Popule meus* antiphon, the first half of which was used in the comparison of the above section, is preserved as one out of a number of antiphons for the Milanese morning office, *Matutinae* (the equivalent of Roman Matins and Lauds), for Holy Saturday.\(^{25}\) Musically it is perhaps closest to our hypothetical archetypal antiphon, and thus of great importance for our history of the *Popule meus* verses. As László Dobszay summarized in 1998,

> The Ambrosian liturgy, and above all, the liturgy of the Office, was regarded for a long time as a curiosity, a local deviance. Recent research in the history of liturgy has made it clear that many features of the original Christian psalmody surviving in the Ambrosian Office were superseded by later processes within the Roman rite. The same is true for the music.\(^{26}\)

The Milanese *Popule meus* antiphon is an *antiphona dupla*, meaning, first, that its text is longer than a normal antiphon, second, that its text and melody are divided into two roughly equal parts, and, third, that the melodies of the first and second part are typically similar.\(^{27}\) There are only 34 in the entire Ambrosian repertoire.\(^{28}\)

---


\(^{27}\) One of three in the PalMus 5 ms.
is one out of 25 with a binary structure, and one out of nine of these in which the melodies of the two halves “correspond very closely,” in the estimation of Terence Bailey.29

In performance, at least in the Late Middle Ages, the two halves of the antiphon were sung “as far as the verse by one half of the choir, and up to the end by the other,” as an early-15th-century manuscript instructs.30 The second half is marked by the word versus (“verse”). The odd use of the word versus, Bailey reasons, is simply for want of a better alternative.31 This odd use of versus for antiphons, of course, also shows up in the Popule meus verses—their labeling this way in the earliest liturgical manuscripts is indeed why they are refered to as “verses” instead of simply “antiphons.”32 This correspondence in rubrication may give another indication, besides the obvious text similarity, of a relationship between the Milanese antiphon and the various Popule meus verses.

Bailey, however, is of the opinion that the practice described in the 15th century is not an ancient one, and that most of the antiphonae duplae themselves, “do not belong to the first stratum of the [Milanese] chant.”33 (Here he is responding to those who would cite the antiphona dupla as evidence for Early Christian antiphonal singing.34) He does concede that antiphonae duplae were “obviously marks of special distinction,” occurring

---

29 Ibid., 17.
30 Trans. ibid., 12.
31 Ibid.
32 Other antiphons with verses are identified in Huglo, “Gallican Chant,” NG. A survey of early chant books containing the Popule meus verses does not, however, reveal the use of the rubric “versus” at Quia eduxi as employed in modern chant books.
34 Ibid., 11.
on the most important feasts, but cites the fact that they are paired with partial psalms as probable evidence of later liturgical reorganization.\(^{35}\) As far as texts are concerned, the \textit{antiphonae duplae} are likely from different periods: some have psalmic texts, others have Biblical non-psalmic texts, and others have non-Biblical texts.\(^{36}\) Musically, “there is nothing about the melodies that suggests a date for the double antiphons. ... Their binary structure is widely found in chants that are not performed as double antiphons, for one of the characteristic methods of adapting a standard theme to a long text was by repeating it once, twice, or even more.”\(^{37}\)

All of this reasoning by Bailey suggests only that the Milanese \textit{Popule meus antiphona dupla} was likely not sung at first as an \textit{antiphona dupla}—that is, by two halves of the choir in succession—and was likely not paired at first with its partial psalm (Psalm 80:8b–17, \textit{Exaudivi te in abscondito})\(^ {38}\) at first; the arguments have no bearing on when the Milanese \textit{Popule meus} antiphon originated. The comparative analysis of this chapter, however, does indeed suggest that the Milanese antiphon, as an antiphon with a doubled melodic structure and a non-Biblical addendum, was sung in Milan early on, since, for one thing, it was integrated into the Old Hispanic liturgy by the 7th century. In the Old Hispanic liturgy, moreover, the doubled \textit{Popule meus} antiphon (there called a \textit{Sonus}) is sung responsorially with the chanting of Micah 6:1–8, with its second part, \textit{quia eduxi}, serving sometimes as the respond. Perhaps this echoes a similar performance practice at Milan as well. Because the Milanese liturgy was written down so late, there are no

\(^{35}\) Ibid., 20, 23, 24.
\(^{36}\) Ibid., 23.
\(^{37}\) Ibid.
\(^{38}\) See this incipit in London, British Library, Add. 34209 (12th c), p. 256. Compare \textit{Breviarium Ambrosianum Carolo Archiepiscopo editum ... pars vernalis} (Milan: Bernardonius, 1830), 471, which has the text in full. This portion of Psalm 80 is its second half.
certain proofs for or against this type of hypothesis. Finally, the doubled structure of the more prolix and melodically-related *Popule meus* chants, with which much of the analysis of this chapter is occupied, makes it very unlikely that the doubled Milanese antiphon is a late derivation or importation. In characterizing these expanded doubled structures, we start in the “Roman” branch of the stemma, with the Responsories of Joshua.

**THE RESPONSORIES OF JOSHUA: ** *POPULE MEUS*

The Responsories of Joshua were so named (with the rubric *De Iosue*) because they were sung in response to readings from the Heptateuch dealing with Joshua in the Matins service for the Fourth Sunday of Lent.\(^{39}\) Looking first at an adiastematic manuscript, the “Hartker Antiphoner” (c. 990–1000), we find that the respond *Popule meus* seems to exhibit a two-part structure. The neumation of the opening and closing gestures in each half is identical, excepting the most rudimentary changes for extra syllables in the opening words.\(^{40}\) The text itself is much longer than the texts heretofore examined, but the parallel to the Milanese text is notable:

---

\(^{39}\) “Responsories set to non-psalmic, biblical texts make up the majority of the core repertory [of Gregorian Great Responsories]. In Advent, responory texts are taken from Isaiah, Jeremiah, Baruch, Daniel, Micah and Zechariah, with Isaiah as the source for their lessons. During Lent, both lessons and responory texts are drawn from the Heptateuch. In Passiontide, the responsories are based on texts from Jeremiah, Job and Wisdom where their lessons draw almost exclusively upon Jeremiah...” Katherine Helsen, “The Great Responsories of the Divine Office: Aspects of Structure and Transmission” (PhD dissertation, Universität Regensburg, 2008), 10. For example, see BnF lat. 17436, the late-9th-century Antiphoner of Compiègne, 50v, transcribed in PatLat 78 col. 758.

Ambrosian *antiphona dupla*  

*Popule meus,*  
*quid feci tibi,*  
*aut quid molestus fui?*  
*Responde michi.*

*Quia eduxi te*  
*de terra Aegypti,*  
*parasti crucem*  
*Salvatori tuo.*

**Responsory of Joshua *Popule meus* (Respond only)**

*Popule meus,*  
*quid feci,*  
*aut quid molestus fui tibi?*  
*Responde mihi.*

*Quoniam ego eduxi vos*  
*de terra Aegypti*  
*et de domo servitutis;*  
*Quadraginta annis in eremo,*  
*manna plui vobis,*  
*et oblii estis me,*  
*dicit Dominus.*

My people,  
what have I done to you,  
or how have I troubled?  
Answer me.

Because I led you *(sing.)* out  
of the land of Egypt,  
you prepared a cross  
for your Savior.

My people,  
what have I done,  
or how have I troubled you?  
Answer me.

For I led you *(pl.)* out  
of the land of Egypt  
and of the house of slavery;  
For forty years in the desert  
manna I fed you,  
and you have forgotten me,  
says the Lord.

What stands out at first glance is the extra text in the middle of the second part of the Responsory of Joshua; perhaps this represents a troping or farsing of an original text more like that of the Milanese antiphon. Also notable is the switch, in the respond text, from a singular “you” to a plural “you” in the second part of the respond. Note that this remains faithful to Micah 6:3, but not to Micah 6:4a, as in the Milanese antiphon.41 Finally, the punchline of the text is different in the two chants yet similar in effect. In place of the specific charge of “prepar[ing] a cross,” the Responsory of Joshua prefers a

---

41 That the incipit *Quia eduxi vos* appears in the Senlis Antiphoner means may suggest a connection with the Responsories of Joshua or an earlier predecessor of them both.
more general yet almost as biting accusation from the Lord to his people: “you have
forgotten me.” The identity of the speaker is also generalized from “Savior” to “Lord.” 42

The melody is clearly doubled, as shown in the following transcription, which
takes the two halves of the respond and transcribes them against each other (a format
which will prove useful throughout this chapter).

42 There are also little things like the moving of *tibi* to the end of the initial bipartite question; this is one of
Sabatier’s variants in the Old Latin. Another minor change is the replacement of *quia* with *quoniam*; this
has no effect on the meaning; based on Hartker’s neumes one may hypothesize a reason for the change by
noticing that both *popule* and *quoniam* have three syllables; note that *quoniam* is “changed back” to *quia* in
BnF lat. 12044, transcribed here. Finally, there is the inclusion of the first-person pronoun *ego*, perhaps
also for reasons of improving the fit of text with melodic formula; as we will see, this added *Ego* is in
common with the Narbonnaise *Popule meus* verses.
Example 2.8. The Responsory of Joshua *Popule meus*: its doubled form, and comparison to the Passion Sunday antiphon

Although subject to much extension and at times diversion, the doubled structure of responsory is clear. Its structural outlines, moreover, agree with the Passion Sunday antiphon. The first cursus is more clearly related to the antiphon, with its ascent from G to D through the passing notes A and C in its first phrase, with its ornamenting of D and then descent to G in its second phrase, and its F–A–C triad in its final phrase. The second cursus is less clearly related, due to its enormously-extended length and a curious transposition down a fifth at the end of the first phrase, perhaps in order to contrast with the extended stay in the upper register to come. The other structural points, however,
remain recognizable, above all the highlighting of the key word oblii with the rising F–A–C triad as responde is highlighted in both the first cursus and in the antiphon. The final on G, lastly, adds credence to a theory of an original “Do”-based Popule meus chant.

THE RESPONSORIES OF JOSHUA: ADDUXI VOS

Popule meus is the second of the Responsories of Joshua. The first, Sicut fui cum Moyse (“As I was with Moses”) is notable for the way its text frames and historicizes the next two responsories; it is, however, melodically unrelated to them, and so we will pass over it in this analysis. The third responsory, however, is quite obviously related, in both text and melody. Here is the text, this time compared to the second part of the Popule meus Responsory of Joshua, of which it remarkably seems to be a further troping or farsing.43

Quoniam ego eduxi vos de terra Aegypti et de domo servitutis; Quadraginta annis in eremo, manna plui vobis, et oblii estis me, dicit Dominus.

Adduxi vos per desertum quadraginta annos, Égo Dominus; non sunt attrita vestimenta vestra, manna de celo plui vobis, et oblii estis me, dicit Dominus.

43 Compare the texts of the second verse of the Carolingian verses and the second verse of the Narbonnaise verses (given below), the latter of which employs adduxi. These three texts perhaps have a common origin.
For I led you out
of the land of Egypt
and from the house of slavery;
For forty years in the desert

I led you
through the desert
for forty years—
I am the Lord;
Your garments
did not wear out,
manna from Heaven I fed you,
and you have forgotten me,
says the Lord.

Manna I fed you,
and you have forgotten me,
says the Lord.

Removed is all distinguishing text from Micah 6:4, with eduxi vos (“I led you out [of Egypt]”) changed to adduxi vos (“I led you”) to correspond now to the leading through the desert and the wording from the covenant institution of Deuteronomy 29:5–6: “He has brought you forty years through the desert: your garments are not worn out, neither are the shoes of your feet consumed with age. You have not eaten bread (i.e., you have eaten only manna), nor have you drunk wine or strong drink: that you might know that I am the Lord your God.” The ends of the texts of both responsories correspond exactly, however.

The melody is further removed from the Passion Sunday antiphon, but its congruencies can be pointed out.
Example 2.9. The Responsory of Joshua *Adduxi vos*: its doubled form, and comparison to the Passion Sunday antiphon

The opening gesture of the respond is easily seen to be an embellishment of the opening gesture of the antiphon. The opening of the second cursus strays from this, however, not even reaching up to a D, and then reaching up above E to F in the second phrase. The structural points are still well-defined though, and perhaps even more so than the *Popule meus* Responsory of Joshua, since there are overall fewer notes.

The structural similarities between the Passion Sunday antiphon and these responsories extend to many other Mode 7 responsories, as Kate Helsen’s work on the
Gregorian responsories has shown.\textsuperscript{44} The opening gesture of these responsories, for example, is at once the most common stock opening for a Mode 7 responsory, an embellished version of the standard stock opening for Mode 7 antiphons, and an embellished version of the \textit{Popule meus} antiphon type—this, of course, is why the \textit{Popule meus} antiphon was sometime categorized as Mode 7.\textsuperscript{45} It is thus impossible to prove exclusive reliance of these responsories on the antiphon. What is important is that the antiphon and the responsories all seem to follow a similar Mode 7 “roadmap,” to use Helsen’s term.\textsuperscript{46} The congruence of “roadmaps” suggests not direct dependence of one chant on another, but rather a way of singing \textit{Popule meus} texts that diversified over time in oral transmission. This is why the “Roman” branch of the stemma is set up with a hypothetical Scripture-only antiphon giving rise to all three of the Passion Sunday antiphon, the \textit{Popule meus} Responsory of Joshua, and the \textit{Adduxi vos} Responsory of Joshua.

Having fleshed out an understanding of the “Roman” branch of the stemma, we must now turn to the “Gallican” or \textit{Parasti crucem} branch, from which the Carolingian \textit{Popule meus} verses arise. Before delving into that analysis, however, it is useful at this point to summarize existing theories of origin of the Carolingian \textit{Popule meus} verses.

\textsuperscript{44} The melodies of GREG responsories may be compared using the body text and database apparatus of Katherine Helsen’s PhD dissertation, “The Great Responsories of the Divine Office: Aspects of Structure and Transmission” (Universität Regensburg, 2008). Standard Mode 7 melodic elements are discussed on pages 204–17. The Responsories of Joshua are transcribed and labelled according to their melodic elements in Appendix 1: Transcriptions, 130–1.

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., 206ff.

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., 45.
THEORIES OF ORIGIN OF THE POPULE MEUS CHANTS IN EXISTING SCHOLARSHIP

Our investigation of Popule meus antiphons and responsories revealed that the singing of the Popule meus is an old tradition cohesive in its textual formulas and its structural apportioning of melodic material yet also diversified in terms of text and melody. As far as text is concerned, this is by no means a new finding. In a series of articles from 1935 to 1937, Louis Brou conducted a thorough examination of the texts of the Western liturgical repertoires and ended up with a similar conclusion. With the melodic analysis about to be undertaken, we continue on where Brou left off, in a series of hasty footnotes at the end of his study of les Impropères both supporting and qualifying his preferred hypothesis that the Roman “composer” of the Popule meus verses (“the first group” of les Impropères) produced his composition by assembling elements scattered in the Gregorian, Ambrosian, and Beneventan liturgies. The most important scattered elements, as listed in the first of these footnotes, are found in the two Responsories of Joshua, in the Ambrosian parasti crucem antiphon, and in two chants beginning with the word Vinea in the Gregorian and Ambrosian repertoires. These are solely text-based conclusions. The only melodic comparison in the articles, occurring in the next footnote, simply cites the observation of Hesbert, who had identified the “kinship” (parenté) and “original identity” (identité d’origine) of the Beneventan Popule

---


48 Brou (1937), 50n2–4. Much previous scholarship, as noted in the Introduction, treats the Popule meus verses and the Ego verses as a single object of study, to a greater or lesser degree, under the name Improperia, “Reproaches,” or in this case, les Impropères.

49 Brou (1937), 50n2. Note that Brou makes no distinction between the Gregorian and Old Roman repertoires in his articles, nor should he have been expected to in the 1930s. The question of Old Roman chant was first examined in detail in the 1950s, as summarized by Helmut Hucke and Joseph Dyer, “Old Roman Chant,” NG.
meus Offertory and the Gregorian initial Popule meus verse.\textsuperscript{50} This is not especially helpful for Brou, since it “rais[es] the problem of the community of origin, at least regarding the melody.”\textsuperscript{51} Finally, in a third footnote, Brou suggests that the Old Hispanic Sonus, due to its use of the parasti crucem phrase, came from either Milan or Rome.\textsuperscript{52}

It is possible that Brou was hesitant to investigate the questions of these second and third footnotes because they might lead him to the conclusion that the Reproaches were not by a compositeur romain. His series of articles thus ends on an inconclusive note. Nevertheless, Brou’s articles are still a valuable reference in their treatment of the texts of the various Popule meus chants.

Despite Brou’s exhaustive treatment of the Popule meus chants in the various repertoires, it was, ironically, just a couple of sentences in Louis Duchesne’s earlier monograph on the “origins of Christian worship” that became the basis for the interpretation accepted by most scholars to this day. Duchesne noted that the chants of the Adoration of the Cross have “certainly an ancient, but rather Gallican ring to them,” citing specifically “the Trisagion, in Greek and Latin, the Reproaches, and the hymn Pange lingua.”\textsuperscript{53} He however also originated a misidentification that, due to the popularity of his work in both French and English, persisted for decades in scholarly literature. In his discussion of the Old Hispanic Ceremony of Indulgence on Good

\textsuperscript{50} Brou (1937), 50n3, citing René-Jean Hesbert, “La tradition Bénéventaine dans la tradition manuscrite,” in PalMus 14 (1931), 60–465, here 266. Like Brou, Hesbert describes what I call the “Gregorian” version as “Roman.”

\textsuperscript{51} Brou (1937,) 50n3. Thomas Forrest Kelly has dealt with this “problem” as explained below.

\textsuperscript{52} Brou (1937), 50n4.

Friday, he equates the *Popule meus* chant found there with the Reproaches. Furthermore, citing a canon of the Fourth Council of Toledo, he dates this ceremony, and implicitly all the material within it, to the year 633. Despite the more accurate identification by Marius Férotin of the Old Hispanic *Popule meus* chant as a divergent text from the Good Friday Reproaches in 1904, Louis Brou, in 1935, would cite Duchesne as the originator of the “running opinion” that the Reproaches originated in Spain. The more general Gallican hypothesis would be cited generally, without further elaboration, in various reference works in the succeeding decades and at least one anthology, Carl Parrish’s *A Treasury of Early Music*, which simply titles the *Popule meus* verses (in their Gregorian form) as “Gallican Chant: *Improperia* of the Mass for Good Friday.”

Michel Huglo, as far as I know, has been the only one to provide specifically musical, as well as general liturgical, justification for the Gallican hypothesis.

---

54 “This ceremony was prescribed by the fourth Council of Toledo (633), and all the details of it are found in the Mozarabic Missal. After a few preliminaries, among which are the reproaches, *Popule meus, quid feci tibi,* now forming part of our Good Friday service, the office begins by three lessons...” *Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution*, 442. “Cette cérémonie est prescrite par le quatrième concile de Tolède (633), et l’on en trouve tout le détail dans le missel mozarabique. Après quelques préliminaires, où l’on trouve le chant de reproche, *Popule meus, quid feci tibi,* qui est entré dans notre service du vendredi saint, l’office commence par les trois leçons...” *Origines du culte chrétien* (1889), 427.


56 “...l’opinion courante qui croit trouver dans la Liturgie Mozarabe l’origine de nos Impropères?” Brou, “Les improprères” (1935), 163.


58 Huglo, “Gallican Chant,” NG. [Note: It is clear that the last sentence in the following quotation was garbled in translation, misplacing the dependent clauses; it is the chant and not its intonation that appears in 9th-century liturgical books and has an Ambrosian parallel. The following quotation thus removes the two offending uses of “which” and inserts the correct one, using brackets.] “In the Gregorian repertory only one type of simple antiphon is generally used with the singing of psalms. The Gallican tradition, however, like the Ambrosian and Mozarabic, had antiphons with verses that were chanted during the Offices and at other occasions such as the Washing of the Feet on Maundy Thursday. ... Gallican antiphons with verses include ... *Popule meus* with two verses, ‘Quia eduxi’ and ‘Quid ultra’. *Popule meus,* which contains a celebrated Gallican intonation on ‘aut in quo,’ [...] appears from the late 9th century in French antiphoners and [...] has an Ambrosian parallel...”
Discussing the phenomenon of antiphons with multiple verses, which occur in the Ambrosian, Old Hispanic, and Gallican traditions, he gives *Popule meus* as an example from the Gallican repertoire, noting that it has “two verses, ‘Quia eduxi’ and ‘Quid ultra.’” This *Popule meus* antiphon with verses, he says, “contains a celebrated Gallican intonation on ‘aut in quo,’” that is, the triadic ascent C–E–G in the third phrase. He additionally notes that the *Popule meus* antiphon (that is, the initial *Popule meus* verse) appears in liturgical books starting in the 9th century and that it has “an Ambrosian parallel,” citing the Ambrosian *parasti crucem* antiphon. In the general discussion of the antiphons with verses, finally, he characterizes them as being “chanted during the Offices and at other occasions such as the Washing of the Feet on Maundy Thursday.” This would seem to be another liturgical justification for a Gallican origin for the *Popule meus* verses, since the Adoration of the Cross, like the Washing of the Feet, is a unique Holy Week ceremony; this connection is not explicit, however, in Huglo’s text.

The theory of Gallican origin, however, has not accounted for Brou’s Beneventan “problem” nor has it explained the relation of the Spanish *Popule meus* to the other chants. Thomas Forrest Kelly has made a first step in dealing with the Beneventan “problem.” In his monograph on the Beneventan chant, he compares the Beneventan *Popule meus* with its equivalent Gregorian version—that is, the first verse of the Carolingian verses—hypothesizing the priority of the Beneventan version, due to its “clearer and simpler parallel structure.”

In general, therefore, the succeeding textual and melodic analysis of this chapter attempts to take these disparate yet useful conclusions of previous scholarship and synthesize them both with themselves and with new melodic comparative work. The other chapters in the dissertation attempt to further situate the development of the *Popule meus* chants in their exegetical and liturgical contexts, thus at once aiding with this synthetic work on “origins” and adding a further dimension of “meaning.” By adding in-depth melodic analysis, heretofore absent in the scholarship, as well as cultural contexts, this study aims to construct a more comprehensive story of the medieval identity of these chants.

THE TEXT OF THE *POPULE MEUS* ANTIPHONS: *MOLESTUS FUI* VS. *CONTRISTAVI*

Before looking at their melodies, it is necessary to notice a fundamental variation in these chants’ texts. Where the Ambrosian antiphon had *aut quid molestus fui* (“or how have I troubled [you]?”) the Gallican, Old Hispanic, and Beneventan chants have *aut in quo contristavi te* (“or how have I grieved you?”). Looking at a chart of variants of this particular section of Micah 6:3 in Latin, spanning Bible text, quotation in early writings, and liturgy, one finds a staggering 14 individual variants. There are two main reasons for this: one is the apparent tendency of writers such as Ambrose to quote from memory, leading to all manner of small differences; the second is the fact that several Latin versions of the Old Testament existed in the Early Middle Ages, translated either from the Greek Septuagint or, exceptionally in the case of Jerome, from the Hebrew. The Hebrew only has one phrase for this section of the verse (transliterated: *uma hel etika*), while the version of “the Seventy,” a group of Hellenistic Jews from around 200 years
before Christ, has two phrases (translit: *e ti elupesa se, e ti parenochlesa soi*). The Hebrew phrase can be translated as “and how have I wearied you?” while the Greek, and thus the Old Latin, bifurcates the word “weary” into two shades of meaning—“or how have I grieved you, or how have I troubled you?”—the first word connoting discouragement on the part of the object, the second connoting annoyance. Jerome’s version, the Vulgate, returns to the precedent of the Hebrew by dropping *contristavi* and retaining *molestus fui*. The distinction between one and two phrases is not so clear-cut between Old Latin and Vulgate, however; Ambrose, writing before Jerome’s translation was made, freely uses one or the other of the phrases or both, with small variations attendant in any option. The only standard seems to be that, if both phrases appear, *contristavi* comes first, following the Septuagint.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Scripture or Influential Writer</th>
<th>Liturgy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aut in quo contristavi te</td>
<td>Ambrose (<em>Cry of Job and David</em>)</td>
<td>Beneventan Offertory; North Italian Antiphon; Old Hispanic Sono Refrain; Aquitainian verses; Narbonnaise verses; Carolingian verses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aut in quo te contristavi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Old Hispanic Sono Verse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aut in quo te contristavi aut in quo tibi molestus fui</td>
<td></td>
<td>Old Hispanic Sono Verse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aut in quo contristavi aut quid molestus fui tibi</td>
<td>Ambrose (<em>Cry of Job and David</em>)</td>
<td>Old Latin Bible (ed. Sabatier, majority reading = Jerome’s “LXX”; all Sabatier’s minority readings can be found on this chart in a Father quotation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aut in quo molestus fui</td>
<td>Ambrose (on Psalm 36)</td>
<td>Popule meus Responsory of Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aut in quo molestus tibi</td>
<td>Vigilius</td>
<td>Popule meus Responsory of Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aut quid contristavi te</td>
<td>Ambrose (<em>On Faith, On Duties</em>); Cassiodorus</td>
<td>Milanes Antiphon; Passion Sunday Antiphon; Popule meus Responsory of Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aut quid molestus fui tibi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Popule meus Responsory of Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et quid molestus fui</td>
<td>Isidore (<em>On the Catholic Faith</em>)</td>
<td>Popule meus Responsory of Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et quid molestus fui tibi</td>
<td>Jerome (Micah, Jeremiah); Vulgate (majority); Isidore (<em>On the Catholic Faith</em>)</td>
<td>Popule meus Responsory of Joshua</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Against this abundance of variants in non-sung versions of Micah 6:3, it is notable that the liturgical chant texts fall into two basic groups—a *molestus fui* group and a *contristavi* group—corresponding with the “Roman” and “Gallican” branches, respectively, with the exception of the Milanese antiphon. If we take simply the distinction between *molestus fui* and *contristavi*, it tells us little about dating; all of the chants are certainly more recent than the Vulgate, and Old Latin versions of the Old Testament certainly persisted for centuries after that, especially in Spain. If we take the Milanese antiphon to be the oldest of the *parasti crucem* antiphons, a hypothesis such as the following is required:

1. Micah 6:3–4a is included in the text of an antiphon somewhere in Italy which adds *parasti crucem salvatori tuo*.

2. In Milan the Vulgate’s *molestus fui* is preferred, while outside of Milan the Old Latin *contristavi* is preferred.

3. The *contristavi* family of chants forms, with exemplars in northern Italy, Benevento, Gaul, and Spain.

We thus finally turn to the melodic analysis of the “Gallican” *contristavi... parasti crucem* family of *Popule meus* chants.

THE BENEVENTAN OFFERTORY

As discussed above, Hesbert, Brou, and Kelly all examined the Beneventan *Popule meus* and found its melodic relationship to the Carolingian *Popule meus* verses striking. Its melody is preserved in only a single manuscript, Ben 38, as the Offertory for Palm Sunday; a text incipit is found in another manuscript, Ben 40, listing it as the Offertory for Holy Thursday. Kelly has reasoned that conflicting liturgical assignments
such as this “may indicate that the preservation of Beneventan chant in a Gregorian format, which requires a fixed chant for every liturgical function, has misrepresented the less fixed, more flexible nature of the Beneventan repertory.”

The melody is clearly doubled, as the following transcription attests. Here the Milanese antiphon is given for comparison.

---

60 Thomas Forrest Kelly, “Beneventan Chant,” NG.
61 Note that the divergence by one note between the first and second cursus, from the end of the word terra, through the word egypti, and to the first note of parasti, is almost certainly a scribal error, rectified only when halfway through the distinctive triadic intonation. On Beneventan scribal errors in general, see Kelly (1989), 153–4. Compare Kelly’s transcription and discussion of the Offertory, 170–2.
Example 2.10. The Beneventan *Popule meus* Offertory, with the Milanese *antiphona dupla* given for comparison

MIL


BEN

Benevento, Biblioteca capitolare, MS 38, 38r.

While certain structural features may echo the Milanese antiphon, the divergence is certainly great enough to warrant caution in any conclusions about their being directly related. This divergence is the reason that the Milanese antiphon appears at the same level as the Beneventan chant in the stemma; the relation between it and the other *parasti crucem* chants is not convincing to warrant an attribution of parenthood.
Example 2.11. Comparative transcription of the first two phrases of the Milanese antiphon and Beneventan Offertory

The first phrase, to start, does not make it up to D, and while the second phrase seems to evidence motion similar to the antiphon, the third phrase presents a challenge in comparison, and this is not simply due to the difference between the molestus fui and contristavi texts. Whereas the Milanese antiphon has an F-based triad and ornament, the Beneventan offertory has a G-based phrase. It may be possible to argue for the connection of the chants by reasoning that the Beneventan offertory on the whole has undergone some tonal shifting, since it seems to straddle G and A modes. Kelly’s characterization of the general Beneventan modality indeed describes this exact situation. It is equally possible, of course, that the Milanese antiphon has undergone tonal shifting and that the Passion Sunday antiphon is thus the best exemplar of an archetypal melody. The necessary uncertainty here is visually depicted in the upper portion of the stemma. From here on out, however, melodic comparison becomes more tractable, in the North Italian antiphon and the various Popule meus verses.

62 “The tonal range is limited. There is no evidence that the Beneventan chant was ever subject to the effects of the eight-mode system of organization that affects much medieval music. Almost every piece ends on one of two notes (A or G), no special characteristics being specific to either group.” “Beneventan Chant,” NG. One should also note that the first and third phrases employ a type of half-cadence (cf. Kelly, The Beneventan Chant, 117, BEN 38, phrase F), while the second and fourth phrases employ a standard full cadence (cf. ibid., BEN 38, phrase G, and, more generally, The Beneventan Chant, 99, examples N through R). For comparisons of mid-phrase extensions such as that on quo, see ibid., 105–6, with discussion on page 104.
THE NORTH ITALIAN ANTIPHON

A North Italian version of the *Popule meus* antiphon, unremarked on till now in the literature, seems suggestive for reconciling the Beneventan and Gallican theories of origin. It appears in an addendum, written around 1100, to a Gradual from a monastery in the province of Brescia or Bergamo (east and northeast of Milan, respectively).\(^{63}\)

While the standard version of the melody—that is, the Carolingian melody—appears two folios earlier, with the Trisagion, at the beginning of the Adoration of the Cross, this second instance of the *Popule meus* appears toward the end of the ceremony as the refrain to the *Ego* verses. A back-comparison with the unheighted neumes of the Gradual-Antiphoner of the Cathedral of the Brescia, from 1000–1050, makes it clear that this version of the chant was solidly fixed in the repertoire.\(^{64}\)

Example 2.12. The North Italian antiphon

\[ \text{Example 2.12. The North Italian antiphon} \]

\[ \text{N. ITAL.} \quad \text{Bergamo, Biblioteca Civica cod. ψ III 8 (c. 1100), fol. 133v} \]

*\(a\) B punctum appears over *aut* and before the G punctum; it has been omitted in the transcription.


As in the Beneventan version, the second and third phrases both begin with the triadic intonation (the “celebrated Gallican intonation” of Huglo). The Carolingian version only has this intonation in its third phrase. Most of the rest of the melodic material of this North Italian antiphon, however, agrees with the Carolingian version. This congruence might be explained by a molding of an older form to fit the nature of the official chant sung at the same ceremony. The fact that two versions of the melody exist, however, with one clearly displaying a structural difference, points loudly to a version of the chant sung before the spread of the Carolingian repertoire. Moreover, if the chant has somewhat molded itself to the Carolingian version, this would most likely speak to the similarity of the chants at this point and not a total incongruity such as is found in the second phrase. It appears, in fact, that this version of the chant links the Beneventan and Gallican versions, particularly the Narbonnaise variety of the latter. It is to this version that we turn next.

THE NARBONNAISE / PROVANÇAL *POPULE MEUS* VERSES

Moving west along the bottom of France and wrapping around the Mediterranean coast, we find a version of the chant that clearly parallels the Carolingian version, with a few important exceptions. In comparing it against itself, we find that there are four distinct melodic phrases in each cursus, which we may call A, B, C, and D.

---

65 This conclusion, incidentally, does much to help validate Drumbl’s dating of the *Ego* verses to 9th century northern Italy. Because the *Ego* verses do not have an impact on the Carolingian *Popule meus* verses until after the Carolingian period, however, they are not discussed in this study.
Example 2.13. The first verse of the Narbonnaise *Popule meus* verses, with two phrases removed from the second cursus

Excised from the above transcription are two long phrases beginning *de terra...* and *in signis magnis...* which are both C phrases, with noodling extensions in the low range.

Here is the entire second cursus.
Example 2.14. The complete second cursus of the first verse of the Narbonnaise *Popule meus* verses

The multiple uses of the C phrase, the phrase with the triadic intonation, recalls the North Italian multiple use of this phrase, not only in its second cursus, as here, but also in its first. These repeated C phrases, with their extensions, also bespeak a formulaic improvisatory practice designed to accommodate texts of various lengths.

In terms of overall form, this is the first version of the *Popule meus* chant we will investigate that illustrates an antiphon with verses, identified by Huglo as present in the Gallican, Milanese, and Old Hispanic repertoires.\(^66\) Similarly to the Responsories of Joshua, the added text in the second cursus of the first verse is simply a troping or farsing of the simpler text seen in the other versions (Micah 6:4a with the *parasti crucem* addendum). Also as in the Responsories of Joshua, in *Adduxi vos* versus *Popule meus*,

\(^{66}\) Huglo, “Gallican Chant,” NG.
the next verse of the chant continues to expand this textual form with further farsing, although with unprecedented length. Finally the verse *Quid ultra... Ego quidem plantavi te...* shifts the tone of the poetry. Most importantly for our purposes, the melody is “farsed” as well, with additional C phrases and their extensions, or a partial cursus of the original ABCD form.

Because this farsing extends the form so much, a transcription that shows the form of the verses synoptically is challenging. The verses will therefore be presented in three ways: in full transcription, in text and translation annotated with musical formal analysis, and in a musical formal analysis chart that only includes text incipits.\(^67\)

---

\(^67\) These are also the analytical formats employed for the Carolingian verses in the Introduction.
Example 2.15. The Narbonnaise *Popule meus* verses

\[\text{A} \quad \text{B} \quad \text{C} \quad \text{D} \]

\(\text{Po-pu-le me-us quid fe-ci ti-bi}
\)

\(\text{C} \quad \text{D} \)

\(\text{aut in quo con-tri-sta-ve re-spon-de mi-chi}
\)

\(\text{A} \quad \text{B} \quad \text{C} \quad \text{ext.} \quad \text{ext.}
\)

\(\text{qui-a e-go e-du-xi te}
\)

\(\text{C} \quad \text{ext.}
\)

\(\text{de-ter-ra e-gi-pti in ma-nu for-ti}
\)

\(\text{C} \quad \text{ext.}
\)

\(\text{in si-gnis ma-gnis et pro-di-gi-is ex-cel-sis}
\)

\(\text{C} \quad \text{D}
\)

\(\text{et pa-ra-sti cru-ce-m sa-lva-to-ri tu-o}
\)
A

Ego quidem trans vexi te mare rubrum

B

et dimersi pharaonem coram oculis tuis

C

et de spoliis eius ego namque dita vi te

D

et de duxi te per desertumquadraginta annis

vestimenta tua non sunt attrita manna quoque cibavit e te

et introxi in terram satis optimam

et parasiti crucem salvatori tuo
Quid ultra debuis facere tibi et non feci

ego quidem plantavi te

et murro circumde di te

et de primiciis frugum tuorum

ace to namque potasisti me

et per fora - sti lancea la tus salva to - ri tuo
Table 2.2. Text and full musical form of the Narbonnaise *Popule meus* verses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Syllables</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td><em>Popule meus,</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>My people</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>quid feci tibi?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>what have I done to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>aut in quo contristavi te?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>or how have I grieved you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>responde michi.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>answer me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Quia ego</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>For I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td><em>eduxi te</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>led you out</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>de terra Egipti,</td>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>from the land of Egypt,</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>in manu forti,</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>with a strong hand,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>in signis magnis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>in great signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>et prodigiis excelsis</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>and lofty wonders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td><em>et parasti crucem</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>and you prepared a cross</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td><em>Salvatori tuo.</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>for your Savior.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Agios. Sanctus.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td><em>Ego quidem</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>I indeed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td><em>transvexi te</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>led you across</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>mare Rubrum,</td>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>the Red Sea,</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>et dimersi pharaonem</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>and sunk pharaoh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>coram occulis tuis</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>before your eyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>et de spolii eius</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>and with spoils from him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>ego namque ditavi te,</td>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>I indeed enriched you,</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>et</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td><em>deduxi te</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>I led you</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>per desertum quadraginta annis,</td>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>through the desert for forty years,</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>vestimenta tua non sunt attrita,</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>your garments did not wear out,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>manna quoque cibavi te,</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>likewise I fed you with manna,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>et</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td><em>introduxi in</em> terram*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>I led you into</em> a land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>satis optimam,</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>perfectly good,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td><em>et parasti crucem</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>and you prepared a cross</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td><em>Salvatori tuo.</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>for your Savior.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Agios. Sanctus.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td><em>Quid ultra</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>What more</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>debui facere tibi, et non feci?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>should I have done for you that I did not do?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td><em>Ego quidem</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>I indeed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td><em>plantavi te,</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>planted you,</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>et [I] muro circundedi te,</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>and with a wall encircled you,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>et de primiciis frugum tuorum</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>and from your firstfruits of your harvest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>aceto namque potasti me,</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>you gave me vinegar to drink,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td><em>et perforasti lancea latus</em></td>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>and with a lance you pierced the side of your Savior.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td><em>Salvatori tuo.</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A plus sign indicates an extension, while a minus sign indicates a truncation.
Table 2.3. Basic musical form of the Narbonnaise *Popule meus* verses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td><em>Popule meus</em></td>
<td>quid feci tibi</td>
<td></td>
<td>aut in quo</td>
<td>responde michi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quia ego</td>
<td>eduxi te</td>
<td>de terra egypti</td>
<td>in signis</td>
<td>et parastri</td>
<td>salvatori tuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ego quidem</td>
<td>transvexi te</td>
<td>mare rubrum</td>
<td>et de spoliis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>et</td>
<td>deduxi te</td>
<td>per desertum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>et</td>
<td></td>
<td>introduxi in terram</td>
<td></td>
<td>et parastri</td>
<td>salvatori tuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Quid ultra</td>
<td>debui facere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ego quidem</td>
<td>plantavi te</td>
<td>et muro circumdedi</td>
<td>de primitiis</td>
<td>et perforasti</td>
<td>salvatori tuo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The logic of the musical form is generally clear. Phrases A and B are used to signal a start of a musical cursus, which happens fully twice in the first verse (per the traditional doubled structure), although phrase C is used two additional times to lengthen the second cursus, as noted above. In the second verse, the form is restarted twice, corresponding with the textual form, phrase C is used to set most of the additional text, and phrase D is withheld to the very end within the C–D refrain *et parasti crucem salvatori tuo*. A similar track is taken in the final verse, although the restarting after phrase B change is somewhat surprising. Also surprising, in terms of text, is the alteration of the textual refrain (*perforasti*...), even while the musical refrain completes the chant as usual.

