

# The Lyrical Compositions of Philip the Chancellor

The lyrics of some of the finest twelfth-century Latin poets are linked with the music of Notre Dame. Yet so many songs are preserved anonymously in the sources that it has only occasionally been possible to establish the canon of a particular lyrical poet and to bring out what is individual in his art. In the 1920s Karl Strecker was able to do this for Walter of Châtillon, to whom he attributed fifty-one songs in all (1). He began with the thirty-three songs preserved in the manuscript St Omer 351: this included thirteen love-lyrics and fourteen hymns, along with six satirical and topical pieces. Strecker was able to show convincingly that all these compositions, though nameless in the manuscript, were by the poet Walter, the author of the epic *Alexandreis*. He went on to ascribe a further eighteen «moral-satirical» songs from other manuscripts to Walter. Nine of these were preserved in a late manuscript under Walter's name, the others were sufficiently close to the St Omer collection in language, themes and forms for the attributions to be likewise safe. In only one song – *Versa est in luctum/cithara Walteri* (for which no music survives) – does the poet name himself and write about himself more directly than elsewhere (2). Later, André Wilmart tried to suggest Walter's authorship for another thirty-one songs, many of which he published for the first time, drawn from two manuscripts. But only four of

An earlier version of this study was presented in German at the symposium 'Das Ereignis Notre Dame', at the Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel, in the spring of 1985. I am grateful to the participants for helpful comments, and especially to Susan Rankin for some vital references on the musical side.

(1) KARL STRECKER (ed.), *Die Lieder Walters von Châtillon in der Handschrift 351 von St. Omer* (Berlin, 1925), and *Moralisch-satirische Gedichte Walters von Châtillon* (Heidelberg, 1929); *Id.*, in *Zeitschrift für Deutsches Altertum*, LXI (1924), 197-222, and LXIV (1927), 96-125, 161-189.

(2) *Moralisch-sat. Gedichte* no. 17. In his admirable new text and interpretation of the song, *On Source, Meaning and Form in Walter of Châtillon's «Versa est in luctum»* (Barcelona, 1977), Francisco Rico has, however, shown the dangers of a simple autobiographical interpretation.

these songs, in my view, can be accepted as Walter's with the same confidence as those in Strecker's canon (3).

In 1976 I attempted similarly to establish the lyrical canon of another outstanding poet, Peter of Blois (4). Here I had the advantage that six songs were known to be Peter's because he dispatched them to a friend in one of his letters. To these six it was possible to add a group of nineteen that were preserved together in a manuscript, B. L. Arundel 384 – songs that could be shown on formal, verbal and thematic grounds to be by the same hand as those in Peter's letter. Then, with a more substantial group of songs secured, I could proceed further not only on stylistic criteria, but also through the steady recurrence of some of these songs in the company of certain others, of closely similar form and language, in manuscripts, to enlarge Peter's canon to about fifty-two songs (in a few cases doubts inevitably remain). Like Walter, Peter in his songs spans from profane to sacred – from love-songs and satires to topical pieces to hymns and other pious compositions. Distinctive with Peter is the number of songs (some serious, others much less so) on the theme of repentance, and the number of lyrical debates – both dialogues and depictions of inner conflicts.

Only a small group of lyrics can be attributed to Alan of Lille, and only one of these – the intellectually dazzling Incarnation-hymn *Exceptivam actionem* (5) – survives with music in a Notre Dame manuscript. Very different is the situation with regard to the youngest of the four major poets linked with Notre Dame – Philip the Chancellor (6). Philip has the largest number of lyrics

(3) ANDRÉ WILMART, *Poèmes de Gautier de Châtillon dans un manuscrit de Charleville*, in *Revue Bénédictine*, XLIX (1937), 121-169, 322-365. The poems I have in mind are three from MS Charleville 190: *Ecce mundus demundatur*, *De nocte sicut noctua*, and *Suscitavit dominus* (I, XIV, XV in Wilmart's edition), the two latter appearing under Walter's name in the MS. and, from the 'florilège de Pierre Daniel' (Paris B.N. lat. 4880), *Dies hec plus dedita* (29 in Wilmart's edition). Other attributions of Wilmart's seem to me to range from the possible to the very unlikely (e.g. Charleville VIII, or Daniel 10-12, 14, 24, 28). The question would deserve a fresh investigation.

(4) *Peter of Blois and Poetry at the Court of Henry II*, in *Mediaeval Studies*, XXVIII (1976), 185-235; reprinted (with a few corrections) in my *The Medieval Poet and his World* (Rome, 1984), pp. 281-339.

(5) Ed. GORDON A. ANDERSON, *Notre-Dame and Related Conductus, Opera Omnia*, VI (Henryville, 1981), 96f; a critical text (without melody) was published by MARIE-THÉRÈSE D'ALVERNY, *Mélanges Henri de Lubac* (Paris, 1964), II 126-128.

(6) The most recent and best-documented account of Philip's career is that of NIKOLAUS WICKI, in his edition, *Philippi Cancellarii Parisiensis Summa de bono* (2 vols., Berne, 1985), I 16\*-28\*. The musicological bibliography relating to Philip's lyrics is cited

assigned to him in the manuscript sources, and his lyrical output – even if not all the manuscript attributions can be accepted – gives every sign of being varied and extensive, whether or not any anonymously preserved songs can be ascribed to him as well.

The reason for the wealth of attributions to Philip is not hard to see: he was not only an important public figure in his day, but his stormy life, his battles with Rome and with both the Church and the University in Paris, soon made him a legend, whether he was hated (as by the Dominican polygrapher Thomas of Cantimpré) or loved (as by the poet Henri d'Andeli, who wrote the *Dit du Chancelier Philippe*). The most accurate earlier indications about Philip's life are those of Henri Meylan and D. A. Callus (7), who decisively distinguished Philip the Chancellor, who died in 1236, from an older Parisian cleric, Philippe de Grève, who was a canon of Notre Dame during the Chancellor's boyhood and who died ca. 1222, without, it seems, having left any poetry or other writings. The confusion of the two Philips was common among older scholars, and is still not quite extinct (8).

To the poet Henri d'Andeli, Philip seemed incomparable in his learning – *flors et rose et pipe, / d'uis et fontaine de science . . . / nul clerck ne voit on or tel* – and incomparable, too, in his friendliness (*flors de compagnie*), his generosity (*plus large qu'Alixandre*), and his goodness: « He never did harm at any price » (*il ne fait mal à nul fuer*) (9). A number of more concrete details in Henri's poem suggest that Philip may have been a composer and vocal and instru-

very fully in THOMAS B. PAYNE'S « *Associa tecum in patria* »: *A Newly Identified Organum Trope by Philip the Chancellor*, in *JAMS* XXXIX (1986), 233-254. I am most grateful to Mr Payne for sending me his valuable essay in time to consider it while preparing the final notes for these pages; at the same time, as will be seen below, I have hesitations about the authorship of the words of *Associa tecum in patria*.

(7) HENRI MEYLAN'S thesis (cf. *Positions des thèses, Ecole Nationale des Chartes*, Paris, 1927, pp. 89-94) has now been continued and brought up to date by Wicki (cit. n. 6), who explains (I 7\*) the extent to which he used Meylan's work as a base; DANIEL A. CALLUS, *Philip the Chancellor and the « De anima » ascribed to Robert Grosseteste*, in *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies*, I 1 (1941), 105-127.

(8) Cf. e.g. the garbled assertion of Johannes B. SCHNEYER, *Die Sittenkritik in den Predigten Philipps des Kanzlers* (Münster, 1963), p. 7, that the Chancellor, « sollte er mit Philippe de Grève identisch sein », would in that case be a leading poet. In his excursus « Der Prediger und der Dichter Philipp », Schneyer displays alarmingly hazy notions of the poetry of the period: thus for instance, using only *Analecta Hymnica*, he cites some verses from Walter of Châtillon's celebrated *Licet eger cum egrotis* (*St. Omer*, cit. n. 1, no. 27, st. 3) as being by Philip in his discussion (p. 29) and as being anonymous in his footnote (ibidem).

(9) *Le dit du Chancelier Philippe*, ed. PAUL MEYER, in *Romania*, I (1872), 210-215, vv. 18ff, 76f, 85.

mental performer as well as poet. The strings of Philip's *viele*, says Henri, break on the night of his death, when he can no longer sing. He is God's *jongleur*, and he makes conductus (*conduis*) for Mary, greeting her with them at every hour. Friedrich Ludwig<sup>(10)</sup> was inclined to see poetic licence behind all these expressions that hint at Philip's musical activity, and indeed we have no proof that he composed any of his own melodies, let alone performed them. Yet I would still submit that Henri's words give at least pointers in these directions, and should not be discounted too readily.

