# *Reviews*

Philippe Bernard. *Du chant romain au chant grégorien (IVᵉ–XIIIᵉ siècle)*. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1996. 986 pp. ISBN 2 204 05314 7, ISSN 0763 8647.

In this weighty volume, a revision of his doctoral thesis of 1993, Philippe Bernard traces the historical development of liturgical chant in Rome and the Frankish Empire from the fourth to the thirteenth centuries. He concentrates first on the Roman tradition during the centuries for which no notated sources exist, then on the period of interchange between Rome and the Franks in the eighth and ninth centuries. The subsequent period is not dealt with in detail. Nor are other Latin chant traditions, the Milanese, Beneventan and Hispanic, and the development of genres such as sequences and tropes form no part of the author's brief. Since chant for the Office hours is largely left to one side, the focus is very much on what we know as Gregorian chant for the Proper of Mass, though even here introits and communions are not discussed.

The book is divided chronologically into three parts. The first, consisting of seven chapters, deals with the era of chants for the soloist (from their origins to the sixth century). The next six chapters discuss the work of the Roman schola cantorum, which the author places in the sixth to eighth centuries. The third part, on the eighth to thirteenth centuries, contains four chapters on 'the Frankish intervention, the birth and expansion of Gregorian chant'. There is a comprehensive bibliography (with a supplement to cover the period from the completion of the thesis up to 1995), and the book is well indexed. Throughout the book Latin textual sources are quoted at length and with parallel translations. One sometimes suspects that the book is not addressed primarily to musicologists, however. Musical examples are contained in a slim appendix, just six sets of chants reproduced for comparison from the *Graduale triplex* and/or Melnicki's transcription of the Old Roman gradual Vat. lat. 5319 in *Monumenta monodica medii aevi*, 2. They are not analysed in detail in the book, and the author seems to expect that, if his readers are concerned with chants in detail, they will be able to recall large numbers of chants in both Roman and Frankish traditions fairly readily, or at least refer constantly to the editions. This would not be

unreasonable. On the other hand, chapter 4, on modality, explains its topic in simple terms more appropriate for a non-musical readership. Perhaps the fairest view would be that the book is written for specialists in liturgy and chant with an intimate knowledge of the repertory, and that it makes few concessions to those not already thoroughly familiar with its subject matter.

The first two chapters, actually standing outside the historical account, sketch the source material available, Roman chant books with notation, books without notation which contain chant texts, then sacramentaries and other liturgical books without chants. In the third chapter the author discusses the 'pre-history' of Roman chant, that is, up to the late third century. The fourth chapter also stands slightly apart, but is a necessary introduction to a topic crucial to what follows, the evolution of modality up to the ninth century. The fifth to seventh chapters then engage directly with particular groups of chants: (1) psalmody without refrain, that is, the cantica of the Easter Vigil and tracts, and (2) psalmody with refrain, meaning graduals. The discussion includes copious detail about the textual and liturgical history of the pieces, but musically it is usually restricted to comments on the modality of the pieces as a whole and of their individual phrases. Since the author believes modal identity to be historically significant (see below), this is justifiable in its own terms. But the reader should not expect musical-analytical tables of the sort familiar from, say, Apel's *Gregorian Chant*.

The second part of the book looks at what the author sees as the new creations of the Roman schola cantorum, the offertories and alleluias. (As already noted, introits and communions are not dealt with.) There is a chapter on the history of the schola, the work of Gregory the Great, and the circumstances in which the schola operated. A short chapter on the modality of the offertories introduces more detailed discussion of particular groups of chants. The oldest layers of alleluias are discussed in a single chapter, while the large expansion of the repertory after the early ninth century falls outside the author's principal concern.

The third part of the book – the reader's pulse quickens somewhat – concerns the emergence and particular identity of Gregorian chant as we know it, which in Bernard's view is due to Frankish recasting of the melodies. Chapter 14 begins by reviewing the documentary sources of the Gallican liturgy, then gives an account of the Frankish-Roman intercourse in the eighth century. Early Gregorian chant sources with and without notation are briefly mentioned and the origins of notation discussed. In chapter 16 the work of some key figures is discussed: Chrodegang of Metz, Remi of Rouen, Leidrad of Lyon, Helisachar of Saint-Riquier, Agobard of Lyon and Amalar of Metz. The final chapter summarizes some aspects of subsequent chant history, with a glance at the non-Roman repertories and the displacement of Old Roman chant by Gregorian in Rome itself.

The book is written in the context of a body of scholarly literature which, after quiet beginnings more than three decades ago, has increased steadily in importance. Fundamental to this research have been the writings of Dom Jean Claire of Solesmes, starting with his articles on the short responsories of the Office in *Revue grégorienne* of 1962–63 and on the antiphons of the ferial Office

in *Etudes grégoriennes* of 1975. Important contributions in recent years have come from Bernard himself, Olivier Cullin, Marie-Noël Colette and Alberto Turco, among others. To some extent overshadowed so far by the debate about the oral and written transmission of chant and associated problems, it may yet prove to be just as significant as the latter for our understanding of what happened in the crucial eighth and ninth centuries.

Drastically simplified, the arguments run something like this. The modality of Gregorian chant is best explained, not in terms of the eight-mode system evidently used for classification from the late eighth century on, but in terms of scale segments around three crucial notes. In Claire's terminology these are the 'cordes-mères' *DO*, *RE* and *MI*. (Bernard prefers the term 'corde modale'.) We could envisage them as *c*, *d* and *e*, or their transpositions *f* – *g* – *a* or g – a – b. Claire demonstrated how the key notes could function as finalis and/or tenors, and how they lay at the root of more complex melodic structures. Many would accept this as a useful analytical tool, which indeed explains several anomalies of the eight-mode system. It would in fact be possible to produce a taxonomy of the complete Gregorian repertory by this means. (Jean Jeanneteau's *Los modos gregorianos. Historia – Analisis – Estética* (Silos, 1985) and Turco's *Il canto gregoriano* (Rome, 1987, 2/1991) are the most comprehensive attempts so far.) These are the terms of reference for the musical comments in Bernard's book.

However, Claire also introduced a chronological and geographical component into his demonstration. At the risk of distorting Claire's (and Bernard's) argument, I translate here the relevant summary in Bernard's book (p. 97):

in contrast to *DO* and *MI*, *RE* is not a key note (*corde*) of Roman origin. Dom J. Claire has in fact shown that it is absent from the most ancient layers of the Roman liturgy. On the other hand, it is clearly present in the other Italian liturgies – notably in Benevento and Milan – as well as in Gaul. The reverse proof of the non-Roman identity of this modal key note lies in the fact that the post-Gregorian repertory – that is to say, the pieces which do not belong to the authentic stock (*fonds authentique*), that which came from Rome and whose presence in Gaul goes back to the eighth century – composed outside Rome from the ninth century onward, is often if not exclusively based on the key note *RE*. After having received the Roman repertory, which included numerous pieces in *DO*, the non-Roman countries returned to their traditional musical idiom, the key note *RE*. In addition, the pieces in *RE* composed outside Italy display a further characteristic: accented notes descend, whereas the Latin accent is always a rising one (footnotes suppressed).

Applied to the Gregorian repertory, such a view of things inevitably produces a striking historical scenario. Some measure of what it implies can be gained by looking at the article 'Gallikanischer Gesang' by Michel Huglo and Olivier Cullin in the new edition of *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (vol. 3, 1995, cols. 998–1027; most of the musical part is Cullin's). Readers will find there many musical examples of what they might innocently have supposed to be Gregorian chant now claimed for the Gallican tradition. Critical reaction to this 'Gallican heresy', as one is tempted to call it – but let us be prudent, and call it the

'Gallican thesis' – has so far been practically inaudible, and a necessarily brief review of Bernard's book is not the place to examine the evidence at length. In any case, as already indicated, Bernard does not go into musical detail, and accepts the thesis as proven.

(The theory that chants in the *RE* mode are non-Roman involves arguing that certain groups of chants in the Roman repertory were patterned on non-Roman models, Gallican in fact. Such are the cantica, the tracts in mode 2, graduals in transposed mode 2, alleluias of the *Dies sanctificatus* type in mode 2 and many introits, offertories and communions.)

Since it is another article of faith among Claire's followers that psalmody without a refrain (*in directum*, as in the tract) constitutes the most ancient layer of the chant repertory, and psalmody with refrain (the forms of responsorial psalmody, such as the gradual) is more recent, Bernard's first musical discussions are of tracts, or rather, the cantica of Easter Eve. It may reasonably be objected that the evidence to support this chronology is too incomplete and equivocal, and it seems, moreover, very difficult to use in the interpretation of melodies first recorded in the tenth century, half a millennium and more since the forms were supposedly fixed. But in fact, Bernard recognizes that all the chants as they have come down to us are the result of recasting (at least on the surface) in the intervening centuries. So the supposed chronology determines the order in which the chant genres are discussed, but is not in all points crucial to the musical discussion.

That Bernard's use of chronology can nevertheless be tendentious is shown, for example, by his dating of the origins of the schola cantorum to the earlier sixth century. He wishes to prove, among other things, that Gregory the Great was not the creator of this body of singers. As evidence he states his belief in the fact that the psalmic Lenten communions were in place (p. 409) by *c.* 520. (James McKinnon places them in the early eighth century: *JAMS*, 45 (1992), 179–227.) And the introit, too, is older than Gregory. These are both schola chants, and therefore the schola must, according to Bernard, have existed before Gregory. But whereas the chants as we know them in sources from the ninth century onward look like sophisticated schola chants, we do not know if this was already so in the sixth century. I will continue to prefer a date after Gregory's time, in the later seventh century, as indicated by the first concrete reference, the statement in the *Liber pontificalis* that the future Sergius I (687–701) was given to the 'priori cantorum' to be educated, this in the early 670s. This benchmark – that of the founding of the schola – is fundamental to Bernard's dating of whole layers of the chant repertory, though a different date does not necessarily invalidate his account of what the schola achieved.

As to the work of the schola, whenever it was accomplished, Bernard believes that it consisted in a simultaneous recasting of older chants and the creation of additional ones in comparable style. In the former case simple recitation with cadential melismas would have been reclothed with a more decorative, melismatic surface. This implies that the old modal character would still be present, making

it possible to continue discussion using the *UT–RE–MI* terminology. Bernard believes that the older responsorial psalmody, in which the congregation sang simple refrains, precluded any very elaborate musical development. The advent of the schola changed this situation. 'In reality this was a step forward indispensable to the development of the art of music; a hidebound atavism (Bernard's 'un archéologisme et un passéisme bornés' cannot be elegantly translated), hanging on to the old, sclerotic forms – the psalm without refrain and the responsorial psalm – would have forbidden all evolution and all progress in liturgical chant, all access to superior forms of elaboration and complexity. That would have constituted a curb on creativity and intellectual and musical research' (p. 413). Such rhetoric does not, however, hide the fact that we do not really know what chant was sung before the Roman schola cantorum assumed responsibility for the tradition, how elaborate it was, what modes it featured. What we have are the two more-or-less elaborate traditions known as Old Roman and Gregorian, and from them we have to surmise what the Roman schola cantorum was singing in the eighth century, let alone the sixth. And that is difficult enough.

