The Worcester Fragments

A Paleographical Examination

Vol. I of II

Elizabeth I. Nyikos

Magdalen College
University of Oxford
OX1 4AU

December 2017

A thesis submitted to the Music Faculty in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Musicology from the University of Oxford

Abstract

The Worcester Fragments represent the largest extant collection of polyphonic music from thirteenth-century England, with over a hundred compositions (many of them *unica*) across more than sixty manuscript fragments. Musicologists have known about the fragments for over a century, but the majority of their attention has been devoted to the remnants of one volume with surviving medieval foliation. Moreover, the tendency has been to conflate the many fragments into one 'Worcester Repertory' as though they represent the output of a single scriptorium at one point in time, with the result that the connections between the individual sources and the differences in manuscript production and musical repertory that they represent have been incompletely examined in scholarship.

This thesis seeks to explore how the various manuscripts that make up the Worcester Fragments were originally created, from the preparation of the page to the original phase of copying to later additions in the fourteenth century and beyond, in order to establish a complete history of the Worcester Fragments, from their creation to their demolition and later rediscovery. It might have been titled 'The Worcester Fragments: A Biography' for this is not a the study of a codified manuscript that was created at a single point in time, but rather, the story of a number of sources that changed and evolved both in presentation and content, as they passed from maker to user to secondary user to binder and eventually to historian and reconstructer in a long and colourful life of usage. In considering both the history of the transmission of music and the history of the manuscript itself as an object of use and reuse throughout the centuries, a more nuanced understanding of the manuscript is proposed, not as

an organised work conceived of and produced in a short period of time, but as a more fluid source, one that has proven to be adaptable, heterogeneously compiled and innovatively updated over time. Through a paleographical and musical re-examination of these various fragmentary sources, the dissertation will propose a new interpretation of the Worcester Fragments, one that separates independently-produced sources by the 'workshops' they represent and establishes the chronological timeline in which they were copied. Identifications of compositions will be made, a comprehensive script analysis of the fragments is given here for the first time and both a relatively unknown piece of music and a very famous one will be re-set in a new context of creation and interpretation. Finally, the dissertation will explore the history of the fragments beyond the thirteenth century and re-examine the possibility of a Worcester provenance in the light of the latest discoveries.

Contents

VOLUME I

Abbreviations

r	recto[1]
v	Verso
fol.	folio(s)
frag.	fragment(s)
T	Text hand
M	Music hand
D	Decorative hand
DIAMM	The Digital Image Archive of Medieval Music
EECM	*Early English Church Music*
PMFC	*Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century*
RISM	*Répertoire International des Sources Musicales*
WF	*The Worcester Fragments*
WMH	*Worcester Medieval Harmony*

Library Sigla

D-Bas	Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek
D-Gs	Göttingen, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliotek
D-W	Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek
E-BUlh	Burgos, Monasterio de Las Huelgas
F-MO	Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine
GB-BEV	Beverley, East Riding Archives and Records Service
GB-ABnlw	Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales
GB-Cclc	Cambridge, Clare College
GB-Ccc	Corpus Christi College
GB-Cgc	Gonville and Caius College
GB-Cic	Jesus College
GB-Cpc	Pembroke College
GB-Ctc	Trinity College
GB-DRu	Durham, University Library
GB-Lbl	London, British Library
GB-Lbm	British Museum
GB-Llp	Lambeth Palace
GB-Lwa	Westminster Abbey
GB-Ob	Oxford, Bodleian Library
GB-Omc	Magdalen College
GB-Onc	New College
GB-WOc	Worcester, Cathedral Library
I-Fl	Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana
US-Coc	Columbia, Columbia College
US-Chu	Chicago, University Library
US-NYpm	New York, Piermont Morgan Library
US-PRu	Princeton, University Library

[1] In the instance where a fragment number in GB-WOc Add. 68 refers to a single folio, the folio will be refered to as fol.1 when distinguishing recto and verso, to avoid confusion with the roman numerals. Thus the verso of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii will be GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii, fol. 1v instead of frag. xiiv. When not specificing recto or verso the dissertation will use standard RISM sigla or, in this example, GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii.

Introduction

> Hughes gives but little information concerning the manuscript material. An inventory such as H. Besseler gave for the portion designated as 'Worc D' by F. Ludwig would have been desirable.[2]
>
> *Jacques Handschin, Review of Worcester Medieval Harmony, 1931*

> There is no master inventory that tells the reader what the Worcester Fragments are. Handschin's criticism of the *Worcester Medieval Harmony* still holds, for the central, primary table of descriptions is missing from Mr. Dittmer's catalogue. It exists, I trust, either in his head or in his notes, but it is never communicated to the reader. There should be an inventory of the fragments with comprehensive, detailed physical description.[3]
>
> *Richard Crocker, Review of The Worcester Fragments, 1959*

It has been over a hundred years since the first mention of the so-called 'Worcester Fragments', a seemingly disorganised collection of sixty-odd fragmentary folios and bifolios of English medieval polyphony, appeared in print.[4] Yet many questions of original format, scribal identification and use from the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries and beyond still remain unanswered, while the relationship between the various surviving fragments – now held between the Worcester Cathedral Library, the London British Library and the Bodleian Library in Oxford – has yet to be thoroughly untangled. Jacques Handschin and Richard Crocker's dissatisfaction with the scholarship on Worcester could as easily be raised today. Despite transcriptions of the music by more than one scholar, despite numerous recordings and

[2] Handschin 1931-2, 54-61. Translated by Richard Crocker in his later review (see fn. 3).
[3] Crocker 1959, 71-74.
[4] The Worcester Fragments were first published in Floyer and Hamilton 1906.

performances of the repertoire of the Worcester Fragments, and despite the collection's significance as the largest surviving body of English polyphony between the Winchester Troper and Old Hall Manuscript, the Worcester Fragments have yet to be subjected to a thorough codicological and paleographical study. It is true that they do not fit neatly into the concept of a 'source' of music since the many fragments, gleaned from the bindings of separate, unassociated medieval books represent several original manuscripts of polyphony, a number of distinctive textual, musical and decorative hands, and layers of use and reuse from palimpsests to fifteenth-century musical additions. Even so, there are a number of reasons why a codicological and paleographical analysis of the Worcester Fragments today might answer some of the questions that earlier studies could not. To begin with, the modern scholar has access to resources unavailable to the musicologists of the early and mid-twentieth century. Photos taken with UV light combined with digital image manipulation can uncover erased layers that were undiscovered before. A set of fragments uncovered in Worcester bindings in the 1990s has now been included in the latest inventory of the Worcester Fragments, but its paleography still needs to be considered and the other fragments re-examined in the light of the new discoveries.[5] Finally, even as I write, musicologists are revisiting and rewriting our understanding of thirteenth-century polyphony. As the scholarship moves forward, so our understanding of the sources themselves changes in light of its revisions.[6] New attitudes towards the history of book production have arisen, with codicologists, paleographers and musicians alike showing an increased interest in miscellany manuscripts, fragmentary sources,

[5] Summers and Lefferts 2016, 35. The new manuscript discoveries will be discussed in in Chapter 1.

[6] I am grateful for the generosity of the scholars in sharing their often unpublished work with me; in particular, I am indebted to Peter Lefferts and William Summers for sharing their introduction to *EECM 57*. I hope that the new facsimile will bring a renewed interest in this at once frustrating and fascinating source of polyphony.

and revisions and annotations to manuscripts.[7] To give but one example, Helen Deeming's recent work on GB-Harley 978 and GB-Lbl Egerton 274 shows how a medieval manuscript can evolve in the hands of its users over the course of a century.[8] The study of a manuscript's evolution over time can be a valuable resource for engaging in a more dynamic understanding of the book as a changing subject through time, an approach that explores how manuscripts were perceived and changed by their medieval audience. The Worcester Fragments provide the perfect opportunity for a fresh analysis of a collection of musical material that clearly underwent revision by its many owners.

The Worcester Fragments range in size from mere scraps of parchment to complete bifolios. The original manuscripts they once belonged to were copied in England in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, but were later dismantled and reused in the bindings of manuscripts, many of which can be traced back to Worcester Cathedral Priory.[9] The addition of fifteenth-century music in the blank margins of a number of the fragmentary folios shows that the manuscripts were still intact in the first half of the fifteenth century, so this process of dismantling and reuse must have occurred in the latter half of the fifteenth century and throughout the sixteenth century. In the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, most of the binding fragments and flyleaves were removed from their 'host' manuscripts (many of which were still in their fifteenth and sixteenth-century bindings) and are now held in three separate collections. The majority of the fragments can still be found in the Worcester Cathedral

[7] See especially Connolly and Radulescu, eds. 2015; Johnston and Van Dussen, eds. 2015; and Deeming 2004.
[8] Deeming 2015a and Deeming 2015b, 141.
[9] All the 'host' manuscripts for the fragments are now known. See Thomson 2000, 89–96. Roger Wibberley also traced the origin of the manuscript sources from which the fragments were taken. With a few exceptions, all of the fragments are more recent than the books they are used to bind, thus they were clearly used for the rebinding rather than the original binding of the manuscripts. Wibberley 1977, 18-23.

Library in the collection Add. 68, while a few manuscript fragments are held at the British Library under the shelfmark Add. 25031. A further twenty-odd fragments can be found in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, where they form part of an attempted reconstruction consisting of negative photostats of the fragments in Worcester and London interspersed with manuscript fragments from the Bodleian's collection, bound in one volume with the shelfmark Lat. lit. d. 20. For ease of reference, this dissertation will use RISM sigla for all manuscripts, thus these three collections will be referred to as GB-WOc Add. 68, GB-Lbl Add. 25031 and GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20. The fragments represent a number of original sources; the three with the most surviving folios have been organised by scholars into 'Reconstructions'. FIGURE1.1 shows the current location of the fragments, and how the 'Reconstructions' are divided among them. The identification of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii as part of Reconstruction II is new to this dissertation; it is made on the basis of scribal concordances and will be discussed in section 2.3.2. The designation 'fragment' also needs clarification. In the portfolio GB-WOc Add. 68, fragmentary folios and bifolios are grouped into small collections called 'fragments'; these divisions are based on the bindings from which they were removed: for example, 'fragment xx' is a single bifolium removed from GB-WOc F. 152, while 'fragment xxix' consists of two bifolios taken from GB-WOc F. 43. Each 'fragment' may represent anywhere between one and four fragmentary folios and from one to two different original sources.

The scribal hands of the Worcester Fragments have proved a challenge to musicologists. Notational styles are almost as broad and varied as the compositions they present: the same

scribes copy works in varying styles and notations.[10] To date, Roger Wibberley's 1977 dissertation is the only study to attempt an analysis of the text and music hands.[11] Wibberley argues for a 'network' of scribes and notators who copied all the music at around the same time. His division of scribal hands has not yet been challenged, apart from a few minor changes proposed by Nicky Losseff in her 1994 dissertation.[12] Chapter 2 will undertake a complete re-examination of the organisational structure, phases of copying, and the text, music and decorative hands that worked to create Reconstructions I, II, and III. The remaining folios of the Worcester Fragments will also be considered, and their connection to the three Reconstructions – with regard to both paleography and musical content – will be examined.

The repertory of the Worcester Fragments represents the largest English body of polyphony in the thirteenth century. Its compositions are varied and those from the original copying phases cover a period from the early thirteenth to early fourteenth centuries; some of the fragments also contain a number of added compositions that extend the manuscript's repertory and use into the late-fourteenth and fifteenth-centuries.[13] Among the oldest compositions are two-voice settings of sequences written in a simple, note-against-note manner characterised by voice-exchange and the predominant use of the third.[14] They include cantus firmus settings, conductus with cauda and a three-voice organum setting. A number of compositions from the

[10] Wibberley 1977.
[11] Ibid., 23 and Wibberley 2000, 41-49.
[12] Losseff 1994, 146-147. With a few exceptions, Losseff agrees with Wibberley's division of scribes, even stating that 'whether we do or do not come to agree with his argument for a network of scribes, his recognition of where one hand stops and another starts cannot seriously be disputed' (146). She does not offer scribal divisions of her own, and amends Wibberley's only regarding his identification of scribes in Reconstruction III and in other fragments not part of the Reconstructions: GB-WOc Add. 68, frag xviii, xxxiv, xii and xxix (147).
[13] For an overview of the range of compositional variety within the Worcester Fragments see Sanders, 'Worcester Polyphony' http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com:80/subscriber/article/grove/music/30564.
[14] Insular sources with a similar style include GB-Lbl Sloane 1580, GB-Ob Bodley 343 and GB-Lbl Arundel 248.

mid-fourteenth century also survive: largely cantilena and chant settings. However, the majority of the compositions date from the second half of the thirteenth century and cover a variety of styles, among them rondelli, motets and troped chant settings. Chapter 3 will review the compositional styles and genres represented in the Worcester Fragments and examine the repertory's concordances and connections with other manuscripts. Two individual compositions – a troped *Sanctus* which appears twice in the Worcester Fragments and the four-voiced motet *Thomas gemma/Thomas cesus/ Primus Tenor/ Secundus Tenor* – will be discussed in detail in order to highlight the variety of repertory and facilitate a discussion of provenance.

A paleographical and musical examination of the folios can only tell part of the story of the Worcester Fragments. Chapter 4 will trace the history of the manuscript as an object including later additions, annotations for performance, newly-written fifteenth-century compositions and the dismantling and reuse of the folios as binding material for manuscripts from Worcester Library. The original provenance of Reconstructions I, II, III and other fragments will be considered, their connection to Worcester re-examined and alternate origins of provenance proposed. While some questions will inevitably remain unresolved, this dissertation will provide a more complete understanding of the individuals and influences that created the Worcester Fragments, and of their place in the history of both thirteenth-century music and twentieth-century musicology.

1.

Modern Reconstructions of the Fragments

> While I was at Worcester, Wilson [the Chapter Librarian] told me how Friedrich Ludwig had been calling, not so long before, hat in hand, asking to have photographs of the newly-discovered manuscripts and permission to publish the results of his studies. Apparently Wilson was not favourably impressed by Ludwig, and declined to give permission, telling me afterwards that he saw no reason on earth why we should let a foreign scholar come in and reap the benefits of editing what we could perfectly well do for ourselves in England.[15]
>
> - *Dom Anselm Hughes, 1959.*

The history of discovery and research on a manuscript will always colour our view of its significance. One wonders for instance how the history of scholarship on the Worcester Fragments might have been different had Ludwig been given access to them.[16] Indeed, the importance of insular music in musicology would probably have been given greater weight had Ludwig written more about English polyphony alongside the Notre Dame repertory. In the case of the Worcester Fragments, the history of discovery, restoration, reconstruction and scholarship played a significant role in how the manuscript fragments and their repertory were perceived in the twentieth (and now early twenty-first) centuries.

---

[15] Hughes 1959, 26. The visit Hughes describes was made in 1912.

[16] Ludwig's work on Worcester remains unpublished to this day, although he gave a brief description of the fragments in his *Repertorium* (Ludwig 1910-61, 648-65). His notes on the fragments are held in the University Library, Göttingen.

1.1 Reconstructing a medieval codex: the *Worcester Motet Book*

The first mention of the musical fragments occurred in John Floyer and Sydney Hamilton's 1906 catalogue of the Worcester Cathedral Library. The entry was quite simple, but it was enough to catch the attention of scholars.[17] In the next decade, Walter Frere, Dom Anselm Hughes and Heinrich Besseler all reviewed the fragments.[18] Dom Anslem Hughes learned of the fragments in 1912 from Frere, who wrote to him that a set of flyleaves of music that 'looked interesting' had been recently removed from bindings at Worcester Cathedral.[19] Hughes was the first to discover the connection between many of the binding fragments from GB-WOc Add. 68, several of the manuscript fragments in the Bodleian's collection, and six flyleaves from a thirteenth-century Worcester Psalter at Magdalen College, Oxford (GB-Omc 100). In 1924, Hughes contacted Dr. H. H. E Craster, the sub-librarian to the Bodleian and Consultant Librarian to Worcester Chapter Library, asking that the manuscript binding fragments of GB-Ob Auct F. Info 1.3 and GB-Omc 100 be removed from their bindings and photographs sent to Worcester for reassembly (Figure 1.3). He hoped that the British Museum would 'follow suit' with their material.[20] In response, instead of sending photographs, Magdalen College offered the fragments to Worcester Cathedral Library and they were moved to join the GB-WOc Add. 68 collection. Interestingly, the Magdalen librarian's letter shows that by then, the fragments were already considered to have an original Worcester provenance, therefore in a sense to rightfully 'belonging' to Worcester and their fellow 'Worcester Fragments' (Figure 1.2). He writes,

[17] Floyer and Hamilton, 1906.
[18] For a list of Hughes's articles and a full discussion of the first fifty years of scholarship on the fragments see Dittmer 1957a, 4-5.
[19] Hughes 1959, 23-26.
[20] Ibid. Note that GB-Lbl Add. 25031 was kept at the British Museum at the time.

> Dom Anselm Hughes recently identified some leaves of music, found in the bindings of books in our library, as belonging to old service-books once used in your cathedral. Other leaves, we understand, are still at Worcester, being now in your library. The President and Fellows, therefore, have given their consent, at a meeting held on 7 July, to a proposal to offer you the gift of these leaves that they may once again be reunited with those, now in your possession, to which they belong.[21]

This language of 'belonging' is also evident in Hughes's writings: he refers to the Magdalen fragments as having been 'returned to' rather than given to Worcester Cathedral.[22] Meanwhile at the Bodleian, the desire to physically reunite fragmented sources and restore a 'lost book' led to the compilation of a reconstructed book of manuscripts and photostats.[23] Under the direction of Dr. Craster, the leaves of the Bodleian binding fragments were interspersed with negative photostats of flyleaves of GB-Lbm Add. 25031 and selected leaves of GB-WOc Add. 68 in an order following Hughes's foliation, bound into one volume under the title *The Worcester Motet Book &c* and shelfmark Lat. lit. d. 20 (FIGURE 1.4).[24] Photographs of GB-WOc Add. 68 frag. xxviii and xxxi were not included: despite Hughes's wishes, 'the Bodleian authorities' were not convinced that they belonged to the same book.[25]

It seems strange that the manuscripts should have been bound in a book instead of being kept loosely in a folder (as they were in GB-WOc Add. 68). The creation of this curious

---

[21] Godfrey Driver, Letter to the Dean of Worcester Cathedral, n.d. The letter is from the 1920s and is kept at Worcester Cathedral Library.
[22] Hughes 1928, 22.
[23] Dom Anselm Hughes, Letter to Dr. H. H. E Craster, 23 September 1924. The letter is now part of the bound manuscript GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. i and ii.
[24] In addition to the leaves from GB-Lbm Add. 25031 (the London fragments at the British Museum at the time), the volume contains photostats of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. ix, x, xi, xiii, xxviii and xxx, flyleaves from the Bodleian manuscripts GB-Ob Auct. F inf. 1.3, GB-Ob Bodley 862 and GB-Ob Hatton 30, and photostats of GB-Omc 100. After the first section of the volume (the 'Motet Book'), several other fragments and images from the 'Worcester Fragments' were added; hence, the title *Worcester Motet Book &*. It is unclear whether Hughes or Craster can be credited with the initial idea of the reconstructed book. It seems that Hughes was consulted, but that the Bodleian had the final say in what was included.
[25] Hughes 1928, 22.

reimagining of a medieval manuscript was no doubt influenced by the number of leaves with medieval foliation still surviving. Nineteen of the first twenty-one folios in GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 have a distinctive red medieval foliation. The attempted reconstruction was well-intentioned but problematic: to begin with, the fragments belong to more than one original codex. The bound volume also complicated the situation of the foliation – those fragments that contain no original medieval foliations are out of order and Hughes himself used two foliation systems.[26] Still, it was Hughes's scholarship that introduced the music of the Worcester Fragments in facsimile, transcription and recordings.[27] The transcriptions and notes on the compositions in his 1928 *Worcester Medieval Harmony* served as an introduction and overview to a then little-known source of polyphony, paving the way for further research. By the early 1950s, facsimiles of many of the folios had been published and a number of new concordances identified.[28]

Indeed the attention that the Worcester Fragments garnered in the late-nineteenth and early twentieth-centuries was second only to that of the Sumer Canon; these two 'giants' of music overshadowed the rest of early insular polyphony. In the introduction to her 2016 dissertation, Amy Williams establishes the political influences that underscored scholarship on the Worcester Fragments and Sumer Canon. The search for a 'lost book' of the same status and significance as thirteenth-century Continental sources, driven by nineteenth- and early twentieth-century nationalism, led scholars to exalt two 'great works' of English music, the Worcester Fragments and the Sumer Canon, at the expense of all other thirteenth-century

[26] Dittmer 1957a, 12-13.
[27] With the help of Percy Grainger, Hughes published a series of practical editions. He also recorded compositions from the Worcester Fragments with his choir at Nashdom Abbey (Early Gothic Music, listed in the discography of Reese, 1940).
[28] Dittmer outlines these in the published extract from his dissertation. Dittmer 1957a, 4-5.

music sources.[29] At a fundraising event for the new Royal College of Music, the Duke of Albany even made the audacious claim that the Sumer Canon, 'a purely English creation' was 'the germ of modern music, the direct and absolute progenitor to the oratorios of Handel, the symphonies of Beethoven, the operas of Wagner'.[30]

As a Benedictine of Pershore Abbey, Dom Anselm Hughes may have experienced pressure from another direction to establish the prominence of English medieval music. In the early twentieth century, the Anglican Benedictine order was experiencing something of a schism; by the time of Hughes's novitiate, Caldey Island had 'defected' to the Catholic Church and Anglican Benedictines were divided between those staunchly faithful to the Church of England and those sympathetic to a reunion with the Catholic Church.[31] To the Anglican Benedictines of Pershore, establishing the primacy of 'English music' was not only a matter of national pride but of ecclesiastical importance: to prove the rich history of the Church in England. Indeed, after a 10-year hiatus from work on the Worcester Fragments, it was at the instruction of his abbot in 1922 to 'go on with musical research' that novice Anselm Hughes revisited the Worcester Fragments and began the work that would lead to the publication of *Worcester Medieval Harmony*.[32] In ascribing a Worcester origin to the fragments and by demonstrating that they represented a significant book of many folios, a book that was likely the product of a 'Worcester School of Polyphony', Hughes was at once elevating the status of English sacred music in general and of English Benedictines in particular.[33]

---

[29] Williamson 2016, 10-15.
[30] Hughes and Stradling 2001, 28. The speech was made at the Free Trade Hall, Manchester, 12 December, 1881.
[31] Anselm Hughes called the Catholic sympathizers 'papalists'. Dunstan 2009, 66.
[32] Hughes 1959, 28.
[33] Hughes 1928, ch. IV 'The "Worcester School"', 25-30.

1.2 Dissertations

The cultural context surrounding the discovery of the Worcester Fragments is important because it coloured how the fragments were encountered by scholars for many years: not as a treasure-trove of many fragmentary sources of English polyphony of multiple possible provenances, but as a 'Worcester' manuscript source given a legendary status as a kind of English *Magnus Liber*, an interpretation which persisted for many years and is even evident in Luther Dittmer's 1957 dissertation. Having identified a number of Alleluias among the Worcester Fragments, which he believed corresponded to those listed in the Harleian index of lost compositions (GB-Lbl Harley 978), Dittmer goes on to speculate:

> If we combine all of the Alleluia Choralbearbeitungen of this type together, then we find an actual *Discantuum Volumen* of English origin, comparable in this respect to the *Magnus liber* associated with Leonin and Perotin.[34]

In 1952, Dittmer submitted his dissertation on the Worcester Fragments: a study that attempted to complete what Hughes' publication had not – the cataloguing and transcription of all the compositions in the Worcester Fragments. Dittmer divided his catalogue between the reconstructed book GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 (including the photostats taken of GB-Lbl Add. 25031) and the fragments from GB-WOc Add. 68. His dissertation incorporated the new leaves discovered since *Worcester Mediaeval Harmony*'s publication and further divided Hughes's reconstruction of GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 into five sources based on original medieval

[34] Dittmer 1954, 37.

foliation and fragment size.[35] He also provided a new system of foliation, an undeniable improvement to those of Hughes in 1928 and 1951. Though only an excerpt of this work was made available, Dittmer published a series of articles from his dissertation in the following years, most notably on the dating and notation of the Worcester Fragments and their significance to an understanding of binary rhythm.[36] Dittmer was also responsible for the introductions to selected facsimiles and transcriptions of GB-WOc Add. 68 and GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 published by the Institute of Mediaeval Music.[37] However, his main contribution to the scholarship was his 1957 *The Worcester Fragments: A Catalogue Raisonné and Transcription*, which listed all the known 'Worcester Fragments' of the time and provided some 180-odd pages of transcriptions.[38] Dittmer's work remains the only attempt to transcribe all the fragments, although Ernest Sanders did provide a revision of several of Worcester's transcriptions in *Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century* IV (hereafter PMFC XIV) – one of which will be critically discussed in Chapter 3.[39] Gilbert Reaney also drew on Dittmer's *The Worcester Fragments* to create the catalogue entry for the Worcester Fragments in RISM, keeping Dittmer's order of compositions, and generally his dating for the pieces. One exception is that Reaney disagreed with Dittmer's dating of GB-WOc frag. xviii: Reaney believed the fragment dated from the second half of the thirteenth century, whereas Dittmer dated it to the first half of the century.[40]

---

[35] Dittmer 1957a, 7.
[36] Dittmer 1954, 19-58 and Dittmer 1957c, 5-11.
[37] Dittmer, ed. 1960, and Dittmer, ed. 1959.
[38] Dittmer 1957d.
[39] Sanders1979, 121-4.
[40] Reaney 1966, 535-590, esp. 589.

Yet, monumental as it was for its time, *The Worcester Fragments* was not without its problems. To begin with, the multiple tables impede rather than clarify an understanding of the variety of the manuscript leaves; the musical compositions are not divided according to their original volume but by their modern presentation – fragments from the Oxford and Worcester collections are listed separately and in alphabetical order. As Richard Crocker pointed out in his 1959 review, the problem of multiple tables unduly complicates what might have been a streamlined, comprehensive inventory. Dittmer's publications also are sadly lacking in a paleographical analysis of the fragments. His dissertation focuses more on publishing a transcription and inventory of the fragments and indeed, aside from a mention or two in his transcription notes of a hand changing, gives no details regarding scribal division. Unlike later scholars, Dittmer does not differentiate between text and music hands, and even claims that 'every composition of volume I was written by a different hand' - a generalisation that does not hold up under paleographical analysis at all.[41] But perhaps the most problematic part of his study is that Dittmer never contested Worcester as the original provenance – he not only assumed that it was so, because the manuscripts were taken from Worcester bindings, but he also embraced Hughes's vision of a medieval school of polyphony at Worcester Cathedral, a school that established Worcester, as 'one of the most important centres (for the cultivation of polyphonic art', and even speculates that it contributed original compositions to the thirteenth-century repertory of English music.[42] Other scholars stated the likelihood of a school of composition in Worcester even more confidently: claiming that the Worcester

[41] Ibid., 8.
[42] Dittmer 1957, 9.

Fragments 'indicate the existence at Worcester of a school of composers', (Gustave Reese) or that the fragments 'point to the existence of a school of composition centering at Worcester Cathedral' (Donald Grout).[43]

From the late 1970s on, a few further studies have mode notable contributions to an understanding of insular thirteenth-century polyphonic music in general, and the Worcester Fragments in particular. Peter Lefferts's dissertation on fourteenth-century motets includes a number of the fourteenth-century motet additions from the Worcester Fragments.[44] Amy Williamson's recent dissertation discussing insular genre, taxonomy and repertory in the thirteenth-century provides a catalogue of the Worcester Fragments and includes a discussion of the format of compositions of Reconstruction I (parts down the page vs. parts across an opening), and a list of table of formats for the other two reconstructions.[45] However, only Roger Wibberley and Nicky Losseff's dissertations tried to prove or disprove the fragment's provenance through a paleographical or repertorial study of the Worcester Fragments, and even their dissertations only devoted at most a chapter to the fragments.[46] The present dissertation will be the first to examine in detail both the paleography and the music of the Worcester Fragments, to reassess the existence of a medieval 'school of polyphony' at Worcester by comparing the fragments to manuscripts copied at or for Worcester Cathedral, and to take into account the history of revisions to the fragments through the centuries for a more nuanced understanding of how medieval music manuscripts were perceived and reused.

---

[43] Reese 1940, 397 and Grout 1960b 131.
[44] Lefferts, 2016.
[45] Williamson 2016, 213-221, 276-81.
[46] Wibberley 1977, ch. 1, 'The Worcester Fragments', and Losseff 1994, 69-82, 146-156.

Roger Wibberley's 1977 dissertation,'English Polyphonic Music of the Late-Thirteenth and Early-Fourteenth Centuries', and Nicky Losseff's 1994 study, *The Best Concords: Polyphonic Music in Thirteenth-Century Britain,* are different but complementary: Roger Wibberley provides a paleographical analysis of the Worcester Fragments, while Losseff situates them in the context of the late thirteenth-century and early fourteenth-century sources of English polyphony.