Henri's allusions to Philip's peerless *science* might likewise be imagined a poetic exaggeration. Yet on the basis of Philip's *Summa de bono* Father Callus saw the Chancellor as «undoubtedly one of the greatest thinkers in early thirteenth century Paris»<sup>(11)</sup>. Philip's sermons have remained almost entirely in manuscript<sup>(12)</sup>, but already in 1894 Hauréau used citations from them to give a lively impression of the Chancellor's personality – passionate, idealistic and combative, fighting everything he saw as unjust in the governance of Church und University<sup>(13)</sup>.

(10) *Repertorium organorum recentioris et motetorum vetustissimi stili*, I, Catalogue raisonné der Quellen i, 2nd rev. ed., ed. LUTHER A. DITTMER (New York, 1964) 243-267, at p. 246.

(11) Art. cit. (n. 7), p. 105. It is probably significant, in the light of Philip's enthusiastic and expert study of Aristotelian texts, that no work of Aristotle's is condemned during the period of his chancellorship (1217-1236). In the *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, I, ed. H. DENIFLE, A. CHATELAIN (Paris, 1889), after the well known prohibitions of 1210 (p. 70) and 1215 (p. 79) of Aristotle's «books of natural philosophy» and metaphysics, the only documents that mention Aristotle in Philip's time are, first, a letter from the *magistri* of Toulouse (1229), in which they stress that *Libros naturales, qui fuerant Parisius prohibiti, poterunt illic audire qui volunt nature sinum medullitus perscrutari* (p. 131): here the pluperfect (*fuerant*) strongly suggests that by 1229 the *libri naturales* were no longer forbidden in Paris. Second, a letter from Pope Gregory IX to three prelates of Beauvais, Amiens and Reims (1231), asking them to examine the *libri naturales, qui Parisius in Concilio provinciali fuere prohibiti*, and to cut out anything erroneous or scandalous they may contain, «sc that for the rest they may be studied without delay and without harm» (pp. 143f). In his own *Summa de bono* (ca. 1225-1228), Philip makes extensive and original use of the 'new' Aristotle, including the *Physics*, *De anima*, and above all the *Ethics*. He is also one of the very first to cite Averroes, though his debt to Avicenna is more substantial.

(12) Wicki (*Summa I 12\**) notes that there is an edition, by JOSSE BADE, *Philippus de Grave cancellarius Parisiensis in Psalterium Davidicum CCCXXX Sermones* (Paris, 1523), and that this is apparently the first instance of the confusion of the Chancellor with Philippe de Grève. However, these «ne sont pas des sermons prononcés, mais un amas de sujets préparés à l'usage des prédicateurs» (I 23\*).

(13) BARTHÉLEMY HAURÉAU, *Philippe de Grèce, chancelier de l'Église et de l'Université de Paris*, in *Journal des Savants*, 1894, pp. 427-440. That Philip (and one other master) stood alone in the University discussions in maintaining that it was not unlawful to possess more than one benefice (cf. Callus, cit. n. 7, p. 106 n. 1), does not necessarily mean

The 1890s, too, saw the beginnings of Dreves's attempts to define Philip's lyrical canon. These culminated in *Analecta Hymnica*, 50 (1907) with a vast list, that included, for instance, the whole of the «rondeau» part of the Florence Laurenziana manuscript (F) – the sixty songs in the section now known as F-II<sup>14</sup>. This quite unfounded speculation was soon rejected, and because of that a number of Dreves's more valuable suggestions came also to be forgotten. The far more methodical assessment of the evidence by Ludwig in 1910 remains, I believe, the best starting-point for serious discussion of Philip's songs. In recent times, Ludwig's suggestions were added to by the late Gordon Anderson, who drew attention to the Prague manuscript (Knihovna Metrop. Kap. N. VIII)<sup>15</sup>, while Robert Falck, on the other hand, has argued for the removal from Philip of an important group of songs that others have claimed for him<sup>16</sup>. But there has never yet been an attempt to work out which songs Philip could have written on the basis of detailed discussion of his choice of lyrical forms and genres, his stylistic habits, imagery and themes – of any of the features, in short, that enable us to perceive his poetic individuality. My purpose in this study is to give a few indications – however provisional – along these lines.

Central to any attempt to define the corpus of Philip's songs is the assessment of two collections in particular where the manuscript rubrics ascribe a group of lyrics to the Chancellor: the London manuscript B. L. Egerton 274 (*Lo B*) gives him twenty-eight songs, and Darmstadt 2777 (*Da*) another twenty-six. Are the London lyrics in fact by a single poet? And the Darmstadt ones likewise? And is the same poet responsible for both groups?

the Chancellor was a «conservateur» (thus Hauréau), defending privilege, or that he was himself enjoying morally dubious gains. Philip's passionate championing of the poor against the mighty, in a number of the songs that are most surely his, makes such an interpretation very unlikely. Quite possibly he saw the resolution about benefices as an inadequate measure, that could easily be used to leave worse injustices concealed and unredressed. His vote, that is, might well have been directed against the *hypocritae* of his milieu, not against ecclesiastical reform as such.

(14) DREVES (*Analecta Hymnica* XX 13f) counted only 55 songs, but they had been correctly listed by LÉOPOLD DELISLE, *Annuaire-Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de France*, XXII (1885), 100-139.

(15) *Thirteenth-Century Conductus: Obiter dicta*, in *The Musical Quarterly*, LVIII (1972), 361-364.

(16) ROBERT FALCK, *The Notre Dame Conductus: A Study of the Repertory* (Henryville-Ottawa-Binningen, 1981), esp. pp. 115-119; *Id.*, *Philippe the Chancellor*, in *The New Grove Dictionary*, XIV, 630-631.

Ludwig, notwithstanding his many criticisms of Dreves, was inclined to follow him in dividing the London songs into two series. For 1-17 (the numbering of songs here and throughout refers to my bibliographical Appendix below, pp. 588-592), neither scholar had any hesitations: they were all by Philip. From 18 to 28, it seemed more difficult: one song was certainly by Philip – the motet 19 (*Agmina milicie*), explicitly mentioned as his by Henri d'Andeli<sup>(17)</sup>. Yet Ludwig learnt from Wilhelm Meyer that 26, *In veritate comperi*, was attributed in a fragmentary München manuscript to *episcopus Wilhelmus Parisiensis*. « William of Paris » still appears as the author of this motet in Friedrich Gennrich's *Bibliographie* (1958). But already in 1931, in an easily overlooked note in his commentary on one of the *Carmina Burana*, Otto Schumann had reported that « William of Paris » seemed to have melted into thin air:

in München hat sich, wie Ludwig freundlichst mitteilt, jenes Fragment nicht wieder auffinden lassen, auch Meyer selbst hat, wie er Ludwig mündlich erklärte, später aus seinen Papieren nichts mehr darüber feststellen können<sup>(18)</sup>.

Schumann, who had pointed out close verbal parallels between this motet and the song *Deduc, Syon, uberrimas* (68), went on to suggest that, if there was no attribution to William of Paris after all, the likeliest author of both pieces was Philip<sup>(19)</sup>. I would fully concur: indeed I would see *In veritate comperi* almost as an epitome of Philip's characteristic poetic features, as its extensive links not only with *Deduc, Syon*, but also, as we shall see, with several pieces among the first seventeen in *Lo B*, will make clear.

If « William of Paris » is no longer an obstacle, let us, as a working hypothesis, accept the manuscript rubric of *Lo B* – *Incipiunt dicta magistri Philippi quondam cancellarii Parisiensis* – for all twenty-eight compositions, and ask: if this is correct, what kind of poet emerges from these songs? Can we see a distinctive artist at work here?

The twenty-eight London lyrics include ten sacred pieces: four

(17) *Le dit* (cit. n. 9), vv. 176f. Henri, however, calls the piece « un conduit ».

(18) *Carmina Burana*, ed A. HILKA, O. SCHUMANN, B. BISCHOFF (Heidelberg, 1930ff), II, 1, p. 53.

(19) Though Schumann still referred to the poet as Philippe de Grève.



for Mary, two for the Nativity, one each for Easter, Pentecost, and the feasts of the Innocents and St Catherine. Among these ten there are motets and rondeaux as well as conductus. There is also one panegyric conductus, for Pope Innocent III (9); but all the remaining seventeen compositions in *Lo B* could be subsumed under the heading «moral-satirical». I would stress that this collection, unlike those of St Omer and Arundel, or Cambridge UL Ff.i.17, which are of comparable size, contains no love-songs. Among the «moral-satirical» pieces we can distinguish, first, three altercations: between the belly and the members (3), between the heart and the eye (7), and between a host of virtues and vices – a lyrical psychomachia (13). Then there are four ferocious satires against corruption among prelates and in the Roman Curia (11, 14, 16, 26). But most frequent of all are «songs of admonition» (*Rügelieder*) of wider import: at least ten of these are addressed to mankind – summoning them, challenging, questioning, accusing, pleading or threatening<sup>(20)</sup>. This group can be clearly differentiated from the songs of Walter of Châtillon and Peter of Blois. One of its characteristic features is the vocative *Homo*, followed by a torrent of imperatives or interrogatives. The most pervasive rhetorical figure is apostrophe. Another device is more unusual: twice the poet takes on a prophetic persona: it is no longer he who is addressing the world, but Christ speaking through him (*Homo, vide que pro te patior*, 4), or else it is the personified Ratio flinging challenges at mankind on the poet's behalf (15). Here the writer comes far closer to a prophet such as Hildegard, who introduces many of her utterances with *Lux vivens dicit*, than to the other lyric poets of his time. Neither Walter of Châtillon nor Peter of Blois uses such modes of address. Their moral and satiric songs are never *Rügelieder* in this specific sense. They do not turn upon humanity with stinging questions and reproaches – a mode in which the poet of the London lyrics clearly owes much to the liturgical *improperia* of Good Friday: *Popule meus, quid feci tibi?* . . .