In view of the general tenor of the 'Gallican thesis' it is not surprising that Gregorian chant is seen as a largely Frankish creation, in some instances welcoming back melody-types borrowed from Gaul in the first place, in general putting a Gallican surface on Roman chant. Bernard documents the exchanges and transformations at some length, but the lack of musical examples means that a vital dimension is felt to be lacking, at least for a musicological readership. And Bernard's tendency to sum up chapters in a frankly hyperbolic manner does not convince. For example, the statements (p. 758) that Gregorian is 'the first truly modern chant' because it is 'expressive', the archaic repertories being 'totally inexpressive, notably because they were still very close to the simple psalmody of their origins: the *vocalises* underline the logical articulations of the text instead of emphasizing the most important words' beg so many questions that they are best omitted. And can it be that there are hints of a French bias to the interpretation of chant history? For example, on more than one occasion the author seems to play down the importance of manuscripts of the St Gall group as opposed to French sources. What is the point of generalizations such as the following? (p. 830):

There exist two principal branches of (Gregorian chant), distinguished from one another by a certain number of variants, textual, neumatic and melodic, though not so that one can go so far as to speak of two different chants. The first, which is also the more ancient, is the 'western' branch; it saw the light of day between the Seine and the Rhine, from the time when the Franks heard the Roman melodies: this is 'Gregorian' chant proper. The second branch, the 'Eastern', is the result of a reworking of the first; the celebrated manuscripts of St Gall and Einsiedeln are its witnesses. This second branch is less Roman than the first, and therefore less 'Gregorian'.

The main value of the book lies in its careful discussion of chant texts, their history, liturgical context and variant readings in different traditions, buttressed by a formidable knowledge of the secondary literature. Chant scholars will want

to check what Bernard has said about particular pieces, and use his footnotes. This is also true of musical matters, although his interpretation of events is coloured by a thesis which I find problematical. It is perhaps not superfluous to remark that, even while the book was being written, other scholars were working along parallel (not usually converging) lines, and readers will want to take into consideration, for example, Joseph Dyer's recent articles on the Roman schola cantorum (in the Hucke Festschrift, the David Hughes Festschrift, and the new *MGG*) and on the offertory. It is a matter of profound regret that the scholar most familiar with much of what Bernard discusses (and from which he often drew quite other conclusions) was taken untimely from us. James McKinnon's forthcoming book *The Advent Project: The Later Seventh-Century Creation of the Mass Proper*, completed just before he died, will show many of the issues raised by Bernard in a different light. A new synthesis may then emerge, in a debate from which we all have much to learn.

DAVID HILEY

Stefan Engels. *Das Antiphonar von St. Peter in Salzburg: Codex ÖNB Ser. Nov. 2700 (12. Jahrhundert)*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kirchenmusik 2. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1994. viii, 352 pp. ISBN 3 506 70622 5.
Bernhard Hangartner. *Missalia Einsidlensia: Studien zu drei neumierten Handschriften des 11./12. Jahrhunderts*. Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens und seiner Zweige 36, Ergänzungsband. St Ottilien: EOS-Verlag, 1995. 277 pp. ISBN 3 88096 626 5.

The monograph on a single manuscript, or on a very small group of manuscripts, is still a popular vehicle in chant research. There are good reasons for this. For one thing, a manuscript associated with a particular place or institution is at the very least a potential source in a broader history of the region. Conversely, local history may provide useful information about the origins and uses of the manuscript. Thus the regional bias in research is both justified and desirable. It does, however, raise various questions: To what extent can local features be discerned in chant manuscripts at all? And how can they be related to broader historical developments?

   In most cases, the manuscripts provide clear signs of their origins. These are discernible in such matters as heraldry, the liturgical calendar, the choice of saints and the selection of alleluias for the Sundays after Pentecost (in a gradual or missal). When the various categories of evidence support one another – as they often do – the origins of the book may be taken as proven. When they do not, they may nevertheless tell us a great deal about the general circumstances under which the book came to be written. This is especially likely when a manuscript was copied some distance from the institution in which it was to be used, or when it was used over a long time in more than one place. This

too occurs relatively frequently. But there are also cases in which the standard tests fail completely. When the origins of a manuscript are difficult, even impossible, to resolve with certainty, its value as a historical source will be limited at best.

The procedures that are used to establish the origins of a manuscript are well known and to a great extent reliable. Unfortunately, this is not always true of the methods used in comparing the contents or 'repertories' of several chant manuscripts at once. Much recent research, for example, proceeds from the reasonable assumption that the best comparisons are those with manuscripts from approximately the same time and place. The chants that occur in several such manuscripts are often described as 'local repertories', which is to say that they are normally absent from manuscripts originating outside a particular region. The chants in a local repertory may (but need not necessarily) be of local origin; what matters is that they belong together as a group and preferably appear in the same order for the same feasts. Local repertories are more evident for certain types of chant, such as alleluia verses or sequences, than for others. Thus between two related manuscripts there may be several different patterns of affiliation. In some cases, there may even be reason to associate a particular repertory with historical events such as the dedication of a church or the visit of a monarch. Such cases are naturally of great interest because of their wider implications for liturgical and institutional history, but they are nearly always a matter of surmise.

The idea of a regionally delimited repertory most certainly has its uses. It lends chant manuscripts a certain regional identity comparable to that conferred on them by palaeographers and art historians. It may be of value in identifying manuscripts of unknown provenance or – perhaps – in finding an exact source for the cantus firmus of a polyphonic work. Research of this kind may provide fascinating hypotheses relating to the compilation of liturgical manuscripts and the scriptoria in which they were copied, to say nothing of local contacts among churches and monasteries. The regional repertories nonetheless have evident limitations. Some chants that now seem regional may once have enjoyed a much wider distribution than is evident from the surviving sources. Others may have been imported from elsewhere and then adapted for local use – by altering the name of a saint, for example. And some chants that are now known in manuscripts from many different regions may themselves once have belonged only to a local repertory.

The new books by Stefan Engels and Bernhard Hangartner, both of which originated as doctoral dissertations, represent this type of research at its very best. Each examines a small number of liturgical manuscripts in various ways, notably considering their physical design, contents, and points of contact with local history. Both authors proceed systematically through their material, making use of standard techniques and drawing on much the same assumptions. It is thus not entirely surprising that the conclusions they reach, particularly about the motives behind the copying of certain manuscripts, are similar to one another. There are also some interesting differences between the two studies that derive

as much from the authors' personal preferences as from the material in question.

   Stefan Engels starts out from a consideration of the famous antiphonary from the Benedictine monastery of St Peter in Salzburg, a compilation that includes, among other things, chants for Mass and Office together with a series of remarkable illuminations. The manuscript was published some years ago in a luxurious facsimile edition containing a useful discussion of liturgical matters but, sadly, no study of the music.[1] It is clearly one intention of the new book to stop this gap. The first, and naturally most conventional, chapter lists the musical contents of the manuscript in some detail, and undertakes various comparisons with manuscripts originating elsewhere in the town. The most important comparisons are with Salzburg, Stiftsbibliothek St Peter, a IX 11, a gradual from the late twelfth century once belonging to the convent attached to St Peter's; Salzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M II 6, an ordinary from the cathedral (an edition is in preparation by Franz Karl Praßl); and Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 11004, a gradual and sacramentary from the abbey of Nonnberg that was later used in the cathedral. Most of the material discussed here thus originates from Salzburg itself. Nonetheless, even within the city there are small differences separating monastic and secular sources, notably in the selection of alleluia verses for the post-Pentecost period, that point to a diverging of traditions. This is all very likely, but it is perhaps not very remarkable. Recent publications by Knud Ottosen and (especially) László Dobszay confirm the impression of a tightly knit liturgical 'zone' encompassing several dioceses across Austria and southern Bavaria.[2] This being so, it seems likely that the characteristics of a distinctive Salzburg tradition will be confined to the sanctorale, the sequentiary and certain other, more flexible parts of the liturgy. The occasional appearance of archaisms, such as the unusually generous provision of communion verses, certainly implies a moderate conservatism in the Salzburg books, but there seems little reason therefore to consider them as isolated.

   Bernhard Hangartner takes as his point of departure a group of three manuscripts, all of the same type and all apparently originating in the same institution. The manuscripts, all missals, were copied for the Swiss monastery of Einsiedeln between the second half of the eleventh and the early twelfth centuries. Two of the three have remained in the Stiftsbibliothek under the shelf-marks 113 (466) and 114 (523). The third, though copied and at first used in Einsiedeln, found its way to St Blasien at an early date, and is now – like other manuscripts from St Blasien – kept in the archive of St Paul's in the Lavant Valley, Carinthia, where it bears the shelf-mark 14/1. These manuscripts are missals in the early sense of a book that includes gradual chants, sequences, a sacramentary and

---

[1] F. Unterkircher and O. Demus (eds.), *Das Antiphonar von St. Peter: Vollständige Faksimiule-Ausgabe im Originalformat des Codex Vindobonensis Seires nov 2700 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, mit Kommentarband*, Codices selecti 21 (Graz, 1974).

[2] K. Ottosen, *L'Antiphonaire latin au moyen-âge: réorganisation des séries de répons de l'Avent classés par R.-J. Hesbert*, Rerum ecclesiasticarum documenta, extra seriem (Rome, 1989); and L. Dobszay, *Corpus antiphonalium officii – ecclesiarum centralis Europae: I/A Salzburg (pars temporalis)* (Budapest, 1990).

Mass prayers in separate sections. Unlike the later 'full missal' none includes readings or combines the chants with the prayers into a single integrated sequence. A tabular comparison of the three gradual sections together with the incipits given in two of the calendaria (those in 113 and 14/1) and a *directorium cantus* (in 114) reveals a relatively close relationship between 113 and 114 and a more distant relationship between these two and 14/1. Certain particular differences suggest that the gradual section, though probably not the sacramentary, of 14/1 is of later date than those of the other two manuscripts. That is, of course, by no means unlikely in the case of a manuscript copied by several hands and quite possibly compiled from separate manuscripts for the gradual and sacramentary sections. More selective comparisons, affecting above all the post-Pentecost alleluia verses, show close agreement with the earlier manuscript, Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, 121 (now also available in a luxurious facsimile edition[3]) and with Zürich, Zentralbibliothek, Rh 88. The Einsiedeln origin of the former seems likely enough, if not absolutely certain, but the origins of the latter remain somewhat mysterious.[4]

 Both authors write lovingly about the musical notation of their manuscripts. These are all notated in neumes of the South German type, of course, but they nevertheless differ considerably in their choice of signs, in various scribal idiosyncrasies, and in melodic details. Neither author manages to find neumes unique to Einsiedeln or Salzburg, but in a footnote Engels mentions a particular type of virga that he considers to be characteristic of Kremsmünster, and Hangartner finds a type of oriscus tied to an epiphonus in only one other manuscript. Two or more scribes seem to have worked together on some of the manuscripts, and here the authors make considerable efforts to distinguish the hands. This, I think, is a perilous undertaking, for scribal hands are known to change over time. Equally risky, though of more general interest, are Engels' attempts to unearth precise melodic meanings for certain neumes. His comparisons with manuscripts in staff notation (not given in the book) lead to remarkable conclusions. He suggests, for example, that the episema (a small, often horizontal stroke) added to a virga, clivis or torculus indicates a note with a semitone beneath it. And, he suggests, a punctum crossed through with a stroke, or a slanting stroke standing for a punctum, may indicate either a note with a semitone above it or a note with a whole tone both above and below it; the difference apparently depends on the position of the sign within a group of descending notes. Certain other neumes, such as the 'oriscus-torculus' (a compound of two common signs), the 'oriscus-pes', the virga strata, the salicus and the pes quassus, may all have had specific melodic meanings in addition to (or even instead of) the rhythmic meanings ascribed to them by previous scholarship. Engels takes

---

[3] *Codex 121 Einsiedeln*, ed. O. Lang, 2 vols. (Weinheim, 1991).

[4] Heinrich Husmann first pointed out the affinities with Einsiedeln in 'Zur Geschichte der Meßliturgie von Sitten und über ihren Zusammenhang mit den Liturgien von Einsiedeln, Lausanne und Genf', *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft*, 22 (1965), 235. He suggested, though he provided no evidence for the assertion, that the liturgy is that of Solothurn.

these ideas so far as to suggest the presence of chromatic notes in the melodies. This has been suggested before and is certainly possible, but the case for it is scarcely overwhelming.

