



The Montpellier Codex

The Final Fascicle

Contents, Contexts, Chronologies

Edited by

Catherine A. Bradley and
Karen Desmond

The Montpellier Codex

Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Music

ISSN 1479-9294

General Editors

Tess Knighton

Helen Deeming

This series aims to provide a forum for the best scholarship in early music; deliberately broad in scope, it welcomes proposals on any aspect of music, musical life, and composers during the period up to 1600, and particularly encourages work that places music in an historical and social context. Both new research and major reassessments of central topics are encouraged.

Proposals or enquiries may be sent directly to the editors or the publisher at the addresses given below; all submissions will receive careful, informed consideration.

Professor Tess Knighton, Institutio Mila i Fontanals/CSIC,
c/ Egipcíacues, Barcelona 08001, Spain

Dr Helen Deeming, Department of Music, Royal Holloway,
University of London, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX

Boydell & Brewer, PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF

Previously published titles in the series are listed at the back of this volume.

The Montpellier Codex
The Final Fascicle
Contents, Contexts, Chronologies

Edited by

Catherine A. Bradley
Karen Desmond

THE BOYDELL PRESS

© Contributors 2018

All Rights Reserved. Except as permitted under current legislation no part of this work may be photocopied, stored in a retrieval system, published, performed in public, adapted, broadcast, transmitted, recorded, or reproduced in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of the copyright owner

First published 2018
The Boydell Press, Woodbridge

ISBN 978-1-78327-272-3

The Boydell Press is an imprint of Boydell & Brewer Ltd
PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF, UK
and of Boydell & Brewer Inc.
668 Mt Hope Avenue, Rochester, NY 14620-2731, USA
website: www.boydellandbrewer.com

A CIP catalogue record for this title is available
from the British Library

The publisher has no responsibility for the continued existence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this book, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate

This publication is printed on acid-free paper

Typeset in Adobe Arno Pro by
Sparks Publishing Services Ltd—www.sparkspublishing.com

Contents

Figures vii

Musical examples ix

Tables xi

Acknowledgements xii

List of manuscript sigla xiii

Abbreviations xv

Table of fascicle 8 contents xvi

Introduction 1

Catherine A. Bradley and Karen Desmond

I THE MATERIAL OBJECT

1. Montpellier 8: Anatomy of ... 13
Mark Everist
2. A Palaeographical Analysis of the Verbal Text in Montpellier 8:
Problems, Implications, Opportunities 32
Sean Curran
3. The Style and Iconography of Montpellier folio 35or 66
Alison Stones
4. The Decoration of Montpellier 8: Its Place in the Continuum
of Parisian Manuscript Illumination 78
Rebecca A. Baltzer
5. Double Motet Layouts in the Montpellier Codex and
Contemporaneous *Libri motetorum* 90
Oliver Huck
6. *Deus in adiutorium* Revisited: Sources and Contexts 100
Eva M. Maschke
7. Thematic Clusters and Compilational Strategies in Montpellier 8 121
Anna Kathryn Grau

II INNOVATION AND TRADITION

8. Texture, Rhythm, and Stylistic Groupings in Montpellier 8 Motets 139
Karen Desmond
9. *Je le témoin en mon chant*: The Art of Diminution in the
Petronian Triplum 161
David Maw
10. How Rhythmically Innovative is Montpellier 8? 184
Mary E. Wolinski
11. Re-Presentation in the *Ars antiqua*: From Chant to Polyphony 197
Solomon Guhl-Miller
12. ... *Que ne dit 'cief bien seans'*: Quoting Motets in Montpellier 8 211
Anne Ibos-Augé

III ANALYTICAL CASE STUDIES

13. Montpellier 8 *PORTARE* Motets and Tonal Exploration 233
Dolores Pesce
14. Repetitions, Rhythmical Evolution, and Rhetoric in the Montpellier
Codex 254
Margaret Dobby
15. Shedding Light on **Mo** 8,304: *Alma virgo virginum/Benedicta es, Maria* 269
Rachel Davies
16. A Performance and Reception History of *On parole/A Paris/FRESE*
NOUVELE 283
Edward Breen

Bibliography 299

Contributors 313

General index 315

Index of compositions, alphabetical 327

Index of compositions in **Mo**, manuscript order 331

Figures

- Figure 2.1 **Mo**, fol. 354r (photo: BIU Montpellier) 36
- Figure 2.2 **Mo** 8, further sampler of script features (photos: BIU Montpellier) 40
- Figure 3.1a **Mo** 8, fol. 350r, D, clerics chanting (photo: BIU Montpellier/DIAMM, University of Oxford) 67
- Figure 3.1b **Mo**, fol. 1r, D, clerics chanting (photo: BIU Montpellier/IRHT [CNRS]) 67
- Figure 3.2 **Mo**, fol. 350r, border: greyhound chasing hare (photo: BIU Montpellier/DIAMM, University of Oxford) 68
- Figure 3.3 Santa Barbara, Special Collections BS75 1250, Bible, fol. 161r, Psalm 97, C, clerics chanting (photo: Alison Stones, by permission of the Department of Special Research Collections UCSB Library, University of California Santa Barbara, CA) 69
- Figure 3.4 Private Collection, Psalter-Hours, fol. 242v, Psalm 119, A, clerics chanting (photo: Alison Stones, courtesy of the Emmanuel Boussard Library) 69
- Figure 3.5 **W**₂, fol. 31r, S, clerics chanting (photo: Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel, with permission) 70
- Figure 3.6 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France (BnF), n.a.l. 3145, Hours of Jeanne de Navarre, fol. 91v, St Louis at mass with clerics chanting (photo: BnF, with permission) 72
- Figure 3.7 **Mo**, fol. 5v, V, Virgin and Child (photo: BIU Montpellier, with permission) 73
- Figure 3.8a Le Mans, Médiathèque Louis-Aragon, 262, Bible, vol. 2, fol. 239v, Canticum canticorum, Virgin and Child (photo: Alison Stones, by permission of Le Mans) 74
- Figure 3.8b Paris, BnF lat. 248, Bible of Philippe le Bel, fol. 495v, Canticum canticorum, Virgin and Child (photo: BnF, with permission) 74
- Figure 3.9 Paris, BnF fr. 2030, Henri de Mondeville, *Chirurgie*, fol. 29, male and female internal organs (photo: BnF, with permission) 76
- Figure 3.10 Ghent, Univ. Bibl. 233, Ceremonial of St Peter Blandin, fols 67v–68r, Crucifixion and Three Maries at the Sepulchre; T, Moses and the Brazen Serpent (photo: Ghent University Library, BHSL. HS.0233) 77

- Figure 4.1 **Mo**, fol. 270r, top (photo: BIU Montpellier) 80
- Figure 4.2 Stadtbibliothek Nürnberg, Solg. Ms. 4.4°, fol. 22r, Dormition of the Virgin (photo: Stadtbibliothek Nürnberg) 82
- Figure 4.3 Paris, BnF lat. 248, Bible of Philippe le Bel, fol. 47v, initial for Exodus (photo: BnF) 85
- Figure 4.4 Paris, BnF fr. 2090, fol. 1r (photo: BnF) 86
- Figure 4.5 Lyon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 5122, fol. 291r (photo: Bibl. virtuelle des mss médiévaux (BVMM), licence CC BY NC 3.0) 87
- Figure 5.1 Motet page layouts 91
- Figure 7.1 Chiastic arrangement of motets in **Mo** 8 133

The editors, contributors, and publishers are grateful to all the institutions and persons listed for permission to reproduce the materials in which they hold copyright. Every effort has been made to trace the copyright holders; apologies are offered for any omission, and the publishers will be pleased to add any necessary acknowledgement in subsequent editions.