(20) Only 12, which is about the Prodigal Son, stands slightly apart from the other groups of lyrics.

(21) See esp. HANS SPANKE, *Beziehungen zwischen Romanischer und Mittellateinischer Lyrik* (Abh. der Ges. der Wiss. zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl. III 18, Berlin 1936), pp. 84-89. On the other hand, as Spanke notes (p. 86), the collectors of the MSS, as is shown by the rubrics, saw the sequences and *lais* as varieties of conductus.

Yet here, remarkably, such *improperia* do not lead into a devotional lyric, a meditation on the Passion, but into accusations of the poet's own world. In the many songs where the poet himself is the apparent speaker, he often goes on from reproaches to evoke the menace of divine vengeance, or the terror of Judgement.

Unusual, too, in the London collection is the formal range. Alongside the motets and rondeaux, there are four forms that I would distinguish, along Spanke's lines<sup>(21)</sup>: *conductus*, which most often have regular strophic form and the same melody for each strophe; classical sequences, where each pair of strophes has a new melody, giving a musical structure AA BB CC . . .; *lais lyriques*, which develop the classical sequence form more freely, admitting three- and fourfold repetition of some strophes and leaving other strophes unrepeated; and finally *descorts*, in which each strophe is of different length and form and has a melody of its own, giving a musical structure ABCDE . . . (I should add that occasionally it is hard to tell whether we have a single long *conductus*-strophe or a *descort*; and also that, if the verses of a song have regular strophic structure but the music shows it was set as a sequence or *lai*, I have classified it accordingly in the Appendix).

The formal inventiveness of the poet of this collection is seen further in his frequent use of virtuoso rhyming, and in his unusual combination of such rhyming with his other favourite device: *annominatio* - playing upon words related in their sound or stem or both. Thus for instance in song 1, where Mary is, in a daring synaesthetic image, «incense of radiance, furnace of ardour»:

libanus	candoris,
clibanus	ardoris.

And in 2 we have:

Tu, generis
proles degeneris,
regeneras
genus in posteris.

You, progeny of the degenerate (human) race, regenerate that race in your posterity.



Or in the psychomachia (13), the vices and virtues

dimicant,  
 implicant se varie:  
 ictibus ac variis,  
 actibus contrariis  
 vulnerant,  
 superant in acie.

tussle, wrestle variously, and with varying thrusts wound with contrary acts, vanquish in the fray.

In the sacred songs, apart from the sheer density of *annominatio*, we can often perceive arresting images, as well as the recurrence of favourite words and expressions. Mary is « resin of clemency » (*clemencie resina*), or the « raincloud » that is begged to « drop dew from heaven, make sweet the arid heart »<sup>(22)</sup> (*nubes pluviosa, | celitus irrorat, | cor aridum dulcorat*) (1). Her remedy for the guilt of Eve is expressed by a witty allusion to Pyramus and Thisbe (2):

osculum inseris<sup>(23)</sup>, paries unionis!

You insert the kiss, you wall of union!

While the rondeaux are for the most part too brief to furnish decisive verbal parallels, the expression *character* (which occurs in both the longer songs for Mary) and the phrase *a luto lateris* (which occurs in 2) are echoed – with new *annominatio* – in the rondeau 22:

Luto carens et latere  
 transit Hebreus libere,  
 novus novo caractere.

Lacking clay and bricks, the Israelite crosses freely, made new by the new sign.

Where in the dispute of heart and eye (7) the poet puns on *hostis* (enemy) and *hostium* (gate), in the motet for St Catherine (19) the pun is extended from *hostia* (gates) to *hostia* (victim). The *nature funiculus* of the Prodigal Son (12) links with the *argenteus funis*<sup>(24)</sup> of the Innocents (18).

(22) Here Philip plays on Is. 45: 8 – *rorate caeli desuper et nubes pluant iustum* – the text that was used liturgically for the Introit of the fourth Sunday of Advent.

(23) This is the reading in the two MSS I have collated: *Lo B* and *F*. Dreves, using both these MSS and *W 2*, prints *miseris* (without comment).

(24) Thus, correctly, *Lo B*; Dreves, using this MS as his sole source, prints *fumus*.

But now let us isolate some of the more notable poetic features of the invectives and *Rügelieder*. Pervasive are the imprecations: *Homo, vide . . . vide . . . vide . . .* (4); *O mens, cogita* (5); *Homo, considera* (6); *Quid ergo, miserrime, / quid dices?* (8); *Homo, quid extolleris?* (10). Such impassioned questions can also be addressed to personifications – Truth, Justice, Largesse:

Dic ergo, Veritas,  
ubi nunc habitas?  
Equitas, Largitas,  
ubi nunc latitas?  
Quid profuit  
que praefuit<sup>(25)</sup>  
Malignitas? (11)

Tell us then, Truth, where now do you live? Justice, Largesse, where are you hiding now? What use has Malignity been, who has taken control?

So too Truth and Justice are personified in 14, where Veritas is oppressed and Iustitia is prostituted.

The challenges are inseparable from the repeated warnings and menaces. One of the poet's favourite biblical *figurae* to convey these is the fate of the Foolish Virgins (e.g. in 8); but equally he chooses savage images from the classical world. In 13, Lamias bare their breasts, Furies join battle and the Graces flee. In 14, the corruption of the Roman papal court is conveyed brilliantly and distinctively by bringing the classical allusions into the Rome of the present. As for Shelley in a later period

Hell is a city much like London –  
A populous and smoky city . . .  
  
There is a Castles, and a Canning,  
A Cobbett, and a Castlereagh;  
All sorts of caitiff corpses planning  
All sorts of cozening for trepanning  
Corpses less corrupt than they . . .<sup>(26)</sup>

so Philip's Rome is a hell with its own, contemporary Cerberus, Pluto and Proteus, its mercenary Danae, and even – an image

(25) *Que profuit* *Lo B* (*que praefuit F*); Dreves, however, using only these two MSS, prints *Quid profuit, Quod praefuit*.

(26) *Peter Bell the Third*, Part III, sts. 1-2.

of consummate cruelty – a Crassus who is put to death by having his gold poured boiling down his throat. Similarly in 16, the clergy are the monsters slain by Hercules, simony is the « Proteus of falsity », and gold the thread of life drawn by Lachesis and weighed by Clotho.

Many of the songs in the London collection are linked by the poet's characteristic use of sombre, pessimistic paradoxes. One is the battle in which flesh defeats spirit: *carne contra spiritum / luctante, succumbimus* (8); *caro vincit spiritum* (13); *suspirat spiritus . . . / subditus / carnis contagio* (15). Related to this is the theme of human inclination to what is forbidden – the Ovidian *nitimur in vetitum* (27) is used in 8, and similarly in both 13 and 39 – the theme of the blind leading the blind (16 and 26), and of the head infecting the other limbs with its viciousness (also 16 and 26). Again, a look at some of the key words of this poet, that recur in more than one song, shows that they adumbrate a dark range of human experience. Men are *ypocrite*, full of *duplicitas*, *perversitas*, *malicia*, *spurcitia*; their greed for food and drink (*ingluvies*, *crapula*) are both literal and metaphorical. Their world is *laqueus*, *sordes*, *pulvis*, *favilla cineris*, and above all *immunditia*: the plays upon *mundus* and *immundus* (and all their cognates) are naturally not exclusive to this poet, yet they are frequent with him and well suited to his leitmotifs.

Thus the poet who emerges from the London collection is one with a number of recognisable and individual features. He is master of a wide range of forms and an extraordinary virtuoso in rhyming; he is addicted to *annominatio* and paradox. Yet, despite his elements of verbal wit and play, he is a darker, more vehement personality than his best-known contemporaries. He does not, like them, appear to write love-songs alongside his serious compositions, and when he uses classical allusions – which he does often and with elegant mastery – their use is never simply playful, as it so often is in twelfth-century lyric. For him the classical figures and the biblical, which he frequently combines in the same context, serve first and foremost as warnings for the present, and he addresses that present less as satirist than as prophet. Unlike even Walter of Châtillon, he dares to speak in the persona of Christ. Unlike

(27) OVID, *Amores* III 4, 17 – *nitimur in vetitum semper cupimusque negata* – became proverbial in the Middle Ages: cf. HANS WALTHER, *Proverbia sententiaque Latinitatis Medii Aevi* (6 vols., Göttingen, 1963-1969), n. 16956.