Clearly, nobody would wish to accept such a sweeping revision of previous scholarship without first seeing detailed comparisons and controls over a wide range of chants. The examples given in the book seem to me inadequate for this purpose. Still, the subject is a very specialized one, and more detailed discussion would probably have seemed out of place. It is to be hoped that Engels, and perhaps others, will pursue this line of thought further.[5]

Engels also draws attention to the presence of the introit trope *Postquam factus homo* in the Salzburg antiphoner and manuscripts of monastic origin only. A recent article by Andreas Haug explains the significance of this trope: it seems to be characteristic of the monastic reforms emanating from Hirsau during the twelfth century.[6] Certain other characteristics of the Salzburg antiphoner seem to Engels to be typical of this or other reforms of the same period, notably the unusual neume forms and the organization of Ordinary chants into cycles, the latter being a familiar procedure in most post-Tridentine chant books. There can certainly be no doubt that monastic reform – and the call for reform – affected music and liturgy during the Middle Ages as profoundly as they did other aspects of monastic life. This is as true of the Cluniac and other reforms that for the most part retained melodies without change, as it is of the Cistercian and Franciscan reforms, which are said to have created entirely new repertories of chant. But however the reforming spirit affected the chant, it seems unreasonable to infer the reformed character of an entire manuscript from the presence of a single chant. Particularly in the case of an expensively produced manuscript like the Salzburg antiphonary, with its high production standards and luxurious illumination, the selection of items may well have been somewhat eclectic.

In this respect Hangartner is on safer ground. The Einsiedeln customary, itself modelled on the statutes of St Maximin in Trier, was adopted in numerous newly founded and newly reformed monasteries throughout South Germany during the late tenth and eleventh centuries. The Einsiedeln 'reform' thus belongs to a group of reforms identified by Kassius Hallinger as beginning in Gorze and ultimately affecting the practices of Cluny.[7] Just what, if any, consequences the reform had on the music of these foundations is hard to say. It seems likely that some of the Einsiedeln influences discussed by Heinrich Husmann – related for the most part to the selection of sequences, alleluia verses and the like –

---

[5] See I. de Loos, 'Der Neumenbuchstabe S als chromatisches Zeichen im Antiphonale Utrecht, Universitätsbibliothek 406, aus dem 12. Jahrhundert', *Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis*, 39 (1989), 5–27. Engels has since developed this line of thought further in 'Die bedeutung der Buchstaben im Cod. Barb. Lat. 559 (XII.2) der Bibliotheca Vaticana', *International Musicological Society Study Group Cantus planus: Papers Read at the 6th Meeting Eger Hungary 1993* (Budapest, 1995), 187–203.

[6] 'Ein ''Hirsauer'' Tropus', *Revue bénédictine*, 104 (1994), 328–45.

[7] K. Hallinger, *Gorze-Kluny: Studien zu den monastischen Lebensformen und Gegensätzen im Hochmittelalter*, Studia anselmiana 22–25 (Rome, 1950–51), 271 and *passim*.

derive from a wider knowledge of its liturgical books rather than from the customary alone. Strictly speaking, there is no direct evidence that the reform led to the adoption of new musical customs at all (Hangartner nowhere makes this claim), but it seems possible that this may have happened, at least in the case of new foundations, since these might well have taken their musical customs directly from Einsiedeln.

These two main themes, the special neumes and the monastic reforms, evidently deserve much broader discussion in the literature than they have received so far. They are, I think, the most provocative aspects of the new books, and their significance clearly extends well beyond the confines of the usual repertorial studies.

KEITH FALCONER

*Lexicon musicum latinum medii aevi: Wörterbuch der lateinischen Musikterminologie des Mittelalters bis zum Ausgang des 15. Jahrhunderts – Dictionary of Medieval Latin Musical Terminology to the End of the 15th Century.* Fascicle 1: *Quellenverzeichnis – Inventory of Sources.* Fascicle 2: *A–authenticus.* Fascicle 3: *authenticus–canto.* Edited by Michael Bernhard. Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Veröffentlichungen der Musikhistorischen Kommission. Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaftem/C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1992–7. cvi; xiii, 161; xi, 159 pp. ISBN 3 7696 6501 5, 3 7696 6502 3, 3 7696 6503 1.

Until the 1990s the study of medieval Latin music treatises, since the venerable publications of Gerbert and Coussemaker, had made steady but incremental advances through the publication of individual works, some accompanied by translations of varying but often low reliability. It now sets fair to be revolutionized by two projects that began to bear fruit in the last decade, the one the *Thesaurus musicarum latinarum (TML)*, which has made an ever-increasing corpus of theoretical writings available in machine-readable form, the other the *Lexicon musicum latinum medii aevi* (which abbreviates itself as *LmL*). The idea for such a lexicon was first proposed in 1961 to the Bavarian Academy of Sciences by Thrasybulos Georgiades and Walther Bulst; it was intended to proceed jointly with the Heidelberg Academy, but the latter was unable to contribute either personnel or money. Ernst Ludwig Waeltner, who together with Hans Schmid had publicized the plan for *LmL*, set about compiling the database till his death in 1975; since then the editor has been Michael Bernhard, assisted by Bernhold Schmid. Calvin Bower is responsible for the English translation appended to the German text throughout.

So far three fascicles have appeared. Fascicle 1 contains the preliminary matter, namely Foreword (in the nineteenth-century sense of 'preface', in German 'Vorwort'), a Bibliography of secondary literature, Inventory of Sources, and List of Incipits; both the Bibliography and the Inventory are updated in the succeeding

fascicles. Fascicles 2 and 3 begin the lexicon proper, together with supplements to the bibliography and the inventory. The fascicles are guillotined into blocks of 160 continuously numbered columns: Fascicle 2 ends in mid-quotation at 'se-', leaving Fascicle 3 to begin with 'cundum' and end in turn with col. 320, about halfway through the article on the verb *canto*.

The Foreword recounts the history of the project and sets out the principles on which *LmL* is compiled. The Middle Ages are considered to extend from the ninth century, as the formative period of Western music theory, to the fifteenth, after which theory ceases to be truly medieval. The limit of 1500 is strictly applied even to authors who spanned it such as Gafurius, whose *De harmonia musicorum instrumentorum* of 1518 is not considered; the exclusion is justifiable less by the date of publication (which is not that of composition) than by the humanistic influence on its style and of rediscovered Greek writings on its content. On the other hand, classical and late-antique authors from Vitruvius to Isidore whose works governed or influenced medieval thinking are included for terms that survived into the Middle Ages. Moreover, classical spellings are used for the lemmata, so that the word commonly spelt *armonia* in the Middle Ages will appear under *h*, but *equalis* appears under *a*.

Within the chosen period, 'our goal has been the complete collection of all printed texts'; these include material surviving in previously unpublished or poorly edited texts of which editions were made for the purpose and published in the Academy's *Veröffentlichungen der Musikhistorischen Kommission*. (Contrariwise, the *TML* incorporates existing editions – sometimes two for the same text – misprints and all.) Unfortunately, incunables are recognized only if modern facsimiles exist, which deprives the reader of the knowledge that *cadentia* is used in the sense of 'cadence' not only by Jean Le Munerat and Florentius de Faxolis (who is cited only from the few pages published by Albert Seay, not from the complete manuscript; so far, *TML* omits him altogether) but by Guillaume Guerson, *Utilissimae musicales regulae* (Paris: Michel Toulouse, *c*. 1492; GW 11688), sig. [c8]r (included in *TML*). Nor is Guerson sig. [b6]v added to the parenthesis in sense 1.

It is editorial policy to include all terms with their own specific musical meanings; on that basis should not the use of *ad* for singing, etc., 'to' an instrument have been registered? In addition, words with 'a prominent role in musical literature' are included if they stand out 'in relation to their usage in the rest of medieval Latin literature'. Thus *morosus* is included, 'since musical theorists show a conspicuous preference for this term', but *suavis* is not, 'for it has no definitive connotation in music and is used the same way in all spheres of Latin literature' (the German is slightly different, but no matter). The choice of examples recalls the commonplace description of the eighth psalm-tone as *suavis et morosus*; to be sure theorists are fond enough of *suavis*, but although its implications for the medieval ideology of music have been recently studied by Rob Wegman and Christopher Page, it has no precise technical meaning. As for *morosus*, although the senses bestowed on it by musical writers may be less

startling to the medievalist than to the pure classicist, they are sufficiently varied to make an entry welcome.

'Compound terms – e.g. *musica ficta* or *cantare super librum* – will be treated more extensively than in other dictionaries'. The articles in question abide our judgement, though material from Tinctoris relative to singing on the book is collected under *cantatio* and *cano*; meanwhile the antitheses *ars Gallica/ars Italica* and *ars nova/ars antiqua* are treated in sufficient detail for the absence of *ars subtilior* to convey a warning. Absent too, however, is Tinctoris's use of *ars nova* for the modern music that he admires, since this is a description not a name; nevertheless it was worth quoting as an admonition that words do not forever lose their general senses for being combined in special phrases.

Consideration is not given (save exceptionally) to the use of musical terms in non-musical writers, for which three reasons are advanced: that authors' competence is often hard to judge; that terms tend to be used vaguely; and that in general only the most basic language is employed. These statements are not false; nevertheless, the student of medieval culture would be glad to know which terms were used, how correctly, and by whom, information that general dictionaries cannot give unless their compilers understand these words themselves. A more conclusive defence would be that neither time nor resources would permit the careful examination of every paean to *harmonia* and every payment to *menestrelli*. Nevertheless, one may find harsh a policy that cites *archicantor* from Aurelian but not from the far older texts concerning the papal archcantor John (*fl.* 680); Aribo's *cantatrix* is admitted, but what hope is there for Nicholas Trevet's *cantorissa*? More reasonably excluded are non-musical uses of musical words, although *brevis* in the sense 'short syllable' is generously illustrated. (Exceptionally, a third-century source is cited, if that be the date of the *Fragmentum Censorini*. Why not Cicero, Quintilian, or Terentianus Maurus?)

The Inventory of Sources comprises a list of abbreviative sigla for authors and texts with their dates, their expansions, and the approved edition. The sigla regularly incorporate the Christian names: although the last great exponents of truly medieval theory are said to be 'Tinctoris and Gafurius', they are abbreviated as Ioh. Tinct. and Fr. Gafur. The principle that sigla should be 'as intelligible as possible' has sometimes been overridden in the interests of classification: whereas Anonymus I and Anonymus IV are registered as Anon. Couss. I and IV respectively, Anonymi II and III are disguised as Trad. Franc. I and II, since they reproduce Franconian doctrine. (Fortunately, the List of Incipits serves as a reverse index from treatise to siglum.) Johannes Gallicus retains the Spanish-looking cognomen Legrense, which blends a misreading of Hothby's handwriting with morphological ineptitude; the correct name is Legiensis, 'of Liège'. The theorist identified in the late Middle Ages with Pope John XXII is abbreviated Ioh. Cott., perhaps because 'Cotto' rests on evidence, however doubtful, and 'Affligemensis' on conjecture; pending definitive proof of his local habitation and his name, might we not call him 'Iohannes non Papa'?