Musical examples

- Example 8.1a **Mo** 8,329, longs 1–8, an example of a ‘334’ profile 144
- Example 8.1b **Mo** 8,317, longs 1–3, an example of a ‘135’ profile 144
- Example 8.2 **Mo** 8,342, longs 1–5, an example of a ‘235’ profile 148
- Example 9.1 ‘Lexicon’ of Petronian groups in **Mo** 166–8
- Example 9.2 Petronian groups in performance practice:
- a. Added 4-groups in **Tu** 169
 - b. Apparent Petronian groups in the Vatican Organum Treatise 169
- Example 9.3 Use of Petronian groups in **Mo** 8,317 171
- Example 9.4 Declamatory use of SSBB:
- a. Florid Petronian groups and SSBB in first phrase of **Mo** 7,264 173
 - b. SSBB in first two phrases of **Mo** 7,289/8,338 173
- Example 9.5 Changing settings of repeated versification schemes:
- a. Ninth and tenth phrases of **Mo** 7,299 176
 - b. First and second phrases of **Mo** 7,254 176
- Example 9.6 Revisions to **Mo** 7,289 in **Mo** 8,338:
- a. Comparison of texts of tenth phrase 178
 - b. Comparison of contrapuntal structures of tenth phrase 178
 - c. Comparison of syllabic rhythms of tenth phrase 178
 - d. Revision to final cadence of 289/338 178
- Example 10.1 **Mo** 8,311, *Se je chante/Bien doi amer/ET SPERABIT*, fol. 358r 188
- Example 10.2 **Mo** 8,332, *Je cuidoie/Se j’ai folement/SOLEM*, fol. 382v 188
- Example 10.3 *Entitio* in the three ordines of Anonymous IV’s imperfect sixth mode 194
- Example 10.4 **Mo** 8,340, *Balam inquit/Balam inquit/BALLAAM*, fol. 393r 195
- Example 11.1a Vatican Organum Treatise, fol. 48r, examples 237–9 200
- Example 11.1b Transcription of the opening of *Iudea et Iherusalem*, **F**, fol. 65r 200
- Example 11.2a Excerpt from *Au cuer/Ja ne m’en repentirai/JOLIETEMENT* (**Mo** 7,260), with variants 203
- Example 11.2b Skeletal structure of excerpt from *Au cuer/Ja ne m’en repentirai/JOLIETEMENT* (**Mo** 7,260) 203
- Example 11.3 Excerpt from *Descendit de caelis* (perfs 105–16) 206
- Example 11.4 Perfections 1–9 and 27–30 of **Mo** 8,317 209
- Example 12.1 *Par une matinee, el moys joli d’avril* in M896 and M807 (perfs 1–4) 217
- Example 12.2 *Dame de valour* in M896 (perfs 14–19) and M363 (perfs 1–6) 217
- Example 12.3 *Li dous penser* in M896 (perfs 30–2) and M881 (perfs 1–4) 218

- Example 12.4 *Bien me doi* in M896 (perfs 33–5) and M611 (perfs 1–3) 218
- Example 12.5 *Chele m'a tollu* and *Lonc tans a* in M901 (perfs 1–4 and 7–12) and M511 (perfs 1–5) 224
- Example 12.6 *En grant effroi* in M901 (perfs 15–18) and M374 (perfs 1–4) 224
- Example 12.7 *Maubatus longuement* in M901 (perfs 25–9) and M707 (perfs 1–3 and 12–13) 225
- Example 12.8 *Sans penser folour* in M901 (perfs 50–3) and M890 (perfs 1–5) 225
- Chapter 12 Appendix 1 Analysis of recurring elements in *Par une matinee/O clemencie/D'UN JOLI DART* 227
- Chapter 12 Appendix 2 Analysis of recurring elements in *Au tans nouvel/Chele m'a tollu/J'AI FAIT TOUT NOUVELETEMENT* 228–30
- Example 13.1 *Sustinere* from *Alleluia dulce lignum* (BnF lat. 1112, fol. 169v) 238
- Example 13.2 **Mo** 7,296 reduction 239
- Example 13.3 **Mo** 8,305 reduction 244–5
- Example 13.4 **Mo** 8,335 reduction 248–51
- Example 14.1 The opening of *Iam nubes/Iam sydus/SOLEM* (**Mo** 7,275) 259
- Example 14.2 The conclusion of *Iam nubes/Iam sydus/SOLEM* (**Mo** 7,275) 261
- Example 14.3 The opening of *Je cuidoie/Se j'ai folement/SOLEM* (**Mo** 8,332) 266
- Example 15.1a The twenty-three pitches of **Mo** 304's tenor 272
- Example 15.1b The *et amara* melisma from the Holy Saturday responsory *Plange quasi virgo*, Sarum Antiphonal, pl. 223 272
- Example 15.1c The *et amara* melisma from the Holy Saturday responsory *Plange quasi virgo*, BnF lat. 15181, fol. 291r 272
- Example 15.1d The melisma for the neuma for the eighth mode 272

Tables

Table 1.1	Contents of Mo by fascicle	14
Table 1.2	Mo 8 works with concordances	18
Table 1.3	<i>Virginal/Descendi/ALMA [REDEMPTORIS MATER]</i> concordances	19
Table 1.4	<i>La bele estoile/La bele, en qui/IOHANNE</i> concordances	20
Table 1.5	English compositions in Mo 8: Group 1	22
Table 1.6	English compositions in Mo 8: Group 2	22
Table 1.7	Repertoire of confraternity motets	26
Table 1.8	Motets using <i>Chose Tassin</i> and <i>Chose Loyset</i> tenors	28
Table 1.9	Motets with French song tenors and their use in upper parts	30
Table 2.1	Changes of pen and ink in Mo 8, fols 372r–381v (motets 322–331)	46
Table 5.1	Concordances with the final fascicle and their layouts	93
Table 6.1	Monophonic versions and transmission of the text of <i>Deus in adiutorium intende</i>	104
Table 6.2	Polyphonic versions of <i>Deus in adiutorium intende</i>	105
Table 7.1	Motet cluster in Mo 8	125
Table 7.2	Texts and translations of Mo 8,338/7,289 and Mo 8,343	132
Table 8.1	Rhythmic profiles of Mo 8 motets	142–3
Table 8.2	Styles of rhythmic motion that are found across the triplum and motetus parts of Mo 8 motets	151
Table 8.3	Rhythmic profiles of Onc	155
Table 8.4	Rhythmic profiles of Tours motets	156
Chapter 8	Appendix	
	Table 8.5a ‘233’ Group	159
	Table 8.5b ‘235’ Group	159
	Table 8.5c ‘223’ Group	160
	Table 8.5d ‘135’ Group	160
Table 9.1	Statistical analysis of breve subdivision in tripla of Petronian motets in Mo	164
Table 10.1	The six rhythmic modes of Johannes de Garlandia	185
Table 10.2	First and second perfect and imperfect modes	190
Table 11.1	Melodic flourishes on weak beats in Mo 7 and 8 motets	202
Table 12.1	<i>Par une matinee</i> and its quotations	213
Table 12.2	M896 and its quotations: textual comparison	214–5
Table 12.3	<i>Chele m’a tollu</i> and its quotations	220
Table 12.4	M901 and its quotations: textual comparison	222–3
Table 14.1	Repetitions in the polyphony induced by the tenor	260
Table 16.1	First recordings of <i>On parole/A Paris/FRESE NOUVELE</i> (Mo 8,319)	285

Acknowledgements

THIS volume derives from the two-day international conference *Montpellier 8*, which took place at St Hugh's College, Oxford on 20–21 March 2014. *Montpellier 8* was generously supported by the John Fell Oxford University Press Research Fund; the Faculty of Music, University of Oxford; St Hugh's College, Oxford; the Plainsong and Medieval Music Society; the Royal Musical Association; the Society for the Study of Medieval Languages and Literature; and the University of Southampton. The publication of this volume has been made possible by awards from the Music and Letters Trust and the Plainsong and Medieval Music Society. Karen Desmond acknowledges the support of the National Endowment for the Humanities, for a Research Fellowship in 2014. We also thank Pascaline Todeschini from the Bibliothèque interuniversitaire de Montpellier.

We are enormously grateful to Elizabeth Eva Leach, who enabled and inspired the entire project. We especially thank all of the conference participants – speakers, chairs, delegates – and, in particular, Mark Everist for his keynote address, Margaret Bent and Emma Dillon for their generously given advice and support, and all those who offered invaluable practical and administrative assistance, especially Matthew Thomson. Caroline Palmer, at Boydell and Brewer, has provided unstinting support in the preparation of the current volume, and Helen Deeming was instrumental in shaping its form and conceptualization.

This volume owes everything to the essays of its contributors and we thank them warmly.