Peter of Blois, he seems to brook no compromise, there is never a hint of Peter's typical « Shall I repent now or later? » This poet is animated by an intense hatred of injustice; he scourges injustice to the point of cruelty. He is unafraid of the mighty in Church and State, he speaks out on behalf of the poor. He attacks the *potentes* perhaps more savagely than anyone before Dante, and, like Dante, with prophetic urgency and an anger that can sound overbearing. Unlike Dante, his spirit does not find rest in an ideal human love: there is no sign here of a Beatrice. And yet even his bitterest songs seem motivated not by spite but by magnanimity – by that *largesse* of spirit which Henri d'Andeli in his *Lai* attributes to Chancellor Philip.

I believe that if we turn to the Darmstadt collection (*Da*) we can see the same verbal artist, the same unusual poet-prophet, at work. The collection consists of twenty-six songs, which the rubric calls *dicta cancellarii Parisiensis*. Two of these are in fact intrusions, as I shall explain later; but the twenty-four songs listed as 29-52 in the Appendix are in my view a unified group.

The range of these twenty-four is notably similar to that of the songs in *Lo B* (28). Once more the manuscript contains no love-songs. There are four sacred pieces – two on Christmas (31, 37), one on the Redemption (46), one on the Finding of the Cross (51). There are panegyrics on Louis VIII (50) and on the bishop of Paris Peter of Nemours (52). There are two harsher *Zeitgedichte*, dealing with Emperor Otto IV (45) and with the destruction of Jerusalem (49). There is another lyrical altercation, this time between soul and body (29). There are four invectives against Rome and against corrupt clergy (30, 34, 35, 39), the first of which is likewise in the form of an altercation. But again ten of the songs in this manuscript are *Rügelieder* in the stricter sense, and in two of these (38, 47) the poet once more adopts the distinctive prophetic device of speaking – in a critical, not devotional, context – in the persona of Christ.

In the songs where the poet speaks *in propria persona*, the imprecations are as in the other collection: *Homo, cur spernis vivere?* (32); *Homo . . . surge* (41); *Exsurge! Dormis, domine?* (43); *Homo qui semper moreris . . . | Dic, homo, res instabilis . . . | Homo, merca-*

(28) On the formal side, there are conductus, sequences, *lais* and *descorts*, but no motets or *rondeaux*. The reason for this was perceived by Fickermann: see his observation cited below.

tor pessime (44). Again there is a striking preponderance of passionate apostrophes, and of imperative and interrogative constructions.

Among the sacred pieces, we can find the same brilliant combination of audacious imagery and rhyming and almost excessive *annominatio*. Thus for instance when this poet, showing the cross as the place of the love-union of God and man, fuses *figurae* from Isaiah, Numbers and the Song of Songs (46) (29):

In hoc vecte botrus vectus,  
in hoc palo predilectus  
morbos sanat omnium;  
hic est lectus preelectus –  
ex electis est collectus  
liliis convallium.

The grape-bunch propped on this pole, the beloved on this stake, heals the diseases of all mankind; this is the forechosen bed plucked from the choice lilies of the valley.

In other songs in *Da*, we find as in *Lo B* the Foolish Virgins (32, 38) and the Prodigal Son (41) used as *figura* and as warning. Similarly we have the conflict between flesh and spirit – *carnis ab ergastulo / liber eat spiritus* (33) – and the personification of Veritas and Iustitia (31), here in allusion to the motif of the Four Daughters of God (30). We find again some characteristic expressions from the London collection: *character, crapula, laqueus, malicia, perversitas, spurcitia*, and the plays on *mundus* and *immundus*. Yet a few detailed comparisons will bring out even more clearly that the same spirit and the same artistry are present in the two collections.

The debate of soul and body (29) is as rich in *annominatio* as that of heart and eye in *Lo B* (7):

Me dum fecit deus mundam,  
mox infecit fex immundam . . .

While God fashioned me as pure, faeces soon infected me the infested . . .

(29) Cf. Num. 21: 9 (*fecit ergo Moses serpentem aeneum et posuit pro signo / quem cum percussi aspicerent sanabantur*) and Cant. 1: 13ff (*botrus cypri dilectus meus . . . lectulus noster floridus . . . ego flos campi et liliium convallium*). At the same time, Christ in his Passion was traditionally identified with both the vintner and the grapes in the winepress of Is. 63: 2f (*vestimenta tua sicut calcantium in torculari . . . torcular calcavi solus*). For the text of this strophe I follow the MS F, fol. 431v.

(30) Cf. esp. HOPE TRAYER, *The Four Daughters of God: A Study of the Versions of the Allegory* (Bryn Mawr, 1907); ARTHUR LANGFORS, *Les Quatre Filles de Dieu*, in *Notices et Extraits*, XLII (1933), 139-288.

But even more, the argument in the two song turns on essentially the same point: the body here says to the soul what the eye had said to the heart: it is you who guide all my actions, so you are wrong to lay blame on me.

The sardonic dialogue between Aristippus and Diogenes (30), while it takes one of Horace's *Epistles* (I 17) as its point of departure, relies on precisely the same unusual device as *Bulla fulminante* (14) in the London collection – the imaginary bringing of the classical world into the Rome of the present day, the Rome of papacy and Curia. The two songs come closest to each other in their allusions to Orpheus and Proteus. In the one (14):

nam etiamsi fores  
 quem audiit Orpheus  
 Pluto deus  
 Tartareus,  
 non ideo perores,  
 malleus argenteus  
 ni feriat ad fores  
 ubi Proteus  
 variat mille colores.

For even if you were Orpheus, whom Pluto god of Tartarus heard, you'd not complete your speech unless the silver hammer struck the doors where Proteus changes colour a thousand times.

In the other (30):

in promissis Protei  
 et sequaces Orphei  
 sacerdotum principes.

In their promises the chief priests are Proteuses and followers of Orpheus.

That is, while the priests' words may sound Orphic in their seductiveness, their deeds show how slippery their promises are.

The Darmstadt *descort* 32 is full of analogues to pieces in the London manuscript. Compare:

Homo! cur spernis vivere?  
 cur dedicas te vitiis?  
 cur indulges malitiis? . . .



O condicio misera!  
 considera  
 quam aspera  
 sit hec vita, mors altera (32)

Man! Why treat living with contempt? Why dedicate yourself to vices? Why indulge in malices? . . . Oh pitiful condition! Call to mind how harsh is this life, this other death

with

Homo . . .  
 cur, sequendo mundi florem,  
 spernis dei mandatum? (17)

Man . . . Why, pursuing the flower of the world, do you treat God's mandate with contempt?

and with

Homo! considera  
 qualis, quam misera  
 sors vite sit mortalis!  
 vita mortifera . . .  
 mors vera, mors vitalis! (6)

Man! Call to mind the lot – how pitiful – of mortal life! . . . Death-bearing life, true death, a living death!

The paradox of the living death also pervades *Da* 36, *O labilis*, which again uses the phrase from the Book of Job (5: 7) – « man born to toil » – that unites *Lo B* 17 and *Da* 29, both of which open: *Homo natus ad laborem* (31). The new song (36) has a refrain that begins *Ha! moriens vita . . .* So too 44 begins *Homo, qui semper moreris, | qui diffluis | cotidie . . .* (Man, you who are always dying, who waste away each day . . .).

(31) As REBECCA BALTZER pointed out (*JAMS* XXV [1972], 12), the illumination in *F* (415r) for 29 (*Homo natus ad laborem, | tui status, tue morem | sortis considera*) in fact relates to the song 17 (*Homo natus ad laborem | et avis ad volatum*): it shows a man and a woman (Adam and Eve, as Baltzer suggested in discussion at Wolfenbüttel?) toiling, and a bird perched above them. Baltzer wrote: « My only explanation is that the artist either thought he was illustrating this latter text or simply copied a prototype that did so ». I would add that it very much suggests that in the prototype the two songs directly followed each other, as the two songs that begin *Dum medium silentium* do both in *F* (422v-423r) and in Oxford Rawlinson C 510 (19v-20r) – see below, p. 579. But whilst there is external evidence that *Dum medium silentium tenerent legis apices* is by Walter of Châtillon and not (as the copyist of *Da* assumed) by Philip, internal evidence – particularly the close thematic and verbal relations of 29, the altercation of body and soul, with 7, the altercation of eye and heart – indicates that both the *Homo natus* songs are Philip's.

Other songs in the two collections are linked in language and thought through the appeals to God to take vengeance upon the powerful and the unjust, and predictions that he will do so. London 26, where Veritas is put to death (*Veritas datur funeri*), ends with the lines:

Non est qui bonum faciat  
 istorum quorum  
 conscientia  
 spelunca latronum:  
 hec vide, videns omnia,  
 deus ultionum! (32)

There is none who does good among these, whose conscience is a den of thieves: behold it, you who behold all, God of vengeance!