The fact that the Responsories of Joshua employ similar textual and musical strategies for farsing may indicate an exchange of ideas between the “Roman” and “Gallican” families of *Popule meus* chants. Indeed, as we shall see, in the Carolingian verses the farsing text is brought more in line with the farsing text of the Responsories of Joshua, suggesting an ultimate “Romanizing” editorial process for the official version of
the chant. Two more versions of the *Popule meus* exist, however, that we must investigate.

**THE OLD HISPANIC SONUS**

Although we cannot provide definite transcriptions of the Old Hispanic *Popule meus* Sonus, we can assess quite a bit of information via the neumes. For example, it is clear that, whereas in all previously-examined melodic versions the second word of the chant, *meus*, is not given special attention, it is emphasized here.\(^{68}\)

Figure 2.2. Realization of neumes for the first two words of the Old Hispanic Sonus in León 8.

![Neumes for the first two words of the Old Hispanic Sonus in León 8.](chart)

This accords with the summary of Maloy and Hornby that “a prolonging of [the personal pronoun] *me* lies within the normal expressive idiom of the Old Hispanic Lenten chants.”\(^{69}\) We can also, by counting the number of notes per syllable, chart the melodic density.\(^{70}\) By this method, for example, we can easily see that there is little divergence between the melody as it is found in two manuscripts representing the so-called Traditions A and B of the Old Hispanic rite.

\(^{68}\) León 8, fol. 166v. The neumes are interpreted using Appendix 1 in Hornby and Maloy, *Music and Meaning in Old Hispanic Lenten Chants*, 315–26, which summarizes existing research on the Old Hispanic neumes.

\(^{69}\) Hornby and Maloy, 161.

\(^{70}\) This method follows Hornby and Maloy as well (14–24).
Using this method to compare to other versions of the chant yields inconclusive results.

For example, here the northern Old Hispanic manuscript is compared to the Narbonnaise version.

A comparison with the Aquitainian verses, to be discussed next, is hardly more conclusive; however, one does find that the Old Hispanic and Aquitainian melodies share an emphasis on the initial *meus* where all the other melodic versions do not.
Finally, and most curiously, if the Sonus ever displayed a doubled structure as all the rest of the versions of *Popule meus* do, it is not apparent from the information that the neumes can provide us. Here are the melodic densities of the first and second part of the refrain.
The apparent divergence in melody from the other versions of the *contristavi*... *parasti crucum*... chant is at least consistent with the fact that there are textual divergences as well. For example, as noted in the chart of variants of Micah 6:3, the verses of the Sonus contain the full Old Latin citation of Micah 6:3, with both *molestus fui* and *contristavi*.\(^71\) Here there is also an ordering *te contristavi*, whereas the Sonus itself has *contristavi te*. In short, we are looking at as many as three textual layers in the chant. This is probably an indication that the Sonus was originally imported. It suggests that a general *Popule meus*... *contristavi te*... *parasti crucem*... chant was circulating when

\(^71\) Most of the rest of the verse text, however, accords more closely with the Vulgate than the Old Latin (at least as given by Jerome and then taken into the edition of Sabatier).
the Old Hispanic liturgy was being filled out (in this case, probably in the 7th century) and was adopted by the Spanish church. The recitation of the full Micah pericope (Micah 6:1–8), with the Sonus serving as the refrain, is also unique in its format: as in a Gregorian responsory, the refrain is not repeated in full but only beginning partway through, usually, from quia eduxi, but at times from parasti, apparently for reasons of textual sense. Finally, the apparent decision by the Spanish adaptor(s) to change salvatori tuo to mici (the typical Spanish spelling of this pronoun) accords with the preference for textual and melodic emphasis on the personal pronoun in Lenten chants as noted above. A more direct explanation for the use of the word mici is that the Sonus was assigned to be sung by the bishop himself in a direct personification of Christ, unlike the apparent tradition elsewhere to have the Popule meus sung by two deacons. Closer examination of the Old Hispanic liturgical context of the Popule meus Sonus will be carried out in Chapter 3.

THE AQUITAINIAN POPULE MEUS VERSES

A final non-Carolingian version of the Popule meus verses is found primarily in the realm of Aquitaine, that is, north of the Pyrenees and south of the Loire. Its first verse, unlike the Narbonnaise version, has no phrase extensions, and so its melody is easily shown in its entirety.

72 ... episcopus cum presbiteris et diaconibus nudis vestigiis ascendunt in pulpitem, et sic inponit episcopus voce tremula Popule meus. (León 8, fol. 166v).
Example 2.16. The first verse of the Aquitainian *Popule meus* verses

As noted above, the A melody emphasizes the word *meus*, a particular feature found only in this and the Old Hispanic melodies. It is thus very noticeable (at least in this visual analysis) when the A phrase is truncated in the second cursus due to the fact that it only sets one word, *quia*, as opposed to, for example, the *quia ego* of the Narbonnaise version.73 There are several features of the Aquitainian version that accord with Italian versions of the melody such as the Milanese antiphon and the Beneventan Offertory. Key among these is the use in phrase C of scale degrees 5 and 6 above the triad only, as opposed to 5, 6, and 7 in the North Italian, Narbonnaise, and Carolingian melodies. This is surely one of the most distinctive parts of the melody in any of these versions, and so

73 Recall also the *quoniam ego* of the Responsory of Joshua *Popule meus*, which likewise may have ended up there for purposes of text-melody relation.
the difference is particularly notable. The Beneventan version is, incidentally, notable for its use of both 5–6–5 and 5–6–7–6–5 in its prolonged acrobatics on *quo*, which Kelly has demonstrated is standard behavior in a Beneventan mid-phrase extension.\(^{74}\) The *parasti* refrain of the Aquitainian verses occurs identically at the end of all three verses, which is the most consistent use of the refrain out of all the versions examined, since the Narbonnais and Carolingian verses use the text *perforasti* in their final verses. Musically, this final C phrase is distinctive because it lacks the bottom note of the standard triadic intonation.

Here, now, are the transcription and analysis of the Aquitainian *Popule meus* verses:

Example 2.17. The Aquitainian *Popule meus* verses

\[\text{A} \]  
\[\text{B} \]  
\[\text{C} \]  
\[\text{D} \]

74 Kelly, *The Beneventan Chant*, 104–6, and see note above in discussion of the BEN Offertory.
Dic michi, filius primogenite,

Quid est quod debui ti bi facere et non feci?

Sed tu retribuiras malam bonam.

Paraisti crucem salvari tuo.

Vinea mea electa.

Ego te plantavi vineam veram.

Quam modo conversa est in amaritudinem?

Paraisti crucem salvari tuo.
Table 2.4. Text and full musical form of the Aquitainian *Popule meus* verses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Syllables</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td><em>Popule meus</em>,</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>My people,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>quid feci tibi?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>what have I done to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>aut in quo contristavi te?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>or how have I grieved you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>responde michi.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>answer me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-*</td>
<td>Quia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>eduxi te</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I led you out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>de terra Egipti,</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>from the land of Egypt,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>parasti crucem</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>you prepared a cross for your Savior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Salvatori tuo.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[Ve nobis.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Dic michi,</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tell me,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td><em>fili meus</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>my son,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>primogenite,</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[my] firstborn,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>quid est quod debui</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>what should I have done for you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>tibi facere</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>that I did not do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>et non feci?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yet you would return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sed tu retribueris</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>evil for good:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>mala pro bonis:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>you prepared a cross for your Savior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>parasti crucem</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>My vine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Salvatori tuo.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>elect,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td><em>Vinea mea</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I planted you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>electa,</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>as a proper vine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>ego te plantavi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>how have you changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>vineam veram;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>to bitterness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>quomodo conversa es</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>you prepared a cross for your Savior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>in amaritudinem?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>parasti crucem</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Salvatori tuo.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whereas the Narbonnaise verses were notable for their development of first-person past-tense verbs (*eduxi, transvexi, deduxi, introduxi*), the Aquitainian verses develop the theme of vocative address (*popule meus, fili meus, vinea mea*). While the Aquitainian version’s melodic particulars diverge from the North Italian, Narbonnaise, and Carolingian versions of the melody (with these three taken as a group), its overall
melodic apportioning among its three verses accords closely with the Carolingian verses (compare Tables 2.5 and 2.7).

Table 2.5. Basic musical form of the Narbonnaise *Popule meus* verses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>P</em> opule meus</td>
<td>quid feci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>aut in quo</td>
<td>responde</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quia</td>
<td>eduxi te</td>
<td>de terra</td>
<td>parasti</td>
<td>salvatori</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>D</em> ic michi</td>
<td>fili meus</td>
<td>primogenite</td>
<td>quid est</td>
<td>sed tu</td>
<td>parasti</td>
<td>salvatori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>V</em> inea mea</td>
<td>electa</td>
<td>ego te</td>
<td>quomodo</td>
<td>parasti</td>
<td>salvatori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In comparison to the above chart, one will notice that here C sometimes indicates C alone or C extended by either an (unnamed) extension or D or both.75

Because of certain similarities between the Carolingian and Aquitainian versions, one might be inclined to posit the latter as a model for the former. Yet the Aquitainian verses are unlikely to be the immediate predecessors of the Carolingian verses. Here my reasoning mostly relies on modal considerations: the Aquitainian verses are an excellent example of a D-mode chant—every single sense unit in the text ends on a D in the melody—while the Carolingian verses display a greater sense of modal ambiguity. There is simply no reason, if the Carolingians had appropriated the Aquitainian version, why they would have changed the melody in this way. Consider the non-refrain C phrases from the last verses of each:

---

75 For the Aquitainian verses it is thus clear that singling out a D phrase is not very useful; D is simply a cadential gesture that rounds off phrases. This awkwardness in analysis lends support to the characterization of the *Popule meus* verses by Ruth Steiner and Keith Falconer, “Reproaches [Improperia],” NG, as being made up of only two phrases. Their A comprises my A and B, while their B comprises my C and D. For overall comparison in this chapter, however, I find that isolating four phrases is useful much of the time.
Example 2.18. Comparison of non-refrain C phrases in the third verses of the Aquitainian and Carolingian Popule meus verses

![AQ BnF lat. 1121 (c. 1000), 151r.](image1)

![CAR Gregorianik Restitution](image2)

In the first place, the intonation is “wrong” in each compared to the triadic intonation preserved in the first verse of each version. The cadences of the Aquitainian version are systematically on D, while those of the Carolingian version are systematically on C. If we transpose the first Carolingian C phrase here up a fifth, it becomes clear that we are dealing with the exact same modal ambiguities as we observed in the preserved versions of the original Popule meus antiphon. G versus A or C versus D—the difference is only a matter of notational convention.

Example 2.19. A third-verse C phrase from the Carolingian Popule meus verses transposed up a fifth

![CAR Gregorianik Restitution](image3)
Finally, there is reason to suggest that the Aquitainian 5–6–5 motion is an adjustment made by the Aquitainians from a 5–6–7–6–5 motion as they received it. From where did they receive it? A portion of a gradual from the early 11th century from Ivrea, in northwestern Italy, survives that seems to answer that question. It preserves the verses *Popule meus*, *Dic mihi*, and *Vinea mea*, but in a much simpler melody, with one or two notes per syllable on average. Although the notation is unheighted, one part of the melody is clearly based on other manuscripts with heighted neumes: the word *parasti* is set with a neume pattern that cannot but indicate the usual 5–6–7–6–5(–6–5) motion:76

Figure 2.7. Neumes on *Parasti crucem* in the Ivrea witness to the Aquitainian *Popule meus* verses

\[
\text{Pa - ra - sti cru – cem}
\]

Vat. lat. 4197, 85v.

We can thus hypothesize that the Aquitainian *Popule meus* refrain was simply another member of the Italian family of *parasti crucem* chants already including the Beneventan Offertory and the North Italian *Popule meus* antiphon, that the Aquitainian verses also originated in northwestern Italy, and that they spread west to Aquitaine from there.

If the Carolingian verses did not come from Aquitaine, and if the concentration of *Popule meus* chants lies in northwest Italy and the French Mediterranean coast, how did a set of *Popule meus* verses get to Saint-Denis to be copied and sent to Senlis? Chapters 5 and 6 will show that two cities in north-central France may have known a Gallican *Popule meus* chant from which it could have been transmitted to Saint-Denis via the

---

76 The word is neumed thus: *pa* (pes) *ra* (punctum, torculus, torculus) *sti* (punctum). Here traced from the reproduction in Henry Bannister, *Monumenti vaticani di paleografia musicale latina* (Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1913), Tavole 24b.
indomitable Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims (d. 882). This would then suggest that these Gallican Popule meus verses had travelled up through the central corridor of the Rhône and the tributaries of the Seine to these northern cities. Is this a legitimate hypothesis? As our investigation of Gallican liturgical texts from central and north-central France will show, the liturgical tenor of Good Friday certainly made the day primed for a set of Popule meus verses in the 6th and 7th centuries. Because a Popule meus... parasti crucem... chant existed in the Old Hispanic liturgy on Good Friday in a well-developed penitential ceremony known as the Ceremony of Indulgence in the 7th century, it is reasonable to suggest that both the ceremony and the chant could be found in the Gallican liturgies as well. But where would this Ceremony of Indulgence have come from? It is not a historical reenactment, as so much of the rest of the Triduum liturgy was. It turns out that, to find the roots of this ceremony, we must return to Milan of the late-4th century under Ambrose of Milan.
CHAPTER 3: PREACHING AND LITURGY IN MILAN, GAUL, AND SPAIN:

CONTEXTS FOR THE PRE-CAROLINGIAN POPULE MEUS VERSES

We have seen how interpretation and preaching of Micah 6:3 connected with Christ’s Passion and the judging-redeeming of the individual can be traced back to 4th-century Milan in the writings of Ambrose (Chapter 1). We then examined the textual variations and melodic grammar of a diverse family of *Popule meus* chants in the Latin liturgies, concluding that an Ambrosian *antiphona dupla* with the text *Popule meus ... parasti crucem Salvatori tuo* may be the oldest exemplar of the “Gallican” family of chants in terms of both text and music (Chapter 2). The object of this chapter is to reconstruct the liturgical context of the subset of *Popule meus* chants that came to be associated with Good Friday, centering on the *Indulgentia* ceremony preserved in the Old Hispanic liturgical books. This investigation in turn leads to two principal theses, looking backward and forward from the Old Hispanic liturgy, respectively. The first thesis concerns origins and complements the theses of Chapters 1 and 2 summarized above: Just as the *Popule meus* chants seem to point back to Milan as seedbed in terms of interpretation and melody, so does their liturgical context in the Old Hispanic rite point back to Milan, and particularly Milan of the late-4th century. The second thesis looks forward to the meaning attached to the *Popule meus* chants in the Carolingian realm leading up to their appropriation in the Good Friday service.

The Old Hispanic Good Friday *Popule meus* is unique among the extant *Popule meus* chants in that it serves as the refrain for a responsorial chanting of Micah 6:1–8, a notable construction for a non-psalmic text that may serve as an indication of great antiquity, perhaps representing the original performance practice of the Milanese *Popule*
meus as well. Whether this is the case or not, the fact that the Old Hispanic Good Friday Popule meus refrain appears in liturgical books of both Iberian traditions, ¹ with a number of textual differences, suggests that it predates the Muslim invasion, which began in 711.²

A morning ceremony adoring the Cross takes place at Terce in the Tradition A, but is unknown by the Tradition B, suggesting that it was a later importation to Spain than other elements of the Old Hispanic Good Friday liturgy.³ The Indulgentia ceremony, however, is in both traditions and preserves the Popule meus with its verses as a prominent early part of the afternoon liturgy at None. The extent to which the Indulgentia ceremony can be traced back in time thus has a bearing on hypotheses of the antiquity and origin of the Good Friday Popule meus.

While its preservation in the northern and southern rite indicates its existence before 711, a few key early Spanish sources give some further clues to the Indulgentia

---


² Specifically, León 8 and Toledo 35.5. Because the Old Hispanic Popule meus is not mentioned in the canons of the Fourth Council of Toledo, Séjourné “hesitaste[d] to believe that it was already in general usage” at that time; this is the only opinion of which I am aware on the date of the Old Hispanic Popule meus in liturgical scholarship. Au cours même de cette lecture [of the Passion], l’assistance chantait tout au long le Popule meus. Sans doute, cette intervention du peuple chrétien dans le récit de la Passion n’est pas notée dans le concile de 633, et nous hesitons a croire qu’elle fût déjà d’un usage général. Cette longue complainte, en effet, porte avec soi sa date. Contribuant à augmenter la dévotion et l’effervescence de l’assemblée, elle était, par cela même, destinée au plus étonnant succès, et devait passer dans la liturgie gallicane au IXe siècle. Paul Séjourné, Le dernier père de l’Église: Saint Isidore de Séville: Son rôle dans l’histoire du droit canonique (Paris: Beauchesne, 1929), 158. It is unclear why Séjourné places the Popule meus in the midst of the reading of the Passion. No liturgical book of which I am aware has this liturgical ordering. The Popule meus is placed at the beginning of the service at None in both Traditions A and B, as discussed below.

ceremony. Isidore of Seville, in his *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, comments on the meaning of Good Friday, saying that it “is held in solemnity because on that day Christ fulfilled the mystery of the cross” and that “human feebleness offers an annual celebration to Christ throughout the whole world, on account of him who was worthy by the blood of his passion to redeem the world, and through the cross conquered by death to absolve the sin of the world.” The overall significance of Good Friday for Isidore is summed up in the term “mystery of the cross,” while the Christ of the Passion is characterized as one who redeems, as one who conquers, and as one who absolves.

These themes, as well as the importance of the involvement of “human feebleness,” emerge in terms more explicitly liturgical in the legislation of the Fourth Council of Toledo, which was held in 633, officiated by Isidore some years after his writing of the *De ecclesiasticis officiis*. Here, in canons 7 and 8, prayers for indulgence, or pardon, are given a prominent place in the designated observance of Good Friday in Spanish churches:

VII. Comperimus quod per nonnullas ecclesias in die sextę feriae passionis domini, clausis basilicarum foribus, nec celebretur officium, nec passio domini populis praedicetur. Dum idem salvator noster apostolis suis praecipiat dicens: Passionem et mortem et resurrectionem meam omnibus praedicate. Ideoque oportet eodem die mysterium crucis quod ipse cunctis adnuntiandum voluit praedicari atque indulgentiam

VII. We learn that, in some churches on the day of the Sixth Day of the Passion of the Lord, due to the doors of the basilicas being closed, neither is the office celebrated, nor is the Passion of the Lord preached to the people; though our Savior commands his apostles, saying, “Preach ye my passion and death and resurrection to all.” It is therefore proper on that day that the mystery of the cross—which he willed to be announced to all—be preached, and that

---

4 Compare the following discussion to that of Ordeig i Mata, “L’ordre hispànic del divendres sant,” who also interprets these documents.
6 See his name at the end of the canons.
7 An alternate trans. of *indulgentia* in the following passages would be “pardon” or “forgiveness,” but I have chosen to leave the term as its English cognate.
The people pray for the indulgence of crimes (indulgentiam criminum) with a distinct voice; that, cleansed by the remorse of penitence, we may be merited to welcome, with iniquities remitted, the venerable day of the Lord’s resurrection, and to take the sacrament of his holy body and blood, clean from sin.

VIII. Some persons, on that same day of the Lord’s Passion, at the ninth hour, break off their fast, and improperly indulge in feasting; and, while the sun itself on that day, veiled in darkness, withdrew his light, and the disturbance of the elements manifested the sorrow of the whole world, they pollute the fast of such a day, and give themselves up to banqueting. Since the whole Church, on account of the Passion of the Lord, spends that day in grief and abstinence, whoever—except children, old men, and sick persons—shall break his fast before the prayers of indulgence (indulgentiae praeces) are finished shall be turned away from the joy of the Pasch; nor shall they participate, on that day, in the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord, who do not honor the day of his Passion by abstinence.

That these special pleas for indulgence occurred with liturgical fixity on Good Friday before the Muslim invasion is further confirmed by a heading in the Old Hispanic Orationale, Oratio dicenda in Parasceven post Indulgentias explicitas. Isidore would not have needed to address the Good Friday observances in two canons unless there was variance of observance; the canons themselves tell us that some churches were closed and that some individuals broke a fast at the hour of the Crucifixion. Both of these practices

---

8 José Vives, ed. Oracional visigótico (Barcelona: Biblioteca Balmes, 1946), 268.
labeled as deviant likely had their own histories and rationales—at Rome at this time, for example, there was indeed still no gathering of the faithful on Good Friday— but what of this unique ceremonial locus centered around the “indulgence of crimes”? Was this a novel invention of Isidore in 7th-century Spain or perhaps a tradition existing in some areas but not yet universally accepted in the Iberian peninsula?

**INDULGENTIA CRIMINUM: THE IMPERIAL PASchal PARDON**

A first indication toward the latter option is a section of laws in the Theodosian Code (compiled in 438) entitled *De Indulgentiis Criminum*, the majority of which explicitly connect the giving of a (legal) *indulgentia* with the paschal time of year. The paschal indulgence laws were promulgated individually by Christian emperors in a timespan of less than twenty years, with the first appearing in 367:

---


11 After Pharr, with ‘Easter’ changed to ‘the Pasch’; for discussion on this, see below.
Emperors Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian Augustuses to Viventius, Prefect of the City.

On account of the Day of the Pasch, which We celebrate in the depths of Our hearts, We release from confinement all those persons who are bound by criminal charges or who are confined in prison. However, the person guilty of sacrilege against the Imperial Majesty, the person guilty of crimes against the dead, the sorcerer or magician, the adulterer, ravisher, or homicide shall be excluded from participation in that boon.

Given on the third day before the nones of May at Rome in the year of the consulship of Lupcinus and Jovinus.— May 5, 367; 369.

This version and the others included under this section of the Theodosian Code were perhaps edited down for their inclusion in the Code, if we are to judge from the prolix version from 380/1 preserved in a non-Theodosian collection of mostly ecclesiastical law known as the Sirmondian Constitutions. The wording of this law shows the specific usage of the word indulgentia in relation to the enacting and promulgating of the paschal clemency:

“...[they] shall be restored by the indulgence of unexpected compassion to perpetual security...”

“...[they are] freed by the indulgence of Our Clemency...”

“Thus Our indulgence shall deliver them to the freedom that is common to all men...”

---


The concept of *indulgentia* is not just the pardon itself, but has a connotation of agency, of a merciful acting on the account of the emperor toward his subjects in prison. Furthermore, this agency acts toward the end of not just the pardon in itself, but a renewal of life described in a mix of legal and philosophical-religious terminology:

“...they shall be brought again to the joys of the common life which had been forfeited by the cruelty of their misdeeds.”

“...they shall be imbued with the light of such a new restoration and shall have a renewal of the better life.”

“...in order that they may follow the precepts of a better life and may not dare to commit any dangerous crime...”

The fact that the terminology is quasi-religious is given explanation in or after 385 in a sermon of John Chrysostom, who refers to the paschal *indulgentia* in a Holy Week sermon as an act of the emperors intentionally designed to mirror the Christian paschal redemption itself:

So why do we call this week great? Because in it many ineffable good things come our way: in it protracted war is concluded, death is eliminated, curses are lifted, the devil's tyranny is relaxed, his pomps are despoiled, the reconciliation of God and man is achieved, heaven is made accessible, human beings are brought to resemble angels, those things which were at odds are united, the wall is laid low, the bar removed, the God of peace having brought peace to things on high and things on earth. This, then, is the reason we call the week great, because in it the Lord lavished on us such a plethora of gifts...

Emperors, too, in fact, by their own action declare the extent of the reverence they have for these august days [of Holy Week] by ordering everyone involved in civic administration to suspend business, the doors of the courts to be closed and all kinds of strife and dispute to be eliminated so that we may have the chance to proceed to our spiritual duties in complete peace and quiet. And not only this: they also give evidence of further generosity by releasing from their chains those confined in prison, and thus imitating their Lord to the extent of human

---

14 Ibid.
capacity. Just as he (as Scripture tells us) releases us from the harsh prison of our sins and offers us enjoyment of countless goods, in just the same way ought we to become imitators of the Lord's mercy as far as we can. Do you see how each of us demonstrates the reverence and regard we have for the days that have been made occasion of such great benefit for us?  

The contrast between the ultimate Lordship of God and/or Christ (the precise person is unspecified) and the subordinate lordship of the emperor is highlighted by Chrysostom’s choice of the word *despotes* (ultimate Lord), rather than the typical *kyrios*, against *basileis* (emperors or kings), which are limited in their human power (*dunamin anthroteinen*); emperors have a dual role as grateful human beings in the true paschal redemption and as models of beneficent rulership underneath a supreme ruler in mimetic earthly paschal redemptions.

The fact that the Old Hispanic *Indulgentia* ceremony occurs on Good Friday raises the question of the timing of this imperial paschal indulgence. From the testimony of Chrysostom we have learned that it takes place during the “august days” of Holy Week. The imperial laws themselves tend to use the word “pasch” or “paschal” to designate the timing, which is what we have adopted in turn. This word, derived from the Hebrew *pesah*, “the passing over,” could thus refer to the Jewish festival of Passover and also an analogous Christian celebration as a passing (Latin: *transitus*) from death to life. An alternate sense of the word emerged in the first centuries of the Church which related the word to the Greek verb *paschein*, “to suffer,” thus highlighting the Passion component of the paschal redemption rather than the Resurrection component. The temporal ambiguity of the term emerged due to the telescoping of the Christian Passover

---

17 Pharr, in the standard English translation of the Theodosian Code, simply uses the word “Easter,” as noted above.
from one day into three days. The Church Fathers of the fourth and early fifth centuries designated the three days of Good Friday, Holy Saturday, and Easter Sunday, either individually or collectively, as *pascha*. The fifth and sixth centuries saw the final shift in meaning of the word to signify Easter Sunday only. While the Theodosian Code was redacted during this last period, the laws themselves came from the prior period; the meaning of the word “pasch” in the *indulgentia* laws must thus be treated with a certain amount of interpretive caution.

The laws collected in this section of the Theodosian Code come in three groupings chronologically: 367–70, 380–1, and 384–5. The two versions of the law from the last group, in the mid-380s, may provide some clarification to the days of Holy Week of Chrysostom (c. 385) and the “pasch” of the earlier versions. The version of 384 does not use the word “pasch” at all, but rather names the *religio anniversariae obsecrationis* (“the rite of the annual supplication”) as the impetus for the imperial pardon. This is quite a change from the wording of the version of the law immediately prior, from 381, which cited *paschalis laetitiae dies* (“the day of Paschal joy”); instead of identifying the feast with a positive human emotion of reaction, it is now identified with prayer or supplication, a human work to be completed, and one that is scheduled to be completed every year. The version of 385 returns to the wording involving “pasch,” but with more precision of designation; it cites the *primum dies paschalis* (“the first day of the Pasch”)

---


20 “Le nom de Pascha, réservé pendant les deux premiers siècles à la commémoration de la mort, étendra sa signification au cours des IIIe-IVe siècles, et s’appliquera à tout le triduum, pour se restreindre ensuite, à partir des Vᵉ-VIᵉ siècles, jusqu’à désigner presque exclusivement la grande fête de la résurrection, notre joyeuse fête de Pâques.” C. Callewaert, “La durée et le caractère du carême ancien,” in *Sacris erudiri* (1940), 455.
as the day when prisoners are to be released. As we have noted, in the second half of the 4th century “the Pasch” was at times conceived of as comprising three days: Good Friday, Holy Saturday, and Easter Sunday. Furthermore, the law of 384 is dated March 22, which was indeed Good Friday in that year.

Looking now to the place of issue of this last set of indulgentia laws we find a possible reason for these changes: whereas all previous versions of the law were issued at Rome, both the laws of 384 and 385 were issued at Milan. From what we know of Ambrose’s relations with the emperors from Chapter 1 we should allow the possibility that the bishop’s influence had some effect on the peculiar innovations in the phrasings of the edicts; in these years particularly, Ambrose proved to have great influence over the western emperor Valentinian II, who was just in his young teens, notwithstanding the enmity between the bishop and Valentinian’s Arian mother Justina, with whom he resided at Milan.

**INDULGENTIA PECCATORUM: MILAN’S PASCHAL RELAXATION OF PENANCE**

We do not have any direct evidence for Ambrose’s influence on Valentinian II in this matter in 384 or 385; however, there are definite references to a “rite of annual supplication” related to the “first day of the Pasch” in Milan from the years immediately following (386 and 387). The first reference comes from a letter from Ambrose to his sister relating the high-tension events of Holy Week 386, at the height of Ambrose’s conflict with Valentinian’s mother Justina over the rights of Arians in Milan to Nicene church buildings.

The next day [Thursday of Holy Week] the Book of Jonas was read according to custom, and when it was finished I began this sermon: “Brethren, a book has been read in which it is prophesied that sinners shall return to penance [or “be converted in penance”]. It is understood to mean
that they may hope for the future in the present... [The story of Jonah is
summarized.]...And, in fact, [the Lord] did away with the destruction
which had been prepared for all the city.”

Word came promptly that the emperor had ordered the soldiers to
withdraw from the basilica, and fines which had been levied on the
merchants were being returned to them. What, then, was the joy of all the
people! What cheering from the whole crowd! What thanksgiving! It
was the day on which the Lord had delivered himself for us, the day when
penance in the Church is ended [or “relaxed” or “again loosened”]. [erat
autem dies, quo sese dominus pro nobis tradidit, quo in ecclesia
paenitentia relaxatur.] ... Then I knew that God had smitten the early
worm so that the whole city might be saved.21

Earlier in the letter, regarding Monday of Holy Week, Ambrose had mentioned the
imperial indulgence in contradistinction to the violations of the rights of citizens of Milan
as the conflict escalated:

Very severe penalties were decreed then and there, first on the entire class
of merchants. Consequently, during the holy days of the last week of [of
Lent], when the bonds of debtors are customarily loosed [laxari], chains
rattled and were put upon the necks of innocent people, and they were
taxed 200 pounds’ weight of gold [to be paid] in three days’ time... The
prisons, too, were packed with tradesmen.22

Connecting the threads between the words of this letter of 386 and the phrasing of
the 384 and 385 indulgentia laws issued at Milan, we see the outlines of an interaction of
both cooperation and struggle between the key power figures of the city regarding the
concept and application of indulgentia during Holy Week. For example, in this last
excerpt, it is clear that Ambrose sees the imposition of taxes and imprisonment on his
Nicene citizens of Milan as a gross perversion of the imperial prerogative of Holy Week.
Justina and perhaps the teenage emperor, for their part, may have indeed timed the
demanding of Ambrose’s churches for Arian use during Holy Week to instigate a

col. 994–1002.
22 Ibid., 366.
dramatic imperial-episcopal showdown at a time of year in which Ambrose customarily
dominated citizen and emperor alike, if we are to judge from Ambrose’s descriptions of
the populace in his letter and the changes in the indulgentia laws; not only did the
wording change designating the religious feast that was to prompt the indulgence, the
paschal indulgentia was explicitly enacted as an annual law in perpetuity in the version of
385. Indeed, this latter development, especially if brokered by an interaction between
bishop and emperor, may have been a factor in Chrysostom’s highlighting of the imperial
indulgentia as a praiseworthy model in Holy Week of 385.

The central subject, of course, of both the imperial laws and the excerpts from
Ambrose’s letter, is a remarkable change that occurs in the church, and perhaps most
precisely in the Milanese church, at the end of Lent and at the beginning of the paschal
triduum. The nature of this change in Rome is clearer in the guidance of Pope Innocent
to Bishop Decentius of Gubbio (central Italy) from about 30 years later:

As to those performing public penance, either on account of serious
transgressions, or for more venial sins, if no sickness intervenes, the
custom of the Roman church shows that they are to be reconciled on the
Thursday before Easter [quinta feria ante pascha]. Moreover, it is the
part of the bishop (sacerdotis) to judge as to the gravity of the offenses, to
weigh the accusation of the penitent, to appraise the corrective of his
weeping and his tears, and then to order him to be absolved, when he had
seen an appropriate satisfaction. But if one shall have fallen sick, and his
life is despaired of, he is to be absolved even before the Paschal time [ante
tempus paschae relaxandum], lest he depart this world without
Communion.  

In Roman practice, then, it was a specific group of people, the public penitents, whose
status was normally changed at the close of Lent and the beginning of the tempus
paschae, on the Thursday of Holy Week. This may have also been the case in Milan;

---

however, if this is so, Ambrose seems to be at particular pains not to single out the penitents in his Holy Thursday preaching, and rather seems intent on fostering a deep penitential experience in the entire congregation.

For example, in his letter cited from above, he draws parallels between the city of Nineveh as depicted in the book of Jonah (read on Holy Thursday, “according to custom”) and the city of Milan. In his personal thoughts to his sister he gives some rationale as to why he thought Milan was in such danger:

“Actually, in my heart I was frightened, since I knew that armed men had been sent to seize the basilica of the church; [I feared] that in defending the basilica bloodshed would occur and turn to the harm of the whole city. I kept praying that I would not live to see the ruin of this great city or, possibly, of all Italy. I dreaded the ill-will that would arise from the spilling of blood; I offered my own throat.”

The proper solution to the imminent threat, for Ambrose, was apparently to offer his own life, and he records himself actually saying to the imperial officials that he would gladly be sacrificed before the altars, yet the proper solution for the inhabitants of the city was to repent: “[Returning to penance] is understood to mean that they may hope for the future in the present.” When the rescinding of the emperor’s orders was then announced, soon after the completion of this sermon, it was most appropriate: “It was the day on which the Lord had delivered himself for us, the day when penance in the Church is ended.” Not only had Ambrose offered himself up for the people, but their sincere penance had been effected and could now end. Furthermore implied, perhaps, is that the emperor had done what he was supposed to do on that day as well: loose bonds.

25 Ibid.; he later offers his blood to one accusing him of being a usurper (375).
The evening sermon for Holy Thursday recorded in Ambrose’s Hexameron also makes note of the nighttime, while also focusing the meaning of repentance in a pre-paschal moment of personal crisis analogous to Peter’s denial of Christ and weeping in the night of Thursday and pre-dawn of Friday. The Hexameron is a collection of sermons for Holy Week, probably preached in 387, just one year after the conflict with Justina and Valentinian II. The political power of the mother and son was lessening, however, and they would soon be driven out of Milan by the invasion of Maximus, a rival claimant to the Western Empire, in the early summer of that year.

Ambrose could now focus during Holy Week on a series of complex sermons relating each day in that week to the primordial week of Genesis 1. Day Five of the Biblical account sees the creation of sea creatures and birds (Genesis 1:20–23), and Ambrose spends most of his sermons for this day outlining a spiritual significance for various species of swimming and flying creatures. He is able to seamlessly address the Old Testament and Gospel readings for the day through discussion of the whale of Jonah and the rooster of Peter. In its overall arch of significance the sermon series peaks at Day Six, “the culmination of the whole debate,” with the day of man’s creation aligning with the day of his re-creation. The most vivid emotional appeal, however, comes at the close of the evening sermon of Holy Thursday.

Having just discussed winged creatures that teach about resurrection (the phoenix), reason (vultures), and divine vengeance and divine grace (the locust and its predator, the seleukis), Ambrose pauses: “But what is this that has happened? While we

are prolonging our discourse, see how the birds of night flit around us!”27 He shifts into
discussion of nocturnal winged creatures—the nightingale who sings a mother’s lullaby,
the night owl who sees only in darkness like a philosopher of this world, the bat who
clumps together with his hanging brethren displaying love in action—and concludes with
a bird who signals, during the night, the dawn: the rooster. The call of this bird is
poignant particularly for this hour: “And so we have purposely prolonged our discussion
in order that the cock may come also to us as we speak.”28

“At cock-crow,” Ambrose advises, “hope returns to all, the sick find comfort, the
wounded find relief, the feverish are calmed, the lapsed return to the faith.”29

Paradigmatic is the experience of Peter during the night of the Passion, who after the
cock crowed received the glance of Jesus and “washed away his sins with his tears.”30

Ambrose prays that this experience will come on his congregation:

Cast your glance on us also, Lord Jesus, that even we might recognize our
own errors, that we might loosen guilt [\textit{solvamus culpam}] with devout
tears, that we might be found to merit the indulgence of sins [\textit{indulgentia
peccatorum}].31

The cock-crow does not just signal the rhetorical climax of the sermon, however, but
something beyond this:

But now it is time to finish the sermon, and close we must: it is time to
best be found silent or weeping; it is time that the indulgence of sins be
celebrated [\textit{celebratur indulgentia peccatorum}]; that for us also that
mystical cock might sing in the rites [\textit{sacris}], inasmuch as the cock of
Peter sang in our sermon; that Peter might weep for us who wept well for
himself, and that the tender expression of Christ might turn to us; that the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[27] Ibid., 221.
\item[28] Ibid., 224–5.
\item[29] Ibid., 224.
\item[30] Ibid., 224; cf. Matthew 26:75.
\item[31] Cf. ibid., 224.
\end{footnotes}
Passion of the Lord Jesus might hasten, which daily pardons our offenses and fulfills the work of remission.32

It is clear that there is some ceremony—“the rites” [sacris]—to follow which is distinct from the sermon, and which also seems to be distinct from the Eucharist, given that it is defined by the elements of Peter’s story and only hastens the arriving Passion, which daily (perhaps meaning in the Eucharist) pardons sins. This interpretation is also borne out by Ambrose’s concluding exhortations, which brings back in metaphors several of the creatures treated throughout the day:

And therefore, we who have frolicked with the birds, we who have sung with the rooster, let us now crow the mysteries of the Lord! And let the eagles renewed by the washing of sins gather at the body of Jesus, for now that great whale has restored to us the true Jonah. And let us be glad that evening is done for us, and let it be morning—the Sixth Day!33

The change in affect, from sadness to joy, in this last section of the sermon, the completed renewal of the eagles (that is, the congregation), as well as the present-ness of the Lord in his triumphing Passion, presuppose some change has occurred. If the “mystical cock” was to crow in any specific rites, Ambrose’s tenses make it clear that these rites have already occurred. A threshold has been crossed into the triduum, into the Pasch, which incites all of Ambrose’s metaphorical imagination, with the congregation cast now as the cock crowing over the arrival of Christ’s Passion and Redemption and as eagles that gather around the body of Jesus. This last metaphor, unpacked according to Ambrose’s Commentary on Luke,34 has several overlapping meanings, but certainly two primary ones in this context: the women and the apostles around the sepulcher of the Lord at his burial on Good Friday and the saints gathered to meet the physical Lord in the

---

32 Cf. ibid., 224.
33 Cf. ibid., 224.
air at his Second Coming. The following metaphor actually highlights the second meaning rather than the former, for if the “true Jonah” is restored from the whale, he is not buried, but rather in a glorified body. This kind of rhetoric exemplifies the way in which Ambrose sees the Pasch as a single triumphant day, not only in the historical past, but in the spiritual present and in a very real historical future.