List of manuscript sigla

ArsA	Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, 135
Arras fragment	Lost (copy in private collection viewed and catalogued by Friedrich Ludwig in 1906)
Ba	Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Msc. Lit. 115
Bes	Besançon, Bibliothèque municipale, 716
Br	Brussels, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, 19606
Cambrai	Cambrai, Médiathèque d'agglomération (formerly Bibliothèque municipale), B 1328; and Cambrai, Médiathèque d'agglomération, Inc. B 165 (fragments now bound in B 165 were part of B 1328)
Cgc 512/543	Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, 512/543
Cl	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, n.a.f. 13521, 'La Clayette manuscript'
Da	Darmstadt, Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek, 3471
Douce	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 308
Douce 139	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 139
DRc 20	Durham, Cathedral Library, C. I. 20
F	Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 29.1
Fauv	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, fr. 146, 'Interpolated Roman de Fauvel'
Ha	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, fr. 25566, 'Adam de la Halle manuscript'
Hu	Burgos, Monasterio de Las Huelgas, II (formerly IX)
Lbl Add 24198	London, British Library, Add. 24198
LoA	London, British Library, Egerton 2615
LoC	London, British Library, Add. 30091
LoD	London, British Library, Add. 27630
LoHa	London, British Library, Harley 978
Ma	Madrid, Biblioteca nacional, 20486
Mo	Montpellier, Bibliothèque interuniversitaire, Bibliothèque universitaire de médecine, H. 196

MüB	Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 16444 (Musikfragmente E III 230–31)
MüC	Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 5539
N	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, fr. 12615, 'Noailles chansonnier'
Ob 7	Oxford, Bodleian Library, e Mus. 7
Ob 594	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 594
Onc	Oxford, New College Library, 362
ORawl	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson C. 400*
R	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, fr. 844, 'Manuscrit du Roi'
Sl	London, British Library, Sloane 1210
StV	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 15139, 'Saint Victor manuscript'
Tours	Tours, Bibliothèque municipale, 925
Trem	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, n.a.f. 23190, 'Trémoille manuscript'
Trier C	Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 322/1994
Tu	Turin, Biblioteca Reale, Vari 42 (formerly part of E. X. 73/ H. 59)
Vorau	Vorau, Bibliothek des Augustiner Chorherrenstifts, 23 (Fragment 118D)
W₁	Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 628 Helmst. (Heinemann no. 677)
W₂	Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 1099 Helmst. (Heinemann no. 1206)
Worc	Worcester, Cathedral Library, Add. 68; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Latin liturgical d. 20; and London, British Library, Add. 25031
Ym	York, Minster Library, xvi. N. 3

Abbreviations

Add.	Additional
Bibl. mun.	Bibliothèque municipale
BIU	Bibliothèque interuniversitaire
BL	British Library
BnF	Bibliothèque nationale de France
CH Anon 5	Anonymous V (<i>De arte discantandi</i>) of Edmond Coussemaker, <i>Histoire de l'harmonie au moyen-âge</i> (Paris, 1852), 262–273
CPI	<i>Cantum pulcriorem invenire</i> conductus database (http://catalogue.conductus.ac.uk)
DIAMM	Digital Image Archive of Medieval Music (https://www.diamm.ac.uk)
<i>Gallica</i>	http://gallica.bnf.fr
lat.	latin
n.a.f.	nouvelles acquisitions françaises
n.a.l.	nouvelles acquisitions latines
PMFC	<i>Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century</i> (Éditions Oiseau-Lyre, Monaco)
RISM	Répertoire internationale des sources musicales

Table of fascicle 8 contents

Latin texts are highlighted in bold to allow for quick identification of Latin double motets and bilingual motets.
Numbers assigned in Ludwig (1910) 1964/Gennrich 1957 are given in square brackets.

No in Mo	Folio ¹	Gathering	Triplum	Motetus	Tenor	Concordances
303	350r	I			DEUS IN ADIUTORIUM	Tu; Br
304	350v–351v		Alma virgo virginum [927]	Benedicta es, Maria [928]	[TENOR]	
305	351v–352v		Mout ai longuement Amour [301]	Li dous maus d'amer [302]	PORTARE [M 22]	
306	352v–353r		O presul eximie [575]	O virtutis speculum [576]	SACERDOTUM [M 77]	
307	353v–354v		Dieus, comment porrai laisser [602]	O regina glorie [603]	NOBIS CONCEDAS [VENIAM PER SECULA] O BENIGNA [M 85]	
308	355r–355v		Audi, mater generosa [789]	Imperatrix potentis gracia [790]	NEUMA	Douce ; quoted in Anonymous of St Emmeram
309	355v–356v		Par une matinee, el moys joli d'avril [896]	O clemencie [897]	D'UN JOLI DART	
310	357r–357v		In sompnis, mira Dei nuncia monerunt [851/595a]	Amours me commande et prie [852/595b]	IN SOMPNIS [M 81]	
311	357v–359v	II (begins fol. 358r)	Se je chante, ce fait Amour [514]	Bien doi amer mon ami [515]	ET SPERABIT [M 49]	
312	359v–361r		Au tans nouvel, que naissent flours [900]	Chele m'a tollu [901]	J'AI FAIT TOUT NOUVELETEMENT	
313	361v–362r		L'autre jour me chevauchois [902]	L'autrier, joiant et joli [903]	VILAIN LIEVE SUS O	

¹ This foliation follows that established by Yvonne Rokseth in 1939; it corresponds to the ink numerals at the top centre of the manuscript (rather than the pencil foliation at the top right, which is two integers behind).

No in Mo	Folio'	Gathering	Triplum	Motetus	Tenor	Concordances
314	362r–363v		Dieus, comment puet li cuers durer [929]	Vo vair oel m'ont esprins [930]	TENOR	
315	364r–364v		Porta preminentie [853]	Porta penitentie [854]	PORTAS	
316	364v–365v		Se je sui liés et chantans [39]	Jolietement [40]	OMNES [M 1]	
317	366r–367r	III	Aucun, qui ne sevent servir [777]	Iure tuis laudibus [778]	[VIRGO] MARIA [O 49]	
318	367v–368v		Tout solas et toute joie [894]	Bone Amour, qui les siens doctrine et aprent [895]	NE ME BLASMES MIE	Tu
319	368v–369v		On parole de batre et de vanner [904]	A Paris soir et matin [905]	FRESE NOUVELE MURE FRANCE MURE MURE FRANCE	
320	369v–370v		En mai, quant rosier florist [796]	J'ai trouvé, qui m'amera [795]	FIAT TENOR [O 50]	Tu; N; Stv
321	371r–371v		De mes amours sui souvent repentis [898]	L'autrier m'estuet venue volenté [899]	DEFORS COMPIEGNE	Douce
322	372r–373r		Marie assumptio [931]	Huius chori suscipe cantica [932]	TENOR	
323	373r–374r		Li savours de mon desir [906]	Li grant desirs, qui j'ai de recouvrer [907]	NON VEUL MARI	
324	374r–375r	IV	Quant se depart li jolis tans [207]	Hé, cuer joli! [208]	IN SECULUM [M 13]	
325	375v–376v		S'on me regarde [908]	Prennés i garde [909]	HÉ, MI ENFANT	
326	376v–377v		Benedicta Marie virginis [409]	Beate virginis [410]	BENEDICTA. TENOR [M 32]	
327	377v–378r		Per omnia secula seculorum, Maria [626]	Per omnia seculorum, secula virgo [627]	PER OMNIA SECULA	
328	378v–379r		Amor potest conqueri [933]	Ad amorem sequitur [934]	TENOR	
329	379r–379v		Ave, mundi gaudium [742]	Ave, salus hominum [743]	APTATUR. TENOR [O 45]	
330	379v–381r		Virginal decus et presidium [769]	Descendi in [h]ortum meum [767]	ALMA [REDEMPTORIS MATER] [O 47]	Mo 7; Ba; Da; ArsA; LoD

No in Mo	Folio'	Gathering	Triplum	Motetus	Tenor	Concordances
331	381r–381v		Descendo Dominus [815]	Ascendendo Dominus [816]	DOMINO	
332	382r–383v	V	Je cuidioie bien metre [703]	Se j'ai folement amé [704]	SOLEM [O 19]	
333	383v–385r		Amours m'a pris; defendre ne me doi [909a]	Bien me maine bone Amour [909b]	RIENS NE VOUS VAUT	
334	385v–386v		A maistre Jehan lardier [269]	Pour la plus jolie [270]	ALLELUYA [M 22]	
335	386v–388r		Cis a petit de bien en li [303]	Pluseur dient, que j'aim par amours [304]	PORTARE [M 22]	
336	388r–389r		Puisqu'en amer loiaument me sui mis [209]	Quant li jolis tans doit entrer [210]	IN SECULUM [M 13]	Arras frag
337	389r–390r		Dame, que je n'os noumer [909c]	Amis, donc est engenree [909d]	LONC TANS A QUE NE VI M'AMIE	
338	390r–391v	VI	Amours, qui si me maistrie [701]	Solem iusticie leticie [702]	SOLEM [O 19]	Mo 7
339	392r–393v		Alle psallite cum luya [584]	Alle psallite cum luya [584]	ALLELUYA [M 78a]	Worc frag xxviii; Worc frag xxxv; ORawl
340	392v–393v		Balam inquit vaticinans [594]	Balam inquit vaticinans [594]	BALLAAM [M 81]	Onc
341	393v–394v		Huic ut placuit, tres magi mistica [595]	Huic ut placuit, tres magi mistica [595]	[HUIC MAGI] [M 81]	Onc
342	394v–395r		Qui d'amours n'a riens gousté [577]	Tant me plaist Amour servir [578]	VIRGA YESSE [M 78]	
343	395v–396r		Virginis eximie celebrantur [705]	N[o]stra salus oritur [706]	CERNERE [O 19]	
344	396v–397r		O castitatis lilium [624]	Assumpta in gloria [625]	KYRIELEISON	
345	397r–397v		La bele estoile de mer [389]	La bele, en qui [388]	IOHANNE. TENOR [M 29]	Mo 2; W 2; MüB; Ba