Wibberley's Oxford dissertation devotes its first chapter to a study of the Worcester Fragments. To date, it remains the most extensive paleographical analysis of the manuscripts. The dissertation does not attempt to provide transcriptions from the Worcester repertory: only two compositions are included to provide an alternative reading to Dittmer's transcriptions.[47] Instead, the main concern of the chapter is to build a case for Worcester Fragments being the product of one scriptorium, whether at Worcester or elsewhere. Wibberley's division of a 'network of scribes' identifies fifteen scribes working in collaboration, including nine textual hands (or 'scribes') and seven musical hands (or 'notators').[48] Wibberley argues that the interrelationships between the Worcester Fragments show that they were all copied in the same scriptorium. He further posits that it is likely that the compositions in the Worcester Fragments represent an 'anthological compilation' copied from a variety of thirteenth and early

[47] Wibberley 1977, 85-6, 230-33. Transcription no. 4,*Virgo Regalis Fidei/ Virgo Regalis Fidei/Pes*, is found on GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxviii fol. 1a verso (previously transcribed by Dittmer, WF no. 12). Wibberley supplies the missing voice from bar 49-54 and interprets the composition in the alternative third mode instead of Dittmer's binary rhythm. Transcription no. 5 – *Dulciflua Tua memoria/Precipue Mihi Da/Tenor de Dulciflua* – is also transcribed in the alternative third mode instead of ternary (Hughes) or binary (Dittmer).
[48] Ibid., esp. 17-22.

fourteenth-century sources.[49] Based on the divisions between scribes, he concludes that both older and newer items would have been copied into the manuscripts around 1300 as, according to his analysis, the old and new notational styles are present in same phase of copying, sometimes written by the same scribe.[50]

The paleographical analysis provides tables to assign 'scribes' and 'notators' to each individual folio, but fails to offer any reasoning behind his decisions. It would have been easier to engage with his work had his scribal hypothesis benefitted from a discussion of characteristics of script and illustrated examples of the different hands he identifies.[51] Wibberley's analysis also reflects the problematic legacy of the reconstructed 'Worcester Motet Book' (GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20): as an Oxford student, Wibberley must have encountered the GB-Lbl Add. 25031 and GB-WOc Add. 68 fragments first as photostats in the Oxford 'book', resulting in a confusing situation where the London fragments and a number of the GB-WOc Add. 68 fragments (those included as photostats in the 'Motet Book') are referred to by their foliation as photostats in GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 rather than their library sigla.[52] Wibberley's dissertation is also unequally divided, focusing on GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 in much greater depth than GB-WOc Add. 68: the analysis of the Oxford fragments is three times as long as that of the fragments at Worcester. The bias toward GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 is evident in Wibberley's peculiar division of his discussion. All the photostats and manuscript fragments of GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 are presented

[49] Ibid. The two exceptions are fragments xxx and xix which contain very different notation.
[50] This excludes the later fourteenth-century compositions (for example, in GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 fol. 24v, 25r, 34r-35r, as these are palimpsests and therefore not part of the original manuscript structure. Wibberley 1977, 23.
[51] Wibberley does provide a table of illustrations in the final pages of the chapter, but it only gives examples of medieval foliation, initials and marginal decorations. Wibberley 1977, 36-37.
[52] No doubt this is because Wibberley worked from GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 first before examining the GB-WOc Add. 68 fragments.

first, and then the remaining GB-WOc Add. 68 fragments (thus GB-Lbl Add. 25031 is subsumed in the discussion of GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20). A discussion based on the modern collections of the manuscript fragments in GB-Ob Lat. lit d. 20, GB-WOc Add. 68 and GB-Lbl Add. 25031 would have been easier to follow, although this structure of discussion would still be less preferable to breaking the analysis down according to the original manuscript sources: Reconstructions I, II, and III and further fragments.

Moreover, Wibberley elevates Reconstruction I over the other two, taking the presence of extensive decoration of Reconstruction I as an indication of its relative importance over Reconstructions II and III, which he considers might have been 'smaller original collections…intended for use in several establishments which may not have placed such great importance upon the cultivation of polyphony'.[53] It is not clear what he means by 'several establishments' since his dissertation concludes that the manuscripts were all copied at the same scriptorium at the same date. It is hard to believe that he envisioned a scenario where several manuscripts were copied at the same scriptorium, sent to various institutions, but somehow still all ended up in Worcester bindings by the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, unless perhaps he meant that they were copied at Worcester and used in establishments near Worcester. Even so, the dissertation chapter is a significant contribution to the scholarship on the Worcester Fragments, and Wibberley's scribal divisions have with little exception been adopted by subsequent scholars.

[53] Wibberley 1977, 36-37.

Losseff's *The Best Concords* generally agrees with Wibberley, Dittmer and Hughes in dividing the manuscripts into three main 'reconstructions'. She also provides a table of the gathering structure of Reconstruction I (including scribes and compositions), ordered according to the red medieval foliation; where the foliation does not exist, Losseff, like Dittmer before her, uses the estimated original bifolio sizes and content to determine order. It is a pity that the dissertation does not provide a table of the scribes, structure and contents of Reconstructions II and III as it does for Reconstruction I.[54] Losseff describes Reconstruction II only generally and gives but a brief mention to the folios that make up Reconstruction III. In the dissertation's appendix, all compositions are listed as a body under the Worcester Fragments. In this, Losseff's approach is rather different from Wibberley's: it is a review of the collection as a whole rather than a codicological study detailing the separate parts. Her dissertation sets out not to determine the paleographic characteristics of the Worcester Fragments – to divide scribes and musical genres and folio size – but to discuss the significance of such divisions, drawing on Wibberley's scribal hands to formulate a discussion of manuscript organisation. Thus she draws attention to the wide variety of genres that each scribe copied: as Losseff points out, Wibberley's Scribe A copies all genres of polyphony in both English mensural and Franconian notation.[55] According to Losseff's ordering of Reconstruction I, all but two scribes copied more than one genre of music and the gatherings do not coincide with the genres represented.[56] It would seem that such a division of copying not only reflects the notators' attitude towards

[54] The gathering structure, content and scribes of Reconstruction I are given by Losseff 1994, 149-152 (FIGURE 7). Her scribal divisions are based on Roger Wibberley's dissertation.
[55] Losseff 1994, 146-7.
[56] The exceptions are Wibberley's Scribe B and E.

genre, but is also indicative of a manuscript in which chant settings and free polyphony alternate in no generic, liturgical, alphabetical or stylistic order.[57]

With regard to provenance, Losseff takes a critical view of the assumption that the Worcester Fragments were created at Worcester. To test this hypothesis, she compares the chant settings in the polyphony of the Worcester Fragments to contemporary chant manuscripts from Worcester Cathedral.[58] Losseff was able to match twelve (out of over forty) chants taken from chant settings and *cantus firmus* motets in the Worcester Fragments with chants from a thirteenth-century gradual that forms a part of the Worcester Antiphoner, GB-WOc F. 160.[59] These matches all contain some degree of difference – often considerable – between the two sources. A large number of the chants cannot be found in GB-WOc F. 160, and even the matches that do exist are out of order with each other.[60] Of course polyphonic sources do not always match the contemporary chant manuscripts from their origin and, as Losseff herself points out, the Worcester Antiphoner alone cannot be taken as representative of all Worcester liturgy in the thirteenth century. Losseff's results are inconclusive – they cannot be used to either support or disprove a Worcester connection.

---

[57] Losseff 1994, 148.

[58] These chant sources include a thirteenth-century gradual and a collection of tropic settings of the Mass Ordinary (GB-WOc F. 160, fol. 292-352). Losseff 1994, 72-75.

[59] GB-WOc F. 160 is commonly referred to as the 'Worcester Antiphoner' but the the manuscript consists of three separate sections: an antiphoner, processional, kalendar, psalter, collectar and hymnary dating to 1230 (fol. 1-115v, 147-284v), a gradual from the mid-thirteenth century (fol. 287-354v), and a supplementary booklet of Office and Mass chants from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (fol. 116-145v). See Thomson 2001, 108-9. Note that Losseff refers to GB-WOc F. 160 as 'the Worcester gradual', since she is only concerned with the chants from the gradual and not those from the antiphoner. Losseff 1994, 72-75. GB-WOc F. 160 will be referred to as the 'Worcester Antiphoner' in this dissertation, regardless of the folios discussed.

[60] The order of chant settings in the Worcester Fragments is at least certain for Reconstruction I, where the original medieval foliation still survives.

In comparing the insular concordances of the Worcester Fragments, Losseff calls into question the idea of a 'Westcuntre' school of polyphony which, as we have seen, was first put forward by Hughes and adopted by later scholars. Like Wibberley, Losseff proposes that the Worcester Fragments might have been copied as a kind of anthology of thirteenth-century polyphony.

> If the volumes were used at Worcester, then one possible explanation is that they were bought in as 'off-the-peg' anthologies of well-known and useful compositions. This would also make some sense of the peculiar order in which songs of all generic types occur, as well as the large number of concordances in other insular manuscripts.[61]

Moreover, of the twenty-odd insular concordances in the Worcester Fragments' repertory, there is only one concordance with the repertory of GB-Lbl Harley 978, and Losseff casts doubt on even this concordance originating from Reading.[62] Other compositions in the Worcester Fragments that have been previously put forth as possible concordances (based on GB-Lbl Harley 978's list of musical compositions, discussed further in Chapter 3) are here also shown by Losseff to have an at best tenuous link with the Harleian list.[63] Thus Losseff claims that the Worcester Repertory provides no evidence for a school of 'Westcuntre' composition. In this case it is inadvisable to further read the absence of evidence as evidence itself – given the fragmentary nature of thirteenth-century English sources and relatively few concorances between them, the lack of Worcester-Reading concordances does not stand out as significant. At best, the only conclusion one can make is that the concordances do not provide evidence of a central school of composition, but do not wholly disprove it either.

---

[61] Losseff 1994, 78.
[62] The music is a *contrafactum* in F-MO H 196 and it appears elsewhere in the Worcester Fragments. Losseff 1994, 78-79.
[63] *The Virgo Sancta Katerina*, for example, is the motetus text in the Worcester and listed as the triplum in the Reading index.

1.3 New Discoveries

The final years of the twentieth century saw four new manuscripts added to the Worcester Fragments. In 1993, while researching the polyphonic manuscript sources at Worcester Cathedral Library, Olga Malyshko uncovered three uncatalogued fragments, two of which appear to be from Reconstruction I.[64] Five years later, her article published in *Scriptorium* provided an introductory study with transcriptions of the three musical fragments. The article is mainly concerned with the third fragment, a single flyleaf in a collection of sermons under the shelfmark Q.19 which contains the music of a two-voice organum purum Gradual from the Parisian Notre Dame repertory.[65] Only the last three pages are devoted to the new Worcester fragments F. 120 A and F.120 B. (Figure 1.2).[66] Malyshko's brief discussion of these new fragments compares them to the text and music hands of GB-WOc Add. 68 and GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, pointing out the similarity of hand especially to Fragments xiii, xxviii, xxxi, and xxxix of GB-WOc Add. 68. Her physical description of the fragments is thorough, although she is perhaps too ambitious in declaring three different text hands and two different

[64] Malyshko credits Mr. Ronald R. Stratton, Assistant Librarian of Worcester Cathedral Library, as the one who alerted her to the existence of the music fragments. In the article, she explains that she was reviewing the Worcester Fragments as a part of a forthcoming book project, *A Reassessment of the Worcester Fragments.* Twenty years later this has yet to be published, although according to the faculty website at Queen's University (Ontario, Canada), she still has a book planned: 'an historical musicological study, entitled *A Reassessment of the Worcester Fragments: A Source Study and Critical Commentary with Transcriptions and Reconstructions of Musical Settings Surviving in Complete and Fragmentary Form in 2 volumes'.* For more information, see http://www.queensu.ca/music/faculty/malyshko.

[65] Malyshko 1998, 66-82. The music of the GB-WOc Q19 fragment comprises the *Magnus liber organi* gradual *Benedicta Virgo Dei genitrix* from the feast of Assumption. Malyshko builds a case for the music of the Q19 fragment being brought back from Paris to Worcester with the return of the Archbishop of York, Walter de Gray, from the fourth Lateran Council in early 1215, though she places the date of the manuscript itself between 1224-1254. However, Thomson's assessment of the manuscript indicates that the host volume would not have been in Worcester before the sixteenth century, thus it is not discussed further in this dissertation. Thomson 2000, 89-96.

[66] On 13 March 1999, the manuscript flyleaves were raised and added to the portfolio of Add. 68. As a result, they were given new shelfmarks, no longer F.120 A and F. 120 B, but GB-WOc Add. 68/xl a and GB-WOc Add. 68/xl b respectively. Offsets onto binding boards of fragments xl and xli still survive *in situ.*

musical ones on fragment F. 120 A recto alone. Her claim that she has identified 50 text hands and 51 musical ones representing as many as six different codices between GB-WOc Add. 68, GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 and GB-Lbl Add. 25031 suggests that she is overcomplicating the situation, reading too much into the variations within a single scribal hand.[67] The introductory article could have benefitted from a facsimile of the new fragments and a discussion of their musical content. While Malyshko does provide a transcription, the only comment she has for the music is that it is likely from a motet. At the time Malyshko viewed them, the fragments were still bound as flyleaves into another manuscript so she was only able to see the recto and not the music or text on the verso.[68] To date, an analysis of the verso has yet to be undertaken, although a facsimile was published only a few years later by Rodney Thomson.

As Malyshko's article was going into press, two further fragments were uncovered. Thomson's preparation of a descriptive catalogue of the medieval manuscripts of Worcester Cathedral Library led him to discover a new fragment of polyphony still in the original medieval binding of a thirteenth-century copy of William of Auxerre's *Summa aurea*.[69] A second fragment was found pasted across the front of the modern binding of a fourteenth-century biblical concordance.[70] Thomson published facsimiles of these along with images of two of the

[67] Malyshko 1998, 71. She does not give examples of the division of hands in the rest of the fragments, other than the ones from the new discoveries.
[68] The flyleaves were glued into the inside of the rear cover of the manuscript with the shelfmark F. 120. The manuscript is a mid-thirteenth century copy of Gratian's *Decretum*, still in its medieval binding. Thomson 2000, 91.
[69] Ibid. The parchment strip was placed there to reinforce the joint between the first quire of the book and the front board.
[70] Ibid. The 'parent volume' was the second volume of a biblical concordance GB-WOc F. 175. The fragment has since been removed, added to the collection of Add. 68, and renamed fragment xlii.

fragments previously described by Malyshko in *Scriptorium*.[71] Based on the format and especially the distinctive red folio numbers characteristic of Dittmer's designated 'Motet Book' or 'first volume', Thomson suggested that the fragments were from this source. The rest of his discussion centers on the case for Worcester as the origin of the fragments and their host volumes, based on documentation from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries that suggests that bookbinding was a 'quasi-regular activity' at Worcester Cathedral priory. Thomson identifies several distinct 'campaigns of binding, rebinding and repair' between the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.[72] Evidence shows that as many as eight thirteenth-century books were used in these repairs and, based on Gullick's assessment of Worcester bindings, the speculated original 'Motet Book' and 'Conductus Book' of Dittmer were likely used in two separate campaigns, one in the sixteenth century and the other in the late fifteenth.[73] As mentioned before, the unusual way in which so many leaves from the same volumes were used in the bindings of one library's collection may lead to the conclusion that they were available to the bookbinders, and thus at Worcester, as complete books by the fifteenth century.

Thomson did not provide a transcription or musical analysis, nor seek to identify the source of the text; he left these questions to other musicologists to answer. William Summers and Peter Lefferts's new edition of facsimiles of English thirteenth-century polyphony, including the

---

[71] It seems Thomson's discovery was made independently of the work done by Malyshko just a couple of years before, although it does reference her article in the context of the Q19 fragment (Thomson 2000, 94, fn. 10).
[72] Ibid., 92. Thomson's introduction is complemented by a study of the Worcester Bindings by Michael Gullick that is helpful to a codicological study of both Worcester manuscripts in particular, and of bookmaking processes in general. See also Pickwoad 2001, 1-22 and Gullick 1987, 93-112 for more information about medieval bookbinding, especially Gullick 1987, 107-9, 111-12.
[73] Thomson 2000, 94.

complete collection of Worcester Fragments, recently published for *Early English Church Music Vol. 57* (hereafter EECM 57), identifies several of the texts in these new fragments, and provides a comprehensive inventory of the Worcester Fragments, with notes on the three Reconstructions and on the further fragments not part of a reconstruction.[74] It is the first study to situate the new discoveries in the context of the rest of the leaves and provides a much-needed update to the foliation of Dittmer from the 1950s and a comprehensive catalogue of all compositions in the Worcester Fragments, including those fragments not part of the Reconstructions. However, as this dissertation will later show, even this latest foliation can be improved, as there are strong paleographical grounds to consider a rearrangement and redistribution of several fragments from one source or Reconstruction to another.

A hundred years after the first mention of the Worcester Fragments was published, much yet remains to be discovered about these enigmatic survivors of the dismantling and reuse of thirteenth-century polyphonic manuscripts. Recent years have seen a new respect for and renewed study of fragmentary sources, and the Worcester Fragments still need a re-examination which takes into account the manuscript discoveries made within the past twenty years. In addition, the many layers of writing, erasure and rewriting – from palimpsests to fifteenth-century musical additions – still need to be untangled, and the history of the whole collection understood in the context not only of its original use but also its afterlife of dismantling and reuse in medieval bindings.

[74] Summers and Lefferts 2016, 32-9.

2.

A Paleographical Examination

It would seem that the fragments are the only surviving remnants of several large musical codices which were all notated at the same scriptorium around 1300.[75]

Roger Wibberley, 1977.

Ever since the discovery of the Worcester Fragments, scholars have tried to determine how many original codices of polyphony supplied the Worcester bookbinders with their material (Table 2.1). Theories range in any number from two to eleven different manuscripts. Dom Anselm Hughes organised the fragments, based on folio size and genre, into 'The Motet Book', 'The Larger Motet Book', 'The Conductus Book' and 'The Troper'.[76] Dittmer suggested the existence of two main groups based on folio sizes, further dividing Hughes's organisation of the collection into five original volumes.[77] Other scholars proposed alternate theories, though most seemed to agree on three main source volumes. Ker believed there to be 'at least three, possibly not more than three' sources.[78] Nicky Losseff's dissertation argued that there were three main 'Reconstructions', following Dittmer's division of volumes such that Reconstruction I

[75] Wibberley 1977, 27.
[76] Hughes 1928, 22-23.
[77] Dittmer 1957a, 7.
[78] Ker 1964, 209, no. 3.

corresponded to Dittmer's Volume 1, Reconstruction II to Dittmer's Volume 2 (plus the added folios of Volumes 4 and 5) and Reconstruction III to Dittmer's Volume 3. Losseff mentioned that there were 'six smaller sets' but did not specify how these would be divided, although she did provide a detailed analysis of the gathering structure for Reconstruction I.[79] In the later twentieth century, Rodney Thomson and Michael Gullick's work on Worcester bindings found that there were at least two main sources that were taken apart and used in separate binding campaigns, while Olga Malyshko referred to six different original codices.[80] The most recent interpretation given by Summers and Lefferts in their introduction to EECM 57 separated the fragments into three Reconstructions following Losseff's divisions, but with the addition of the fragments discovered in the 1990s.[81] Summers and Lefferts considered each of the 7 remaining fragments (GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii, xviii, xx, xxix, xxx, xxxiv and xxxix/1) to represent a different original source or, in the case of fragment xxxiv, two original sources. Thus, in addition to the three Reconstructions, Summers and Lefferts identified 8 further sources, bringing the total number of original sources to 11.

It is easy to see why scholars might be divided in their readings. The 'Worcester Fragments' range in size from mere scraps of parchment to complete bifolios and contain a seemingly haphazard arrangement of text and musical hands. However, by considering the surviving medieval foliation, consistency of layout and original folio size, preparation of the page, distribution of text, music and decorative hands and musical content, it is possible to create a

[79] Losseff 1994, 148-153. Losseff's gathering structure does not include the fragments discovered in the later twentieth century but has until this dissertation been the only attempt to define gathering structure for any of the reconstructions of the Worcester Fragments.
[80] Thomson 2000, 89; Malyshko 1998, 80. She does not indicate how these six sources would be divided.
[81] Summers and Lefferts 2016, 32-9.

compelling argument for dividing the manuscript fragments. This chapter will keep the terminology and division of the 'Reconstructions' of Summers and Lefferts, making changes to the allocation of certain fragments to one Reconstruction or another. Later additions to the manuscripts, such as the fourteenth-century scribes of Reconstruction III and the fifteenth-century scribes found throughout the three Reconstructions, will be considered in Chapter 4.

In prior scholarship, the system of referring to the Worcester Fragments has been unduly complicated by multiple foliations. Each scholar's foliation represents a separate attempt to divide the fragments according to their original sources to accommodate new discoveries or redefine reconstructions. However, such foliations need constant updating: Dom Anselm Hughes himself provided no fewer than three distinct foliations and, as this dissertation will show, even the most recent order in EECM 57 can be improved.[82] Foliations have been further complicated by the compilation of GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, which bound folios from both Reconstruction I and II in an order that does not always follow their original manuscript order. Certain scholars add to the confusion by referring to the fragments interchangeably by their medieval foliation and their out-of-order foliation in GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, rather than by their current locations in London, Worcester, or Oxford.[83] Appendix TABLE 1 provides a reference guide for the previous foliations of the Worcester Fragments, organised by their current location and the manuscript sigla used by RISM/DIAMM.[84] To simplify the situation of

[82] For Hughes's three foliations, see Dittmer 1957a, 6-7.
[83] Dittmer 1957d and Wibberley 1977.
[84] DIAMM gives up-to-date library sigla for all collections. For ease of access, the reference tables all appear in the Appendix, Vol. II. The appendix tables comprise:
1. Table of Foliations
2. Table of Hands
3. Table of Decorations

referencing, this dissertation will refer to the fragments by their RISM/DIAMM sigla. Instead of introducing yet another new foliation (which would inevitably need alteration should further discoveries come to light), Chapter 2 will provide tables that illustrate gathering structure and, to the extent determinable, manuscript order for all three of Worcester Reconstructions and many of the other fragments.

While relationships between many of the fragments will be established in this chapter, it is with a note of caution that this dissertation continues to use the term 'Worcester Fragments'. In his dissertation on Italian manuscripts of the same period, Michael Scott Cuthbert discourages the umbrella term 'Fragments' for a collection of fragmentary remains of several unrelated codices:

> It is important not to fall back on the old term, 'Paduan fragments' which includes several sources in different styles and perhaps from different times, and which opens the door for any future Paduan discovery to be lumped with these manuscripts without careful scrutiny of the discovery's relationship to other sources.[85]

Similarly, the 'Worcester Fragments' should not be viewed as a unified body or repertory of material unless there is more to connect them than their common fate as flyleaves. Thus, discoveries made about the dating or provenance of one fragment or Reconstruction should be treated independently and should not affect the conclusions made about other fragments, unless there are paleographical or musical grounds to associate one fragment with another.

---

4. Inventory of Compositions

[85] Cuthbert 2006, 218.

2.1 Paleographical Considerations

In the paleographical analysis that will follow, the three Reconstructions will be treated separately. However certain paleographical features are the same across three sources, so to avoid unnecessary duplication they will be discussed first. Paleographical characteristics that are specific to one Reconstruction will be saved for the individual analysis of that Reconstruction.

2.1.1 Preparation of the page

The Worcester Reconstructions follow typical thirteenth-century conventions of pricking and ruling. Prickings at the top and bottom of folios were used to mark the text block, while prickings running vertically along the outer edge delineated the staves and lines of text. Frame rulings were generally executed with lead that was later rubbed out, and the text was double-ruled in many places. Double ruling (‘*linéation double*’) of text – both above and below the script – was common especially in larger manuscripts of the time in order that the letters of the script might appear consistent in size.[86] For some manuscripts, not only was the text double ruled, but the text area was also double ruled with vertical lines on the outer edge of the text block (but only single-ruled on top and bottom). Such double vertical rulings were usually used to help define the musical space for clefs and custodes between the frame rulings at the left and right side of the text area respectively; however, in Worcester Reconstructions I and II, the inner frame ruling outlines the outer edge of the text block so the double ruling does not seem to have an apparent purpose. Due to erasure, frame rulings and text rulings are not detectable

[86] For more on the conventions of pricking, ruling and rastrum usage, see Derolez 2011 and Denis 1985.

on all lines of text. Only in a few cases are traces still visible where the frame rulings extended into the margins of the folio, as seen in FIGURE 2.1. In pages that were custom-ruled for compositions, the space for the initial letter was also outlined with lead (FIGURE 2.1). This is true for some of the folios of Reconstruction II, and one section of Reconstruction I (GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 14r-16v).

In the case of a fragmentary source like the Worcester Fragments, prickings can be easily confused with sewing holes from the fragments' second life as binding material; additionally, pricking holes and frame rulings are often lost to trimming. Fortunately, sample folios from at least Reconstructions II and III exist in a complete enough state to estimate pricking patterns used, though it is impossible to tell whether or not such patterns were consistent throughout the manuscript, as the majority of the gatherings are lost. This is especially true for Reconstruction III, where only a fraction of the original codex survives.

All three Reconstructions were ruled with red staves of varying number, gauge and length.[87] It is difficult to make a positive argument for rastrum usage – a clearer case can be made for where the rake cannot have been used. In general, one would expect rastrum-ruled staves to be unusually even, with only marginal variation in the distance between the stave lines and the splay at the end of staves, as might have been created from uneven pressure. Additionally, where there is a 'wobble' or a ruling that is not perfectly straight, one would expect all lines of

[87] As these vary between the Reconstructions, they will be included as part of the discussion of format for each Reconstruction later in this chapter.

the stave to remain parallel to each other even when they are not parallel to the frame rulings or horizontal edge of the bifolio.

By contrast, freely-ruled staves appear more uneven and individual. The most obvious sign of freely-ruled staves is a full set of prickings relating to each line of the staves. While this is not the case with the ruling of the Worcester Fragments, other differences in stave appearance do indicate free-ruled staves, including:

1. Varying gauge of staves
2. Unequal length of line endings
3. Uneven splay at end of staves
4. Lack of parallelism between stave lines

FIGURE 2.2 shows examples of all of the above in the Worcester fragments, and provides an example of rastrum-ruled lines in a late fourteenth-century source (GB-Ob Canon. Ital. 16) for comparison. While the staves in the Worcester Fragments do at times appear very even, the small, yet measureable variations according to the four categories shown above seem to preclude a multiple-pronged ruling instrument. It would in any case be an early example of rastrum use; most rastrologists date the first appearance of the ruling instrument to the thirteenth century, although it did not become widespread until later.[88] Helen Deeming has argued the case for an earlier kind of 'medieval rastrum', one which might exhibit the kind of

[88] Everett 1983, 137; Jander 1967, 112-16.

signs which rastrologists would normally take for an indication of freely-ruled staves. She writes, speaking of twelfth and thirteenth-century books specifically:

> In all kinds of music books, the consistent success of scribes in ruling stave-lines that were uniformly spaced and rigidly parallel suggest that some such tool was in use. No tool of this kind, however, survives from the period and we are forced to use comparative evidence from much later periods… tests for the use of rastra only apply to those with fixed nibs; the medieval rastrum, if it existed, could just as easily have been a tool in which separate pens were bracketed together… In such a tool a single pen might 'wobble' independently from the others, and therefore its use would be visibly undetectable now. We can merely assume that scribes who were required to rule stave-lines on a regular basis would have invented ways to save their labour.[89]

It is a rational argument, but even if it is true, it cannot be the case for all of the Worcester Fragments. Where double-ruling of texts exists, the lines of the staves are parallel and equidistant to the double-ruling of the text underneath them – an alignment that would be virtually impossible with rastrum-ruled staves but easily accomplished with freely-ruled staves. Moreover, the ruler of Reconstruction II occasionally ruled over the text and on GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 1v, only did so with one line of the 5-line staff meaning that that each line must have been drawn individually, as the other four lines break to leave space for the letter (FIGURE 2.2). Other manuscripts also exhibit very regular freely-ruled staves – for example, the staves of GB-Ob Lat. lit. c. 1 are meticulously ruled according to prickings on the inside and outside of the bifolio (FIGURE 2.3).

Staves could be ruled left to right but among the Worcester Fragments they are more frequently ruled right to left: thus, the space between the lines of the staves is usually more

[89] Deeming 2006a, 48.

irregular on the left-hand side of the staves than on the right-hand side. For instance, compare the evenness of the right-hand side of the penultimate stave on GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 12v to the uneven appearance of the left-hand side of the same stave (FIGURE 2.4). It appears that the scribe spaced the lines equidistant on the right but did not rule the third line straight, thus creating an uneven ending on the left-hand side of the stave. The fact that the length of lines is also more varied on the left than on the right (note especially the difference between stave lines 2 and 5) seems to point to a right-to-left ruling stroke, where the scribe aligned the beginning of each line to match the lines above, but did not always end the stroke as precisely. While this may seem an anomaly, ruling of manuscripts was done left to right as often as right to left, or even interchangeably in one manuscript.[90] Scribes in some thirteenth-century manuscripts show a preference for ruling from one direction, or from the inside crease of folded bifolios toward the outer edge (i.e. right to left on the left hand side and left to right on the right hand side of the bifolios).[91] Where it is possible to determine such preferences in the Worcester Fragments, they will be included in the examination of each Reconstruction or fragment.

An important element that will be assessed in the paleographical discussion of the sources is the placement of the hair and flesh side of folios in a gathering. In most continental medieval manuscripts and in insular manuscripts after the eleventh century, the convention was to align the hair and flesh sides of parchment bifolios in each gathering, so that the flesh and hair sides faced similar sides of parchment. Thus, if the verso of a manuscript was a hair side, the facing recto would be a hair side as well. Consecutive surviving pages in the Reconstructions follow

[90] Everett 1983, 114.
[91] Ibid.

this folio arrangement without exception so it will be a useful tool for identifying gathering structure and even, in one case, the division of compositions.

Of course, the information available will depend on the condition of the manuscript. Many of the paleographical features particular to a manuscript, such as foliation, preparation of the page or pricking and ruling patterns are lost when a folio is fragmented. It will simply not be possible to 'reconstruct' the original makeup of every fragment – some knowledge is unfortunately lost for good.