These link particularly with Darmstadt 48:

O quando discutiet  
 speluncam latronum?  
 Quam tremendus veniet  
 deus ultionum (33)!

Oh when will he shatter the den of thieves? How awesomely will he come, the God of vengeance!

as well as with one of the anonyma in *F* (68), that I am convinced is by the same poet:

Vide, deus ultionum,  
 vide, videns omnia,  
 quod spelunca vispillonum  
 facta est Ecclesia!

Behold, God of vengeance, behold, you who behold all, that the Church has turned into the corpse-robbers' den!

I could add many further details of this kind, but I hope these will suffice to indicate that the poetic links between the London

(32) The expression *spelunca latronum* occurs in Matt. 21:13, Marc. 11:17 and Luc. 19:46; *deus ultionum* in Ps. 93:1.

(33) Cf. also 43, where the contrast is between the mighty of the earth, inventors of crimes, and the pitiable poor:

miserere miserie  
 miserandorum pauperum,  
 et inventores scelerum  
 tue virtute dextere  
 potentes cito contere... (*F* 425v)

and Darmstadt collections are far-reaching, and that a closely similar imagination and verbal art are revealed in both. There is every reason, then, to accept the explicit testimony of the rubrics in both manuscripts, that they preserve collections of the Chancellor's songs (34).

On the other hand, one song has crept into *Da* which clearly belongs to Walter of Châtillon: it is the song on the Redemption, *Dum medium silentium tenerent legis apices* (*d* in the Appendix below). This forms an integral part of a longer *prosimum* that Walter delivered at the University of Bologna, probably in 1174 (35). Norbert Fickermann in 1931 gave what I believe is the right explanation of how this piece came to be inserted among those of Philip:

*Da* geht nämlich letzten Endes, wie gewisse Varianten beweisen, auf dieselbe Vorlage wie *F* . . . zurück; es trifft seine Auswahl aus einer Musikhandschrift, und zwar aus einem einzigen Faszikel. Dieser muss dem 10. Faszikel von *F* . . . sehr ähnlich gewesen sein: hier aber folgen sich (genau so auch – und das ist entscheidend – in Oxford Rawlinson C 510, fol. 19v-20r) zwei Lieder des Anfangs *Dum medium silentium* (36)!

It is easy to see, then, how the copyist might have chosen the wrong piece of the two; it also suggests that the other *Dum medium silentium* can probably be attributed to Philip. In the case of the second intrusion (*c*), which I argued in 1976, on stylistic grounds, was more likely to be by Peter of Blois (37), something similar may well have occurred: it is significant that this song is preceded both in *F* and in *Da* by Philip's *Ve mundo a scandalis* (34), to which it is sufficiently close in verse-form for the copyist to have mistaken it for a simple continuation of Philip's song.

Yet even if we concede two such errors in transmission, we still have in *Lo B* and *Da*, taken together, a collection of fifty-

(34) From the stylistic evidence adumbrated here it will be apparent why I regard FALCK's hypothesis (*Notre Dame* cit. n. 16, loc. cit) – that the author referred to in the *Da* rubric, *Ista sunt dicta cancellarii Parisiensis*, is a different Chancellor of Paris, \* and that the poems in *Da* are really his work \* (p. 117) – as wholly fanciful. The existence of a second Parisian Chancellor who was a brilliant, hitherto undiscovered, lyrical poet, and who could compose more than twenty poems with such deep affinities to those of Philip in *Lo B*, would be a miracle of the first magnitude.

(35) *Moralisch-sat. Gedichte* (cit. n. 1), no. 3 (see pp. 49-51).

(36) *Studien zur lateinischen Dichtung des Mittelalters. Ehrengabe für Karl Strecher*, ed. W. STACH, H. WALTHER (Dresden, 1931), p. 37 n. 2.

(37) *Peter of Blois* (cit. n. 4), pp. 227f; *The Medieval Poet* (cit. ibidem), p. 330.

two songs by a gifted poet of keenly individual temperament and ways of expression, whose particular poetic devices – and obsessions – carry the stamp of his personality and allow us to look for their occurrence elsewhere.

The Franciscan chronicler Salimbene (1221-1287/8) attributes nine songs in all to Philip. For eight of these he mentions that they were set by his own music-teacher, Henry of Pisa – though, as Ludwig pointed out, this does not necessarily imply that Henry was the first composer to set these pieces (38). Two – the disputes of heart and eye, and of belly and members – are in *Lo B*, and there seems little reason to doubt Salimbene's other ascriptions. In the motet *Homo, quam sit pura* (53), the fact that the whole piece is a summons to man uttered by Christ indicates one of Philip's distinctive devices – though here Christ's words are closer to sacred meditation than to *Zeitkritik*. The other sacred pieces – the dialogue between Mary and the Cross (54), the Incarnation-hymn (55), and the triple hymn to Mary Magdalen (56-8) – belong together, in my view, in that their language shows a particular kind of intellectual exuberance that links Philip with the finest baroque religious poets. Here we see accumulations of paradoxes, or else a single sustained paradox, and images that are « conceits » in precisely the seventeenth-century manner – cerebral and impassioned, witty and serious at the same time. When in 55, *Centrum capit circulus*, the poet describes the Incarnation as « the potter of the world shutting himself inside his own little vase », he conjoins the word *figulus* not with the biblical *vas* but with its diminutive, *vasculum*, as he also does in an invective in *Da* (35); similarly, at the close of this hymn, we have Philip's familiar personified Veritas. The dialogue of the Virgin and the Cross, which is independently attested for Philip in a manuscript (Wien 883), is particularly close in poetic imagination both to the Darmstadt hymn on the Cross (46) and to the Magdalen hymns. It is a rare combination of unexpected images and wordplay and daring paradoxes that unites these compositions. Salimbene's ascription of the Magdalen hymns to Philip, on the other hand, has been contested in recent years by Victor Saxer, on the ground that the earliest manuscript to mention one of them, a Breviary from Saint-Thierry (Reims 313), was written shortly before 1200 and

(38) *Repertorium* I i (cit. n. 10), p. 247.

hence is too early to mention any lyrics that could be by Philip<sup>(39)</sup>. Yet even if it is certain that the hand in the Reims manuscript (which I have not seen) belongs to the end of the twelfth century and not to the early thirteenth, it seems to me not impossible that the Magdalen hymns were youthful compositions of Philip's, perhaps from the years 1185-90. (His date of birth is unknown, but may have been as early as 1160)<sup>(40)</sup>. These hymns might well have struck some contemporaries as so exceptional that in at least one northern French Benedictine house it was soon decided to adopt them for liturgical use.

A further confirmation of some of Salimbene's ascriptions to Philip can be found in the Roman Santa Sabina manuscript that was discovered by Heinrich Husmann<sup>(41)</sup>. A fascicule of this manuscript (s. XIII<sup>2</sup>) brings together eight compositions; though here the author is not named, there are good grounds for holding them all to be by Philip. What is of special interest is that this manuscript unites the three sources of Philipian transmission we have considered so far: it contains four songs ascribed to him in *Lo B* (4, 6, 7, 10), two ascribed to him in *Da* (32, 34), and three ascribed to him by Salimbene (53, 54, and the dispute of heart and eye, which is *Lo B* 7).

Of the remaining songs assigned to Philip in manuscripts, some attributions are more problematic than others. One of the most certain, in my view, is 60, *Dic, Christi Veritas*, which musically – in its « cauda », *Bulla fulminante* – provided the melody for 14, the song that begins with these words. Indeed, I would see *Dic, Christi* as one of Philip's most characteristic and compelling lyrics. Its opening verses link with the close of 11 (cited and translated above). Compare:

Dic, Christi Veritas,  
dic, cara raritas,  
dic, rara Caritas,  
ubi nunc habitas? (60)

Dic ergo, Veritas,  
ubi nunc habitas?  
Equitas, Largitas,  
ubi nunc latitas? (11)

(39) VICTOR SAXER, *Les hymnes magdaléniennes...*, in *Mélanges de l'école française de Rome (Moyen Age)*, LXXXVIII (1976), 157-197, at pp. 184, 194 (no. 35).

(40) CALLUS (cit. n. 7), p. 105 suggested ca. 1170. If Wicki, *Summa I* 24\*, is right in seeing Philip's song 9 (*Pater sancte, dictus Lotharius*) as composed for Innocent III's inthronisation (1198), then his own date-limits for Philip's birth – between 1165 and 1185 – must be modified. Wicki cannot seriously have imagined Philip writing this consummately accomplished lyric as a boy of thirteen.

(41) *Ein Fassikel Notre-Dame-Kompositionen auf Texte des Pariser Kanzlers Philipp...*, in *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft*, XXIV (1967), 1-23.