Introduction

CATHERINE A. BRADLEY AND KAREN DESMOND

ONE of the most important manuscript witnesses to polyphonic music in the Middle Ages resides in the library of Montpellier's historic medical school. The so-called Montpellier codex (Bibliothèque interuniversitaire, Bibliothèque universitaire de médecine, H. 196, hereafter **Mo**) is modest in dimensions,¹ but it contains the largest medieval motet collection in existence,² and is packed with gorgeous gold-leaf illuminations, historiated initials, decorative borders, and exquisite music calligraphy. Unsurprisingly, this comprehensive and beautiful manuscript has long attracted scholarly attention and the details of its production are, in the main, well established and widely accepted. It seems that the earliest layer of the book – commonly referred to as **Mo**'s 'old corpus' – was produced in Paris in the late 1270s or 1280s. This old corpus comprises four internal fascicles (numbers 2–6), discrete sections of the manuscript usually devoted to certain musical genres or stylistic types, with the opening of each new fascicle clearly signaled by a historiated initial. **Mo**'s old corpus was later bookended by two additional fascicles (numbers 1 and 7), probably in the 1290s.³ But the last stage in **Mo**'s compilation, and the status of its final fascicle – number 8, containing forty-three three-voice compositions – remains mysterious and contested. Most scholars agree that the forty-eight folios appended to the end of **Mo** must be chronologically later than the rest of the codex, but just how much later is still in question. Intriguingly, the contents of fascicle 8 straddle a crucial historiographical juncture: alongside examples of the established thirteenth-century motet tradition represented by the earlier parts of **Mo**, fascicle 8 features musical and notational techniques conventionally associated with newer practices. Why and at what date was fascicle 8 produced? Was it intended to be part of **Mo** from the outset? And how and why might this eclectic collection of different types of compositions – some perceptibly outmoded, others noticeably innovative – have come about? The essays in this volume engage with these fundamental questions, challenging and undercutting a still pervasive historiographical division between the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in the study of medieval music.

A slight section of a single manuscript – albeit a provocative and little understood one – **Mo** 8 might seem an unusual subject for book-length investigation. Yet the fascicle merits detailed consideration on its own terms, not only because of its idiosyncratic contents and historiographical status but also because of the manner of its presentation within **Mo**. Fascicle 8 opens with a musical setting of the liturgical versicle *Deus in adiutorium*, a conventional gesture to mark the beginning

¹ At 192 × 136mm **Mo** is just smaller than an A5 page.

² **Mo** records 337 individual musical compositions, 327 of which are motets.

³ Supplements (or appendices) were also added to fascicles 3 and 5 at this time. The status of fascicle 7's two later supplements is discussed in detail by Everist in Chapter 1; see also n. 6 below.

of a motet book and one employed also at the outset of **Mo**'s first fascicle.⁴ This choice of opening piece asserts fascicle 8's identity as an autonomous collection. At the same time, however, the historiated initial contained within the letter 'D' underlines the fascicle's connection to the rest of the codex. Alison Stones draws attention to the fact that, although the initial is painted by an artist whose decorations are exclusive to fascicle 8, it closely resembles the three singing clerics that appear within the 'D' of *Deus in adiutorium* at the outset of **Mo**. The arrangement of the singing figures, their red silk copes, and the highly unusual folding lectern upon which their music book rests create a symmetry between the historiated initials of fascicles 1 and 8 (see Figure 3.1a and 3.1b).⁵ The circumstances of fascicle 8's opening *Deus in adiutorium* encapsulate its complex relationship to the earlier parts of the manuscript, a relationship explored from a variety of perspectives in this volume. The beginning of the fascicle simultaneously signals its profound independence from – yet awareness of – **Mo** as a whole.

In many respects, it is an impression of independence that prevails in fascicle 8. Its forty-eight folios are copied by a single scribe, whose work – just like that of the illuminator's – is found exclusively in this section of the codex. Significantly, **Mo** begins with an index that lists the contents only of fascicles 1–7, according with the series of folio numbers that spans the first seven fascicles, inked in Roman numerals and centred in the top margin.⁶ Fascicle 8 not only did not receive this Roman foliation, but it bears traces of a self-contained Arabic sequence, positioned top right, and running from 1 to 48.⁷ Although Mary E. Wolinski has argued convincingly that the Arabic numerals are in a later (fifteenth- or sixteenth-century) hand, the fact that fascicle 8 ever received a separate foliation is telling, particularly when coupled with its absence from the index.⁸ It is far from certain, therefore, that fascicle 8 was intended simply to be an additional 'part' of the larger codex, prior to **Mo**'s current seventeenth- or eighteenth-century binding.⁹ Furthermore, at whatever point the various layers of **Mo** were trimmed and joined together, all of fascicle 8's illustrative borders survived carefully intact, while fascicles 1–7 – presumably trimmed to match the comparatively smaller folios of fascicle 8 – lost some of their outlying decorations.¹⁰ This suggests that fascicle 8 had already been trimmed by itself

⁴ Paradoxically, this conventional opening for a motet book, *Deus in adiutorium*, is the only non-motet in fascicle 8. It more closely resembles a conductus (with its monotextual presentation and lack of a plainchant tenor).

⁵ See Stones's discussion of the rare folding lectern on pp. 68–71.

⁶ This Roman foliation terminates before the two supplements to fascicle 7, whose contents are also absent from the index. In Chapter 1, Everist discusses these supplements to fascicle 7 alongside the contents of fascicle 8, considering them to be broadly contemporary. Stones, however, believes decorations in the supplements to fascicle 7 and in fascicle 8 to be the work of different artists (see p. 75 n. 14).

⁷ Most of these Arabic folio numbers have been trimmed away, but the sequence 10–12 on fols 359r–361r is still clearly visible.

⁸ See Wolinski 1992, 287–8.

⁹ See Baltzer's discussion of the binding and its date on pp. 78–9.

¹⁰ This is Baltzer's observation: see her discussion on p. 78 and the list of examples in p. 78 n. 5.

before it was joined with the rest of the manuscript: if the various layers of **Mo** had all been trimmed at once, this would presumably have been done more generously, to better accommodate fascicles 1–7.

Fascicle 8's autonomy is further underlined by its musical contents, which are predominantly unique to the collection in question. Just twelve of the fascicle's forty-three pieces are recorded elsewhere; only two of these are widely disseminated; and no other extant manuscript shares more than three works with fascicle 8.¹¹ This stands in sharp contrast to the immediately preceding fascicle in **Mo**, in which the situation is effectively reversed: thirty-two out of thirty-nine motets have external witnesses outside fascicle 7, whose repertoire overlaps substantially with that presented in other motet collections.¹² Fascicle 8's unprecedented lack of concordances and connections – in the context of **Mo** and of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century music manuscripts more broadly – suggests that the circumstances and motivations for its compilation were unusual. It seems likely that the fascicle did not draw on any existing large-scale or formally arranged collection but instead attempted to gather together diverse works that were not widely available elsewhere. This accords with understandings of the copying process and page layout presented here by Sean Curran and Oliver Huck, in which fascicle 8's scribe seems to be grappling with the format of different exemplars. A hypothesis of differently formatted and variously sourced exemplars also fits with the stylistic diversity of the fascicle's contents, as does its inclusion of three compositions that are attested only in fourteenth-century English manuscripts and were probably of English origin.¹³ The creators of fascicle 8 evidently had a wide variety of materials at their disposal. Given the striking paucity of additional manuscript witnesses, it seems plausible that they consciously selected and sought to preserve works that they recognized as rare and unusual.