2.1.2 Scribal hands: some general observations

In script analysis, it is often a challenge to find the balance between conflating varying hands into one 'scribe' or dividing 'hands' according to every nuance of script. Overall this dissertation's division of scribes falls between Wibberley's 'fifteen scribes working in collaboration' and the 100 hands that Olga Malyshko found.[92] When examining script, this discussion will try to look beyond the differences in appearance that are the result of circumstance – such as smaller or more compressed text to fit allotted space, changes in ink or different writing tools – to find the personality of each hand. For a text hand, these will include the choice of letter forms, peculiarities of abbreviation, pen angle, and decorations or flourishes, to name some of the most common identifying features. Musical individualities are rather more complicated. The choice of one style of notation over another may have more to do with a previous manuscript exemplar than the notator's personal preference, so this analysis will limit

[92] Wibberley 1977, 10; Malyshko 1998, 71.

the distinction between musical hands to the character of the musical script itself. Choices of notation will be considered during the assessment of the manuscript's organization and dating, but do not form a part of the description of the musical hands. Individual musical hands may be determined by forms of notes, ligatures, noteheads and stems, clef choices, the shape or presence of custodes, the spacing and angle of the music and any notational idiosyncrasies.

It is important to stress that 'hand' is not necessarily analogous to 'scribe' - handwriting style can change over time, legibility can alter depending on the scribe's ease or hurry in writing, or the space, inks and writing instruments available, and one person may have several different formal or informal hands. In a large codex it is possible to trace the evolution of one hand: the gradual changes in penmanship often show that there are fewer scribes responsible for a manuscript than might appear at first glance. Unfortunately, a collection of fragments as incomplete as the Worcester Fragments does not allow for a thorough examination of hands distributed over a large codex. And as paleography is not an exact science – distinguishing between hands relies on nuances in writing style that may be different versions of the same person's work – it would be unwise to assume that each hand represents a different person. It is entirely possible that one scribe was responsible for several different 'hands', especially those that bear resemblances to one another, as will be seen below. In many cases, text and music hands are linked both in the choice of compositions notated and the ink used. However, even where there is reason to believe that the same scribe added text and music, the hands will still be treated separately in order to accurately assess the copying order.

Appendix TABLE 2 details the distribution of the hands found in the Worcester Fragments, showing the division of text, music and decorative hands across the folios of Reconstruction I, II, III and related fragments. The numbering system for the hands is based on the order in which they are discussed in the dissertation and does not reflect a hand's relative chronology or prominence. Scribal hands which copy text are referred to as T1, T2 etc., music hands will be designated M1, M2 etc., and hands adding decoration will be given the numbering system D1, D2 etc. The order in which each hand will be considered will be determined by where they appear in the dissertation – Reconstruction III hands will be discussed first and the hands that appear in fragments not part of the Reconstructions will be last. Each hand will only be described once but where it appears in multiple Reconstructions or related fragments, the script analysis will draw on all examples of the hand's occurrence.

Copying order will be assessed for each manuscript source individually. While it may seem logical to assume that the ruling of staves was done first, then text and music and finally, decoration, this does not seem to be a rule among thirteenth-century insular sources.[93] It is easiest to assess copying order in the cases where some element of copying was left incomplete (FIGURE 2.5). For example, on GB-Lbl Arundel 248, fol. 200v, text has been copied but some of the staves are still empty and the initial 'A' for 'Alleluia' has not been added. The recto of GB-Cjc QB 1, fol. 1b contains both text and initial letters but not all the music was entered. GB-Cjc QB 5, fol. d verso/c recto also has text but empty staves, while GB-Ob c. 400* only contains text (including larger initial letters) and, while space was left for staves and music,

[93] It is a common assumption. For example, Wibberley states that the limner or 'rubricator' is typically the last person to edit each folio. Wibberley 1977, 32.

neither was copied (FIGURE 3.2). Thus it seems that music was often copied last, even in some cases after decoration of the pages. Perhaps this is because copying polyphonic music was a more specialist skill than copying text or decoration; it may even be that the first was done professionally, and the second locally – such scenarios will be considered in Chapter 4.

2.1.3 Decorations: general observations

As with changes in scribal hands, the presence and appearance of coloured initial letters and the way in which the leaves are decorated provide valuable clues to the order of copying. Two types of initial letters appear frequently among the Worcester Fragments. Simple initials are drawn in one colour of ink, either red or blue, while flourished initials (with two exceptions) are usually painted with one colour of ink for the letter (again either red or blue) but are embellished with pen work surrounding the initial of the opposite colour – blue pen work for red initials and red pen work for blue initials.[94] Pages were prepared for decorated letters in four possible ways:

1. Space was left for the initial in the ruling of the staves, and by the text/musical hands.
2. No space was left in the ruling, but space was left by text/music hands, and the limner added letters over pre-ruled staves.
3. No space was left in the ruling, but space was left by text/music hands and the limner erased pre-ruled staves to create space.
4. No space was left in the ruling or by the hands and the limner added letters in the margin.

[94] The exceptions can be found on GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii, fol. 1r and xviii, fol. 2r and will be discussed later.

The first of these is evidence of a very intentional (and in some cases, as will be seen in Reconstruction II, composition-specific) preparation of the page, but the second and third also show a degree of planning on the part of the text and music hands, who had to leave space available for the letters. A single source can use multiple kinds of page preparation: to illustrate, FIGURE 2.6 gives examples of all variants as they appear in Reconstruction I.

Certain folios of the Worcester Fragments are also decorated with line fillers, figures and other decorations. These can be useful in determining the stages of copying and connections between the limner and text hand. The inclusion of initials, the type of initial letters and the kind of decorations used may differentiate the original sources or determine a scribal connection between separate fragments. In cases where the limner is the last hand to add to the manuscript, the division of limners can give an idea of the copying order if 'batches' of folios were decorated at a time. Appendix TABLE 3 is a catalogue of the decorations in the Worcester Fragments. Decorative styles and their significance for the history of copying will be examined more closely in the discussion of each individual source.

Historically, scholars have started any discussion of Worcester Fragments with Reconstruction I. With its medieval foliation that assists an organisation of manuscript order and gathering structure, it seems the logical place to start. However, the following discussion will start with Reconstruction III and end with Reconstruction I. This will facilitate a discussion of scribal hands – Reconstruction III contains two of the most important hands in establishing connections between the sources – and allow the discussion concerning Reconstruction I to draw on discoveries made about the other Reconstructions.

2.2 Reconstruction III

Of the three reconstructions, we can draw the fewest conclusions about the original extent, structure and usage of Reconstruction III because it has the fewest number of surviving folios. Only three fragmentary bifolios and one additional folio of this lost codex survive. As these are identical in pricking patterns, text block size and format, there can be no doubt that they are from the same original manuscript. Dom Anselm Hughes did not consider them as part of the 'Worcester Motet Book' (or belonging with the fragments from Worcester Reconstruction I), so they do not appear in the compiled GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 volume. As a result, they were not assigned a foliation number in either Hughes's *Worcester Medieval Harmony* or Dittmer's *The Worcester Fragments*. The folios belonging to this Reconstruction are:

GB-WOc Add. 68 frag. xix, fol. a1-a2, b1-2, c 1-2 (three bifolios)
GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxii

The three bifolios are almost complete on the right-hand side (a2, b2 and c2); the left side is trimmed so only about a third of the original leaf remains for folios a1, b1 and c1. Based on these surviving fragments, the original dimensions of the codex would have measured around 277 x 203 mm with a text block of 220 x 155 mm – a substantial size for a polyphonic manuscript of this period, especially compared to Continental sources.[95] Of the eighteen pieces, only one has a concordance and only three are complete.

[95] Measurement estimations are from Summers and Lefferts 2016, 38. See Ibid., 7 for a comparison to insular and continental thirteenth-century manuscripts.

2.2.1 Page preparation, layout and gathering structure

The preparation of the manuscript follows a consistent format in Reconstruction III. Folios were pricked in upper and lower corners but were only frame ruled with a single line at the top and down the sides of the musical area, the lower end and interior writing blocks were not ruled (FIGURE 2.7).[96] The pages of Reconstruction III were ruled for four systems of three voices in score, ruling was done both left-to-right and more frequently right-to-left. Thanks to this layout and the inclusion of conductus compositions, the manuscript has come to be associated with the conductus repertory, and Reconstruction III has come to be known under the moniker the 'Conductus book'. Given the similar ink and lack of variation between folios, it would seem that the folios were batch-ruled at the same time.

Individual staves are ruled very tightly. The space left between the systems is the same as those between the lines of the staff so the resulting layout is not three sets of 5-line staves but rather 15 equidistant staff lines between each line of text. Occasionally this has resulted in unclear barring so that the voices appear to be divided with an unequal number of lines, as in the four-five-six line stave division in FIGURE 2.8. Stave-gauge measurements vary between 14-17 mm.

Two of the bifolios are consecutive but neither is the centerfold of a gathering, thus it is possible to come up with an estimated gathering structure for at least adjoining bifolios c and b (TABLE 2.2). Bifolio a may well be from the same gathering, given its arrangement of

[96] Musical area here is defined as the space the staves and notes occupy and not the text below them, which can vary in size depending on a scribe's handwriting.

thirteenth-century music on the left and fourteenth-century music on the right folio.[97] If the normal convention of aligning flesh and hair sides to face similar sides were followed (as is the case with consecutive bifolios c and b) then there must have been an even number of further folios between bifolios b and a and an odd number between a's folios, which are not the centerfold of the gathering. GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxii, on the other hand, is a lone folio impossible to place, though from the same original manuscript judging by its layout and dimensions.

If the bifolios from fragment xix were originally in same gathering, then the arrangement of the music reveals a clear chronological order of copying. As Summers and Lefferts have pointed out, the thirteenth-century music must have been entered on left-hand side of gathering (fol. c2, b2 and a2), and the right-hand leaves (fol. a1, b1 and c1) left blank.[98] After the original phase of copying, various unrelated compositions were copied on the blank folios by six different fourteenth-century hands (shown in blue in TABLE 2.2). Finally, a very late fourteenth-century or early fifteenth-century composition was entered in void notation in the available space remaining. These later hands will be discussed in Chapter 4.

2.2.2 The Scribes of Reconstruction III

For such a limited number folios it is perhaps surprising that Reconstruction III has many musical and textual hands: excluding the fourteenth-century additions on originally blank folios, there are at least eight noticeably different hands (four text hands and four music hands).

[97] Summers and Lefferts propose that a is part of the same gathering, reversing the order of RISM, which lists the manuscripts in the order a, b and c. Summers and Lefferts 2016, 38.
[98] Ibid.

The situation may seem even more complicated at first glance because the writing of the main text hand, T1, is not always uniform – he expands and contracts the height of letter forms depending on available space. Disregarding the differences in writing from this kind of alteration, there is one text hand in Reconstruction III that copies more than one folio (T1), two hands that copy only one page each and one hand that copies the folio GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxii. There are also four music hands, and these seem to correspond exactly to the text hands. Not only do the hands appear together on the same pages (T1 and M1 together, T2 and M2 together, etc.) but the text and music on each folio also use the same ink, even where the ink changes from one folio to the next. While it cannot be said for certain that text and music hands are the same, their appearance together nonetheless creates a very strong correlation between text and music hands in this Reconstruction.

Hand 'T1' writes in a typical thirteenth-century gothic textualis semiquadrata bookhand and for this reason is perhaps the most difficult hand to define, as several other hands writing in this style look very similar.[99] The hand is responsible for all but one of the folios in the original production phase of Reconstruction IIII. TABLE 2.3 illustrates the characteristic letter forms of this text hand. Not all the hands of the Worcester Fragments will be examined in such detail: T1 is a special case as the hand is possibly also responsible for copying a large number of folios in Reconstruction I. As the scribal concordances between the manuscripts will prove significant, the table will include letter forms from both Reconstructions I and III. T1's hand varies over the space of the folios he copies. He uses a couple of different letter forms for several letters interchangeably with no apparent consistency (See TABLE 2.3, especially 'a' and 'd'). It is

[99] For an analysis of scripts of this period, see Derolez 2003, 72-101.

fortunate that many folios of his work exist with copies of both forms on one folio, otherwise a small sample of his writing could seem like two different hands, although certain letter forms, especially the 'g', 'r', and 'x' are distinctive. As the Appendix TABLE 2 shows, T1 roughly corresponds to Wibberley's scribes 'b' and 'd'. Since Wibberley provides no specific arguments to support his division of scribes, it is not clear why he believes these hands to be distinct; especially given that, in more than one case, 'b' and 'd' switch back and forth in the space of a few folios. For example, in Reconstruction I, Wibberley ascribes all but one page of the bifolio GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xi (and the preceding 7 folios as well) to 'scribe b'. However, he lists frag. xi, fol. 1v as the work of 'scribe d'. FIGURE 2.9 provides script samples from frag. xi, fol 1r, 1v and 2r for comparison: note especially the long stroke to the right of the 'g', the bifurcated stem of the 'l' and the sometimes trailing limb of the 'h' – these look like the same hand. With regard to Reconstruction III, Wibberley scribe 'd' copies GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xix, fol. b2 and a2 while 'b' copies fol. c2 even though fol. c2v-b2r are the same Gloria (FIGURE 2.9). Unlike this dissertation's 'T1', Wibberley's scribes 'b' and 'd' also make an appearance on the following fragments which are not part of the reconstructions: GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 23v-24v, GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xx and GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. viii. The latter, frag. viii, is not even from the same time period – Summers and Lefferts date it to the mid-thirteenth century.[100] Losseff disagrees with Wibberley in this regard, and suggests that GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xviii, xxxiv, xii and xxix, as well as Reconstruction III and Reconstruction I were all copied by different scribes. She bases her argument on the relatively late date of compositions of Reconstruction III, and particularly the altered 'Petronian notational reforms' found in

[100] Summers and Lefferts 2016, 32.

Reconstruction III.[101] While Losseff is surely correct in her estimation of frag. viii, xxxiv and xxix, the composition with 'Petronian' alterations is actually a later addition to Reconstruction III, so at least part of Reconstruction I could have been copied at the same time as Reconstruction III.[102] Thus there is no reason that T1 could not appear in both Reconstructions I and III.

As with T1, it can also be argued that the main musical hand of Reconstruction III (M1) also appears in Reconstruction I. Wibberley considered the same notator to be responsible for all but one folio of the thirteenth-century music of Reconstruction III, for many folios of Reconstruction I and for GB-WOc Add. 68 frag. xviii, an earlier thirteenth-century source (Appendix TABLE 2). As mentioned previously in the discussion of T1's hand, the latter of these ascriptions is very unlikely given the early date of the fragment, but whether or not all of seven of the folios of the thirteenth-century music in Reconstruction III are the work of this hand is also a matter open for debate. There are certain independent features in the hands that seem to belong to different individuals. TABLE 2.4 gives examples of various folios of M1 in Reconstruction I and III, while TABLE 2.5 illustrates the differences between the scripts of M1 and the other music hands in Reconstruction III. Like T1, M1's scribal hand seems to vary a good deal, but the basic elements remain constant. Stems of longae vary in length over the folios, but tend to be longer, thinner and straighter than those of the music hands of the middle folios of Reconstruction I and those of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xiii (M7, M8 and M9). The 'f' clef often has a short stroke or 'flag' to the left of its stem; the 'c' clef changes in the

[101] Losseff 1994, 147.
[102] The fourteenth-century addition will be discussed in Chapter 4.

amount that the upper and lower stroke are curved, but the line that joins them is straight, thin and usually fairly long. Conjuncturae vary in width of pen stroke (perhaps depending on the nib used) but tend to be slightly more curved than those of other scribes in the Reconstructions.

In addition to T1 and M2, three further text and three music hands can be found in the folios of Reconstruction III. Few conclusions can be made regarding hands 'T2' and 'T3' (FIGURE 2.10) and 'M2' and 'M3' (TABLE 2.5) as only one page of script survives from each. T2 appears on fol. c2r. Generally, the hand is square and letters are short and wide. T3's script on fol. a2r uses an open-bottomed 'a' and 'u' (see 'salve' and 'salut-'), while stems of letters such as 'l' and 'h' are generally thick and blunt and suspensions are a simple, single stroke. M2's copies an 'f' clef in a distinctive 'u' shape and custodes like check marks, while conjuncturae are drawn very close to each other (fol. c2r). By contrast, M3 (fol. a2v) draws perfectly square noteheads, long stems (sometimes with a slight left slant), custodes that are a thick stroke, an upright, thin f-clef and a square c-clef.

A final text and music hand appear on the independent folio of Reconstruction III that is not a recognizable part of any gathering. M4's stems are very long and not consistently vertical, the 'c' clef is very compact and the 'f' clef always has a flag on the left side of its stem (FIGURE 2.11). M4 also uses wavy, often long custodes. T4 and M4 both appear on one folio of Reconstruction III and several folios of Reconstruction II, as well as in GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 24v and GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 5.

T4 may not be the most prolific of the copyists, but it is an important hand, as it connects a number of the Worcester Fragments and is responsible for several of the later additions to the repertory in the early 1300s. Given that T4 is the most variable hand found in the Worcester Fragments, it is worth looking at a 'case study' of text hand T4. The same hand arguably appears on the following folios:

GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 24v, 34r, and 35v
GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii, xxxii and xxxv, fol. 5r

In analysing the scribal hands in a codex, it is possible to track how a hand gradually develops and changes; it is impossible to show how a hand evolved over time in a fragmentary source because the relative copying order is unclear in the absence of many consecutive folios. However, it is possible to show several different versions of same hand and why they may or may not be considered to be the same scribe. One of the difficulties with hand T4 is that several of its appearances are as palimpsest text over previously erased text and music, thus the parchment used is a much less even surface than where the hand copied on a blank folio; moreover, the size of text and the ink and nib used vary. Individualities of script can help identify the same hand even if it is using different writing equipment or writing on varying material. Just as custodes in musical notation can have very singular appearances and are one of the tools musicologists use to determine music hands, so too suspensions and abbreviations in text can take on very individual shapes. There are three particular letter forms and abbreviations that T4 uses in the Worcester Fragments:

1. Suspensions with pronounced 'stems'.
2. An elaborate looped ending for the abbreviation '-tus'.
3. The figure of four dots and a descending tail that marks the end of a voice part.

The first two of these appear elsewhere in the Worcester Fragments (GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 14r-16r), but the third is unique to the folios of T4. TABLE 2.6 gives script samples from each folio that T4 copies. Other forms one finds (though not consistently) in T4's hand are 'l's that end in a club stem (occasionally bifurcated or trifurcated), long strokes to dot 'i's, a long limb of the letter 'h', a figure-eight shaped miniscule 'm', a curved miniscule and majuscule 'p' with serifs, and a particular majuscule 'A' not seen elsewhere in the Worcester Fragments.

The most obvious scribal concordances are between GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 fol. 34-35 (the motet *Thomas gemma/Thomas cesus/Primus Tenor/Secundus Tenor*) and GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii, fol. 1. Dittmer considered these two to be the same scribe but does not mention other fragments of the same hand.[103] All three of the features of T4 listed above are found on these folios; in addition, there are examples of the miniscule 'm', and 'd', 'l' and 'h' with club (sometimes additionally bifurcated or trifurcated) stem.

Owing to the larger format of GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 24v, letter forms are slightly different and, given the spacing of the text underlay, more compressed and abbreviated than the previous folios discussed. This and the much blacker ink of fol. 24v might be grounds for considering

[103] Dittmer, 1957c, 7.

this folio to have been written by a different hand. The voice-ending figure of three dots and tail is not used here, however as the folio is fragmentary there is only one voice ending surviving on the page. The 'et' abbreviation is also similar, but with an added curl although this is in a lighter ink and a separate stroke so it might have been a later decoration. Finally the miniscule 'd's are never looped here as they are occasionally in the folios GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 fol. 34-35 and GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii, fol. 1.

However, there are reasons to consider that this is the same hand. Suspensions with 'stems', the curled '-tus' abbreviation, the figure-eight miniscule 'm' the majuscule and miniscule 'p' with serifs all make an appearance, as does the club (sometimes club trifurcated) stems of 'l'. Finally there are some unusual script forms common to this folio and GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii, fol. 1 in particular. The decorated left extension to the majuscule 'I' on frag. xii, fol. 1v is similar in shape to that of the decorated 'n' in the final word on Ob-Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 24v. Finally, while the voice-ending figure does not appear, the 's' on the last line of text is extended, as it is in GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 35r. On balance, there are more reasons to consider that it is the same hand writing with different equipment than that there are two different hands writing with very similar elements and choices of script.

The most dissimilar appearance of this hand is on GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxii from Reconstruction III. This folio simply has less text and what does survive seems to be written with a wider nib pen. Wibberley considers this to be the same hand as the ones discussed above, but there are far fewer similarities of text to the other appearances of this hand.

Suspensions with stems and the '-tus' ending are found here but, as previously mentioned, these are not unique to this hand in the fragments. However, what is interesting is the extension to the 's' as seen in GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 fol. 24v and 35r, and the trifurcated club stems of 'l' and 'h' as well as the 'p' with serifs. This dissertation considers the two to be the same hand, but it could be argued that these similarities are not enough to establish a scribal concordance, especially since it is the only appearance of this scribe in Reconstruction III.

Thus far, 'T4' has corresponded to Wibberley's 'scribe f'; however, this is not the case with GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 5r, which Wibberley believes to be written by 'scribe g', the scribe also responsible for copying GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 13r, GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxviii, fol. 2v and GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxviii, fol. 3r. He does not give his reasoning for this, but FIGURE 2.12 provides side comparison of Wibberley's scribe 'g' and 'f' and TABLE 2.6 shows script samples from GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 5 that look like the work of T4. The folio has all of three of T4's unique script forms discussed above, as well as the trifurcated 'l', 'p' with serifs, long 'i' and the majuscule 'A' typical to T4 (also seen on GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 35r). Wibberley does not provide clear paleographical grounds for his division, but one argument for treating GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv as a different source is that it is written at a much higher standard. The text is well-formulated and later beautifully decorated; in the other places T4 appears the hand is more informal and messy, usually as palimpsest text (note for example, the visual difference between fol. 35r of GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 and frag. xxxv). These could represent one hand taking on different forms depending on whether the text was entered on blank parchment (more formal, consistent) or palimpsests (more informal, less consistent).

Or it could be two scribes who were trained in the same style of decoration, possibly one even copied – or learned from – the other. However, even if they were two different hands, that of frag. xxxv cannot be the same as Wibberley's scribe 'g'. The latter writes with a completely different miniscule 'l' and 'b' and a different '-tus' ending from that used in fol. xxxv, and uses figure-eight suspensions rather than suspensions with stems. As Wibberley does not offer an analysis of script it is unclear why he may have thought that they were the same hand.

In all, the similarities between the appearances of T4 are too many to be merely a coincidence, but demand explanation. Whether this is the work of one hand, or of several hands imitating each other, or a similar script style that was developed at an institution will be considered further in Chapter 4. However, there is clearly paleographic evidence to point to a scribal concordance between these folios and thus this dissertation will consider them one hand.

2.2.3 Decoration and copying order

Given that only a few folios of this codex remain, it is impossible to determine the extent of decoration. However, the three surviving initial letters suggest that the decoration was simple. Only one ink colour is used on each letter, and there is no pen work decorating the initials and margins. Red capitals appear on the verso, blue on recto of folios. The letters extend for the space of three staves and are found both at the top (GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xix, fol. b2v and frag. xxxii, fol. 1v) and in the middle of the folio (GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xix, fol. a2r). Red line fillers of two interweaving lines (FIGURE 2.13) are comparable to those of the other two

reconstructions. Many of the smaller initial letters are also coloured in red, as can be seen in the majuscule 'E', 'B' and 'A' in FIGURE 2.13.

There is good reason to believe that decorator for Reconstruction III is also one of the main decorators of Reconstruction I. The lighter blue and darker red inks here are comparable to those used by the main decorative hand of Reconstruction I, and both have a penchant for adding red to the text hand's gothic majuscules. The main initials are much larger in Reconstruction III but this is surely due to the presentation of three-stave systems. Finally, both decorators use the line filler of a small double helix or intertwining lines. For these reasons, the two limners will be considered to be the same hand, D1.

There are not many clues among the seven folios as to copying order of text and musical hands. On fol. a2v, the music is indented to leave room for an initial 'S', and on the following line, the music hand M3 ran out of room and had to extend the staff (FIGURE 2.14). This must mean that the text was copied first, and suggests that the T3 was not prepared for the space necessary for the music. The decoration was last, as the first initial 'S' on fol. a2v is clearly copied over the longa. The 'Amen' to the conductus on fol. c2v is a later text addition; the hand is clearly different from the others in Reconstruction III.

2.2.4 Conclusions

The massive physical dimensions and clean preparation of this Reconstruction belong to a substantial undertaking, and suggest that the folios of Reconstruction III are only one section of a much bigger volume. Although Reconstruction III may appear disorganised, a careful analysis of scripts shows a deliberate page layout and copying order. Dittmer dated the notation of the fragments to ca. 1300; this seems likely given that there is a concordance for the *Gloria* (WF 88) in GB-Ob Mus. c. 60, a source copied in the early fourteenth century.[104]

While only a few folios survive from the original codex, they contain two sets of text and music hands with important scribal concordances that link Reconstruction III to the other Reconstructions. T1 and M1 connect Reconstruction III to the outer folios of Reconstruction I, while T4 and M4 appear as palimpsest text to previously erased folios of Reconstruction II, but appear to be part of the original copying phase of Reconstruction III, as the decorations of D1 on this folio match those of the other folios of Reconstruction III. If the scribal concordances outlined here are correct, than it would have significant implications for the relative dating of the fragments, as the original phase of copying for Reconstruction III (and by extension, the outer folios of Reconstruction I) would have to date to roughly the same time as the additions to Reconstruction II. It remains to be seen from an analysis of the other Reconstructions whether this is indeed the case, whether Wibberley's claim that there was a 'network of scribes' between the three Reconstruction is true, and whether scribal concordances can provide any further clues to the origin of Reconstruction III.

[104] Dittmer 1957c, 7-8.

2.3 Reconstruction II

At an estimated original size of 230 mm x 350 mm, Reconstruction II is the largest of the three lost codices in dimension. This measurement is based on the new assignation of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii to Reconstruction II and estimates a slightly larger size for the entire Reconstruction than previous studies have given, since frag. xii has a larger surviving margin on the right side of its folio than do the other trimmed folios of Reconstruction II, although the written space is roughly the same.[105] In all, eleven fragmentary folios, eight pages of which are palimpsests, can be assigned to this Reconstruction. Dom Anselm Hughes called Reconstruction II 'The Troper' and believed that it may have originally been copied using as exemplars 'The Motet Book' (Reconstruction I) and 'The Larger Motet Book' (GB-WOc Add. 69, frag. xii and GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 23-24. The fragments belonging to this Reconstruction are:

GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii
GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. ix
GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 (but not 5)
GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 25, 28, 34 and 35

Note that while the two fragments of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. ix are numbered as two separate folios by DIAMM (GB-WOc Add. 68 ix fol. 1, 2) they are actually two halves of the same folio, numbered separately as they are two separate fragments from one original folio. This dissertation will treat them as one folio and refer to them as GB-WOc Add. 68, frag ix.

[105] Summers and Lefferts estimate that Reconstruction II is 223 x 330mm. The written spaces of Reconstruction II and GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii, fol. 1 are 170-80 x 267mm and 173-5 x 260-70m, respectively. Summers and Lefferts 2016, 7.

Traditionally, the folios of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 5 and GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 23-24 have also been included as part of Reconstruction II; however, a strong case can be made for the exclusion of these three folios.[106] All of the folios assigned to Reconstruction II were selected based on the large size of their pages compared to those of Reconstructions I and III. However, the three folios mentioned above have slightly different dimensions from those of Reconstruction II: the latter are 330 mm x 230 mm, while the size of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 5 is 340 mm x 223 mm.[107] As the upper and lower margins are greater than for Reconstruction II, the text block sizes are shorter and wider for the these three folios than for those of Reconstruction II. Additionally, the preparation and execution of their pages are quite different. Staves of Reconstruction II are without exception ruled with a width of 14 mm and are consistently 170 mm long. The five-line staves of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv fol. 5 and particularly GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 23 and fol. 24 can vary between 15-17 mm (the latter also has four-line staves).[108] The length of the staves is considerably greater than those of Reconstruction II, measuring anywhere between 174-180 mm. In the case of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv fol. 5, the parchment is also a different grade, smoother and thinner than that used for the folios of Reconstruction II. Finally, as will be shown below, the text and music hands in Reconstruction II are not found in these three folios and, unlike the other compositions in the original production phase of Reconstruction II, the music on them is not

[106] See TABLE 2.1 for the division of fragments into original sources. It is interesting that both Hughes and Dittmer considered GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 23 and 24 as a separate source, but since then musicologists have included the two folios as part of Reconstruction II. GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv fol. 5 has always been considered part of Reconstruction II.

[107] GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 23 and fol. 24 are trimmed, so it is not clear what the original dimensions were but their text block is comparable to GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 5.

[108] The exception to this range in stave width is the presence of several 4-line staves which are obviously narrower overall than the 5-line staves on the pages, though the spacing between lines is roughly the same.

in Mode I.[109] Thus these three folios will not be included in the main discussion of this section, but only at the end as separate sources which, judging from the paleographical evidence, have no closer connection to the original manuscript of Reconstruction II than do the folios of Reconstruction I or III.

In addition to the folios discussed above, there is also the trace of a lost leaf offset on the binding (specifically, on one of the boards) of GB-Ob Bodley 862, where it must originally have formed one of the flyleaves. The offset on the other board corresponds to GB-Ob Lat. lit. d.20, fol. 27 and several more folios from Reconstruction II (GB-Ob Lat. lit. d.20, fol. 25, 28, 34 and 35) were also originally bound in the volume as flyleaves. The lost leaf is included by Summers and Lefferts in their division of Reconstruction II with the conclusion that it may be a palimpsest folio of Reconstruction II. Certain elements of the script that are discernable from the offset – such as the cadential decorations– do look like other folios of the 'Worcester Fragments', especially GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 23r. However, the offset provides insufficient evidence that the lost folio belonged to Reconstruction II and so will not be included in this dissertation's divisions of the Reconstructions.