It is the fault of the language that the English definitions do not match the

German for succinctness in specificity, but why have relative clauses ('letter that designates', 'breve that consists of') supplanted present participles? The first definition is not the most felicitous: sense I of *A* (as of *B* and *C*) is stated as 'Markierungspunkt in Mensuren', which gains in length but not in clarity as 'letter that designates a specific point in measurements'. From the examples we learn that these letters are labels for points in diagrammatic representations of notes or strings, or in expositions of the *mensura monochordi*, as opposed to names of notes themselves, which comprise sense II ('Tonbezeichnung – letter that designates a note'). A general dictionary of medieval Latin, even if its editor had noticed the distinction, would have cited an example or two of each and left it at that. We demand more of a specialized lexicon, and are not disappointed. Under sense I different diagrams in Boethius and other writers are treated separately; under sense II the systems of the *Musica enchiriadis*, its *scolica*, *Alia musica*, and Hucbald are all considered before we reach 'Odonian' notation (II.5), thence at length to continue our journey by way of Berno and Theinred and Walter Odington all the way to Ramos. These entries are histories of medieval letter notation; yet Hothby's *A* (etc.) *primi* and *secundi ordinis* at *Exc.* 36–7 are not noticed. This passage, as Bonnie Blackburn informs me, is a sliver of a more complex six-order system transmitted in various manuscripts, from one of which Christian Meyer edited the account cited under *B* and *C* (it was published too late to be taken into consideration for the article on *A*) as Mon. Iste.

Naturally, the analytical structure and the allocation of examples may sometimes be questioned. The article *accidens* presents phenomena that occur *per accidens*, such as the diapente in the plagal modes and a dot after a note, as if they were senses of the word in their own right; it is certainly useful to be told what things are said by the theorists to be accidents, but a diapente or a dot is no more a sense of 'accident' than Socrates of 'mortal'. (On that footing, indeed, the exclusion of *suavis* seems unjust. Ought we not to be told what effects this or that theorist described as 'sweet', and how they are produced?) At the opposite extreme the article *ballada* makes no distinction between the French 'ballade' and the Italian *ballata*.

*Cantilena*, which in its earliest attestations means 'the same old song', i.e., something said over and over again without convincing us, is found in Antonine Latin denoting a light-hearted song or a lampoon; later on it is also used for religious odes attributed to Solomon (Vulgate Ecclus. 47: 18), and for harmony or consonance in general. This last is sense A in *LmL*, though its tunnel vision disregards St Ambrose's statement (*De Abrahamo* 2.8.54) that the four cardinal virtues resound with *suavem decorem, vitae cantilenam*; sense B, for a musical composition, is divided into B.1, general, and B.2, specific, and sense C, as a generic designation, into C.1, the *cantilena* as an independent genre, sense C.2, 'als Oberbegriff verschiedener Satzformen – as a general term that encompasses several musical forms'. One may wonder why B2a's applications of the word to a mnemonic melody, to the upper voice of a motet, and to the melodic character of the ancient genera deserve to be grouped together; how the application to a

specific piece (B.2.b) can be distinguished from sense C.1 with title attached, except when the piece would not be accepted as a *cantilena* in the narrow sense; and what *Quat. princ.* 4.2.32, where *cantilena* means 'voice-part', is doing in sense C.2. Indeed, this *Oberbegriff* seems more overarching than conceptual: it encompasses Grocheio's distinction of *cantilena* from *cantus*, two other places in *Quatuor principalia* where the word means 'musical genre', and one from Paulus Paulirinus where it denotes any form of mensural music. (Abbreviation of the extract conceals its incoherence, but the comma after 'existat' is misplaced: 'existat dummodo' = 'provided that there is'.) Furthermore, it is left to the examples to reveal that when there is a distinction of ethos between the *cantilena* and other forms, the *cantilena* is the lighter, most famously in Grocheio, most specifically in Tinctoris, who defines it as a *parvus cantus*, usually about love; the quoted phrase confirms the suspicion that the suffix was felt to be diminutive. *Cantilena* was equated in late-antique glossaries with the Greek diminutives ἀσμάτιον and ᾠδάριον; the fifteenth-century copyist of Anonymus II wrote 'cantinellis' instead of 'cantilenis', though if the *cantilena coronata* is equivalent to *cantus coronatus* ('probably', says *LmL*), and if this means what it does in Grocheio (we are sensibly referred to the *Handwörterbuch der musikalischen Terminologie*), the lighter sense is not present. (However, *cantinellis* may be correct after all; see Du Cange s.v. *cantinella* 2.)

   In the face of so valuable a resource it would be ungrateful to dwell at length on individual errors and deficiencies, of which no such work can be free, and which may be corrected from the abundant examples with which each sense is illustrated. This is a work that no scholar of medieval music theory can afford to be without; we can but wish that the remaining fascicles appear as soon as possible – and that, armed with *LmL* and enjoying the ready access to texts provided by *TML*, scholars show themselves worthy of this munificence by engaging with the full range of texts that are relevant to their concerns, not merely with those of which there is a purported translation in purported English.

Leofranc Holford-Strevens

*Fauvel Studies: Allegory, Chronicle, Music, and Image in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS français 146.* Edited by Margaret Bent and Andrew Wathey. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. xx, 666 pp. ISBN 0 19 816579 X.

Music historians have long been interested in the *Roman de Fauvel*, by which they always mean the particular version supplemented by musical items, found in a single manuscript, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 146. The version transmitted in Paris 146 is actually the third version of the work. Book I, dated 1310, was completed within the reign of Philip IV, 'the Fair' (1285–1314). The anonymous author is implicitly critical of his policies, and pessimistic about the state of the world. Book II, attributed to Gervès du Bus, a royal notary, is dated 6

December 1314, just after Philip IV's death on 29 November, thus within the rule of Louis X (1314–16).[1] In this second book, the character Fauvel takes on an active role, designing to marry Lady Fortune, who rebuffs him in a very long harangue. He settles for Vain Glory, they produce many children, and although Fauvel cannot live forever, the author remains pessimistic about the fate of France. A third stage in the genesis of the work, a revision attributed to Chaillou de Pesstain, contains references to 1316, a year that saw the end of the rule of Louis X, the short life of the infant John I, and the beginning of the rule of Philip V (1316–22). The new version, transmitted uniquely in Paris 146, includes insertions of music and some minor adjustments to the text of Book I, and a thoroughgoing revision and extension of Book II. Adopting an even more pessimistic view than its predecessors, this version recounts the courtship of Fauvel and Fortune, the wedding feast of Fauvel and Vain Glory, the charivari cruelly interrupting their marriage night, the tournament of Vices and Virtues on the following morning, and a scene at the Fountain of Youth that renews Fauvel and his progeny. Musical insertions include chant (some newly composed), conductus (some with newly composed music), motets, French refrains, fixed-form songs, lais, *sottes chansons*, and semi-lyric hybrids. The *Roman de Fauvel* in Paris 146 is followed by several political *dits* by Geffroy de Paris, a collection of songs by Jehannot de Lescurel, and an anonymous rhymed chronicle covering the period 1300–16.

*Fauvel* comes at a turning point in the history of music, the beginning of the Ars nova, a phenomenon associated with advances in the notation of musical rhythm described in several music theory treatises. Surviving practical sources for this period are few, and Paris 146 stands nearly alone as a monument to the sort of notation described in the early Ars nova treatises, and to the concomitant development of the isorhythmic motet and fixed-form secular song. Yet these innovations in musical notation and style actually make up only one facet of this unique document. For literary studies, Paris 146 provides insights into the technique of intertextual glossing found in the so-called narrative with lyrical insertions, a poetic genre common in northern France during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The *Roman de Fauvel* is in fact the *ne plus ultra* of this art, exhibiting an enormously nuanced page-by-page coordination of narrative, lyric and image. It also documents a crucial moment in the consolidation of the fixed forms in poetry and, as mentioned above, in music, moving from the thirteenth-century genre hierarchy that gave pride of place to the *grand chant*, to a new fourteenth-century hierarchy that placed the fixed-form ballade above all other lyrical genres. Historically, the manuscript mirrors a period of political crisis in France, marked by the rapid succession of four French kings (Philip IV, Louis X, John I and Philip V) during the years 1310 to 1317.

It has taken a long time for modern scholars to come to terms in even a small

---

[1] See the scepticism concerning the date of Book II registered in Bent and Wathey's Introduction, 17–18.

way with the diverse issues raised by the expanded and interpolated version of the *Roman de Fauvel* in Paris 146. So far as I know, Fétis was the first to announce the rediscovery of the manuscript, dating it between 1314 and 1321, and providing diplomatic facsimiles and editions of Jehannot de Lescurel's *A vous douce debonnaire* in both its monophonic and three-voice forms.[2] For Fétis, Lescurel 'fournit la preuve que l'harmonie n'était pas restée stationnaire en France pendant qu'elle se perfectionnait en Italie' (270). Lescurel thereby filled a gap in Fétis's history of the development of harmony between Adam de la Halle and Landini.

In the course of the 160 years since Fétis, modern editions of one or another part of Paris 146 have appeared. Arthur Långfors published a critical edition of the two books of the *Roman de Fauvel* in 1919, based on the fairly consistent text tradition found outside of Paris 146, ironically the earliest extant source for the work. Långfors gives Chaillou de Pesstain's longest interpolation in an appendix and some smaller interpolations in critical notes, but omits the texts of the 169 inserted musical items.[3] Emilie Dahnk filled in most (though not quite all!) of the gaps in 1935, leaving the reader to shuttle back and forth between the two editions to reconstruct the textual portions of the *Roman de Fauvel* in Paris 146.[4] Leo Schrade published the polyphonic items in 1956, in the process laying out a complete-works edition of the corpus of motets he attributed to Philippe de Vitry.[5] An edition of the monophony (excluding chant and one prose) by Hans Tischler and Samuel Rosenberg appeared only in 1991, and the monophonic chant and pseudo-chant items were published for the first time in Susan Rankin's contribution to the collection under review here.[6]

Over the years several non-*Fauvel* works in Paris 146 have also been stripped from their original context and published in forms more palatable to modern sensibilities. In 1855 Anatole de Montaiglon published the texts by Lescurel, the only body of lyrics ascribed in Paris 146 to a particular author.[7] Friedrich

---

[2] F.-J. Fétis, 'Histoire de la musique: Notice d'un manuscrit de la Bibliothèque du Roi', *Revue musicale*, 12 (1832), 265-70. None of the extraordinarily thorough recent studies of Paris 146 acknowledges Fétis's pioneering article, though Friedrich Ludwig knew it (*Repertorium organorum recentioris et motetorum vetustissimi stili*, vol. 1, *Catalogue raisonné der Quellen*, part 2, *Handschriften in Mensural-Notation*, Institute of Mediaeval Music, Musicological Studies 26 (Assen, 1978), 621). I am loath to believe that Fétis himself made the transcriptions for which he takes credit. He may have discovered them among the papers of François-Louis Perne, who had died earlier in the year 1832. That Perne was familiar with Paris 146 is proved by a textless copy of the *Fauvel* motet *Super cathedram / Presidentes / Ruina*, made probably around 1810, which slipped into unrelated material on Machaut's Mass that Perne left to the Bibliothèque de l'Institut (today MSS 930–931).

[3] A. Långfors (ed.), *Le Roman de Fauvel par Gervais du Bus*, Société des anciens textes français (Paris, 1914–19).

[4] E. Dahnk, *L'Hérésie de Fauvel*, Leipziger romanistische Studien, Literaturwissenschaftliche Reihe 4 (Leipzig, 1935).

[5] L. Schrade (ed.), *The Roman de Fauvel: The Works of Philippe de Vitry: French Cycles of the Ordinarium missae*, Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century 1 (Monaco, 1956).

[6] S. N. Rosenberg and H. Tischler (eds.), *The Monophonic Songs in the Roman de Fauvel* (Lincoln, NE, and London, 1991). An earlier edition by G. A. Harrison, Jr., 'The Monophonic Music in the ''Roman de Fauvel''', Ph.D. diss., Stanford University (1963), which includes the chant, has seen little use.

[7] A. de Montaiglon (ed.), *Chansons, ballades et rondeaux de Jehannot de Lescurel* (Paris, 1855).