Paradoxically, the lack of duplication between fascicle 8 and the rest of **Mo** might in fact link the fascicle more closely to its host codex. Three motets in fascicle 8 are also found earlier in **Mo**. This is a considerable overlap by fascicle 8's own standards, but given the very large quantity of material recorded in **Mo** fascicles 1–7 it is a remarkably small number. Furthermore, two fascicle 7 motets that re-appear in fascicle 8 do so in noticeably different forms, one with a different top-voice or triplum (musically more modern and with a contrafact text) and the other also musically revised.¹⁴ Significantly, the single motet in fascicle 8 that replicates earlier material is the fascicle's most widely disseminated work: found in a four-part version in **Mo**'s old corpus (fascicle 2), it is reproduced (now in three parts) as the codex's closing item. An awareness of the contents of **Mo** 1–7 in the preparation of fascicle 8 is in line with the kinship between the opening historiated initials in fascicles 1 and 8, but it complicates other indications of fascicle 8's autonomy. Does this mean that fascicle 8 was, from its conception, intended to follow fascicles 1–7 of

¹¹ See Everist's list of concordances in Table 1.2, p. 18.

¹² **Mo** 7 has seventeen works in common with **Ba** and sixteen with **Tu**.

¹³ See Everist, pp. 21–4, and Grau, pp. 135–6.

¹⁴ See Maw, pp. 176–8. Maw proposes a progressive chronology of the Petronian style that spans the compositions of fascicles 7 and 8.

Mo, its traces of independent foliation simply a red herring and its 'opening' *Deus in adiutorium* a conceit? It seems more likely that fascicle 8 was meant to begin a new book, one deliberately fashioned in the same mould, perhaps as a sort of independent companion or successor to **Mo**, which never came to fruition.

Connections to other parts of **Mo** beg the question as to when and where fascicle 8 was produced: by a different scribe and artist but in close chronological and geographical proximity to the rest of the codex; or, alternatively, at sufficient distance (in either or both respects) to account for the independence of contents. The likely Parisian provenance of fascicle 8, along with the rest of **Mo**, is not directly challenged here. Mark Everist's identification of **Mo** 8 as an important witness to a group of motets linked to Parisian confraternities, for instance, suggests an origin and reception in Paris for at least this portion of the fascicle's repertoire.¹⁵ However, certain findings presented in the current volume indicate that **Mo** 8 may not be a typical or purely Parisian production. It is telling that efforts by Rebecca Baltzer and Alison Stones to find the work of fascicle 8's artist in a very wide range of Parisian books have not yielded any definitive match, and this has encouraged Stones to moot here the possibility that the fascicle travelled north for its decoration. Karen Desmond has aligned the rhythmic behaviour of fascicle 8's motets with early fourteenth-century English collections, and techniques of modal rhythm explored by Mary E. Wolinski similarly feature in sources and theoretical documents of English provenance.

This volume, therefore, opens up for further discussion the question of fascicle 8's geographical origins, and those of its exemplars. It also offers firmer and important new evidence concerning the date of **Mo** 8. Stones proposes that the fascicle was decorated between 1315 and 1325, while – also on art historical grounds – Baltzer favours a date in the 1310s, probably early in that decade. These hypotheses are broadly compatible with Curran's tentative ascription of a slightly earlier date, somewhere between 1290 and 1310, for the fascicle's scribal hand, based on a comprehensive comparison of hands found in dated and datable manuscripts of French, and particularly Parisian, origin.

A date in the fourteenth century for the production of fascicle 8 is significant, since none of the earlier parts of **Mo** are considered to be any younger than the late thirteenth century. This later, fourteenth-century, dating is supported by both the fascicle's contents and its layout. Fascicle 8's rare concordances are chiefly found in other fourteenth-century sources.¹⁶ In addition, as Oliver Huck demonstrates, the final fascicle frequently employs a page design that is found nowhere else in **Mo** – or indeed in any extant thirteenth-century collection – but which is commonly used in polyphonic books and rotuli dating no earlier than the late 1310s.¹⁷ This '**Mo** 8 layout', as Huck calls it, accommodates a stylistically and notationally 'advanced' feature of the motet repertoire, allowing more space for a fast-moving triplum that features many more notes and syllables of text than its accompanying lower voices.

¹⁵ Everist also suggests, however, that at least one of these so-called confraternity motets may be linked to Arras: see pp. 27–8.

¹⁶ **Tu; Onc; Worc; Da; Br.**

¹⁷ See Huck's discussion on pp. 90–4.

Three of fascicle 8's motets employ an innovative 'Petronian' notation – characteristic of compositions ascribed to Petrus de Cruce – in which a short note (or breve) may be divided into as many as seven constituent parts.¹⁸

Admittedly, a circumscribed time span for **Mo**'s Petronian motets is difficult to establish.¹⁹ Outside fascicle 8, Petronian motets are prominently in evidence in **Mo** 7 (copied in the 1290s): **Mo** 7 opens with two pieces of this type and contains four in total (with a further three in its supplements). Another important source for the Petronian repertoire is a manuscript from Liège, **Tu**, considered on artistic grounds to date from the mid 1320s–mid 1330s. **Tu** is the external source with which fascicle 8 has most in common, sharing three concordances, a circumstance that would seem to reinforce a fourteenth-century date for fascicle 8 also. In fact, however, similarities between **Tu** and **Mo** 7 are the more significant, despite their potential chronological distance of four decades or more: sixteen of the thirty-one motets in **Tu** are also recorded in **Mo**'s seventh fascicle.

To explain this curious circumstance, it might be tempting to argue for a later date for **Mo** 7, one closer to or even contemporary with that proposed here for **Mo** 8.²⁰ Yet, in addition to the palaeographical, artistic, and codicological evidence (as well as fascicle 7's inclusion within the index to **Mo**), other musical features confirm fascicle 8's status as undeniably later than fascicle 7: its 'up-dated' versions of two fascicle 7 motets; certain advanced modal rhythmic devices as analysed here by Mary E. Wolinski that are absent from fascicle 7 (*entitio* and a special binary form of the third rhythmic mode);²¹ the exploration of large-scale structural devices in some fascicle 8 motets that foreshadow *Ars nova* techniques;²² the 'deliberate

¹⁸ Bent 2015, 39–43, makes the case for a more neutral descriptor for the notational style that incorporates more than three unstemmed semibreves per breve, suggesting 'post-Franconian' as a preferable term to 'Petronian'. She rightly observes that two fourteenth-century theorists (Jacobus, author of *Speculum musicae*, and Robertus de Handlo) attribute the practice of subdividing the breve into more than seven semibreves to someone other than Petrus de Cruce (both theorists cite the exemplary motet *Aucun ont trouvé*, and specifically attribute it to Petrus, who they say sometimes notated up to seven semibreves per breve). With reference to the small subset of motets that employ this notational style in **Mo**, this volume maintains the more traditional (and better-known) descriptor of 'Petronian', while acknowledging its limitations.

¹⁹ The notation that distinguishes the Petronian repertoire found in **Mo** 7, **Mo** 8, and **Tu** – that is, more than three unstemmed semibreves per breve, with the semibreve groupings separated by dots of division – is found in a variety of fourteenth-century sources, including **Fauv**, and a number of English sources. For a partial listing of these sources and a brief discussion of the 'English' Petronian motets identified by Peter Lefferts, see the essays in this volume by Desmond (pp. 153–8) and Maw (p. 168 n. 16).

²⁰ Maw suggests (pp. 179–81) that the sequence of Petronian motets in **Mo** may reflect a chronology, but notes the significance of the fact that these pieces were not simply grouped together. This again substantiates the claim that fascicle 8 constitutes a later layer.

²¹ On these modal techniques, see Chapter 10 by Wolinski, especially pp. 194–6.

²² For example, see **Mo** 8,311, **Mo** 8,312, and **Mo** 8,332.

tonal shaping' of the two fascicle 8 motets examined by Dolores Pesce;²³ and the unusual group of motets based on French song tenors that in some ways, as previously demonstrated by Everist, prefigure the fourteenth-century chanson, albeit in a polytextual form.²⁴

Chronologically counter-intuitive connections between sources of the Petronian repertoire underline the potential complexity of relationships between the probable date of production of a manuscript and the age of its contents. Palaeographical and art historical evidence is clearly vital in establishing reasonable chronological parameters, though it can be misleading too: manuscripts may wait or travel to be decorated, and an aged scribe could continue to write in an 'old-fashioned' hand. Yet the very nature of a compilation like **Mo** 8 seems itself to defy chronological specificity. Fascicle 8 is notably eclectic in the style and type of works it contains: there are French, Latin, and bilingual motets; motets based on vernacular chansons, as well as those with Latin plainchant tenors of different kinds (some conventional chant segments with a long history of liturgical polyphonic composition, others more freely selected); and Petronian motets sitting alongside Latin double motets in straightforward modal rhythm. Admittedly, as Curran observes, the script is less formal and less consistent than that of the main text scribe of fascicles 2–6, and the fascicle lacks any discernible overarching ordering principle.²⁵ Yet the collection does not appear simply to be haphazard. As noted above, fascicle 8 opens self-consciously with a *Deus in adiutorium*. Its choice of closing work seems significant too. This is the fascicle's most widely disseminated motet, and its only straightforward duplication of an earlier piece in **Mo**, significantly one within the old corpus. The anomalous duplication allows fascicle 8 to close with what appears to be its most historic and most famous composition, perhaps as a final nod to past traditions, maybe even specifically as represented by earlier layers of **Mo**.