There is no sign of an original foliation, but several of the fragments do fall into sets of consecutive folios, their music continuing from one folio to the next.[110] In one case (GB-Ob

[109] Wibberley's dissertation drew my attention to this dissimilarity, although he still includes these three folios in the 'Large format volume'.
[110] Continuous pieces can be found on GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 25 and GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 6; GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. ix and GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 28; GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol.3 and GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol.1; and GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 34 and fol. 35. Note that continuous folios could either be centre bifolios or simply adjacent folios.

Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 34 and fol. 35) the continuous piece is a later addition over the erased text, so while it is not certain that the original composition was also continuous, it is highly likely.[111] Apart from these obvious groupings, the order of the folios used by Dom Anselm Hughes and later scholars has followed their arrangement in the GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 ordering. While the ordering may appear arbitrary (especially as it comes between groups of folios from Reconstruction I in the GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 volume), an analysis of the inventory of the original layer will show that it makes musical sense. This dissertation will keep the traditional ordering, updating it to reflect the new fragment inclusions and exclusions mentioned above.

2.3.1 Pricking and ruling patterns

Both pricking and ruling patterns of Reconstruction II indicate a certain level of planning and order. The four prickings were used to align the inner frame rulings on the left and right of the text block, though the lower pricking close to the fold of the bifolio was usually omitted. FIGURE 2.15 shows the pricking and ruling pattern Reconstruction II. The vertical frame rulings were double-ruled, as were the text lines. The top ruling occasionally extends into the margin, the bottom ruling, where it exists, does not.

All folios of the original layer were ruled with twelve five-line staves per page, always ruled left to right. (The palimpsest texts have varying number of staves and were frequently ruled right to left – for example, see GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 6r.) The uniformity of these staves,

[111] The folios might not have been originally continuous if the original manuscript was dismantled before the later text and music was added; however, as many of the original folios were not scraped down and written over, it is clear that much of original material was left untouched. It seems that certain compositions from the original copying phase were still being used when the palimpsests were added and therefore it is unlikely that the codex would have been taken apart. From the layout and decoration of the later additions, it is more probable that the manuscript was still bound when the palimpsest text was entered.

and their consistent number would seem to indicate that the folios of Reconstruction II were batch ruled. On closer review, it is surprising to see that space was left for the initial letters on all pages but one, not only for the pen work-decorated initial letters at the start of a composition or voice, but – far more unusually – even the internal initial letters added by the text hand (FIGURE 2.15).[112] This can only mean that at least some folios (those with space left for internal letters) were ruled for specific pieces after the text was added. Custom ruling for individual compositions, with spaces left for initials and lines ruled for the necessary music shows a clearly-executed plan of production that started with the text and possibly the decorative hands even before the staves were ruled.

2.3.2 Text, music and decorative hands: the first phase of production

At first, the folios of Reconstruction II may seem an odd mismatch of hands, notations and decorative styles. However, by ignoring the later additions and focusing only on the first phase of production of text and music – clearly visible in the folios that have not been erased, barely so in the palimpsest folios – an entirely different picture emerges, one that is very organised and cleanly executed.

The elegant hand of the main text scribe, T5, is clearly recognisable: it is rounder and more even than the angular gothic hands found elsewhere in Worcester Fragments (TABLE 2.7). He decorates initial letters with short strokes giving them a spiked look. Majuscules are rounded – the curves of letters such as 'G' and 'T' and 'S' frequently close their loop. Occasionally, one

[112] The one exception to this is the verso of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 4; space was left by the text scribe but not the scribe ruling the lines of music.

word will be connected to the following word with a thin ligature – this frequently happens after the 't' of 'Et' or before a 'p' (TABLE 2.8). As for his minuscules, the use of bifurcation in the letters 'b' 'd' 'h' and 'l' and the predominance of the upright 'd' over the backsloping uncial 'd' points to an earlier hand than those of the other reconstructions.[113] The notation of the main musical hand (M5) of Reconstruction II is are also even and cleanly executed. Noteheads have a distinct right curvature, stems are short and thin (TABLE 2.9).

Unlike Reconstructions I and III, all the large initial letters in the original phase of copying of Reconstruction II are decorated with red and blue pen work. While the style of these red and blue initials bears a superficial resemblance to those on the middle folios of Reconstruction I, the initials of Reconstruction II display more skilled workmanship. They are considerably larger and more elaborately decorated, the pen work on them thinner and finer than either the flourished initial letters of Reconstruction I or the decorations of the palimpsests of Reconstruction II (compare to GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 34r and fol. 28v. in TABLE 2.10). Such elaborate penwork initials are commonly found in manuscripts of this period; those of Reconstruction II more closely resemble earlier mid-thirteenth century sources such as the manuscript GB-Llp MS 752 and GB-Ob MS Wood 591 than the palimpsest compositions of Reconstruction II or the initials in Reconstruction I. Red capitals are embellished with blue pen work and blue capitals with red flourishes, the colours alternate from recto to verso.

[113] During the thirteenth century, the backsloping 'd' quickly replaced the earlier, upright form of the 'd' although both appeared together for a while. The hands of Reconstruction I favour the later d, while Reconstruction II's T5 makes predominant use of the upright form. See Tillos, 'The History of D', http://medievalwriting.50megs.com/scripts/letters/historyd.htm

The decorations of Reconstruction II, like the musical hand, were all done by one person (D2) and share a close connection to the main text hand T5 (TABLE 2.10). Some of the decorations – such as the line fillers from the original phase of copying – are clearly drawn by T5. For example, in GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 2v and fol. 4r, the vertical strokes on the extender of the tendril decoration on terminal 's' letters mimic those of the line fillers – these stroked lines echo the spiked initial letters typical to T5. The shape of the decorated initial letters is also the same as those of the small initial letters written by T5 – see for example the 'A's in GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxv, fol. 1r in TABLE 2.10. However, the limner is unlikely to have been the same person as the main text hand since in at least one folio, GB-WOc Add. 68, frag ix, T5 left letter cues in the margins for the limner – 'a' for 'Alleluia' and e for 'Et'. There are several clues to the copying order of the original phase of production and the relationships between T5, M5, and D2. The text spacing seems to establish a strong link between main text and music hands. Evidently T5 was familiar with the music to be notated, as the text hand left ample space blank at the beginning of two lines for melismas on GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 1v (FIGURE 2.17). Indeed the precision of text underlay across Reconstruction II leaves no doubt that T5 was well aware of the space required, either because he was copying from an exemplar with a similar format, or because he was musically literate. Given the typical custom ruling and space left for initials in Reconstruction II, the order of copying on many of the folios may have started with the text (possibly also the decoration), then the ruling of the staves, then notation. It is certainly so on GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 2v, where the staves were even ruled over some of the letters (FIGURE 2.18). However it is not the case with all the folios. GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, folio 6r is the only folio where

twelve ruled staves were not enough, and a (short) additional stave was added. Significantly, the ruling is much finer than for the other stave lines, and yet the text and music hands are the same – clearly those of T5 and M5 (FIGURE 2.17). It seems in this case the staves were ruled before text and music, since an additional stave needed to be added. Another case where the staves must have been ruled first occurs on GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 4v (FIGURE 2.18). Not only is the decoration copied over the staves but T5 also wrote the wrong text ('Sanctus…' instead of 'pleni sunt celorum'). Before the music for this section was added, the text (and with it the staves underneath) was erased, the revised text 'pleni sunt celorum' was added, lines were ruled to connect the staves (filling in the space left by erasure) and finally, the music was copied. That the notation (unlike the altered text, ruling and initial letter) was uninterrupted shows that the music must have been the last element to be entered, and that the staves were there before the text was altered, as they needed to be touched up after the erasure. Thus Reconstruction II shows a relationship between text hand, limner, notator and stave-ruler that is not always straightforward. The most logical explanation for the variable order of copying is that the scribes creating this manuscript worked together.

2.3.3 Text, music and decorative hands in the palimpsests

A careful analysis of the ten palimpsest pages (GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 fol. 25r, 28v, 34 and 35), GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii, and frag. xxxv, fol. 6v) shows that all but GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 34 (a sliver too small to be able to decipher the palimpsest text) were originally texted by

T5, and possibly notated by M5.[114] All of the following examples of text are illustrated in FIGURE 2.19. Easily the most visible example of T5's hand is the appearance of spiked initials, with short strokes of the pen radiating outward from the stems of the letters (FIGURE 2.19). On fol. 25r, the '…lle' of 'Alle' can be compared to the text on the following page (fol. 25v). The same folio provides another clear example of text correlation, the hand of 'gaudeam' from the palimpsest layer of fol. 25r is identical with that of 'gaudeat' on fol. 25v: note especially the closed curved loop of the initial 'G'. Conversely, GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 28v is so thoroughly erased and copied over that it was formerly thought to be originally blank.[115] One line of the original text is visible and digital editing in Photoshop, removing the palimpsest text and leaving only the remnants of the original text, reveals a barely visible Tenor 'Alleluya'. Even from this one word, the use of bifurcated 'l' stem in 'luy' and typical dot over 'y' shows that the original layer of fol. 28v was texted by T5. Finally, the Kyrie settings on both recto and verso of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii seem to be in T5's script, the 'e', bifurcated 'l' and 'y' are all hallmarks of his hand. Summers and Lefferts state that the Kyrie on the verso may be either a polyphonic or monophonic setting, but given the page layout – one line of text underlaying three staves of music at a time, similar to the composition on GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 35v – it is probably a three-voiced setting.[116]

---

[114] As the variations of musical hands are more nuanced, I would hesitate to claim that M5 appears in any of the palimpsests; certain of the erased notes do seem to correspond to his hand but these examples are not clear enough to draw a reliable conclusion. Given that T5 and M5 appear together in all the folios of Reconstruction II that are not erased, it is not unreasonable to suggest that M5 was probably responsible for the music of the palimpsests.

[115] Wibberley's dissertation argues that the music on this folio was a later addition to an originally blank folio. Wibberley 1977, 16. Dittmer, Losseff and Hughes do not mention the page at all.

[116] Only part of the text on the verso is discernable: *Kyrie.…Christe verbum patris incarnatum eleyson. Christe lux oriens per quem sunt omnia eleyson.*

As for the palimpsest text, there are three different text and music hands each, and their contributions were decorated in distinct ways. According to Dittmer's dating, the earliest of these is the addition of *Candens crescit lilium/Candens lilium columbina/Quartus cantus* on GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 28v (hereafter *Candens crescit lilium).* Dittmer dated it to 1300 based on the script style and the composition copied.[117] The gothic initials with bifurcated stems bear a resemblance to those of T1 in Reconstruction I, the use of the uncial instead of the upright 'd' is consistent with a hand that is later than that of the main body of Reconstruction II (FIGURE 2.20). The music is notated with longae note heads that are made with a perfectly horizontal stroke and conjuncturae that have a slight curve to the right side. The clefs are also very square and the notes have long, thin stems, similar to the script of M1 (TABLE 2.4). If the hands are indeed T1 and M1, then the dating of 1300 would make sense, since T1 and M1 also copied Reconstruction III which, as we have seen before, can be dated to ca. 1300 based on notation and concordances. The later addition of 'quartus cantus' may have been done by the same hand that added text to GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 5r (previously thought to be part of Reconstruction II).

The other additions were copied in the early fourteenth century.[118] The pages of GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 25r and GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 6r are written by the same text and music hands, T6 and M6. T6 is a compact, more informal hand with a slope to the right. The simple painted initials in this section are like those of Reconstruction III and the first folios of

[117] Dittmer 1957c, 7.
[118] Ibid. The dating is based on concordances, notation used (particularly the inclusion of elements of notation 'that corresponds to the teachings of Odington') and script style.

Reconstruction I (FIGURE 2.21). T4 and M4, previously encountered in Reconstruction III, are responsible for one troped chant setting (*Regnum sine termino/T. Regnum tuum solidum* – GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii, fol. 1r) and three motets: *Ut recreentur celitus/Secundus tenor* (GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii, fol. 1r), *Inter choros paradisicolarum/Invictis pueris inter flammas*, (GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii, fol. 1v) and *Thomas gemma/Thomas cesus/Primus Tenor/Secundus Tenor* (hereafter *Thomas gemma*) on GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 fol. 34r-35v.

One of the most striking features of the palimpsest pages is the amount of decoration used. *Candens crescit lilium* is decorated with a flourished initial, the compositions copied by T4 and M4 contain flourished initials and double-helix line fillers extensively embellishing the tenor part for two of the compositions in particular.[119] In one case, red dots ornament the tenor's ligatures and an initial 'E' is decorated in a style that is unlike that of any other thirteenth or fourteenth-century music manuscript.[120] The double-helix figure also appears on the folio with *Candens crescit lilium* and may point to a shared scribal concordance for the additions as the shape of the figure is very similiar to those of D1 in Reconstruction III (compare to D1 and FIGURE 2.13). That T1 and M1 and T4 and M4 are also decorated by D1 in Reconstruction III might further indicate that this is the same limner.

But the most interesting case of decoration appears on GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii, fol. 1v. The light blue initial 'I' for 'Iustus' is decorated with elaborate penwork of a much higher quality

[119] Compare tenor parts on GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 35r and GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii, fol. 1r.
[120] Williamson draws attention to this in her dissertation; although she incorrectly refers to the fragment (GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii, fol. 1) as a folio of Reconstruction I. Williamson 2016, 143.

than those found on the other palimpsests of Reconstruction II. However, a closer examination reveals that the letter was not originally an 'I' but is the stem of a 'K' for the erased 'Kyrie' underneath the palimpsest text: remnants of lines that originally connected the bow of the 'K' to its stem are still visible (FIGURE 2.22). Not only does the style of the letter perfectly match the rest of initials from the original copying phase of Reconstruction II (see TABLE 2.10), but the pen flourishing in the upper margin is identical to those of the other folios of Reconstruction II, even the other palimpsest pages (FIGURE 2.22). In the case of *Candens crescit lilium,* the original pen flourishing is so seamlessly incorporated in the new initial 'C' that it is hard to tell where the original ends and the palimpsest decorator takes over – the fact that the rest of this folio was erased so thoroughly that it was considered a blank folio by previous scholars shows that the marginal decoration was left not as the result of careless erasure, but as an intentional decision. These identifications, along with the scribal concordances of T5 in the erased text and T4 and M4 in the palimpsest text with the other folios of Reconstruction II (for example, GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 34), as well as the comparable written area of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii, fol. 1 to the other folios of Reconstruction II, leave no doubt that this folio originally belonged to the same source.

2.3.4 Inventory and order of copying

As with the many text and musical hands, the musical order of Reconstruction II may seem haphazard until the layers are considered separately.[121] However, once the phases of copying are taken into account, a more coherent musical order for the original manuscript takes shape.

[121] Reconstruction II is usually considered more 'homogeneous' than Reconstruction I, but still essentially a 'heterogeneously' organised volume. Wibberley 1977, 34; Losseff 1994, 155; Williamson 2016, 276.

TABLE 2.11 details the compositions, scribal hands and copying order of the folios of Reconstruction II. Additions to the original 'layer' or phase of copying are in different colours to show the various scribal hands. Folios are arranged in liturgical order in the table, but this may or may not be the original manuscript order (consecutive folios are certainly in the correct order with respect to each other). The compositions of Reconstruction II can be roughly divided into three general phases of copying.

The first of these is the original phase of production with one text hand, notator and decorator. The music, all in Mode 1, consists of troped chant settings grouped by tenors – Kyries together, Alleluias together and Sanctus tenors together. It may be that the compositions were arranged liturgically with the Kyries first, then the three grouped folios of Alleluias and then the two folios of Sanctus tenors. It is also possible that the compositions were arranged alphabetically – the placement of *Sursum corde elevate* coming after *Sanctus ex quo omnia* makes sense either way. Or it may be that a combination of liturgical and alphabetical ordering was used: the arrangement of Sanctuses on the folios certainly suits an alphabetical ordering (*Sanctus ex quo omnia* follows *Sanctus et eternus Deus*, while *Sanctus adonay genitor* comes before *Sanctus Deus ens ingenitus*). One of the unidentified palimpsests (GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 34) and a folio of conducti (GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 34) may have come from another section of the codex. The neat texting, notation and decoration of the pieces and the grouping of music by mode and tenor, shows a clear plan of compilation. There are concordances for *Sanctus et eternus Deus* and *Ave magnifica Maria/Ave mirifica Maria/Alleluia V. [Dulce lignum]* in Reconstruction I (these will be discussed in Chapter 3), and a double-texted concordance of the conductus *Quem trina polluit* in GB-Dru Bamburgh Collection, Sel. 13, which Summers and

Lefferts date to the third quarter of the thirteenth century.[122] This concordance, along with the main text hand's use of an earlier form of 'd' and the dating of the other compositions to around the 1270s by Sanders, suggests that the original copying phase of Reconstruction II may be dated to the third quarter of the thirteenth century.[123] Pages belonging to this phase are GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. ix; frag. xii (erased text only); frag. xxxv, fol. 1,2 3, 4 and 6r, fol. 6v (erased text only) and GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 25r (erased text only), 25v, 34r-v (erased text only), 35r (erased text only), and 35v.

The 'second phase' may be defined as those palimpsest texts which share similar decorations, and thus may have been copied at the same time. The text hand and notator of GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 28v who copied the refrain motet *Candens crescit lilium* does not appear elsewhere in this Reconstruction but the decorative initials and line fillers may be the work of D1. The kind of notation used (with differentiated rests) led Dittmer to date to copying of the composition to 1300; concordances in Gb-Cpc 228 and US-NYpm MS 978 (both with a copying date of the early fourteenth century) support this dating.[124] The palimpsest compositions on GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii and the motet on GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 34v-35r are copied in a different text and music hand (T4, M4) but the decorative hand appears the same: the plain initial letters and line fillers especially correspond to those of D1 in Reconstruction I and III, suggesting that by the time these additions were entered, the manuscript was at the same institution as the other Reconstructions, since the three Reconstructions share the same decorator (D1). Concordances for *Thomas gemma* on GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 34v-35r will

[122] Summers and Lefferts 2016, 38.
[123] Sanders,'Worcester Polyphony'.
[124] Dittmer 1957c, 7; Harrison 1978, 420-1.

be discussed in Chapter 3, but seem to date the copying of this motet to the early fourteenth century – certainly no earlier than 1295. The pages belonging to this phase are GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii (added compositions only) and GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 28, 34r-v and 35r (added compositions only).

The third phase may be considered to be those palimpsest texts which are copied in a hand that does not appear elsewhere in the Worcester Fragments (T6, M6). Two folios share this text hand and notator: GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 25r and GB-WOc Add. 68, xxxv, fol. 6v. Not enough of the decorative hand survives to draw a comparison between this hand and those of other fragments in the Worcester collection. These additions may have been copied earlier, later, or at the same time as the 'second phase'. There are no surviving concordances but Sanders estimates the date of their composition to be between 1295-1315 and Dittmer the script to the early fourteenth century, suggesting that this phase is a later addition than the second 'phase'.[125] Pages included in this phase are GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 25r (added composition only) and GB-WOc Add. 68 frag. xxxv, fol. 6v (added composition only).

2.3.5 Conclusions

It has been argued by scholars in the past that Reconstruction II was produced at the same scriptorium as created Reconstructions I and III.[126] However by examining the compositions

[125] Sanders, 'Worcester Polyphony', Dittmer, 1957c, 6.
[126] Wibberley 1977, 27; Losseff also accepts Wibberley's scribal divisions except for Reconstruction III (Losseff 1994, 147).

and hands represented in the original manuscript layer, it is apparent that the connections to the other two Reconstructions are based on later additions and are not part of the manuscript's original concept, design and structure. It is clear that the manuscript source of these fragments was a large-format choirbook, with a thoroughly planned and executed format: with staves ruled for specific pieces, space left for initial letters and a close connection between the text, music and decorative hands. The volume was the work of one text hand, notator and limner. The earlier date of Reconstruction II (as opposed to Reconstructions I and III) can be established from its text, notation, and decoration; later additions, which 'update' this repertory, reflect the growing popularity of the motet and the use of notational styles other than English mensural notation.

The identification of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii as a part of Reconstruction II has two immediate consequences: first, it is clear that Reconstruction II's collection of troped chant settings included a group of Kyries in addition to the Alleluia and Sanctus settings; second, it is apparent that Reconstruction II was a larger volume with wider margins than previously suspected. This second consideration shows that folio size is not always a reliable means of 'reconstructing' or grouping fragments together, especially when dealing with fragmentary sources that were taken from the flyleaves of bindings, for which they were trimmed. Meanwhile, the palimpsest hands' treatment of the original decorations sheds light on the attitude of medieval users towards pre-existing material. What is striking about Reconstruction II's palimpsests is the appreciation that the scribes adding new material, or 'updating' the collection, had for the decorations. Rather than erasing the folios completely, they retained elements of the decoration; in one case, even going so far as to alter an initial letter and 'recycle'

it, incorporating it in the newly-copied palimpsest composition. These amendments show that the medieval users valued the original manuscript, while the selective deletion of compositions (rather than a systematic replacement of continuous folios) suggests that manuscript was still in use when the palimpsest compositions were added in the early fourteenth century. The question of whether or not this kind of attitude is specific to the folios of Reconstruction II, or indeed to the 'Worcester Fragments' will be taken up in Chapter 4; certainly the markedly similar approach of adding palimpsest text exhibited by several different scribes is a copying practice that needs to be explored further.

While other folios (GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 5 and GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 23-24) have been considered as part of Reconstruction II, there is no evidence to support this: the writing area, stave gauge, stave length and text, music and decorative hands are all different. There is a superficial resemblance in the pen work of the red and blue initials, but these are common in the period. It seems unlikely that the fragments GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 5 and GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 23 and fol. 24 were produced by the same scriptorium as Reconstruction II, since the calibre of work is much higher in the latter. Rather, their connection belongs to the later additions of script – the same decorative hand (D1) appears in the added compositions – and their afterlife in the bindings of medieval books from Worcester Cathedral Library. Conversely, GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii, previously considered to be an independent source, can be associated with the other folios of Reconstruction II based on scribal concordances (in both the original phase and later additions), the dimensions of the folio and the correspondence of the original decorations to other folios of Reconstruction II.

In short, there is no reason to suppose that the large-format volume was created by the same scriptorium as produced Worcester Reconstructions I and III or the pages of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 5 and GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 23 and fol. 24. It is more likely that the manuscript source represented by the fragments of Reconstruction II (with its elegant layout, production and decoration) was produced elsewhere, and only later brought to the same location where the source of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 5 and GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 23 and fol. 24 were either produced or reused, the establishment that also compiled Worcester Reconstruction I, where it was 'updated' with palimpsest text and music by hands that can be found in Reconstructions I and III. Whether this later phase of production was undertaken at Worcester cannot be said for certain, but the less-skilled workmanship does lend credence to a theory of a local scriptorium rather than a professional workshop. Chapter 4 will dig further into the origins of Reconstruction II, but for now one thing is clear - wherever its original production and later additions took place, the added compositions of Reconstruction II demonstrate that it was well-used for many years before the manuscript found its way out of the church and into the bindings of the books of Worcester Cathedral Library.

2.4 Reconstruction I

Known in literature as the 'Motet Book', Reconstruction I comprises folios from all three modern collections in Oxford, London and Worcester. The musical organization and multiple scribal hands in this Reconstruction have long frustrated scholars. The collection of surviving pieces includes not only pes, cantus firmus and voice-exchange motets, but also conducti, rondelli, a rota and many troped chant settings. Hardly any gatherings contain only one genre of composition. True, the surviving bifolio of gathering 1 does consist entirely of troped chant settings; however, even assuming that the entire gathering consisted of troped settings, the following three folios change abruptly to a conductus rondellus (*De supernis sedibus*) a pes motet (*Prolis eterne genitor/Psallat mater gratie/ T. Pes super Prolis Psallat*) and a conductus (…*est ex te verbum*). And this is but one example. As Nicky Losseff has pointed out:

> This pattern continues throughout Reconstruction One, with chant settings alternating with free polyphony in no apparent order, generic, liturgical, alphabetical or stylistic…. Further, no argument could be made for heterogeneous pieces being 'additions' as the flourishing was clearly all done at the same time.[127]

Though not the largest of the three in dimension, Reconstruction I is by far the most extensive. In all, there are over thirty surviving folios, many of them forming blocks of continuous material, representing more than sixty compositions. Original folio size seems to have been ca. 280-283 x 200-205 mm.[128] The following fragments are considered parts of Reconstruction I:

GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. x, xi, xiii, xxviii, xxxi, xl ,xli, xlii
GB-Lbl Add. 25031

[127] Losseff 1994, 149.
[128] Summers and Lefferts 2016, 35.

GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 12-19, 22

A caveat must be made here regarding GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xiii, a fragment not always considered to be part of the same original volume as the other folios of Reconstruction I.[129] The upper part of the folios of frag. xiii have been trimmed so that the medieval foliation – if it existed – has been cut off. An argument could be made against its inclusion in Reconstruction I, considering that its format is different. Unlike the other folios of Reconstruction I, which were ruled for nine 5-line staves each, the folios of frag. xiii have twelve to thirteen 5-line staves ruled so tightly, that the scribes copying on them often erased lines from the staves to make more room for the text, resulting in folios with 4-line as well as 5-line staves (see especially GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xiii, fol. 1). However, there are a number of paleographical reasons why this fragment will be considered part of Reconstruction I in this dissertation. Losseff and Wibberley have both given detailed reasons for their inclusion: not only do the folio sizes correspond, but this fragment also shares scribal concordances with Reconstruction I, and it is decorated with the same initial letters as parts of Reconstruction I (for example, the 'S' on GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xiii, fol. 2 corresponds exactly to the initial on GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxviii, fol. 1 from Reconstruction).[130]

A large number of folios from Reconstruction I survive with original foliation. The medieval foliation is written in red-inked roman numerals, centered on each recto often with a dot or spiral on either side of the initial letters. Foliation survives for 26 of the 137 or more folios of

[129] See TABLE 2.1 for specific details about how scholars have allocated this folio to the 'volumes' or 'reconstructions' of the Worcester Fragments.
[130] Wibberley 1977, 27; Losseff 1994, 153.

Reconstruction I, representing about a fifth of the original volume. A uniformity of script, pen angle and ink type for all but one of the folios indicates that most of the leaves were probably foliated at the same time, and certainly by a single hand, the same hand which also added initial letters to the manuscript.[131] Initial letters of the foliation maintain a similar shape throughout the volume from the lowest surviving foliation (vi) to folio ci, the characteristically straight C, V, L and I in contrast to the angled X, as can be seen in FIGURE 2.23.[132]

2.4.1 Preparation of the page

Unlike the stave ruling in Reconstruction II, the pages of Reconstruction I are varied. A majority of the volume was ruled with nine 5-line staves, but the size of the musical area varies. Following the medieval foliation, the very early part of the book (of which only fol. vi-xvi survive) had a consistent musical area of 155 mm x 200 mm.[133] The middle part of the codex has a slightly wider musical area of 165 mm x 200 mm.[134] The surviving folios of lxxxxii – ci have a yet smaller musical area of 150 x 190 mm and for the final folios from cxxxvi, the musical area is again the same as for the first (155 mm x 200 mm). Clearly, the folios were not prepared all at once but at different times. Given the identical text area and ruling for the first and last sections, they may have been prepared at the same time or at least by the same person.

---

[131] Wibberley 1977, 33. The 'x' of 'Xpe' on GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. x, fol. 1r is by the same hand as the medieval foliation.

[132] Cxxxvi – the highest surviving foliation – appears slightly different with an angular V instead of rounded one and a larger loop on the stem of the X. However since the ink is the same and since the shape of the 'X' changes gradually over the course of the book it is possible that it is a variation of the same scribe's handwriting.

[133] Even where individual staves vary, the writing block can be determined from the frame ruling.

[134] The fragmentary fol. xxxvi may also belong in this group.

Finally, the staves of the gathering composed of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xiii are completely different, ruled with twelve to thirteen 5-line staves that were altered to 4 and 5-line staves.

2.4.2 Structure of the manuscript and stages of copying

The presence of medieval foliation and number of continuous folios means that a large proportion of the existing folios can be organised into their original gatherings. As the number of folios in each gathering varies from four to six, where gatherings are incomplete it is not always possible to tell how many folios were originally in that particular gathering. TABLE 2.12 shows the gathering structure for the surviving folios of Reconstruction I. For ease of reference, the gatherings have been numbered in the order that they appear in the manuscript, although this by no means represents the gathering numbering of the original manuscript, which was obviously a much larger volume. Those fragments with no surviving medieval foliation are given at the end of the table (gatherings 8, 9 and 10). Dittmer, Wibberley, Losseff, Summers and Lefferts have previously enumerated the reasons why certain folios must follow others within each gathering so there is no reason to repeat their work here.[135] The gathering structure given by Losseff in her dissertation is expanded here to include updates in the repertory provided by the fragments GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xlii, xl and xli discovered in the 1990s.[136]

Previous scholars have tried to find a pattern of copying that makes sense of the many different hands and notations of Reconstruction I, following the ordering of the medieval foliation.

[135] See especially Losseff 1994, 146-152. Of course the fragments discovered in the later 1990s do not form a part of her discussion.
[136] Genre categorisations are taken from Summers and Lefferts 2016, 32-9.