We can now attempt with reasonable grounds to connect the meaning of the events of the mid-380s that we have examined. It is clear that Valentinian II was the emperor responsible for the distinctive versions of the law from 384 and 385. At this time Valentinian II ruled over only Italy, while the usurper Maximus controlled Britain, Gaul, Spain, and Africa; Theodosius ruled the Eastern part of the Empire including Illyricum. Valentinian was indeed beholden to Ambrose from 383, when the bishop negotiated a truce with Maximus to allow this arrangement of power. We have two letters from the summer and autumn of 384 preserving Ambrose’s council to the young emperor about refusing a request to rebuild a pagan altar in the Senate; Valentinian followed Ambrose’s advice. It is only in 385 and 386 that troubles arise between Valentinian and Ambrose, apparently at the behest of Justina. The period from Good Friday 384 to February 25, 385 may thus be seen as a period in which the teenage emperor and Ambrose held good relations. Valentinian I had espoused Nicene Christianity, and Valentinian II eventually did as well in his request to be baptized by Ambrose in 392; there is a sense in which Ambrose plays a father figure to the emperor.35

---

35 For example: “I am amazed at your zeal for the faith” (32); “let no one take advantage of your youth” (33); “a decree like this [allowing the pagan altar rebuilt] cannot be enforced without sacrilege” (34) “Nothing is of more importance than religion; nothing is more exalted than faith” (35); “What will you answer the priest [i.e., Ambrose] who says to you: ‘The Church does not want your gifts because you have adorned the heathen temple with gifts... The Lord Jesus scorns and spurns your worship since you have worshiped idols...’ What will you answer to these words? That you are but a boy who has fallen? Every age is perfect in Christ, every one full of God” (35–36); “What will you answer your brother? ... What will
After a period in which the indulgentia law was not promulgated (in 382 and 383), it is readily imaginable that Ambrose should prevail upon Valentinian, after his successful negotiations with Maximus, to issue it again, with lengthy reasoning on the spiritual and liturgical bases for it, perhaps in a letter now lost or in person. Perhaps Valentinian was even present at an evening sermon on Thursday of Holy Week 384 like that given in the Hexameron, emphasizing the indulgentia peccatorum, which prompted him to issue his civil indulgentia law in observance of “the rite of the annual supplication” on the next day: Good Friday. In 385 the release of prisoners upon the arrival of Good Friday is made explicit in the law as “the first day of the Pasch,” and the law is furthermore perpetuated indefinitely. That these particularly phrased versions of the law represent some exchange between Ambrose to Valentinian, as spiritual father to spiritual son and certainly vice versa, seems highly likely.

That the Sirmondian Constitutions preserve an indulgentia law issued from Constantinople (i.e., Theodosius I) in 386, thus ignoring the decree of perpetuity, shows that Valentinian II’s laws might be held lightly by the Eastern emperor. Still, Chrysostom’s praise in Antioch in 385 of the reverence held by the emperors [basileis] for the days of Holy Week, releasing captives in imitation of their Master [despoten] perpetually, as the law says, on the “first day of the Pasch,” shows that the signification of the law was not lost on Eastern bishops. More significantly for our story, at a unique time in the West, it appears that the indulgentia peccatorum and the indulgentia criminum were united in a unique way at Milan. We shall now investigate to see whether this

---

you answer your father, who will confront you with great sorrow, saying: ‘Son, you have judged me very ill, thinking that I would have connived with the pagans... You have judged me very ill if the Gentiles’ superstition and not my faith preserved the Empire.’ Wherefore, O Emperor, you see that if you decree anything of this kind you will offer injury first to God and then to your father and brother; I beg you do what you know will benefit your own salvation before God” Trans. Beyenka, Saint Ambrose, Letters, 36–7.
coincidence of liturgical and legal understanding survived the great shifts in political and social structure of the 5th and 6th centuries.

MERITING INDULGENCE ON JUDGMENT DAY: THE SERMONS OF CAESARIUS OF ARLES

The Theodosian Code was published in 438 in the late Roman Empire as a collection of laws of the Christian emperors. It collected various laws together under subject headings such as *De indulgentiis criminum*—several laws of which we have just examined—and probably redacted these laws, reducing them to their bare essentials. Still, the collection was quite enormous, and as the 5th century passed and political power shifted to the various *foederati* the need for a concise code of Roman law arose. This need was met in the *Lex Romana Visigothorum* of Alaric II, known as the *Breviary* of Alaric, assembled by a group of Gallo-Roman bishops and noblemen, and promulgated in 506 for the governing of the Roman (non-Visigothic) subjects of the Visigothic kingdom of Toulouse. This law code remained in use in the Visigothic kingdom, centered at Toulouse and then at Toledo, until the year 654. In the section *De indulgentiis criminum* only one law remains out of twelve: the 385 version of the imperial paschal *indulgentia*, promulgated from Milan and instituting a law in perpetuity, that “As soon as the first day of the Pasch [*primum dies paschalis*] arrives, no person shall be confined in prison; all shall be released from their bonds.” This is supplemented by a newly-written rewording of the law:

---

Interpretation: The person guilty of sacrilege, the adulterer, the person guilty of incest, the ravisher, the violator of tombs, the sorcerer, the magician, the counterfeiter of money, and the homicide shall by no means be pardoned during the days of the Pasch \([\text{diebus paschae}]\). All the rest whom the blame for minor crimes constrains shall be specifically pardoned during the venerable days of the Pasch \([\text{diebus venerabilibus paschae}]\).\(^{38}\)

While we may doubt that the paschal \textit{indulgentia} was carried out every year and in every city in the Visigothic kingdom, the wording of the 6th-century committee’s interpretation—“by no means” and “specifically”—certainly seems to both presuppose and encourage the practice, and a copy of the Breviary was indeed sent to the count of each city.\(^{39}\) That a number of the committee were bishops may have had bearing, additionally, on the retaining of the law in the face of cutting others and the wording of the interpretation.\(^{40}\)

Caesarius, bishop of Arles from 502 to 542, was not on the committee compiling the Breviary of Alaric, but did preside over a council of Gallo-Roman bishops of Alaric’s kingdom later in that year of 506 which had the comparable aim of providing uniform guidelines for the Catholic church in Visigothic Gaul.\(^{41}\) One liturgical guideline, that the creed was to be preached to baptismal candidates in all churches on Palm Sunday, points to the influence of Milanese liturgical practice on southern Gaul as well as the importance of preaching to Caesarius.\(^{42}\)

\(^{38}\) After Pharr, \textit{Theodosian Code}, 254, again replacing the terms involving Easter with more literal translations.

\(^{39}\) Klingshirn, \textit{Caesarius of Arles}, 95.

\(^{40}\) Ibid.

\(^{41}\) The council of Agde, described in Klingshirn, \textit{Caesarius of Arles}, 96–8; also see Klingshirn on the history of Arles as an imperial city from c. 395 (53–4), on the city’s corresponding rise to ecclesiastical prominence through the 5th century (65–9), and on its role in the Visigothic kingdom from 476 (69–70).

\(^{42}\) Canon 13; Klingshirn, \textit{Caesarius of Arles}, 101. Other guidelines emphasize the important role of a city’s bishop in the rites of penance: only a bishop could administer the imposition of penance or bless penitents (canons 44 and 15; Klingshirn, 101); all those living outside cities, moreover, were required to attend Mass
At the height of his career, two decades later, Caesarius presided over another
council bringing to a close the Semi-Pelagian controversy, which had, for the last
century, endeavored to reconcile the Augustinian limiting of human agency in favor of
divine grace with the monastic emphasizing of human agency.\footnote{Rebecca Weaver, \textit{Divine Grace and Human Agency: A Study of the Semi-Pelagian Controversy} (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1996).} Overall, the Council of Orange ratified a moderate Augustinianism in its canons, a draft of which had been
prepared prior to the council at Rome; yet the closing definition of faith, almost certainly
written by Caesarius, includes a statement on Christian works that attempts to reconcile
the Augustinian and Pelagian extremes and is as much pastoral as theological:

According to the catholic faith we also believe that after grace has been
received through baptism, all baptized persons have the ability and
responsibility, if they desire to labor faithfully, to perform with the aid and
cooperation of Christ what is of essential importance in regard to the

Those things “of essential importance” for salvation are explicated in the sermons of
Caesarius, chief among which are penitence, fasting, and almsgiving, and forgiveness.
Their necessity and effects are described with a number of metaphors; they are medicine
for the ailing soul, a means of clearing out the vineyard of one’s soul, and a means of
gathering stores in a time of harvest. The primary image over all these, however, is not
presented as a metaphor, but as rather the very measure of human reality: the Last
Judgment. Indeed, underlying the statement from the Council of Orange given above is
the presupposition that salvation is not finished at baptism but rather completed after
during the solemn feasts of the Pasch, Nativity of the Lord, etc. in the city—that is, under the officiating of
the bishop (canon 21; Klingshirn, \textit{Caesarius}, 102).
one’s life has been lived, in the account given before the Judge; human agency—“ability and responsibility”—plays a vital role in the attaining of salvation.

The time to do all these things “of essential importance,” especially private and public penance, is above all in Lent, in preparation for the Pasch; this is because Lent stands in relation to the paschal celebration as earthly life stands to heavenly salvation:

Now just as we have a kind of sadness in Lent in order that we may rightly rejoice at the Pasch, so as long as we live in this world we ought to do penance in order that we may be able to receive pardon for our sins (possimus peccatorum indulgentiam accipere) in the future and arrive at eternal joy.\(^45\)

At the beginning of Holy Week, on Palm Sunday at the recitation of the Creed, Caesarius indicates that a privileged time of forgiveness is approaching and encourages the faithful to keep pressing onward:

Behold, beloved brethren, through the goodness of God the days of forgiveness are now near (iam deo propitio dies remissionis in proximo sunt); therefore as good and perfect sons of the Church prepare your souls with the help of God.\(^46\)

This time of forgiveness seems to be further circumscribed, at the close of a Holy Thursday sermon, to “the assembly of the church” on Good Friday:

And above all this I ask, dearest brothers, that tomorrow—that is, in the Passion of the Lord—you would complete the joy which you have accomplished in us continually up to this point concerning your devotion. Indeed, it is not the one who begins, but he “who will have persevered to the end, this one will be saved” [Matthew 10:22; 24:13].

And for that reason you must act that you might not ruin through the negligence of one day what you have acquired during the whole of Lent. Thus indeed to fast, to pray, or to sing the psalms within the whole of Lent and, in the Passion of the Lord (that is, in Parasceve) to withdraw oneself from the church—this is just as if someone with great labor would strive


\(^{46}\) Sermon 201, trans. Mueller, *Caesarius of Arles, Sermons*, vol. 66 of FCNT, 63, with “now are at hand” changed to “are now near.”
to cultivate the ground and not be merited to receive [non mereatur accipere] the harvest.

And therefore I pray you that no one withdraw himself from the church—unless by chance one is kept occupied by either infirmity of the body or a great and official obligation. For the very one who will have refused to withdraw himself from the assembly of the church [ecclesiae conventu] in the Passion of the Lord, the same will be able to celebrate a lawful [legitimum] joy in the paschal solemnity. The one who willingly will have harkened to me in this suggestion, I am confident, God will repay glorious recompense both in this world and in the one to come. May he himself deem this worthy to provide, he who with the Father and the Holy Spirit lives and reigns in ages of ages. Amen.47

Given what we know about the persistence of the imperial paschal indulgentia in the contemporary law code, the spread of Milanese practices into the liturgies of southern Gaul, and the theological framework of Caesarius’ sermons, it seems quite possible that the subject of this exhortation is a Gallican Good Friday indulgentia ceremony, one that would serve as a bridge in both time and place between the Holy Thursday night ceremony of Milan and the Good Friday afternoon liturgy of Spain.48

It has been demonstrated how a ceremony of indulgentia in Milan, based on Ambrose’s Thursday evening sermon, would have served as a culmination of Lenten sorrow for sin and a gateway to the three-day paschal feast. Caesarius’ Holy Thursday sermon indeed proceeds much along the same lines as Ambrose’s in its rhetorical arch: before the excerpt given above, Caesarius emphasizes the “remedy of tears” in the example of Peter’s denial and repentance; he then ends by describing the joy that follows upon this remedy. For Ambrose the turning point is the night of Thursday and the pre-

47 Germain Morin, ed., Sancti Caesarii Arelatensis Sermones, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 103–4, (Turnhout: Brepols, 1953), 2:816–17,
48 I am not the first to propose this hypothesis regarding this passage; see Enrico Mazza, “La celebrazione della penitenza nella liturgia bizantina e in occidente: Due concezioni a confronto.” Ephemerides liturgicae 115, no. 4 (2001):385–440.
dawn of Friday, while for Caesarius the turning point is the *conventus eccelsiae* of Good Friday. Seen in the context of the growing individuation of the paschal days and the concomitant growth of the sorrowful affect of Good Friday, this shift appears wholly natural.

Of the many actions that Caesarius might have emphasized for his congregation to bring about the “completion” of his joy on Good Friday—fasting, praying, almsgiving, singing the psalms—it is especially notable that it is attending the “assembly of the church” that brings in the Lenten harvest and is thus a *sine qua non* of the whole Lenten endeavor. A special ceremony of the faithful, reifying the close of 40 days of private penance with the request for and assurance of *indulgentia peccatorum*, would explain this otherwise curious injunction. This also would explain the particular application of the metaphor of cultivation and harvest, which, as we have mentioned, Caesarius used often to talk of Lent. Whereas in other places Caesarius describes the entire season of Lent a time of storing up goods for the entire year or harvesting, here he shifts the metaphor to emphasize a particular harvesting on Good Friday, in comparison to which the Lenten time seems only a preparatory cultivation. This harvest, then, allows one the joy of the paschal solemnity (which most concretely would refer to communion on Easter Sunday).

The whole progression is tripartite, at three interpretive levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE 1</th>
<th>→</th>
<th>STAGE 2</th>
<th>→</th>
<th>STAGE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) cultivation of the ground</td>
<td>harvest</td>
<td>stores for the year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Lenten penance and works</td>
<td>Good Friday assembly</td>
<td>paschal joy (communion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) earthly life</td>
<td>Last Judgment</td>
<td>eternal reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The connection between the Good Friday assembly and the Last Judgment, in this sermon of Caesarius, as well as in the writings of the Spanish bishops to be examined in the next section, is an interpretive key to characterizing the meaning of the *Popule meus* in the *Indulgentia* ceremony.

There is one sermon of Caesarius that explicitly connects reproaches regarding the Passion with the Last Judgment. Sermon 57, entitled “An admonition concerning the Day of Judgment, which is to be always considered with great fear and concern,” paints a dramatic scene of Christ as Judge culminating with him refusing *indulgentia* to those who have first despised his benefactions and subsequently refused “the medicine of penance.” Before this final verdict, however, he recounts at length his benefactions to them and their evil responses, moving from the creation and Fall of man to his decision to enter mankind in the virgin birth and bear the sorrows of being human, culminating in the specific sufferings of the Passion. The enumeration has a quasi-poetic structure with the first-person perfect verb concluding each statement.

The palms and spittle of ridicule *I accepted* [*suscepti*].

Vinegar with gall *I drank* [*bibi*].

Beaten with scourges, crowned with thorns, fastened to a cross, pierced with wounds, in order that you might be saved from death, in agony my spirit *I released* [*dimisi*].

Here are the marks of the nails, by which, affixed, *I hung* [*pependi*].

Here, pierced with wounds, is [my] side. 49

After this the format of the statements changes to allow counterpoint between Christ’s action and the intended effect for those who have despised his mercy:

I accepted your sufferings
that you my glory I might give.
I accepted your death
that you in eternity might live.
Concealed I lay in a sepulcher
that you might reign in heaven.\(^50\)

Then come a series of malefactions given in return, paralleling the benefactions by all ending in a second-person perfect verb: *perdidisti* (“you ruined”), *rennuisti* (“you rejected”), *polluisti* (“you polluted”), *adfixisti* (“you affixed”). This last verb recounts not the Cross of man’s salvation, on which Christ willingly hung, but rather “the cross of your crimes” (*criminum tuorum cruce*) and “the cross of your sins” (*peccatorum tuorum crux*), “upon which I hang unwillingly.” All of the actions attributed to Christ and humans are quite literal rather than allegorical; this last metaphor of the cross relies all the same on very real “crimes” and “sins” against the Lord, the very things absolved only by *indulgentia* of the Lord through the penance of man. Despising penance is thus the final and fate-determining malefaction of the monologue’s addressee, now a *maledictus*:

And because, after all your evil, you refused to flee to the medicine of penance, from the evil word [Psalm 111:7] you will not be merited to be absolved [*non mereberis liberari*], but you will hear with those who are like you “Depart from me, cursed ones [*maledicti*], into the eternal fire that has been prepared for the Devil and his angels” [Matt 25:41]; and you will descend into the eternal fire of Gehenna with him whom to me, captive of your life through sweet ensnarements and false goods, you preferred.\(^51\)

And thus the impenitent *maledictus* descends into Hell, with the last word of the Judge, *praetulisti*, ringing in his ears. The moral of the story, given in the conclusion of the

---


\(^51\) *Et quia post omnia mala tua ad medicamenta paenitentiae confugere noluisti, ab auditu malo non mereberis liberari, sed auditurus es cum tuis similibus : discedite a me, maledicti, in ignem aeternum, qui paratus est diabolo et angelis eius; et descendes cum illo in aeternum gehennae ignem, quem mihi vitae tuae captus dulcibus laqueis et bonis fallacibus praetulisti.* Morin, ed., *Sancti Caesarii*, 1:254.
sermon, is for all Christians to make sure that they do penance, and do it often, so that they can be merited to obtain, not eternal fire (*ignem aeternum*) but an eternal pardon (*aeternam indulgentiam*).

That therefore we might be able to escape this frightful rebuke, as often as any kind of sins creep upon us, without any concealing, let us hurry to flee to the medicine of penance, that, absolved from the evil word [Psalm 111:7], we might be merited to arrive at eternal *indulgentia*: with our Lord Jesus Christ fulfilling this, to whom is honor and authority, with the Father and the Holy Spirit in ages of ages.52

The last word of the sermon, before the closing doxological formula, is thus *indulgentia*. Sermon 57 provides a rationale both carefully argued and visceral for penance, certainly, but perhaps also for attending a church assembly on Good Friday. To participate in a communal plea for *indulgentia* from the Judge on the day of his Passion in culmination of forty days of penance is indeed precisely the kind of thing a Christian should do to avoid hell-fire, according to Caesarius in Sermon 57. Might there furthermore be a connection between the poetic structure of this monologue of Christ as Judge and a Good Friday *Popule meus* chant at this time? With neither any direct correspondences between this extant sermon text and extant chant texts nor a citation of Micah 6:3 in the sermon, this question is not definitively answerable; yet key aspects of the textual structure—the careful placement of verbs and pronouns, the enumeration of benefactions followed by malefactions—and content—the details of the Passion and salvation, the utter rejection of Christ’s benefactions symbolized by a cross—seem to echo the text of the basic *Popule meus* antiphon and refrain that we have posited to be in Milan around this time.

---

52 *Ut ergo istam terribilem increpationem possimus evadere, quotiens nobis qualiacumque peccata subrepserint, sine aliqua dissimulatione festinemus ad paenitentiae medicamenta configere, ut ab auditu malo liberati ad aeternam mereamur indulgentiam pervenire : praestante domino nostro Iesu Christo, cui est honor et imperium cum Patre et Spiritu sancto in saecula saeculorum.* Morin, ed., *Sancti Caesarii*, 1:254.
A look at a final sermon transmitted in the sermons of Caesarius, Sermon 142, provides a vital clue to support our hypothesis of a *Popule meus* chant spreading from northern Italy. It also provides an explanation of the origins of the Old Hispanic exegetical context of Micah 6:3 found in the writings of Isidore, which will be examined next. As with a number of his sermons, much of Sermon 142 seems to have been appropriated by Caesarius from pre-existing material and modified to suit his purposes. In this case, the bulk of the sermon is almost certainly by Augustine, although this material is transmitted nowhere else except in the version of Caesarius. Augustine’s friend and biographer, Possidius, lists a sermon in his works list of the bishop of Hippo “On the Reading of Isaiah: Lord, Who Has Believed Our Report?”—that is, on Isaiah 53:1 and following. This sermon covers Isaiah 53:2–9. A conclusion by Caesarius characteristically directs the sermon into a meditation on the Last Judgment.

The sermon was almost certainly preached on Good Friday at the time of Caesarius, and likely originally by Augustine as well, since Isaiah 53 was the Old Testament reading for Good Friday in the Milanese, Gallican, and Old Hispanic liturgies. The main rhetorical strategy of the sermon is the contrasting of the wretched human condition of Jesus as the suffering servant with his divine glory. For example, Isaiah’s description of the suffering servant as “a man in wounds” provokes this dictum: “a man in wounds, God before the wounds, man God after the wounds.”53 Isaiah’s question: “Who will describe his begetting?” provokes a detailing of not just the one, but both of

Christ’s begettings “before everything was made” and then “by faith conceived” as a human being.”

Then,

“He was led like a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb before the one who would shear him he was without a voice, such that he did not open his mouth. In humility his judgment was taken away [\textit{iudicium eius sublatum est}]. Who will describe his begetting? For he was taken away from his earthly life” [Isaiah 53:7–8].

Let his rising again be foretold [\textit{praedicat}!] You see because the Lord said this truly (as if the Truth could say anything except truly): “These things are written in the Law and the Prophets and the Psalms concerning me” [Luke 24:44]. Wherefore you heard “It is necessary that the Christ should suffer,” you presently heard “and rise again” [Luke 24:46]: “for he was taken away from his earthly life” [Isaiah 53:8] “And that penance and remission of sins should be preached [\textit{praedicari}] in his name to all peoples, beginning from Jerusalem” [Luke 24:47]. You will hear that also from such a prophet [i.e., Isaiah]. Wherefore we should not prefer the prophet to our Lord; the herald preceded, the Judge has followed. The herald did not utter his own words but those of the Judge, and the Judge, following, confirmed his words from the herald.

The risen Christ, who appeared to his disciples and pointed out prophecies about his Death and Resurrection, is characterized as a Judge, even though the passage under exegesis explicitly states that “his judgment was taken away.” This paradox becomes the central subject of the next section of the sermon (and then—after the final exegetical passage about the burial of Jesus—of the conclusion by Caesarius).

“For he was taken away from his earthly life. Through the iniquities of my people [\textit{populi mei}] he was led to death” [cf. Isaiah 53:8].

You just now heard him saying to them, “What have I done to you? If you have found sin in me, accuse!” [\textit{Quid vobis feci? Si invenistis in me peccatum, arguite}], and they: “Crucify, crucify” [John 19:6] a man, as they believed, yet innocent. Therefore “through the iniquities of my people he was led to death” [cf. Isaiah 53:8].

\footnote{Ibid., 294.}
\footnote{Ibid., 295.}
\footnote{Ibid.}
The first question that arises is why Christ is quoted as taking charge of his own human trial. The suffering servant of Isaiah 53 is explicitly silent in the face of injustice against him, and versions of “he did not open his mouth,” “he was without a voice,” etc. had already been cited from the text five times in the sermon up to this point. The second question that arises is what Scripture passage is being quoted in the words attributed to Jesus, which are described as having been heard by the congregation “just now” [modo], that is, apparently, recently before the sermon.

Both these questions are reasonably met in our hypothesis of some sort of *Popule meus* chant. Addressing the second question first, we find that the phrase *Quid vobis feci* does not occur specifically in the Latin Bible, and is most easily explained, even apart from the details of the current investigation, as a modification of the *quid feci tibi* of Micah 6:3. The phrase, *si invenistis in me peccatum, arguite* is Augustine’s version of John 8:46, as found in several of his works including his commentary on the Gospel of John itself, as well as his commentary on Psalm 50:6 in his *Enarrationes*, which neatly explains its use in Sermon 142:

> What is, “And conquer when you are judged”? He [David] sees the future Judge to be judged, one just by sinners to be judged, and therein conquering, because in him was nothing to be judged. For alone among men could truly say the God-Man, “If you have found in me sin, say [dicite].”

The one who thus gives this challenge to the “my people” of the Isaiah verse is indeed not Jesus as the suffering servant, then, but as the “God man.” This is further made clear by the substitution of the word *arguite* for the usual *dicite*, which, given the exegetical

---

history of Psalm 50:6, almost certainly intends to reference Isaiah 1:18: “And then come, and accuse me [arguite me], saith the Lord: if your sins be as scarlet, they shall be made as white as snow.” While the paradox of this section is not stated explicitly, it would apparently have been clear to the faithful of Augustine’s congregation: the Judgment of Jesus as God is layered over the judgment of Jesus as man, as in the varied images combined in a stereoscope to produce one three-dimensional image in the mind’s eye.

Whereas in the writings of Ambrose one or the other image generally predominated, now the two images are being combined with an increasing seamlessness and an increasingly specific homiletical drive. A certain point of arrival is reached in Caesarius in the conclusion to this sermon as he brings together the abstract themes of the benefactions of God, the First and Second Judgment, the First and Second Coming, and the resulting practical admonition for Christians to take heed and “labor with all strength” in penance in as much time as remains to them.

We then, dearest brethren, for whose salvation all these things were both foretold and fulfilled, let us give thanks for the divine mercy; and, as much as we can, let us labor with all strength, that the benefactions of God may not bring forth judgment for us but success: that when the terrible day of judgment and the time for rendering an account comes, whatever our Lord and Savior, judged, bestowed on us, he, judging, will find complete. And indeed, when he has come he will be rendering that which he promised, but also will be requiring that which he ransomed; and that which he bestowed at the First Coming he will be exacting in the Second. However much we should count on the mercy of God, we should not heedlessly fear his justice; with justice indeed he will judge you, who with mercy redeemed you. For as much as we sin and he spares, this is not negligence but rather patience: he has not lost power, but rather reserves us towards penance.

Let us therefore fear the justice of him whose mercy we desire. He indeed spares us now but is not silent; yet even if he is silent, he will not always be silent. [cf. Psalm 49:3] Let us listen therefore to him while he is not silent in teaching, if we want him to spare us when he will not be silent in the Judgment. Indeed just now his mercy is conferred upon us; then justice
will be demanded of us, and “he will render to everyone according to his works” [Matthew 16:27]. Then will take place what the Apostle said: “Judgment is without mercy to those who have not shown mercy” [James 2:13].

The somewhat strained allusion to Psalm 49:3—“God shall come manifestly: our God shall come, and shall not keep silence”—struggles because Caesarius claims that Christ is not silent now in his teaching. For this sermon specifically, his challenge to his people beginning with *quid vobis feci* would be a prime example of teaching, as would be any other words spoken or sung in the Good Friday service *in persona Christi* such as a *Popule meus* antiphon or the chanting of the whole of Micah 6:1–8 with *Popule meus* refrain as in the Old Hispanic liturgy. Another interesting phrase, “Indeed just now [*modo*] his mercy is conferred upon us,” might additionally refer to a ceremony of *indulgentia* following on the sermon, as in the Old Hispanic liturgy. To evaluate these possibilities, it is now to the Old Hispanic liturgy that we shall turn. From there we will return to southeast France and evaluate the extant material on the Gallican Good Friday liturgy.

---

58 Nos ergo, fratres carissimi, pro quorum salute ista omnia et praedicta sunt et impleta, gratias agamus divinae misericordiae, et quantum possimus, totis viribus laboremus, ut beneficia dei non nobis iudicium pariant, sed profectum: ut cum tremendus iudicii dies et tempus reddendae rationis advenerit, quicquid in nobis dominus et salvator noster contulit iudicatus, integrum inveniat iudicaturas. Et quidem ille cum venerit, redditurus est quod promisit, sed requisiturus est quod redemit; et quod in primo adventu contulit, exacturus est in secundo. Quamvis multum praesumere debeamus de misericordia dei, non tamen negligenter debemus timere iustitiam eius: cum iustitia enim te iudicabit, qui cum misericordia te redemit. Nam quod tam longo tempore peccamus et parcit, non est negligentia, sed patientia: non ille potentiam perdilit, sed nos ad paenitentiam reservavit. Timeamus ergo iustitiam cuius misericordiam desideramus. Parcit enim modo, sed non tacet: sed et si tacet, non semper tacebit. Audiamus ergo eum, dum non tacet in praecepto, si volumus ut nobis parcat, cum non tacuerit in iudicio. Modo enim nobis praerogatur misericordia: tunc a nobis exigetur iustitia, et reddet unicumque secundum opera sua; ac fiet illud quod apostolus dixit: iudicium sine misericordia his, qui non fecerint misericordiam. Morin, ed., Sancti Caesarii, 1:587.
The influence of Caesarius on Spain is well-attested. In Caesarius’s lifetime, despite ecclesiastical competition between Arles, Narbonne, and Vienne, Arles garnered the most influence in the region through the favor of the pope. Caesarius was named the apostolic vicar in Gaul and part of Spain in 514, and presided over six councils of Gallican bishops. He supervised the duplication of his sermons, giving them to churchmen who visited him as well as sending them out to Italy, Gaul, and Spain.

It is thus not surprising to find that the Good Friday liturgy of Spain includes themes developed in the sermons of Caesarius, such as meriting indulgence at the appearance of the Lord. But of course this theme goes back to Ambrose’s exegesis and preaching and the Milanese liturgy, as does the juxtaposition of Christ’s First Judgment and Second Judgment. Isidore takes over both of these themes; but whereas previously they had had a strong moral flavor (as in Caesarius) or a strong allegorical flavor (as in Ambrose), Isidore now adds a historical flavor to them. Good Friday, according to the 4th Council of Toledo, over which Isidore presided, was proclaimed to be the day on which “the sun . . . withdrew his light” and “the disturbance of the element manifested the sorrow of the whole world,” and is likewise in the present a day on which “the whole Church, on account of the Passion of the Lord, spends . . . in grief and abstinence.”

Combining moral, allegorical, and historical interpretations of Micah 6:3 and the celebration of Good Friday was of course crucial in the development of what would

60 Duckett, 34.
61 Klingshirn, Caesarius of Arles, 9.
62 From the translation given in the introductory pages of this chapter.
become the Carolingian *Popule meus* verses, since they rely on recollection of specific moments from the Passion, such as the vinegar being offered to Christ and the piercing of his side. Isidore does not just increase the historicity of the Passion in the past, however, but also in the future, and not just for believing Christians, but for another group with which Christians shared both faults and eventual merits—the unbelieving Jews.

Isidore quotes Micah 6:3 twice in his surviving works, both times in the first book of his treatise *De fide catholica contra Judaeos* (“On the Catholic Faith Against the Jews”). He addresses it to his sister, probably an abbess, in a preface that states his aim to cite “a few of the many passages of the Old Testament which in various time foretold about our Lord and Savior’s divine birth [i.e., his begetting of the Father], his incarnation, his passion and death, and his resurrection, kingdom, and coming judgment, that the authority of the prophets may strengthen the grace of faith and prove the ignorance of the unbelieving Jews.” Yet this is only the preface of the first of two books. The preface to the second book explains that, having laid out the prophecies of Christ, he may now treat the prophecies regarding the two peoples of the Jews and the Gentiles. As Jeremy Cohen has noted, Isidore grounded his view of the Jews in his Christology. Most notably for our story, however, it is clear that Isidore’s view of the Jews, and especially their place in history, colored his perception of Micah 6:3, the Crucifixion, and the Second Coming.

---

63 The title is not Isidore’s, but is appropriate.
65 PatLat 83, col. 499.
66 Cohen (1999), 118.
In the first part of his treatise, Isidore takes 61 chapters to provide Old Testament prooftexts for Christ as the Son of God (1–4), his incarnation (5–13), his messiahship (14–17), his opposition from the Jews and his trial (18–28), his passion and crucifixion (29–48), his burial, descent into hell, and resurrection (49–54), his ascension and establishing of the Church (53–60), and, in a final long chapter, his second coming and judgment (61).\(^\text{67}\) In this broad outline Isidore is clearly following the trajectories of Christological statements by the Fathers, the Church Councils, and, above all, the Creeds.\(^\text{68}\) It is telling, however, that, the Passion is treated in such great detail. Micah 6:3 is employed in Chapters 24, on the judgment at the First Coming (that is, Jesus before Pilate), and 61, on the judgment at the Second Coming.

His prooftexts for Chapter 24—Psalm 50:6 and Micah 6:3—are clearly drawn from the works of Ambrose.

Because he [Christ] was to be judged, David cries under the figure of the sinning people to God: “To you alone have I sinned, and have done evil before you, that you may be justified in your words, and you may overcome when you are judged” [Psalm 50:6]. Indeed, coming in the flesh, Christ placed himself in the position of the accused, and the Judge of men supplied himself judged of men, and so, mild and patient/suffering \([\text{patient}]\), when he is judged, he triumphs, and this because the prosecutor, the people, finds nothing in him worthy of judgment.\(^\text{69}\)

While quoting Ambrose (“Christ placed himself in the position of the accused”) and Augustine (“the Judge of men supplied himself judged of men”), Isidore is his own

---

\(^\text{67}\) Following the outline of Cohen (1999), 115–17, with slight modifications. An epilogue to the first book is traditionally numbered as Chapter 62.

\(^\text{68}\) Drews, 66.

\(^\text{69}\) Quia judicandus erat, clamat David sub figura populi peccantis in Deum: Tibi soli peccavi, et malum coram te feci, ut justificeris in sermonibus tuis, et vincas, cum judicaris. Veniens enim Christus in corpore, tanquam reum se constituit, et judex hominum hominibus judicandum se praebuit, sic que mitis, et patiens, dum judicatus est, vict, quia nihil in eo dignum, quod judicaretur, populus persecutor invent. PatLat 83, col. 479–80. The words “reum se sonstituit” are drawn from Ambrose’s exegesis of Psalm 50 in the Apologia Prophetae David (“Defense of the Prophet David”). See above, Chapter 1.
exegete in his emphasis on “the people” (“under the figure of the sinning people” and “the prosecutor, the people”). In continuation, he leaves the judgment of the First Coming and seems to abruptly fast-forward to the judgment of the Second Coming, applying Micah 6:1–4 there to the “very same people”:

> Whence even the prophet, announcing the coming of his Judge, in this way threatens against the very same people, saying: “Hear what the Lord says: ‘Arise, contend in judgment [etc.]’.”

Because the Micah pericope, in its relatively extensive form here, in fact identifies this people as “Israel” and cites not only the Exodus but “Moses, Aaron, and Miriam,” and because the subject of the chapter is the actual judgment of Jesus at his Passion, it is relatively clear at this point that Isidore is interpreting the Micah passage literally, even though his patristic sources prefer the allegorical sense. His stressing of the fact that each new context involves “the very same people” seems to confirm this. The fact that he introduces the people as simply “the sinning people,” however, demonstrates his awareness of the patristic tradition he follows and leaves the door open for an allegorical interpretation, even as his language strongly implied an identification of “the people” as “the Jews.”

There is an important corollary to Isidore’s preference for the literal here: while a minority of previous interpretation of Micah 6:3 had mentioned the Jews, and a greater amount of interpretation had mentioned the Last Judgment, Isidore is the first to bring them together. In order to understand his rationale for this unprecedented move, we must look ahead, from Isidore’s history of Christ in the first part of the treatise, to his treatment of Jewish and Gentile history in the second. Here he includes a chapter of prooftexts.

---

70 Unde et propheta, adventum judicii ejus annuntians, sic comminatur contra eundem populum, dicens: Audite quae Dominus loquitur: Surge, et contendite judicio... PatLat 83, col. 480
demonstrating that “at the end of the world, the Jews will believe in Christ” (*Quia in fine mundi in Christum credituri sunt Iudaei*). 71 One of these prooftexts, Hosea 3:5, relates directly to the Last Judgment interpretation of Micah 6:3: “...the children of Israel shall return and shall seek the Lord their God, and David their king, and they shall be amazed regarding the Lord, and regarding his good things, in the last days.” 72 This prophecy indicates Christ’s reign as king and his judgment, Isidore says, and Israel’s being saved and acknowledging Christ as “the Lord our Just One” [Jeremiah 23:6]. 73

Isidore draws attention to the fact that these Jews are referenced as “the children of Israel.” What was wrong with the previous generation? In a later chapter on the destruction of Jerusalem he tells us just that. Jerusalem was destroyed, he says, and the people scattered because

> God waited for them to do justice and accept the generosity of so many gifts, but they gave thorns with which they crowned Christ and gave cries with which they shouted against the Lord, that is, against Christ, to be crucified. 74

In this light we can return to Chapter 24 of the first part of the treatise and read Isidore’s explanation of Micah 6:1–4 more pointedly. This passage, he says, “shows the benefactions of the Lord offered to his people, and, in contradistinction to these, their evils against him.” 75 Finally, Isidore uses Micah 6:9b–10a to make an oblique reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, although for anyone who had read the whole treatise, it would be obvious.

---

71 PatLat 83, col. 508.
72 Ibid.
73 Ibid.
75 *Ubi ostendit beneficia Domini praestita in populum suum, et contra haec adversus eum mala eorum.* PatLat 83, col. 480.
And that which would come to this same people he [the prophet Micah] then adds: “Hear, O tribes, and who shall approve it? As yet there is a fire in the house of the wicked, the treasures of iniquity” [Micah 6:9b-10a].

It is here that we realize that Isidore has not arbitrarily jumped from the judgment of the First Coming to that of the Second Coming. Like the phrase “quid vobis feci” in Caesarius’s Sermon 142 (as noted, likely by Augustine, but not transmitted elsewhere), the Micah passage is here used to collapse the two judgments into one timeless event. Christ is simultaneously judged, and judging, moreover in at least two ways each: he is judged as he is condemned to be crucified and he is judged as the Just One of Israel; similarly, he condemns Jerusalem to be burned and judges everyone at the Second Coming.

The Biblical association of fire with judgment is brought up again in Isidore’s Chapter 61, on the Second Coming. “A fire shall burn before him” [Psalm 49:3b], Isidore reminds us, “so that, like wood, hay, and stubble, the works of those falling short will be consumed, and, like gold, silver, and precious stones, the deeds of the just will be proved” [cf. 1 Corinthians 3:12–15]. This is the same passage that Ambrose referenced in his commentary on Luke to frame Micah 6:3 there, unquestionably addressing Christian believers. But, again, Isidore is not content to simply address Christians, at least not in a direct, pastoral way. Isidore’s preferred method of explicating the theme of Christ’s judgment, it seems, is to present a virtuosic synthesis of all of history, in which the two events bookending the sixth age of man or Church Age—the Crucifixion and the Last Judgment—become pegs in the fabric of the cosmos on which all else is hung.

---

77 Sequitur: Ignis ante eum ardebit, quia, ut ligna, fenum, stipulam, delinquentium consumpturus est opera, ac, sicut aurum, argentum lapides que pretiosos, justorum probaturus est gesta. PatLat 83, col. 497.
He begins with two obscure verses from Ezekiel that enigmatically but beautifully present a précis of all to follow:

But that we await the coming of Christ the Judge from the clouds, and that the Father gives all judgment to him, it is thus announced by Ezekiel:

“Thus says the Lord God: Remove the diadem, take off the crown: is it not this One that raised up the low one, and brought down the high one?

Iniquity, iniquity, iniquity I will put on him [cf. Isaiah 53:6]: and this was not accomplished till he came to whom judgment belongs, and I will give it him” [Ezekiel 21:26–7].

He then presents two passages, one from Isaiah and one from Psalms, that speak of the Lord coming in judgment with a loud voice, having previously kept silent, describing, Isidore maintains, the First Judgment and the Second Judgment, respectively.