Fascicle 8's self-conscious positioning within broader musical conventions and traditions is strongly evident in an unprecedented process of quotation in two of its unique motets, which – as Anne Ibos-Augé demonstrates here – effectively create an intricate dialogue between the old and the new. In a novel and idiosyncratic compositional approach, these two fascicle 8 motets creatively combine musico-textual fragments of motets preserved earlier in **Mo** (in fascicles 3 and 5 of the old corpus, as well as in fascicle 7). Apart from a reference to one motet that survives uniquely in **Tu**, most of the quoted pieces are quite widely disseminated, and all are found in other fascicles of **Mo**. Given the scope of **Mo**, the presence of almost all quoted materials earlier in this manuscript is perhaps unsurprising, although it could constitute a further connection specifically between fascicle 8 and the rest of the codex. More certain is the fact that the two quoting motets – whose compositional process seems to be exclusive to **Mo** 8 – engage with an existing body of works, and they

²³ See Pesce's analysis of **Mo** 8,305 and **Mo** 8,335 in Chapter 13.

²⁴ See the examples discussed in Everist 2007, esp. 374–80 (on **Mo** 8,318), 380–2 (on **Mo** 8,309), and 390–8 (on **Mo** 8,325).

²⁵ See Chapter 2 by Curran, esp. pp. 44–5.

appear actively to invoke their musical heritage. By extension, therefore, it seems possible that certain of the unique Latin double motets contained in fascicle 8, which would be at home within the earlier fascicles of **Mo** but are notably absent there, could in fact be new compositions in a retrospective style.²⁶

An interest in tradition and retrospection, as well as in novelty, is especially striking in **Mo** 8 because it occurs within the very short space of a single fascicle. However, the combination of chronological diverse materials, as well as a layered, fascicular construction, is characteristic of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century polyphonic sources more generally. The so-called *Magnus liber* manuscripts of the early and mid thirteenth century are more generically diverse than **Mo** – with individual fascicles devoted to organa, conducti, motets, and so on – but they similarly encompass a chronologically broad span. For instance, **F**, the earliest surviving source to contain motet fascicles and dated to the 1240s, records organa that must have been at least half a century old at the time of copying. However, the appearance of **F**, whose eleven fascicles were all copied by a single scribe and in an essentially consistent notational style, is a much more uniform one.²⁷ And, as a project, the copying of **F** seems more chronologically circumscribed and carefully controlled than **Mo**. **Mo** effectively marks the end of the earlier thirteenth-century tradition of the ‘great book’, an undertaking whose appearance of uniformity became more difficult to sustain as the available written repertoire inevitably increased in size and chronological breadth, and as notational and musical styles diversified.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, therefore, later thirteenth- or early fourteenth-century sources of motets tended to be more modest in scale: the late thirteenth-century Bamberg motet book, with its seemingly self-limited group of exactly one hundred compositions, for instance, or the even smaller collection of ten works copied on both sides of the early fourteenth-century Brussels rotulus (**Br**). There is only one surviving complete motet manuscript from the early fourteenth century that is comparable in scale and ambition to **F** or **Mo**: the painstakingly planned copy of the *Roman de Fauvel* (**Fauv**), produced c.1317–22, in which monophonic and polyphonic music was interpolated within an allegorical narrative poem.²⁸ Fascicle 8 is potentially an autonomous unit, yet it is surely too slight to have been bound by itself, but too high-grade to have circulated unbound. The organization of its contents and codicology reflects an important transitional moment in the production of motet manuscripts, somewhere between the ‘great books’ tradition of the thirteenth century and the less comprehensive and fundamentally different types of collections that became characteristic of the early fourteenth.

²⁶ As hypothesized by Desmond: see p. 145.

²⁷ **W**₁, **F**, and **W**₂ exclusively use modal or unmeasured rhythm, and never employ mensural or Petronian notation.

²⁸ The Las Huelgas codex (**Hu**) could be potentially added to this list. Although not of the same scope as **F**, **Mo**, or **Fauv**, **Hu** had – according to its contemporaneous foliation – at least 164 folios (of which 157 are now extant). Taking fragmentary sources into account, both **Worc** and **Cambrai** also represent sizeable collections that probably date from the first half of the fourteenth century, although **Cambrai** may be a little later.

In this respect, **Mo** 8's closest comparand is the later **Tu**, essentially also a single fascicle, about equal in size, opening with the same *Deus in adiutorium*, containing motets in similar styles to **Mo** (though many fewer unica), of which several employ Petronian notation.²⁹ Both **Mo** 8 and **Tu** could have been intended to begin monumental collections of the older thirteenth-century sort, projects that then became unfeasible or unfashionable. Or perhaps, even as they were being copied, the fate of these smaller collections was already uncertain, and they were retrospective imitations of, or attempts to revive, a tradition that had already declined. That this tradition languished may explain the difficulties of contextualizing **Mo** 8, of locating elsewhere its artist, its scribe, and the vast majority of its musical compositions.

The idea of fascicle 8 as transitional, and as a historically aware collection at a complex moment of historical change, accords powerfully with many of its characteristics. How, for instance, was the short-lived and essentially transitional Petronian notation regarded at the time of fascicle 8's production? The possibly contemporaneous interpolated *Roman de Fauvel* demonstrates that some notators already employed a slightly more advanced form of this notational technology – with the addition of downward stems to semibreves and the use of colour – ahead of a more thorough overhaul of the notational system that took place in the 1320s and 1330s. Fascicle 8 straddles (and in many ways exemplifies) a period of pronounced flux in musical notations, layouts, types of music manuscripts, and musical styles. In consequence, the creators of the fascicle – with access to diverse exemplars and drawing together a wide variety of often unusual materials – may themselves have been uncertain of its future, unsure as to how the fascicle would circulate (alone, with the rest of **Mo**, or as the start of a new companion codex) and how exactly it would be put to use.

Uncertainties and ambiguities surrounding the production of fascicle 8 itself would account for the difficulties faced by scholars in arriving at definitive conclusions about its chronological position and purpose. The current volume engages with existing hypotheses about the production and function of **Mo** 8 from a variety of perspectives, as well as advancing new ones. It offers much-needed palaeographical, art historical, codicological, and notational analyses, in addition to musical and hermeneutic close-readings of individual compositions and groups of compositions. Mark Everist's opening essay lays out the contents of fascicle 8, considers the idiosyncrasies of its organization, and identifies the sub-groups and musical types contained within it. This sets the scene for a detailed examination of **Mo** 8 as a material object. Sean Curran presents a close palaeographical study of the fascicle, while Rebecca A. Baltzer and Alison Stones consider the manuscript's artist, and Oliver Huck focuses on its page layout. Eva M. Maschke's chapter reflects on the tradition and transmission of *Deus in adiutorium* as an opening piece, proposing that the use of this versicle evokes a paraliturgical heritage of clerics' Offices at Christmastide. Fascicle 8's position with regard to Christmas paraliturgical festivities is developed further in Anna Kathryn Grau's study of a cluster of motets for Epiphany that are suggestive of a devotional context, at least for their exemplar.

²⁹ **Tu** was later bound within a composite source (whose four parts are now separated) at the Benedictine Abbey of St Jacques in Liège. See Maschke, pp. 113–18.

The second part of the volume is thematic, dissecting and contextualizing specific techniques associated with fascicle 8 motets. Karen Desmond and David Maw examine **Mo** 8's most modern characteristics: Desmond aligns particular subsets of motets and their innovations in rhythm and texture with other motet collections such as **Onc** and **Tours**, while Maw establishes that the Petronian figurations are not simply ornamental elaborations, but are fundamental expressions of a strange and subversive musical style. Mary E. Wolinski considers the fascicle from the opposite perspective, situating its rhythmic techniques in the context of the older thirteenth-century repertoire recorded earlier in **Mo**, while still highlighting the fact that **Mo** 8 preserves the codex's most innovative rhythmic practices. Solomon Guhl-Miller likewise advocates for the status of fascicle 8 as part of the *Ars antiqua* tradition, emphasizing the improvisatory aspects of fascicle 8 motets that seem closer to the flexibility of musical performance in organa, a flexibility later curtailed by the increasing specificity of *Ars nova* notation. Ideas of tradition and innovation in **Mo** 8 are further addressed in Anne Ibos-Augé's study of two refrain motets which newly draw on and recast quotations from older and contemporaneous motets.