However, if the gatherings are examined outside the framework of a 'Reconstruction' or foliated codex, then the distinction between each gathering is apparent. An examination of the distribution of text and music hands across the folios shows a clear separation between gatherings. There seem to be three main groups of scribes working in collaboration, each of which appears in specific gatherings. Group 1 (Gathering 1, 2, and 7) has one main text and music hand. There can be no doubt that the text hand was T1, previously seen in Reconstruction III and II, the music hand may also have been M1 (it is hard to say since the nib and ink are different between the reconstructions – Reconstruction III's is much thicker and darker).[137] TABLE 2.13 provides script samples for the scribes of each of the three groups. In Group 1, the text is likely written before the music, owing to the space left for initial letters by the text and music hands (though not by the ruler of the staves). Group 2 includes scribes who were clearly copying together as there are several different music-text hand combinations. They correspond to gatherings 3-5 and the unfoliated GB-WOc Add. 68 xiii and xl. The ruled staves of this group do not leave room for initial letters and the limner usually added initials in the margin or over the staves. They were also clearly batch-ruled: on GB-WOc Add 68 frag. x, fol. 1r the unused lowest stave has been pre-ruled for both music and text (FIGURE 2.24). Music in these folios seems to have been copied after the texts at least some of the time. For example, on GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxviii, fol. 2r, the lower part of 'pollidet' was erased to make room for the note (TABLE 2.13). In other cases, it seems that the music was written first. T9 copied text after music on GB-WOc frag. xxviii, fol. 2: the tight spacing of notes led to a

[137] Wibberley thought they were the same; however he also believed that Gatherings 1-2 and 7 were notated and texted by different scribes whereas, as demonstrated before, they appear to be copied by the same text hand (FIGURE 2.9).

more crammed version of the original hand.[138] Finally, Group 3 appears on the first half of gathering 6. Once again a new group of scribes is clearly working together. Text and music hands were custom-ruled for compositions, with room left for the decorated initials by the ruler of the staves as well as the text hand. Traces of the frame-ruling show that at the time the musical area and text space was ruled, the area for initial letters was also defined. Interestingly, the music scribe here had access to red ink whereas M1 (Group 1) did not, as is clear from the few places were staves were-ruled or 'touched-up' after erasure. GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 fol. 15v, stave 7 and fol. 16r, stave 7 are two examples of such an occurrence (FIGURE 2.24). Here, the staves have been ruled twice – once in the usual bright red ink of the rest of the staves of that gathering and a second time in a darker red ink traced over the first in places where significant rewrites resulted in erased staves. Both of these folios were executed by Group 2. By contrast, the notator of GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 17v (Group 1) retouched erased staves with black ink, suggesting that he may not have had ready access to red ink (FIGURE 2.24).

2.4.3 Decorative hands

There are three main limners for Reconstruction I (D1, D3 and D4), one of which also decorated Reconstruction III (D1). They decorated separate gatherings and do not overlap, except in the case of the gathering composed of GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 14-19. D3 was responsible for the surviving folios from xxxvi to lxxxix as well as for GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii, for which foliation is missing. D4 decorated lxxxxii-lxxxxiv and D1 appears on folios from lxxxxix until the end of the book, and on the folios from the first part of the book (fol. vi-xvi).

[138] Wibberley considered this a different scribe, but the letter forms for T9's work are the same here as elsewhere, if slightly more crammed and narrow.

D3 changes styles between lxxiv to lxxvi from simple initial letters with no decoration to more flourished initials and more elaborate line fillers. The ink colour and similar smaller initials mean that they were possibly executed by the same person, especially since the evolution of the hand is gradual.[139] The hand becomes more decorative through the later folios, with tendrils from the scrollwork of initial letters extending further into the margin and new line fillers appearing (see GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 12 especially). These developments in style correspond to groups of folios (simple initials for Gathering 3 and GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xiii, flourished initials appearing alongside simple ones in Gathering 4 and even more flourished initials and line fillers in gathering 5). TABLE 2.14 gives examples of the styles of D3 and the work of the other limners in Reconstruction I. There is only one case of an 'interior' initial (one inside the musical area) in D3's work – the 'q' for 'quam' on GB-WOc Add. 68 frag. xxviii, fol. 3r, but the limner had to erase the text hand's 'q' before adding his own (TABLE 2.14). This is a pattern for all the folios that D3 decorates – the text hands only left room for initial letters at the top of each page, and sometimes not even then, so that initial letters had to be fitted to the available space.

By contrast, the decorations on folios from the first half of gathering 7 (GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 14, 15 and 16r) copied by D4 have wider initials with interior scrollwork, a darker blue ink and thicker nib for the embellishment. There are no small initials, but there are elaborate interior initials. The staves around these have been erased so well that, without the help of UV

[139] It is also possible that there were two decorators copying contemporaneously with each other with access to the same ink, and that they were mimicking one another's letter forms.

light, they look custom-ruled. The text hand for this section clearly planned ahead for the interior letters, unlike the hands that worked on the folios that D3 decorated.

The limner D1 appears on the first and last surviving folios of the codex. D1 usually uses red and blue simple, undecorated painted initials and distinctive red and blue line fillers. He also erases staves to create space for initial letters, but is less thorough than D4, so remnants of the original staves are often clearly visible. D1 is the same hand as is responsible for the foliation of the entire volume. Another distinction between scribal groups is the texting of the tenor. For group 1 and 3, the tenor is usually texted by the same hand as provides the texts for the upper voices (T1 for group 1, T11 for group 3) in a red ink. The text to the tenor is never added in Group 2, either by the text hands or by the limner D3.

If we compare the gathering structure to the distribution of text and music hands and the decorations of Reconstruction I then a pattern clearly emerges. Scribal groups 1, 2 and 3 exactly coincide with Decorators 1, 3 and 4. The implications of such an organisation are significant. First of all, the clear division of textual, musical and decorative hands allows us to situate those fragments that lack foliation. Thus GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xl, with D3's decoration, T7's text and M7's music clearly belongs with gatherings 3 and 4. Gathering 8 possibly does as well but here the connection can be called into question since the preparation of the pages is different. Gathering 9, on the other hand, clearly shares scribal hands and decorations with the folios belonging to Gathering 7.

It is not unheard of for a manuscript to contain different scribal groups, particularly if it was produced over an extended period of time. However the organisation of Reconstruction I is unusual in two respects. First, not only do the scribal groups not overlap, but the preparation of the pages and even the decorations are different. When the ruling of the staves and the decorations are taken into consideration as well, it is clear that Reconstruction I represents much more than individual gatherings produced by a 'network of scribes'. Rather, these three groups of folios represent independent projects, from start to finish – from the preparation of the page, to the notation and texting and the final decorated product.

However, the division of Reconstruction I into distinct, independently written and decorated gatherings is far more important when the notation and dating of the compositions is considered. Gatherings 3-5 are clearly a unit, with compositions dating from the 1270s-1280s all copied in English mensural notation (notice especially the appearance of the English rhomboid breve).[140] Group 2, copied by T12 and M10 and decorated by limner D4 in Gathering 6 use Petronian notation with dots of division and separate semibreves. They include compositions from the latter thirteenth century, from 1280-1290.[141] Finally, Group 1 was copied in Franconian notation with no separate semibreves, c.o.p. ligatures and a preference for conjucturae. Gatherings 1 and 2 are troped chant settings which may date as early as 1270, but Gatherings 6 and 7 contain music from the very late thirteenth century.

[140] For dating of the compositions in Reconstruction I, see Sanders, 'Worcester Polyphony'; for an analysis of notations, see Wibberley 1977, 23-26.
[141] Wibberley 1977, 25.

Another consideration that divides the Reconstruction into groups is the format of the compositions on the page. Williamson's dissertation examined the format of each composition in Reconstruction I, taking into consideration whether they were copied in parts, in score, across an opening or down the page.[142] If we compare her results to the 'groups' of Reconstruction I, it is clear that the three groups had different attitudes towards mise-en-page. 'Group 1' copied music in parts, 'Group 2' used a mixture of score and parts (both down the page and across an opening), alternating from one format to another multiple times in one gathering, while 'Group 3' consistently copied in parts down the page.

2.4.4. Conclusions

In the past, scholars have not been able to make sense of how Reconstruction I alternates between notations and genres, suggesting that a network of scribes was working together to create a kind of anthology of music from the century.[143] There is another explanation for this arrangement. Considering that the middle section (copied by Group 2) represents an older repertory, and is bookended by two groups of gatherings by T1, M1 and D1, a collection of hands that also foliated the volume, it is possible to imagine a scenario where the former group of folios (or project) was completed at an earlier point in time than the others. Just as Reconstruction II was, in its first phase of existence, a much simpler volume before it was edited by T4, M4, T1, M1 and D1, so too the middle part of Reconstruction I may have been an independent volume to which the first and last gatherings were added and then the whole

[142] Williamson 2016, 213-226.
[143] Wibberley 1977, 23; Losseff 1994, 149.

collection foliated. This would explain the difference in page preparation, stave rulings, music, text and decorative hands and formats and notations used. Perhaps what we are seeing is an anthology of music retroactively compiled by the scribes who produced Group 1. We know from Reconstruction II and GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 23 and 24 that the scribes of Group 1 were also involved in editing other books. In Reconstruction II, D1, T1 M1 added *Candens crescit lilium*, while D1, T4, and M4 all copied *Thomas gemma*. It is not a leap to think that this group of scribes valued the old repertory, for instead of discarding books they 'updated' sections, preserving old material alongside new compositions. Indeed the first folios of Reconstruction I reflect just such an 'older repertory', yet copied by Group 1, the same hands responsible for more recent compositions, dating from the end of the thirteenth century, in Gathering 6. Instead of representing a network of scribes working together at one point in time on a single, pre-planned codex, Worcester Reconstruction I may be viewed as a collection of independent gatherings that prepared and copied in a unique manner and only later compiled.

One element left to be considered is the *lacunae* of Reconstruction I. While only thirty leaves survive today, the original medieval foliation reached at least CXXXVII (137). Even assuming that the highest surviving foliation was the last folio in the original codex, the number of extant folios would be a mere 21% or a fifth of the folios of the entire original manuscript. If we consider that sixty-three original compositions survive to some extent in those thirty folios, then we could be missing as many as 200 compositions. It is a shame indeed that such a large body of compositions – many pieces probably unknown in other sources, given how few concordances there are for the Worcester repertory – has been lost to us forever.

2.5 Further 'Worcester Fragments'

There are a number of other fragments that are not part of the Worcester Reconstructions. These are still considered part of the 'Worcester Fragments' as they were also taken from Worcester bindings. They are kept in the GB-WOc Add. 68 collection along with fragments from the three Reconstructions, but they represent different scribal styles, mise-en-page, repertory and original page size and are manifestly from more than a couple of sources. A brief summary of these fragments follows, starting with the fragments that have the most connections to the Worcester Reconstructions. In some cases, no paleographical evidence can connect them to the Reconstructions other than that they were also taken from Worcester bindings. Only a short description of each group will be given here. The following discussion will draw on EECM 57 for concordance identifications and estimated original folio sizes.[144]

2.5.1 GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 23 and 24

These two folios have a historical association with Worcester Reconstructions ever since their binding in GB-Ob Lat. lit d 20. As mentioned before, they were considered to be part of Reconstruction II, although their ruling, dimensions, and script are distinct. The two folios are continuous so they clearly belonged to the same manuscript. Staves of GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 23 and fol. 24 typically have a stave width of 16 mm, although they can vary between 15-17 mm. Not only are the staves freely-ruled but they also appear to have been ruled specifically for the music notated on them. Here, the typical five-line staves are used interchangeably with a four-line staff where the range of the music can be accommodated on fewer lines (Figure

[144] Summers and Lefferts 2016, 32-34.

2.25). The original phase of production for the two folios shares scribal concordances with the middle part of Reconstruction I (Group 2) and may have been copied at the same time. Sometime after it was notated, the music was subject to alterations, including the addition of puncti to certain ligatures.[145] The hand that added music to the palimpsest page 24v is arguably T4 and M4, the hands that appear in both Reconstruction III and the palimpsest additions in Reconstruction II. As previously discussed, this added composition has a concordance in GB-Onc 362, an early fourteenth-century source, and shows the same kind of elaborate decoration of palimpsest compositions seen in Reconstruction II. TABLE 2.15 gives the layout of the compositions for these two folios.

2.5.2 GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 5

This folio was also considered part of Reconstruction II but is clearly from a different manuscript. There are no frame rulings and the staves are very even. Dimensions are slightly smaller than the massive Reconstruction II at 340 mm x 223 mm. There is a musical concordance (*Loquelis archangeli*) with the middle folios (copied by Group 2) of Reconstruction I and scribal concordances with Group 2 on the verso, and with a scribal concordance with many of the Worcester Fragments in the hands of T4, M4, D1 on the recto (TABLE 2.16).[146]

[145] For a discussion of the various changes and their implications, see Wibberley 1977, 76-78.
[146] For dating of compositions, see Sanders, 'Worcester Polyphony'.

2.5.3 GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xviii

Fragment xviii is a single bifolio of a mid-thirteenth-century source with no original scribal concordances to the three Reconstructions. It has the largest dimensions with an estimated original page size of 380 x 260 mm, and written area of 306 x 193 mm. The pages are custom-ruled and vary in stave number and length; the compositions are in English mensural notation. There is one original text and music hand (T13, M11) throughout these pages (FIGURE 2.26). Compositions are continuous, so the bifolio must have been the centrefold of a gathering (TABLE 2.17). A monophonic *Sanctus* and *Ad honorem summi regis* were added later by different hands (T14 and M12; T15 and M13, respectively), the latter composition was decorated with a flourished initial 'A' that is more elaborate than the simple initials of the rest of the compositions in this fragment.

2.5.4 GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xx

Fragment xx is another single bifolio, but smaller in dimension, with an estimated original page size of 288 x 212 mm. The written space, stave number and height vary, but the staves are much larger than those of the other Worcester Fragments (measuring between 19-25 mm). Compositions include a conductus-rondellus, troped chant setting, rondellus and a motet; the latter has a concordance in F-MO H 196 (TABLE 2.18). Fol.1 is written and notated by one text and music hand (T16, M14), fol. 2 by another text and music hand (T17, M15). The hands on folio 2 bear a resemblance to T1 and M1 but it is difficult to compare them given the

larger dimensions of frag. xx. The decorations certainly look as if they were added by D1, as the painted large initials, red added to majuscules and characteristic double-helix line fillers are typical of his hand (FIGURE 2.27).

2.5.5 GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxix

Fragment xxix consists of two non-consecutive bifolios that have been sewn together in a nested collection (TABLE 2.19 gives the layout of each bifolio separately). They are from a smaller-format volume than the Reconstructions: original folio size measured around 240 x 170 mm. Neither bifolio is a gathering centrefold, but fol. a2 has a foliation at the top ('xiiii'). The pages are custom-ruled in a variety of different ways: line number (4-5 lines in a staff), stave colour (red or black), stave gauge and number of staves per page all vary. There is no indication of the relative order of the compositions, which include monophony as well as polyphony. Music and text hands have no concordances with the other Worcester Fragments, but were copied at various stages; there are no paleographic indications of relative copying order apart from the palimpsest pages, where the erased text was obviously copied before the palimpsest text. Interestingly, the palimpsests are written over erased compositions which had not been completely copied – the text and staves had been entered but not the music. The palimpsest scribe on b1r also copied only the text and large initial letter and left staves empty. As the hands do not have any connection to the other Worcester Fragments, they are not discussed here but they are listed in Appendix TABLE 2 as T18-T27 and M16-M23. Only one music and one text hand (M23, T27) copied more than one composition: they were responsible for both polyphonic and monophonic pieces on b2v and a1r-v.

2.5.6 GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxx

'Fragment xxx' is a collection of three small fragments from one source (in GB-WOc Add. 68, they are numbered a1-a2, b and c). Summers and Lefferts estimate that the original manuscript measured 190 x 142 mm with a written area of 150 x 112 mm. Pages are ruled in red 8-9 mm four-line staves, with five systems of two staves on each page. There is no indication of musical order, although an old foliation of 'iii' can be found on fol. b1v. Compositions are mostly two-voiced sequences that date to the mid thirteenth century.[147] There is one main text and music hand (T28, M24) and one addition hand of text and music (T29, M25) on fol. b1r (FIGURE 2.28). No concordances for either the text or music hands exist among the other Worcester Fragments and there are no concordances for the compositions.

2.5.7 GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxiv

Fragment xxxiv also represents a collection of small, individual fragments (a, b, c, d) from the. They belonged to two different sources: fragment 'd' belonging to one and the a, b, and c to another. The former is a fragment of polyphony (possibly a rondellus) in English mensural notation latter half of the thirteenth century; the latter contain monophonic sequences (TABLE 2.23). One text hand (T30) and music hand (M26) copies the folios of a, b and c; another text and music hand (T31, 27) copies the fragment from the second source. None of the hands appears elsewhere in the Worcester Fragments.

[147] Summers and Lefferts 2016, 33.

2.5.8 GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxix/1

Finally, GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxix/1 is a strip of parchment that was cut from the cross-section of a bifolio. The fragment measures 64 x 275 mm and Summers and Lefferts estimate that the original musical area would have been 235-310 mm in height, depending on whether or not it was ruled for 9 or 12 staves 9 (staves gauge is 16-17mm and there is 9mm between each stave). The music, written in Franconian notation, seems to be a number of fragmentary motes, including one honouring St. Katherine and another which uses text from *Summe summi* in honour of St. Bernard (TABLE 2.21).

This brief summary of the fragments not belonging to the Reconstructions is enough to show that the Worcester Fragments do not represent a unified body of sources that reflect the output of one scriptorium, but a number of different sources, dating from various periods in the thirteenth century, many copied by hands that do not have scribal concordances among the other fragments. Not counting later fourteenth and fifteenth-century additions, a total of 32 text hands and 28 music hands can be counted but, apart from the hands that appear in more than one source, these divisions are helpful only insofar as they show how unrelated many of the fragments are, since the majority of hands appear only once. Even the sources sharing musical and scribal concordances vary with regard to page preparation, format and material and call for a more nuanced interpretation of origin than that they were all produced by the same scribes at one physical location.

2.6 The 'Worcester' Workshops

It is evident from the scribal connections between the sources and their order of copying that what the majority of the 'Worcester Fragments' represent is not a unified network of scribes working in collaboration, but the product of independent efforts, conducted at different times during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries by groups of text, music and decorative hands working in collaboration.[148] The art-historical term 'workshop', referring to an artist or an association between several artists working together, will be borrowed here to discuss these efforts rather than Wibberley's 'scriptorium': the latter may bring to mind a physical location where manuscripts are produced. In colloquial usage, 'workshop' might also call to mind a physical space, but because of its history of use to describe the unified output or style of one artist or artist's studio, it is more appropriate. 'Workshop' was chosen over 'group', 'network' or 'collaboration' because the latter necessarily signify the work of more than one individual, whereas the art-historical term 'workshop' can be also be used for discussing the work of a single artist and in particular, of a singular style. What is meant by 'workshop' is 'that person or group of people who were responsible for an identifiable style of work'.[149] 'Workshop' in this sense is not a physical location but a style; it could refer as much to a group of scribes working in the same location as to a professional scribe employed by an institution. The possible means of copying and transmission of material will be explored further in Chapter 4. In order to facilitate a discussion of the Reconstructions and those fragments they share scribal concordance with, this dissertation will define three of the 'workshops'. Obviously more are

[148] Group 3 is an additional independent project that is hard to place because there are only a few folios with its ruling pattern, text and music hands and limner.
[149] Godfried and Ainsworth 2006, 217.

represented by the entire collection of 'Worcester Fragments', however, other workshops are not defined here because the fragmentary state of the manuscripts they produced give insufficient paleographical information, such as the format of the page and copying order to be able to divide them further.

Workshop 1 produced the manuscript known as Reconstruction II, Workshop 2 was responsible for the middle folios of Reconstruction I, the folios of GB-WOc Add. 68 frag. xiii and the two folios GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 23 and 24. Finally Workshop 3 produced Reconstruction III and the outer folios of Reconstruction I, codifying Reconstruction I in one volume by providing foliation numbers and editing certain pieces. This collective of music, text and decorative hands also edited the folios of Ob 23 and 24, and 'updated' Reconstruction III. The company of scribes and the output of the three workshops are summarised in TABLE 2.12.

The three workshops date to separate periods of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. All of the original compositions of Reconstruction II date to around 1270, so the manuscript may have been copied soon after this date.[150] The middle folios of Reconstruction I might also have been produced before 1300, but the latter folios were the work of an early fourteenth-century workshop – some of the repertory dates from around 1295-1310.[151] It cannot be determined from the paleographical evidence of the Worcester Fragments whether the independence of scribal workshops represents separate provenances of the manuscripts they copied. The dissimilarities between the various workshops may represent different generations of scribes in

[150] For dating of individual pieces, see especially Dittmer 1957c, 5-10 and Sanders, 'Worcester Polyphony'.
[151] Ibid.

the same institution. Certainly in the case of Workshop 2 and Workshop 3, some individual nuances of decoration seem to be shared, and might represent the evolution of writing style in one institution. However it is clear that more work must be done to determine whether or not these 'Workshops' and various unrelated fragments may have been produced at the same institution, and whether that might have been at Worcester. Chapter 4 will address this concern by examining a range of thirteenth-century medieval books with a known Worcester provenance to look for scribal concordances and consider to what extent these manuscripts may have been mobile collections that were bound together at a later date.

Of the hands discussed in Reconstruction I-III and in the previous section 2.5, those fragments sharing scribal connections with Reconstructions I, II or III contain a total of 13 text, 12 musical and 6 decorative hands that copy more than one folio of music. They represent three larger compilations (larger only in the sense that more of them survives today) and two additional, smaller fragment collections. The former are of course Reconstructions I-III, the latter two share original scribal concordances with the three Reconstructions but cannot be further grouped based on paleographical evidence alone. They are, in no particular order:

1. GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 23r, 24
2. GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv-5

Two further sources, GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xx and xviii have a looser link to Reconstructions, in that the original decorations of the former and the decorations of added compositions in the latter show a similar approach to decorating music found in

Reconstruction II and GB-Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 23-24. Finally, there are five completely unrelated sources that cannot contribute to the understanding of these workshops because is no scribal overlap between them and the 7 sources above. They are:

1. GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxix
2. GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxx
3. GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxiv, fol. a, b, c
4. GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxiv, fol. d
5. GB-WOc Add. 68, frag xxxix/1

The most conservative estimate from the paleographical evidence is that there are 12 individual sources represented by the 'Worcester Fragments'. However the number of sources could be fewer; although there is insufficient paleographical evidence to group the fragments further, it is possible that several fragments that were copied around the same date (based on notation, musical material and script) might have been from the same codex even where they do not share scribal concordances. As the scribal 'groups' of Reconstruction I have shown, fascicles of the same manuscript may look very different. Given that Reconstruction I preserves independently-produced fascicles that share no scribal concordances, it is possible that other fragments that do not share mise-en-page might still have been collated in the same book after they were originally produced. Such a method of creation may seem strange if compared to the well-organised collections of polyphonic music found on the continent during the thirteenth century (I-Fl Plut. 29.1 and F-MO H 196 especially come to mind). Surviving sources of English music from the century, however, show a different pattern of usage. Helen Deeming's work on GB-Lbl Egerton 274, for example, sees fascicle I-IV as a single thirteenth-century

book, to which one small and two large sections were subsequently added.[152] Compilations of independently-produced fascicles are also true of miscellanies of the period, most famously GB-Lbl Harley 978, a miscellany of texts, only some of which are musical.[153] Instead of viewing manuscripts as 'whole books' modern scholarship must ask questions about medieval attitudes towards collecting, compiling and reorganising that take into account how written collections could change value and presentation over time.

How these manuscripts circulated is also up for debate. The fragmentary state of many folios often does not leave enough data to make definitive conclusions about their original sources. It is clear that Reconstruction I was a substantial codex of polyphony and, based on its beautiful original production and later careful preservation and updating, Reconstruction II was also a well-used polyphonic codex. Some of the fragments include both monophony and polyphony. In GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xviii, polyphonic compositions represent the original phase of production; while two monophonic chants were added later by different hands. GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxix has monophonic sequences and three-voice polyphonic chant settings copied both in its original 'layer' and in palimpsest texts, showing that both its original creators and later users did not consider it necessary to separate the two. The music is a collection of Mass Ordinary settings (*Kyrie*, *Sanctus* and *Alleluia*), sequences and Marian hymns. They are in no apparent liturgical order, but as multiple different hands have entered music at different times, might reflect the repertory, monophonic and polyphonic, of a particular institution.

[152] Deeming 2015b, 141.
[153] Taylor 2002, 76-136.

One observation that can be made about a number of fragments is that they were decorated not only in the original phase of copying but for their later additions as well. The additions to folios of GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 23-24 and GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xviii, fol. 2r were not haphazardly entered but were carefully copied, then embellished with line fillers and initial letters. Reconstruction II's decoration of palimpsest pages incorporates existing decorative structures into newly copied compositions, showing that the medieval scribes who were using and updating the manuscript were innovative and resourceful, making the best use of the materials they had. It also shows that they valued the original source, because they did not erase the material completely, or merely leave vestiges of the original material, but integrated elements of the original decoration as an essential part of the new decoration; seamlessly so in the case of the 'C' in *Candens crescit lilium.* Meanwhile the 'K' that was recycled as an 'I' on GB-WOc frag. xii, fol. 1v brings forward interesting questions about how the mind of the medieval 'recycler' saw existing material: whether the copyist merely took advantage of the fact that a 'K' could be used as an 'I' or whether the initial even played a role in the choice of palimpsest composition to be copied or conversely, the choice of which original composition would be replaced based on the new composition's potential of working with original decorated letter (i.e. a 'K' could be altered to be an 'I' but not a 'T'; an 'S' or 'A' could not be altered to form an 'I'). In other words, the medieval updater may either have scouted out initial letters to find one that could work with an 'I' or picked compositions for which a 'K' could be altered. That the decoration of musical additions is employed in several 'Worcester Fragments' may prove significant.

2.7 Conclusions

It is clear that paleography alone cannot effectively date these fragments – for a hundred years they have been considered to have been copied all at the same time, when this cannot have been the case, especially for Reconstruction II. This Reconstruction must have been produced before at least the outer folios of Reconstruction I, as the scribal concordances show that Reconstruction I was copied by the same hands as the palimpsest texts of Reconstruction II. This discussion has shown that in the institution where Workshop 3 (and likely Workshop 2) was located, there was a respect for the older repertory. Newer compositions were copied into (or bound together with) older gatherings, and an older repertory continued to be copied by certain scribes – such as the chant settings in Reconstruction I's first folios.

It seems the claim that Worcester Fragments were produced at one place by a network of scribes is not supported by the paleographical evidence. The similarities of hands that Wibberley demonstrated do not all bear weight under close scrutiny, and certain superficial resemblances (for example, between Reconstructions I and II) were not part of the original projects, but were created by later scribes editing the manuscript or manuscripts. Connections between the Worcester Fragments show that they are not the result of 'a network of scribes' but are an early fourteenth-century attempt to refashion or 'reconstruct' older manuscripts. This observation in turn has an impact on the dating and provenance of the Reconstructions. Those fragments that were not part of twentieth-century reconstructions have escaped dating by association and are assigned various different dates by Summers and Lefferts in EECM 57; but

Reconstructions I, II, and III were artificially assigned the same date because of the idea that the same scriptorium produced them. EECM 57 dates all three Reconstructions to the third quarter of the fourteenth century, and Wibberley, as we have seen, dates them to ca.1300.[154] In her dissertation, Losseff at one point expresses doubts about the connection between the main musical hands of Reconstruction I and III (Wibberley's Scribe 'c').[155]

> If indeed this hand does not occur in Reconstruction Three, then this has serious implications for the view that Reconstructions One – and hence Reconstruction Two, with which Reconstruction One shares hand e – was written at a period which could encompass Petronian notational reforms. One could, however, look to the evidence of the repertory itself. Two pieces from Reconstruction One and one from Reconstruction Three are found in Ob Mus c 60; but this manuscript does seem to preserve music in later notation, even in an adapted form of the Worcester rhythm.

The following chapter will undertake an examination of music across the 'Worcester repertory' represented in the sources of the Worcester Fragments. In order not to allow the 'workshop' hypothesis to bias the musical examination, Chapter 3 will consider the music of the Worcester Fragments independently of the paleographical interconnections between Reconstructions I, II, III and further fragments. Even where concordances are considered, the discussion will keep an open mind for alternate theories of transmission. Chapter 3 will first look at the chronological groups in which the repertory of the Worcester fragments has been divided to see how the dates of compositions in the various fragments overlap or diverge (Section 3.1). Section 3.2 will re-examine the concordances, including Gb-Ob Mus c. 60, which may help date the Reconstructions and link them to other insular and continental sources, and consider the

[154] Wibberley 1977, 27; Summers and Lefferts 2016, 34-38.
[155] Losseff 1994, 147. Wibberley's hand 'e' is analogous to M9. Generally Losseff agrees with Wibberley's scribal divisions.

shared musical material between Reconstructions I and II to see if it proves or challenges the hypothesis of a shared provenance. Finally, two compositions will be analysed in detail – Section 3.3 will explore the only piece that is an exact concordance between Reconstruction I and II, and Section 3.4 which will consider one of the compositions added by hands T4 and M4. As these hands appear on a number of original and palimpsest pages in Reconstructions II and III and several other fragments, they may be most closely linked to the institution which owned these sources. Thus it will be worth discovering what prejudices and influences, political or religious affiliations may have affected some of the changes that were made to the repertory, and nowhere is this more evident than in the motet discussed in 3.4. Only after the 'evidence of the repertory itself' has been considered, will Chapter 4 be able to tie the individual threads of paleographical and musical characteristics together and establish a history of the Worcester Fragments as objects of use and reconstruction throughout the thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth centuries and beyond.

3.

The Music of the Worcester Fragments

It is hard to overstate the significance of the repertory contained in the Worcester Fragments. Reconstructions I, II and III and the other fragments from the Worcester collection encompass over a hundred complete and incomplete compositions spanning a century of music, from the first third of the thirteenth century until the first third of the fourteenth. The vast majority of these compositions have no concordances, so the Worcester collection is the only extant source of a substantial body of late medieval polyphony. In all, the repertory of the Worcester Fragments represents no less than a third of all the surviving English music of the period.

It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to analyse such a large collection in detail, and a study equally divided between the many compositions would leave only a cursory understanding of each one. Thus, this dissertation will begin with an overview of the musical contents: a general background of the works, genres and compositional phases represented in the Worcester Fragments (Section 3.1). Section 3.2 will explore how the Worcester repertory, particularly the music of the three Reconstructions, connects to the wider collection of manuscripts of the

thirteenth century by examining the surviving textual and musical concordances of the compositions.