...he will come, not humbly to be judged, but as the Strong Judge; neither will he be silent, as he was in the First Coming, nor patient/suffering [patiens], as he was in the Passion of the flesh, but he shall cry out judging...

... certainly although in the First Coming in his humility he kept silent and was judged, in the Second, when he comes manifest, in order to judge, he will not be silent, but will cry out, to render to each according to his works.

It is at this point that Isidore brings forward the verses about works being judged by fire mentioned above. In this section, he is possibly talking about just Christians, quoting an

---

78 Quod autem venturum Christum de caelis judicem speramus, et quod ei omne judicium dedit Pater, per Ezechielem ita annuntiatur: Haec dicit Dominus Deus: Aufer cidarim, tolle coronam, nonne hic est qui humiles sublevavit, et sublimes humiliavit? Iniquitatem, iniquitatem, iniquitatem ponam eam; et hoc non factum est, donec veniat cujus est judicium, et tradam ei. PatLat 83, col. 496–7. Isidore is surely, based on what follows, connecting the phrase beginning with “Iniquity” to Isaiah 53:6b—“and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all” (et posuit Dominus in eo iniquitatem omnium nostrum)—even though he does not say this explicitly. He may also be connecting the question in the passage to Luke 1:52, from Mary’s song of praise, which concerns the birth of Jesus as Messiah: “He hath put down the mighty from their seat, and hath exalted the humble” (Deposuit potentes de sede, et exaltavit humiles). These verses from Ezekiel seem to be uniquely used by Isidore to describe the Second Coming. Summers, “Isidore of Seville’s De fide,” 174n1.

79 ... non humilis, ut judicetur, sed ut judex fortis egredietur; neque tacebit, quod in priori adventu fecit, aut patiens erit, sicut fuit in passione carnis, sed judicans voceferabitur... PatLat 83, col. 497.

80 ...utique quia etsi in primo humilitatis suae adventu tacuit judicatus, in secundo, dum manifestus venerit, ut judicet, non tacebit, sed clamabit, ut reddat singulis secundum opera eorum. PatLat 83, col. 497.
Old Testament verse that refers to the “saints” of God being gathered [Psalm 49:4–6].

But he immediately broadens his scope again, referring to a cosmic event at the other end of time, the judging of Lucifer and his being cast out of Heaven, apparently by Christ, in Isidore’s telling; the same strength of judgment displayed there will be displayed again.

The final long string of Old Testament citations and commentary that Isidore presents produces a climax for the chapter and indeed of the whole first part of the treatise, and does much to explain the meaning of the Old Hispanic Good Friday *Popule meus* Sonus, given that it begins with Micah 6:2–3.

Of Christ’s judgment Micah the prophet speaks in this way, saying: “Hear, mountains, the judgment of the Lord, and the strong foundation of the earth, for the Lord will enter into judgment with his people, and he will plead against Israel, saying: ‘My people, what have I done to you, or how have I troubled you? Answer Me’” [Micah 6:2–3]. Then indeed, according to Zechariah, “they shall look upon the One whom they have pierced: and they shall mourn for him as one mourns for an only son, and they shall grieve over him, as the manner is to grieve for the death of the firstborn” [Zechariah 12:10b; cf. John 19:37]. Indeed they shall grieve on account of him crucified, when they see him judging and in the Father and reigning in his majesty. By which Job, with the clarity of the Gospel, [even] before the Law, himself redeemed and resuscitated, and presented to the judgment of God (who will come to judge the living and the dead), by the prophetic authority, proclaims: “For I believe that my Redeemer lives, and in the last day I shall rise out of the earth. And I shall be clothed again with my skin, and in my flesh I will look upon God my Savior” [Job 19:25–6]. Which God [is this], if not he who will be looked upon in judgment? As we read: “They shall look upon the one whom they have pierced” [Zechariah 12:10b; cf. John 19:37].

By which some say he will be judging the wicked in that place where he himself was judged, by the testimony of Joel the prophet: “Let them arise,” he says, “and let the nations come up into the valley of Josaphat: for there I will sit to judge all nations round about” [Joel 3:12]. And many place the future judgment there where the Lord underwent his Passion, proving this with Isaiah: “For the Lord God of hosts shall make a consummation, and an abbreviation in the midst of the earth” [Isaiah 10:23]. Which preceding consummation and abbreviation could this be, except the future judgment? But [as to] where that midst of the earth is, faithful David revealed testimony regarding the Passion of the Lord which
says: “But God, our king before ages, has wrought salvation in the midst of the earth” [Psalm 73:12]. Indeed nothing else is our salvation, except the redemption of the Lord our Savior and Judge, which arose in the midst of the earth.\(^{81}\)

Isidore thus ends his exposition of the history of Christ “our Savior and Judge,” as told through Old Testament passages, in Jerusalem, simultaneously at the Crucifixion and the Last Judgment, and introduced by the *Popule meus*.

It appears richly symbolic, then, that the first item in the Old Hispanic Good Friday afternoon service is the *Popule meus* Sonus with its verses of Micah 6:1–8. The Sonus is preceded only by a procession to the altar, with the relic of the True Cross, which is placed on the bare altar. The *Popule meus* is thus sung, as it were, in the presence of the Crucifixion in Jerusalem. But where is the connection to the Last Judgment? Where are the Jews who are supposed to “look upon the one whom they have pierced?” I would suggest that the answers to both these questions are vital for understanding the *Popule meus* chants as a whole in the Spanish and Gallican liturgies.

The first question has a more immediate answer. Isidore himself seems to have hinted at it in his introduction to Chapter 61 with his statement that “we await the coming

---


of Christ the Judge from the clouds” and his citation of the Ezekiel passage that conflates the Passion and the Last Judgment. Braulio, bishop of Zaragoza, in northeast Spain (590–651), was a student of Isidore, a key figure in preserving his writings, and then the leading intellectual of the mid-7th century in Spain after Isidore’s death. In a letter to a fellow churchman he talks about the meaning of Good Friday and the paschal feast generally, giving reasons why the *Gloria* is not to be sung on Good Friday. He proposes the various reasons (which are all similar) in the form of questions. The following question is the first of several to suggest a connection between Good Friday and the Second Coming.

Or is it because every Christian living this life piously in the likeness of Christ “must enter the kingdom of God through many tribulations [cf. Acts 14:21],” and so this admonition of sorrow is signified to us in the renewed revolution of the year in Christ, so that thus Christ may be imitated beyond doubt?

The turn of phrase “renewed revolution of the year in Christ” is almost certainly more than just rhetoric. There is indication that the liturgical year was actually seen as ending on Good Friday–Holy Saturday morning in Gaul (and thus Spain) early on, despite the fact that the earliest Old Hispanic liturgical book—the *Orationale* of Verona, from before 711—begins with Advent. Hughes Oliphant Old summarizes the contents of the *comes* of Weissenberg, a lectionary produced in the first half of the 6th century in southern France:

The cycle of festal readings in the Weissenburg *comes* begins with the Easter vigil, which is clearly understood as the beginning of the year. This is underlined by the fact that the vigil starts out with extensive readings from Genesis, covering the creation narrative, the flood epic, and the story

---

83 Louis Brou and José Vives, eds. *Antifonario visigótico mozárabe de la Catedral de León* (Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1959), 1.
of Abraham's sacrifice. Apparently a long reading of the Passover narrative was included, although only a few lines from it have survived in our palimpsest. There is a long reading from the second and third chapters of Habakkuk and a selection from the story of the deliverance of the three young men from the fiery furnace in Daniel. The series of readings ends with the singing of the Canticle of the Three Young Men. No Gospel reading is mentioned...

... Good Friday was marked by numerous lessons from the Prophets: Isaiah 50:6–9, Jeremiah 11:18–20 and 18:18–23, Jeremiah 20:10–?, and Isaiah 52:12–53:12. Psalm 16 was sung, using verse 10 as an antiphon, and a long portion of the passion narrative was read, made up of passages from various Gospels. Another formulary intended for Good Friday, according to Dold, includes Isaiah 51:4–16, selected verses from Zechariah 12:10–14:9, and Ezekiel 36:24–28. This, of course, brings the cycle of the church year to an end, but the manuscript also contains readings for several other kinds of services such as funerals, ordinations, and church dedications.84

This structuring of the liturgical year, in turn, would have stemmed from the old tradition, mentioned by Jerome, of not dismissing the faithful before midnight at the Easter Vigil, because the Second Coming might well happen at that time.85 In fact, Braulio mentions this very tradition that Jerome himself had referred to as “apostolic” as carried on by the Spanish Church:86

Thus, the feast [the Easter Vigil] is celebrated during the night until midnight, at which hour we believe that we ourselves shall arise from the dead and that the Lord “will judge the living and the dead” [2 Timothy 4:1]; for what has already occurred in the Head will follow in the members.87

It is because of this expectation, apparently, that the liturgical year ended on Good Friday (and Holy Saturday morning following) and began anew on Easter Eve. It is also apparently because of this expectation that Caesarius’s sermons focused so much on the

84 Hughes Oliphant Old, The Medieval Church, vol. 3 of The Reading and Preaching of the Scriptures in the Worship of the Christian Church (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 83, 85 (emphasis mine).
86 Ibid.
87 Claude Barlow, trans., Braulio of Saragossa, 40.
Last Judgment during Lent and Holy Week. It is unclear how strongly (or literally) this view was held in Gaul or Spain, but the matter-of-fact tone in Braulio’s citation of the view, with the words “we believe” (nos credimus) prefacing it, seems a strong indication of general familiarity, if not acceptance. Furthermore, this expectation of Christ’s return at the Easter Vigil provides a rationale for the continuation of the ceremony of indulgentia, even as the old Roman laws of paschal indulgentia were perhaps receding into history. The transition from penitence to full communion during the Pasch is indeed described by Braulio with a double lens, in terms of “present” and “future”:

For just as the Resurrection of the Lord, signified by the Pasch, is simple in joy, so ours is double, both in the present, that is, and in future time, and so it is necessary that on that day the sorrow represented by the form of our present life be set aside and the joy in the glorious Resurrection of our Redeemer be assumed in its place.\

Focusing on the joy of the Pasch here, Braulio had focused on the sorrow of Good Friday earlier in the letter (in the first excerpt above), speaking of the imitation of Christ and the entering of the kingdom of God “through many tribulations.”

This is certainly an apt description of the Old Hispanic Good Friday afternoon liturgy, of which a constant refrain was the words of the penitent thief on the cross: “Remember me when you will come into your kingdom” (Luke 23:42). The numerous repetitions of the refrain, by the bishop—interrupting his sermon to sing the words—and by the people—also in the middle of the sermon—and then by the bishop again after his sermon, indeed seem to signal the “many tribulations” required to enter the kingdom of God. The manner in which the people are to use the refrain is particularly striking,

88 Ibid., with “Easter” replaced by “Pasch.”
repeating it after verses of the first half of Psalm 50, vividly combining the two exemplary penitences of David and the thief:

[Bishop:] Have mercy on me, God, according to your great mercy: and according to the multitude of your mercies blot out my iniquities.
[All:] When you come into your kingdom.
[Bishop:] Wholly wash me from my injustice, and cleanse me from my sin.
[All:] When you come into your kingdom.
[etc.]

This continues through verse 13 of the psalm, approximately halfway. The other half of Psalm 50 comes later, deep into the Ceremony of Indulgence, with a new refrain—“You, the one who after sins gives indulgence.”

In fact, the great part of the Ceremony of Indulgence is made up of texts of this structure, with refrains sung by the people, culminating in a series of *preces*, or short prayers, sung by the deacon, to which the people respond with the one word refrain, *Indulgentiam*. Finally, at the height of the ceremony, the people give, as it were, the refrain only, crying *Indulgentiam* repeatedly—the León Antiphoner restricts this repetition to 72 times. Silence follows, as the bishop recites two prayers silently. He then walks from the altar to the place where the penitents are prostrate on the ground, “cling[ing] to the pavement” and praying, and says a final prayer; then everyone returns to their homes.

Although each detail of the second half of the Old Hispanic Good Friday service is not likely to have been in place when the *Popule meus* Sonus became a part of it, it seems almost without doubt that the general outline was in place for a good part of the 7th century, to judge from the Fourth Council of Toledo’s injunctions for the “mystery of the cross” to be preached, for “all the people [to] pray for the indulgence of crimes
indulgentiam criminum] with a distinct voice” to be “cleansed by the remorse of penitence,” and its warning against those who at None would “break [their] fast before the prayers of indulgence [indulgentiae praeces] are finished.” The Orationale of Verona, from around 700, moreover, preserves the three final prayers mentioned. These prayers further attest to the uniting of the themes of Crucifixion and Second Coming.

God the Father was willing to let his Son come to earth, the first prayer says, “that by sublime humility the race of man might be carried away to the heavens [eveheret ad celos].” The second prayer addresses Christ and concludes by requesting this very destiny, beginning with words reminiscent of the thief on the cross: “allot to us . . . the infinite beatitude of the celestial kingdom, so that we, who are prostrated, venerating your passion, might be raised up, in the joy of your resurrection, to the heavens [ad caelestia sublevemur].”

---

89 José Vives, Oracional visigótico, Monumenta Hispaniae Sacra, Serie Liturgica 1 (Barcelona: Biblioteca Balmes, 1946), 267–8:

1) Maiestati tuae, omnipotens Deus, salutari obsecratione famulantes, rationabile servitutis nostræ praesentamus obsequium, qui dominum nostrum Iesum Christum filium tuum aput te ante secula verum Deum, eundemque postea hominem verum ad redemtionem nostram venire voluisti, ut humilite sublimi hominem genus eveheret ad celos, propter quod nostrae carnis suscepit et obprobrium; quia alapis cesus est, ut nobis delicta operum nostrorum patientie suae virtute dimitteret; spuitis sordidatus est, ut humilitatis gloria caecorum oculos aperiret; flagellis verberatus est, ut nos plagarum suarum livore sanaret; spinis coronatus est, ut spinas et tribulos nostrorum eveleret peccatorum; exaltatus est in ligne crucis, pertulit paenas, ut cruci nostra peccata infigeret; cum iniquis deputatus est, ut nos ab iniquitate salvaret; amaritudinis nostrae felle et aceto potatus est, ut nos pulcro salutare sui sanguinis propinaret; mortificatus est, ut nos eternitati donaret. Sol refugit in tenebras, aeternam noctem secula cruenta timuerunt, velum templi scissum est, ut occultæ praeteritis temporibus apparet divinitus sanctorum, et, velamine spiritualis scientiae reserato, caelestium sacramentorum patrum cognosceret; per quem adnuntiatam domini nostri Iesu Christi filii tui pro nobis inerarribilem claritatem, prout possumus, mortali ore celebrantes, te, pater sancte omnipotens, deprecamur ut in spiritu vivifices suplices, et in carne dextruas adversantes. Per gratia ... 

2) Ingeniti patris unigenite Christe, qui pro nobis impios hodie occideris innocens, tui sanguinis reminiscere pretium, et totius populi dele peccatum: quique pro nobis perferre dignatus es sputa, probrabrum, vincola, calafos, alapas, et flagella, crucem, clavos, amaritudinem, mortem, lanceam, ac novissime sepulturam, nobis miseris, pro quibus haec passus es, caelestis regni tribue beatitudinem infinitam; ut, qui, passionem tuam venerando, prosternimir, resurrectionis tuae gaudibus ad caelestia sublevemur.

3) Exaudi, Domine, supplicum preces, et tibi confitentium parce peccatis; ut, quos conscientiae reatus accusat, indulgentia tuae miserationis absolvat.
Both prayers also make explicit mention of the various things undergone by Christ in the Passion: “for us,” the second prayer states, Christ “deigned to bear spittle, insults, bonds, blows, slaps, and scourging, cross, nails, bitterness, death, lance, and finally the tomb.” The first prayer takes each of these items and uses it as an opportunity for a poetic comparison, pairing each evil Christ suffered with an aspect of the salvation of his people:

He was struck down with blows, that he might remove the offences of our deeds by the virtue of his patience.

He was dirtied with spitting, that he might open the eyes of the blind by the glory of [his] humility.

He was struck with scourging, that he might heal us by the bruises of his wounds [cf. Isaiah 53:5].

He was crowned with thorns, that he might pull out the thorns and thistles of our sins.

He was exalted on the wood of the cross, [and] he endured penalties, that he might affix our sins to the cross.

He was reckoned with the wicked, that he might save us from iniquity [cf. Luke 22:37; Mk 15:28; Isaiah 53:12].

He drank the vinegar and gall of our bitterness, that he might give us salvation by the cup of his blood.

He was put to death, that he might give us eternity.\(^{90}\)

Particularly notable here, of course, is the explicit attribution of a suffering of the Passion, in one case, to the people: “He drank the vinegar and gall of our bitterness.” In this sense, the prayer refers back to the very beginning of the Good Friday afternoon service, to the assigning of the guilt of the Cross, and thus the Passion in general, to the people. Here, however, the poetic juxtaposition occurs in the opposite order. Instead of a benefaction of God being followed by a malefaction of the people, the prayer first gives a malefaction (of the people) and then gives the corresponding benefaction of God.

\(^{90}\) Latin text cited above.
There is a beautiful symmetry here, but, one will recall, a symmetry that only the bishop can appreciate at this point. Reciting the prayers in silence while the people cling to the earth, out of breath after shouting *Indulgentia*, the bishop looks ahead to what is beyond—to Easter Sunday, when Resurrection life is celebrated, and beyond that, when the people are “raised up, in the joy of [Christ’s] resurrection, to the heavens.” The people, however, are waiting in silence, praying that their many refrains and cries throughout the service will be effective for both Easter Sunday and for the Second Coming.

With all this in mind, then, we can return to the beginning of the afternoon service and more exactly pinpoint the nature and function of the opening *Popule meus*. The chant is clearly meant to evoke a startling and affective appearance of the divine. The rubric in the León Antiphoner prescribes the bishop to begin the chant “in a tremulous voice” (*voce tremula*). The rubric also connects the placement of the cross and the beginning of the chant in a single directive: “[T]his same holy wood will be placed on the altar; the bishop with the presbyters and deacons ascend barefoot into the pulpit; and the bishop in a tremulous voice begins thus: ‘My people...’” The appearance of Christ, represented here by the defrocked Gospel book, the relic of the True Cross, the form of the cross as the reliquary holding the relic, the bishop, and finally the tremulous voice, must have struck a note of terror into the gathered faithful. As a representation of the Second Coming and Last Judgment, the *Popule meus* thus required the *preces* and cries of *Indulgentia* by which the service would climax.

---

91 Spain, León 8, 166v.
92 Ibid.
All of this reasoning sounds logical, until we remember that the primary examples of exegesis of Micah 6:3 in the greatly-influential writings of Isidore of Seville apply the verse to the Jews. Where in this Good Friday service are the Jews? Of course they appear in the Gospel reading, a lengthy account of the Passion story drawn from the four Gospels, treating events from, at the beginning, Judas’s return of the betrayal money and the trial before Pilate to, at the end, the sealing of the tomb with a stone.\(^93\) The crowd of Jews is there, demanding the crucifixion of Jesus and taking responsibility for it, but it is notable that the Passion account highlights two remorseful Jews: Judas, at the beginning of the account, and the penitent thief, just before Jesus’s death. The Jews are also mentioned in the epistle reading, another combination of individual passages, which begins with 1 Corinthians 1:23: “Brothers, we preach to you Jesus Christ and him crucified—an offense indeed to the Jews, and certainly foolishness to the Gentiles.”\(^94\)

Unlike the Good Friday service at Rome, there are no prayers here for the Jews. We have also examined the end of the Old Hispanic service and found no references to the Jews there. What about the opening *Popule meus*, however? Let us start with the people. It is of course unlikely that very many of the people in the assembly would have read Isidore’s *De fide*. While it is possible that certain individuals would have harbored anti-Jewish feelings, as the foregoing analysis has shown, it would have been virtually impossible for the *Popule meus* Sonus to have added to or encouraged these feelings based on its position in the narrative of the liturgy. What about the bishop and any other churchmen that had indeed read the treatise? In the bishop’s case, the implications are startling. The liturgy requires him to stand in the place of Christ, as the Judge returning

\(^94\) Ibid., 160–2.
in glory, and address his flock as the Jews looking on the One whom they have pierced. That is, if the bishop takes on the persona Christi, the people take on the persona Iudaeorum. The people, then, playing the role of the Jews, do indeed look upon the One they have pierced, the One who “drank the vinegar and gall of [their] bitterness,” through the reading of the Passion and the rest of the service, and are drawn into a powerful stream of penitence that climaxes at its end. As Isidore says, quoting the Zechariah passage in full and then commenting on it,

“They shall look upon the One whom they have pierced: and they shall mourn for him as one mourns for an only son, and they shall grieve over him, as the manner is to grieve for the death of the firstborn” [Zechariah 12:10b; cf. John 19:37]. Indeed they shall grieve on account of [him] crucified, when they see [him] judging and in the Father and reigning in his majesty.95

The focus on the various elements of the Passion, then, the cross, the vinegar, and so forth, in this light, do not just foster a meditation on the cruel death of the Lord, but also an unescapable realization of personal responsibility for “him crucified” and a corresponding repentance. The Jews of the Second Coming are a model for present-day Christians.

This is not the only implication of reading the Old Hispanic Good Friday service in light of Isidore’s De fide, however. Jeremy Cohen has demonstrated that Isidore’s treatise was not simply abstract speculation, but had ideological connections to a very current event: King Sisebut’s decree that all Jews in Visigothic Spain must convert to Christianity.96 In his Historia Gothorum, also written during Sisebut’s reign (612–620/1)

95 PatLat 83, col. 498.
Isidore had closed out his history by identifying a few significant acts of the king, one of them being his mandate of the conversion of the Jews:

At the beginning of his reign, leading the Jews to the Christian faith, he was zealous indeed, but not wisely so; for he compelled with force those whom one was supposed to bring to the faith with reason. But, as it is written, whether in pretense or in truth, Christ is proclaimed [Philippians 1:18].

Isidore’s stance on the conversion of the Jews did not alter much in between the time of writing this and the Fourth Council of Toledo in 633, over which he presided, which made explicit that the Jews were not to be compelled to accept Christianity, and yet forbid baptized Jews to return to Judaism. Cohen explains, however, that Isidore saw Sisebut’s conversion of the Jews as basically a good thing. Isidore’s philosophy of history placed a great deal of importance on terrestrial history and saw the history of human civilization and the history of cosmos as united; Christ’s birth, for example, coincided with the *pax romana*. The progress of the Sixth Age, from Christ to the Second Coming, moreover, would also be intimately tied up in details of the earthly realm. According to the Augustinian tradition, the Jews would convert at the end of the world, that is, at the end of the Sixth Age. In his account of world history, Isidore, after relating the king’s conversion of the Jews, concluded: “the time remaining in the sixth age is known to God alone.”

Isidore’s *De fide*, likewise, “situates the Jews and their conversion between the appearance of Christ in human history and the future fulfillment

---

98 Translation of this canon of the council, number 57, given in Cohen, *Living Letters*, 102.
100 Ibid., 112.
of Christian historical aspirations.” Summarizing the content of the treatise in this light, Cohen concludes:

If the first book of the *De fide catholica* defines the foundations and parameters of the Christian epoch in human history, the second book identifies the dynamics of its inauguration, its development, and its consummation: the replacement of the Jews by the Gentiles, the fulfillment of the Old Testament in the New, and, at last, the conversion of the Jews to Christianity. Book 2 of Isidore’s polemic, in other words, bridges the gap between the first sixty chapters of book I and chapter 61. It elaborates the mechanisms of progress from the present age of Christian history, that deriving from the incarnation, to its culmination in the seventh age of glory. The *De fide catholica* suggests that human history will culminate in the resolution of conflict—in this case, that between Jew and Christian, old law and new—when all people will acknowledge the sign of the cross and receive the sacrament of the Eucharist. In practical terms, only with the conversion of the Jews will a fully integrated Christian society resemble the body of Christ born at the time of the divine incarnation long ago. Only then can history reach its proper climax, approach the end of its present age, and announce the final judgment and redemption.

This characterization of Isidore’s treatise suggests a final way to read the *Popule meus* of the Old Hispanic Good Friday liturgy. If the end-time Jews could be a model for present-day Christians, then present-day Christians, in the *persona Iudaeorum*, could just as well be models for present-day Jews. Indeed, according to the Isidorean body of writings, should the Jews ever witness or hear tell of the Christian Good Friday liturgy, they should in theory be convinced of their error, become Christians, and precipitate the glorious Second Coming and the Seventh Age. In the broad arch of history, Isidore would say, the involvement of the Jews in the Crucifixion and their dispersal was only a temporary setback:

> [A]t the beginning of the world, as if in the morning, this people accepted the law, but in the late afternoon, when it should have become believing, it

---

101 Ibid., 115.
separated between the New and Old Testaments. All that is promised to Israel in the future is aimed at those who will believe in Christ after his conversion at the end of time, according to the prophet Hosea: “And it shall be in the place where it shall be said to them, ‘You are not my people,’ it shall be said to them, ‘Ye are the sons of the living God.’ And the children of Judah and the children of Israel shall be gathered together: and they shall appoint themselves one head” [Hosea 1:10b–11a]. This will happen at the end of time, when Judah converts to Christ through the preaching of Elijah, so that it will be spiritually one with Israel, that is, with the people of the Gentiles. These by their faith have already seen God, have put forward a single leader, who is Christ, and have left the earth, that is, the hope that is carnal and earthly, to the celestial promises.\(^\text{103}\)

And indeed all Christians did hope to leave the earth, at least according to Isidore’s *De fide* and the Old Hispanic Good Friday liturgy, when they, having accomplished sufficient penance, sufficient cries of *Indulgentiam*, and sufficient prayers of the penitent thief, might hear the response of Christ to that thief read in the Passion: “Verily I say to you, today you will be with me in paradise” (Luke 23:42).

THE BOBBIO MISSAL AND THE QUESTION OF THE GALLICAN LITURGIES

In comparison to the Old Hispanic liturgy we have very little surviving evidence of the Gallican liturgies. The investigation of this chapter has been constructed, however, so as to be able to triangulate the meaning of their Good Friday ceremony, where—I have argued from musical analysis—one or more versions of the *Popule meus* verses was sung. We first examined the nature of this day in the Late Roman Empire, particularly at Milan in the late 4th century. We then became acquainted with the pastoral concerns for this day in southern Gaul in the early 6th century in the sermons of Caesarius of Arles. After this, we went in detail through the Good Friday liturgy that was in all likelihood closest to that of the Gallican liturgies, that of the Visigoths, as it developed in the 7th

---

\(^{103}\) PatLat 83, col. 510.
century. Finally, we will delve into a unique liturgical book from around the year 700 known as the Bobbio Missal.

The Bobbio Missal was copied as early as the end of the 7th century in southeast Gaul—more particularly, in the southeast Provençal region of the Merovingian Frankish realm, possibly in Vienne. It is not a book suited for a large church but rather an itinerant churchman, a bishop, perhaps, or a priest. It has connections to material in every period we have talked about so far. Some of the leaves added to the manuscript in the first half of the 8th century had previously held text from Ambrose’s Commentary on Luke, copied in the 6th century. Germain Morin, editor of the sermons of Caesarius of Arles, found many resonances between those sermons and the liturgical texts of Bobbio Missal, especially “its Biblical catechesis preparing for Easter baptism.” If the manuscript was copied in Vienne, its liturgy may have a direct link to Caesarius through his pupil Theudarius, said to have been appointed intercessor for the city in the middle of the 6th century. One of the texts subsequently added, in folios prepended to the manuscript, is an anonymous sermon entitled *De dies malus* (“About the Evil Day”), which also resonates with the sermons of Caesarius. It asks its listener “Do you think to treat your neighbor badly and yourself well?” and warns him of “despis[ing] the

---


106 McKitterick, in *The Bobbio Missal*, 50, 52; David Ganz, “The Palimpsest Leaves in the Bobbio Missal,” in *The Bobbio Missal*, 54 identifies the text as being from Book 7 of Ambrose’s Commentary. (The passage discussed in Chapter 1 was from the latter half of Book 6.)


benevolence of God” and thus “storing up wrath for [him]self on the Day of Wrath and of revelation: the judgment of the just God who will reward each according to his works.”

This exhortation at the front of the manuscript balances several practical penitential materials in the rear of the manuscript, including a tariffed penitential (a list of sins and their assigned penitential acts, still relatively new at this time) and prayers over penitents, both in original and added layers of the manuscript.

The main part of the manuscript is a combined sacramentary and lectionary, meaning that it holds the texts to be recited by the celebrant and the biblical lections to be read during mass. On Good Friday the manuscript curiously holds no prayers, but simply a composite Passion reading—beginning with the description of the *titulus* above Jesus on the cross and ending with Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus preparing his body for burial—divided in three parts for Terce, Sext, and None. The absence here of prayers, which proceed in abundance on most feast days, speaks loudly by silence. Are we to assume that the Good Friday liturgy in the Bobbio Missal is an austere affair with little more than the readings, as was probably the case in Rome up to this time? Other sources of the Gallican liturgy do include prayers for Good Friday at these hours, some
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109 Trans. Wright and Wright in *The Bobbio Missal*, 97, 100, 103.
110 The contents of the Bobbio Missal, with additions signalled, are given in the Introduction to *The Bobbio Missal*, 16–18. The earliness of this tariffed penitential is discussed in Meens, “Reforming the Clergy: A Context for the Use of the Bobbio Penitential,” in *The Bobbio Missal*, 155–6.
concise, and some lengthy, but these sources still do not tell us what else went on during these three services.114

There is one text in the Bobbio Missal that perhaps does indicate the type of extraordinary liturgical action that happened on Good Friday, despite the fact that it appears on the morning of Holy Saturday. Following on a final installment of the Passion story in the manuscript—where the chief priests and Pharisees request and are granted permission to guard the tomb—come two remarkable sets of preces, in which Christ speaks in the first person:

114 On the prayers for Good Friday in liturgical books of the Gallican liturgies other than the Bobbio Missal, see Louis van Tongeren, “Imagining the Cross on Good Friday: Rubric, Ritual and Relic in Early Medieval Roman, Gallican and Hispanic Liturgical Traditions,” in Envisioning Christ on the Cross: Ireland and the Early Medieval West, ed. Juliet Mullins et al. (Portland, OR: Four Courts, 2013), 42–4.
I. My enemies lay in ambush for me.

More freely, Holy Father, have mercy and deliver me.

1. I was brought like an innocent sheep to the slaughter,
   Captured by enemies like a bird in a snare.
   More freely, Holy Father, have mercy and deliver me.

2. All opened their mouths against me:
   They raged with their teeth, making their complaint to overwhelm me.
   More freely, Holy Father, have mercy and deliver me.

3. They were crying out, hissing, and shaking their heads
   As they discussed me to bring forth false testimony.
   More freely, Holy Father, have mercy and deliver me.

4. Hung on the cross they condemn, fixed with iron nails,
   Sold by the Jews for thirty silver coins.
   More freely, Holy Father, have mercy and deliver me.

5. Stabbed in my side by a horrific sword,
   Water flows there with an un-harming [innoxium] blood.
   More freely, Holy Father, have mercy and deliver me.

6. Everyone overflowed, as the water above me
   Plunged [me] into the sepulcher; [here] they placed a stone.
   More freely, Holy Father, have mercy and deliver me.

7. Stretch forth, dear Father, and aid the wretched ones,
   For whom I am afflicted with such bitter suffering.
   More freely, Holy Father, have mercy and deliver me.

Insidiati sunt mihi adversarii mei.
Magis gratis tu, pater sancte, miserire et libera me.

1 Portatus sum ut agnus innocens ad victimam, captus ab inimicis ut avis in muscipola. Magis ( . . )
2 Aperuerunt omnes dentibus fremuerunt, ora sua contra me: querentes deglutire me. Magis ( . . )
3 Sivilantes clamabant tractantis de me proferre et movebant capita, falsum testimomum. Magis ( . . )
4 Suspensum cruce damnant fixum clavis ferreis, venditum a Iudeis propter triginta argenteis. Magis ( . . )
5 In latere confossus gladio horifico, illic confluat aqua cum sanguene innoxium. Magis ( . . )
6 Omnes inundaverunt sicut aqua super me, dimersum in sepulcrum adposuerunt lapidem. Magis ( . . )
7 Intende, pie pater, et succurre miseris, pro quibus tam acervis adfligor suppliciis. Magis ( . . )
II. Look, O Lord, upon my humiliation: for the enemy has arisen.
   Have mercy, just Father, and to all grant indulgence.

1. Sent by the Father, I have come to seek the lost
   And, taken captive, to redeem an enemy by blood.
   The cruel people cast me aside.
   Have mercy, just Father, and to all grant indulgence.

2. Foretold by the prophets, I was born of a virgin
   I took the form of a servant to recover the scattered.
   Hunting, they captured me.
   Have mercy, just Father, and to all grant indulgence.

3. For good the greatest evils are rendered me,
   They gave evil council against me –
   Sold for money.
   Have mercy, just Father, and to all grant indulgence.

4. A crown of thorns they put on my head,
   The impious mocked me, dirty with spittle,
   Savagely afflicted.
   Have mercy, just Father, and to all grant indulgence.

5. Hung on the gibbet with harmful thieves,
   Fed a cup with cruel and bitter fare,
   Delivered to punishments.
   Have mercy, just Father, and to all grant indulgence.

6. Those who I came to deliver accused me,
   Struck with lashing, to the cross they affixed me.
   With a lance they pierced me.
   Have mercy, just Father, and to all grant indulgence.

7. Forgive them [their] harm, most merciful Father,
   Wipe out every sin and drop [their] charges.
   They know not what they do.
   Have mercy, just Father, and to all grant indulgence.
Vede, domine, humilitatem meam, quia erectus est inimicus.
*Miserire, pater iuste, et omnibus indulgencia dona.*

1 A patre missus veni
et hostem captivatus
plebs dira abiecit me.

2 Predictus a prophetis,
adsumpsi formam servi
venantes cepurunt me.

3 Mihi pro bonis mala
 adversus me dedurunt
Vindetus pecunia.

4 Spiniam coronam
 sputis sordidatum
adlickum crudelter.

5 Cum noxiis latronibus
 amaro cibo pastus
 traditus supplicis.

6 Quos vini liberare
 flagellis verberatum
Lancia percusserunt me.

7 Dimitte illis noxa,
cuncta dele peccata
Ignorant quid faciunt.115

Each of the *preces* has a non-rhythmic prelude, which introduces the refrain, and then seven strophes.116 The people would have sung the refrain, and, because the *preces* appear in the manuscript, it seems that the celebrant would have sung the individual versified orations. This calls to mind the bishop’s singing of the *Popule meus* verses in the Old Hispanic liturgy, especially given the correlation in voice and content. What is remarkable about these *preces* in comparison to the *Popule meus* Sonus and the various *Popule meus* verses is that the identities of Christ and the people become blurred: while

---


the celebrant gives each refrain out first, the people are the ones who continue them, praying, at first, simply for their own deliverance, and then, second, for indulgence for all. Similarly the identities of the Jews and the people seem intentionally blurred. In the first set of *preces* the language of the imprecatory psalms is brought to bear in full force, it seems, on the Jews; it is clear that the ones “rag[ing] with their teeth,” for example, are the Jewish leaders, and the Jews are named explicitly (and incorrectly) as the ones who “sold” Jesus for 30 silver pieces. The final strophe has Jesus praying to the Father for “the wretched ones [*miseris*] for whom I am afflicted with such bitter suffering.” It seems to be an open question whether this prayer is for Christians, Jews, or both.

The second set of *preces*, in my opinion, does indeed answer that question, but by no means straightforwardly. The prelude juxtaposes the two main modes of the previous set of *preces*: supplication and intercession. The refrain now takes on the intercessory mode. The first strophe persists in muddling the question of who are to be saved and who are enemies, not least through its grammar, which mixes the functions of accusative and ablative.\(^{117}\) The third strophe speaks of “greatest evils” being rendered for good, but does not explain what the good is. The sixth strophe and seventh verse, however, finally meld the identities of everyone involved, accusing them of the most torturous elements of the Passion in quick succession—whip, cross, and lance—and then immediately praying for their forgiveness. It is clear from the liturgical language of the rephrased prayer on the Cross—“drop their charges” (*relaxa crimina*)—that the people are the primary objects of the prayer and thus, retrospectively, the implied perpetrators of all that came before.

The definition of the people in the *persona Iudaeorum* is not especially surprising, given our analysis of Old Hispanic Good Friday texts, but it is accomplished in a way

\(^{117}\) Ibid.
that is certainly more readily ascertainable by the people participating in the *preces*. The definition of the people as the interceding Christ on the Cross, moreover, is quite exceptional, empowering the Christian faithful to view the world from the Cross, as it were, and pray for universal forgiveness: “Have mercy, just Father, and to all grant indulgence.”

It is not certain where these preces were composed. Because they appear in the Bobbio manuscript and a Toledo liturgical manuscript there is no absolute reason to classify them as either Old Hispanic or Gallican. The *preces* genre is equally well-represented in each variety of liturgy, and in fact, *preces* are “the most substantially intact surviving group of chants thought to be of Gallican origin.” Because they are found in a manuscript of Toledo and one of southeastern Gaul, one might suggest that they were composed in between, in the area of Narbonne, in the northern part of the Visigothic realm.

Perhaps answering another pressing question will help us answer that one. Why are these *preces* so clearly assigned to Saturday morning and not Good Friday? One might first look to the Milanese liturgy, where the Saturday morning chants, including the *Popule meus* antiphon, all reflect on the happenings of the prior liturgical day. One might also look to 7th-century Spain, where the reading of the book of Revelation “from the Pasch to Pentecost” was mandated at the Fourth Council of Toledo; the first

---

118 Dronke, “The *Preces Mozarabicae*,” 218.
119 Huglo, “Gallican chant,” NG.
passage of Revelation to be read in the Old Hispanic liturgy was on Holy Saturday morning:

In those days, I John, servant of Jesus Christ, was in the spirit, and I heard a voice from heaven saying to me: “I am the first and I am the last and the living, and was dead, and behold I am living for ever and ever” [condensed from Revelation 1:9, 10. and 17–18].

If we take the speech of Christ in the Bobbio Missal preces as that of one “living, and dead, and [again] living,” juxtaposed against the Gospel narrative of the day of the tomb being guarded and sealed, which is indeed mentioned in the preces, then we can perhaps more surely claim a hypothesis that the preces had their origin in a northern Visigothic area where elements of “Gallican” and “Old Hispanic” liturgies were being exchanged.