Gennrich provided musical transcriptions of the Lescurel works in 1921, and Nigel Wilkins re-edited them in 1966.[8] The six French *dits* of Geffroy of Paris were published in 1950, the two Latin *dits* were edited for the first time in Leofranc Holford-Strevens's contribution to the present collection, and the rhymed chronicle was published in 1956.[9]

Paris 146 is an ideal candidate for the sort of contextual study of manuscript presentation that has begun in the last few years, furthered especially as regards medieval France by Sylvia Huot's 1987 book *From Song to Book*.[10] For *Fauvel* research, this new era opened with the publication of a complete facsimile of the manuscript in 1990, including a superb introductory study by the interdisciplinary team of Edward Roesner (music), François Avril (art) and Nancy Freeman Regalado (literature), and for the first time treating the manuscript, despite its diversity of contents, as an entity.[11] The importance of this full facsimile for further research can hardly be exaggerated, given that the original *mise en page* of Paris 146 is essential to a proper understanding of much of its contents. Important subsequent work includes a doctoral dissertation supervised by Edward Roesner, two literary monographs and, most recently, an edition that integrates the complete text of the *Roman de Fauvel* in Paris 146 with editions of the complete music.[12]

The present book, in twenty-seven chapters, gathers research carried on in Margaret Bent's seminars at Oxford (1992–5) and at a 1994 Paris conference organized by Bent and Andrew Wathey. A perfect match for such a diverse manuscript, the volume explores in impressive interdisciplinary fashion just about every direction taken by scholarly studies of the period *c.* 1300 in France. Based on descriptions in the list of contributors to the volume, I count five political historians, four art historians, eight literary historians, and ten musicologists. A few years ago such a collaborative effort would have been unthinkable; nowadays a student of medieval music simply cannot avoid coming to grips with the best

[8] F. Gennrich, *Rondeaux, Virelais und Balladen aus dem Ende des XII., des XIII. und dem ersten Drittel des XIV. Jahrhunderts mit den überlieferten Melodien*, 2 vols., Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur 43 and 47 (Dresden, 1921 and 1927); N. Wilkins (ed.), *The Works of Jehan de Lescurel, Edited from the Manuscript Paris, B.N., f. fr. 146*, Corpus mensurabilis musicae 30 (n.p., 1966).

[9] W. Storer and C. Rochedieu (eds.), *Six Historical Poems of Geffroi de Paris, Written 1314–1318*, University of North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures 16 (Chapel Hill, 1950); A. Diverrès (ed.), *La Chronique métrique attribuée à Geffroy de Paris*, Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg 129 (Paris, 1956).

[10] S. Huot, *From Song to Book: The Poetics of Writing in Old French Lyric and Lyrical Narrative Poetry* (Ithaca and London, 1987).

[11] E. H. Roesner, F. Avril and N. Freeman Regalado (eds.), *Le Roman de Fauvel in the Edition of Mesire Chaillou de Pesstain: A Reproduction in Facsimile of the Complete Manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Français 146* (New York, 1990).

[12] J. C. Morin, 'The Genesis of Manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, fonds français 146, with Particular Emphasis on the ''Roman de Fauvel''', Ph.D. diss., New York University (1992); M. Lecco, *Ricerche sul 'Roman de Fauvel'*, Scrittura e scrittori 10 (Alessandria, 1993); J.-C. Mühlethaler, *Fauvel au pouvoir: Lire la satire médiévale*, Nouvelle Bibliothèque du Moyen Age 26 (Paris, 1994); P. Helmer (ed.), *Le premier et le secont livre de fauvel in the Version Preserved in B.N. f. fr. 146*, Institute of Mediaeval Music, Musicological Studies 70/1 (Ottawa, 1997).

work in political history, literary studies and art historical studies. (Perhaps – we still have a ways to go – we will someday read histories of the Middle Ages that take music into account as a matter of course.)

After the enormous advance of Roesner, Avril and Regalado, it is inevitable that some of the essays in this volume serve to fill in gaps left after that study. Leofranc Holford-Strevens, in 'The Latin *Dits* of Geffroy de Paris: An *Editio Princeps*' (chapter 11), applies his erudition to two unedited Latin *dits* by the likewise thoroughly erudite Geffroy de Paris, providing model scholarly editions of these works. Based on historical references, Holford-Strevens dates *Hora rex est* (the original index gives *Des alliez en latin*) after the consecration of Philip V (9 January 1317), or more precisely in late April or early May 1317. *Natus ego* (index: *De la creation du Pape Jehan*), expressing high hopes for the new pope John XXII, can be placed at approximately the same time. These works supply the latest datable material copied into Paris 146. Elsewhere in the volume, Holford-Strevens provides new critical texts of the prose *Carnalitas luxuria* (p.mus. 36) and its source motet *Floret / Florens / Neuma* (see Alice Clark's contribution).[13]

Mary and Richard Rouse, in 'Jehannot de Lescurel' (chapter 22), contribute a brief note that allows us to toss out the old biography of Jehannot de Lescurel, which had him hanged in 1304. From the available archival evidence, we simply do not know who Lescurel was.[14] It is thus perfectly possible that he was alive at the time of the redaction of Paris 146. Judging from the style of the music, this possibility has always seemed warranted, and it affirms that Lescurel's works, like the analogous modern songs in the *Roman de Fauvel*, should be read according to the rhythmic prescriptions in early Ars nova treatises.

Two articles provide new catalogues raisonnés. In an appendix to her chapter, 'The Refrain and the Transformation of Genre in the *Roman de Fauvel*' (chapter 5), Ardis Butterfield catalogues fifty-five refrains incorporated into the *Roman*, covering five uses of the refrain in *Fauvel*: (1) constituent elements of fixed-form songs, (2) segments incorporated into motets, (3) independent insertions in narrative, (4) fragments recalling known songs, and (5) as a 'visual motto' (cf. 121 and 133).[15] The catalogue, a model for the eventual replacement of the bibliographies of Gennrich and van den Boogaard,[16] includes transcriptions of the music that reflect the conventions of the early Ars nova rhythmic practices that surely inform the music in this manuscript.

Susan Rankin's 'The ''*Alleluyes, antenes, respons, ygnes et verssez*'' in BN fr. 146: A Catalogue Raisonné' (chapter 19), catalogues the fifty-three items of monophonic chant and pseudo-chant interpolated into the *Roman de Fauvel* (over thirty

---

[13] I refer to musical works in Paris 146 according to the serial numbering of each 'p[ièce] mus[icale]' in Dahnk, *L'Hérésie de Fauvel*.

[14] Concerning Lescurel, Elisabeth Lalou notes elsewhere in the volume under review that the accounts of the hôtel mention several 'Jeannotus ministerellus' (316, n. 53).

[15] Starting from different assumptions, Dahnk, *L'Hérésie de Fauvel*, had distinguished fifteen refrains, while N. H. J. van den Boogaard, *Rondeaux et refrains du XIIᵉ siècle au début du XIVᵉ: Collationnement, introduction et notes*, Bibliothèque Française et Romane D3 (Paris, 1969), counted fifty.

[16] Gennrich, *Rondeaux, Virelais und Balladen*; van den Boogaard, *Rondeaux et refrains*.

per cent of the total of 169 musical items).[17] Thirty-two of the chants are new compositions, drawing their texts from one or two text sources, or centonizing a text from several sources; the melodies may adapt standard antiphon frameworks or simply incorporate standard modal melodic turns. Long stretches of Chaillou's narrative quote the chant material exclusively or nearly so, maintaining a distinction between newly composed pseudo-chant and the traditional repertory. For instance, in the *Roman* segment set in Paris leading up to Fauvel's wedding and the charivari episode, of the seventeen interpolated pieces (p.mus. 73–89), fourteen are chant, all but one newly composed. (The series is filled out by a motet on a text by Philip the Chancellor, a segment of a Victorine sequence, and a trope to the Christmas responsory *Descendit de caelis*.) In the segment on the Virtues preparing for the tournament with the Vices, all but three of the series of twenty pieces (p.mus. 91–110) are drawn from actual chant. It should now be possible for literary historians to examine the ramifications of all this for the insertion practice in the *Roman de Fauvel*.[18]

Anne Walters Robertson, in 'Local Chant Readings and the *Roman de Fauvel*' (chapter 21), focuses on the actual Gregorian repertory in Paris 146. Robertson collated the readings of alleluias, antiphons, responsories and one responsory trope, as well as the fragments of chant serving as motet tenors, drawing upon some sixty sources for the Mass and some thirty for the Office.[19] Although most of the chants are closest to Parisian sources, especially those from Notre Dame, some exhibit variants that point to uses outside of Paris. Robertson proposes that certain chants were self-consciously altered to seem foreign, giving them 'other-worldly, even heavenly, status' (p. 517), for petitions to God, to Christ, or to the Virgin, thereby separating such petitions from any association with Paris, understood here as an earthly realm. The argument is subtle, but given the *Fauvel* editor's sophisticated control of the various interpolated genres, it is worth pondering.

Several articles define the horizon of expectation of contemporary readers through examinations of the cultural context of the highly diverse material in Paris 146. Martin Kauffmann's 'Satire, Pictorial Genre, and the Illustrations in BN fr. 146' (chapter 13) studies the models adapted for two important images in the *Fauvel* pictorial cycle: Fauvel enthroned, usurping images of the king of France, Christ in majesty, and even of the God of Love; and the Fountain of Youth, parodying baptismal imagery and contemporary images of the Fountain of Youth derived from courtly romance.

---

[17] The material usefully supplements Rankin's article, 'The Divine Truth of Scripture: Chant in the *Roman de Fauvel*', *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 47 (1994), 203–43.

[18] See the interesting discussion in Rankin's 'Chant in the *Roman de Fauvel*', 230–42.

[19] Elsewhere, Robertson's enquiries into variant readings have provided some important and unexpected advances to our knowledge of Philippe de Vitry's biography. On the basis of chant readings in the Trinity motet *Firmissime / Adesto / All. Benedictus*, she locates his town of origin at Vitry-en-Artois, near Arras (A. Walters Robertson, 'Which Vitry? The Witness of the Trinity Motet from the *Roman de Fauvel*', in *Hearing the Motet: Essays on the Motet of the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, ed. D. Pesce (New York, 1996), 52–81).

Michael Camille's 'Hybridity, Monstrosity, and Bestiality in the *Roman de Fauvel*' (chapter 6) notes that in Paris 146, the locus of images of hybridity, monstrosity and bestiality is not in the margins of the manuscript, but reversed, in the centre of the page. In the context of literary and iconographical tradition, the transformation of Fauvel from horse to near-human form subverts the Christian view of the creation of man in God's image: society, the *Roman de Fauvel* teaches us, is threatened by transformations.

Nigel F. Palmer, in 'Cosmic Quaternities in the *Roman de Fauvel*' (chapter 18), focuses on a passage in Fortune's response to Fauvel's marriage proposal found near the end of Gervès du Bus's Book II (vv. 2993–3104). Here Fortune lays out the qualities of the microcosm (man) and the macrocosm (world), in terms of the four primary elements (moisture, heat, dryness and cold), keying each one to the four complexions, four ages of man and four ages of the world. Palmer demonstrates that the many discussions of similar material found in medical, philosophical and theological texts do not always agree on the assignment of a specific humour to a given category. Nevertheless, he finds some analogues to a peculiarity of Gervès's schema, his equation of melancholy (black bile), not only with old age but also with the final age of the world, filled with evil and sin, expecting the Antichrist.

In a brief notice, 'Le Contexte folklorique et musical du charivari dans le *Roman de Fauvel*' (chapter 12), Michel Huglo fills in some information on the charivari, popular demonstrations taunting widows and widowers who remarry, or couples of widely separated ages. Government statutes reaching back at least to the late thirteenth century, and extending into the seventeenth, prohibited such demonstrations, celebrated in Molière's 1664 farce *Le marriage forcé*, with ballets by Lully. *Fauvel* remains the earliest and most detailed description of a medieval charivari.