In order to balance breadth with depth, the general overview will be followed by two case studies. Section 3.3 will look at *Sanctus]/Sanctus et eternus Deus/Tenor*, an incomplete troped Sanctus setting which appears twice in the Worcester Fragments, copied in both Reconstructions I and II. Section 3.4 will review the famous four-voiced motet, *Thomas gemma/Thomas cesus/Primus Tenor/Secundus tenor*. Setting up these very different case studies, which represent two diverse genres, stylistic influences and possibly even performance practices will allow the dissertation to explore some of the variety of material in the Worcester repertory, while examining a troped chant setting from the original production phase and a motet that was added later may contribute to an understanding of how the original collections of music changed and evolved in the hands of their medieval users. The varying contexts of the two copies of *Sanctus et eternus Deus* in Reconstruction I versus Reconstruction II will allow for a comparison of the influences, methods and priorities of their scribes as editors or copyists, while the presence of two surviving concordances for *Thomas gemma* will facilitate a depth of discussion in the analysis of music and text that would not be possible either from a broad survey of the repertory or from the case study of an *unica* fragmentary composition with missing parts, such as the troped Sanctus. Finally, the Benedictine and Dominican influences found in these two case studies may help to discern the provenance of the original manuscripts, the environment in which they were created and the original institution or religious community for which they were intended.

3.1 The Repertory of the Worcester Fragments: an Overview

In the previous chapter, the compositions were examined in the context of the Reconstructions and further Worcester Fragments, grouped by gathering structure and divided into phases of production so that the order of copying for each manuscript was apparent. Such an examination was essential to understanding the organisation and repertory of the individual sources, their subsequent development and transformation with the addition of later compositions, and the history of the repertory in these codices. Another advantage of this kind of source-based approach is that it avoids artificially conflating the compositions from the many separate manuscripts into one unified 'Worcester Repertory'. It is important to emphasise that, as the preceding paleographic evidence has shown, these fragments do not represent a single unified project; the combined folios of the Worcester Fragments are not a lost English *Magnus Liber*. Rather the 'Worcester Repertory' is an amalgamation of many different sources, copied at various dates and (probably) in different workshops, containing music that spans a century.

However, the shortcoming of an individual analysis of the Reconstructions is that it becomes source-focused and does not accurately convey the variety and similarities of compositional style and (in some cases, even shared repertory) between the separate Reconstructions. Before any individual case study can be analysed, it is necessary to review a compositional timeline in which individual works may be situated. In his discussion of the music of the Worcester

Fragments, Ernest Sanders divided the repertory into five chronological groups.[156] TABLE 3.1 illustrates these chronological divisions. The dating for the compositions of the table and for the discussion that follows is based on Sanders's assessment in *Grove Music*, and refers to the musical style and probable date of composition, not the date of the manuscript copies.

The repertory of the Worcester Fragments is spread across a number of sources, not all of which are paleographically linked. For example, the earliest works (Group I, TABLE 3.1) are found in fragments that have no scribal or musical concordances with any of the three Reconstructions or with each other, but feature an earlier style: note-against-note writing, the predominant use of the third, and overlapping vocal registers.[157] They include two-voice sequence settings (WF 100, 101, 102), three-voiced cantus firmus settings (WF 97, 98) a conductus (WF 99) and a three voiced organum setting of *Alleluia Nativitas* that was clearly influenced by Perotin's version.

Apart from the earlier two-part settings, the vast majority of the compositions are three-part settings. In the later phases of production, however, we see the rise of four-part music and an expanding vocal range. The change in genres represented by the repertory also reflects the development of thirteenth-century polyphonic composition. Forms like the rondellus and conductus appear in the late-thirteenth-century collection but become rare after 1300. The motet, present by 1270, grows in prominence throughout the late thirteenth century and into

[156] Dates for the discussion that follows will be based on Sander's dates of composition (not copying) for the musical material in the Worcester Repertory. Sanders, 'Worcester polyphony'.
[157] GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xviii, xxix and xxx. Frag. xviii shares a concordance with the fourth fascicle of F-MO H 196.

the fourteenth, while new forms, such as the cantilena, emerge. Even within genres there are changes to the forms that compositions take. Mid- to late-thirteenth century chant settings (Group II, III) elaborate the text with long, sometimes poetic tropes (Section 3.3 will discuss these in greater detail). Chant settings remain popular throughout the thirteenth century and into the fourteenth, but with fewer tropes: only half the chant settings in the very late thirteenth and early fourteenth century (Groups IV and V) are troped. The division of pieces finds similar counterparts in other thirteenth-century insular sources: conducti and troped chant settings also feature in D-W Cod. Guelf.1099 Helmst, while the dominance of Marian music is typical of thirteenth-century sources of sacred polyphony.[158]

While TABLE 3.1 seems to show a clear distinction between genres, in practice the attitude towards genre could be more fluid than it appears on the page.[159] The conducti from Group II (1270s) often feature rondellus passages, while troped chant settings from the same period incorporate pre-existent material in a fashion similar to the motet, or set rhythmic poetry to music in a style more commonly associated with the conductus. Other insular sources show a similar attitude towards genre. In many cases, motet and conductus were not differentiated as clearly as they were on the Continent. Mark Everist has drawn attention to a more hybridized concept of genre found in English music of the period, where lines between genres such as the conductus, rondellus and motet were often blurred.[160] Thus Continental pieces were

[158] Steiner 2013, 18. Williamson 2016, 27-8.
[159] Note that the genre differences in the table are taken from Sanders and are open to other possible interpretations. For a discussion on the hybridisation of insular compositions, see Williamson 2016, 55-64 especially.
[160] Everist 1992, 17.

occasionally altered in English sources, sometimes creating a direct change in genre and sometimes with more ambiguous results. For example, the three-part compositions in GB-Ctc MS 0.2.1 are preserved as conductus motets, but are all adaptations of early Notre-Dame pieces copied in successive form.[161] Meanwhile Williamson describes *Sponsa rectoris omnium* (WF 98) as 'generically ambiguous' and gives four different descriptions under which it could be classified.[162]

Scholars have long used the Worcester Fragments to illustrate the typically 'English' sound of thirteenth-century insular music.[163] Particularly 'English' characteristics, especially in the main body of compositions from the Worcester repertory from 1270-1300, include the predominant use of the 'major mode' (sometimes mixed with the Lydian mode), an emphasis on thirds, triads and the prevalence of 6-3 chords, voice-exchange techniques, ostinato effect, non-liturgical tenors, the stress on chords of the tonic and supertonic and the prevailing use of trochaic rhythms and the mode 1 rhythmic mode. The case studies (Section 3.3, 3.4) will show how these characteristics are reflected in individual pieces, and concordances show to what extent a composition can be assigned an English provenance based on stylistic features alone (Section 3.2).[164]

---

[161] Ibid., 19. Everist offers a number of other examples of genre alterations or outright genre changes including the motet *Ave virgo regia /Ave gloriosa/ Domino* which is presented in GB-Lbl Harley 978 as a conductus.
[162] Williamson points out that the composition could be identified as a 'chant setting', 'Marian Latin song', 'Marian contrafactum' or hymn (Williamson 2016, 113). In this dissertation it is listed as a chant setting, as it is in EECM 57. *Sponsa rectoris omnium* is found on GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxix, fol. b2.
[163] Taruskin 2010, 593; Levy 1951, 230.
[164] Sanders, 'Worcester Polyphony', also Handschin 1949, 55-94 and Levy 1951, 220-239.

Finally, so much attention has been devoted to the polyphonic material of the Worcester Fragments that it is worth mentioning that the fragments contain monophony as well as polyphony, though not in the three Reconstructions. GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xviii, fol. 2r contains a monophonic *Sanctus* and *Ad honorem summi regis*, while the verso of frag. xxix, fol. a1 has another monophonic Sanctus and two Marian texts: *[A]ve Maria gratia plena virgo amantissima* and *[Ave] virgo concipiens angelo salutatis*. The former seem to be additions to a previously blank folio, but decorated with initial letters so that they are aesthetically integrated into the collection. As seen in the previous chapter, the fragmentary nature and multiple hands of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxix make it difficult to assess the copying order, but it does seem that monophony and polyphony were part of the original copying phase. This is not without precedent in insular manuscripts of the period. Williamson has drawn attention to a number of sources which contain polyphony and monophony.[165] Indeed, some sources contain polyphony and monophony integrated in the same composition: more specifically, there are a number of troped chant settings (sometimes polytextual but largely monotextual) that contain monophonic chant insertions.[166] As with genre distinctions, it seems insular manuscript compilers had a less rigid attitude towards manuscript organisation.

[165] Williamson 2016, 90-93.
[166] Ibid., 91-92.

3.2 Musical Concordances of the Worcester Fragments

Given both the fragmentary, scattered nature and limited number of English sources, the number of musical concordances for the Worcester Fragments is fairly low.[167] There are only ten concordances for Reconstruction I, five for Reconstruction II (two of these are palimpsest additions), two for GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xx, two for GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 5, one for Reconstruction III and one for GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 23-24. In addition, there are a number of cases where the text of a composition is found in another source, with a different musical setting. Table 3.2 gives a list of all of the known musical concordances to the Worcester Fragments. A number of the pieces in the Worcester Fragments have also been connected in the past to the lost list of compositions from GB-Lbl Harley 978.[168] These are not included in Table 3.2, as recent scholars have cast considerable doubt on all of the attributions.[169]

The distribution of concordances is notable in a few ways. First, there are a number of concordances among the Worcester Fragments themselves, including several concordances between Reconstructions I and II. There are also two sources that have more than one concordance with the Worcester Fragments: F-MO H 196 (the Montpellier Codex) and GB-Ob c. 60. Finally, while only 3 of the 21 original (legible) compositions in Reconstruction II

[167] Wibberley 1977, 8; Losseff 1994, 79-81 (Table 2).
[168] Dittmer in particular used the association of the textual incipits from GB-Lbl Harley 978 with several compositions from the Worcester Fragments to help build the case for a connection between Worcester and Reading and a 'Westcuntre' school of polyphony. Dittmer 1954, 19-58.
[169] Wibberley 1977, 6-7; Losseff 1994, 78-80. Williamson has shown that the Alleluias listed in GB-Lbl Harley 978 (previously associated with the troped Worcester Alleluias) are actually unlikely to have been troped, as the Harleian list normally specifies tropes and it does not do so for these Alleluias. Williamson 2016, 82.

have concordances, a quarter of the later additions have concordances in more than one source.[170]

Concordances for the motet additions to Reconstruction II include an addition around 1300 of the refrain motet *Candens crescit lilium* and an early fourteenth-century copy of the four-voiced motet, *Thomas gemma.* As previously mentioned, *Candens crescit lilium* (WF 53) has two concordances, one in GB-Cpc MS 228, fol. ii and another in US-NYpm MS 978, no. 13, 7v. The latter is a much later copy as the manuscript mentions the war between England and France already being in progress, so it must date from between 1340 and 1377.[171] There are only minor differences with the GB-Cpc MS 228 copy: the latter uses plicas, slightly different Triplum parts at 'sub ditum' and 'partriarchas' (different cadences) and a few obvious errors.[172] The Worcester copy also adds a few performance marks (ficta). *Thomas gemma* has concordances with GB-Cgc 512/543 and US-PRu Garrett 119, Fragment A (hereafter US-PRu Garrett119A). The work is a Latin motet for four voices, with paired upper and lower parts in a double twinned texture. The triplum honours Thomas Becket of Canterbury, the duplum sings of Thomas Hale, a Benedictine monk killed in early August of 1295 during the French raid on the priory of St. Martin in Dover. Section 3.4 will discuss this motet in detail.

The concordances with F-MO H 196 have been analysed in detail by other scholars, so only a summary needs to be given. There are three concordances with F-MO H 196, two with the

[170] The number of original compositions includes erased compositions only where the text and music is legible; it does not include erased compositions where only a fragment of text is visible.
[171] The original manuscript's provenance is most likely the Chapel Royal, St Stephen's Chapel, Westminster or St George's Chapel, Windsor. Harrison 1963a, 192-193, 204.
[172] Dittmer 1957d, 32.

fourth fascicle and one with the eighth fascicle, the latter of which will be discussed later in connection to its Reconstruction I and II concordances. The incomplete motet *Sed fulsit virginitas/Primus tenor* (GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xx, fol. 2r) only survives with two out of the four voices in Worcester, the facing folio having been lost. In Montpellier a three-voiced version of the motet includes the triplum *Super te* and tenor *Dominus*. The inventory of lost compositions in GB-Lbl Harley 978 also lists the motet with the *Super te* triplum as in the fourth fascicle of F-MO H 196. However, due to the unsupported fourths in the three-voiced setting, Summers and Lefferts propose that the four-voiced setting is the original version.[173] Another concordance with F-MO H 196 is the *Alleluia V. Nativitas gloriose virginis Marie. Ex semine Habrahe* (GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xviii, fol. 1v-2r), one of the earliest compositions in the Worcester repertory. The work is a three-voiced organum with a texted clausula-motet, *Ex semine Habrahe/Ex Semine Habrae/Ex semine* in place of the clausula which clearly borrows the discant section from Perotin's famous version of the organum *Alleluia V. Nativitas*. While the organum is unique, the motet has several Continental concordances, including Latin and French two- and three-voiced motets. A copy with the triplum missing can be found in I-Fl Plut. 29.1, while the music appears as the motet *Ex semine rosa/Ex semine Habrahe/Ex semine* in F-MO H 196.[174] The Worcester version is a rare combination of organum and motet. Their co-existence in one piece is an English peculiarity that shows the influences of both the Notre Dame School and the early motet in the insular repertory.

[173] Summers and Lefferts 2016, 32.
[174] Bradley 2015, 187. Bradley has discussed the whole family of motets that rework the discant from Perotin's organum; she considers the Worcester copy to be a conductus-motet.

The only other source to share multiple concordances with the Worcester repertory is a set of fragments found in the Bodleian Library under the shelfmark Mus. c. 60 (FIGURE 3.1). The source is a modern guard book with a collection of eight fragmentary parchment leaves, seven of which (fol. 79-85) were previously the front and rear flyleaves of GB-Ob Bodley 816, and one unrelated single folio (fol. 104).[175] These seven fragments were probably originally from two different sources. Fol. 79 and 82-85 are the remains of a single leaf and two consecutive bifolios that form the center of a gathering that shares concordances with Reconstructions I and III and a more tenuous link to Reconstruction II (TABLE 3.1). The Kyrie on fol. 82r of GB-Ob c. 60 appears in Reconstruction I (GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 16v), and the Gloria on 82v-83v has a concordance in Worcester Reconstruction III (GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xix, fol. c2v, b2r).

It has been further pointed out by Dittmer that the setting of the Gloria trope *Spiritus et alme orphanorum* found in the subsequent folios of GB-Ob c. 60 (fol. 84v- 85r) is reminiscent of Reconstruction II's *Sanctus … unus tamen et divinus.*[176] The unusual division between the lower two voices of the latter is similar to the voice-exchange in the lower parts of *Spiritus et alme.* Rather than the upper two voices participating in an exchange of material while the tenor repeats itself (as one might expect from a composition of the period), the roles are flipped: it is the upper voice that sings repetitions, while the lower two voices exchange melodic material.[177] Even without this connection, the fact that a quarter of the eight pieces that survive from this thirteenth-century source share concordances with Reconstructions I and III is significant. In particular, it is notable that both concordances in Reconstruction I and III are copied by

[175] Lefferts 2012, 80; Lütolf 1970, 237-43.
[176] Dittmer refers to the troped Sanctus setting as an organum. Dittmer 1957, 45.
[177] Ibid.

Workshop 3. This may indicate that the copyist of Gb-Ob Mus. c. 60 and Workshop 3 had similar attitudes towards the selection of compositions and thus the complete repertory of Gb-Ob Mus. c. 60 might have shared more concordances with Reconstructions I and III.

Perhaps the most unexpected and fruitful concordances are the ones that occur within the repertory of the Worcester Fragments. Similar material shared between two sources can be evidence of related transmission and common provenance or conversely, an argument for a disparate usage. Significantly, of the concordances that appear among the sixty-odd fragments, with one exception the shared material occurs between Reconstructions I and II.[178] There are three cases of shared text or music between Reconstructions I and II:

1. *Sanctus et eternus Deus* – two copies of same piece

R I: *Sanctus et eternus Deus* (GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xiii, fol. 4v)[179]

R II: *Sanctus et eternus Deus* (GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 4r-v)

The Sanctus is the only instance where a composition appears twice in the Worcester Fragments with very little difference between the two copies. It will be the focus of a case study later in this chapter (Section 3.3).

[178] This exception is the composition *Loquelis archangeli/Quartus cantus* which appears both in Worcester Reconstruction I and GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 5. The folio was previously considered part of Reconstruction II but, as argued in Chapter 2, is more likely to have been from a different original codex.
[179] The upper voice is missing from Reconstruction I (it would have been on the facing folio), while Reconstruction II has only the beginning and end of the tenor, the end of the triplum, and most of the duplum. Dittmer numbers the Reconstruction I and II copies no. 77 and 61 respectively and has produced an edition combining both (see Appendix TRANSCRIPTION 1).

2. *Ave magnifica Maria* – two versions of a Marian antiphon[180]

R I: *Ave magnifica Maria/Ave mirifica Maria/Alleluia V. Post partum virgo* (GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxviii, fol. 4v)

R II: *Ave magnifica Maria/Ave mirifica Maria/Alleluia V. Dulce lignum* (GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 3)

The three-voice setting of the *Ave magnifica Maria/Ave mirifica Maria/Alleluia* appears as an antiphon before two different Alleluia verses in the Reconstructions – before the verse *Post partum virgo* in Reconstruction I and transposed up a perfect fourth before the verse *Dulce lignum* in Reconstruction II, so that it would lead seamlessly to the mode 8 Alleluia following. The existence of multiple copies of the *Ave magnifica Maria* indicates that the original composition was a popular one. The same music appears with text *Alle –psallite cum- luya/ Alle –psallite cum- luya /Alleluia* in the eighth fascicle of F-MO H 196 (no. 339).[181] While various interpretations for the tenor have been offered, it is mostly likely an unknown melody.[182] Elizabeth Boos identified the source of musical material for the duplum (and to some degree the triplum) as borrowed from the Epiphany antiphon 'Psallite Deo nostro', transposed up a perfect fifth.[183] Boos uses the intertextuality of the antiphon and the triplum and duplum text to argue that the F-MO H 196 version is the original one and possibly even of French origin.[184]

---

[180] Editions of the two pieces are WF 19/EECM 26 for Reconstruction I and WF 56/EECM 16 for Reconstruction II.

[181] Boos 1971, 93-98.

[182] Handschin and Grout considered the tenor to be a paraphrase of the opening of the *Post partum* melody, Dittmer ascribed it to the *Dulce lignum/Dulcis mater* melody, as it forms the tenor for the Alleluia verse in the Reconstruction II version. Neither seems a likely candidate, as the contour and cadences are different in the motet's tenor to the known versions of either chant. Boos 1971, 94 -95; also Handschin 1949, 69; Grout 1960b, 131 and Harrison 1963b, 34. Harrison believed that the tenor was not an Alleluia verse, as did Gustave Reese (Reese 1940, 320).

[183] Boos 1971, 97.

[184] Boos speculates that the piece was composed as an alternative to the antiphon 'Psalite deo nostro', although the substitution of new text in the duplum makes the piece liturgically malleable. Boos 1971, 95.

However, the English sonorities and voice-exchange structure clearly show that the motet's origins are insular. The two pieces that follow the *Alle –psallite cum- luya* in F-MO H 196 are the divided parts of another English composition, a concordance of which can be found in the early fourteenth-century GB-Onc 362.[185] The *Alleluia magnifica Maria* is not the only case where an Alleluia is introduced with a tropic text of general character; the same happens again at *Alleluia psallat hec familia* in Reconstruction II. The form of this motet is very similar to that of *Ave magnifica Maria* and might indicate a shared provenance.[186]

Only the final section from the tenor text of the Reconstruction II survives. Dittmer reconstructs the tenor as *Dulcis lignum* in his inventory and edition, since the music and only surviving word 'celorum' belong to the antiphon.[187] However the *Dulcis virgo*, a contrafactum of *Dulce lignum* might be a better candidate for the text of Reconstruction II's tenor. In the contrafact text, the image of the Cross bearing the weight of Christ is transformed to that of Mary carrying Jesus:[188]

---

[185] Everist 1992, 20-21. Everist points to the 'idiosyncratic choice of tenor melisma' in the second composition, *Balaam inquit vaticans/Balaam inquit vaticans /Balaam* to prove its English origins. GB-Onc 362 also has a concordance with the polytextual rondellus *Fulget celestis/O Petre flos/ Roma gaudet* of Reconstruction I. C.f. Harrison 1978, 420-428.

[186] Handschin 1949, 69. Of course, this would not explain the textual link between Montpellier's 'alle- *psallite*-cum-luya' text in the triplum and the duplum's '*Psalite* deo nostro' melody that Boos argues is an intentional connection.

[187] The *Dulce lignum* melody usually appears in connection with the Holy Cross. In his edition, Dittmer reconstructs the tenor part with the text and melody of the *Dulce lignum* source.

[188] Emphasis added to highlight the changed text. Pesce 1997, 3-11, 28-51. The eleventh fascicle of D-W Cod. Guelf.1099 Helmst (fol. 197v) contains a further Marian contrafactum of the Alleluia, v. 'Salve virgo, dei mater' (Ibid., 47, fn. 31). Pesce has examined a number of Parisian sources which contain the *Dulce lignum* or *Dulcis virgo*. The link between Mary with Child and the cross has liturgical precedent. In the fourth lesson for the feast of the Assumption, Second Nocturne of Matins we find: *Hodie Eden novi Adam paradisum suscipit animatum, in quo solute est condemnation, in quo plantatum est lignum vite, in quo operta fuit nostra nuditas* 'Today the Eden of the new Adam receives the living paradise in which our condemnation was dissolved in which the tree of life was planted, in which our nakedness was clothed' (Ibid., 40). In medieval legend the tree of life was synonymous with the cross, as both were life-giving trees.

In the original text:	In the contrafact text:
Alleluia. *Dulce lignum, dulces claves,* dulcia ferens pondera, que sola fuisti digna *sustinere* regem celorum et Dominum	Alleluia. *Dulcis virgo, dulcis mater,* dulcia ferens pondera, que sola fuisti digna *portare* regem celorum et Dominum.
Alleluia. Sweet wood, sweet nails, bearing the sweet weight, you alone were worthy of bearing the Lord, king of heaven.	Alleluia. Sweet virgin sweet mother, bearing the sweet weight, you alone were worthy of carrying the Lord, king of heaven.

The text resonates with the duplum of the Reconstruction II verse, which begins with similar text to the *Dulcis virgo*:

Dulcis mater
cuius nati Deus pater
dulci nato deo incarnato
dulcia melifula preciosa
celi rore madida

The duplum also ends with two words lifted from the *Dulce lignum/Dulcis virgo* text:

Christum que laudare
Regem coelorum

If *Dulcis virgo* was the tenor of Reconstruction II's verse, the duplum and tenor would begin singing 'dulcis' together and both end with 'celorum' even though the text in between would diverge. Alternatively, the Marian duplum voice and *Dulce lignum* tenor might have been used together to draw a parallel between Mary and the cross. Dolores Pesce has shown a number of thirteenth-century motets that use *Dulce lignum* and *Dulcis virgo* interchangeably – they appear based with the same section of chant, but as *portare* in one version (*Dulcis virgo*) and *sustinere*

(from *Dulce lignum)* in another.[189] Sylvia Huot has also emphasised the connection between Mary and the Cross, giving the example of the liturgical sequence *Lignum vite querimus*:[190]

> The Virgin and the Cross are presented as the two loci where the fruit of life must be sought, and hence as two manifestations of the tree of life. Each embodies a paradox that is part of the sacred mystery of the Incarnation and Redemption:
>
> Hic virgo puerpera
> Hic crux salutifera
> Ambe ligna mystica
> Haec hysopus humilis
> Illa cedrus nobilis
> Utraque vivifica
>
> Here is the child-bearing virgin, here the salubrious cross, two mystical trees; this one a humble hyssop, that one a noble cedar, and both life-giving.[191]

Seen in the context of the connection between Mary and the cross, the *Dulce lignum* and *Dulcis mater* texts are both plausible candidates for the tenor of Reconstruction II's *Ave magnifica Maria*. The two versions might even have been used interchangeably and adapted for different liturgical uses. In addition, a case can be made for *Dulce lignum* (or *Dulcis mater*) being the original verse for *Ave magnifica Maria* and not *Post partum*. GB- Lbl Harley 978 includes an *Alleluia Dulce lignum* among its list of Alleluia settings by W. de Wic. As Reading and the Harleian list are closely connected to the composer, the *Dulce lignum* might have been the original version of the melody, if indeed it is the same setting as the Worcester one.[192] Moreover, the fact that both *Dulce lignum/Dulcis mater* and *Psallite Deo nostro* are mode 8

---

[189] Pesce 1997, 28-51.
[190] The composition is possibly by Philip the Chancellor of Paris (d. 1236). See Payne 1991, 574, 577. The two pieces that follow the *Alle- psallite cum- luya* in F-MO H 196 are one piece divided in two, a concordance of which can be found in another English source, the early fourteenth-century GB-Onc 362. Everist considers both pieces 'undoubtedly English', citing many identifiably English compositional characteristics. Everist 1992, 20.
[191] Huot 1997, 163.

chants means that the simplest trajectory of composition is that the *Ave magnifica Maria* was first combined polyphonically with another mode 8 chant (*Dulce lignum/Dulcis mater)* and later transposed to fit the *Post partum* verse, not that it was originally transposed to fit the mode 4 *Post partum* and then transposed again back to mode 8 to suit the *Dulce lignum* verse.

In another manuscript in the Bodleian Library, GB-Ob c. 400*, the text *Ave magnifica Maria* is paired with *Alleluia Post partum virgo* as it is in Reconstruction I. GB-Ob c. 400* is a collection of parchment flyleaves originally from three sources: two rotuli and a booklet. The Worcester concordance is with the booklet, which consists of two nested bifolios from the centre of a gathering. These fragments contain only the text for six compositions: space was left for the staves and music, but never added.[193] While Dittmer believed the GB-Ob c. 400* copy to be a different musical setting, the spacing of text suggests a similar composition, if not a direct concordance. FIGURE 3.2 offers a comparison between the GB-Ob c. 400* and Worcester copies, highlighting corresponding sections of the upper voice. The similarity of spacing especially at the words 'salvifica deigera Maria' 'salutifera marie' and 'integra inviolate permansisiti' leaves no doubt that the melismatic passages fell in the same place in both sources.

Ave magnifica Maria is not the only case of incorporating pre-existent music into a new composition. Another example from Reconstruction II, the troped Alleluia *In tuis laudibus/Gaude per quam cornu David]/ T. Alleluya V. Gaude virgo gaude* (GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 25) directly quotes the poem beginning 'Gaude virgo, quae de caelis iuxta vocem

[192] Williamson and Losseff have called into question whether any of the Worcester Alleluias can be connected to the Harleian list of lost compositions. Losseff 1994, 78-80; Williamson 2016, 82.
[193] Dittmer 1954, 19-58.

Gabrielis' in the second voice.[194] The Worcester Alleluias are a prime example of how pre-existent elements can interact in a new setting, of how old and new can be combined to create an integrated whole.

3. *Regis Caelorum and O regina glorie* – A motet and troped Alleluia with same text

R I: *O regina glorie Maria/T. [pes]* (GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xi, fol. 2r)

R II: *Regis celorum - O regina glorie/Alleluia…/ T. Alleluia V. Regis celorum mater* (GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol.1v)

Finally, there is the looser connection of the same text set to different music in the two Reconstructions. *O regina glorie* is found in the upper voice of a troped Alleluia verse in Reconstruction II, and in the duplum of a motet in Reconstruction I, otherwise the musical settings are completely different. As the upper voice is missing for *O regina Gloria Marie/Tenor [pes]*, it is not clear whether it would also have shared text with Reconstruction II's Alleluia. That the Reconstructions use the same text might be seen as a sign that their creators shared similar influences; significantly, this concordance appears just after Reconstruction II's *Ave magnifica Maria*, another shared text between the two Reconstructions. However, the two text concordances appear in completely different parts of Reconstruction I (*O regina glorie Marie* in the final folios by Workshop 3 and *Ave magnifica Maria* in the middle gatherings by Workshop 2); this and the fact that the text setting of *O regina glorie* is completely different seems to indicate a separate transmission of the two concordances especially since, apart from the *Sanctus et eternus Deus*, there are no exact concordances between Reconstructions I and II.

[194] The full text from a fifteenth-century source (a manuscript from Braunbach cloister near Wertheim) was published in Kehrein 1873, 187.

3.3 Thirteenth-Century Troping: A Case Study of *Sanctus et eternus Deus/ Tenor*

The troped Sanctus setting *Sanctus et eternus Deus* appears twice among the Worcester Fragments (Figure 3.3, Appendix Transcription 1). It is a yet unstudied concordance between two of the three Reconstructions. *Sanctus et eternus Deus* is one of three connections between the repertory found in Reconstruction I and that of Reconstruction II. However, two aspects of the copies of *Sanctus et eternus Deus* make it the ideal study for reviewing and comparing the content, presentation and, by extension, the purpose of the two collections in which it is found. First of all, *Sanctus et eternus Deus* is the only instance of an almost exact concordance in the Worcester Fragments: only the deviation of a few notes distinguishes the two copies. Significantly, the composition is also part of the original phase of production in both Reconstructions: by Workshop 1 in Reconstruction II and Workshop 2 in Reconstruction I. Although the Reconstructions are fragmentary, in both cases *Sanctus et eternus Deus* appears in a set of other folios from the same or nearby gathering with compositions copied in the same hand as the surrounding material. These two conditions allow for paleographical comparisons between two almost identical copies of the same piece and highlight the difference of context between the placements of these copies among other compositions in the original production phases of the two Reconstructions.