*Dic, Christi* goes on to combine classical and biblical allusions in Philip's distinctive way (42), in order to bring accusations against the world of his own time. Moreover, the links of this song are as close with Darmstadt as with London ones. Here as in *Veritas veritatum* (39), the Good Samaritan becomes a central *figura*, and the words of divine Love, «I am not where you are murmuring» (*non sum quo mussitas*), are close to Christ's words in 47: «But who are you who are murmuring?» (*Sed tu quis es, qui mussitas?*). And where at the close of his panegyric to Peter of Nemours (52) Philip echoes the Gospel words of rendering to Caesar the things that are Caesar's (*que Cesaris sunt Cesari*), here he reverses the Gospel message, telling the *ypocrite*, the mighty of Church and State, who have deprived the poor: «Give back the things that are Caesar's (*que Cesaris sunt reddite*), so that you may serve Christ!».

The French version of the debate between heart and eye (61) is preserved with an ascription to Philip in its unique manuscript. If correct, this means that he composed both the Latin and the French himself. This is by no means implausible, since Henri d'Andeli praises Philip for his vernacular as well as his Latin songs. Yet one cannot wholly rule out that the ascription merely means that the copyist knew who had written the Latin version.

A different range of problems arises with the manuscript from the Prague Metropolitan Chapter. In this a group of twenty-three song-texts is copied without music (as in *Da*), and is superscribed *Carmina Philippi Parisiensis Cancellarii* (43). But here we are in the fourteenth century, and we must reckon with the possibility that some pieces may have become attached to Philip because

(42) One allusion has been obscured in the critical edition, *Carmina Burana* (cit. n. 18) I 2, no. 131. The lines that follow those cited above should read:

aut in Valle Visionis?  
 aut in throno Pharaonis?  
 aut in alto cum Nerone?  
 aut in antro cum Timone?

The editors, printing *cum Theone*, suggest (I 3, p. 237) that this refers to «Theonas, heiliger Abt». Yet the connotations of the passage demand a negative figure, alongside Nero. The reading *cum Timone*, though attested only on the authority of FLACIUS ILLYRICUS, *Pia quaedam vetustissimaque poemata* (Magdeburg, 1552), is unlikely to be merely «Konjekture von Flacius», as the editors claimed (I 2, p. 217): here as often Flacius will have relied on a MS that today is lost. The legend of Timon the misanthrope will have been known to Philip especially through Cicero's *De amicicia*, 87. Reading *cum Timone*, we see two classical allusions balanced against two biblical ones.

(43) See GORDON A. ANDERSON, *Obiter dicta* (cit. n. 15), p. 361.



his name and legend were still remembered rather than because they were genuinely his. Among the Prague texts, thirteen present no problem: twelve are attested for Philip by *Lo B*, and one by Salimbene. Of the rest, four (62-65) seem to me worthy of Philip on poetic grounds: they show his particular gift with *annominatio*, and they take up some of his characteristic motifs – the potter shut in his own little vase (62), or the Foolish Virgins (64).

About the remaining six pieces in the Prague manuscript (*j-o* in the Appendix below), I am more dubious. The first two (*j, k*) are motets for St Stephen, in which short rhyming verses tend to become mere jingling of sounds, with the meaning largely sacrificed to the music (which survives in other sources). There is nothing comparable to this in Philip's acknowledged lyrics. The same facility with rhyme at the expense of meaning is true of the conductus (*l*) *Associa | tecum in patria*: there near the opening some verses on transience – *Vite brevis | peritura | preterit | figura, | umbra levis | ut pictura | interit | litura* – sound less like Philip's own phrases in *O mens, cogita* (5) than like an epigone's somewhat clichéd imitation of this song. Besides, it should be noted, the song *Associa* is addressed to St Eligius (though Anderson, who prints text and melody, obscures this by twice translating the vocative *Eligi* not as «Eligius» but as «thou chosen one», as if he read *Electe*) (44). Neither St Stephen nor St Eligius is mentioned in any song known to be Philip's, and this too should prompt a certain caution.

The motet *Doce nos optime* (*n*) similarly consists of a virtually meaningless string of rhymes. More interesting poetically is the sequence *Regis decus et regine* (*o*): here my hesitation about the ascription to Philip has a different cause. The words are devoted entirely to a point-by-point moral allegoresis of features of the tabernacle prescribed in Exodus 26. This is a very unusual procedure in medieval lyrical – as against didactic – poetry. Such an introduction of methodical exegesis into lyric has certain parallels in Walter of Châtillon (45), but none, as far as I can see, in Philip.

(44) *Opera Omnia* (cit. n. 5) VI, p. cv. This point, which I made at Wolfenbüttel, has meanwhile been noted independently by Thomas Payne (cit. n. 6). Payne also rightly underlines that Philip was an archdeacon of Noyon, the city of Eligius. Yet this does not entirely persuade me that *Associa* must be by Philip: is it not precisely at Noyon that a less gifted disciple might have been tempted to write a piece for Eligius, echoing his master's voice?

(45) Cf. especially his *Propter Sion non tacebo*, *Ecce nectar roseum*, and *Versa est in lactum* (*Moralisch-sat. Gedichte*, cit. n. 1, nos. 2, 14, 17).

The final song in the Prague group, *Ave, virgo virginum* (m), is one that I would link with the two Florentine ascriptions (e, f) and the München one (h), judging them all negatively. These four hymns to Mary consist wholly of conventional phrasing, and are thus hard to imagine as being by the author of the Marian songs 1 and 2 in *Lo B*, which are replete with unusual expressions and images. Moreover, as Ludwig already showed, the München song is attributed in other manuscripts to Robert Grosseteste, the Florentine ones to a « Prior Montis acuti » (46). Of the remaining manuscript attributions to Philip, I would follow Handschin in being sceptical of the two Basel ones (a, b) in a manuscript written ca. 1400 (47); the Köln sequence for John the Baptist (g), again ascribed to Philip around 1400, seems to me to stem from the school of St Victor; and the French song (i), given to Philip in one Paris manuscript (48), cannot be his, since in the text the poet names and addresses himself:

Thiebaut congié prent,  
la mort le sorprent  
qui le contralie . . .  
O Thiebaut d'Amiens,  
tant as eüs biens  
les jors de ta vie . . .

Most recently, Christopher Page has signalled that in the *Speculum laicorum* (1279/92) « the Chancellor of Paris » is said to be the author of a *cantilena* « that begins thus: *Angelus ad virginem* » (49). But apart from the fact that it is not wholly certain that this refers, as Page assumes, to the well-known conductus (p), where the words continue *subintrans in conclave* – another, *Angelus ad virginem, Christe, destinatur* (AH I 92f), might also be meant – the very unusual manuscript transmission of the first of these songs (50), and the poetic simplicity of its language, make it unlikely to be Philip's. The second consists of seven rather trite « goliardic stanzas » (*Vagantenstrophen*), and would be an even less plausible candidate poetically.

(46) *Repertorium* I i (cit. n. 10), p. 246.

(47) JACQUES HANDSCHIN, *Die Schweiz, welche sang*, in *Festschrift Karl Nef zum 60. Geburtstag* (Zürich-Leipzig, 1933), pp. 126, 128.

(48) B.N. fr. 12581: cf. PAUL MEYER, *Romania*, I (1872), 200f.

(49) *Early Music*, XI (1983), 69f.

(50) Cf. JOHN STEVENS, « *Angelus ad virginem* »: *The History of a Medieval Song*, in *Medieval Studies for J.A.W. Bennett* (Oxford, 1981), pp. 297-328.

Space does not permit me to go into detail here about the two longer compositions in *Vagantenstrophen*, which were probably never set to music. The one (66), printed by Peiper over a century ago, is ascribed to Philip in a manuscript that also contains the dialogues between Mary and the Cross (54) and the heart and the eye (7). It is a dispute between the personified Fides and Ratio, and both the theme and its skilful treatment suggest that the manuscript attribution may well be correct. If it is correct, one might also be able to accept a suggestion Hans Walther made in 1920<sup>(51)</sup>, that the same poet may have composed the anonymously transmitted piece 88, the dispute of the Four Daughters of God – a theme to which, as we have seen, Philip alludes in his lyrics.

Together with 88 I have grouped four other pieces about which I remain tentative. With three of them – 84, 86, and 87 – I am resubmitting for consideration suggestions that were made by Dreves. 84 is a sequence that consists entirely of an extended conceit comparing Mary with the Cross – it has a quality of serious intellectual play and a technical assurance worthy of the author of *Crux, de te volo conqueri*. 86 and 87 are a pair of *Rügelieder*, preserved in three Victorine manuscripts that also contain Philip's *Cum sit omnis caro fenum* (10). Stylistically, as Dreves noted, they show many affinities with the Chancellor's songs. Formally they are very unusual, in that each uses only two rhymes in the course of its five strophes. The poet – whether or not he was Philip – was clearly familiar with the practice of *coblas unissonans* among the troubadours, and was determined to achieve something comparable in Latin.