This area, of course, is one of the places that the Carolingian Popule meus verses may have taken their original long shape as the Narbonnaise Popule meus verses. The Bobbio Missal preces indicate the exchange of liturgical material along the Mediterranean coast of France and Spain. They may also indicate the exchange of liturgical material that was more precisely designated as chant, that is, material that would have not shown up in the Bobbio Missal or our other surviving Gallican liturgical books. I suggest that the Narbonnaise Popule meus verses had their origin around this time (that is, around 700), before the Muslim invasion swept over Spain and southern France, that they made their way east and then up the Rhône (as has been suggested of liturgical material in the Bobbio Missal), and took root as far as north-central France. In Chapters 5 and 6 I will demonstrate my reasons for this supposition. Before that, however, we must trace out a cursory history of a completely different chant, whose history in the Christian West would become irrevocably yoked to that of the Popule meus chants in the late 9th century: the Trisagion.
CHAPTER 4: THE MEANING OF THE TRISAGION IN EAST AND WEST

The Trisagion, or “thrice-holy,” is a Greek chant consisting of four short textual phrases: three acclamations of God in his divine attributes followed by a single invocation: *Agios o Theos, agios ischyros, agios athanatos, eleison imas* (*Sanctus Deus, sanctus fortis, sanctus immortalis, miserere nobis*; “Holy God, holy strong, holy undying, have mercy on us”). With origins in the Eastern Mediterranean by the mid-5th century, it was translated into Latin early on for use in the Latin liturgies, and it is indeed most well-known to students and heirs of the Western liturgical traditions in a bilingual version for the Good Friday Veneration of the Cross.1 This use of the Trisagion on Good Friday appears to be datable to the second half of the 9th century, during the waning of the Carolingian Empire.2 The fact that the Trisagion had been employed in most of the Eastern and Western liturgies for centuries before this, in various liturgical and paraliturgical contexts, meant that it had accrued a wealth of potential meanings by this point. Assessing the meanings received by the late Carolingian liturgists and their hermeneutical contribution in turn is the object of this chapter.

But before we delve into the pre-Carolingian contexts, a preliminary look at the Carolingian context itself is in order. The Adoration of the Cross ceremony appeared in the Roman liturgy around the year 700 and was adopted by the Franks within a few generations, initially with just the single antiphon *Ecce lignum crucis*; towards the end of
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1 E.g., see *Liber Usualis* (1961), 737–8. On the earliest records of the Trisagion, see the discussion below.

2 The Trisagion only appears on Good Friday in the latest two of Hesbert’s mass antiphoners, those of Corbie (after 853) and Senlis (between 877 and 882). René-Jean Hesbert, *Antiphonale Missarum Sextuplex* (Bruxelles: Vromant, 1935), 96–7; for the discussion of dates, see xxii and xxiii. Peter Jeffery summarizes: “The singing of the trisagion on Good Friday did not originate in Rome; it was one of those ‘imaginative and dramatic elements . . . [that] were introduced into the Roman liturgy by the Gallo-Frankish reformers’ when the Roman rite was imported into northern Europe.” *Translating Tradition: A Chant Historian Reads Liturgiam Authenticam* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2005), 27.
the 9th century the Trisagion became the headlining musical item in the Carolingian version.³ A liturgical ordo from the north of France, additionally (OR 31), serves as a companion to these later mass antiphoners in describing in detail the ceremonial context in which these chants were sung:⁴

In the midst of communion activities on Good Friday, following the communication of the pontiff, the attention shifts to the cross. It is to have been placed behind the altar and apparently at some distance from it, since it is to be moved in three stages from this position ever nearer the altar, until directly in front of it. The Trisagion accompanies this dramatic action. Two minor clerics carry the cross to its first position, and then two cantors approach, bow before it, and sing the Trisagion in Greek—“Holy God, holy strong, holy undying, have mercy on us”—and then the chorus responds with the Trisagion in Latin. The cross is moved again, nearer to the altar; again the cantors bow and sing in Greek and the chorus responds in Latin. It is finally moved directly in front of the altar and the bilingual singing of the Trisagion happens a third and final time. In a culminating action, the pontiff removes the covering and sings the antiphon Ecce


lignum crucis: “Behold the wood of the cross, on which hangs the salvation of the world.”

So now the question: Why was the Trisagion integrated into the liturgical action of Good Friday at this point in history in such a unique and dramatic way? The traditional Byzantine interpretation of the Trisagion had the hymn being addressed to the Trinity, certainly not to the Crucified Christ. Why adopt a Greek chant in a way seemingly so antithetical to Byzantine tradition, a tradition second only to that of Rome in prestige accorded by the Carolingians? In tracing the multiple routes of transmission for the Trisagion’s texts, melodies, and contexts, it becomes clear that many meanings animated the Trisagion on its way to the Carolingians, meanings that were Trinitarian and Christological, penitential and incarnational, angelic and human. While these meanings served as touchstones of exclusivist orthodoxy at times, I argue that the Trisagion of the Carolingian Good Friday liturgy ended up, probably unwittingly, as a small-scale ecumenical synthesis with respect to Christian tradition.

ORTHODOXY AND CONFLICT: ANTIOCH AND CONSTANTINOPLE

The story begins in the midst of the Christological controversies, which led to the split between the Byzantine Orthodox Church, the Nestorian Church (Church of the East), and the Oriental Orthodox Churches. The Council of Chalcedon of 451 was the point of severing between the Byzantine and Oriental Churches. While the key work of the council consisted in hammering out a Christological definition, the first order of business was the trial of Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria, for his role in the deposition and murder of Flavian, patriarch of Constantinople, at a previous council debating
Christology. The bishops were seated according to their support of Dioscorus, and when the sentence was read—Dioscorus was to be deposed as patriarch of Alexandria—responses followed from either side:

The most devout Oriental bishops and those with them [against Dioscorus] exclaimed: “This judgment is just.”

The most devout Illyrian bishops and those with them [for Dioscorus] said: “We have erred. Let us all be granted forgiveness.”

The most devout Oriental bishops and those with them [against Dioscorus] said: “Many years to the senate! Holy God, Holy Almighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy on us. Many years to the emperors! The impious are always routed; Christ has deposed Dioscorus. Christ has deposed the murderer. This is a just sentence. This is a just council. This is a holy council. The senate is just, the council is just. God has avenged the martyrs.”

While the bishops for Dioscorus expressed contrition, the bishops against Dioscorus approved the sentence with acclamations of the council and all authority figures represented there, including Christ, who was indeed physically represented by a Gospel Book at the center of the council to signify his ultimate presidency. The Trisagion thus validates the sentence and is closely connected to the picture of Christ as ultimate Lord or Emperor judging on the side of the speakers; the words “have mercy on us” seem somewhat out of place, suggesting both a liturgical or paraliturgical source for the words as well as a newfound usage as a touchstone of political and theological debate.

Indeed the Trisagion emerges in theological writings not long after this, by the 480s, as a non-negotiable standard of orthodoxy and protection against heresy. This might not have been so remarkable had it not been true in two opposing camps: those that

---

accepted the Chalcedonian definition of Christ and those that did not. The non-Chalcedonians claimed that the Trisagion exemplified worship of Christ in a single divine-human nature. A new phrase added to the Trisagion in non-Chalcedonian Antioch, furthermore, served as a test of loyalty: if one sang “Holy God, holy strong, holy undying, crucified for us, have mercy on us,” then one was safe from being accused of the two-nature heresy of Nestorius. In Chalcedonian Constantinople, however, if one sang this version, a riot might ensue, as indeed happened in the year 512. It was not acceptable to sing the Trisagion to Christ in his divinity and humanity, the Byzantines countered, but solely to the divinity of the Godhead and more precisely to the Trinity, given the tripartite acclamation. The singing of the Antiochan addition to the Trisagion thus served as a signifier of orthodoxy or heresy, depending on whose side you were on.

At this point we may further unpack the meaning of the hymn in each camp, beginning with the Byzantines. For them, the divine attributes listed in the Trisagion—holy, mighty, immortal—protected against the heresy of denying these attributes. As one legend went, during invasions and earthquakes in Constantinople some of the people were heretically invoking a God “that ha[d] suffered and died for [them].” To remedy this, the Trisagion was revealed by God as an appropriate means of intercession; the attributes “mighty,” and “immortal” here counteract the words “suffer[ing]” and “d[ying],” respectively. According to a related legend, during a severe earthquake the

---

people were praying outside the city, and a little child was snatched away to heaven for one hour, where he learned the song of the angels, the Trisagion. Returning to earth, he taught the people the chant and, when they sang it, immediately the earthquake ceased. In the first legend, unacceptable human praise was replaced by the Trisagion to safeguard the attributes of God. In the second legend, moreover, this proper human praise mimics actual heavenly worship. This is all well and good, until someone adds the words “crucified for us,” which have the effect of crucifying God in the angels’ song and concomitantly corrupting human praise.

And yet, argues the non-Chalcedonian, crucifying the Divinity is precisely what was necessary for our salvation. It was indeed Christ the Divine Word, the holy, strong, and immortal, that underwent the suffering and death of the Cross, for how could a mere mortal have overcome death? Incarnational theology suffered in rigid Chalcedonian concepts about God: “On account of the term ‘homoousios’ you do violence to the Economy which was carried out to save our life.”

11 This legend is repeated many times in Byzantine writings; the earliest version containing all these details is perhaps the letter forged by the Sleepless Monks around 512 which attributes itself to Pope Felix III (483–492). See Brian Croke, “Two Byzantine Earthquakes and Their Liturgical Commemoration,” Byzantion 51 (1981): 122–47, here 27–8. The text of the pseudo-Felix letter is given as Epistola III Ad Petrum Fullonem ex Synodo Romana in PatLat 58, cols. 903–12, with the legend 909–10.


and terrific cry” of the Cross, its body in flight a cruciform shape.\footnote{Michael van Esbroeck, “The Memra on the Parrot by Isaac of Antioch,” Journal of Theological Studies 47 no. 2 (October 1996):464–76, here 472, 475, 470, 471.} In Constantinople, in conjunction with the riot mentioned above, there was an eclipse of the sun from noon until 3pm, “proving to wise men that Christ, who was crucified in the flesh at Jerusalem, was God.”\footnote{F. J. Hamilton and E. W. Brooks, trans., The Syriac Chronicle Known as that of Zachariah of Mitylene (London: Methuen, 1899), 178.} Finally, unlike the Chalcedonians, who attempt to mimic the angels, the tongues of the non-Chalcedonians sing the expanded Trisagion as they are “moved by truth.”\footnote{Vaschalde, Three Letters of Philoxenus, 101: “...the tongues which are moved by truth cry out [the Trisagion].”} To sum up, then, while the Byzantine Trisagion seeks to uphold the divine attributes unsullied and approach via the angels’ song, the key theme of the non-Chalcedonian Trisagion is theophany, incarnation, and embodiment.

OUTSIDE THE BATTLE: EGYPT, SPAIN, GAUL

While the latter view is more mysterious, the former view is more rational, and the non-Chalcedonians indeed chided the Chalcedonians often for their attempts to shoehorn the Trisagion into a Trinitarian framework in, for example, pairing each divine attribute of the Trisagion with a member of the Trinity.\footnote{See, for example, Sermon 125 of Severus of Antioch in Maurice Brière, trans., Les homiliae cathedrales de Sévere d'Antioch: Homélies 120–125, Patrologia Orientalis 29 no. 1 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1960), 245, 247.} But outside the debate raging between Constantinople and Antioch, one did not need to approach the Trisagion with reason, nor did one find it necessary to thunder forth paradoxes such as “The Immortal One was crucified for us”\footnote{Philoxenus, Memra 10 against Habib, in M. Brière and F. Graffin, trans., Sancti Philoxeni Episcopi Mabbugensis Dissertationes Decem de Uno et Sancta Trinitate Incorporato et Passo (Mēmrē contre Habib), IV. Dissertationes 9⁴, 10⁵, Patrologia Orientalis 40 no. 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1980), 333.} in a fight for loyalty in a factional war. The Churches outside the debate, on the whole, embraced non-Chalcedonian paradox without polemic, and
spun out beautiful pictures of Christ in their versions of the Trisagion. This is not to say that the ideas emanating from the debate did not filter into these other places. The legend of the revelation of the angelic song, for instance, found a home in the writings of the Church of the East in Persia, while the Antiochan addition to the Trisagion became standard in the Armenian liturgy.²⁰

Egypt is particularly notable for its poetic compositions on the model of the Trisagion. For example, one hymn preserved on a piece of leather, probably from the 7th century, recounts the story of Christ’s earthly life from Birth through the Resurrection as an acrostic poem interwoven with the acclamations of the Trisagion, including not only the addition of “crucified for us” but also, twice, “risen from the dead.”²¹ Letters 1 through 8 of the Greek alphabet narrate the birth of Jesus through Herod’s massacre:

[\alpha] A star from heaven
[\beta] heralds the king.
[\gamma] Jesus is begotten
[\delta] through the word of God
[\epsilon] of the virgin Mary,
[\zeta] (Jesus) the giver of life.
[\eta] Herod sought
[\theta] to kill God.
YOU WHO ROSE FROM THE DEAD,
HAVE MERCY ON US.²²


²² Ibid., 39.
Letters 9 through 16 of the Greek alphabet narrate the baptism of Jesus up to his Passion, interwoven with another iteration of the Trisagion, this time with the addition “crucified for us”; highlighted is the incongruity of the suffering of the “Lord of all” (*pantōn despotēs*): 23

...[o] For the Lord of all  
[π] submitted to suffering,  
YOU WHO WERE CRUCIFIED FOR US,  
HAVE MERCY ON US. 24

Letters 17 through 24, finally, reprise the addition “risen from the dead,” suddenly introducing, not a boy caught up to heaven, but the descent of the angels voices’ praising the Risen Lord:

...[φ] A voice from heaven!  
[χ] The angels rejoicing,  
HOLY AND IMMORTAL,  
[ψ] praising and proclaiming,  
[ο] O immortal,  
WHO ROSE FROM THE DEAD,  
HAVE MERCY ON US. 25

Another Egyptian expanded Trisagion, from an 7th or 8th century shard of pottery, juxtaposes this Lord now surrounded by angelic praise with his previous state of being surrounded by animals:

Holy God, whom the cherubim celebrate and the angels adore,  
Holy mighty, whom the incorporeal choir of angels glorifies,  
Holy immortal, who manifested yourself in the feeding-trough without reason;  
have mercy on us. 26

23 Ibid., 38.  
24 Ibid., 39, 41.  
25 Ibid., 41.  
Intriguingly, this Egyptian expanded Trisagion appears to be a close cousin of another expanded version of the hymn found among the paraliturgical antiphons of the Old Hispanic liturgy:

Holy God, whom the cherubim bless and the seraphim adore,
Holy mighty, whom the praising choir of angels glorifies,
Holy immortal, grant us pardon,
and have mercy on us.  

The Old Hispanic version leaves behind the paradox of the Incarnation and instead highlights the standard plea for mercy with an additional plea, matching the tone of the surrounding responsories and antiphons, which are categorized under the rubric *de clade*—for calamity.  

Recent historical work has indeed identified the likely period of the Hispanic adoption of the Trisagion, the mid-6th to the mid-8th century, as one of marked pestilence and plague, and one may also find several Old Hispanic homilies of the 7th century which are entitled *De clade*.  

This Trisagion *De clade*—intended for a time of calamity, mentioning the cherubim of Revelation 4 as well as the seraphim of Isaiah 6, and requesting *veniam*—has both Christological and apocalyptic overtones.  

In southern Gaul the paraliturgical tradition of Rogation processions employed an explicitly Christological Trisagion with the remarkable addition of the words *qui tollis peccata*.

---


28 León 8, fol. 255r and 256r (rubrics), 257 r–v (Trisagion).


30 The Apocalyptic meaning is clearer in another Old Hispanic Trisagion, sung on Christmas and Easter, which includes verses taken from the book of Revelation. See Brou, “Études,” 320–1.
It should be clear from these two examples, although there are more, that Trisagion texts and meanings theologically unacceptable to the neighboring Byzantine Empire were not unusual in the Western Churches. How might this be explained? A letter from the Burgundian bishop Avitus to the king of that realm in the year 512 perhaps provides a clue:

...It is customary in the East in the churches of important cities for a supplication to be made at the beginning of the mass to accompany the divine praise. The voice of the plebs raises this acclamation as one with such religious enthusiasm and alacrity that they believe—not without reason—that any plea made in the subsequent liturgical celebration will find favor as long as this dutiful expression of devotion is added at the beginning. Even though Your Piety is very familiar with it, I decided that it would be a good idea to cite the end of this supplicatory prayer here, since my argument requires it:

‘Holy God, Holy Powerful One, Holy Immortal, have mercy on us! You who were crucified for us, have mercy on us!’

And just as it had been whispered to the emperor, so he too made it known to the bishop: that nothing should be a cause of dissension, and that there would be no mention of dissension, if the bishop, once he had been asked to do so by the emperor, were to order or allow what used to move the souls of some in the prayer to be removed... “You who were crucified for us, have mercy on us!”

Avitus describes the Trisagion as being a “supplication to be made at the beginning of the mass,” probably at the end of the procession to the church, which turns the divine favor toward the people. He maintains, mistakenly, that the non-Chalcedonian addition to the Trisagion is sung in Constantinople, and relates a story of the removal of the addition sparking a riot in the city. This is the riot mentioned above—but of course it had been

31 BnF lat. 776, fol. 85v.
precisely the opposite; it was the proposed implementation of the Trisagion addition that sparked the riot.\textsuperscript{33} Avitus thus transmitted his own misinformed version of the story, marking the non-Chalcedonian Trisagion for the Burgundian realm as a standard of Chalcedonian Orthodoxy in the Byzantine capital city. Indeed, the survival of the Trisagion \textit{qui tollis peccata mundi} in the antiphons for Rogations— instituted by Mamertus, bishop of Vienne about a generation before Avitus wrote his letter\textsuperscript{34}—allows the possibility that it was in the Rhône valley that the first Christological Trisagion was sung in the West. Thus, in attempting to replicate Byzantine worship, Gallican liturgists may have instead imported a version of the Trisagion more accurately replicating a form a worship repudiated by the Empire.

If Avitus’s mistake is indeed what engendered or at least allowed the unique Trisagion texts of Spain and southern Gaul that we have examined, it may have given the early Carolingian rulers just another reason, when the mistake was discovered, to suppress the Gallican liturgy. For the Trisagion was not just an antiphon sung in Rogations, but was the primary musical item of the Gallican Mass, at least in the area of Autun, as the famous exposition of pseudo-Germanus attests.\textsuperscript{35} It is thus very well possible that the Trisagion was officially banned during the height of the Carolingian liturgical reforms, not just because it was heterogeneous in the Roman liturgy, but because its Western standard form was heterodox in the Byzantine liturgy. Not until a century after the first Carolingian liturgical reforms does the Trisagion make a re-

\textsuperscript{33} Whitby, trans., \textit{The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus}, 195.


appearance in the manuscript record, after the split of the kingdom (in 843) and in a time when the monasteries, including the influential abbeys of Corbie and Saint-Denis, were taking over the cultural space left vacant with the dissolution of the central Carolingian court.

THE CAROLINGIAN SYNTHESIS

The locations of the first records of the Trisagion in the Carolingian Good Friday service—OR 31, Corbie, and Senlis—are restricted to a relatively defined area north of Paris;\(^{36}\) the mass antiphoner of Senlis was most likely produced at Saint-Denis to be sent there.\(^{37}\) Why would the prominent monastic centers of Corbie and Saint-Denis have wanted anything to do with this chant that, I have suggested, was of questionable status? It is possible that the dissolution of the unified Empire and the Norman raids, affecting the geographical area under consideration starting in the second third of the 9th century, might have provoked a reawakening of this supplicatory Gallican chant in a “great examination of conscience.”\(^{38}\) A preliminary comparison of Trisagion melodies, however, shows that the Carolingian melody is closer to standard Byzantine melodies than to other Western melodies,\(^{39}\) suggesting a fresh transmission from the Eastern

---


Empire, perhaps during the visit of Michael II’s embassy to Louis the Pious in 827. The updated melody, in addition to the clean text stripped of any insertion, would indicate that the Carolingians were interested in rehabilitating the Trisagion’s Byzantine nature, at least to some degree. It is clear that some existing Western associations were retained, however, and the Carolingian Trisagion is thus best viewed as a synthesis of several cultural trends in an age of “tradition and learning in search of ideology.”

Einhard’s 836 apologia for the Adoration of the Cross indeed emerges from the Carolingian engagement with the question of iconoclasm over the previous decades:

“Therefore, when for the sake of adoration you prostrate yourself on the ground [before the cross], you will at the same time be praying in your mind to God and adoring with an action of your body him, who is everywhere, as if he were in front of you and present . . . And we believe that we too ought to do this, namely to prostrate ourselves before the cross and, with our inner eye open, to adore him, who is suspended on the cross.”

The Second Council of Nicaea (787) had prescribed that veneration should be paid to images, for “honor rendered to the image ascends to its prototype and he who reveres an icon is worshiping the hypostasis [person] of the one portrayed.” The Nicaean definition used veneration of the Cross and of the Gospel Book as models of appropriate separate melodies of Western Trisagia in the 11th-century manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 776, folio 63v, 70r, and 85v, available digitally on Gallica.

40 Charles Atkinson has suggested this occasion, which also saw the gift of copies of the pseudo-Dionysian corpus (discussed below), as a possibility for the origins of the Missa graeca in his article “O Amnos Tu Theu: the Greek Agnus Dei in the Roman Liturgy from the Eighth to the Eleventh Century.” Kirchenmusikalisches Jahrbuch 65 (1982):29.


veneration of images, and while the Carolingians ultimately rejected the veneration of images, Western thinking on veneration of the Cross was greatly advanced by the time of Einhard’s apologia.\textsuperscript{45} In comparison with the Nicaean definition, we can see that Einhard includes three levels of approach in the veneration of the cross: first is the physical action of adoring the cross; second is the opening of the “inner eye” to the person of the Crucified Lord; third is prayer to the Divine Nature of God, “who is everywhere.”

Much of the writing in favor of icons in the East relied on the neo-Platonic framework of Pseudo-Dionysius, specifically the idea of procession from and return to God, the paragon of which was the Incarnation.\textsuperscript{46} Dionysian thought was appropriated indirectly by the Carolingians in the iconoclastic crisis and then studied directly in both monastery and court starting around 830 through new Latin translations.\textsuperscript{47} Liturgy and symbol are basic modes for pseudo-Dionysius, for while “we shall be equal to the angels . . . at present we employ (so far as in us lies), appropriate symbols for things Divine; and then from these we press on upwards.”\textsuperscript{48} In this upward approach, to “that Mystery of Godhead which exceeds all Mind and Being,” we are “conformed unto that sacred hymnody” of the Divine praises.\textsuperscript{49} This role of hymnody in the upward ascent corresponds to the Byzantine meaning of the Trisagion, while the role of the symbol

\textsuperscript{45} Noble, \textit{Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians}, 101; 285–6, 336, 368–9. Noble’s description of “principled indifference” (368) perhaps better describes the later stages of Carolingian thought about icons and images.

\textsuperscript{46} Filip Ivanovic, \textit{Symbol & Icon: Dionysius the Areopagite and the Iconoclastic Crisis} (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2010).


\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., 54–5.
would be most readily associated by Carolingians with the Cross. In addition, Hilduin, abbot of Saint-Denis, placed significant emphasis on Dionysius’s account of witnessing the eclipse of the Crucifixion (from Egypt, while still a pagan) in his translation of the corpus and his writings about the saint, highlighting a connection between the Crucifixion, personal conversion, and coming to know the “unknown God.”

Assembling this conceptual framework, then, with Einhard’s analysis of Cross adoration and new ideas from the East, the literal procession of the Cross in OR 31 becomes a metaphor for the concept of procession from the Godhead, and the veneration of the Cross is the outward and initial step in approaching God by means of first the physical wood and then the mental imaging of the Crucified Lord. The acclamation of God in his divine names—Holy, Mighty, Immortal—approaches him perhaps most directly, while the supplicatory end of the Trisagion reminds the faithful of their dire present states—in need of spiritual protection from damnation and of physical protection in a deteriorating Empire—and provides the opportunity to entreat the One “who was crucified for us” and “who takes away the sins of the world,” even in the explicit absence of these phrases from the hymn text.

To summarize, then, soon after the origins of the Trisagion, its incarnational (downward) and heavenly (upward) meanings were parsed out and pitted against one another in the East. As these meanings spread out, and particularly as they filtered into the West, they lost their polemical associations and were used and reused in innovative liturgical and paraliturgical formulations. Finally, then, several of these threads were

---

50 Delaporte, “He Darkens Me with Brightness,” 236.
51 “[Y]ou will find all the sacred Hymnology, so to speak, of the Theologians arranging the Names, of God with a view to make known and praise the beneficent progressions of the Godhead.” Pseudo-Dionysius, On the Divine Names, trans. John Parker, The Works of Dionysius the Areopagite (Oxford: James Parker and Co, 1897), 5.
woven together in the adoption of the hymn in the official liturgy on Good Friday, spurred on by new interactions with the East, in a ceremony that has helped shaped many Christians’ conceptions of salvation to this day.

The final thread, of course, that explains the Trisagion here are the *Popule meus* verses. This further synthesis is discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 5: CAROLINGIAN CONTEXTS I: HAIMO OF AUXERRE AND HINCMAR OF RHEIMS

As seen in the case of the Trisagion, the Carolingian period was characterized by “tradition and learning in search of ideology”: unprecedented engagement with several kinds of sources in a newly critical way, with the goal of a unified and stable Christendom.¹ Whether in the controversy over images, in the theorizing of the nature and worship of the Cross, or in liturgical formulation, moreover, there were some basic materials and methods in this Carolingian quest for synthesis and unanimity: 1) Holy Scripture, 2) the Scriptural exegesis of the Fathers, 3) orthodox (Roman) tradition, and 4) rational interpretation.² As the pre-Carolingian Trisagion and Popule meus verses were processed through this system and incorporated into the developing official liturgy, the preceding meanings of the Popule meus, as discussed in Chapter 3, were dismantled, evaluated, and redirected, as a Gallican chant became a chant for Carolingian Christendom. This chapter will begin to trace that process, while Chapter 6 will complete it.


² This list is suggested, as descriptive of Alcuin’s writing, and then of the Libri Carolini, by Giulio D’Onofrio, History of Theology, II. The Middle Ages, trans. Matthew O’Connell (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008), 60, 65.
EXEGESIS FOR CHRISTENDOM: HAIMO OF AUXERRE ON THE MICAH PERICOPES

While the early *Popule meus* chants seem to be most strongly connected to the commentary of Ambrose on the Micah pericope, and, as was mentioned in Chapter 1, the *Ego* verses depend on John Chrysostom’s exegesis, Jerome’s commentary on Micah 6, in his commentary on the Minor Prophets, was the most authoritative voice on the pericope at the time of the Carolingian *Popule meus* verses. Jerome’s voice was mediated, however, by the monk Haimo of Auxerre (fl. 840–860), and Haimo’s editorial and authorial voice, with its particular Carolingian presuppositions, colored the reception of the Minor Prophets from the mid-9th century onward, including through its incorporation into the *Glossa ordinaria.*\(^3\) It is thus worth examining this exegesis of the Micah pericope that, setting a standard of interpretation about a generation before the first extant record of the Carolingian *Popule meus* verses, may have influenced their formation, and certainly influenced their reception.

Much of Haimo’s commentary takes over the wording of Jerome, with only minor adjustments for clarity, as in this summary of the literal sense of Micah 6:3:

---
Jerome:

Loquitur igitur Deus ad populum Israel, et ad iudicium provocat, et licentiam contra se tribuit disputandi.⁴

God, then, speaks to the people of Israel, and provokes [them] to judgment, and presents [them] with a license to argue against him.

Haimo:

Loquitur Deus ad Israel, et eum ad iudicium provocat, et dat licentiam adversum se disceptandi.⁵

God speaks to Israel, and provokes them to judgment, and gives [them] license to argue against him.

At times, however, Haimo carries out significant editorial work.⁶ Elisabeth Mégier has characterized one of Haimo’s key systematic revisions of Jerome as the replacing of an opposition between literal and spiritual interpretations with “a gradation or progression from one to the other,” a progression that can move not only “from a Jewish to a Christian understanding, but also from one Christian understanding to another.”⁷ A second systematic revision is the bolstering of a specifically ecclesial interpretative sense.⁸ Indeed, at the critical juncture between the literal and spiritual interpretations of Micah 6:3–5, we find both of these types of revision in play:

⁴ PatLat 25, col. 1208.
⁶ “Since he did not quote his sources verbatim but drastically paraphrased them sometimes using only his own words, minor differences and alterations of his sources are critical.” Johannes Heil, “Labourers in the Lord’s Quarry: Carolingian Exegetes, Patristic Authority, and Theological Innovation, A Case Study in the Representation of Jews in Commentaries on Paul,” in Celia Chazelle and Burton Van Name Edwards, eds., The Study of the Bible in the Carolingian Era (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2003), 86.
⁷ Elisabeth Mégier, “Spiritual Exegesis and the Church in Haimo of Auxerre’s Commentary on Isaiah,” in Ineke van ‘t Spijker, ed., The Multiple Meaning of Scripture: The Role of Exegesis in Early-Christian and Medieval Culture (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 162.
⁸ “…if Jerome emphasizes the spiritual quality of his interpretation as a way of underlining its higher legitimacy, Haimo rather emphasizes the spiritual character of the fulfilment, that is, of the Church.” Ibid., 167.
Jerome:

Taken as history, God is speaking this to carnal Israel. But to us who desire to contemplate the unveiled glory of the face of the Lord [cf. 2 Corinthians 3:18], and who truly have father Abraham, we hear God disputing against us as we sin and proving to us the magnitude of his benefactions. We were of course ever slaves of Pharaoh, and we made mud and bricks for the Egyptian people, and he redeemed us, he “who gave himself the redemption for all” [1 Tim 2:6].

Haimo:

This is according to the letter, which morally can also be referring to us, who are in the Church. The Lord, therefore, disputes against us and reasons with us by the surrendering of his Son to death for us.

While Jerome presents a disjunction between literal and spiritual interpretations with a “but” (autem), Haimo prefers an “also” (etiam) to connect them. Where Jerome insists on the supersession of Christians over Jews, characterizing the nation of Israel as “carnal,” for instance, Haimo chooses an additive hermeneutic, validating the literal Biblical meaning while challenging fellow Christians with additional layers of spiritual meaning, of which there are at least three in number. First, Haimo takes over Jerome’s pure allegorical meaning: Christian redemption is a spiritual benefaction. Second, he steers this allegorical meaning in the direction of ecclesiology: Christian redemption as spiritual benefaction only makes sense within the boundaries of “the Church.” Finally, he explicitly identifies all this as a moral meaning: Christian redemption as spiritual benefaction, within the Church, should cause one to live a better life. While Haimo adds very little new content in comparison to Jerome, his reworking is unique in its presentation and its aims.

---


10 *Haec iuxta litteram, quae etiam possunt moraliter ad nos referri, qui sumus in Ecclesia. Disputat ergo contra nos Dominus, et arguit nos tradendo pro nobis Filium suum in mortem.* PatLat 117, col. 161.
In addition to the smooth transition between literal and allegorical meanings, the absence of discussion of the Jews of the Passion makes it clear that the Micah pericope is best applied to Christians; if interpreted literally, the passage is simply applied to the historical nation of Israel.\textsuperscript{11} Equally important for our investigation is the fact that Haimo’s spiritual explanation, in condensing that of Jerome, isolates the Crucifixion as the epitome of spiritual benefaction, clearly assigning a Passion theme to the pericope.

This raises the question: Might Haimo have known an existing version of the \textit{Popule meus} verses for Good Friday? In his discussion of the literal meaning of Micah 6:4, he departs from Jerome with an added phrase that may indeed support that hypothesis:

\begin{verbatim}
Jerome:  \textit{...dolebis te eductum de terra Aegypti, ac de domo servitutis meo auxilio liberatum...}\textsuperscript{12} \\
Haimo:  \textit{Ego te in manu forti eduxi de domo servitutis,..}\textsuperscript{13}
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
...will you suffer pain in being led from the land of Egypt, and also in being liberated through my aid from the house of servitude... I have brought you out of the house of bondage \textit{with a strong hand},..
\end{verbatim}

The Narbonnaise / Provançal \textit{Popule meus} verses add this phrase as well, in the corresponding section of the Micah-based text:

\begin{verbatim}
Popule meus, quid feci tibi, aut in quo contristavi te; responde mihi. Quia eduxi te de terra Egypti \textit{in manu forti}, in signis magnis et prodigiis excelsis, tu Parasti crucem salvatori tuo.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{11} Mégier points out that “Haimo’s favourite term by which he specially recommends a certain interpretation is precisely the comparative \textit{melius},” “Spirituale Exegesis and the Church in Haimo,” 162. Both meanings are valid; one is just better than the other.

\textsuperscript{12} PatLat 25, col. 1208.
\textsuperscript{13} PatLat 117, col. 161.
\textsuperscript{14} Transcription, from the Gradual of Apt (ms. 6), by Johann Drumbl, “Die Improperien der lateinischen Liturgie,” \textit{Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft} 15 (1973): 68–100, here 96.
My people, what have I done to you, or in what have I grieved you; answer me. Because I led you from the land of Egypt with a strong hand, in great signs and lofty wonders, you prepared a Cross for your Savior.

The words *in manu forti* are found a number of times in the Pentateuch in formulaic statements such as this one at the institution of the Passover celebration: “And when your son asks you in the future, saying: ‘What is this?’ you will answer him: ‘With a strong hand the Lord brought us out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery’ (In manu forti eduxit nos Dominus de terra Aegypti, de domo servitutis) (Exodus 13:14). The Micah pericope itself makes use of this Pentateuch-based formula, but in a version without the words *in manu forti*. The inclusion by Haimo of the words *in manu forti* may simply display his familiarity with the Pentateuch; on the other hand, perhaps he knew a chant text similar to the Narbonnaise *Popule meus* verses. Either type of source, Biblical or liturgical, could have been naturally incorporated into a commentary. A third possibility, that this small phrase from Haimo’s commentary somehow entered the sung liturgy several hundred miles south of Auxerre and not elsewhere, would be harder to explain. I would like to propose that Haimo did indeed know a version of the *Popule meus* verses which were closer to the Narbonnaise version than the eventual Carolingian version, further evidence for which will be given below.

There are a few other sections of Haimo’s commentary on the Micah pericope that shed light on newly-emphasized meanings against the backdrop of Carolingian Christology, liturgical experience, and ideas of Church and Empire. In the discussion of Micah 6:1 and 2, where the words of the Lord are introduced, Haimo gives a one-

---

15 Other places include Exodus 13:3, 9, and 16, Numbers 20:20, and Deuteronomy 5:15, 6:21, 7:8, 9:26, and 26:8. This last verse also includes the phrase “with signs and wonders” (*in signis atque portentis*).
sentence spiritual interpretation which, again, in condensing Jerome, is basically his own formulation:

“Hear ye what the Lord saith: Arise, contend thou in judgment toward the mountains, and let the hills hear thy voice; let the mountains hear the judgment of the Lord” [Micah 6:1–2a]. ... The mountains are a metaphor for the powerful and the rich; the subject and the less powerful are indeed called hills.16

The corresponding explanation of Jerome—that the people’s case should be heard before the hills if not worthy of the mountains17—is literal, although hinting at allegory in taking over the prophet’s anthropomorphic description; Haimo “completes” the allegory and concretizes it into a two-tier human hierarchy.18 This “completing” of an interpretation of Jerome is typical of Haimo, as Mégier has noted.19 While Haimo’s interpretation here seems to be one of secular lord–vassal relationship, his usual “completion” is towards an ecclesial interpretation.20 In fact, Haimo gives three allegorical interpretations of the mountains and hills of Micah 6:1–2, including an ecclesial one, which may be summarized, against Jerome, as follows:

17 Pro montibus ad quos propheta loquitur, et pro fortibus fundamentis terrae, colles et valles LXX transitulerunt, id, ut mihi videtur, intelligentes, quod populus nihil dignum montium anditione [auditione] fecerit, sed vel collibus qui inferiores sunt a sublimitate montium, vel vallibus in ima demersis. PatLat 25 col. 1206. The typo of anditione for auditione is corrected in CCSL 76.
18 Assuming that humans, and not heavenly beings, may be described as “rich” (divites), as is standard in Biblical texts.
19 Mégier, “Spiritual Exegesis and the Church in Haimo,” 164.
20 Ibid.
To start, Jerome’s basically literal exposition (J0) is given an allegorical reading by Haimo (H1), as described above. Proceeding onward, Haimo first takes over Jerome’s primary interpretation of angels (J1 = H2) and then yet again “completes” an interpretation: while Jerome introduces a comparison of angels with bishops with an “as” (sic ut), Haimo simply presents the two as equally-valid interpretations by connecting them with a “that is” (id est);\(^{21}\) a comparison becomes an interpretation (H3). Here is the continuation of Haimo’s commentary, containing his second and third interpretations, versus Jerome’s:

### Jerome:

And “contend in judgment towards the mountains,” which, I think, signify none other than the angels to which the management of human affairs has been entrusted, which agrees with the Canticle of Deuteronomy [Deuteronomy 32:1–43]: “When the Most High divided the nations, when he separated the sons of Adam, he appointed the bounds of the earth according to the number of the angels of God” [Deuteronomy 32:8, LXX]. These are the “ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them, who shall receive the inheritance of salvation” [Hebrews 1:14].

### Haimo:

“Mountains and hills” can signify the angels, to which the management of human affairs has been entrusted. For the Apostle calls the angels “ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them, who shall receive the inheritance of salvation” [Hebrews 1:14].

\(^{21}\) Id est is typically employed for parenthetical allegorical identifications, of which several can be seen in Haimo’s commentary on Micah 6:4–5: *Et misit ante faciem nostram Moysen, id est legem, et misit Aaron, qui interpretatur mons fortitudinis, id est Christum, qui est magus sacerdos sacerdotum. Misit et Mariam, id est, vaticinia prophetarum, quando etiam Balach, qui interpretatur eligens, id est diabalos...* PatLat 117, col. 161.
And “content in judgment”; so that if the mountains or the hills are found to have attended to the people in an unfitting manner, the fault should either be considered mine, who placed such ones in command, or it should be removed from the people, and referred to the leading ones. Let us read the Apocalypse of the Apostle John [Revelation 2 and 3], in which the angels of the churches are praised and accused for the virtues and vices of the ones with which they have been charged; as indeed sometimes the bishop is guilty and sometimes the people, and often the master sins and often the disciple, and sometimes the vice is the father’s, sometimes the son’s, as the latter is instructed well or poorly. Thus, in the judgment of God, the charge would fall either on the angels, if they had not done all that pertained to their ministry, or on the people, if, the angels having done everything, they refused to listen.  

“Contend,” he says, “in judgment with the mountains” [Micah 6:1b], that is, with the angels, so that if they are found to have attended to men in an unfitting manner, the guilt should be removed from the people and referred to the leading ones, or to me, who placed such ones in command. In the Apocalypse [Revelation 2 and 3] we read that the angels, that is, the overseers of the Church, are either praised or censured for the life of those over whom they preside.