Examining the copies of this Sanctus in the context of their surrounding compositions can give a better understanding of the purpose for which the original sources were copied and

performed. In Reconstruction II, *Sanctus et eternus Deus* appears alongside other similarly troped Sanctus settings, all penned by the same text and music hands. By contrast, although Reconstruction I's copy is also produced in the same text and music hand as the rest of the gathering, the other works are pes or cantus firmus motets. Thus in one case, the Sanctus stands alone as a liturgical setting from the Mass Ordinary, while in the other source, the Sanctus is one of many in a section of troped Sanctus and Alleluia settings.

The slight musical variation and very different repertorial context begs the question of why the same repertory was copied according to different priorities and how this one composition appears in both sources and not any of the other similarly troped Sanctus or Alleluia settings. Meanwhile a paleographical comparison of the two copies underlines the unevenness of execution between the two Reconstructions and may lead to determine whether or not the same composition may have arrived by two different transmissions to end up being sung at the same institution, while a thorough unravelling of the text will reveal something about the kind of person who might have been interested in writing new liturgical poetry in thirteenth-century troped chant settings, the new compositional developments they were following and what sources they were using to inspire them.

3.3.1 Paleographical, textual and musical analysis: some considerations

The presence of the same composition in the original phase of production of Reconstructions I and II allows for an easy comparison of the methods and priorities of the scribe as an editor and

copyist. In Reconstruction II, the folio is one of two non-continuous folios with Sanctus settings: Add 68, fragment xxxv, fol. 4 (see FIGURE 3.3).[195] Its recto contains the *Benedictus* section of the second and third voice parts of a three-part Sanctus, followed by the lower two voice parts of the three-voiced *Sanctus et eternus Deus*, except for the final 'Osanna'.[196] The verso contains the final bars of *Sanctus et eternus Deus* for the first voice and the tenor (the second is presumably on the lost, facing folio). These are followed by two voices of *Sanctus ex quo omnia* and two voices of a three-part setting of *Sursum corda elevate*. All these compositions are the work of the original hands of Reconstruction II (Workshop 1) and decorations for the compositions are also part of the original phase of production.

In Reconstruction I, the Sanctus is one of two continuous bifolios from one gathering (FIGURE 3.3). Neither is the centre of the gathering and, judging from the gathering structure of the rest of Reconstruction I, there were at least two to three other bifolios in the gathering.[197] The *Sanctus et eternus Deus* can be found on the verso of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xiii, fol. 4. Only the lower two voices appear on this folio; the margins have been trimmed so that the first line of the second voice is missing, otherwise the voices are complete. The odd arrangement of two lower voices on a verso (instead of on a recto) led Dittmer to conclude that the Reconstruction I was a reduced version copy of the *Sanctus* with only two voices, as this would leave room for a

[195] The other folio containing Sanctus settings is GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxxv, fol. 2.
[196] In Dittmer's 1957 edition, the *Benedictus* is assigned to the *Sanctus Deus ens ingenitus* from GB-WOc Add. 68 frag. xxxv, fol. 2. Dittmer gives no reason for why he considers these two folios continuous, possibly he was following Dom Anselm Hughes' earlier designation. Considering that the *Sanctus Deus ens ingenius* ends at 'hosanna in excelsis' on fol. 2, it is possible that they are the same piece, with the Benedictus section of fol. 4 picking up where fol. 2 left off, but it could also be a coincidence that the folios are divided in this way. If the compiler were following the conventions of aligning hair and flesh sides facing each other (as seems to be the case for the folios that are clearly continuous from Reconstruction II) then an even number of folios must have appeared between the folio with the incomplete *Sanctus Deus ens ingenitus* and the one with the *Benedictus* fragment, otherwise the flesh and hair sides would not align.
[197] Complete gatherings in Reconstruction I run between 4 to 6 folios in one gathering.

complete composition on the opposite recto.[198] All compositions in this gathering were copied by hands T7 and M7 (from Workshop 2), most likely at once in the same phase of production since there is no discernable change of ink or pen angle across the folios.

The most immediate difference between the two versions is the spacing of the text and music and the *mise-en-page* of the folios. The layout for Reconstruction II was clearly planned ahead – there was ample room left for the music in every section, and all voices cadence with space to spare at the end of the composition. By contrast, the text hand of Reconstruction I at times struggled to fit the notes to the text: notes were crammed at the end of the *Pleni sunt caeli* section, and at the tenor part of the 'Benedictus qui', the notator ran out of space for music on the penultimate staff, even though on the very next stave, there was more room for music than needed, so the music could have been better divided over the folio (FIGURE 3.4). The text hand's issues of space clearly show that text was copied first, and then music (possibly by another hand), and that the text hand T7 was not aware (or at least, not concerned) of the exact spacing that would be needed for the music.

Reconstruction I also omits rests and changes clefs without notating a new clef. For example, a rest is missing from the second voice after 'Gloria prae magnifica tua' and in the tenor between 'qui' and 'venit'. A change in clef from c3 to c2 in the triplum at 'Osanna in excelsis' occurs without the new clef being notated: it had to be crammed in between the notes later. That such musical changes were simply made to fit in the available space instead of the section being

[198] Dittmer 1957, 48.

erased and rewritten shows a prioritisation of functionality over aesthetics: this was a book to be performance-ready, presentation was not as important as accuracy.

Reconstruction II shows the opposite case: in a number of places the notator M1 has erased music and then rewritten it with exactly the same notes, but in a slightly different spacing. Such changes do not seem driven by greater accuracy of text setting (in fact, at 'perhenni', the note was arguably better placed over the word before it was moved) but seem rather to stem from a desire for a clean, evenly executed page. Both copies of the Sanctus underwent change after their original notation. For Reconstruction I, stems were lengthened later – whether this was practical measure to clarify note values or an aesthetic one to look more 'modern' is unclear. Reconstruction II presents a more curious paleographical puzzle: the last section of the tenor of *Sanctus et eternus Deus* was erased (FIGURE 3.4). Of course there are many palimpsests in Reconstruction II, but this Sanctus seems to present a different scenario, as the rest of the composition is unaltered. Perhaps *Sanctus et eternus Deus* was at one point slated for replacement, but the removal of the piece never completed. Or it may be that this erasure the work of the original hand T5 or M5, who meant to rewrite the tenor part, either to compose a new part or to notate the original part more evenly: if the alterations were not musical corrections, they may have been aesthetic ones – the spacing or appearance of the notes may not have suited the scribe's high standards, evident in the consistently even presentation across the rest of the surviving folios of M5's work. To draw an insular comparison, the songs of GB-Lbl Harley 978 also have alterations that do not change the rhythm or pitch of the note but simply replace one note-form with a different, albeit equivalent one, serving no clarification

purpose apart from creating a 'modern' aesthetic.[199] The tenor of *Sanctus et eternus Deus* is notated correctly, but the scribe may still have wanted to re-notate the music to fill the last line more evenly. Just one line above (FIGURE 3.4), a three-note ligature was erased and rewritten by M5, even though the original ligature was correct. It is possible the scribe was dissatisfied with the appearance of the original ligature. That M5 was extensively editing his own music speaks to a higher standard of presentation than in the corrected errors of Reconstruction I. It may even be that the latter represents a pedagogical history transmission – that the work and mistakes of a less-skilled scribe were later edited by someone more musically literate (or the rewrites of the original scribe) who fixed the inaccuracies and clarified the notation.

While the paleographical differences between the two copies may provide only a limited analysis of their transmission, the placement of the pieces in the manuscripts' order is very revealing. On the one hand, in Reconstruction I the Sanctus appears as a lone troped Mass Ordinary setting in a collection of continuous folios of motets from the middle of a gathering. All of these compositions were entered with the same ink and writing tools by one hand, indicating that the gathering was produced in one batch. The regularity of rubrication, decoration and foliation of this section also signals a single production phase. Although it may seem oddly placed among the cantus firmus and pes motets in the gathering, the Sanctus was

[199] Deeming 2015, 135.

clearly conceived from the outset as part of this section of the codex. *Sanctus et eternus Deus* is one of only 6 Mass Ordinary settings in Reconstruction I and the only Sanctus.[200]

By contrast, *Sanctus et eternus Deus* appears in a section of troped chant settings in Reconstruction II. Here again, consistency of scribal hands and decoration points to a single phase of production. However, the ordering of compositions is much clearer than in Reconstruction I. While there are only a handful of compositions that are continuous across more than one fragment, it is clear even from individual fragments that compositions follow a certain grouping: Kyries, Alleluia the troped Sanctus settings are each grouped together. Reconstruction II's ordering of the troped settings of the Alleluia and Sanctus (and the *Sursum corda elevate* following the Sanctus tropes) might suggest an ever further level of organisation of tenors by liturgical order; however, there is no evidence to show that this was the intention of the manuscript's compilers. Both Dittmer and Losseff have identified the plainsong material, where possible, in these troped Alleluia and Sanctus settings, and there is no apparent order of liturgical use.[201] Moreover the chant *cantus firmi* are often substantially altered to allow a tonal unity of the tenor with the upper voices, and the same source chant is occasionally used for more than one setting, though it is impossible to tell from the non-continuous folios whether the pieces with the same chant cantus firmus were grouped together.[202] As mentioned

---

[200] The others are three troped Kyrie and two troped Alleluia settings, including the *Ave magnifica Maria/Ave mirifica Maria/Alleluya* v. *Post partum virgo* discussed earlier. Reconstruction III contains later, untroped Mass Ordinary settings.

[201] Dittmer 1957, 41-44; Losseff 1994, 72-87. Dittmer gathered various identifications of the chants from previous scholars – sometimes disagreeing with their conclusions where the chant was substantially changed. Losseff's analysis paired plainsong material used in Worcester Polyphony with the Worcester Antiphoner, GB-WOc F. 160, in order to determine whether the fragments were originally composed for Worcester, but her results were inconclusive.

[202] For example, the *Sanctus et eternus Deus* and *Sanctus ex quo omnia* both use a paraphrase of Sanctus Ed. Vat. VIII as the material for their tenors.

previously, the Sanctus tropes are in alphabetical order on the two folios (*Sanctus adonay genitor* comes before *Sanctus Deus ens ingenitus*; and *Sanctus et eternus Deus* precedes *Sanctus ex quo omnia*) but whether this was intentional or coincidental is unclear, since the Alleluias show no similar ordering, and there are only four surviving Sanctus tropes with intact beginnings to consider.[203]

An analysis of the music is limited because the Worcester Reconstruction II copy only preserves the final *Osanna…in excelsis* from the triplum, the rest of the upper voice is missing. The existing lower voices behave very similar to other settings in Reconstruction II, like *Sanctus Deus es ingenitus* and *Sanctus adonay genitor*. Form is determined by the tenor's phrases, which get longer as the work progresses, from 9-11 longae phrases at the opening 'sanctus' sections to 22 longae phrase at the end. Divisions between the major sections are punctuated either by a longa rest in both voices (after the opening Sanctus declamations, between the *Pleni sunt caeli* and *Osanna* sections, and before 'in nomine domini') or a double bar; the tenor uses longae rests at other points during the phrases, but the second voice continues seamlessly, resting only at the end of sections. The figure of a descent from Bb – F in the tenor occurs throughout the piece, appearing at almost every major cadence, including the two *Osanna* sections. In addition, the tenor of the first six phrases (all the music before the *Osanna* section) follows the same rhythmic pattern at the start of each phrase: three longae followed by a longa rest and then the

[203] The initial text is missing for the tropes of 'Sanctus…unus tame nest divinus' (EECM no. 18, WF no. 58) and 'Benedictus/T. Sanctus', (EECM no. 20, WF no. 60). The alleluias do not follow an apparent order.

rest of the phrase. The tenor is an unidentified melody and considering the source material for other Sanctus tenors in Reconstruction II, probably a Sanctus chant.[204]

Some musical material is repeated by the tenor (FIGURE 3.5 highlights the sections that appear more than once). The first and third 'Sanctus' settings use the same tenor part, though the second voice is different. Although the order of notes and their length varies somewhat the tenor follows the same contour for 'Pleni sunt caeli' and 'venit in nomine… Osanna'; the second voice is also similar in certain parts of this section. There is only one instance where the tenor part is identical and the second voice is also very similar: at 'In perhenni seculorum' and 'In caelesti ierarchia' (EXAMPLE 3.1 a and b).[205] The same music appears yet again at 'in nomine domini', here the melody is even more pronounced as the voices move note-against-note in longae for four bars, the only moment in the composition where the second voice uses consecutive longae outside of cadences. This use of chant material, emphasizing certain sections, creates an aural parallel between two parts of text and highlights the moment of repetition – the more significant because the text here 'In perhenni seculorum' is a reference to the sequence of the feast of St. Dominic. That the musical setting of this text is emphasized means that the Dominican reference is not a passing moment easily overlooked, but is elevated.

---

[204] Handschin believed that the tenor was a paraphrase of the Sanctus Ed. Vat. VIII, but the tenor part does not share a single phrase with the famous chant. Handschin1927-8, 519-20. The famous Sanctus Ed. Vat VIII serves as the tenor for two other Sanctus settings in Reconstruction II, one of which immediately precedes the *Sanctus et eternus Deus*. However the other Sanctus settings follow their tenors more clearly, so it seems unlikely that this Sanctus, which in other respects is very like the others from Reconstruction II, should take such liberties with the original chant as to be unrecognisable. If anything, the opening bears a greater resemblance to Sanctus no. 74 and 75 of Thannabaur, although this too is unlikely, as the melody is quite different apart from the opening phrase. Thannabaur 1962, 145.

[205] Note that the tenor for 'Osanna' is almost the same for both, except that the first ends on a longa and the second extends an extra bar to accommodate the triplum. The edition is Dittmer's (WF no. 61).

The Osanna section, especially 'In perhenni seculorum' and 'In caelesti ierarchia' stands out for several further reasons. For one, the rhythmic beginning formula for phrases used from the start of the composition up until the Osanna section does not appear again. There are generally fewer rests in the tenor that are not cadential, and 'In perhenni seculorum' and 'In caelesti ierarchia' are the longest continuous sections of tenor melody. Rhythmic correspondence between text and music is also more apparent in these sections. The setting of the music to the text in the second voice is uniform: unstressed syllables receive shorter values than stressed. Elsewhere in the composition this pattern is less consistent: for example, the text setting of 'sator usyae totius' assigns longer notes to unstressed syllables, such as on the middle syllable of 'totius' (EXAMPLE 3.2).

More peculiar is the musical difference between the Reconstruction I and II copies which occurs at 'Gloria prae magnifica'. Where the second voice in Reconstruction I rests with the tenor, that of Reconstruction II extends the phrase 'et terra' so that it continues seamlessly to 'gloria tua'(EXAMPLE 3.3). Given such a small difference, it would be hard to establish which version (if any) came first. One could argue that the Reconstruction II version is the earlier physical copy, or that it shows a more typical connection between tenor and second voice – the second voice always continues where the tenor rests, except at the end of sections (for instance, at 'coeternus Deus filius', 'consempiternus Deus' or even a bar before at 'et terra').

At first reading, the presence of shared repertory might seem to tie the two Reconstructions more closely with each other. However, if the two sources were produced for the same location, one might expect that either they would be the same piece copied identically or they would

have different uses (as is the case with the antiphon *Ave magnifica Maria*, appearing in transpositions corresponding to two different Alleluia verses). An alternate scenario is that Reconstruction I was copied from Reconstruction II but that the text hand did not follow the layout of the latter either because the presentation was not a priority, or because he was trying to fit two voices on one folio. Dittmer has argued that Reconstruction I represents a reduced version copy, as the second voice and tenor are on a verso, not a recto as might be expected. He suggests that only the lower two voices were sung together, so that a complete composition could be copied on the facing page. This would be an unusual solution, especially since all the other works from Reconstruction I are for 3 and 4 voices. Moreover without the upper voice the third of the harmony is missing and the typical 'English' sound is lost. The final cadence would also end on a fifth instead of an octave between the upper and lower voices. If the upper voice of Reconstruction I were on the (lost) facing folio, it would be the only surviving case of such a layout in the volume. A different reading might be that the two manuscripts were used together and while the upper voice could be read from Reconstruction II, the lower two voices could be performed from Reconstruction I. Perhaps this is even why the erased section of the upper voice in Reconstruction II was completed but the tenor was not – it was no longer sung from that copy. However, if this were the case surely there would be more such instances of shared repertory or incomplete compositions (with voice parts shared between the two Reconstructions). Moreover, if one version was directly copied from the other, then it would be hard to explain the varying 'et in terra' phrases and the differences in text layout, particularly the difficulties of fitting music to text spacing in Reconstruction I. The slight musical variation and very different *mise-en-page* seem rather to point to two distinct transmissions, and this scenario suits the paleographic conclusions made in the previous chapter. While the original

production phase of Reconstruction II pre-dated the compilation of Reconstruction I (and Workshop 3), the *Sanctus et eternus Deus* appears in the middle folios copied by Workshop 2, which shares no scribal concordances with either the original 'layer' or the updates of Reconstruction II. Thus there is no reason to believe that the two manuscripts were in the same location at the time of either one's copying. Ultimately, while it may possible to determine the exact order of use and copying from either manuscript evidence or musical content, the situation certainly offers some interesting interpretations and shows yet again the difficulty of establishing a connection between two distinct sources of polyphony.

Reconstruction I and II are the only sources of this *Sanctus et eternus Deus* trope. The two copies have the same text in the second voice: [206]

Sanctus *et eternus Deus*
Pater, a nullo gentius
Sanctus *coaeternus Deus*
filius, a patre solo dei genitus
Sanctus *et consempiternus Deus,*
utriusque spiritus

Dominus *unus et* Deus
es immensus,
sator usiae totius
Adonai, Sabaoth

Pleni sunt caeli et terra
gloria *praemagnifica* tua
Hosanna

In perhenni seculorum
aevo manens aeternorum
quem laudat sanctorum
chorus angelorum
in excelsis

Benedictus
Deus dei filius
qui *salutem redditurus homini*
venit in nomine domini

Hosanna
In caelesti ierarchia
Dulci sonat armonia
Coelicorum cantus
Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus
in excelsis

[206] Reconstruction II is missing the final section of the second voice from 'Benedictus…' to the end of the composition. Troped text is shown in italics.

The upper part (only found in Reconstruction II) also sets a similar text at the very end:[207]

Hosanna
in caelesti gloria
coelica sonant agimina ter
Sanctus in excelsis

While the *Sanctus et eternus Deus* has several inserted phrases of tropes throughout the composition, the two that stand out are between 'Osanna' and 'in excelsis' in both *Osanna* sections. Here, the trope is not merely added text elaborating the liturgical chant within the framework of the original text, but it exists as inserted independent poetic stanzas that follow their own form and accent. Each is organised into two rhyming octosyllabic couplets and two rhyming hexasyllabic lines, all with paroxytone endings (8p8p6p6p). For the first, all lines end in –orum, in the second, the rhyme is split between the two pairs of lines (aabb). The two stanza's correlation is further highlighted by the musical setting: as mentioned before, not only is the tenor in these sections identical, but the second voice is very similar.[208] They are also the longest continuous phrases in the tenor – the others are broken by longa rests scattered throughout the piece. Moreover, the correspondence of accented and unaccented syllables to longer and shorter note values respectively is more prominent and consistent here than elsewhere in the composition.

Significantly, the second of these two poetic stanzas bears a striking resemblance to the opening lines of the sequence 'In caelesti hierarchia' for the feast of St Dominic:

---

[207] The rest of the upper voice is missing in Reconstruction II (the upper voice is entirely absent in Reconstruction I).
[208] The upper voice is only present for the second section, but it must have been similar as well for the cadences and vertical sonorities to work.

In caelesti hierarchia
nova sonet harmonia
novo ducta cantico

The sequence follows a different poetic structure, as the stanzas alternate between 3 different forms:

1. Two rhyming octosyllabic lines and one heptasyllabic line

2. Two rhyming heptasyllabic lines and one hexasyllabic line

3. Two rhyming octosyllabic lines and one pentasyllabic line (this last form is only used for two stanzas of the sequence).

The poetry is divided so that the stanzas form pairs where the same form is used and the third line rhymes so the overall form is aab ccb dde ffe etc. While the poetry of the *Sanctus et eternus Deus* is noticeably different, it is easy to imagine a scenario where the author of the new *Sanctus et eternus Deus* trope may have been inspired by the Dominican sequence and incorporated poetry using similar stress and meter in his work.[209] Worcester was of course a Benedictine community so the Dominican reference is unexpected, though it is not the only composition among the Worcester Fragments with Dominican connections.[210] The fact that the musical setting of the two stanzas also sets them apart from the rest of the composition shows that the

[209] Another less likely scenario is that the two poetic stanzas came from another source of poetry, possibly quoting material from or even directly lifted from another poem in honour of St. Dominic. It is unlikely that the musical setting is taken from another composition as the two sections cadence with the same descending Bb-F figure that is so common in the rest of the piece, and the tenor part from the beginning of the section is also copied in 'venit in nomine'.

[210] Hohler has drawn attention to another work from the Worcester Fragments with Dominican connections; it will be discussed in the following chapter.

composer was aware that the kind of poetic trope in the *Osanna* section was very different from the previous tropes and chose to highlight it accordingly.

But the Dominican sequence is not the only pre-existent material that might have influenced the new Sanctus tropes. Opening with a Trinitarian formula for the three 'Sanctus' declamations is fairly standard among Sanctus tropes. It is even seen in the opening of the preceding Sanctus trope, *Sanctus Deus ens ingenitus*:[211]

Sanctus, Deus ens ingenitus
Sanctus *Deus genitus*
Sanctus *Deus utriusque spiritus*

Meanwhile at the end of the composition, the second voice finishes with three iterations of 'Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus', echoing the beginning and bringing the composition full circle. The threefold Sanctus can also be found in the famous *Angeli et archangeli* trope found in many other sources:

Angeli et archangeli
Troni, prinicpatusque celi
Te laudant cherubin et seraphin
Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus

This prosula to *Osanna in excelsis* is documented from the fourteenth century on in German and Bohemian sources, and is associated with the feast of Corpus Christi.[212] According to

[211] It is possible that the incomplete *[Sanctus] …unus tamen et divinus* in Reconstruction II, of which only the latter half survives, may have begun with a Trinitarian formula as well, since much of the trope expounds on the Trinity.
[212] Iversen 1989, 14-15.

Thannabaur, it probably originates in the Benedictine tradition, an interesting connection if the copy was really written for the Benedictine Worcester Priory, although it seems the ending form is not particular to the *Angeli et archangeli* prosula.[213] Just as it is a tradition to begin with a Trinitarian formula, so too a number of Sanctus tropes end with the singing of angels. The Aquitanian Sanctus prosa *Hosanna Plasmatum populum* transmitted in the gradual Benevento 40 also follows this convention in its ending:[214]

Osanna plasmatum populum
Et qui uerum fore promit ore christum
Et qui cosmi satorem permanentem
In excelsis

Benedictus qui venit in nomine domini
Osanna dulcis est cantica
Melliflua nimisque laudabilia
Organica trinum et unum laudemus
Omnes in hac aula

Suscipie *cum agmina angelorum* carmina
Sit dicat nunc osanna in excelsis

The source's resemblance to triplum of *Sanctus et eternus Deus*, which ends 'coelica sonant agimina [sic] ter sanctus in excelsis'. The juxtaposition of the two voices at the end of *Sanctus et eternus Deus* is curious: Even as the triplum mentions three-fold singing, the duplum simultaneously repeats 'Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus'. It is almost as though the triplum is instructing the duplum or describing the duplum's actions, since they appear at the same musical moment (EXAMPLE 3.4).

[213] Thannabaur 1962, 84.
[214] Emphasis added. See Boe 2001, 37 and Vlhova-Woerner, ed. 2011.

It is as though the composer is consciously recasting traditional monophonic tropes in a polyphonic framework. 'Sounding' and 'singing', 'sonant' and 'cantus', appear together and the final 'sanctus' is emphasised by the voices coming together to sing identical words after having followed different paths to reach the same end. It is a shame that more of the triplum does not survive: the last Osanna of *Sanctus et eternus Deus* is the only place that all voices of the three-voiced Sanctus settings of Reconstruction II survive. Given the number of cross-references found in just this one small extant section of Sanctus, it is not unreasonable to hypothesise that, had more of the Sanctus setting survived, the full three-voice texture might have contained many more clever cross-references between the triplum and motetus texts interpreted in a polyphonic setting.

It remains to be asked who might have been behind these newly-composed Sanctus tropes and their musical settings. There are no textual concordances for the troped Sanctus settings nor musical concordances outside the Reconstructions.[215] The similarity of idiom and treatment of troping conventions, as well as the comparable musical arrangement of the lower voices across the Sanctus settings certainly indicates that the texts and musical settings of the Sanctus tropes in Reconstruction II, and possibly some of the Alleluia tropes as well, were created by the same person. While the identity of the person generating the new Sanctus tropes is unknown, it is left to discover his prejudices or affiliations from the choice of pre-existent texts and troping conventions. By examining what was taken and what left from old texts, the priorities of the composer and compiler become clearer. The language of Sanctus tropes is often rich in

[215] Dittmer 1954, 45; Sanders 1980, 552-553.

symbolism, and the vocabulary trope authors worked with even included musical terminology.[216] Certain contemporary tropes played with words such as 'melodia', 'harmonia' 'symphonia' and 'organum'. 'Harmonia' in particular is steeped with meaning: it refers not only to the harmonious consonance of voices singing together, but also the celestial 'harmony of the spheres', a concept referenced by many influential medieval figures, including Hildegard of Bingen and John Scotus Eriugena.[217] In Worcester Reconstruction II, the listing of choirs of angels in the older *Angeli et archangeli* trope is replaced with a more generic hierarchy of angels, leaving room for a reference to the real action of the singers. The appearance of 'armonia' in a polyphonic setting may be a reference to polyphonic practice; the choirs of angels singing in harmony are incarnated in the voices of the singers.

As for religious affiliation, the author could have been aware of the Benedictine connection for the *Angeli et archangeli* prosula, but equally its origins may have been obscured by years of widespread use: by the thirteenth century, the prosula appears across a variety of sources, not all of which were Benedictine. A more pointed connection is the paraphrase of the opening of the Sequence of St. Dominic: the borrowed Dominican text is highlighted in the poetry by rhythmic stanzas and a regular stress and rhyme scheme, and in the music with improved text setting, a change in the form of musical phrases, and the repetition of musical material in the

---

[216] Iversen and Charles Atkinson both interpret the music-theoretical language of an Aquitanian source, the Sanctus prosula *Clangat Hodie*, which includes such specific terms as 'tonorum modulamina' 'vocum discrimina' 'diapason' and 'tetrachordum': Iversen 1993, 771-789 and Atkinson 1992, 790-806. Although more general in terminology, an insular parallel here could be made with the Worcester Sanctus setting's use of 'harmonia' and 'cantus'

[217] Iversen 1993, 780-2. In *Scrivias III, Visio XIII*, Hildegard of Bingen speaks of a vision that illuminated her, claiming that when voices sing in *harmonia*, the music elevates the text as the symphony of voices ponders the celestial glory in concordance. See also Atkinson 1993, 792-3. 'Armonia' also appears in Reconstruction II in the Alleluia verse *Alme veneremur diei* on GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. ix.

tenor and second voice.[218] Sequence-like writing of Osanna prosulas was a development of troping that appears in a number of sources.[219] In the Worcester copy, the polyphonic musical setting gives the trope a greater emphasis. It is clear that the author and the composer of these troped chant settings was participating in a deliberate process of change – the redaction, embellishment and new adaptation of old texts rewritten and set to new music, while paying homage to previous interpretations, reflects an emerging development in troping that gained prominence in the thirteenth century.

3.3.2 The 'new' thirteenth-century Mass Ordinary trope

The Sanctus and Alleluia settings of the Worcester Fragments clearly show that tropes can be an intricate combination of a number of sources, and expressed in a variety of styles. While it is common to think of troping according to the textbook definition of inserted words and phrases into pre-existent text, there are actually many different functions for the thirteenth-century trope. This dissertation proposes a typology of at least three main kinds of tropes common to the period:

1. Those with the trope interwoven between the liturgical text throughout the entire composition
2. Those where all or the majority of the trope appears towards two final sections, functioning as a prosa or prosula

[218] For a list of tropes in sequence form see Iversen 1993, 771. The relationships between tropes and sequences is also explored in Iversen 1992, 427-444 and Fassler1992, 319-335.
[219] Atkinson 1992, 95-117.

3. Those where the all or the majority of the trope occurs soon after the start of the text, functioning as a prosa or prosula

In the case of troped *Sanctus* settings, these three types of tropes appear in the following ways:

1. Those with the trope interwoven between the liturgical text of the Sanctus throughout the entire composition
2. Those where all or the majority of the trope appears between 'Osanna' and '…in Excelsis' sections.
3. Those where all or the majority of the trope occurs before 'Osanna in excelsis' usually immediately after the first declamation of 'Sanctus'

The first case is the one most commonly associated with the practice of troping – inserted text that expounds the liturgical 'base' text which surrounds it. A Worcester example is the composition immediately preceding the *Sanctus et eternus Deus* in Reconstruction II, the *Sanctus Deus es ingenitus* (WF no. 60):

Sanctus, Deus ens ingenitus[220]
Sanctus *Deus genitus*
Sanctus *Deus utriusque spiritus*
Dominus *et* Deus *trinus tamen unicus* sabaoth
Pleni sunt *et etant prorsus omnia*
Moeni coelestis *a simul* et terrestria
Gloriosae dei tatis tue *summa* gloria
Osanna *pie nos salvifica salvator* in excelsis
Benedictus qui venit in nomine domini
Osanna in excelsis

[220] The trope text is in italics.