The song 85, a conductus with refrain, is rather different: it has never been attributed to Philip, and has been virtually forgotten since Bartsch published it a century ago. It is a fervent attack on «adulterous Rome» (*Roma adultera*), where Peter lies in chains and Ecclesia «neronizes» before the eyes of her offspring: she is the mother who abuses and disembowels her children:

Neronizat in oculis      sue prolis Ecclesia . . .  
Mater suos eviscerat      natos, quibus abutitur<sup>(52)</sup>.

(51) *Das Streitgedicht in der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* (Munich 1920, repr. with additions by PAUL GERHARD SCHMIDT, Hildesheim, 1984), pp. 85-88.

(52) In the fourth verse, where Bartsch prints

Producitur in medium      cedar et Babel altera,

the text should probably be corrected to «*Sennaar et Babel altera*» (cf. Genesis 11:2).

It is not only the theme and the violent expressions that make me think of Philip: it is also the fact that the unique copy of this song is on a later leaf of the Darmstadt manuscript of the *Dicta cancellarii Parisiensis*, and that on this same leaf is copied *Quid ultra tibi facere* (38), a song that would be hard to assign to anyone but the Chancellor.

Finally I would comment briefly on one other group of songs that I have ventured to list in the bibliographical Appendix: seventeen of the anonymous compositions in *F*. While it is clear today that one cannot follow Dreves in attributing a whole section of *F* to Philip, it remains true that, in Ludwig's words, «eine Erweiterung . . . besonders durch weitere Lieder des 10. Faszikels von *F* zu erwarten ist». Yet there is no intrinsic reason for limiting attention to *F*-10 to the detriment of other fascicules. So I have listed a number of songs from several sections of *F* that seem to me, with greater or lesser force, to suggest Philip's authorship through their language, themes and conception. Naturally we cannot rule out that Philip had disciples, and I would not wish to imply, for instance, that every *Rügelied* which begins with the vocative *Homo* must be by Philip.

Among my seventeen anonyma, one (67) was proposed by Dreves<sup>(53)</sup>, two others (72, 80) by Ludwig<sup>(54)</sup>. But the one that seems to me most certain as an attribution is the vehement, blazing *descort* (68), *Deduc, Syon, uberrimas*, for which Schumann first mooted Philip's authorship<sup>(55)</sup>, and the relation of which to some of Philip's songs we have observed. The other suggestions are, to the best of my knowledge, my own, and are offered primarily as a basis for further discussion. The group is not sacrosanct, and there may turn out to be good reasons for diminishing it, as well as perhaps for increasing it<sup>(56)</sup>.

(53) *Analecta Hymnica*, XX 31.

(54) *Repertorium*, I 1 (cit. n. 10), p. 266.

(55) See n. 18 above.

(56) To comment briefly on one piece in each category: in the discussion at Wolfenbüttel, Fritz Reckow advanced some reasons for believing that 76 (*Ypocrite pseudopontifices*) alludes to events after Philip's death and thus belongs to a later generation. I had included this lyric because the following features in it had seemed to me to be characteristically «Philipic»: the vehement expressions of the opening verses - *Ypocrite . . . ecclesie duri carnifices*; the rhyme that follows these - *in crapulis | epulis*, and the expression *in cathedris | cum Iove fulminant*; the phrase *O misera conditio*, which recurs almost identically in 32 (*O conditio misera*); and above all, the exclamations near the end - *O Veritas | que sub nube latitas, | o bonitas . . . | o caritas . . . doces et habitas* - seem uncannily close in their rhyming and phrasing to both 60 (*Dic, Christi Veritas*) and 11 (*Veritas, equitas*).

I would conclude with a brief comment on one piece in this group, the conductus *Adulari nesciens* (79). Here – unusually for a *Rügelied* – the poet speaks in the first person:

Adulari nesciens  
 ab amicis deseror,  
 quos monere cupiens  
 nimis egre toleror . . .

Magna michi gloria  
 si que loquor sentiam . . .  
 Salomonis gloriam  
 nollem per mendacia.

Sed tanta severitas  
 movet michi iurgium,  
 nam scio quod veritas  
 sepe parit odium . . . (87)

I, who am ignorant of flattery, am abandoned by my friends; I long to give them counsel, they find it very hard to bear with me . . .

To me it is great glory if I live the things that I speak . . . I would not want Solomon's glory if it meant telling lies.

But such great severity brings me men's abuse, for I know that verity often arouses hatred . . .

We have enough personal poetry from both Peter of Blois and Walter of Châtillon to be able to say, I think confidently, that this remarkable piece is not theirs. It seems to fit uncannily well the personality of the poet and administrator whose passionate attachment to *veritas* and *severitas* (note the *annominatio*!) aroused such hatred in the Church and the University of his day, whose

While it cannot be wholly ruled out that this song is an imitation of Philip, the fact that it combines notable features which occur separately in a number of his songs made me inclined to think it authentic. At the same time, if Reckow's suggestive historical reasons for dating this piece later can be fully verified, then we must clearly reckon with a younger imitator who was intimately familiar with Philip's poetry. Much will depend on whether the *pseudopontifices* who fulminate in *cathedris* can be decisively identified. I had thought that Philip was here making a general, rather than specific, attack – on duplicitous bishops, who denounce or excommunicate unworthily, from the height of their episcopal thrones.

A possible addition to the list below would be the conductus for two voices *Austro terris influente* (F 299r-300v), the final melisma of which provided the melody for Philip's *Minor natus filius* (12) – words that also conclude the earlier song. GORDON ANDERSON (*Studies in Music*, V, 1971, 37) was thus inclined to attribute *Austro terris* to Philip also. Yet here the style seems to me less surely « Philippic » than in *Ypocrite* – though the verses *serpens dirus exturbatur | ad vagitum pueri, | per quem pauper liberatur, | potens datur carceri* do suggest something of Philip's timbre.

(57) I follow the text (based on four MSS) of OTTO SCHUMANN, *Die jüngere Cambridger Liedersammlung*, in *Studi medievali*, N.S. XVI (1943-1950), 62f.

numerous *Rügelieder* show how much he longed to give counsel (*monere cupiens*), and whose integrity (*que loquor sentiam*) was stressed by Henri d'Andeli, a friend who did *not* abandon him.

That *Adulari nesciens* may be by Philip, and may even carry hints of a self-portrait, is for the present only a conjecture. Yet it seems to me that, in trying to attribute some of the anonyma in *F*, further help may be possible from the musical side. If the melody of this song, or of any of the others preserved namelessly in *F*, shows clear musical links with songs acknowledged as Philip's in other sources, some conjectures could well come nearer to being certainties. But that is a problem where we must await the verdict of experts in the music of Notre Dame.

PETER DRONKE

#### APPENDIX

##### *A tentative bibliography of Philip's lyrics*

		Text	Music in Anderson and Tischler
(i) Ascribed to Philip in <i>Lo B</i> (London B.L. Egerton 274, s. XIII ex.)			
1 Ave, gloriosa virginum regina	S	AH 10, 89f	VI 107f
2 O Maria, virginei	L (2 voices)	AH 20, 141f	
3 Inter membra singula (ascr. confirmed by Salimbene)	L	AH 21, 116f	

##### Abbreviations:

C: Conductus L: *Lai lyrique* (*Leich*) M: Motet R: Rondeau S: Sequence,  
AH: *Analecta Hymnica* (cited by volume and pages).

AMw: *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft*.

Anderson: G. A. ANDERSON, *Notre-Dame and Related Conductus, Opera Omnia III 2pt Conductus - Transmitted in Four and Three Central Sources; V 2pt Conductus - Unica in the Four Central Sources; VI 1pt Conductus - Transmitted in Fascicule X of the Florence Manuscript; VIII 1pt Conductus - The Latin Rondeau Répertoire* (cited by volume and pages).

CB: *Carmina Burana*, ed. A. Hilka, O. Schumann, B. Bischoff (cited by numbers of songs).  
Jahrtausend: G. M. DREVES, C. BLUME, *Ein Jahrtausend Lateinischer Hymnendichtung*.

MARS: *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies*.

Mone: F. J. MONE, *Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters*.

Tischler: H. TISCHLER, *The Earliest Motets* (cited by 'T' and number).

For other musical editions of songs in this list, see the bibliography in R. FALCK, *The Notre Dame Conductus: A Study of the Repertory*.