Thus, in redacting Jerome’s commentary on Micah 6:1–2, Haimo has drawn out a theme of well-ordered hierarchy at multiple levels. The prophet’s literal description of the Lord,

---

22 Et iudicio contende adversum montes, quos non alios significari puto quam Angelos, quibus rerum humanarum commissa est procuratio, Deuteronomii Cantico in idipsum congruente: Cum divideret excelsus gentes, cum disseminaret filios Adam, constituit terminos terrae secundum numerum Angelorum Dei. Hi sunt administratorii spiritus, missi in ministerium propter eos qui haereditatem salutis possessuri sunt. Et contende iudicio; ut sive montes, sive colles reperti fuerint, non digne populos procurasse, vel meum videatur esse qui tales praeposui, vel culpa tollatur a populo, et referatur ad principes. Legamus Apocalypsin Ioannis Apostoli, in qua laudantur accusanturque Angeli Ecclesiarum pro virtutibus vitisque eorum, quibus praeesse dicuntur. Sicut enim internum episcopi culpa est, internum plebis: et saepe magister peccat, saepe discipulus, nonnumquam patris vitium est, nonnumquam filii, ut vel bene vel male erudiantur: ita in iudicio Dei, vel ad Angelos crimen referetur, si non egerint cuncta quae ad suum officium pertinebant, vel ad populum, si illis universa facientibus, ipsi audire contempserint. PatLat 25, col. 1206–7.

23 Possunt per montes et colles angelii significari, quibus rerum humanarum commissa est procuratio. Nam Apostolus angelos dicit administratorios spiritus, in ministerium missos propter eos qui haereditatem capiunt salutis. Contende (inquit) iudicio cum montibus, id est, angelis, ut si reperti fuerint non digne homines procurasse, tollatur culpa a populo, et referatur ad principes, vel ad me, qui tales hominibus praeposui. In Apocalypsi legimus quod angelii, id est praepositi Ecclesiarum, vel laudantur, vel vituperant ex vita eorum quibus praesunt. PatLat 117, col. 160. Haimo produces his third hierarchical reference, in the ecclesial sense, from Jerome’s comparison by interpolating a standard Apocalypse interpretation into the overall Micah interpretation—that is, by providing an allegorical interpretation for an allegorical interpretation. Compare the commentary of Bede on Revelation 3:1, in William Weinrich, Revelation, ACCS New Testament XII (Downer’s Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2005), 40 (which is in turn referred back to the 4th-century bishop Tyconius in n2); Caesarius of Arles, Homily 2 on Revelation, in William Weinrich, Latin Commentaries on Revelation, ACT (Downer’s Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011), 66; and, finally, the Revelation commentary of Haimo of Auxerre himself, (listed as a secure work in Ian Levy op. cit. 161): Et angelo Ephesi Ecclesiae scribe . . . Quod enim dicitur angelo, id est sacerdoti ipsius Ecclesiae (PatLat 117 col. 963); Tenes nomen meum, et caetera, sed ad eos qui simul misti erant cum reprobis, quos angelus Pergami, id est episcopus ipsius civitatis, prava docere permittebat (col. 973).
the mountains and hills, and the people is colored and variegated through spiritual
interpretation. While the Lord is still at the top and the people (now the Christian people)
are still at the bottom, there are as many as six distinct groups of intermediaries involved
in the judicial proceedings: a higher and lower group of angels, a higher and lower group
of ecclesiastical authorities, and a higher and lower group of secular authorities. This
summation, of course, pushes Haimo’s interpretations a bit farther than they explicitly go;
the focus on hierarchy, however, is undeniable.

It is no wonder that the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius, including the tracts The
Celestial Hierarchy and The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, garnered interest in the royal
abbey of Saint-Denis and beyond. Christendom could be well guided by the Dionysian
definition of hierarchy: “a sacred order, a state of understanding and an activity
approximating as closely as possible to the divine”,24 it was the Carolingian thinkers who
revived Christian antiquity’s conception of a “cosmic order governed by the perfect
rationality of the Word.”25 The ordained existence of hierarchy, of course, is a more
characteristically Western thought than the Pseudo-Dionysian idea of an ascent through
this hierarchy, and indeed the concept of hierarchy itself can mitigate against any impulse
towards ascent. Haimo’s choice to bypass Jerome’s spiritual interpretation of Micah 6:1
indeed eliminates a clear idea of upward ascent. Jerome’s text, completely eliminated by
Haimo, had read as follows:

“Arise,” he says, “contend in judgment toward the mountains, and let the
hills hear your voice.” It is one who is sitting, or lying down or sleeping,
or dead who is ordered to arise, as in that which the Apostle says: “You
who sleep, get up, and arise from the dead, and Jesus Christ will shine on

25 D’Onofrio, History of Theology, II. The Middle Ages, 59, discussing Alcuin.
you” [Ephesians 5:14]. Arise from the dead that you may walk in newness of life, that, abandoning the earth, you might press higher up.\(^{26}\)

As noted above, Haimo took Jerome’s literal interpretation of this verse and turned it into a new spiritual interpretation emphasizing hierarchy, rather than using Jerome’s existing spiritual interpretation, which had emphasized ascent.\(^{27}\)

Haimo’s elevating of the ecclesial sense of interpretation is buttressed by his emphasis on the Church’s activity in contemporary history, particularly regarding the conversion of pagans.\(^{28}\) Haimo’s extension of Jerome’s commentary on Micah 6:5 perhaps suggests the Christianizing of pagans during the days of Charlemagne, or in the present-day, or in the future—the Christianizing of the Vikings would of course have been a major blessing for the raid-weary Empire in the mid-9th century.

The curses and reproaches of [the Gentiles, like those of Balaam] are turned to blessing, because now they glorify the ones they were persecuting and slaying.\(^{29}\)

While the Gentiles are brought up in connection with Balaam (“which is interpreted ‘the vain people’”), the Jews are brought up, at least implicitly, in connection with Balaak (“which is interpreted ‘choosing,’ that is, ‘the devil’”).

\(^{26}\) *Surge, inquit, judicio contende apud montes, et audiant colles vocem tuam. Iubetur surgere qui vel sedet, vel iacet vel dormit, vel mortuus est, secundum illud quod Apostolus ait: Elevare qui dormis, et resurge a mortuis, et illuminabit te Christus. Surge a mortuis, ut in novitate ambules vitae, ut terram deserens, ad altiora nitaris.* PatLat 25, col. 1206.

\(^{27}\) As John Contreni has noted, Carolingian commentators generally “stripped from patristic commentaries everything that was not literal or historical and made the works of the Fathers more accessible by making them briefer.” “Carolingian Biblical Culture,” in Gerd van Riel et al., eds., *Iohannes Scottus Eriugena: The Bible and Hermeneutics* (Leuven: University Press, 1996), 8.

\(^{28}\) Mégier, “Spiritual Exegesis and the Church in Haimo of Auxerre’s Commentary on Isaiah,” 170, esp. n68, and 172: “[Haimo’s Church is] more rooted in the present . . . [and] much more historically real and circumstantial than Jerome’s.”

\(^{29}\) *Quorum maledicta et opprobria in benedictionem versa sunt, quia nunc glorificant quos persequebantur et occidebant.* PatLat 117, col. 161.
Jerome:

We call to mind therefore what was plotted against us by he who wished to devour our congregation and lick it clean, the true Balaak, the devil. Indeed, Balaak is interpreted *ekleichon*, that is, “licking clean.” [He is] “king of the water of the father” if, according to another etymology, Moab is called “water of the father.”

Haimo:

...Balaak, which is interpreted “choosing,” that is, the devil, who seeks to devour everyone, and who is the king of Moab, which is interpreted “of the father of all,” of course [referring to those] to whom it is said, “You are of your father the devil” [John 8:44]...

Haimo appears to have modified Jerome’s second etymology in order to connect the ideas of Balack being the devil and Moab having something to do with a “father” by way of the Gospel passage quoted. John 8:21–59 is one of the bitterest exchanges in the Gospels between Jesus and “the Jews,” in which they accuse him of having a demon and he accuses them of being not sons of the devil rather than of Abraham based on their seeking to kill him. Just because Haimo chooses a smooth transition between literal and spiritual meanings, and chooses Christianized and ecclesial interpretive senses as best, does not mean that he lacks in disparaging references to the Jews. In encouraging


31 ...Balach, qui interpretatur eligens, id est diabolus, qui omnes quaerit devorare, et est rex Moab, qui interpretatur ex patre omnium, scilicet quibus dicitur: Vos ex patre diabolo estis. PatLat 117, col. 161.

32 Note that this verse from John was also connected, in a homily formerly attributed to Haimo of Halberstadt, to the murderer Barabbas and the rise of the Anti-Christ: *Barabbas qui interpretatur filius magistri, vel patris eorum, typum Antichristi tenet, quem Iudaei in fine saeculi pro Domino suscepturi sunt... Bene filius patris eorum, id est filius diaboli, qui est pater eorum, sicut Dominus eis improperat, dicens: Vos ex patre diabolo estis*. Pseudo-Haimo, Homily 64 de tempore, PatLat 118, col. 374, cited in Celia Chazelle, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era: Theology and Art of Christ’s Passion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 144. Homily 64 is listed as anonymous in the study of Henri Barré, *Les homéliaires carolingiens de l'Ecole d'Auxerre: authenticité, inventaire, tableaux comparatifs, initia* (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca apostolica Vaticana, 1962), 51.

33 In fact, in a survey of Carolingian commentaries on Paul, Johannes Heil has characterized Haimo’s as having “the harshest anti-Jewish tone” and “try[ing] to deny the Jews any hope for future redemption.” “Labourers in the Lord’s Quarry,” 86. Still, Carolingian intellectual engagement with the Jews, as this passage from Haimo shows, was on the whole cursory or non-existent. “The idealized unity of the religious culture of Carolingian Europe did not seem to marginalize Jews . . . Indeed, Jews were often overlooked by Carolingian Christianity. Contemporary Jews were seen as Pharisees and not as the true heirs of the Israelites. They thus offered no challenge to the assumption of the Israelite mantle by the
hierarchy, Haimo here shows a positive evaluation of “the Gentiles” and a negative evaluation of the “the Jews.”

These evaluations are secondary, however, being only excursions from the main course of exegesis. Haimo’s main points in his exegesis of Micah 6:1–5 include the setting of the trial within the framework of the cosmic hierarchy, the faithfulness of God to Israel in the literal sense, and the spiritual benefactions from God to the Christian people in the spiritual sense, headed up by “the surrendering of his Son to death for us.” Little time is spent on the ingratitude or sinfulness of the people; this is rather taken for granted. The discussion of the mountains and hills as angels or as bishops, in which the blame for the people’s sins may fall upon members further up in the hierarchy, including the Lord himself, seems to be soteriologically pregnant, especially in the version of Haimo, with its pithy *vel ad me* (“the guilt should be removed from the people and referred to the leading ones, *or to me*, who placed such ones in command”). In fact, perhaps the most important part of Haimo’s commentary is making current the association of Micah 6:3 with Psalm 50:6, where the Lord triumphs when he is judged:

Jerome: 

“The Lord will therefore enter into judgment with his people, and he will plead against Israel” [Micah 6:2b]. He was able, as God, to inflict punishment according to the evil deeds of the people’s sins. He does not want to appear powerful, however, but rather just, and provokes sinners to judgment, as in the prophecy: “‘Come, and let us be judged,’ says the Lord” [Isaiah 1:18 and Isaiah 43:26]. He indeed urges the people of

Haimo: 

God, therefore, who was able, as God, to inflict punishment according to the evil deeds of the people’s sins, does not wish to exercise power, but justice; and he urges the people of Israel, in the presence of the angels and every creature, to speak whatever they have [cf. Isaiah 43:26], that, in

Carolingians themselves.” Jonathan Elukin, *Living Together, Living Apart: Rethinking Jewish-Christian Relations in the Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), 44. Elukin gives examples of religious and political events in the Carolingian lands from 839 to 877 that could have ended with the punishment of the Jews but did not (48).
Israel, in the presence of the angels and every creature, to bring any charge they might have [cf., Isaiah 43:26], that God might be justified in his words, and triumph when he is judged. [Psalm 50:6].

This self-sacrifice of the top of the hierarchy, to “exercise . . . justice” by being judged, is more fully explained in the commentaries of Jerome and Haimo on Isaiah 43:26, from which allusions were taken, as noted, in the previous quotation:

Jerome, Commentary on Isaiah:

“Put me in remembrance” [Isaiah 43:26a]: if you have anything of justice to respond to me I will gladly accept it.

Haimo, Commentary on Isaiah:

“And let us be judged at the same time” [Isaiah 43:26b]: and accuse me [cf. Isaiah 1:18] of not having done that which I should have done [cf. Isaiah 5:4]. We find this sense more fully developed in Micah: “O my people, what have I done to you, or in what have I wearied you? answer me. For I brought you up out of the land of Egypt, and delivered you out of the house of slaves: and I sent before your face Moses, and Aaron, and Mary” [Micah 6:3–4]. And in the fiftieth psalm, David says to God: “That you may be justified in your words and triumph when you

according to the Psalmist, God might be justified in his words, and triumph when he is judged. [Psalm 50:6].

—Iudicium ergo Domini cum populo suo, et cum Israel diiudicabitur. Qui poterat quasi Deus pro sceleribus populi peccatoris inferre supplicia, non vult videri potens, sed iustus, et ad iudicium provocat peccatores, iuxta illud propheticum: Venite, et iudicemur, dicit Dominus, etiam nunc populum Israel cogit, praesentibus Angelis, et omni creatura, si quid habeat respondere, ut iustificetur Deus in sermonibus suis, et vincat cum iudicatur. PatLat 25, col. 1207.

Deus ergo qui poterat, utpote Deus, pro sceleribus peccatoris populi supplicia inferre, non vult exercere potentiam, sed iustitiam, et cogit populum Israel praesentibus angelis et omni creatura, ut dicat si quid habeat, ut secundum Psalmistam iustificetur Deus in sermonibus suis, et vincat cum iudicatur. PatLat 117, col. 160.
are judged” [Psalm 50:6].

Haimo’s insertion, departing from Jerome, with its embellished version of the Pentateuch formula, corresponds with no particular Scripture, just as with the in manu forti insertion discussed above, and may testify to a Popule meus chant text—the words in signis are also unique to the Narbonnaise text (given above). With the use of Psalm 50:6, in Jerome’s Micah and Isaiah commentaries, and in Haimo’s Micah commentary, there is also an implicit connection made to the Davidic kingship. The genuine penitence of David in Psalm 50 validates his kingship, while, in imitating Christ’s humility, he also earns the right to triumph when he is judged, or when asking his people “What have I done to you,” or “What more should I have done for you that I did not do?” Indeed, in the 9th century the legend of the penance of Louis the Pious in 822 (for unintentionally inflicting death on his rebelling nephew Bernard) was writ large. While connections between Micah 6:3, the Popule meus verses, and Carolingian rulership are tenuous in the writings of Haimo, connections between the Popule meus chants (namely, the Responsories of Joshua) and ecclesiastical and secular rulership are explicit in the writings of Hincmar of Rheims.

---


38 See the final section of this chapter. “[At Auxerre,] the bishopric, and the monastery of St Germain, had both been closely linked with the Carolingian dynasty since the eighth century. Charles was able to exploit these ties to the full, and kept episcopal and abbatial appointments in his own hands throughout his reign. The schools and scriptoria of Auxerre flourished under royal patronage.” Janet Nelson, “The Frankish Kingdoms, 814–898: The West,” in Rosamond McKitterick, ed., The New Cambridge Medieval History, Volume II: c. 700–c. 900 (Cambridge University Press, 1991), 132.
Haimo’s exegetical work gave us a mid-9th-century view of Micah 6:3; Hincmar of Rheims provides us with a view of Micah 6:3 and of the Responsories of Joshua from the 3rd quarter of the 9th century. We are moving north, from Auxerre to Rheims and from there we will eventually move west, into the area of political and cultural stronghold of Charles the Bald, especially the royal abbey of Saint-Denis. We are also moving in time from the early years of the reign of Charles the Bald (from 843) in West Francia through the expansion of his power to his coronation as Holy Roman Emperor in 875 until his death in 877. Recall that the Senlis antiphoner, our earlier record of the Carolingian *Popule meus* verses, was written in 877, the year of the death of Charles the Bald, or soon after.

We now discuss two writings of Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, that contain liturgical quotations in the service of larger arguments. To my knowledge, these liturgical quotations have not yet been identified. Both works engage with the legitimacy of the ecclesiastical-monarchical hierarchy, one in order to quash the rebellion of one of Hincmar’s inferiors, the other in order to preserve the soul and the kingdom of Charles the Bald himself.

The *Opusculum LV capitulorum* was written between November 869 and March–June 870 in a bitter match of power and wits between Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims and his namesake, nephew, and ecclesiastical subordinate, Bishop Hincmar of Laon. At issue was the balance of power in the Frankish Church between king, pope, archbishop,

---

and bishop. In various situations involving land, money, and discipline, Hincmar of Laon had acted without sufficient regard for the interests and approval of his immediate superiors, Charles the Bald and Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims. When challenged, he had recourse to the so-called Pseudo-Isidoran Decretals, claiming that he was primarily under the jurisdiction of the pope, not the king or the archbishop.

Hincmar of Rheims characterizes Hincmar of Laon’s actions as prideful and harmful to many, comparable to Satan’s tempting of Adam and Eve in the garden: “[You say to your fellow bishops] ‘Support and defend this compilation [the Decretals] with me, and you shall owe submission to no one except the Roman pontiff, and you shall destroy along with me God’s ordination of the universal episcopal order into discrete ranking by seats.’”

Citing the celestial and ecclesiastical hierarchy outlined by “Blessed Dionysius the Areopagite,” and then giving Biblical examples of the two types of hierarchy, he reminds his nephew, quoting a verse of Augustine, that the self-exalted Devil brought man into death while the self-humbled Christ brought man to life.

Hincmar of Laon is said to glory in himself in everything, to never recognize his defeat, and to not be able to bear it when someone speaks to him of some good thing without acknowledging a good thing that the bishop has merited. It is this last reputed fault, addressed in the fiftieth chapter (of fifty-five), that engenders Hincmar of Rheims’s citing of two responsories from the liturgy.

This fault of wanting to hear about good things by one’s own merit, Hincmar begins, is clearly a result of pride. The solution is as simple as acknowledging the words

---


42 Opusculum chs 46, 47, and 50.
of the Apostle “For what do you have that you have not received?” (1 Corinthians 4:7).

When we respond to the good things done to us with evil works, or simply become ungrateful, it is the custom of the Lord to place these good things before our eyes, that we might be converted back to his good things and his grace.

Ait enim ad peculiarem populum suum: Popule meus, quid molestus fui tibi? Ostende mihi. Adduxi vos per desertum quadraginta annis, non sunt attrita vestimenta vestra, manna de coelo plui vobis, et obliti estis me.

For he says to his peculiar people: “My people, how have I wearied thee? Show me. I led you through the desert forty years; your garments did not wear out; I fed you manna from heaven; and you have forgotten Me.”

Hincmar is clearly quoting here the second and third Responsories of Joshua, sung at Matins on the Fourth Sunday of Lent, cited here from the contemporary “Antiphoner of Charles the Bald”: 

\[ R. \text{ Popule meus, quid feci, aut quid molestus fui tibi? Responde mihi. ... } \]
\[ R. \text{ Adduxi vos per desertum quadraginta annos, ego dominus. Non sunt attrita vestimenta vestra, manna de celo plui vobis, et obliti estis me, dicit dominus.}^{43} \]

The readings and responsories for the fourth week of Lent at this time traced out the stories of Moses and Joshua, with the first responsory of Joshua (\[Sicut fui cum Moyse;\] “As I was with Moses”) encapsulating his inauguration as leader of the Israelites in Joshua 1 and the second and third encapsulating his farewell speech in Joshua 24, after the Israelites had conquered the Promised Land.\(^{44}\)

Hincmar next gives another text drawn from a responsory:

---

\(^{43}\) BnF lat. 17436, fol. 50v. Transcription in PatLat 78, col. 758. The antiphoner was “perhaps copied around 870.” Ritva Jacobsson, “The Antiphoner of Compiègne: Paris, BnF lat. 17436,” in Margo Fassler and Rebecca Baltzer, eds., \textit{The Divine Office in the Latin Middle Ages} (Oxford University Press, 2000), 147.

\(^{44}\) Cf. Louis Brou, \textit{Les Improprès} (1937), 45–6, who proffers somewhat different Biblical sources. As with the second verse of the Carolingian \textit{Popule meus} verses, the choice is somewhat arbitrary (see the Introduction).
Et ad David dilectum servum suum, de quo dicit: Inveni David servum meum, qui facit omnes voluntates meas: Ego, inquit, te tuli de domo patris tui, et posui te pascere gregem populi mei, et fui tecum in omnibus ubicunque ambulasti, firmans regnum tuum in aeternum.

And to David his beloved servant, of whom he says: “I have found David my servant” [Psalm 88:21] “who shall do all my wills” [Acts 13:22]: “I,” he says, “took you from the house of your father, and placed you to feed the flock of my people; and I have been with you in all things, wherever you have walked, establishing your kingdom forever”

The Responsory *Ego te tuli* is the third Responsory for the book of Kings (*de libro regum*), from the “summer histories.”


As with the Responsories of Joshua, the text is made up of Scriptural segments that are combined into a unique text (in this case, from 2 Kings 7:8, 9, and 13, altered). It is thus clear that Hincmar is quoting from the liturgy in order to prove his points. The responsories *Sicut fui cum Moyse* (the first Responsory of Joshua), *Ego te tuli* were additionally used in a special office *de susceptione regum* (“for the reception of kings”) with a responsory *Inveni David servum meum*.

Hincmar was in fact what one might call a royal liturgist, producing and officiating the coronation ceremonies for Charles the Bald as his power expanded. In September 869, he officiated at the coronation ceremony for Charles the Bald as King of Lotharingia. It is no wonder that Hincmar should have king-related liturgy on his mind during the writing of the *Opusculum*. Hincmar did not aim simply to glorify the king,

---

45 “...the responsories and Lessons for the period after Pentecost draw their texts from Kings, Wisdom, Job, Tobit, Judith, Esther, Ezra and Maccabees. During this time, the lessons and responsories build liturgical sets which are drawn exclusively out of one of these books at a time. These sets of responsories are then referred to by the book from which they come (i.e.: ‘From Kings,’ ‘From Judith,’ etc.) and are often referred to as the ‘summer Histories.’” Katherine Helsen, “The Great Responsories of the Divine Office: Aspects of Structure and Transmission” (PhD dissertation, Universität Regensburg, 2008), 10.

46 BnF lat. 17436, fol. 96v. Transcription in PatLat 78, col. 832.

47 BnF lat. 17436, fol. 93v–94r. Transcription in PatLat 78, col. 827–8.
however, but rather to yoke court and church in a mutually beneficial system. As Janet Nelson has summarized, in the reign of Charles the Bald “the West Frankish bishops strove to increase the prestige of the royal office and to operate through it.”

Hincmar “applied to kingship, on the one hand, that order and functional definition which he found, in principle at least, in the church's own internal organization, so that the king's office acquired the same clear juristic delimitation as the bishop's.”

One of the ways that Hincmar effected this sacerdotalizing of the king was through similarly-constructed royal and episcopal consecration rites. Since liturgy such as the coronation rite effected the grace of God for rulership, the archbishop was confirmed in a “new triangle of authority.”

Looking at the texts of the 869 coronation rite, we see that Charles the Bald is announced by Hincmar as being “crowned and consecrated to the Lord in the possession of the kingdom [of Lotharingia] by the agency of the bishops.”

His anointing is identified as identical to that of prophets, priests (i.e., bishops), and martyrs. The words during the act of crowning itself, also said by Hincmar, declare that the Lord crowns the

---


50 Ibid., 279n1.

51 Ildar H. Garipzanov, *The Symbolic Language of Royal Authority in the Carolingian World (c. 751-877)* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 152, 310.


53 *Dominus . . . ungat te in regni regimine oleo gratiae Spiritus sancti sui, unde unxit sacerdotes, reges, prophetas, et martyres, qui per fidem vicerunt regna, et operati sunt iustitiam, atque adepti sunt promissiones*. PatLat 125, col. 807.
king now that he may persevere, in correct faith and in good works, to obtain the crown of the eternal kingdom of Heaven.\(^{54}\)

After citing the responsory *Ego te tuli* in the *Opusculum* against Hincmar of Laon, Hincmar of Rheims notes that all the benefactions listed in the responsory, and more, were used in reproaching David, because he sinned gravely without considering them. A king’s actions matter a great deal, but, even more than this, a king’s inward motivations matter, since it is the consideration of God’s benefactions that will convert him back towards grace. The grace of God, conferred on the ruler at the coronation through the agency of the bishop, is the prime benefaction for a king, and recalling this will help keep the king persevering in right faith and good works. Because the king and the bishop are both anointed, moreover, the bishop is held to this standard equally, if not more.

Hincmar of Rheims’s reproach of Hincmar of Laon through liturgical texts associated with the king is thus designed to both bolster Hincmar’s ideological framework and personally remonstrate the bishop of Laon.

The second work of Hincmar that uses the Responsory of Joshua text proceeds much along the same lines, but with a simpler objective. As a moral guide for Charles the Bald, written around this same time, likely in 869–70, Hincmar’s *De cavendis vitiis et virtutibus exercendis* (“On vices to be avoided and virtues to be cultivated”) aims to at the same time bolster the king’s office and soberly deal with the king’s person, with the latter in service of the former. Drawing from Gregory the Great’s *Moralia in Job*, as well

\(^{54}\) *Coronet te Dominus corona gloriae atque iustitiae, ut cum fide recta, et multiplici honorum operum fructu, ad coronam pervenias regni perpetui, ipso largiente, cuius est regnum, et imperium in saecula saeculorum*. PatLat 125, col. 808.
as from the Last Judgment homiletic tradition of Caesarius of Arles, Hincmar pleads with the king in the Prologue to make ample use of his intellect to do good.55

But you, beloved master, whom God has magnificently and powerfully endowed with the talent of intellect, cleverly apply it, since you will be rendering an account of it in the sight of all humankind and the angels and archangels; and refuse to conceal it in the earth tied in a handkerchief [cf. Luke 19:20], that is, to be involved in many earthy activities: but lift your heart up to him, who marvelously created us, freely nourished us, endowed us with the substance of reason at our creation, called you by his grace, enlightened you with his gifts, restored you to the joys of saving health by the pains of scourges of fatherly solicitude, did not abandon you sinning, glorified you with great gifts and power.

Every day account to yourself the things you received from the hand of the Lord, and weigh these against what you have compensated, because he will enumerate every good all together, saying: “My people, what have I done to you, or how have I wearied you? Answer me. Because I led you out through the desert for forty years; your garments did not wear out; I fed you manna from heaven; and you have forgotten me.” And again, “What more should I have done for my vine that I did not do?” [Isaiah 5:4]. And, “I waited for it to bring forth grapes, but it brought forth wild grapes” [Isaiah 5:2b].

And to those doing good, and in right faith even to those persisting in good works he will say in the Judgment: “I hungered, and you gave me to eat,” and the rest which follows, well known to you, up until it that will be said, “Come, you blessed ones of my Father, possess the kingdom prepared for you from the origin of the world” [Matthew 25:34]. And to the evildoers, and those persisting in evil works set apart he says, “I hungered, and you did not give me to eat [Matthew 25:42] up until that which will be said, “Depart, you cursed, into everlasting fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels” [Matthew 25:41]. And we shall not be reprieved of that shame, when the books (that is, the consciences) are opened, in the sight of every man and angel. And in no small degree we shall become fearful of our punishment, which will follow that shame,

55 In this passage Hincmar draws certain phrases from Book 8, Chapter 24, Paragraph 41 of the Moralia in Job, in which Gregory uses the verses Job 7:13–14—Si dixerō: Consolabitur me lectulus meus, et relevabor loquens mecum in strato meo: terrebis me per somnia, et per visiones horrore concuties (“When I say my bed shall comfort me, I shall be eased in speaking with myself on my couch, then you scare me with dreams, and terrify me through visions”)—to paint a picture of the Last Judgment. The Latin text may be found in PatLat 75, col. 825–8, while an English translation may be found in John Henry Parker, Morals on the Book of Job by St. Gregory the Great (London: Rivington, 1844), 447–8.
when guilt shall fall upon the soul imperishably perishing, and Gehenna shall consume the flesh unfailingly failing.56

It was not without reason that Hincmar cited Charles the Bald’s intellect as his greatest gift from God, for the king, having been schooled under Walafrid Strabo for nine years, was arguably the best educated of all the Carolingian rulers.57 Yet Hincmar’s point is surely that humility is at the root of one’s choice to use one’s intellect for good works. In both these passages the voice of the Lord calls to the addressee from the Scriptures, from the liturgy, and from the future Judgment emphasizing the sufficiency of his benefactions and the expectation for a proper return.58 Hincmar’s citation of Isaiah 5, which recounts a less-than-pleasing return, here comes either from the exegetical tradition, perhaps Jerome through Haimo of Auxerre, or from a version of the Popule meus verses—the Aquitainian, Narbonnaise, and Carolingian verses all make use of Isaiah 5. In fact,

---

56 PatLat 125, col. 859–60: Vos autem, domne charissime, quem Deus talento intellectus magnifice et potenter ditavit, solerter attendite, cui inde rationem estis reddituri, in conspectu totius humani generis, et angelorum atque archangelorum, et nolite in sudario religatum in terra illud abscondere, id est in terrenis tantum actibus implicare: sed sursum cor ad illum levate, qui mire nos condidit, gratuito nutrivit, rationis substantia in conditione ditavit, gratia sua vos vocavit, donis suis vos illuminavit, paternae pietatis sollicitudine a flagellorum doloribus ad salutis gaudia misericordiae medicamento reduxit, peccantem non deseruit, munera multa et potentia glorificavit.


58 While the Judgment is not mentioned explicitly in Opusculum Ch. 50, it is in Ch. 49, using the same Matthew passage as De cavendis vitiiis, suggesting that Chs. 49 and 50 be read as a continuous thought.
because of his apparent predilection for a liturgical *Popule meus* text, it is not unreasonable to suggest that Hincmar of Rheims was instrumental in the incorporation of the new *Popule meus* verses himself. Since we can trace the Carolingian verses in the extant record back to a specific monastery, however, an investigation of its possible contexts for the new verses is warranted first. We will discuss Saint-Denis under Charles in the next chapter, but now we turn to a significant memory of the monastery, fostered by Hincmar, that became the stuff of legend in Charles’s time.

MEMORIES OF PIOUS EMPERORS

After a rebellion by Louis the Pious’s older sons (Charles’ half-brothers) kept Louis and Charles in custody for the better part of a year in 833–4, Louis was dramatically reinstated as emperor in an impromptu ceremony on the Second Sunday of Lent in the church of Saint-Denis.59 The memory of that event was evoked by Hincmar in heroic tones in a speech given at Charles the Bald’s 869 coronation:

...after subsequently being deprived of earthly power by a faction of certain men, he [Louis] was given back to the said part of his realm by the unanimity of bishops and faithful people before the tomb of St Denis [*ante sepulcrum sancti Dionysii*], outstanding martyr of the holy Church...60

Hincmar too had special connections to Saint-Denis, having spent his formative monastic life there under the tutelage of Hilduin.61 More than one scholar, additionally, has suggested that he had a hand in Hilduin’s infamous *Life of Saint Denis*, and the account of the miracles of Saint Denis, which emphasizes the protection by the saint of

---

the Frankish kings, has also been attributed to him.\textsuperscript{62} Being a “graduate” of Saint-Denis and then being part of Charles’ circle would have been reason enough for this reference, but the significance of the events in 833–4 ran much deeper for Hincmar than this. When the rebellion had begun, he had disobeyed his superior in remaining loyal to the emperor while Hilduin sided with the emperor’s sons.\textsuperscript{63} Hincmar joined the emperor’s personal service following his restoration at Saint-Denis in 834, and may have even been with the emperor before this, in his custody.\textsuperscript{64} The restoration of Louis before the \textit{sepulcrum Sancti Dionysii} was a life-changing event for Hincmar, for it confirmed his status as a trusted imperial churchman and opened the way to his archbishopric in a very literal way: Ebbo of Rheims, his predecessor, had led the bishops’ trial against the emperor in 833, forcing him to do penance for a long list of sins; Louis’s restoration meant the end of Ebbo’s archbishopric.

One account of the bishops’ trial, included in a biography of Louis the Pious from c. 835, frames it as a modern-day Passion account, with some phrases perhaps echoing \textit{Popule meus} chants. When Louis was taken captive “all the bishops wearied him” \textit{(omnes enim episcopi molesti fuerunt ei)}, especially those he had raised up from low positions.\textsuperscript{65} Ebbo, having been raised from a family of slaves to the archbishopric of


\textsuperscript{63} Nelson, \textit{The Frankish World: 750–900}, 164.

\textsuperscript{64} Ibid.

Rheims by the emperor’s goodness, is worthy of a righteous tirade from the biographer, who interrupts the historical narrative to address Ebbo directly:

O qualem remunerationem reddidisti ei! Fecit te liberum, non nobilem, quod impossibile est. Post libertatem vestivit te purpura et pallio; tu eum induisti cilicio. Ille te pertraxit immeritum ad culmen pontificale; tu eum false iudicio voluisti expellere a solio patrum suorum.  

Later he concludes the following:

Quando in temptatione sua erat mitissimus principum, hi tales tam molesti ei fuerunt, qui eis immeritis omnem benignitatem exhibuit.  

When the mildest of princes was in his testing, such men as these [slaves elevated to counselors] so greatly wearied him, who furnished them, unmerited, with every benevolence.

Because Charles was a mere 10 years old when these events occurred, he is likely to have simply remembered a time of uncertainty and perhaps fear; it would have been up to his advisers to provide a retrospective significance for the events. This biography and its demonizing of Ebbo undoubtedly contributed to that significance, as would have Hincmar’s speech, suggesting the patronage of Saint Denis for a rightful ruler of the Franks. These accounts seem to be unquestionably in favor of Louis. But the events of 833–4 for Hincmar were not simply a means for bolstering the image of the king; before a king could be received by bishops and the people as a justified ruler he needed to understand humility. This is clear is the passage from De cavendis vitii in an abstract

---

66 Ibid., 232.
67 Ibid., 244.
way; and Hincmar saw Louis’ penance as a literal and exemplary working out of this process, as he makes clear in a treatise addressed to Louis’s eldest son Lothair c. 860.68

Ambrose excluded the emperor Theodosius from the church on account of his sins and called him back by penance. In our era, after the august, pious Louis, who had been ousted from the kingdom, [rendered] a satisfaction, the united episcopacy, with sounder counsel, and the consent of the people, restored him to the kingdom and the church.69

Here Hincmar emphasizes not the patronage of Saint Denis nor the villainy of Ebbo, but rather the dependence of a ruler on the episcopacy. The anomalous actions of the archbishop Ebbo are glossed over, only hinted at from the comparative “sounder” (saniore); the action of Louis—rendering satisfaction—and the action of the collective of bishops—restoring Louis—are the key ingredients in an exemplary process which involves Christian rulers of the highest caliber. Ambrose did not spare Theodosius this process, he advises later in the treatise, because through it the emperor obtained “both merit in heaven before the Lord and perpetual memory on earth before men.”70

This outcome resonates with the account of Louis’s restoration by “the Astronomer,” which some scholars have identified with Hincmar’s mentor, Hilduin:71

“[At the restoration ceremony] the exaltation of the people rose to such an extent that even the weather, which seemed to have suffered an injury with

70 Unde constat, quoniam nulli est contra Deum personae parcendum, ut et nobis et illi parcamus salutit, cui diligenter non parcamus sequentes pro modolo nostro, quantum Dominus dederit, beatum Ambrosium, qui non pariendo Theodosio, et illi meritum in coelis coram Domino, et sempiternum memoriale in terris coram hominibus...
him, now rejoiced in his restoration. The elements seemed somehow to have participated in his absolution, such that the harsh winds soon calmed and the face of heaven returned to its old but long unseen serenity.\textsuperscript{72}

The Astronomer also had recounted Louis’s earlier penance of 822, describing it as “imitating the example of the emperor Theodosius,” and undertaken by the emperor “to return to God’s grace.”\textsuperscript{73} The penance of 822 was undertaken by Louis “of his own volition” and was not in fact imposed by a bishop.\textsuperscript{74} The fact that Hincmar focuses on the penance of 833–4 in his narratives perhaps indicates that he sought to conflate the penances of Louis the Pious in 822 and 833–4, the one voluntary and the other forced, into an ideal penance undertaken by a ruler voluntarily and concluding with a quasi-coronation ceremony in the proximity of the holy tomb of Saint Denis, the royal saint.

The decision by Charles to take on the lay abbacy of Saint-Denis cannot be divorced from these histories of his father’s penance and restoration. Moreover, the time of the year Charles regularly took up residence there—Lent through Easter—was at the same time significant of his father’s restoration as well as Christian penitence and renewal in general.\textsuperscript{75} There can be no doubt that Charles’s identity as Christian ruler was

\textsuperscript{72} Trans. Noble, Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, 284.

\textsuperscript{73} Trans. Noble, Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, 262, 263.

\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., 262, and 262n201.

\textsuperscript{75} Paul Dutton comments in “Eriugena, the Royal Poet,” in Jean Scot écrivain: actes du colloque international, Montréal, 28 août–2 septembre 1983, ed. G.-H. Allard, Cahiers d’études médiévales, Cahier spécial, 1 (Montreal: Bellarmin, 1986), 67: “The plan to be at Saint-Denis for Easter was never haphazard, but had been anticipated long in advance. In 876, for instance, the Annals of Saint-Bertin tells us that, after being tied up with business elsewhere in the kingdom, Charles rushed to Saint-Denis to celebrate Easter. Doubtless the court had long ago been informed of his intention and was there awaiting his arrival. John, waiting with poem in hand, was probably to be found on at least a few occasions among their number.” 67n67 [AB = Annals of St-Bertin trans. Nelson]: “Charles spent the pascal season at Saint-Denis in 867, AB, p. 135; 868 when he arrived on the Sunday before Palm Sunday, AB, p. 143 ; 869 for Ash Wednesday and Lent, AB, p. 152; 871 also there for Lent, AB, p. 181 ; 872 also for Ash Wednesday and Lent, AB, p. 185 ; 874 also for Lent, AB, p. 195-196; 875 there for Ash Wednesday as well, AB, p. 197 ; and 876, AB, p. 200. What fixed Charles’ pascal itinerary with regard to Saint-Denis was probably the fact that in 867, AB, p. 134- 135, he made himself lay abbot of Saint-Denis, and in 869, AB, p. 152, took the trouble to refortify it.” However, (67n68) “Charles celebrated Easter at Compiègne in 864, AB, p. 117; 870, AB, p. 1
shaped in key ways during these more reflective sojourns at Saint-Denis during Lent, before the start of the summer military season. In the next chapter, we will sketch out the materials and meaning of Good Friday at Saint-Denis, including the newly-instituted *Popule meus* verses, and thus conclude our study.
CHAPTER 6: CAROLINGIAN CONTEXTS II:
GOOD FRIDAY AT SAINT-DENIS UNDER CHARLES THE BALD

In 867 Hincmar of Rheims recorded the following in his annals:

Louis, abbot of St-Denis, grandson of the Emperor Charles [i.e., Charlemagne] through his eldest daughter Rotrude, died on 9 January. King Charles [the Bald] retained the abbacy of that monastery for himself, making arrangements for the monastery’s administration and working of its lands to be handled on his behalf by a provost, a dean and a treasurer, while a mayor of the household took responsibility for its military contingent.¹

While the rise of lay abbacies occurred under his father, Louis the Pious, it was Charles the Bald who took the unprecedented step of taking on a lay abbacy himself.² On one hand, it was a very practical move, indicated by the mention of the monastery’s “military contingent”: Vikings had occupied Saint-Denis for twenty days just over a year before this, “carrying off booty from the monastery to their ships each day,” and Charles was determined not to let this happen again.³ On the other hand, it was a dramatic statement of the dual secular and sacred rule of the king whom John Scottus Eriugena addressed as “rex atque thelogus.”⁴ There was no better place, moreover, to make this kind of statement, for the abbey was rich in significance for Charles’ career and the life of his father, Louis the Pious, who had set him on his way to kingship.