Finally, Michael T. Davis, in 'Desespoir, Esperance, and Douce France: The New Palace, Paris, and the Royal State' (chapter 8), offers a fascinating re-creation of the royal palace complex as it was rebuilt and expanded under Philip IV, with construction continuing for several years after his death. The project was thus absolutely current with the production of Paris 146. In the *Roman de Fauvel*, the new palace is dubbed 'Desespoir', the seat of Fauvel's court in the topsy-turvy city of Esperance.

Four chapters elucidate the literary horizon of Paris 146. Kevin Brownlee bases his study, 'Authorial Self-Representation and Literary Models in the *Roman de Fauvel*' (chapter 4), on five passages in Book II in which Chaillou asserts himself as the author figure. Brownlee discovers some convincing and suggestive parallels between the situation in *Fauvel*, in which the two earlier *Fauvel* books are continued and rewritten by Chaillou de Pesstain, and the continuation and rewriting of Guillaume de Lorris's *Roman de la Rose* by Jean de Meun. Jean-Claude Mühlethaler, in 'Discours du narrateur, discours de Fortune: les enjeux d'un changement de point de vue' (chapter 16), also deals with the narrator figure, contrasting the omniscient narrator of Book I with the witnessing-I of Chaillou's expanded

Book II. Lady Fortune, now addressing Fauvel directly, assumes the function of revealing the dangers of Fauvel to the world. In effect the stakes are raised in the revised Book II, since the dangers posed by Fauvel in 1310 (Book I) and in 1314 (Book II, original version) are still rampant.

With 'Tradition and Innovation in BN fr. 146: The Background to the Ballades' (chapter 17), Christopher Page picks up a neglected literary-musical question of the early fourteenth-century transitional period, the emergence of the ballade as a high-brow genre. The monophonic ballades in the *Roman de Fauvel* – turning the thirteenth-century genre hierarchy on its head – are after their fashion just as path-breaking for the fourteenth century as the better known isorhythmic motets elsewhere in the manuscript. Particularly useful is Page's examination of formal flexibility in the late thirteenth-century ballade/virelai songs found among the 'balettes' of the Lorraine text chansonnier (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 308, trouvère chansonnier I). On the delicate evidence of the lack of any mention of the ballade form in Grocheio's treatise of *c*. 1300, Page suggests that models for the ballade may have come to Paris from Lorraine after 1300. From the mid-thirteenth century, manuscripts from this region had already shown a preference for reductions of lengthy *grand chants* to three stanzas, a characteristic of the ballade. (Note that loosening Lescurel from the 1304 death date makes sense here as well: many of the anonymous ballades composed expressly for the *Roman de Fauvel* are comparable stylistically to the works of Lescurel found later in the manuscript.)

Ardis Butterfield's 'The Refrain and the Transformation of Genre in the *Roman de Fauvel*' (chapter 5) was cited above for its index of refrains. The essay itself is of central importance, situating the *Roman de Fauvel* in the tradition of narratives with lyrical insertions (in place of this awkward locution, Butterfield on different occasions uses 'interpolated narrative', '*roman à chansons*' and 'hybrid narrative'). The *Roman de Fauvel*, well known for its critical position in music history, is also a key work in the literary tradition of such hybrid narratives. The *Fauvel* editor exercised various manners of interpolation, from the loose juxtapositions of old and new material in Book I, to the long and brilliantly innovative 'set pieces' composed for Book II, in which even the boundary between lyric and narrative is effaced. The first of these set pieces, part of Fauvel's courtship of Lady Fortune, is the 'central semi-lyric ensemble', occupying more than eight pages (fols. 23v–27v) in the manuscript, and incorporating no fewer than thirty-two musical insertions, including two absolutely unique formal units, a 'dit à refrains' (less regular structurally than the two *diz entez sus refrains de rondeaux* of Lescurel found later in the manuscript), and a 'motet farci', which takes the motetus voice of a three-voice motet known from the Brussels rotulus (*Trahunt / An diex / Displicebat*), and splits it into short fragments, each of which functions as a refrain heading its own six-line strophe. As if this were not complicated enough, the known motet appears earlier in the *Roman*, now with four voices, but our motetus voice has a new Latin text (*Quasi / Trahunt / Ve / Displicebat*, p.mus. 21). The second set piece, part of the charivari scene com-

menting on Fauvel's marriage to Vain Glory, occupies six pages (fols. 34r–36v), and incorporates twelve items.

Butterfield's discussion of thirteenth-century precedents for *Fauvel* is splendid. Just to take one point, Butterfield finds that two of the most important precedents for refrain citation, the *chansons avec des refrains* and the *saluts d'amour*, are genres secondary and peripheral to modern literary scholars, and this fact further underlines how difficult it is for us to obtain access to the world of Paris 146. After *Fauvel*, one could go no further, only take a new direction, as in the sorts of hybrid *dits amoureux* not compiled like *Fauvel* from diverse materials, but written from start to finish by a single author, Jehan Acart de Hesdin or Jehan de le Mote, Guillaume de Machaut or Jean Froissart.

Several chapters explore the circle that was responsible for the conception, production and destination of Paris 146. Alison Stones, in 'The Stylistic Context of the *Roman de Fauvel*, with a Note on *Fauvain*' (chapter 23), traces the current state of knowledge of the large complex of some fifty manuscripts related to Paris 146, the work of the *Fauvel* painter and associated painters, whose activity centred on the rue Neuve Notre-Dame (on the Cité, running West to East to the parvis of the cathedral). This group of artists contributed more to the illuminated book trade in Paris in the first half of the fourteenth century than did the better-known work of Jean Pucelle and his associates.

Stones's 'Note on *Fauvain*' deals with the difficulties of finding parallels to the curious style of drawing in a manuscript compilation related to Paris 146: Paris, B.N. fr. 571, containing the so-called *Roman de Fauvain*. The diverse original contents of Paris 571 constitute a mirror of princes, made, as Andrew Wathey has proposed, for the betrothal in 1326 of Philippa of Hainaut and the future Edward III of England.[20] Formerly thought to be English, the style of drawing is tentatively located by Stones in Tournai. There is unfortunately no coordination of this material with Jane H. M. Taylor's essay, '*Le Roman de Fauvain*: Manuscript, Text, Image' (chapter 24). Taylor notes a common origin of *Fauvel* and *Fauvain* in Jacquemart Giélée's *Renart le Nouvel*, but finds a more direct influence in the *dits* of Watriquet de Couvin, menestrel to Guy de Châtillon, count of Blois. (Guy's wife Marguerite, a daughter of Charles of Valois, is one of the many links between the House of Valois and *Fauvel*-related material.) Taylor masterfully draws a picture of Watriquet, a 'chancery artist' (Nancy Freeman Regalado's term), i.e., a court official and poet concerned with the manuscript presentation of works, a character emblematic of the early fourteenth century. In effect, the producers of Paris 571 and Paris 146 moved in the same circles, and indeed the plan for *Fauvain* may have been hatched between Watriquet and Gervès du Bus in Paris in 1326.

Malcolm Vale's 'The World of the Courts: Content and Context of the *Fauvel* Manuscript' (chapter 25) provides some details concerning the service of Philip

---

[20] A. Wathey, 'The Marriage of Edward III and the Transmission of French Motets to England', *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 45 (1992), 1–29.

the Fair's chamberlain Enguerran de Marigny, whose deleterious influence and ultimate downfall are allegorized in the *Roman de Fauvel*. Emanating as it does from the royal chancery, the *Roman* betrays a wide knowledge of the workings of the king's household, seen in references to the colours of liveries, in mentions of the rich appointments of the royal apartments, in distinguishing *mesnie* (retinue) from *mesnage* (family), in the mention of dishonest innkeepers familiar to an itinerant retinue, and in the insights on courtly drama and entertainment seen in the charivari sequence. (Vale is currently at work on archival materials relating to entertainments for princes' courts of this region and time.) The arms of the Virtues in the tournament scene in *Fauvel* may flatter some specific princes, e.g., Jean de Luxembourg. As for the sponsor of the manuscript, Vale notes that princes retained royal servants, such as Gervès du Bus, as supernumerary employees, thus a disaffected lord of the king's council could be the patron of the manuscript.

In 'La Chancellerie royale à la fin du règne de Philippe IV le Bel' (chapter 14), Elisabeth Lalou details some of the history of the royal chancery in the period leading to *Fauvel*. During the reign of Philip IV, government institutions were consolidated and the bureaucracy grew strong. Rather than government by an informed king, the perception was that the king did not seem to govern at all. Thus, in the *Roman de Fauvel* those closest to the situation, the bureaucrats, may be addressing their discontent to the new king, Philip V, through satire. Lalou identifies Chaillou de Pesstain (or Pesscain, as she reads it) as Geoffroy Engelor dit Chalop de Persquen, a Breton notary who served the Crown from 1304 until 1334.[21]

Jean Dunbabin's 'The Metrical Chronicle Traditionally Ascribed to Geffroy de Paris' (chapter 10) argues against attribution of the metrical chronicle to Geffroy of Paris (Holford-Strevens concurs in this). Although many have taken the chronicle as a fully trustworthy source, Dunbabin notes that this is dangerous when dealing with a chronicle in verse, since literary and entertainment issues are at stake. Although Paris 146 is our only source for the chronicle, it probably existed separately, composed to flatter Charles of Valois, brother of Philip IV, manipulating history in Charles's favour to influence public opinion.

The chronicle may be the work of a minor official under Etienne de Mornay, Charles of Valois's chamberlain, who was put in charge of Louis X's chancery. Thus, the chancery under Louis X, a locus for officials favourable to Charles of Valois but critical of Philip IV and Marigny (Charles of Valois was Marigny's main enemy), was a milieu ripe for the sort of disaffection allegorized in the *Roman de Fauvel*. On the other hand, when Philip V succeeded to the throne, he replaced Etienne de Mornay, and Charles's influence waned. Perhaps this explains why the metrical chronicle breaks off a bit unsatisfactorily in November 1316,

---

[21] Elsewhere in the volume, Wathey expresses scepticism over Lalou's identification of Chaillou de Pesstain as Chalop de Persquen, who was apparently absent from the court during the critical period of July to December 1316 (603, n. 18; 606; and the Introduction, 2–3 and 15).

before the coronation of Philip V. In a long-term project like Paris 146 (Dunbabin suggests that production required perhaps two years), the metrical chronicle remained valuable as a key to the satire, but it became necessary to include the *dits* of Geffroy of Paris to render the project politically correct. We should note that Morin's codicological evidence of a radical re-adjustment in the manuscript structure, occasioned by the incorporation of the *dits* into the manuscript, supports Dunbabin's view.

With 'Gervès du Bus, the *Roman de Fauvel*, and the Politics of the Later Capetian Court' (chapter 26), Andrew Wathey provides a brief but substantial discussion of the milieu that conceived the *Roman*. Noting that some of the names in the list of those responsible for the impeachment, trial and execution of Enguerran de Marigny, with Charles of Valois at the head, are also found in the Estroit Conseil (Great Council) advising the future Philip V in July 1316, Wathey sketches the careers of several high officials employed by Valois or by allies of Valois who were connected in various ways to the *Fauvel* project. For instance, Jean de Condé, employed by the countess of Hainaut, Charles of Valois's daughter, may have served Charles in earlier years: other poems of Jean de Condé pursue themes found in political pieces in *Fauvel*. Other Valois allies connected to the *Fauvel* project include Regnaut de Picquigny, vidame d'Amiens, mentioned in the motet *Detractor / Qui* (p.mus. 12), which should now be considered an attack on Marigny, not the Templars, as previously thought (and hence datable later than scholars had been wont to suppose), and Jehan Hanière, prosecuting lawyer of Marigny, whose speech to the Parlement is quoted in an item of *Fauvel* pseudo-chant, *Non nobis domine* (p.mus. 127).