The volume concludes with a series of case studies (each focused on a different motet tenor) that offer productive models for further analysis of late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century music. Both Dolores Pesce and Margaret Dobby draw parallels between fascicle 8 and fascicle 7 motets that share the same tenor plainchant foundations. On the one hand, Pesce highlights the carefully cultivated tonal coherence of *PORTARE* motets in both fascicles. On the other, Dobby outlines contrasting compositional processes in fascicles 7 and 8 motets on the *SOLEM* tenor. Rachel Davies offers an interpretative reading of a Marian motet on an unidentified tenor in fascicle 8, considering various plainchant matches for this tenor melody, as well as possible liturgical and hermeneutic contexts. A closing chapter by Edward Breen brings the consideration of fascicle 8 motets up to the present day, examining four recordings of the famous motet *On parole/A Paris/FRESE NOUVELE* – based not on a Latin liturgical melody but on the Parisian street cry of a vendor selling fresh strawberries – and reflecting on changing interpretations and understandings of the sounds of the Montpellier codex.

The Montpellier Codex: The Final Fascicle aims to foster further discussion and deeper understanding of a particularly significant and little understood moment in the history of music: the juncture between the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, in which new musical notations and styles emerged and coexisted alongside established ones. The volume allows different disciplinary approaches to fascicle 8 and **Mo** to coexist, encouraging various perspectives of the fascicle as an object and of its contents, of its relative modernity, of its relationship to the rest of **Mo** (and specifically to fascicle 7), and of its position within broader historical, artistic, and codicological contexts. The sharp focus of this study results in many common threads between the various essays, which often offer a new point of view on a particular piece or technique. In the case of *Amours/Solem/SOLEM*, for instance – one of just two motets copied in both fascicles 7 and 8 (**Mo** 7,289 and 8,332) – Huck analyses the layout of both versions, Grau considers the motet's position as part of a liturgically ordered cluster in fascicle 8, while Maw examines the Petronian notation

and musical variants between versions, and Dobby addresses questions of compositional process in the context of other **Mo** 7 and 8 motets on the *SOLEM* tenor.

As a topic of enquiry, fascicle 8 lends itself particularly well to this discursive approach, since the very circumstances and production of the fascicle and its heterogeneous contents and seem to resist straightforward codicological, chronological, and stylistic conclusions. By foregrounding a small, seemingly anomalous, and transitional fascicle, rather than a complete manuscript source, this volume seeks to redress the scholarly balance, which has tended to privilege the almost exclusive study of monumental 'great books' in their entirety. The final fascicle of the Montpellier codex offers a rich and productive basis to engage with broader historical and artistic questions of material culture, book production, and decoration in the Middle Ages, illuminating a complex sense of past and present, old and new, at the turn of the thirteenth century into the fourteenth.

I

THE MATERIAL OBJECT

Montpellier 8: Anatomy of ...

MARK EVERIST

THE later parts of the Montpellier codex are fascinating in so many ways. First of all, the complexity of exactly how these later parts – the seventh fascicle, the two appendices or supplements for the seventh fascicle, and the eighth fascicle – relate to each other is in itself a conundrum; second, these later fascicles and their supplements effortlessly hurdle the entirely false chronological barrier of 1300 erected by the term ‘thirteenth-century motet’; and, third, the later parts of the manuscript contain such a profusion, an abundance, a cornucopia, of different types of work. This essay brings together for the first time answers to the most important questions that might be asked about **Mo** 8. Some of these relate to topics addressed elsewhere in this volume, but in most other cases, sketching out the questions and drafting answers is this essay’s purpose. The title of this chapter could well allude to Otto Preminger’s 1959 classic film *Anatomy of a Murder*, with a stellar performance by James Stewart and an equally stellar score by Duke Ellington and Billy Strahorn, music that has been recognized for its effective alignment of various strands in Ellington’s late œuvre.¹ Alternatively, it might reference the 2006 album *The Anatomy of* by the thrash metal band Between the Buried and Me, which covers more than a dozen classics from Pink Floyd, through King Crimson and Metallica, to The Smashing Pumpkins and Counting Crows.² But actually, anatomy, *tout court*, describes what **Mo** 8 needs, as well as defining music that brings various traditions into alignment and that provides, in some cases, ‘covers’ of medieval classics: disassembling the component parts of the corpus and setting them out on a stainless steel dissecting table – a tenor here, a refrain there, a group of ‘Petronian’ semibreves over there – at which a dispassionate look may be taken, and of which some sense can begin to be made.

Recent work on the subject of the history of **Mo** in its entirety has shown that Robert Branner’s 1977 re-shading of Friedrich Ludwig and Yvonne Rokseth’s views remains largely accepted. Ludwig and Rokseth – for different reasons and probably independently – proposed that the first six fascicles of the manuscript constituted its *corpus ancien* or *alte Corpus*, while the seventh fascicle was later and the eighth even later still, perhaps as late as the early fourteenth century.³ Branner’s recalibration of the make-up of the volume argued that fascicles 1 and 7 were coterminous.⁴ Although their contents are of course very different, what we now understand about the reception and continued practice of sustained-tone organum at the end of the thirteenth century makes it much easier to accept that the contents of the

¹ See Domek 2012. For a broader examination of Ellington’s film output, see Cooke 2009.

² Between the Buried and Me have left little trace in the literature on heavy metal. See, however, Wagner and Wilson, 2010, 125–8.

³ Ludwig (1910) 1964; Ludwig 1972; Ludwig 1978; Rokseth 1935–9, 4:30.

⁴ Branner 1977, 238.

first fascicle could date from the same period as the seventh.⁵ There is very little that has changed in the overall physiognomy of the manuscript (outlined in Table 1.1) and its history in the intervening forty years.

But fine-tuning, testing, and re-contextualizing these earlier findings have occupied some of the best-known names in art history and musicology: Rokseth herself, Branner, François Avril,⁶ Eleanor Simmons,⁷ Mary Wolinski,⁸ Catherine Parsoneault,⁹ Rebecca Baltzer, and Alison Stones.¹⁰ Almost all agree that the history of **Mo** involves the cumulative updating of a book while keeping the outlines of the *mise en page*, size of written block, approaches to *ordinatio*, and so on, more or less the same. This updating involved a minimum of three, and probably more, phases, depending on how the various supplements to the growing volume are interpreted. There is an important dialectic between this cumulative updating and the emergence over the same period of conventions governing the *liber motetorum*. One of the reasons for reflecting on Branner's restriction of the old corpus to fascicles 2 to 6, excluding their supplements, is that those fascicles constitute a coherent and logical compilation from around 1280, as Table 1.1 shows. Dedicating a fascicle to each of four-part motets, bilingual motets, Latin double motets, French double motets, and two-part French motets is an irresistible clue to how the motet was thought of in the years leading up to 1280, and – given that there are elements of this type in books from perhaps twenty or thirty years earlier – during most of the third quarter of the century. The *compilatio* of the motet book was driven by number of voice-parts, language of its texts, and work-by-work organization. Alphabetical

Table 1.1 Contents of **Mo** by fascicle

<i>Fascicle</i>	<i>Contents</i>
1	<i>Deus in adiutorium</i> ; hockets; organa
2	4vv French motets
3	3vv bilingual motets
4	3vv Latin motets
5	Hocket; 3vv French motets
6	2vv French motets
7	3vv French bilingual and Latin motets
8	<i>Deus in adiutorium</i> ; 3vv French, bilingual, and Latin motets

⁵ There is still a need for a study of the reworkings of the organa in the first fascicle of **Mo** in the light of other mensural reworkings both of the same repertory and of the conductus from the same period that builds on Branner's review of Ludwig and Rokseth.

⁶ In a personal communication to the author, 9 November 1983, cited in Everist 1985 and published in Everist 1989, 106 and n. 19.

⁷ Simmons 1994.

⁸ Wolinski 1988; Wolinski 1992, 263–301.

⁹ Parsoneault 2001.

¹⁰ Stones 2013–14, Part I, vol. 2:48–53.

organization appears as a sub-category in such collections as the French motet fascicles in **W**₂ and in **Ba**, where the alphabetical organization by motetus is subservient to the overall planning of a collection of exactly one hundred motets.

The addition both of fascicles 1 and 7 and of fascicle 8 not only adds up-to-date repertory, or – as in the case of some parts of fascicle 1 – reworkings of older material, but also attempts to reflect the emerging practice of prefacing the *liber motetorum* with a setting of *Deus in adiutorium*.¹¹ There is a real logic to placing the setting of *Deus in adiutorium* at the beginning of fascicle 1, and in turn placing that entire fascicle before fascicle 2, and also adding in fascicle 7.