³ Nelson, trans., Annals of St-Bertin, 128. The occupation took place beginning on October 18, 865 according to the annals. In 869 Charles ordered the construction of fortifications around the monastery (ibid., 153).
It was under the rule of Louis that Hilduin, abbot of Saint-Denis and spiritual adviser to Louis, had merged the identities of Dionysius/Denis, advancing the reputation of both the saint and the abbey.\textsuperscript{5} Louis had in turn shown particular devotion to Saint Denis, requesting Hilduin to compose an Office for the saint;\textsuperscript{6} and when Charles (the Bald), son of his second wife, Judith, was born, Louis dedicated him to Saint Denis.\textsuperscript{7} It must have been richly significant, then, when, Louis was reinstated there after the rebellion of 833–4.

What sort of meaning did Good Friday hold for Charles, his entourage, and the monks at Saint-Denis in the third quarter of the 9th century? Furthermore, how did the meaning of Good Friday intersect with meanings of kingship and Christendom? We have a variety of artistic media that survive from this period, more or less firmly connected to Charles and Saint-Denis, that can help answer these questions. First we will examine the poetry of Johannes Scottus Eriugena, the “royal poet” of Charles’s court. Then we will examine visual art, focusing on the central images of the altar frontal of Saint-Denis and the Prayerbook of Charles the Bald. Both the poetry and the visual art have explicit connections, I argue, to the Good Friday liturgy. This will lead us, finally, to a detailed consideration of the Good Friday liturgy insofar as it can be constructed at Saint-Denis under the lay abbacy of Charles the Bald. It is here, I will argue, that the Carolingian \textit{Popule meus} verses were likely first incorporated into the official liturgy, from which they would spread to Senlis and, eventually, the rest of Western Europe.

\textsuperscript{5} Robertson, \textit{The Service Books of the Royal Abbey of Saint Denis}, 39.
\textsuperscript{6} Ibid.
THE PASCHAL POETRY OF ERIUGENA

Of the members of Charles’s court, we have spent the most time so far on Hincmar of Rheims, in particular looking at the archbishop’s use of the Responsories of Joshua (*Popule meus* and *Adduxi vos*) and memories of Louis’s penance to theorize the roles of king and bishop within Christendom. We shall now turn to the writings of John the Irishman, known as “Scottus” or “Eriugena,” both terms indicating his geographical origins. Hincmar and Eriugena were easily the largest intellectual personalities at Charles’s court in the 860s and 870s; Lupus of Ferrières, a third prominent scholar at court, died c. 862. While Hincmar, as a Frankish bishop, strove toward “the erection of a metropolitan church structure, the regularization of religious life, the proclamation of the basic duties of Christian women and men, the christianization of the Frankish aristocracy and especially the royal family, the reform of cult,” Eriugena, as a scholar from Ireland, worked under presuppositions that often diverged from the archbishop of Rheims. There was, for example, no need for Eriugena to particularly define the nature of the Frankish ecclesiastical structure, although he worked on the hierarchy-laden texts of pseudo-Dionysius. In the same way, there was no need for him to particularly advise the king about moral conduct, as we have seen, a task taken very seriously by Hincmar.

It is no wonder that the two seem not to have gotten along. Their original falling out seems to have been in a controversy over predestination around mid-century:

---

8 To use both terms together, as is sometimes done, is an anachronism; I will prefer using the name “Eriugena” for the sake of convenience, as it is the most distinctive of the scholar’s names, given the fact that he himself coined it. D’Onofrio (2008), 82.

9 “Of the scholars who dedicated their works to him, only Lupus of Ferrières, John Scottus and Hincmar of Rheims seem to have spent any time at court.” McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms Under the Carolingians: 751–987*, 214.

although the two men had been on the same side, Eriugena’s philosophical approach to his arguments had garnered some criticism for their side of the conflict. As a protégé of Hilduin, Hincmar would have been less than pleased when Charles requested a new translation of the Dionysian writings from the Irishman, in 860, to replace that of Hilduin, produced about three decades prior. Additionally, Eriugena may have resided in the Greek colony in Laon. In 869, in the *Opuscula*, Hincmar would accuse his nephew, Hincmar of Laon, a patron of Eriugena, of corrupting his writing with “Scottica et alia barbara.” On his part, Eriugena may have composed this droll epitaph for the archbishop:

Here lies Hincmar, a violently covetous thief.
Squalid and inconstant, he becomes wet with the dew of danger.
He did only one noble thing: he died.

With respect to the Good Friday liturgy, then, it would be natural for these two advisors to the king to disagree. It is easily possible, in fact, to imagine Eriugena as a defender of the Trisagion and Hincmar as a defender of the *Popule meus* verses. The two may have even had a hand in bringing the respective chants into the Good Friday liturgy, although this must remain mere speculation. We have already examined Hincmar’s

---

11 D’Onofrio, 78.
thoughts on the *Popule meus*; we must now investigate Eriugena’s thoughts on the Cross as shown in his occasional poetry for the paschal days.

The poems seem to have been recited in close proximity to key liturgical celebrations, as the paschal poem *Auribus hebraicis* indicates:

O Christ, deign to fete your Charles at eternal banquets, which these mystical symbols prefigure.
He is a loyal servant who honours and worships you, preparing golden vessels for the temples he has built.
Throughout the long naves curtains are spread and drawn, and the clergy are decked in raiment dyed with purple.
Holy priests around your altars cry out with joy:
“so shall Charles be yours in the temples of eternity.”

While this particular poem, with its festal mood and description of rich vestments, as well as its direct content—“Christ, the first state of things, cast off the bonds / of the tomb”—would have been meant for Easter Sunday, two other poems may have been recited on Good Friday. The poem *Hellenas Troasque*, for example, quotes the standard antiphon for the Adoration of the Cross, *Ecce lignum crucis*:

Antiphon:  

*Ecce lignum crucis,  
in quo salus mundi pependit.  
See the wood of the cross, on which the salvation of the world hangs.*

Eriugena:  

*Ecce crucis lignum quadratum continet orbem,  
In quo pendebat sponte sua dominus  
See the wood of the cross that embraces the four-cornered world: / of his own accord did our Lord hang upon it.*

---

16 *Aeternis epulis, quas mystica signa figurant,  
Dignis Karolum pascere, Christe, tuum  
Devotum famulum, qui te veneratur honobar  
Aedibus constructis aurea vasa parans,  
Cortinis patulis et e longa per atria tentis,  
Vestito clero murice purpureo;  
Presbyteri sancti reboant altaria circum:  
17 *Primitiae Christus reseravit septa sepulchri...* Herren, *Carmina*, 70–1
To introduce this quote of *Ecce lignum* Eriugena uses an injunction similar to Einhard’s in his apologia for the Adoration of the Cross: “Now let us see the high triumphs of Christ / and the stars shining bright in our mind.”¹⁹ Later in the poem a phrase from the kenotic passage of Philippians is cited, in this context a probable reference made to the act of genuflecting before the cross: “We worship you, Christ, who have power on heaven and earth: / for to you alone every knee is bent.”²⁰

Robert Deshman has discussed the “exalted servant” theology of Carolingian artwork associated with Charles the Bald, using as his key objects the Prayerbook of Charles the Bald (discussed in the next section) and the Adoration of the Cross liturgy.²¹ He draws out a key paradox of this liturgy: “If Christ’s humbling himself on the cross led to his exaltation, then the worshipper’s proskynesis in willing imitation of the Lord's humility carried the implication, or at least the hope, that a corresponding elevation of the adorant would result.”²² Eriugena indeed highlights the elevation of the Christian, but seems to not require any particular humility on his part in order to obtain it, choosing instead to point to the blood of Christ as a totally sufficient means of *theosis*. A high point of the narrative of *Hellenas Troasque*, for example, occurs at the piercing of Christ’s side:

---


²⁰ *Te Christum colimus caeli terraque potentem: / Namque tibi soli flectitur omne genu.* Herren, *Carmina*, 60–1. The word “kenotic,” a theological term, references the Greek word *ekenōsen* in Philippians 2:7, meaning “emptied” (*exinanivit*).


²² Ibid., 393.
From the midst of his side, the unlocked fount of salvation,
flow living draughts of water and blood.
The water washes the whole world clean of its sin of old;
the blood makes us mortals divine.\textsuperscript{23}

And in \textit{Aspice praeclarum}, similar ideas are found in a direct address to Christ:

\begin{quote}
O Christ, Word of God, Power, Wisdom of the Father,
the wave of your blood, in which the altar of the Cross is bathed,
Purges, redeems, releases, leads us back to life
and shows to your elect that they are gods.\textsuperscript{24}
\end{quote}

A \textit{variation} on this theme is the acclamation of Charles at the end of this last poem as
\textit{christophoros}, “Christ-bearing,” in a list of honorary titles in Greek (\textit{orthodoxos anax},
“orthodox lord,” \textit{eusebēs egklutos archos}, “reverent renowned ruler,” \textit{sophrōn}
\textit{christophoros kyrios}, “moderate Christ-bearing master”).\textsuperscript{25}

While Eriugena’s use of the Greek word \textit{christophoros} in this context seems at
first to simply ally the concepts of Charles’ and Christ’s rulerships, a deeper meaning is
implicit when the poem as a whole is taken into account. Earlier in the poem a Latinized
version of the same word, \textit{christifer}, is used as an acclamation of the Cross itself:

\begin{quote}
O fostering cross,
...our Church sends you praise with a fitting hymn;
For through you, O bearer of Christ, it was redeemed.\textsuperscript{26}
\end{quote}

In the light of this earlier usage, the meaning of \textit{christophoros} as applied to Charles thus
becomes much more rich and dynamic. Charles is not simply the bearer of Christ’s
divine rulership; like the Cross, he is the bearer of Christ’s Passion, his death, his cosmic

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{23} \textit{In medio lateris, reserato fonte salutis, / Vitali\'es haustus, sanguis et unda, fluunt. / Unda lavat totum veteri peccamine mundum, / Sanguis mortales nos facit esse deos.} Herren, \textit{Carmina}, 58–9.
\item \textsuperscript{24} \textit{Christe, dei verbum, virtus, sapientia patris, / Sanguinis unda tui, qua madet ara crucis, / Nos purgat, redimit, solvit, vitamque reducit, / Electisque tuis praestitit esse deos.} Herren, \textit{Carmina}, 66–7. The words \textit{unda sanguine} are likely borrowed here from the hymn \textit{Vexilla regis: ut nos lavaret crimine / manavit unda sanguine} (“So that we might be washed of crimes, / A wave of blood was flowing”).
\item \textsuperscript{25} Herren, \textit{Carmina}, 66–7.
\item \textsuperscript{26} \textit{O crux alma... / Te ΠΝΥΞ nostra dehinc iusto modulamine laudet: / Per te, Christifera, namque redempta fuit.} Herren, \textit{Carmina}, 64–5,
\end{itemize}
redemption, and his exaltation. This in turn is the reason that the human Charles and his earthly realm both have significance and positive value in the universe of Eriugena’s poetry. Michael Herren has theorized the meaning of this “top-down” approach:

> Are human events intended to be the real focus of Eriugena's poems because of their prominent placement at the conclusion of his works, or are they meant to be seen sub specie aeternitatis, that is, from a bird's eye view from atop the empyrean, as in “Si vis ογρανιας”? The answer is really “both,” and Eriugena provides for this changing perspective in his image of “gentle descent” through the theoremata, “the objects of contemplation,” through the events of divine history (and the symbols that represent them) down into the world of history and mutability. Thus, our perspective changes as the “wings of the mind” come nearer the earth and to the court of Charles. Through this poetic sleight of hand our own eye becomes identical with God's eye, and we gain confidence that Eriugena’s prayers for Charles will be answered.27

This passage—from the celestial realm, through the divine history and its symbols, most notably the Cross, into human history—is also characteristic of the Good Friday Trisagion. In Chapter 4 we saw how, in the light of the Trisagion’s theological and liturgical history, as well as new theorizing about images and the Cross, the literal procession of the Good Friday cross could signify the more abstract process of God’s nature being revealed. The juxtaposition in the text, moreover, acclaiming in timeless fashion God as holy, mighty, and undying, and then turning to an immediate present need—“have mercy on us”—has the same top-down effect.

For those familiar with the Dionysian writings, and above all for Eriugena, the acclamations of God in the Trisagion would call to mind pseudo-Dionysius’s treatise *The Divine Names*. *The Divine Names* treats the various names of God as revealed in

---

Scripture, explaining them as “the beneficent processions of God.” These names are revealed for our sake, and lift us up even as we grasp hold of them:

Imagine a great shining chain hanging downward from the heights of heaven to the world below. We grab hold of it with one hand and then another, and we seem to be pulling it down toward us. Actually it is already there on the heights and down below and instead of pulling it to us we are being lifted upward to that brilliance above, to the dazzling light of those beams.

There is no question that Eriugena would have been pleased with the presence of the Trisagion in a Good Friday service; he would have seen it as a means to ascend to God, in contemplation and praise, on one of the most sacred days of the year. The following section of the poem Aspice praeclarum, of which the beginning and end were quoted above, may indeed reference the Trisagion:

O fostering cross, past Seraphim and Cherubim you shine.
All that is being, non-being, beyond-being worships you.
The ‘lords of creation’, the Virtues and Powers,
and the middle rank of the angels adore you;
Angels, archangels, principalities, aye, the totality
of the celestial band, seeking the heights, pays you homage.
So, too, our Church sends you praise with a fitting hymn;
For through you, O bearer of Christ, it was redeemed.

The opening words here, O crux alma nites ("O fostering cross, you shine"), may be citing an existing chant for the Cross—a Crux benedicta nitet and a Crux alma fulget are both attested to in sources from around 900—but, if so, Eriugena clearly repurposes the words to denote the specific concept of theophany, and seemingly, with the mention of

---

29 Ibid., 68.
30 O crux alma nites ultra Seraphynque Cerybque;
   Est quod, quod non est, te colit omne super.
   Te domini rerum, virtutes atque potestas,
   Ordo colit, medium iure tenendo locum.
   Aggelus, archagelus, princeps, totusque supremus
   Caelestis numerus te colit alta petens.
   Te INYΞ nostra dehinc justo modulamine laudet:
   Per te, Christifera, namque redempta fuit. Herren, Carmina, 64–5.
proximate seraphim and cherubim, the theophany of Isaiah 6 / Revelation 4. If the hymns of these Biblical passages are evoked by the description of the theophany and the celestial beings, it is well possible that the corresponding and mirroring “fitting hymn” of the Church, in a poem celebrating the Cross, should be the Trisagion.

After the seraphim and cherubim are mentioned there follow the rest of the nine ranks in the celestial hierarchy, in their three divisions. But are there nine listed here? In fact, when aligning the entities mentioned in the poem with the Dionysian hierarchy, a startling realization emerges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Celestial Hierarchy, Ch. 6</th>
<th>Aspice praeclarum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Thrones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherubim</td>
<td>Seraphim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seraphim</td>
<td>Cherubim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Virtues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominions</td>
<td>Lords of creation (the middle rank of angels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtues</td>
<td>Virtues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powers</td>
<td>Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Angels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archangels</td>
<td>Angels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principalities</td>
<td>Principalities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only entity not accounted for is the Thrones, and it becomes clear that the Cross itself, in the company of the Seraphim and Cherubim, and even outshining them, is meant to take the place of honor as the first member of the celestial hierarchy, as the christophoros, the Christ-bearer, and thus the very throne of God. This type of riddle

---

31 In the general scheme of nine ranks, each of the three within a triad were equal (Donald Duclow, “Isaiah Meets the Seraph: Breaking Ranks in Dionysius and Eriugena?” in Eriugena: East and West: Papers of the Eighth International Colloquium of the Society for the Promotion of Eriugenian Studies Chicago and Notre Dame, 18–20 October 1991, ed. Bernard McGinn and Willemien Otten (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991), 233 and The Celestial Hierarchy ch 6), which accounts for Eriugena’s ad hoc reorderings, coordinated via the arrows in the diagram. Note that I differ with Herren on this interpretation, as is implicit in his punctuating of the text and explicit in his critical note: “[Lines 9–11:] A list of the seven choirs of angels that follow the Seraphim and Cherubim mentioned in line 7: Dominations, Virtues,
does not seem to be atypical of Eriugena; the opening of this poem itself is widely agreed upon by art historians to indirectly reference the Irish high cross. Support for the solution to the riddle suggested here, moreover, can be drawn from several places. First is the description of pseudo-Dionysius of the Thrones in *The Celestial Hierarchy*, as translated by Eriugena:

> The name Thrones, the title of the patterned frameworks of the most sublime Seats (*sedium*), so conveys that they are lovingly exalted above every impure degradation, that they are bearing ever upward to the summit of supermundane heights, that they are ineffably separated in a most exalted manner, that they have been arranged unchangingly and with a supreme stability, in the totality of their power, around the one who is truly the Most High, that they are able to receive divine approach in complete serenity and in a perfectly immaterial way, and that they both bear God (*deiferum*) and are open, like a humble servant (*famulariter*), to receive God into their being.

Much of this description seems to resonate with Eriugena’s conception of the Cross, for example, as being fixed and stable—the opening of the poem describes the Cross as “embracing” the earth in a structural manner—as bearing God, and as being thus exalted. Second is the poem which prefaced the translation of the Dionysian corpus, as presented to Charles (around 860), which recounts events in the life of Dionysius, including a trip to the third heaven where the three highest ranks of celestial beings dwell: “Seraphim in the first rank and the holy Cherubim, / then the heavenly thrones where God himself is

---


seated (*Aetheriosque Thronos, quo sedet ipse Deus*). Finally, in the mid- to late-
860s—most likely contemporaneous with the poem *Aspice praecelarum*—Eriugena wrote
a commentary on *The Celestial Hierarchy*. In expounding on some of the ideas in the
passage quoted above, he states that God sits on the Thrones, “ruling and judging all
things,” that the Thones’ bearing of God is the “divine origin of their powers,” and that,
through these Thrones, “all those multitudes of lower orders who walk and crawl before
them” are humbled but are then “raised into the most majestic heights above every
impure thing.”

In any case, it turns out that an “exalted servant” theology was not so far from
Eriugena’s mind after all, even when not announced explicitly in the poem. His
characterization of “the loving humility of all those multitudes of lower orders who walk and
crawl before” the Thrones as being humbled and then elevated “into the most
majestic heights” squares precisely with so many other Carolingian artifacts as analyzed
by Deshman, albeit in a more philosophical way than most Carolingian creations.

Yet neither of the two poems that deal extensively with the Cross explicitly
mention humility, except in the multi-faceted word *christophoros / christifer*. It is clear
that the Adoration of the Cross, for Eriugena, is primarily about the elevating and not
about the humbling, the “Holy God” rather than the “have mercy on us.” Scripture and

---


36 Trans. Chase, 176, 175. It should be noted that the riddle of the Cross as representing the celestial beings Thrones does have a clue that would have not required such a subtle grasp of Dionysian thought, but simply knowledge of a well-known hymn of Fortunatus. As long as a churchman, monk, or layman hearing the poem knew that there were nine ranks of celestial beings, that one of them was the Thrones, and that “God reigned by wood,” as the hymn *Vexilla regis* announces, the riddle was easily solvable. For another use of this theme in Eriugena’s poetry, note the plan of the devil, in *Postquam nostra salus*, to “deny the rule of the Lord who was hanged on a tree” (*ligno suspensum dominum regnare negando*). Herren, *Carmina*, 94–5.
liturgy, for Pseudo-Dionysius and for Eriugena, were primarily anagogical, or upward-leading. In their quest to attain to the heavens, Eriugena reminded Charles, Christians had been preceded by the Apostle Paul and by Saint Denis himself, who had been caught up to the third heaven and thus had actually been in contact with the Thrones, Seraphim, and Cherubim. In the Adoration of the Cross it was possible to recreate this ascent to the third heaven: the Cross was the Throne, and, if the Trisagion was sung, the Seraphim and Cherubim were also somehow present. Through all this one could attain to an experience like that of Isaiah 6, in which Isaiah beholds the Lord himself, on his Throne and surrounded by the heavenly beings. Isaiah 6, and possibly the Trisagion, were invoked at every service involving the high altar of Saint-Denis, moreover, through the altar’s brilliant altar frontispiece.

THE ALTAR FRONTAL OF SAINT-DENIS

The luxurious jewel-studded gold frontispiece for the main altar of Saint-Denis was likely commissioned and given to the abbey by Charles after he became abbot there in 867, and there is good reason to think that it was indeed made there. Covering the entire front of the altar with breathtaking beauty, it would have gleamed in the candlelight and drawn attention to this most important liturgical furnishing. One of

---

37 The altar is no longer extant, but a detailed representation of it, on which this section relies, may be viewed in the painting The Mass of Saint Giles, by the Master of Saint Giles, from around 1500, at http://www.nationalgallery.org.uk/paintings/master-of-saint-giles-the-mass-of-saint-giles (accessed 7 January 2014). The principle scholarly publication is still William Martin Conway. “The Abbey of Saint-Denis and its Ancient Treasures,” Archeologia 66 (1915):103–58. Also see Peter Lasko, Ars Sacra 800–1200, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 51–4. The lack of scholarly publication on both the altar frontal and the Cross of Saint Eloy (discussed below) can be attributed to the fact that we do not have the actual objects anymore, eliminating much certainty about details of the objects as well as methods of composition analysis, etc. For our purposes, that 1) the objects clearly did exist, 2) they are reasonably documented to have been in place in the 9th century, although not by 9th-century sources, and 3) the basic physical and iconographic features are certain, make them appropriate objects of analysis for this study.
Eriugena’s poems, *Graculus Iudaeus*, undoubtedly speak of the frontal in the following lines addressed to Saint-Denis:

> From your high seat of celestial life cast down your gaze
> Upon the homage of Charles your son who decorates
> Your holy relics and temple with mighty works,
> With gold and gems that flash like fire.
> Your altars are redolent with incense everywhere;
> The melodious songs of celebrants strike the stars;
> The most holy feast is readied by the serving priests . . .

The poem has been dated to 867, when Charles took the abbacy of Saint-Denis; if this is so, then we can reasonably date the making of the altar frontal to Lent of 867, commissioned and presented by the “rex atque theologus” for the first Easter celebration under his abbacy.

The imagery on the altar is divided into three main sections via arches, with Christ in the center section and saints under smaller triple arcades in the outside sections, with votive crowns descending above each of those arcades. The crowns represent typical physical votive crowns: they are suspended via three chains which come together at a ring, have jewels embedded in them, and also have jewels hanging from them. The rings are in turn grasped by hands which lower the crowns into view. Besides being held by the hands, the crowns are further assisted by a pair of angels each, who, flying, flank the crowns.

---

38 *Prospice caelestis vitae de sedibus altis*
*Vota tui tei Caroli tuae leipina sancta*
*Ornantis gratamque tuam magnalibus aedem,*
*Instar flammarum gemmis flagrantibus auro.*
*Undique turicremis redolent altaria fumis;*
*Armonici cantus θιασωτων sidera pulsant;*
*Officio vatum sanctissima cena paratur . . .* Herren, *Carmina*, 97. The ellipsis at the end is his, indicating his judgment that the poem is incomplete.

39 Herren, *Carmina*, 148–9. Lasko, *Ars Sacra 800–1200*, 54, agrees that the altar must have been given under Charles’ lay abbacy and thus from 867 or later but suggests a date of 876, when Charles gave several other gifts to the abbey. The evidence of Eriugena’s poem makes a date this late highly unlikely.
The two crowns are most likely to be associated with the saints Peter and Paul, to whom the main altar was dedicated by Pope Stephen II in 754, the same year he anointed Pepin king, endorsing the Carolingian line. Hilduin related a further story about the reason for the dedication. Apparently Pope Stephen was gravely ill earlier that year (754) and had been wintering at Saint-Denis. Praying before the tomb of Saint Denis, the pope had a vision in which Peter, Paul, and Dionysius appeared. Peter and Paul agreed that Dionysius should grant the pope healing. Dionysius came to the pope holding a censer and a palm, with a presbyter and a deacon attending him, and told him to arise whole and dedicate the altar to Peter and Paul. After experiencing a time of clarity and sweetness, the pope arose and did as he was told.⁴⁰

The main altar of Saint-Denis was thus dedicated to Peter and Paul, although it was located in front of the tomb of Saint Denis (ante sepulchrum).⁴¹ Thus, when Hincmar referred back to Louis the Pious’s re-coronation in 834 “before the tomb of Saint Dionysius” he was talking about the main altar of the church. The combined patronage of the two Apostles of Rome and the patron saint of the Franks thus legitimized Carolingian rulership.

---

But of course it is not Peter or Paul or Dionysius who appears in the center of the altar frontal, but Christ himself. The story of Pope Stephen’s vision, with its echoes of Isaiah’s vision in Isaiah 6—where the seraph cleanses Isaiah with a coal taken from the altar—may have had some bearing on the details of Christ’s depiction. He appears seated on a throne, dressed in robes with jeweled trim. In his left hand he holds a Gospel book,
which rests on his knee, while in his right hand he holds a jeweled cross which is upraised and held at an outward angle from his head. On his head he wears a crown of jewels, while around the crown is a halo of pearls. A figure-eight or cusped aureole surrounds his whole person and the throne, with the upper portion much larger than the lower, thus emphasizing his divinity over his humanity.\textsuperscript{42} Above and to either side of the aureole are multi-winged seraphim of Isaiah 6:2. A two-line inscription, finally, running at Christ’s shoulder level inside the aureole and split on either side of him, runs as follows—the trapezoid here represents Christ’s shoulders:
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It is ambiguous how the inscription is to be read. If read vertically—Sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth—it quotes the Sanctus of the Mass: Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabaoth. However, if read horizontally—as might be more natural and as is certainly intended in some inscriptions in visual art of this time\textsuperscript{43}—it produces a unique formula: Sanctus Deus Dominus Sabaoth. Perhaps this is another riddle, maybe even suggested by Eriugena himself, allowing the Sanctus Deus of the Trisagion to coexist with the Sanctus Dominus of the Mass, and thus fusing the Adoration of the Cross on Good Friday with the celebration of the Eucharist throughout the entire year.\textsuperscript{44} The


\textsuperscript{43} For example, take three representative works of visual art reproduced in Lasko, \textit{Ars Sacra 800–1200}, 22, 26, and 41. In the first, an ivory of John the Evangelist (early 9th century), the inscription of John 1:1 (\textit{In principio}, etc.) is written across the pages of the open book he holds. In the second, an icon on a bookcover (early 11th century) has the name of Jesus Christ broken on either side of his head, with IC on one side and XC on the other. In the third, a crystal depicting the story of Susanna (mid-9th century) breaks the words \textit{Invertere diem malorum} across the head of the character pronouncing these words.

\textsuperscript{44} Note that the Greek version of the Sanctus lacks the word “God” altogether, after the Septuagint version of Isaiah 6:3. For example, in Pseudo-Dionysius’s \textit{The Celestial Hierarchy}: “Others thunder out that famous and venerable song, telling of God: “Holy holy, holy is the Lord of hosts. The whole earth is full of his glory.” Trans. Luibheid, \textit{Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works}, 165–6. This could be a further twist
intense theorizing about the Crucifixion and the Eucharist in the 9th century led to much overlap between the two, as Celia Chazelle has shown.\textsuperscript{45} The intimate presence of Christ was theorized, in particular, in both the Eucharistic elements and in expositions of the Adoration of the Cross, with both obviously invoking the Crucified Body of Christ. The salutary effects of both the Adoration of the Cross and the Eucharist, especially if one takes Eriugena as a guide to the former, were practically one in the same, resulting in the cleansing of sin and the elevation to godliness.

It was not just in contemporary writings, however, that the overlap between the Crucifixion and the Eucharist was effected. The so-called Cross of Saint Eloy, dating from the Merovingian era, was attributed to the craftsmanship of the metalworking saint Eligius (Eloy) (c. 588–663) and the patronage of King Dagobert (603–39), who granted the cross to Saint-Denis.\textsuperscript{46} It was apparently placed above the main altar for approximately a millennium, from the 7th to the 17th centuries.\textsuperscript{47} It was about six feet high and composed of gold and silver, glass mosaic, mother-of-pearl, and precious stones. Containing a piece of the True Cross in an inset enameled reliquary, it is practically certain that the Saint Eloy Cross would have also been used for the Adoration of the Cross ceremony on Good Friday.

Also compare Memling’s painting of the 1480s, where the neckband of Christ’s alb displays the words AGIOS O THEOS. See Maurice McNamee, “The Good Friday Liturgy and Hans Memling’s Antwerp Triptych.” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 37 (1974): 353–6.


\textsuperscript{46} Conway, “The Abbey of Saint-Denis and Its Ancient Treasures,” 125.

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid.
Eriugena was apparently responsible for a number of the poetic tituli of important artworks of the time, and, although this particular inscription is too short to be in a meter, the parallelism, both visually and aurally, between the words sanctus and deus and then dominus and sabaoth, as well as the clever synthesis of existing liturgical texts (which we also saw in Aspice praeclarum) suggests a literary mind behind the inscription here. It would be natural for the Greek-loving scholar, if given an opportunity to suggest a titulus for Christ in a newly-commissioned altar frontal, to fuse elements of the Eastern and Western tradition, for this is precisely what had happened in the Good Friday liturgy and what was coming to a spectacular fruition in his own philosophical writings.

This depiction of Christ in Majesty also fuses Eastern and Western traditions. Typical markers of this mainly Eastern iconographic tradition occur. Christ is seated on a square throne with his left knee angled out and raised to support the Gospel book (or New Covenant), which he holds in his left hand, and this whole image is surrounded by the aureole. There are also elements which are distinctive to both the Saint-Denis frontal and the metalwork altar in the church of San Ambrogio in Milan, completed in the 850s, on which the Carolingian piece (from the 860s or 70s) seems to be based. The rectangular dais on which the throne rests, for example, is particularly distinguishable in each. Most notable, however, is the action of Christ’s right hand. In the typical Byzantine version of the iconographic tradition Christ makes the sign of blessing with his right hand; in the Milan and Saint-Denis depictions, Christ is holding a cross, angled out from his body. Finally, there are elements that distinguish the Saint-Denis depiction from its Milanese counterpart. At Milan, the aureole is oval-shaped, while at Saint-Denis the aureole is a figure-eight or cusped form, as mentioned above. While at Milan the halo around
Christ’s head is filled with a jeweled cross, at Saint-Denis the halo is filled with a jeweled crown. The crosses are also notably different. The cross of Milan’s Christ in Majesty is slim, reaches to the ground, and is held near the cross-bar as if a military standard. The cross of the Christ of Saint-Denis is thicker, and, rather than simply being embossed in the metal, is made up of jewels, clearly portraying or at least echoing the Saint Eloy Cross above the altar frontal.

The emphasis thus placed on the cross, and in particular the cross actually present in Mass and the Adoration of the Cross, is surely unique when the Saint-Denis altar frontal is compared to existing iconographic traditions. This lends credence to the hypothesis that the inscription is meant to invoke the Trisagion as sung on Good Friday. More than that, though, the iconographic choices in the cross and in the rest of the image point to particular Christological emphases at Saint-Denis. The figure-eight shape of the aureole, as noted above, suggests the two natures of Christ, while the greater size of the upper loop emphasizes his divinity. The prominent jeweled crown within the halo and the jeweled trim on his garments emphasize his kingship and thus help elevate the earthly office of king; while Eriugena calls Charles a Christ-bearer, here Christ is bearing the king’s image. The cross, finally, along with the Gospel book, is a key expression of Christ’s person. The jewels making up the cross cause it to indeed “shine past” the Seraphim, which are simply embossed. Looking upon Christ in Majesty means looking at the Cross, with an appropriate response of Sanctus Deus, Dominus Sabaoth.

THE PRAYERBOOK OF CHARLES THE BALD

A unique document survives that includes some sentiments reminiscent of Eriugena’s poetry, and some quite contrary. It also provides further detail on the Good
Friday liturgy as celebrated by the king himself. Entitled the *Enchiridion Precationum Caroli Calvi Regis* ("Handbook of Prayers [or Supplications] of King Charles the Bald"), it was presented to the king sometime before the year 869.\(^{48}\) It is the earliest surviving medieval royal prayerbook.\(^{49}\) As its title indicates, it is filled mostly with prayers, carefully selected from the Fathers and “blessed Alcuin,” that confess sin, ask for forgiveness, and pray for the elimination of vices. Prayers for the hours and a selection of psalms, including the seven penitential psalms, are included. The incipit of the main text states that the king commanded the prayerbook to be assembled and written for him.\(^{50}\) Although critical work on the text remains to be done, the voice of Hincmar of Rheims might be recognizable in the titles given to the prayers, for example:

| III. Oratio beati Hieronimi propter abscindenda vitia, et virtutes animo inserendas | 3. A prayer of blessed Jerome, for the vices to be cut away from his soul, and for the virtues to be grafted in |
| iii. Oratio beati Gregorii pro petitione lacrimarum, dicenda ante confessionem | 4. A prayer of blessed Gregory for the petition of tears, to be said before confession |
| V. Confessio quam beatus Alchuinus composuit Domino Karolo Imperatori | 5. The confession which blessed Alcuin composed for the Lord Emperor Charles |
| XX. Oratio beati Gregorii pro omnibus beneficiis sibi a Deo collatis, et ut ipse se accusat neglectis | 20. The prayer of blessed Gregory [Nazianzus] for all the benefactions added to him by God, and when he blames himself [of having] neglected [them] |

\(^{48}\) A complete digital version of the prayerbook (starting at the image of Charles) may be accessed via [http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/bsb00079994/image_80](http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/bsb00079994/image_80) at the Münchener DigitalisierungsZentrum Digitale Bibliothek, where it is catalogued as “Gebetbuch Karls des Kahlen - München, Schatzkammer der Residenz -- ResMü Schk 4 WL, wohl Reims, zwischen 846 und 869” (accessed 3 January 2014). Lasko has dated it to the early 850s, while Garipzanov, thinking it to come after the First Bible of Charles the Bald reached court, narrows the timeframe instead to 855–869. Other scholars simply say c. 860. For our purposes, it is sufficient to realize that these timeframes suggest that the prayerbook dates from before Charles’ assumption of the abbacy of Saint-Denis and Hincmar’s tracts (examined in Chapter 5).


\(^{50}\) *Incipit liber orationum quem Karolus piissimus rex Hludovici Caesaris filius omonimus colligere atque sibi manualem scribere iussit*. 6v.
While all of this sort of material is meant to be used at any time, the highpoint of the book is intimately linked to a specific time in the year: the Adoration of the Cross ceremony on Good Friday. The table of contents lists the entry as “17. Prayers in Parasceve, with the pictured crucifix, and your image, and the antiphons that are to be sung.”\textsuperscript{51} We will examine the images mentioned and their \textit{titulus}, inspect the prayer and antiphon texts that follow them, and then evaluate the Good Friday material against the prayerbook as a whole.

The only illumination in the book is a boldly-colored two-page spread which shows Charles on the left-hand page and Christ crucified on the right. Charles is kneeling before the cross, obviously meant to reference the actual ceremony of the Adoration of the Cross. Robert Deshman has eloquently characterized the king’s depiction:

The king’s posture in the prayerbook cannot be considered as an absolutely realistic representation of proskynesis. Both knees of the figure touch the ground, as was customary in proskynesis; nonetheless, the figure gives the impression of motion. The chlamys flaring out behind him, the placement of one leg before the other, the forward inclination of the body, and finally the outstretched arm all make it seem as if Charles the Bald is crawling, even lunging, to Christ and the cross on the opposite page... Perhaps the artist wished to allude to both parts of the adoration of the cross, the prostration and the subsequent kiss, by depicting the figure simultaneously kneeling and moving towards the cross... But the illuminator did take advantage of the separation between the worshipper and the Crucifixion to heighten the emotional power of the image. As the king leans forward, breaking the frame with his outstretched hand, the gap which separates him from the object of his devotions, the Savior on the victorious cross, lends greater urgency and poignancy to his yearning supplication for salvation.\textsuperscript{52}

The depiction of the Crucifixion itself is not treated in detail by Deshman. He points out that the victory wreath descending from heaven, held by the hand of God the

\textsuperscript{51} Orationes in parasceve cum crucifixo picto, et imagine vestra, et antiphonis decantandis. 3r
\textsuperscript{52} Deshman, “The Exalted Servant,” 389.
Father, was “a purely Western iconograpical tradition that first appeared earlier in the ninth century.” We can relate this motif here, then, to the votive crowns descending from above on the Saint-Denis altar frontal: while here God is crowning his victorious crucified Son, there he crowns the victorious martyrs Peter and Paul. The width of the wood making up the cross is very wide, and a titulus is mounted at its top. Although no longer legible, the inscription there was certainly, in accordance with the Gospel of John and with other Carolingian Crucifixion representations, *Ihesus Nazarenus, Rex Iudaeorum*. This is important to remember, for the descending wreath, immediately above the titulus, is affirming the kingship described there, although certainly in the Christian sense of the Church being the new nation of Israel.

The appearance of the sun and moon over the two arms of the cross, a typical feature of Crucifixion iconography at this time, is described by Eriugena in his poem recounting the life of Saint Denis:

Dionysius the Areopagite and brilliant sage
adorned Athens with his stellar light.
He was shaken forthwith by the moon’s drawing near to the sun
at the time when our Lord was fastened to the cross.
Overcome by the frightful eclipse he was soon converted...  

Charles is thus seeing Christ as the primary theophany; the ancillary theophanies of the Father’s hand reaching down out of heaven and the eclipse remind of the transcendent importance of the primary theophany of Christ in Majesty. A coiled snake appears at the

---

53 Ibid., 392.
54 *Lumine sidereo Dionysius auxit Athenas / Ariopagites magnificusque sophos, / Primo commotus Phoebo subeunte Selena, / Tempore quo stauro fixus erat Dominus. / Mox et conversus mira stupefactus eclypi... Herren, Carmina*, 110–111.
bottom of the cross, representing the Cross’s triumph over the devil and evil, despite the attempts of the former to “deny the rule of the Lord who was hanged on a tree.”

All in all, the imagery presents an undeniably positive image of both the Crucifixion and the king’s adoration of it. Deshman has thus characterized the illumination as portraying an “exalted servant” “ruler theology.” An inscription appears above the portrayal of the king, bearing a poetic prayer that seems to attempt a précis of the whole prayerbook. I give Deshman’s translation, as well as a more literal one:

In cruce qui mundi solvisti crimina Christe
Orando mihimet tu vulnera cuncta resolve

O Christ you who on the cross have
absolved the sins of the world, / absolve, I pray, all [my] wounds for me.56

(On the cross, you who absolved the crimes of the world, Christ, / by [my] having prayed for myself, resolve every wound.)