Gervès du Bus remained closely associated to high levels of the administration (as did Jean Maillart, whose *Roman du comte d'Anjou* is extensively quoted in Chaillou's revision of Book II) all through the critical period of July to December 1316 – the period of the death of Louis X, the death of the infant John I, and Philip of Poitier's definitive claim to the throne as Philip V – and thus could have been involved with revisions of his own work.

We still cannot say what role, if any, Philippe de Vitry played in the project. Wathey has found him as a clerk of Louis de Bourbon, Count of Clermont by 1321, perhaps as early as 1315.[22] Louis, a supporter of Philip V in early 1317, had ties to Charles of Valois. Thus, Paris 146 was produced 'within a circle of royal councillors led by Charles de Valois' (p. 607).

Noting that by 1317 Marigny had long since ceased to pose a threat to the French Crown, Wathey goes on to discuss some new threats – usurpers and false councillors – that may lie behind the allegory of the *Roman de Fauvel*. They include not only men who threatened Charles of Valois's influence, such as Charles de la Marche, Philip V's younger brother and the future Charles IV, or

---

[22] A. Wathey, 'European Politics and Musical Culture at the Court of Cyprus', in *The Cypriot-French Repertory of the Manuscript Torino J.II.9: Report of the International Musicological Congress, Paphos 20–25 March, 1992*, ed. U. Günther and L. Finscher, Musicological Studies and Documents 45 (Neuhausen-Stuttgart, 1995), 33–54.

Eudes, Duke of Burgundy, or Charles's half-brother Louis, Count of Evreux, but also Edward II, who is explicitly discussed in the metrical chronicle and indirectly figures in the satire of the *Fauvel* charivari. The Antichrist who would threaten France, already born, is then to be understood as none other than Edward III.

Essays that concern the problem of reworking material for *Fauvel* bring us back to musical issues. Alice V. Clark, in 'The Flowering of Charnalité and the Marriage of Fauvel' (chapter 7), discusses the prose *Carnalitas luxuria* (p.mus. 36), the reworked triplum of the Marigny motet *Floret cum Vana Gloria / Florens vigor / Neuma* that appears in B-Br 19606 and F-CA 1328, but not in Paris 146. An appendix provides new editions of the texts of the motet and prose that benefit from emendations by Leofranc Holford-Strevens, with translations by David Howlett and Holford-Strevens.[23] It has been something of a mystery exactly why *Floret / Florens*, with regard to text references perhaps the earliest of the four Ars nova motets on Enguerran de Marigny (*Floret / Florens / Neuma*, *Garrit / In nova / Neuma*, *Tribum / Quoniam / Merito* and *Aman / Heu / Heu*), was omitted from the *Roman*. It seems that the best we can do is call on a serious problem of page layout at the point in the manuscript where it was wanted, near the beginning of Book II, where the denizens of Fauvel's court are described.[24] Clark believes it possible that the new prose was a matter of on-the-spot reworking of the original motet triplum.

Lorenz Welker's 'Polyphonic Reworkings of Notre-Dame Conductûs in BN fr. 146: *Mundus a mundicia* and *Quare fremuerunt*' (chapter 27) provides a useful table of the twenty-three Notre-Dame conductus in *Fauvel*, all but one of which are found in the Florence codex, and thirteen of which can be ascribed to Philip the Chancellor. Book I includes fifteen conductus, many of them contiguous in the manuscript, in versions little revised from the original, except *Quare fremuerunt* on fol. 1. Book II includes eight conductus, only three of which, in lengthy lai structures, are unrevised. Anomalies in the text layout in Paris 146 – where text spacing reflects melismas in the original setting not set melismatically in the revised setting – indicate that the texts of the revised works were copied from a source that contained the old music.

Welker selects three works for detailed study of compositional procedure, *Mundus a mundicia* (p.mus. 2), *Quare fremuerunt* (p.mus. 3), and, later in the chapter, because of its origins as a motet, *Favellandi vicium* (p.mus. 1). All three are contiguous on fol. 1r. Concerning *Mundus*, Welker proves that the work is not an example of 'top-down' composition, as formerly held, but rather was composed in conductus style, with much voice-crossing, from the monophonic version. I do not find it convincing, however, that despite its motet-like layout in the manuscript, the work ought to be performed as a conductus, the performer of the textless tenor somehow supplying the full text to his part (who in 1317 would have thought to do this?).

---

[23] Since Rosenberg and Tischler's *Monophonic Songs in the Roman de Fauvel* unaccountably leaves the prose out, it would have been useful to include a musical edition as an appendix to the article.

[24] Roesner, Avril and Regalado, *Le Roman de Fauvel*, 29.

As for *Quare fremuerunt*, again revising the received view, Welker has found that the A section does indeed rework the 'tenor' in the Florence codex, apportioning it between the two voices, while the B section, unrelated to the old piece, reworks the *Salve regina*. In contrast to *Mundus*, *Quare* reflects a modern conception in form and in rhythmic language. Despite their classification in the original index as motets, both *Mundus* and *Quare* resemble the old conductus with regard to compositional structure.

Joseph Morin discovered that *Favellandi vicium* reworks the triplum of the thirteenth-century motet *Bien me doi / Cum li plus / In corde*.[25] While Morin calls on the original tenor to help explain the structure of the revised tenor, Welker argues that the reviser worked from an individual transmission of the motet triplum, though such a transmission pattern is a rare and problematic phenomenon. Based on a variety of anomalous factors, Welker observes that when the texts of the three pieces of music were first copied on fol. 1r of Paris 146, the revised music was probably not yet available. Here, on the very first page of the manuscript, the differing musical style of each of the three works explicitly lays out a broad band of the stylistic spectrum that will characterize the rest of the manuscript.

Particularly interesting are those discussions that deal with material across the entire manuscript (seen also in the essay of Dunbabin, discussed above). Joseph C. Morin presents some of his codicological examination of Paris 146 in 'Jehannot de Lescurel's Chansons, Geffroy de Paris's *Dits*, and the Process of Design in BN fr. 146' (chapter 15). The codicological approach argues that despite its miscellaneous contents, Paris 146 must be considered a unified whole. In the manuscript as it stands, the interpolated *Roman de Fauvel* ends on the ninth folio of a gathering of twelve folios (senio). After a blank verso, the series of *dits* of Geffroy de Paris begins. A single bifolio accommodates the second *dit*, while the remaining *dits* begin a fresh series with a new gathering. Formerly (Roesner, Avril Regalado), it was argued that the structural irregularity could indicate that the manuscript was to end after the second *dit*, providing a certain parallelism: Book I ends with a motet to Louis X and a motet to Philip V, now Book II ends with a *dit* to Louis X followed by a *dit* to Philip V. For his part, Morin shows that the gathering containing the second series of *dits* was already in progress as the *Roman* was being copied. In fact, it began originally with the songs and *dits* of Jehannot de Lescurel, material that presently falls at the middle of the gathering. The unfinished gathering was folded back on itself, and a new outer bifolio added, allowing Geffroy's *dits* to fall between the *Roman* and the works of Lescurel. Such a radical reorganization proves that planning was involved in the overall organization of the manuscript: the appearance of seemingly random items after the *Roman de Fauvel* was not a haphazard occurrence.

Like most scholars, Elizabeth A. R. Brown regards *Fauvel* as counsel for the new king Philip V. In '*Rex ioians, ionnes, iolis*: Louis X, Philip V, and the *Livres*

---

[25] Morin, 'The Genesis of Manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, fonds français 146', 325–44.

*de Fauvel*' (chapter 3), she focuses mainly on fols. 10r–11r of Paris 146, the end of the first book and the beginning of the second, containing two motets, one for Louis X, *Se cuers ioians | Rex beatus | Ave* (p.mus. 32), and one for Philip V, *Servant regem | O Philippe | Rex regum* (p.mus. 33). Brown's careful exegesis of the texts calls freely on the *dits* and rhymed chronicle copied later in the manuscript to explicate messages critical of Louis X and intended to instruct and admonish Philip V.

Emma Dillon, in 'The Profile of Philip V in the Music of *Fauvel*' (chapter 9), begins with some interesting comments on chronology. Since *dits* in Paris 146 refer to current events at least up to May 1317 (Holford-Strevens), one can study how the fictional present of the narrative (past at the time of writing) is informed by future events. Although the Virtues defeat Fauvel's forces, his progeny obtain eternal life in the Fountain of Youth. Such a pessimistic tone, going as far as to hint that the rule of the Antichrist has begun with Philip, suggests that the work is a very strong admonition to Philip V, a warning from his uncle Charles of Valois. Dillon calls on the larger context of Paris 146 (Geffroy of Paris's *dit Un songe* and the motet's Advent tenor) in her multi-faceted analysis of *Servant regem | O Philippe | Rex regum* (p.mus. 33).[26]

Nancy Freeman Regalado is the only one of the scholars involved with the 1990 facsimile edition to contribute to the present volume. Her essay, 'The *Chronique métrique* and the Moral Design of BN fr. 146: Feasts of Good and Evil' (chapter 20), is concerned with intertextual parallels between the metrical chronicle and the *Roman de Fauvel*, especially in Chaillou's main interpolation to Book II. She advocates a 'reciprocal reading' of the two to elucidate how the clear moral lesson of the chronicle, that the welfare of the kingdom depends on the moral strength of the king, applies in the *Roman*. For instance, there is a parallel between the description of the 1313 Pentecost fête, in which Philip IV appears as the ideal ruler, and the wedding of Fauvel, in which the charivari makes a mockery of the proceedings. The satire playing off the historical event provides an *admonitio* for Philip V.

Regalado notes that one can draw the moral lesson essentially from any segment of Paris 146. Like the image of the *civiere*, frequent in the *Roman*, the 'complex juxtapositions of works in different genres' (p. 469) invites the reader to move backwards and forwards in the collection. One imagines that that is how many people confronted Paris 146 at the time: turning over pages, the eye lights on a random narrative passage, or image, or song text. Enjoyment and meaning come in affirming that all the diversity reinforces a basic lesson.

---

[26] Dillon's appended edition of the motet is marred by numerous inaccuracies, the most critical being the last pitch in the motetus. Further analytical work needs to take account of D. Leech-Wilkinson, 'The Emergence of *ars nova*', *Journal of Musicology* 13 (1995), 285–317, which attributes the work to the 'Master of the Royal Motets'; and the article of A. Walters Robertson, whose collation of chant readings indicates that the tenor of *Servant regem | O Philippe | Rex regum* also (like that of *Firmissime | Adesto | All. Benedictus*, see n. 19, above) mirrors readings from Arras, and thus suggests that Philippe de Vitry may be the composer (512, n. 23).

No essay in the collection should excite more controversy than Margaret Bent's 'Fauvel and Marigny: Which Came First?' (chapter 2). Musicologists have always operated on the assumption that a motet's date can be established by the date of the references in its text. Thus, the Ars nova political motets taken into the *Fauvel* project had an independent existence; the music editor included them because of their relevance to the project. Unfortunately, recalcitrant stylistic features sometimes work against the chronology of the text references. For example, the familiar *Garrit gallus / In nova / Neuma* (p.mus. 129) has been dated before 29 November 1314, because the text obliquely refers to Philip IV as still alive, while *Tribum / Quoniam / Merito* (p.mus. 120), is datable after Marigny's execution on Montfaucon (30 April 1315), and *Aman / Heu / Heu* (p.mus. 71) falls later, sometime within the following two years, after which the body was removed for burial. Yet of these three, *Garrit gallus / In nova / Neuma* seems far and away the most advanced work as regards musical style. Bent cuts the Gordian knot, arguing that the new-style motets were composed specifically for the Paris 146 project, and thus a motet written after a given event could have been written at any point during the planning of the manuscript, even after some still later event had overtaken the first.