4	Homo, vide que pro te patior (ascr. confirmed by Chartres 341)	C	AMw 24, 6	VI 77
5	O mens, cogita	L	AH 21, 97	VI 82ff
6	Homo, considera	C	AH 21, 93f	VI 80ff
7	Quisquis cordis et oculi (ascr. confirmed by Salimbene)	C	AH 21, 114f	VI 75f
8	Nitimur in vetitum	C	AH 21, 106	VI 77f
9	Pater sancte, dictus Lotharius	C	AH 21, 173	VI 87
10	Cum sit omnis caro fenum	C	AH 21, 95f	
11	Veritas, equitas, largitas corrui	L	AH 21, 127ff	VI 88ff
12	Minor natu filius	D	AH 21, 196	VI 116
13	Vitia virtutibus	C	AH 21, 118f	
14	Bulla fulminante	C	CB 131a	
15	Suspirat spiritus	C	AH 21, 110f	
16	Mundus a mundicia (ascr. confirmed by Paris B.N. lat. 8207)	C (2 voices)	AH 21, 144f	
17	Homo natus ad laborem / et avis	C	AH 21, 197	
18	Laqueus conteritur	M	AH 21, 195	T 272
19	Agmina milicie (ascr. confirmed by Henri d'An- deli)	M	AH 21, 195	T 34-1
20	Festa dies agitur	R	AH 20, 89	VIII 35
21	Sol est in meridie	R	AH 20, 212	VIII 35
22	Luto carens et latere	R	AH 21, 39	VIII 3
23	Tempus est gratie	R	AH 20, 31	VIII 36
24	Veni, sancte spiritus, / spes omnium	R	AH 21, 56	VIII 36
25	In salvatoris nomine	M	AH 21, 189	T 36-3
26	In veritate comperi	M	AH 21, 203	T 36-1
27	In omni fratre tuo	M	AH 21, 200f	T 221-1
28	Venditores labiorum	M	AH 21, 203	T 265-1

(ii) Ascribed to Philip in *Da* (Darmstadt 2777, s. XIII ex.)

29	Homo natus ad laborem / tui status	S	MARS 4, 74	VI 1f
30	Aristippe, quanvis sero	S	CB 189	VI 3f
31	In hoc ortus occidente	S	AH 20, 53f	VI 9ff
32	Ad cor tuum revertere	D	CB 26	VI 19ff
33	Bonum est confidere	D	CB 27	VI 51ff
34	Ve mundo a scandalis	S	AH 21, 148	VI 39f
35	Fontis in rivulum	L	AH 21, 146f	VI 11ff
36	O labilis / sortis humane status	S	AH 21, 97f	VI 44f
37	Beata viscera / Marie virginis	C	AH 20, 148f	VI 25
38	Quid ultra tibi facere	C	AH 21, 141	VI 28
39	Veritas veritatum	C	CB 21	VI 30f
40	Vanitas vanitatum	C	AH 21, 100	VI 29f
41	Excute de pulvere	C	AH 21, 105	VI 38f
42	Vide quo fastu rumperis	C	AH 21, 159	VI 21f
43	Exurge! Dormis, domine	C	AH 50, 535	VI 36f
44	Homo qui semper moreris	C	AH 21, 98f	VI 46f
45	Rex et sacerdos prefruit	D	AH 21, 173f	VI 70ff

46	Si vis vera frui luce	S	AH 50, 534f	VI 55f
47	Quo vadis, quo progredieris	C	AH 21, 107	VI 46
48	Quomodo cantabimus	C	AH 21, 165	VI 37f
49	Venit Jesus in propria	C	AH 21, 164	VI 59f
50	Beata nobis gaudia	C	AH 21, 176	VI 61f
51	Sol oritur in sidere	C	AH 20, 82f	VI 24
52	Christus assistens pontifex	C	<i>Ehregade</i> <i>K. Strecker</i> (1931) 37ff	VI 69f

## (iii) Ascribed to Philip by Salimbene

53	Homo, quam sit pura	M	AMw 24, 8f	T 21-1
54	Crux, de te volo conqueri	S	AH 21, 20ff	VI 84f
55	Centrum capit circulus [Quisquis cordis et oculi = <i>supra</i> , 7]	C (2 voices)	AH 20, 88	V 64ff
56	Pange, lingua, Magdalene	C	AH 50, 532f	
57	Estimavit hortulanum	C	AH 50, 533	
58	O Maria, noli flere	C	AH 50, 534	
59	Natus, passus dominus / resur- rexit hodie [Inter membra singula = <i>su- pra</i> , 3]	S	unidentified	

## (iv) Ascribed to Philip by Henri d'Andeli

[Agmina milicie = *supra*, 19]

## (v) Ascribed to Philip in other manuscripts

Berlin Theol. Lat. Fol. 312, and München Clm 26860:

60	Dic, Christi Veritas	C	CB 131	
Paris B.N. n. a. fr. 1050:				
61	Li cuers se vait de l'ueil plai- gnant	C	<i>Romania</i> 1 (1872) 202ff	

Praha, Knihovna Metropolitní Kapituli N. VIII:

(this MS also confirms ascr. to Philip of *supra* 1-6, 11-12, 14-16, 19, 55)

62	Vide prophetie	M	AH 49, 216f	T 94
63	Homo cum mandato / dato	M	AH 49, 217	T 95
64	Veste nuptiali	C	AH 21, 200	VI 115
65	Gedeonis area	C	J. Knapp, 35 <i>Conductus</i> , 46	

Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka I. Q. 102:

66	Phebus per dyametrum luna fu- giente ( <i>Vagantenstrophen</i> )		<i>Archiv für Lite- raturgesch.</i> 7 (1878) 420ff	
----	--	--	---	--

(vi) Ascribed to Philip in MSS, but of doubtful or mistaken attribution  
Basel, Bibl. der Univ. B XI 8:

a	O amor, deus, deitas	C	<i>Katalog II</i> (1966) 902ff	
b	Venite, exultemus	D	<i>Katalog II</i> (1966) 909ff	
Darmstadt 2777:				
c	Quo me vertam nescio (probably Peter of Blois)	L	AH 21, 143	VI 41f
d	Dum medium silentium / tene- rent legis apices (Walter of Châtillon)	C	<i>Moralisch-sat.</i> <i>Gedichte Walters</i> <i>von Châtillon,</i> <i>Strecker, 49ff</i>	VI 25f

Firenze, Laurenziana Plut. XXV 3:

e	Virgo, templum trinitatis	C	Mone II 165ff	
f	Missus Gabriel de celis	C	Mone II 55f	
Köln, Seminarbibl. 12a:				
g	Inter natos mulierum	S	AH 39, 173f	
München Clm 14940:				
h	Ave, dei genitrix et immaculata	C	Mone II 100ff	
Paris B.N. fr. 12581:				
i	J'ai un cuer mout lait / Ma joie m'annour (Thibaut d'Amiens)	C	F. Gennrich, <i>Cantilenae Piae</i> 17f	

Praha, Knihovna Metrop. Kap. N. VIII:

j	De Stephani roseo sanguine	M	AH 21, 195f	T 96
k	Adesse, festina	M	AH 49, 251ff	T 97
l	Associa / tecum in patria	C	AH 21, 194	VI 114f
m	Ave, virgo virginum	C	AH 20, 210f	
n	Doce nos optime	M	AH 21, 198	T 25
o	Regis decus et regine	S (2 voices)	—	V 83ff
Speculum laicorum MSS:				
p	Angelus ad virginem	C	J. E. Stevens, <i>Fs. J.A.W. Ben-</i> <i>nett, 297ff</i>	

(vii) Some anonymous lyrics that could be by Philip

(a) In *F* (Firenze, Laurenziana Plut. XXIX 1):

67	Consequens antecedente (327r-v)	C (2 voices)	G. Milchsack, <i>Hymni et Seq.</i> I 176	III 52ff
68	Deduc, Syon, uberrimas (336r-337r)	D (2 voices)	CB 34	III 36ff
69	Heu, quo progreditur (350v)	C (2 voices)	AH 21, 147	V 53
70	Regnum dei vim patitur (352v-353r)	C (2 voices)	AH 21, 114	III 186
71	Caput in caudam vertitur (356v-357r)	C (2 voices)	—	V 61ff

72	Clavus pungens acumine (358r-359v)	S (2 voices)	AH 21, 22f	V 67ff
73	Luget Rachel iterum (359v-360r)	C (2 voices)	—	V 71f
74	Nostrum est impletum (384r-v)	M	AH 49, 227	T 19-1
75	Homo quo vigeas (386v-387r)	M	CB 22	T 23-1
76	Ypocrite pseudopontifices (411v-412r)	M	AH 21, 202	T 71-7
77	Dum medium silentium / com- ponit omnia (422v-423r)	C	AH 20, 39f	VI 27
78	O curas hominum (424v)	C	AH 21, 151	VI 33f
79	Adulari nesciens (429v)	C	AH 21, 124f	VI 49f
80	Clavus clavo retunditur (437r-v)	C	AH 21, 169	VI 74f
81	Dogmatum falsas species (438r)	C	AH 21, 149	VI 78f
82	Homo, cur degeneras (444r-v)	C	AH 21, 99	VI 97f
83	Homo, cur properas (444v-445v)	C	AH 21, 162	VI 99f
	(b) In other sources			
84	Lignum vite querimus	S	Jahrtausend II 282f	
85	Tuum, Syon, exilium	C	Germania 1887, 254	
86	Dic, homo, cur abuteris	C	AH 45b, 68	
87	O Christi longanimitas	C	AH 45b, 69	
88	Post peccatum hominis ( <i>Vagantenstrophen</i> )		AH 46, 377ff	