That the king was meant to actually pray this prayer is indicated by the list of contents at the beginning of the manuscript, which lists prayers in the plural for Parasceve—only one other prayer for Good Friday follows the illumination. The prayer includes a self-referential element—“by [my] having prayed for myself, resolve every wound”—and might be called a “metaprayer.” The pair of verses, written in hexameter, may have been supplied by Eriugena, the royal poet.57 If the main body of the prayers was chosen by Hincmar of Rheims, then the prayerbook would represent a collaboration between these two very different personalities. The verses, one may note, do not call attention to the inherent wickedness of the one praying, as so many of the other prayers in the book do,

55 _Ligno suspensum dominum regnare negando_. Herren, _Carmina_, 94–5, in the poem _Postquam nostra salus_, which, in this excerpt, is spoken the in the first-person voice of the devil after the Crucifixion and the Harrowing of Hell.


but rather take a specific metaphor from those prayers that externalizes the nature of sins, speaking of them as “wounds,” drawing a parallel, as Deshman has pointed out, between the one praying and the Crucified One addressed. The universal nature of the redemption on the Cross becomes effective for “resolv[ing]” or even “dissolv[ing]” (both possible translations of resolve) the wounds of the king as he prays.

On the page following the illumination opening is a “prayer at the Adoration of the Cross” (oratio ad adorandam sanctam crucem):
Adoro te domine ihesu ascendentem in cruce. I adore you, Lord Jesus, ascending onto the cross.

Deprecor te ut ipsa crux liberet me de angelo percuciente. I entreat you, that that very cross would free me from the striking angel. [cf. Exodus 12:12–13]

Adoro te vulneratum in cruce. I adore you, wounded on the cross.

Deprecor te ut ipsa vulnera sint remedium animae meae. I entreat you, that those wounds would be the cure of my soul.

Adoro te mortuum et sepultum. I adore you, dead and buried.

Deprecor te ut ipsa mors sit vita mea. I entreat you, that that death would be my life.

Adoro te descedentem ad inferos et liberantem captivos. I adore you, descending to those below and liberating the captives.

Deprecor te ut non dimittas me ibidem introire. I entreat you, that you not dismiss me to enter there.

Adoro te resurgentem a mortuis et ascendentem ad dexteram dei patris. I adore you, rising again from the dead, and ascending to the right hand of God the Father.

Deprecor te miserere mei. I entreat you, have mercy on me.

Adoro te salvatorem venturum et iudicatum. I adore you, Savior, coming and judging.

Deprecor te ut in tuo sancto adventu ne intres in iudicium cum me misero peccatore I entreat you, that in your holy advent you would not enter into judgment with me, a poor sinner.


The prayer is a testament that, as Einhard advises, the Adoration of the Cross is to be in the end an adoration of Christ; here, moreover, it is clear that the Cross images not just Christ in the Crucifixion, but in the Resurrection, the Ascension, the Second Coming and
Judgment. These kinds of connections are not particularly novel in themselves; however, the personal nature of the prayer and the cumulative force of their enumeration bring a new vividness of piety to the personal experience of the Frankish Adoration of the Cross.\(^58\) There is more than one version of this prayer, and it probably dates from the early 9th-century, based in turn on an Irish model which is attested to in the early-9th century.\(^59\) This version of the prayer was transmitted throughout Europe and indeed back across the Channel, where it appears as an important element of the Adoration of the Cross in a prescription for all the monastic houses of England.\(^60\)

A further turn of the prayerbook page brings into view the “Antiphons for the Holy Cross” (\textit{Antiphonae de sancta cruce}), which are as follows:\(^61\)

Sanctus deus, sanctus fortis, sanctus immortalis, miserere nobis.  
\textit{An.} Ecce lignum crucis, in quo salus mundi pependit. Venite adoremus.

\textit{An.} Crucem tuam adoramus.

\textit{An.} Tuam crucem adoramus.

\textit{An.} Crux fidelis inter omnes.

This list may be added to Hesbert’s synoptic table as follows:\(^62\)

---

\(^{58}\) Note that the use of the word \textit{vulnera}; the hexameter verses may have been influenced by this usage, although here only the wounds of Christ are explicitly identified, while it is the opposite in the verses.

\(^{59}\) André Wilmart, “Prières médiévales pour l’Adoration de la Croix,” \textit{Ephemerides Liturgicae} 46 (1932):22–65. He also points to a similar Irish prayer in the so-called Book of Cerne (early 9th century) that is certainly related and may have been an influence on the (thus) Carolingian version of the prayer. (25–6). This version spread across Europe, e.g., to Farfa (37), which accumulated an amazingly large number of prayers to the Cross, discussed in Wilmart (pp) and Susan Boynton, \textit{Shaping a Monastic Identity: Liturgy and History at the Imperial Abbey of Farfa, 1000–1125} (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006), 98–105.


\(^{61}\) fol. 40r.
Table 6.1. The chants for the Adoration of the Cross in three Mass Antiphoners and the Prayerbook of Charles the Bald

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecce lignum crucis Ps. Beati immaculati</td>
<td>Agios o Theos Sanctus Deus</td>
<td>[Agios o Theos] Sanctus Deus</td>
<td>Agios o Theos [Sanctus Deus]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecce lignum crucis Ps. Beati immaculati</td>
<td>Ecce lignum crucis Ps. Beati immaculati</td>
<td>Popule meus Quia eduxi vos Quid ultra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crucem tuam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecce lignum crucis Ps. Beati immaculati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crux fidelis. Pange lingua.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crucem tuam Ps. Deus misereatur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuam crucem Crux fidelis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The prayerbook’s list of antiphons can be seen to be closest to that of Senlis, which is unsurprising, giving their relative closeness in date and considering that they both have connections with the king and/or Saint-Denis, where the king customarily spent his Lenten seasons. The prayerbook can also be included in a list of four 9th-century sources for the Good Friday Trisagion (with OR 31). The only major difference between the chants in the prayerbook and the chants of the Senlis antiphoner is the presence of the *Popule meus* verses.

Because the Good Friday section of the prayerbook is by far the most distinctive of the various items in the prayerbook, it may be that Charles himself requested it when

---

62 Hesbert, *Antiphonale Missarum Sextuplex*, 97, and, for dates, xix, xxi, xxiii. Ritva Jacobsson, “The Antiphoner of Compiègne: Paris, BnF lat. 17436,” in *The Divine Office in the Latin Middle Ages*, ed. Margo Fassler and Rebecca Baltzer (Oxford University Press, 2000) gives a date for Compiègne of “around 870” (147). To promote clarity, only incipits have been used here, whereas Hesbert’s inventory faithfully transcribes the text as found in the manuscripts, whether that means incipits or full chant texts. For the same reason I also have rendered Corbie’s Greek text in Roman characters, whereas the manuscript, and thus Hesbert, do not. I have also left out the identifiers *Ant.* and *Versus* (meaning hymn, for *Pange lingua*) for the sake of space.
he requested the book, and perhaps it is even the raison d’être of the book itself. Whether this was the case or not, one can still see the prayerbook as a testament to a Good Friday liturgy in flux. At this time the Adoration of the Cross had been part of Frankish Good Friday liturgies for less than a century, having been adopted from the non-papal Roman liturgy around the year 800, the late 9th century saw a process of filling in the austere Roman version with a vivid collection of prayers and chants that gave the ceremony a sense of drama. The prayerbook demonstrates this process not only through its inclusion of a full selection of prayers and chants, but through its brilliant illumination as well. The Adoration of the Cross, as a high point of Holy Week but not one of its historicizing elements, was a malleable ceremony that, as Hesbert’s mass antiphoner inventory shows, was being intentionally expanded and shaped during the reign of Charles the Bald.

Relatively early on it seems that the antiphon Ecce lignum crucis, with its invitatory conclusion venite adoremus, signaled the beginning of the adoration of the cross by the people. In OR 31, moreover, and almost certainly at Saint-Denis until the 11th century—the date of the first preserved rubrics for the Adoration of the Cross there—the priest adored the cross separately and prior to the people. In the 11th-century Saint-Denis gradual we find that the priest prays prostrate before the cross before adoring it, the Greek Trisagion is sung by deacons, the Latin Trisagion is responded by “the

---

63 Louis van Tongeren, “The Cult of the Cross in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages,” 66, summarizing the Ordines Romani.
65 van Tongeren, “A Sign of Resurrection on Good Friday: The Role of the People in the Good Friday Until c. 1000 A.D. and the Meaning of the Cross,” in Omnes Circumadstantes: Contributions Towards a History of the Role of the People in the Liturgy, ed. Charles Caspers and Marc Schneiders (Kampen: Kok, 1990), 107.
whole chorus of brothers,” and the adoration by the faithful is introduced by *Ecce lignum* and then accompanied by various chants. This sequence of events allows us a more precise evaluation of the significance of the liturgical elements in the king’s prayerbook.

To start, the prayer is not simply a paraliturgical meditation. It represents the complete prostration of the minister of the Lord before the cross in the ceremony itself. The dynamic quality of Christ in the poem, as he ascends onto the cross, descends to hell, ascends into heaven, and then returns, is contrasted to the utter stasis of the humbled priest before Christ’s cross. Anyone besides the priest praying this prayer is participating vicariously in the humbleness of the prostration. The *Sanctus Deus*, on the other hand, is a point of participation by all. The “whole chorus of brothers” prescribed in the rubric for the singing of the Latin Trisagion surely, taking place in a monastic institution, means everyone present, including the king himself, as lay abbot. The lack of the Greek Trisagion text in the prayerbook emphasizes the responsorial nature of the Latin version of the chant. *Ecce lignum* is sung by the priest, and the antiphons *Crucem tuam* and *Tuam crucem* and the hymn verse *Crux fidelis* may or may have not been sung by everyone. The one chant that assuredly was sung by the king is the *Sanctus Deus*; the melody was given out in the Greek version, and, if the king knew any Greek, the words would come more readily as well. We can suppose that Charles was a heartfelt participant in the liturgy: Eriugena explicitly references the king’s singing in his Easter poem *Mystica sanctorum*, addressing him as “[you who] with humble heart decree that

---


67 Further evidence that suggests the Latin Trisagion was sung by the community in Charles’ time is given in the gradual Laon 239 (c. 900), 50v, where the Greek Trisagion is marked “V” for verse and the Latin Trisagion is marked “R” for respond.
these antiphonal choruses be sung and sing them yourself.” As lay abbot, and as chief layman at the abbey, Charles would have had a leading role to play in the ceremony in general at Saint-Denis. If the threefold genuflecting during the Latin Sanctus described in the 11th-century rubric reflects the 9th century as well, which is probable, then the king would have been the highest ranking person making these genuflections. At the adoration by the general populace, he may well have been the first to approach the cross.

If Hincmar was ever at Saint-Denis on Good Friday when the king was there, which is possible, he would have officiated the Good Friday service, being an archbishop, and higher in rank than anyone else there. One can imagine the older archbishop (who would have been in his sixties during Charles’s lay abbacy) prostrate before the cross with everyone else looking on, and the complicated interaction between churchman and the king as the archbishop sang *Ecce lingum crucis* and then Charles approached the cross in humility.

Deshman has pointed out that an image of a Byzantine emperor in proskynesis before Christ appears right around the same time that Charles’s prayerbook was made. A Byzantine lectionary may have been the model for the prayerbook, and the title given to it, the *Enchiridion*, also may signify Greek aspirations. The inclusion of Good Friday in the book, with its Greek-derived chants and its Greek-derived image, surely would support this hypothesis. The majority of the prayers, however, are taken from Western Fathers; the Crucifixion illumination has no Byzantine parallel; and the hymn *Crux fidelis* is a quintessentially Western expression, having been composed by Venantius Fortunatus.

---

68 Qui sub honore sui humili cum corde canoros / Alternos statuis, psallis et ipse choros. Herren, *Carmina*, 78–9.
70 Ibid., 395.
in the 6th century. In fact, the prayerbook, just like the Good Friday liturgy, seems to be a struggle between Eastern and Western views of salvation. The Good Friday section, despite its image of Charles in adoration, or, as Deshman has suggested, because of it, is a primarily positive and upward-looking account of the Christian’s salvation. Most of the other prayers in the book, on the other hand, display the characteristically Western preoccupation with deep veins of sinful nature within.

The Good Friday section occurs near the end of the book, and in that sense is perhaps intended as the climax of the collection. If so, what comes after the climax? A collection of prayers for the hours follows, which is not so surprising, given that the prayers for the third, sixth, and ninth hours make explicit reference to the Crucifixion. The prayers for compline and bedtime, additionally, provide what could be a gentle denouement to the collection. The prayers for the hours are not the last thing in the book, however, but the second-to-last. After the bedtime prayers, surprisingly, comes a prayer already referred to in the excerpt of the table of contents of the manuscript above. Entitled “The prayer of blessed Gregory for all the benefactions added to him by God, and when he blames himself [of having] neglected [them],” the prayer is actually drawn from Rufinus’s translation of the prayers of the Eastern Father Gregory of Nazianzus. There is no way for the reader to distinguish this Gregory from the Western pope Gregory the Great—they are both listed as beatus Gregorius in the contents and headings—and it is possible that the compiler was not aware of this distinction. The prayer that appears in the book, however, is the result of some quite-heavy editing, including the excising of multiple sentences at a time, the re-writing of the first-person plural text (“we”) into a first-person singular version, and the writing of a completely
original ending to close it. As the editor’s title indicates, he sees the theme of the prayer as ingratitude for God’s benefactions. Even following the redaction, however, it is a stretch to say that this is the theme of the prayer. The opening, for example, simply laments personal deficiency: “I have sinned, o Lord, and have conducted myself unjustly, and have failed [Baruch 2:12]...” A continuation of this thought, with its reference to Christ’s Passion, perhaps supplies the otherwise lacking justification for this prayer at the end of the book: “...I have not walked worthily of the calling by which you called me [cf. Ephesians 4:1] through the Gospel of your Christ, nor have I properly taken on his holy sufferings [passiones], nor have I accepted humiliation in place of merit...” The closest the prayer gets to depicting the prayer’s ingratitude is the following: “O Lord, you have brought about your kindness and your mercy for me [cf. Bar. 2:27], but I have done iniquity.”

A particular phrase, finally, of Gregory Nazianzus’s prayer seems to have stirred the editor into enough creativity to add to the prayer himself and give it an early ending. Gregory’s words “Spare, o Lord, spare, o Lord!” (Parce domine, parce domine) are taken over into the new prayer, and then, two sentences later, are reworked within the new conclusion as “Spare me, o Lord, spare your servant” (Parce mihi domine, parce servo tuo). This latter formulation may reference an antiphon for Rogations (Parce domine, parce populo tuo) and possibly the Aquitainian Popule meus verses’ refrain (Parce, redemptor, parce, iam parce). The poem ends with a plea for the Lord to save, both “in the present and in the future age.”

We thus see that, even with the prayerbook’s multiple Byzantine connections, and the “exalted servant” message of its Good Friday portion, the editor of the collection took
great pains to promote a fearful, inward-looking, humbled, and pious nature in Charles rather than a confident, upward-looking, and triumphant nature. It is for this reason that I suspect Hincmar of having a hand in the production of this book, and it is for a similar reason that I suspect him of having a hand in the production of the *Popule meus* verses at Saint-Denis as well.

**OTHERS WITHOUT AND WITHIN: THE CAROLINGIAN *POPULE MEUS* VERSES AND THE LAST DAYS**

So far we have been examining what important Carolingian thinkers thought of their God, their saints, and themselves. All the sources involving the Micah pericope, the Trisagion, and the Responsories of Joshua have pointed that way, with the exception of the possible veiled references to the Northmen and the Jews in Haimo’s exegesis of the later verses of the Micah pericope. We must allow, however, that the Adoration of the Cross carried subtle commentary on other people groups, Carolingian “others,” as well. After all, the verses probably originated in the politically-troublesome south of France, spoke (if interpreted literally) of one or more groups of Jews, and were instituted in a time of heavy Viking raids. In this section we shall deal with contemporary thoughts about these othered people groups, thereby filling out our perception of the Carolingian world through the eyes of its later inhabitants, and make our final assessment of the origins and meanings of the Carolingian *Popule meus* verses.

Eriugena seems, at first glance, one of the least likely candidates to characterize “others.” His poems celebrate the cosmic universality of redemption and the potential of humans to ascend to God. But what does he see when looking at those who seemingly refuse to make this ascent, at those who remain in the cave of their own shadowy
misunderstandings? The way up is clearly open, Eriugena would say. If one is aware of God and refuses to ascend, then he is not God’s, but the devil’s. The Jews, like the older brother in the parable of the Prodigal Son, refuse to come to the feast of Christ and “are left in the passions of their ignominy and the most grievous pangs of envy.” Eriugena can even picture the Devil as a refugee from Hell plotting to inhabit their darkened hearts immediately after the Crucifixion. Eriugena can thus easily lump the Jews together with Muslims and pagans as enemies of Christ and as Christian others in a typically cosmic vision: “The Jewish magpie (Graculus Iudaeus), and now the southern Saracen, and the savage pagan springing from the northern pole will bow their subject necks; Christ everywhere shall reign.” At the end of the world, however, after being further confounded and in awe of Christ, the Jews will be received by God.

Eriugena’s writing has been characterized by Michael Herren as some of the most explicitly anti-Jewish at the time of Charles the Bald; Herren wonders why Eriugena


72 In his poem Postquem nostra salus, Eriugena depicts the Devil’s planning what he is to do after Christ is crucified and descends into hell: “What new light arises that I shall never be able to bear? Now everywhere my kingdom lies in ruins; darkness has no abode... A single refuge remains, a single consolation: There is an ancient domicile of death and deepest night – The heart of the Jew! – ...I shall quit the breast of the gentile and take my refuge there... and deny the rule of the Lord who was hanged on a tree.”


74 Periphyseon 5.38. “For while the unbelieving heathen deny the Word of God through ignorance, the Jews deny Him through envy; and as the sin of ignorance is more venal than the sin of envy, so the gentiles are less wasteful of their natural goods than the Jews. Therefore the gentiles, when they have been brought forth from the darkness of their ignorance and summoned into the light of the Truth, are received, while the faithless Jews who deny the Son, are left in the passions of their ignominy and the most grievous pangs of envy until at the end of the world, by the ineffable generosity of the Divine Goodness, they too shall be received, when they shall be turned towards evening, and shall be hungry like dogs, and they shall prowl about the city,’ that is, the Christian society, wishing to be received into it, and the words spoken by the prophet in another place shall be fulfilled: ‘Let all my enemies be confounded and be in awe of me, let them be turned back again and let them be confounded very swiftly.’ “ Trans. Inglis Patric Sheldon-Williams, Periphyseon, The Division of Nature, Cahiers d'études médiévales, Cahier spécial 3 (Montréal: Bellermin, 1987), 699. PatLat 122, col. 1009.
would risk the favor of his patron to express these thoughts.\textsuperscript{75} For Charles was firmly pro-Jewish, as his father and grandfather had been.\textsuperscript{76}

Hincmar, although less outspoken, also seemed to harbor anti-Jewish sentiment. In 846 he was part of a group of bishops that presented a series of propositions to the king requesting greater power for the Church in terms of land and a series of repressive measures for the Jews; while Charles approved some of the former, he approved none of the latter.\textsuperscript{77} In 861 to 865 Hincmar was involved in a dispute similar to the one he would have with his nephew later in the decade over a bishop who sold some silver belonging to the Church to a Jew.\textsuperscript{78} It is apparent that part of Hincmar’s anti-Judaism was a very practical one; his designs for hegemony by Frankish archbishops and the Frankish Church necessitated it. Another side of Hincmar’s views, about the Jews, unsurprisingly, was a moral one. For example, Hincmar quotes Augustine in the final section of his moral tract for Charles, \textit{De cavendis}, on receiving communion: “Therefore approach him and be enlightened. The Jews approached him that they might be darkened, for they approached him that they might crucify him. We should approach him in order to take his body and blood. They were darkened by him crucified; we are enlightened by eating and drinking him crucified.”\textsuperscript{79} In his annals, Hincmar describes Charles’s death as being the fault of the king’s Jewish personal physician, “whom he [Charles] loved and trusted

\textsuperscript{75} Herren, “Gli ebrei,” 549.
\textsuperscript{76} Bernard Bachrach, \textit{Early Medieval Jewish Policy in Western Europe} (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977), Chs. 4, 5, 6.
\textsuperscript{78} Bachrach, \textit{Early Medieval Jewish Policy}, 119, takes the silver charge to be the sole issue in the episode. A more balanced account is to be found in Devisse, \textit{Hincmar, archevêque de Reims}, 2:595.
\textsuperscript{79} \textit{Accedite ergo ad eum et illuminamini. Accesserunt Iudaei ut tenebrarentur; accesserunt enim ad illum ut crucifigerent. Nos ad eum accedamus ut corpus et sanguinem eius accipiamus. Illi de crucifixo tenebrati sunt, nos manducando crucifixum et bibendo illuminamur.} PatLat 125 col. 921.
all too much.”\textsuperscript{80} Indeed, at least in the case of Hincmar, “the friendships of Charles the
Bald with the Jews were considered by the clergy to be a moral weakness for a Christian
king.”\textsuperscript{81}

While there was no direct connection between anti-Jewish rhetoric and the
Trisagion or \textit{Popule meus} verses, this summary of Eriugena and Hincmar on the Jews
shows that there was certainly rhetoric in the air that could serve as an undertone for
these chants. What is more interesting, perhaps, is the fact that Charles was decidedly
pro-Jewish. During his father’s rule, Agobard of Lyon had sent several letters to Louis
complaining of the Jews’ favored place at court, and during Charles’s rule, Agobard’s
successor Amulo had also put together a similar writing; neither of these attempts had
swayed the respective monarchs an inch in their policies.\textsuperscript{82} Louis had specifically
ordered Agobard to cease the anti-Jewish actions he was undertaking in his diocese.\textsuperscript{83} A
letter is preserved from Charles speaking of “Judah the Hebrew, our \textit{fidelis}.\textsuperscript{84} Given
Charles’ lay abbacy of Saint-Denis and the fact that he spent most of his Good Fridays
there, it would be unlikely for any noticeably anti-Jewish elements to be added to the
liturgy at the abbey during his tenure.

There were sizeable Jewish communities in Aquitaine, Narbonne, and Septimania,
areas from which the \textit{Popule meus} verses may have come to the north. These areas were
notoriously hard for the Carolingian rulers to keep under control. Obtaining and keeping
the favor of the Jewish communities had been an important part of the Carolingian

\textsuperscript{80} Nelson, trans., \textit{Annals of St-Bertin}, 202.
\textsuperscript{81} Herren, “Gli ebrei,” 539.
\textsuperscript{82} Bachrach, \textit{Early Medieval Jewish Policy}, 110; Cohen, \textit{Living Letters of the the Law}, 145.
\textsuperscript{83} Bachrach, \textit{Early Medieval Jewish Policy}, 100.
\textsuperscript{84} Ibid., 117.
Aquitainian policy since Pepin.\textsuperscript{85} There had also developed a policy of the current ruler of the Empire or, later, Francia, setting up his son as king of Aquitaine; Charles had been King of Aquitaine from 838, two years before Louis died. In the ever-developing controversies between Charles and his relatives over who was to reign where, Aquitaine was a frequent place of dispute and for dispute. For instance, in 854, Charles journeyed to Aquitaine during Lent to avoid it being taken over by one of his relatives and stayed there until after Easter, thus celebrating Good Friday somewhere in the region.\textsuperscript{86} In 855, Charles set up his son Charles “the Younger” as king in Aquitaine.\textsuperscript{87} In 856, “nearly all the counts” of Aquitaine formed a conspiracy against their ruler.\textsuperscript{88} Hincmar accompanied Charles to Aquitaine on the mission to reconcile them.\textsuperscript{89}

All this makes it likely that Charles and Hincmar would have been familiar with indigenous liturgical practices still prevalent in the various southern centers where they stayed. As the contents of liturgical books from the 10th and 11th centuries and beyond make clear, the effect of the liturgical reforms in imposing the “Roman” chant were only partially influential at best in these areas. This brings us to the matter of Charles’ general liturgical policies. Yitzhak Hen has given the following summary, although it is to a large degree based on specifically royal liturgical innovations:

His liturgical policy reveals a considerable amount of inventiveness as well as a strong tendency towards systematisation. Yet, no attempt was made by Charles the Bald or any member of his court to impose uniformity on the liturgical practice of his kingdom, nor did he attempt to

\begin{footnotes}
\item[85] Ibid., 66.
\item[86] Nelson, trans., \textit{Annals of St-Bertin}, 78.
\item[87] Ibid., \textit{Annals}. 80.
\item[88] Ibid., 82.
\item[89] Devisse, \textit{Hincmar, archevêque de Reims}, I:294.
\end{footnotes}
Romanise the Frankish rite. One may well wonder whether he was even capable or wanted to do so.\textsuperscript{90}

The king’s interest in Greek liturgy is unquestionable. After being made Emperor in 875 he reported in a letter that “also celebrated in our presence were the holy office of the mass according to the practice of Jerusalem, composed by the Apostle James, and according to the Constantinopolitan practice, composed by Basil.”\textsuperscript{91} This, as well as Charles’s patronage of the Greek scholarship and poetry of Eriugena, make it easily possible that the king had some influence over the incorporation or promulgation of the Trisagion in the Good Friday liturgy.

But was Charles at all interested in incorporating “Gallican” chant into his liturgy? We have no hard data on this question; however, we at least know that Charles would have probably known one or more of the southern versions of the \textit{Popule meus} verses. Furthermore, Hincmar, who could be called the royal liturgist, was in Aquitaine on at least one occasion with Charles, and probably more, possibly for a Good Friday. If Hincmar had heard any of these \textit{Popule meus} verses he would of course have been drawn to them. We know that he knew and admired the Responsories of Joshua for their moral-inducing properties, since he used them in not just one but two of his works written to specific people for moral purposes. We also know that Hincmar admired Ambrose’s interactions with Theodosius, and one of these, as described in Chapter 1, involved Micah 6:3. We know that Hilduin combined “Roman” and “Gallican” parts of existing Offices for Saint Denis to create a new Office for the saint in the time of Louis, when Hincmar

\textsuperscript{90} Yitzhak Hen, \textit{The Royal Patronage of Liturgy in Frankish Gaul to the Death of Charles the Bald (877)} (London: Boydell, 2001), 146.

\textsuperscript{91} Hen, \textit{Royal Patronage of Liturgy} 139.
would have been the abbot’s protégé. The Gallican Office of Saint Denis was said to have been revived because of the vividness of its text. Finally, we know that, in creating a marriage and ordination ceremony for Charles’ daughter Judith to the King of Wessex, Hincmar drew from the Anglo-Saxon ordo in the Leofric Missal. Indeed, it seems as if either Charles or Hincmar could have been the instigator for the formation of the Carolingian Popule meus verses, while Hincmar was likely the one who carried out their formulation, with some editing and combining, as in his other liturgical projects, to make something new.

The appropriation of a vivid chant from the south of the kingdom, with its bold dramatic element, into a ceremony originally received quite bare from Rome, but which had become relatively full of Greek chants by the 870s, is still a unique and fascinating move, even after our detailed investigation of the developing melodies and meanings of the pre-Carolingian Popule meus chants. Besides the obvious appeal for Hincmar, Charles may have seen the adoption of the Popule meus chants as a propitiating gesture to the Aquitainian counts, who seemed to be so unstable in their loyalties. The expedition to Aquitaine back in 854, when Charles was there for Lent and Easter, was subject to a large flaw, as the Annals of Saint-Bertin note with condemnation:

Charles swiftly launched a campaign into Aquitaine during Lent, and stayed there until after Easter [22 April]. His people devoted all their efforts to looting, burning and taking people captive: they did not even restrain their greed and insolence in the case of the churches and altars of God.95

---

93 Ibid.
94 Hen, Royal Patronage, 138.
The legend of Louis’ original penance in 822, after having blinded and inadvertently killed his nephew Bernard, and his second penance in 833, when tried before his bishops, could not have ever been far from Charles. Charles never undertook a public penance as his father had, but perhaps events like these, especially this one in Aquitaine, would have contributed to an adoption of the *Popule meus* verses in the highly visible Adoration of the Cross ceremony. With Christ meting out his harsh judgment of his people’s actions, there was yet an opportunity for cleansing by the shining cross, reconciliation through adoration, elevation through heavenly song, and mystical communion through the Eucharist. If one could hear Christ say *Popule meus* today, and not have to hear him say it at the last day, as Hincmar demonstrated, the momentary sorrow would be worth it. In this assessment, Hincmar and the king were probably in agreement.

Because Charles became Emperor in 875 and had fallen out with Hincmar over another matter of church hierarchy, the most likely date range for the introduction of the *Popule meus* verses is 870–5; this takes into account the fact that Hincmar quoted the Responsories of Joshua version of the *Popule meus* twice in 869–70 (a monastic chant), and did not quote a new Good Friday version to the king, which surely would have been more appropriate had it been in existence. It is unsure if Charles was at Saint-Denis for Good Friday in 876; he was traveling there throughout the last part of Lent and the annals only recount that he made it there in time to celebrate Easter. In 877, however, Charles made a decision to spend Easter at Compiègne instead of Saint-Denis. Having had a sufficient run at the royal abbey for Lent and Easter in the past decade, there is indication

---

96 Ibid., 190.
97 Ibid., 199.
that Charles was planning on making Compiègne his new imperial residence of choice.⁹⁸

We do not know what Charles would have done in subsequent years, however, because he died in 877, as Hincmar’s annals recount, at the hands of his Jewish doctor. One of Charles’ last actions before falling ill was to give a golden cross with precious stones to the pope to take to Saint Peter’s.⁹⁹ This cross, from its description, sounds much like the Cross of Saint Eloy used at Saint-Denis. There was one major difference, however: this was “an image of the Savior fixed to the cross,” a crucifix.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁸ Ibid., 199n4. If so, this may have been more of a personal decision than anything. The body of Saint Denis had been moved from the Abbey in November of 876 further inland to Conseuvreux due to Viking raids. Described in the Miracula Sancti Dionysii (attributed by some to Hincmar of Rheims), printed in D’Achery and Mabillon, eds., Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti in Saeculorum Classes Distributa. Saeculum III, quod est ab Anno Christi DCC ad DCCC. Pars Secunda (Paris: Billaine, 1672), 361. Also, Charles’ baby son, baptized with the same name as his father, had just died and was buried at Saint-Denis (199), perhaps further discouraging Charles from spending great lengths of time there.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 202. Louis the Stammerer, however, did indeed celebrate Easter at Saint-Denis in 878 (206). He died on Good Friday 879 (216).

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 202.
CONCLUSION

Although the *Popule meus* verses do not appear in liturgical manuscripts until the end of the 9th century, this study has left little doubt that they were taken over from one exemplar out of many of a long and wide tradition of singing the *Popule meus*. The musical and exegetical roots of the *Popule meus* chants, indeed, can be traced back to the seminal periods of Western chant and patristic Biblical commentary, respectively.

I have proposed a stemma for the development of the various versions of the chant in the Western rites. This stemma relies on key similarities in the melodies, such as a doubled structure and distinctive phrases, and textual attributes, such as the use of Old Latin or the Vulgate and the presence or absence of a refrain. It is important to realize, however, that this stemma must always remain hypothetical, given the fact that all our chant sources post-date the chants themselves, sometimes by centuries. This inherent uncertainty is why so many of the versions of the chant are hypothesized as “siblings” rather than as “parents” or “children.” The co-existence and mutual influencing of several *Popule meus* chants, indeed, seems to be almost a given due to their number; a stemma is perhaps a poor tool to deal with such complexity. Still, it seems reasonably clear that families of *Popule meus* chants developed, including a family of *Popule meus* verses. The Carolingian *Popule meus* verses, in this model, would have been just one of a number of competing *Popule meus* chants in Western Europe in the late 9th century, although it would inevitably edge out the rest due to its official sponsoring.

Much of this study, however, has not dealt with these *Popule meus* chants in isolation. It is clear, for one thing, that the key associations of the verse Micah 6:3 and the verses surrounding it—associations of the Crucifixion and the Last Judgment—were
consistently present in Western Europe from the time of Ambrose in the last quarter of the 4th century. It also seems possible that a liturgical Ceremony of Indulgence was in place from this time, at Milan and then in the Gallican and Old Hispanic liturgies, that coincided with the beginning of the paschal triduum. Between the sermons of Caesarius of Arles, the writings of Isidore of Seville, the Old Hispanic liturgy, and Gallican liturgy as preserved in the Bobbio Missal, a relatively stable context is seen to have emerged, moreover, for the formation of the various versions of the *Popule meus* verses that preceded and/or precipitated the Carolingian verses. The Adoration of the Cross ceremony and the Trisagion chant—with their rich histories of penitential liturgical action and promise for salvation and ascent to God—provided the immediate context for the incorporation of the *Popule meus* verses into the Carolingian liturgy. We sought in this study, finally, to fine-tune our hermeneutical characterizations of these liturgical elements, including the *Popule meus* verses, through recourse to Carolingian texts and artwork from the time and place of the verses’ probable incorporation: the Abbey of Saint-Denis under the abbacy of Charles the Bald (867–77).

This last period was crucial for the later history of the *Popule meus* verses, into the High Middle Ages and beyond, for several reasons. For one, there appears to be something of a bottleneck in terms of the flow of usages and meanings. Some of the *Popule meus*’ history was undoubtedly lost starting at this time and during the spread of the Carolingian Good Friday liturgy in the years to come. On the other hand, this bottleneck can be seen as a funnel towards a point of brilliant synthesis—a synthesis of melodic material from various times and cultures, a synthesis of various strands of exegetical tradition, a synthesis of conceptions of Christ, the Cross, and the Christian
people. In the realm of political thought, for example, the *Popule meus* verses can be tied to a new interest in legitimizing hierarchical arrangement; the king is king by the grace of God, and through his sincere penitence (e.g., at the Adoration of the Cross) may hold power securely; the archbishop in turn can use his position in the Church hierarchy to keep the king in this paradoxical position or to chastise an underling attempting to disrupt the hierarchical structure (e.g., through quoting a *Popule meus* chant from the liturgy). In the realm of Western Christian thought, the incorporation of the *Popule meus* verses is of course tied to the ever-growing importance and theorization of the Cross. In this respect, the Carolingian *Popule meus* verses stand at a point of juncture, as Rachel Fulton has noted, between Christ being characterized primarily as Judge and his being characterized primarily as Suffering Savior in the period 800–1200.101 Looking at the matter another way, however, the Carolingian *Popule meus* verses allow the effusive poetry of the Gallican liturgies regarding the Crucifixion to pass through the bottleneck of the late Carolingian liturgy and become mainstreamed.102

As the *Popule meus* verses of the Carolingian Good Friday liturgy spread throughout Europe, their message and their enactment would have been seen as particularly expedient in the face of a disintegrating Empire and invasions by the Northmen. The only way to regain legitimate hierarchy and safety from invasion would be the grace of God, spurred on by the penitence of the people. On the other hand, if these were indeed the last days, then penitence was even more necessary as the people prepared to meet their Savior and Judge.

102 The same might be said of the prayer *Adoro te, Domine Ihesu* in the prayerbook of Charles the Bald with respect to the Irish liturgy.
There is little question that the *Popule meus* verses cannot, during the Early
Middle Ages, be called anti-Jewish; their primary meaning always focused first on the
identity of Christ and secondly on the identity of the Christian people. From their
probable origins in southern Gaul (perhaps in the Narbonnaise liturgical sphere around
700) in the rich context of a Gallican Indulgentia Ceremony, to their incorporation in the
Adoration of the Cross in the later Carolingian era, their meaning was always at base
penitential for the Christian. With a text that could be literally applied to another group
of people, however, there would always be an underlying tension between accepting
blame and diverting blame. While in the later Middle Ages, in Passion Plays, for
example, this tension would prove to be untenable, and would lead to a rupture between
the two options, in the Early Middle Ages, either a spiritual interpretation prevailed,
reducing this tension to negligible, or, in some cases like the Old Hispanic liturgy and the
Bobbio *precés*, this tension was harnessed by liturgists to produce a deeper meaning.103

In the Carolingian era, finally, it appears that this tension may have been played to
personal gain in a double-edged way by Hincmar of Rheims: introducing the *Popule
meus* verses in the Good Friday liturgy would help with his image-building of the king as
“king by the grace of God” (*gratia rex Dei*) while at the same time implicitly casting
shadows on the Jews at court. It was perhaps a sign of a coming time when the anti-
Jewishness of the Good Friday liturgy in general, including the *Popule meus* verses, soon
to be called the *Improperia*, “the Reproaches,” would become more of a historical
certainty. Until then, however, the *Popule meus* verses would take their place, as a richly

103 Stephen Wahle, “O liebes folgk, sage mir an: was han ich dir zu leide getan: Auf der Spurensuche einer
Wirkungsgeschichte der Improperien in spätmittelalterlichen Passionsspielen,” in *Kontinuität und
Unterbrechung: Gottesdienst und Gebet in Judentum und Christentum* (Paderborn: Schoeningh, 2005),
173–212.
storied chant, in the equally storied ceremony of the Adoration of the Cross, producing a rich synthesis for Christians and for Christendom.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript Sources

Apt, Trésor de la Basilique Sainte-Anne, ms. 6 (olim 1)
Benevento, Biblioteca capitolare, ms. 38
Bergamo, Biblioteca Civica cod. ψ III 8
Laon, Bibliothèque municipale, ms. 239
León, Archivos de la Catedral, ms. 8.
London, British Library, Additional ms. 29988
London, British Library, Additional ms. 34209
Metz, Bibliothèque-Médiathèque municipales, ms. 351
München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Musikabteilung Clm 14965b
München, Schatzkammer der Residenz, 0004-WL
Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, ms. 384
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds latins, ms. 776
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds latins, ms. 1121
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds latins, ms. 1240
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds latins, ms. 12035
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds latins, ms. 12044
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds latins, ms. 12050
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds latins, ms. 17436
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, novelles acquisitions des fonds latins, ms. 1535
Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, ms. 111
St. Gall Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. Sang. 390
Toledo, Biblioteca Capitular, ms. 35.5
Rome, Biblioteca Vaticana, ms. lat. 4197
Vich, Archivo Capitular, ms. 117
Westmalle, Abbaye Onze-Live-Vrouw van het Heilig Hart, ms 12A–B
Worcester, Library of the Cathedral, ms. F 160

Printed Sources


Bailey, Terence. “Ambrosian Chant.” NG.


Croke, Brian. “Two Byzantine Earthquakes and Their Liturgical Commemoration.”


Huglo, Michel. “Antiphon.” NG.


———. “Gallican Chant.” NG.


Kelly, Thomas Forrest. “Beneventan Chant.” *NG*.


Pétridès, S. “Un tropaire byzantin sur un fragment de poterie égyptienne.” *Echos d’Orient* 3 no. 6 (August 1900):361–7.


Thibaut, Jean-Baptiste. Ordre des offices de la Semaine Sainte à Jérusalem, du IVe au Xe s., Paris, 1926.