What is less clear is the reason, when the compiler added fascicle 8, why they placed another setting of *Deus in adiutorium* at the beginning. The eighth fascicle of **Mo** functions just as well as a free-standing *liber motetorum* in the same way as **Tu** or **Br** – both of which also begin their motet collections with the same *Deus in adiutorium* setting – as a carefully copied addition designed to go with the preceding seven fascicles. One way of squaring this circle is to work with the idea that a single *atelier* could develop and re-use an identical *mise en page* and that **Mo** 8 emerged from the same workshop as the previous fascicles, but with up-to-date repertory and layout, including *Deus in adiutorium*, which was then added effortlessly to the existing book as it then stood. **Mo** 8 could hypothetically have circulated very well on its own – better, in fact, than fascicles 1 or 7.¹²

When this idea was first developed,¹³ some of the most imaginative research on thirteenth-century Parisian book production and circulation – the work of Richard and Mary Rouse and Patricia Stirnemann among others – was still in its infancy.¹⁴ In revisiting some of the detail around the successive compilation of **Mo**, it is difficult not to be drawn back to work on the book collection of Richard de Fournival, and the ways in which books of similar formats were assembled and then decorated together to give a sense of consistency to the finished product.¹⁵ Most of Fournival's books were Latin texts and included no music, most of the decorative campaigns involved flourished initials only, and he was apparently based in Amiens rather than Paris. But he was never far from the circles in which the protagonists of **Mo** were active: among his many other activities, he wrote a *Bestiaire d'amours*, and he was involved in the composition of poetry, some of which – alongside a collection of *chansons* and a couple of *jeux-partis* with Gautier de Dargies – found its way into the motet repertory.¹⁶ And Fournival's careful preservation of his library in ways that are analogous to the compilation of **Mo** is only one well-documented

¹¹ See Chapter 6 of this volume by Eva M. Maschke.

¹² Günther 1988, 111–22.

¹³ Everist 1989, 110–34.

¹⁴ Eventually published as Rouse and Rouse 2000.

¹⁵ Rouse 1973 included an outline of the Fournival library. See also Birkenmajer 1922. The key text that discusses the additive qualities of many of Fournival's books so closely aligned with the additive construction of **Mo** is Stirnemann 2011.

¹⁶ For the songs, see Zarifopol 1904. Fournival is discussed frequently in Gennrich 1926; and the broader Amiens context is given in Johnson 1991, 282–383. The relationships between song and motet in Fournival's œuvre are discussed in Thomson 2016, 1:49–56 and 1:180–6.

example among many.¹⁷ Put bluntly, the additive construction of **Mo** – phase 1, fascicles 2–6; phase 2, fascicles 1 and 7; phase 3, fascicle 8 – finds many analogies in the construction of various genres of manuscript in the thirteenth century.

In some ways, the question of the overall structure of **Mo** is not really germane to the status of its eighth fascicle because of its late date and more discrete nature. However, there is one further complication and that concerns the supplements to fascicles 3, 5, and 7. This is complex and contested ground, but it does seem that the supplements to fascicle 7 are of importance in any discussion of **Mo** 8. The supplements to fascicles 3 and 5 belong to an earlier period of reworking that is captured by the table of contents at the beginning of the manuscript.¹⁸ It might be too easy to argue that the fascicle 3 and 5 supplements are contemporary with the addition of fascicles 1 and 7 and that the supplements to fascicle 7 date from the same time as the compilation of **Mo** 8. The situation may well be codicologically more complex, but the music in the two supplements to fascicle 7 requires consideration alongside any discussion of fascicle 8.¹⁹

The most recent dating of **Mo** 8, in Stones's *Gothic Manuscripts, 1260–1320*, puts it in the second decade of the fourteenth century, and Stones invites us to consider the fascicle alongside the *Vie de saint Denis* of 1317 (Paris, BnF fr. 2090–2).²⁰ This date aligns well with what is known of a key point of comparison with **Mo** 8: **Tu**. Judith Oliver's work on manuscripts from the diocese of Liège has put **Tu** somewhere in the next decade,²¹ and it barely needs saying that the date of the *Vie de saint Denis* that is so important for **Mo** 8 is also a significant date in the compilation of the notated version of the *Roman de Fauvel* (**Fauv**).²²

Issues of both chronology and codicology are fundamental to any understanding of **Mo** 8, its contents, conventions, and context. It has been observed that – unlike the highly organized old corpus – the eighth fascicle is immensely varied and incoherent. Rokseth saw evidence of highly varied musical tastes in this fascicle. She wrote:

More varied still than any of the preceding fascicles, the eighth does not only represent the various tastes at the heart of a single nation, not only the concerns of use in different social milieux – ecclesiastical, courtly, or popular.

¹⁷ Vleeschauwer 1965 is fundamental. See also Glorieux 1963; and more recently Excell 1986.

¹⁸ The table of contents of **Mo**, fols 1r–4r includes all the compositions in the first seven fascicles, and the supplements to fascicles 3 and 5, but not the supplements to fascicle 7.

¹⁹ The first supplement to **Mo** 7 contains eight French double motets (**Mo** 7,292–9). The second supplement has three pieces (**Mo** 7,300–2): two Latin double motets and a bilingual double motet.

²⁰ Stones 2013–14, Part I, vol. 2:50. In a private communication to the author (24 September 2013), Patricia Stirnemann proposed a date of 1310 for **Mo** 8.

²¹ Oliver 1988; Oliver 1995. See the discussion of the significance of these dates for **Tu** in Everist 2007, 370, n. 18.

²² The bibliography on **Fauv** is enormous, but the paradigmatic statement for the dating, chronology, and context of its compilation is Wathey 1998.

The compositions that it concerns ... nevertheless belong to sufficiently distinct techniques that one can discover there traces of clearly separated musical schools.

*Plus composite encore qu'aucun des fascicules précédents, l'huitième ne représente pas seulement des goûts divers au sein d'une même nation, des soucis d'utilisation en des milieux sociaux différents – milieu ecclésiastique, courtois ou populaire. Les compositions qu'il réunit ... appartiennent néanmoins à des techniques assez distinctes pour qu'on y puisse découvrir les traces d'écoles musicales nettement séparées.*²³

Ludwig, unbeknown to Rokseth, had reached the same conclusion as to the variety of types in the fascicle, although typically he spoke in terms of style rather than school: 'Like of all the major mensurally notated manuscripts, it has a most stylistically variegated composition' (*Stilistisch ist es wie alle grossen Mensuralhandschriften auf das Bunteste zusammengesetzt*).²⁴ And whether the variety of type in **Mo** 8 is to be considered in terms of sociological/school or technical/stylistic impulses, this overall view has not changed in the century since Ludwig set forth his account.

Less clear in the literature, ancient and modern, is the striking difference in concordance base between **Mo** 8 and the rest of the repertory. Of the forty-three compositions, no fewer than thirty-one are unica, or – to put it another way – only about 25 per cent of the fascicle is found in sources elsewhere. If this were not striking enough, of those works with concordances, many have the tiniest range of further witnesses (Table 1.2). There are three pieces with a single concordance in **Tu**, another with a single concordance in a lost Arras fragment,²⁵ and the two pieces with concordances in **Douce** are in fact the same poem because the two motets in question share in part the same text. The two motets with concordances in the Oxford New College motet collection (**Onc**) have often been thought to be parts of the same work, and are found in **Mo** 8 preceded by *Alle psallite/Alle psallite/ALLELUYA*, which has concordances of its music in two separate fragments of **Worc**, with contrafact texts; one of these contrafacted texts is also in **ORawl**, but with empty music staves). This really leaves just two works with any sort of extensive concordance base: *Virginale/Descendi/ALMA [REDEMPTORIS MATER]* and the last piece in the fascicle *La bele estoile/La bele, en qui/IOHANNE*.

Table 1.3 shows concordances for *Virginale/Descendi/ALMA [REDEMPTORIS MATER]*. The motet is found in the main part of the seventh fascicle of **Mo**, but here, in its eighth fascicle, the triplum text and its music are different. In the version in the seventh fascicle, both upper voices are verbatim quotations from the biblical Song of Songs, whereas, in the version in the eighth, the triplum not only adds in syllabic semibreves but its text only very loosely tropes the text of the tenor and – even more loosely – the surviving Song of Songs text in the motetus. This version is also preserved in **Da**. The piece is found in **Ba** with a further triplum and triplum text which makes no reference to either motetus or tenor text and collapses at the

²³ Rokseth 1935–9, 4:85.

²⁴ Ludwig 1978, 547.

²⁵ In 1906 Ludwig viewed a private copy of the lost Arras fragment: see Ludwig 1978, 633–4.