As can be seen from the 'p.mus.' order, the three Marigny motets involved are placed in the *Roman* in the reverse of the chronology suggested by the historical events alluded to in their texts. Bent calls on a literary rationale to explain this. In the *Roman de Fauvel*, Lady Fortune is described as having two wheels, each with a smaller internal wheel moving in contrary motion to the first. Like Fortune's multiple wheels, the *Roman de Fauvel* is spinning in several directions at once.[27] The Fauvel narrative moves one way, while the motets inspired by historical events relating to Marigny move the other way. Bent's hypothesis allows us to breathe a sigh of relief, for now we still have a group of motets approximately datable, without needing to feel discomfort over a particular composer's uneven stylistic development (after all, none other than Philippe de Vitry is at stake here). By now, one humbly grants any and all measures of subtlety to the *Fauvel* editor. Let's let this settle in to see where it leads. The battle lines are drawn.[28]

---

[27] Elizabeth A. R. Brown relates the reverse chronological order of the three topical motets in Book II to the labyrinth (70–1). Theseus's victory over the Minotaur stood for Christ's victory over Satan, and relates to a theme of the *Roman de Fauvel*, Philip V's upcoming battle with Fauvel.

[28] Other scholars who have undertaken stylistic studies bearing on the chronology of the motets of this period include K. Kügle, 'Die Musik des 14. Jahrhunderts: Frankreich und sein direkter Einflußbereich', in *Die Musik des Mittelalters*, ed. H. Möller and R. Stephan, Neues Handbuch der Musikwissenschaft 2 (Laaber, 1991), esp. 355–74; *idem*, *The Manuscript Ivrea, Biblioteca Capitolare 115: Studies in the Transmission and Composition of Ars nova Polyphony*, The Institute of Medieval Music, Musicological Studies 69 (Ottawa, 1997), chap. 3; and Leech-Wilkinson, 'The Emergence of *ars nova*'. Leech-Wilkinson suggests an early chronology for much of Philippe de Vitry's known oeuvre, and even proposes that a conservative music editor of *Fauvel* may have omitted notationally more advanced works. (On the conservative music editor, see also Roesner, Avril and Regalado, *Le Roman de Fauvel*, 26a.) In general, these scholars have not been directly addressed in the volume under review, but see M. Bent, 'Early Papal Motets', in *Papal Music and Musicians in Late Medieval and Renaissance Rome*, ed. Richard Sherr (Oxford, 1998), esp. 8–15. Roesner indicates that some text

Finally, Wulf Arlt, in 'Jehannot de Lescurel and the Function of Musical Language in the *Roman de Fauvel* as Presented in BN fr. 146' (chapter 1), demonstrates that Lescurel's songs can be shown to break up the *Gerüstsatz* of the Adam de la Halle chanson style through melodic diminution; Lescurel thereby made explicit what may have been a matter of unwritten performance practice for the prior generation. So far, Arlt is restating material familiar to those who have followed his work.[29] The point for the present essay, however, is to define some characteristics of the new style, for Arlt proposes that the deployment and positioning of variously styled musical works within the whole is significant for the message. Fauvel, for instance, sings in the new style, usually in French, while Fortune maintains the old-style, usually in Latin (in his courtship of Fortune, he mimics her old style music, while she mimics his French: see their dialogue ballade *Douce dame debonaire* (p.mus. 42)). At one point, Fauvel even perverts a conductus of Philip the Chancellor, applying the new rhythmic-melodic ballade style to the venerable text (*Favelle qui iam*, p.mus. 69). Thus the style of music deployed at a given moment in the narrative is significant to the message. I shall return to this thought presently.

As one plays the *jeu de la civiere* with this collection of studies, moving back and forth between articles, one does notice a few minor inconsistencies (the editors explicitly state that they 'have not imposed consistency on the interpretations'). Often the editors have supplied relevant cross-references to other chapters in footnotes, but just as often they have not. Sometimes contributors had access to the complementary work of other contributors, sometimes not. Alison Stones notes that limitations were placed on the number of illustrations she was allowed (her chapter is nonetheless very generously illustrated), but three manuscripts she mentions are illustrated elsewhere in the volume, and the editors could have cross-referenced these (pls. 6.5, 13.10, and 24.7). Butterfield, in her refrain no. 6 (p. 138), includes a reasonable emendation (not marked as such) that could have improved Page's transcription of the full ballade (ex. 17.1,

---

variants in the Paris 146 copy of *Garrit gallus | In nova fert | Neuma* (p.mus. 129) emphasize a connection to Marigny more directly than does the version in B. N. Picardie 67, a detail that may suggest the independent existence of this motet before its inclusion in the *Fauvel* project (Roesner, Avril and Regalado, *Le Roman de Fauvel*, 52). Other works in the modern style included in Paris 146 that may have been in circulation prior to their inclusion in *Fauvel* are *Servant regem | O Philippe | Rex regum* (p.mus. 33) and *Detractor est | Qui secuntur | Verbum* (p.mus. 12); as it happens, these are the very works independently transmitted in Paris 571 (Roesner, Avril and Regalado, *Le Roman de Fauvel*, 31b).

[29] See W. Arlt, 'Aspekte der Chronologie und des Stilwandels im französischen Lied des 14. Jahrhunderts', in *Aktuelle Fragen der musikbezogenen Mittelalterforschung: Texte zu einem Basler Kolloquium des Jahres 1975*, Forum Musicologicum: Basler Beiträge zur Musikgeschichte 3 (Winterthur, 1982), 193–280. Concerning unwritten performance practice made explicit in Lescurel, an oblique reference from Italy, while of course not dealing with this repertory, at least reveals that this need not be so, and that Lescurel's works may in fact represent a new departure: Francesco da Barberino's Latin gloss to his *Documenti d'amore* (*c.* 1315), apparently referring to the exuberant melismas prominent in the madrigal, states: 'In my opinion, the old songs, exhibiting the *dolce stil novo* [*habentibus dulces novas*] and few notes, have more to delight the spirits of discriminating listeners' (F. da Barberino, *I documenti d'amore*, ed. F. Egidi, 4 vols. (Rome, 1922–7), III, 20 (translation mine)).

p. 355). The policy on translation is inconsistent: Middle French and Latin are translated about half the time.

The book includes a useful genealogical table (Houses of Capet and Valois), a chronology of relevant events 1295–1346, a bibliography of items specific to Paris 146 (the enormously valuable interdisciplinary bibliography of related items in history, literature, art history, architectural history and music, is of course available by chasing footnotes in individual chapters), an excellent general index, as well as an index of manuscripts and an index of musical compositions. Most welcome of all are the eight absolutely stunning colour plates.

My only real quibble concerns a missed opportunity. I wish the editors had imposed a consistent editorial approach with regard to musical transcriptions. Butterfield and Page supply transcriptions in accord with early Ars nova conventions, while Arlt and Welker provide transcriptions that are of the sort used for the monophonic works in the edition by Tischler (and now even for Ars nova motets in the edition of the complete music by Helmer); several articles refer to Tischler's transcriptions without comment.[30] It is difficult for me to imagine why we still challenge Friedrich Ludwig's ninety-five-year-old statement: 'alle . . . neuen Stücke im Fauvel sind senar imperfekt'.[31] Not only do the theory treatises in the vicinity of the period of the *Roman de Fauvel* attest to the popularity of this mensuration (one of them boldly and openly proclaiming: *sex minime possunt poni pro tempore imperfecto*[32]), but also contemporary Italian theorists find it characteristic enough of the modern French sound to dub *senaria imperfecta* the *senaria gallica*.[33]

A few pieces, I admit, remain ambiguous (exactly which pieces are the 'neue Stücke'?), but very close attention to the context of the musical insertions may refine our view of the ambiguities of the notation of this period. For example, I wonder if the very last piece, the motet on the refrain *Cis chans veut boire* (p.mus. 130, transcribed by Butterfield according to Ars nova principles on p. 158) might not be better viewed in Vitry's *tempus perfectum minimum*, an old Franconian tempus.[34] Thus, after the extremely modern *Garrit / In nova*, we return to earth with an old-style drinking song. 'Ci me faut un tour de vin' – is this our solace in the end?

Let me finish the discussion with some further thoughts on Arlt's proposal

[30] See A. Butterfield's review of Rosenberg and Tischler, this journal, 2 (1993), 193–5; and, especially, the devastating review by D. Leech-Wilkinson, *Early Music*, 20 (1992), 489–91.

[31] F. Ludwig, review of J. Wolf, *Geschichte der Mensural-Notation von 1250–1460, Sammelbände der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft*, 6 (1904–5), 625.

[32] G. Reaney, A. Gilles and J. Maillard (eds.), *Philippi de Vitriaco Ars nova*, Corpus scriptorum de musica 8 (n.p., 1964), XV, 2, 23.

[33] G. Vecchi (ed.), *Marcheti de Padua Pomerium*, Corpus scriptorum de musica 6 (n.p., 1961), 172–80. See the summary of further Italian testimony on the French manner in F. A. Gallo, 'Die Notationslehre im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert', in *Die mittelalterliche Lehre von der Mehrstimmigkeit*, ed. F. Zaminer, Geschichte der Musiktheorie 5 (Darmstadt, 1984), esp. 307–16.

[34] Reaney, Gilles and Maillard, *Philippi de Vitriaco Ars nova*, XX, 29. The work is to be transcribed with major-minor interpretation of the semibreve pairs; see Roesner's discussion in Roesner, Avril and Regalado, *Le Roman de Fauvel*, 34b–37b.

that the musical style of a given interpolation is significant for the message. This is a very important finding, and one that now needs to be worked out over all 169 musical interpolations. We have seen the beginnings of such a study in several of the contributions to this volume, each treating a different repertory: Rankin's work shows that most of the chant and pseudo-chant is deployed systematically in certain segments of the work; forty-five of fifty-five refrains that Butterfield catalogues are accounted for by the two large 'set pieces' in Book II; all but the first two of the eight items in Page's list of ballades figure in the first grand 'set piece' described by Butterfield, and even the two exceptions are part of the dialogue between Fauvel and Fortune that sets up the segment; Welker's list of conductus shows that the deployment of old or new settings of conductus texts is also systematic.

But one can go further than this. I think Arlt has stepped to the edge of the abyss, but has backed off. We now need to take seriously the fact that the progressive new style, as Fauvel's preferred musical language, represents – what is bad! For example, most of the artistically progressive ballades occur in the courtship scene of Fauvel and Fortune, a perverted transformation of the old order of courtly love. Was the aesthetic distance set up in this satirical segment a necessary stage along the path to the eventual acceptance of the new-style chanson?

The most extreme musical embodiment of transformation is the last major work in the manuscript, the masterful motet *Garrit gallus / In nova fert*, with its quotation of the opening of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* at the opening of the motetus. To us, *Garrit / In nova* seems the epitome of modernist progress, the victory of rational control over the caprice of the Petrus de Cruce style: but in the context of the *Roman de Fauvel*, does this music, with its red tenor notes leering at us, not instead represent the ultimate state of transformation, so dangerous to the well-being of France, the victory of perversion, the promulgation of the little *fauveaus nouveaus* – all this in spite of its moralizing text? (The Fountain of Youth is draped in another infected work, *Firmissime / Adesto*.) The *Roman de Fauvel* is a document of transformation in the political, literary and musical realms; but how was the tension between the artistic trends it embodies (and to us champions), and the use of this same art to represent the danger of transformation perceived at the time? Was Jacques de Liège more in tune with the moral lesson of the *Roman de Fauvel* than Philippe de Vitry? Ironically, transformation may be perverse, but it produces great art.

Lawrence M. Earp