The introduction of trope elements integrated between phrases of the original chant is a practice typical of older troped chant settings, stemming from a tradition that goes back to the Winchester Troper.[221] In this form, the new trope is seamlessly inserted within the framework of the text of the Sanctus. By contrast, in the second and third types of trope, the troped text appears nearly all at once, as a poem inserted into the original text. The second type, where the majority of text appears between 'Osanna' and 'in excelis' has been encountered in the *Sanctus et eternus Deus* and there are many monophonic troped Sanctus settings from the same period that also show this pattern of troping. Finally, the third type acts as a sort of prosula offering theological expansion before the liturgical text, as seen in Reconstruction II's *Sanctus ex quo omnia:* In this type of trope, the new text is usually placed just after the three Sanctus declamations and before 'Dominus Deus sabbaoth'.

Sanctus, *ex quo omnia*
Pater ingenitus
Sanctus *per quem cuncta genius*
Sanctus *in quo omnia*
Celestia terrestria
Divinus spiritus
Dominorum potens dominus
Deorumque Deus
Saneta summa trinitas
Vera simplex unitas
Aqua sanctorum
omnis sanctitas
Dominus et Deus sabbaoth
Pleni sunt *caelorum* celi et *cinu techide fructifera* terra
Gloria *magnifica* osanna in excelsis
Benedictus qui venit in nomine domini
Osanna in excelsis

[221] Steiner 2013, 44.

Given its placement in the liturgy, Sanctus tropes often have a Eucharistic focus, occasionally directly quoting segments of text from other parts of the Mass, especially the Canon. As Kate Steiner has pointed out, the *Sanctus Voce vita* lifts text from the Canon of the Mass, from the most pivotal words of consecration 'Hoc est [enim] corpus'.[222] Similarly, *Sanctus ex quo omnia* references the words of the Mass 'ex quo omnia per quem omnia in quo omnia'.
Comparing this version of *Sanctus ex quo omnia,* which exists only in the Worcester Fragments, with the more common *Sanctus ex quo omnia* found in sources across the twelfth and thirteenth centuries shows that the two represent very different approaches to troping. The latter begins

Sanctus *ex quo sunt omnia;*
Sanctus *per quem sunt omnia;*
Sanctus *in quo sunt omnia;*
Dominus Deus Sabbaoth *tibi gloria sit in saecula*
Pleni sunt caeli et terra (etc.)

Although the voices begin with the same words, the very sense and purpose of troping is distinct: whereas one maintains the primacy of the original text and embellishes the words of the liturgy, the kind of troping exhibited in the Worcester settings uses the original text as a vehicle to present new poetry which, while updating the musical style to a more conductus-like form also theologically expands the original liturgical text, resulting in a kind of 'supercharged trope' that is more prosa than trope. As seen in the case of the Reconstruction II Alleluias, these troped chant settings may knit separate pre-existing texts together in a fashion reminiscent of the motet. Alternatively, they may incorporate the pre-existing material in a less direct way (as

[222] Ibid., 29-30.

in the echoes of the Dominican sequence and 'Angeli et archangeli' prosula in the *Sanctus et eternus Deus)*: embedding earlier material in the new composition more as an influence on newly-composed voice texts than a direct quotation or even paraphrasing.

The Worcester collection shows a new model of Mass Ordinary settings, representing an updating of the liturgical function of the Sanctus and Alleluia, expanding original liturgical text with the 'supercharged' trope. In her 2013 dissertation, Kate Steiner addressed the changing role of monophonic tropes in liturgy: insular sources reflect a continuing use of tropes but in a fluid, interchangeable incarnation. The conception of the trope can be similar to that of a conductus, or in some cases, a motet. Her argument is based on how the practice of troping is reflected in D-W Cod. Guelf.1099 Helmst; she traces a 'fundamental shift' in the forms of Mass Ordinary tropes that occurred in the thirteenth century, as evidenced by the music of D-W Cod. Guelf.1099 Helmst. While she reviews the older polyphonic settings of the *Sanctus* and *Agnus Dei* that appear in Fascicles III, IV and IX, her examination is primarily focused on the later addition of monophonic tropes (four *Sanctus* and four *Agnus Dei* tropes) in Fascicle X. Steiner asserts that these later tropes 'represent a different approach to poetic form and musical style in tropes, influenced by classical poetry and treatises on ornaments'.[223] This new form of trope uses regular, rhythmic poetry that exists as a poem independent of the liturgical chant. It can function as a prosa or prosula, but the text governs the music. Rather than a texted melisma, where the text is fitted to existing music, the musical movement, vertical sonorities

[223] Steiner 2013, 43.

and cadences are dictated by the newly-composed poetical text.[224] As an example, Steiner offers *Voce vita,* which appears in D-W Cod. Guelf.1099 Helmst as an Alleluia trope. The *Voca vita* prosa takes its form from the Victorine sequence, an independent composition designed to appear as a final texted melisma to the Alleluia. Typically, the Victorine sequence has double strophes of poetic texts divided into two octosyllabic lines with paroxytone endings and a heptasyllabic line with a proparoxytone ending (8p+ 8p + 7pp).[225] This rigid poetic structure in turn impacts the music, so that the music's melodic contour and rhythm are determined by the word accents: stressed syllables are usually set to the primary pitches of the mode and paced on the stronger beats of the bar.

In the case of *Sanctus et eternus Deus*, the blocks of two four-syllable lines and two three-syllable lines of poetry function as independent moments of thought – an insight into their author's theological beliefs (possibly even religious affiliations, as in the case of the Dominican echo in *Sanctus et eternus Deus*). Musically, the Sanctus and Alleluia settings of the Worcester Fragments also show a shift in the understanding of troped liturgical forms. As Sanders has shown, these new thirteenth-century compositions incorporate tonally unified tenors, texts in the upper voices are arranged like old troped organa and there are moments of simultaneous declamation by the three voices. The rhythm is fluid and changeable, very unlike the rigid rhythmic patterns of earlier repertory. Rather than creating polyphonic stratification, polytextuality here is manifested more as an 'integrated effect of homogeneity'.[226]

---

[224] Ibid., 51.
[225] Indeed as Steiner has pointed out, the opening text of the Sanctus trope *Voce vita sit unita* borrows the first two words from the Victorine sequence, *Laudes crucis attollamus*: 'Voce vita non discordet'. Ibid., 52. See also Fassler 2011, 77-78 for more on the sequence *Laudes crucis attollamus*.
[226] Ernest Sanders, 'Worcester polyphony'.

The newly composed poetry and compositional style call into question to what extent these compositions can still be said to be liturgical chants, and to what extent the troped Mass Ordinary settings have evolved under the influence of other compositional styles such as the conductus or motet. Williamson has elsewhere drawn attention to the developments of troped chant settings and the hybridization of motet and troped chant settings. While earlier settings were more faithful to the original chant source, the manipulation of chant melodies and introduction of freely-composed musical settings in the later thirteenth-century, a manner of treating pre-existing material that had previously been primarily associated with the motet.[227]

The thirteenth century might be considered the twilight of troping: elsewhere on the Continent, troped chant settings were being replaced by newer forms of composition, owing in part to development of new polyphonic forms and also to the religious reforms of the Cistercians and Canons Regular.[228] Yet while the thirteenth century saw the decline of troping on the Continent, the Worcester repertory not only shows a retention of older troping conventions, but the rise of the new 'supercharged' poetic Mass ordinary trope. Far from a decline into obsolescence, the insular tradition of troping seems to have a renewed and continued development throughout the thirteenth century. The practice of supplementing the Mass Ordinary texts with whole sections of tropes (rather than inserted words and phrases) allowed the composer creative license to insert newly-composed poetry into the everyday liturgy and may even have been a loophole around such reforms, that allowed composers to insert their

[227] Williamson 2016, 85-6. While the alteration of chant would have been 'liturgically unacceptable' for troped chant settings in the earlier part of the century, chants could be altered in a motet because it had 'no strict liturgical function' (86).

[228] Steiner 2013, 44. For more on the reforms of monastic orders, especially with regard to Mass settings, see Lütolf 1970, 297; Fassler 1987, 345-374 and Hiley 1991, 125-138. Interestingly, Max Lütolf does not consider the troped Sanctus settings of the Worcester Fragments as Ordinary settings because their tropes are so extensive.

own poetry and words into Mass settings.[229] A tradition of reframing classical liturgical texts can be seen elsewhere in the late thirteenth century. Not only Mass Ordinary settings, but motets and conducti also employ the practice of recreating moments of the Mass with new words. For example, *Sursum corda,* which directly follows the Sanctus settings in Worcester's Reconstruction II brings together three different parts of the Mass in the various stanzas: the Sursum corda itself, the Sanctus and the Agnus Dei.[230] Other such compositions include the *Deus et Auditum* and *Pater noster*, both found in the Montpellier Codex. Italian and Spanish sources show a similar kind of compositional development as seen in the Worcester tropes. In her 2007 article on Iberian Sanctus settings, Gunilla Iversen observes a shift in Sanctus tropes occurring in the thirteenth century repertory of the Cathedral of Tortosa. Unlike the prose-like composition of earlier tropes, the new Sanctus trope is versified in strophes of rhyming phrases, resulting in what Iversen describes as 'hymnlike strophic compositions inserted either between *osanna* and *in excelsis* or between the lines of the entire Sanctus chant'.[231] She offers the strophic prosulas *Clangat cetus* and *Veni redemptor gentium* as examples, the former of which has paired strophes of varying lengths, the latter a regular meter of 8pp, and is clearly influenced by Pentecostal hymns and sequences:

Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus
Dominus Deus sabaoth,
Pleni sunt caeli et terra gloria tua.
Osanna in excelsis.
Benedictus qui venit in nomine domini,
Osanna,

[229] I am grateful to Hana Vlahova for bringing this idea to my attention.
[230] See Mark Everist's discussion of the *Sursum Corda* in the Metz fragment: Everist 2000, 135-163.
[231] Iversen 2007b, 141-157, especially 153.

Veni redemptor gentium
veni creator spiritus
veni vita viventium
nostros solari gemitus
Verus nobis paraclitus
in fide firma mentium
in fine morientium
te laudat omnis exitus

Nostrum regens exilium
rorem infunde caelitus
quo furor persequentium
non nos seducat ambitus
sed amor tibi debitus
fervens corde fidelium
nobis ad vitae praemium
sit tibi soli deditus

Tu, qui salvasti saeculum
mirando partu virginis
ut confudas incredulum
vires infunde numinis
et contra virum sanguinis
tuum exaltet populum
qui gerit Christi titulum
ad laudem tui nominis.

O quam beata servitus
qua servit et est libera
qua mundi miserabitur
dum mutatur in prospera.
O quam libertas misera,
per quam liber sit subditus
et dives inter prospera
vivit Gehenne perditus
In excelsis.

Meanwhile, John Boe considers a number of prosulated Sanctus settings in Italian manuscripts.[232] Writing about Italian liturgical tropes in the latter half of the thirteenth and the early fourteenth centuries, Boe surmises,

> One can speculate that the passing fashion for Sanctus tropes disappeared quickly, but that the Hosanna prosulas, which lent themselves to rhythmical verse forms and rhyme schemes, increased in popularity for a time.[233]

Thus the Worcester Sanctus settings of Reconstruction II show that their editor was aware of compositional styles not just in England, but the rest of the continent, and the compositions included in Reconstruction II reflect popular fashion not just of polyphonic composition but also monophonic styles. Certainly the hymn-like poetic inserted structures in both the polyphonic Alleluia and Sanctus settings in Reconstruction II and the monophonic Sanctus and Agnus Dei settings in D-W Cod. Guelf.1099 Helmst clearly show that thirteenth-century insular composition employed a liberal elaboration of the Mass Ordinary texts. However, while the new troped Sanctus and Alleluia settings can still function as parts of the Mass Ordinary, the compositions have an almost conductus-like (for the polyphonic settings) or hymn-like (monophonic settings) quality of poetical accent and structure. Thus a strict distinction between genres is not only impossible but ineffective. By recombining new poetic material with older forms, the assembly of the music from the Worcester Fragments was a deliberate attempt to create something new: the reimagining of liturgical chants with fresh, individualised tropes smuggled into liturgy.

---

[232] Boe 2001, 29-48.
[233] Ibid., 44.

The new forms of troping for Mass Ordinary settings found in the Worcester Fragments and the inclusion of *Sursum Corda* show that the editor of Reconstruction II was aware of the current compositional climate. Old and new material alike were transformed in new polyphonic settings reflecting the development of both monophonic troping and emerging polyphonic forms.

In collecting these Mass settings, which included specific references such as the Dominican sequence and newly-composed texts as tropes, the editor of Reconstruction II was effectively creating an individualised collection of new poetic and musical material under the guise of Mass Ordinary settings, which hypothetically might even have been customised to reflect the traditions of the community for which the collection was commissioned (if, for example, it had been compiled for a Dominican institution). Editorial decisions such as the inclusion of certain musical compositions over others have an impact on musical performance and liturgical practice. In Reconstruction II, the primacy of the troped Mass ordinary chant and conductus was replaced by later additions of pes and *cantus firmus* motets. Texts for Alleluia and Sanctus tropes were no longer confined to a few words elaborating the basic liturgical text but used sections of newly-composed rhythmic poetry more commonly associated with conductus and hymns. An individualised selection of troped Mass settings such as that in Reconstruction II provides insight into the priorities of the community which performed from the collection and the changing role of troping in thirteenth-century England.

3.4 Pilgrimage, Primacy and Two Saints Thomas: A Case Study of *Thomas gemma/ Thomas cesus/ Primus T/ Secundus T*

Among the compositions with known concordances in the Worcester Fragments, perhaps none has a more colourful history of transmission than the four-voiced motet *Thomas gemma/Thomas cesus/ Primus Tenor/ Secundus Tenor.* The piece appears as an early fourteenth-century addition to two palimpsest folios of Reconstruction II: GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 34 and 35. The folios are fragmentary (folio 34 is a mere vertical sliver of parchment) so only a few notes of the duplum and primus tenor are preserved on fol. 34r, along with a nearly complete triplum and an incomplete secundus tenor on fol. 35r.[234] However the motet appears in two further manuscripts: an almost complete copy of all four voices can be found on fol. 254v-255r of GB-Cgc MS 512/543 an incomplete copy of the four parts is preserved in US-Pru Garrett 119A, the remains of a rotulus with music on both sides.[235] The text honours two saints – the great Thomas Becket of Canterbury in the triplum and the comparatively unsung martyr Thomas Hale of Dover in the duplum (Table 3.3).[236] Shared imagery, vocal range and voice exchange unite the two upper voices; the lower parts are similarly paired in vocal range and the primus tenor follows repetitions of the same musical unit.

Thomas gemma is one of the best known compositions of the Worcester repertory. It has been performed and recorded many times and received the attention of a number of scholars in the

[234] The two folios were continuous; however, what is now fol. 34r was originally the verso facing the recto of fol. 35. When they were repurposed as binding material, the two folios were separated and re-attached so that fol. 34 was flipped and what was once the recto became the verso. They were kept in this order when the two folios (still attached to each other) were bound into GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20.
[235] For a comprehensive list of the extant and missing material of each source, see Sanders, ed. 1979, 243.
[236] The Benedictine Thomas Hale is also sometimes referred to as Thomas de la Hale or Hayle but should not to be confused with Thomas des Hales, a thirteenth-century English Franciscan Friar and author of the *Luue-ron.*

past century. Parallel transcriptions of the three sources were provided by Kenneth Levy (partial) in 1951 and Luther Dittmer (complete) in 1957 (Appendix TRANSCRIPTION 2 gives Dittmer's version).[237] In 1979, Ernest Sanders produced an edition of the motet for Volume 14 of PMFC XIV (Appendix TRANSCRIPTION 3).[238] Sanders's version of the four-voiced motet was compiled from all three sources, with new material added to (or replacing) some of the primus tenor repetitions. Peter Lefferts drew on this edition to provide an analysis of the motet in his 1983 dissertation; Lisa Colton explored the cults of the Saints Thomas and put forward various hypotheses with regard to the date and context of the motet's creation.[239]

The popularity of the motet in scholarship is partly due to the work's connection to Thomas Becket and its appearance in three separate English sources (a rarity for insular thirteenth-century polyphony). However, much as the Summer Canon was exalted for its 'Englishness', as seen in Chapter 1, *Thomas gemma* has also been highlighted because of its stereotypically 'English' characteristics which fit neatly into the twentieth-century historiography of insular music. Richard Taruskin called it 'A marvelous summation of everything we have learned to identify as English' and the piece indeed exhibits all a musicologist's favourite checklist of 'Englishness'.[240] While examining this motet apart from its neighbouring musical material it is perhaps worth remembering that it is but one composition in a book of polyphony and not even a part of the original project, but a later added work. Yet it is for this very reason that the

[237] Levy 1951, 220-239. Dittmer, Luther, ed. 1957, 116-132.
[238] Sanders 1979. The motet is number 61 in PMFC XIV, 121-124.
[239] Lefferts 1986, 44, 46-8. Colton 2003, 261-7.
[240] Taruskin 2010, 408. Kenneth Levy also used this motet as an exemplar of English (as opposed to French) characteristics in his introduction to the US-PRu Garrett 119, highlighting the prominent use of the 6/3 chord, the importance of voice-exchange techniques, the interest in many voiced sonority, employment of a non-liturgical tenor, and, significantly in relation to the 'Sumer' canon, the use of an ostinato organisation. Levy 1951, 230.

motet is positioned to offer insight into the transmission of the materials of Reconstruction II. Its inclusion begs the question why this motet was chosen to replace troped chant settings on the folios it covers, and to what extent its presence may be considered to reflect the updating of repertory according to changing fashions, or if the explanation for its addition is more complicated.

3.4.1 A musical and textual analysis and its implications

The musical setting follows a straightforward format – it is divided into two pairs of voices, each pair corresponding to the other in vocal range and musical material. Structurally, the piece is built in 29 units of eight longae each, following the tenor's 28 repetitions of an eight-longae pes. 29 may seem an odd prime number of units (indeed Lefferts was puzzled by the choice of number) but it is undoubtedly a reference to the Feast of St. Thomas Becket, which was celebrated on 29 December.[241] The repetitions sustain the same harmonic structure, with slight variations. Frequent voice exchange and hockets characterise the upper voices; the triplum and duplum take turns passing musical material back and forth over the static movement of the lower voices. Primus tenor and secundus tenor are similarly paired, thus the piece as a whole forms what Taruskin dubs a 'double twinsong texture'.[242] Such a musical structure is perhaps linked to the saints the composition honours – as the name 'Thomas' means 'twin'. The text of the duplum also plays with the idea of twins, as it includes alliterative twins Romulus and Remus.[243] The prevalence of the dominant voice in one part (alternating between triplum and

[241] Thomas Hale's feast was on the 2 August.
[242] Taruskin 2010, 408.
[243] Many thanks to Lisa Colton for bringing this to my attention.

duplum), supported by the three others, creates what Levy considers an ostinato sound superficially similar to the Summer Canon; this and the simple variation pattern in the two tenors has led some scholars to suggest that the piece comes from an improvisatory tradition.[244]

In his dissertation, Peter Lefferts offers an alternate view of the tenor: his structural examination of the textual and musical material argues for a more rigid construction, 'a varied reuse of distinct yet related materials, not merely the stringing together of recurring formulas'.[245] His analysis of the piece further divides the tenor's repetitions into variations of three different versions, which form thirteen subsections: five larger sections (three to five tenor repetitions each) interchanging with six hockets (one tenor repetition each), beginning and ending with the hocketing sections and the entire piece framed by an additional section of music the length of one tenor repetition at the beginning and end of the composition (FIGURE 3.6).[246] Lefferts has described the structure of the text as 'two primary texts…which are regular in rhyme, syllable count and stress (8p6p); they form ten pairs of lines framed by introductory and concluding verses.'[247]

Lefferts further points out that the text and music both divide into two large sections. After the fifteenth tenor repetition, there is a change in the dominant rhyme from 'ate' to 'atus', dividing the text of the composition into 15+14 units. Meanwhile the music changes after the 13th

[244] See especially Levy 1951, 230. The term 'dominant' can be understood as the voice that attracts attention, being higher in range, and with a greater syllable count than the other texted voice.
[245] Lefferts 1986, 44.
[246] The final tenor repetition is 10 longae instead of 8.
[247] Lefferts 1986, 46.

tenor repetition, dividing the piece into 13 +16 repetitions. Until this point, the duplum was always the first partner of textual and melodic voice exchanges; however from here on, the pattern is flipped so the text and music are passed from triplum to duplum. It seems the passages of hocket were not a part of Lefferts's musical division, for the voices take turns initiating the hocket throughout the piece.[248] As Lefferts based his analysis of musical material on Summers's edition in PMFC XIV (which included Summers's own rewritten tenor), his division of the tenor repetitions into versions A, B and C does not align with any of the three manuscript sources.

However, Lefferts is surely right in asserting that the musical and textual division into two parts and the regular spacing of the hocketing 'refrain' shows a deliberate overall structure. Thus if an improvisational element in transmission created the discrepancies between the three versions of the composition, it must have been within this structure. As Lefferts has pointed out, the text is best understood in the context of the musical structure. The voice exchanges and hockets are reflected in the syllable count, rhyme scheme and stress.

To expand on Lefferts's structural analysis, TABLE 3.4 outlines the construction of music and text. *Thomas gemma* begins with both upper voices singing 'Thomas' (EXAMPLE 3.5). This declamation is the only moment until the very end of the motet where all four voices move together for two longae, and where the upper voices carry the same text. The very end of the motet also finishes with two longae in triplum, duplum and primus tenor of GB-Cgc 512/543 but not for the duplum in US-PRu Garrett 119A or the secundus tenor of either version.

[248] Ibid.

Triplum and duplum end with similar final syllables: 'ro*gatus'* in the triplum and 'be*atus*' in the duplum. After the 'Thomas' declamation and first hocket, the dominant text travels back and forth between the two upper voices, alternating over each tenor repetition (the direction of movement is indicated by blue arrows in TABLE 3.3). The dominant phrase (highlighted in blue) ranges from 9 syllables to 15 syllables in length but is usually 14p syllables, or 4p4p6p. For the first half of the composition, the rhyme scheme for the dominant text is (–ina-ina-ate). Thus, after the opening hocket we have:

A divina	*repentina*	*mira caritate*
Matutina	*vespertina*	*lucis increate*

After the fifteenth tenor repetition, this pattern changes. The final rhyme in each dominant phrase is '-atus' instead of '-ate'; while the internal rhyme varies from phrase to phrase, but never returns to '-ina'. Throughout the motet, the subordinate phrases are irregular in rhyme and the number of syllables varies from 2-6, except at tenor repetitions 8 and 12 which have 8 and 9-syllable phrases respectively (highlighted in yellow). Finally the hockets are usually 5-6 syllables long, and almost all end in –ulo.

There are three exceptions to this structure, highlighted in darker blue in Table 1. First, at the eighth and ninth tenor repetitions, the dominant phrases are 15 syllables long. A rapid three-breve gesture (three semibreves in GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20) at the start of each phrase intensifies the movement, as does a more active subordinate voice (eight syllables in length). The text at this point speaks of Thomas elevated to the court of his heavenly king; the internal rhyme scheme is momentarily abandoned, although the phrase still ends with '-ate'.

Another compelling exception appears at tenor repetition 12. Not only is the subordinate phrase here the longest in the piece (9 syllables) it is also one of the few points where the subordinate voice rises above the other in the musical texture to become the highest voice. The resulting effect is that the two voices are heard as almost equal: the duplum describing the filth – the 'feces' – of sin, while the triplum offsets the duplum text by singing of healing and medicine. This section of the triplum, 'tu doctrina medicina serva sanitate' is the only dominant phrase that is not sung by both voice parts. Up until this point, each section of text has passed from duplum to triplum; after this point, their roles are reversed. Thus, tenor repetition 12 acts as a highlight and a turning point or 'hinge' of the motet.

Finally, at the tenor repetitions 26 and 27, the dominant phrase is only 13 syllables long and the subordinate phrase has no internal rhyme. Repetition 27 is also the only appearance of the word 'Thomas' apart from the opening. While the triplum sings a prayer of petition to Thomas, the duplum describes Thomas as being among the heavenly host (EXAMPLE 3.6). It is a clever moment in the motet's textual-musical relationship for 'Thoma' in the triplum voice is the middle of the voices in range; thus Thomas is literally placed 'in' the texture of the music among the other voices at the same time the text speaks of Thomas among heavenly host. Moreover, repetition 27 also has the only instance where all three sources differ in text: when asking Thomas to intercede for the petitioner, the triplum of Worcester sings 'fura populo', that of GB-Cgc MS 512/543 prays 'nunc pro puplo', while US-Pru Garrett 119A has 'mira populo'. This is the more unexpected in that the moment of petition is usually the most clichéd part of text. Perhaps what is reflected here are individual performance traditions, which

harmonise the petition with a familiar formula, a personalised ending to suit different institutions or ensembles.

While scholars such as Taruskin and Levy have delighted in the Englishness of the motet's music, the poetry has either been passed over or, in the case of Christopher Hohler, treated with contempt. Hohler's opinion of the text was that the triplum was 'farsing of a poem in honour of S Thomas of Canterbury' and the duplum was 'plain nonsense…verbiage designed to carry music'.[249] Certainly the text would have been bad poem outside the context of the music: the ostinato form shapes the text to be organised in a certain way. Even if the words were written to serve the music, the text should not be dismissed out of hand.

There are subtle differences between the texts of the triplum and duplum but they generally express the same sentiments. Owing to the voice exchanges, most texts are heard twice; however there are five words that appear at very different points in the motet and their significance in placement should not be underestimated: 'primula'/'primulo ('first') 'cesus in' ('slain in'), 'gemma'/ 'gemmis' (jewels), 'rivulo' (stream), 'stimulo' (suffering) and 'tremulo' (trembling). The first two of these must be considered in relation to the motet's two namesakes. The opening line of the duplum, 'Thomas cesus' is echoed moments later by the Triplum's 'cesus in ecclesia', effectively creating a connection between the martyrdoms of St. Thomas Hale and St. Thomas Becket. Throughout the piece, the motet endeavours to treat the two saints as equal – shared register and voice exchange ensure that the two upper voices have the same music and words. Nowhere is this equality more apparent than the musical setting of the motet's opening words. 'Thomas gemma Cantuarie' in the triplum and 'Thomas cesus in

[249] Hohler 1978, 2-38, especially 30.

Doveria' in the duplum – swap notes, so that what is heard is a repeated 'c-f' sonority where neither voice is higher than the other (see EXAMPLE 3.5). In the GB-Cgc 512/543 copy, this happens again at the end of the first tenor repetition. The two voices in tenor repetition 1 also have exactly the same syllable count, so that neither one can be considered 'dominant'. Moments later, however, the motet text plays with the language of primacy – in the exposed setting of the first hocket the first word 'primula' in the triplum, reaching the highest range of the piece, is followed by 'emulo'('rival') in the lower duplum voice, almost as though Thomas of Canterbury was the greatest of the Thomases, and Thomas of Dover was his lesser rival. However, at the end of the piece, it is Thomas of Dover in the duplum who takes the word 'primulo' – the last word of the penultimate hocket. Curiously, although there are two Thomases celebrated in the motet, they are each called 'singularis'. Triplum and duplum, at repetitions 16 and 17 respectively, sing the text 'singularis nuncuparis gratia diatus'. The music of the dominant and subordinate phrases in repetitions 16 and 17 shows no duality- it is almost identical between the two tenor repetitions, the material passed from one dominant voice to the other, from one subordinate voice to the other seamlessly.

With such an intentionally equal setting of the two upper voices, one might think the two Thomas texts were interchangeable. Examined more closely, there are subtle differences between the two. The language of the duplum uses the same imagery and metaphor of the triplum, but in less specific terms. For example, the triplum describes the tomb of Thomas Becket with vivid imagery: 'preciosis generosis gemmis tumulatus/auries modulo tumulo' – Thomas lies buried in a precious jewelled tomb wrought with gold. Meanwhile the duplum at the same point in the poetry only praises a 'magnificent church', a general reference that cannot

be narrowed to Dover. It is possible that the more generic language is an indication of the poets' unfamiliarity with the *vita* of the admittedly fairly obscure Thomas of Dover. Colton thought the mention of a magnificent church in the duplum meant the composer-lyricist was familiar with Dover, but is more likely to be the opposite: if the author was familiar with the Dover church, he would have added more particular imagery, as in the case of the gold and jewels of Canterbury in place of the generic language of description.[250]

One of the most striking individualities of the triplum is its visceral language of healing. The sick are said to be cured by the moisture flowing from Thomas's own veins: 'rivulo madido pie sanans egros' (tenor repetitions 19 and 20). 'Rivulo' is here used a second time in the motet; the first occurs at tenor repetition 7. The word's reuse is obvious because on both occasions, 'rivulo' occurs during the exposed texture of a hocket, so the word can be heard very well as no supporting voices (in the first instance) and only one other voice (in the second instance) are singing at that moment.[251] Given that 'rivulo' in the duplum is a description of the martyr's flowing blood, the text of the triplum can only be referring to the holy water of St Thomas Becket. Collecting holy water at places of pilgrimage was a widespread practice in the Middle Ages and is occurred at the shrines of many different saints. However, at Canterbury, the pilgrim ampullae – vessels used to collect holy water – also contained trace amounts of the blood of Saint Thomas, which was said to have been collected from his wounds by the monks of the Cathedral after Becket was murdered (FIGURE 3.7). This famous 'Canterbury water' was

[250] Colton 2003, 263.

[251] A similar situation is found with the repetition of 'stimulo' – first in the duplum (in reference to the suffering of St Thomas Hale) and then in the following hocket, where the triplum voice calls on Thomas for help. The sufferings of the faithful are thus united to the suffering of Thomas, their intercessor.

believed to have great healing powers, capable of curing all illnesses, even restoring the dead to life. There are many stories of miracles of healing experienced by those that drank the blood of St Thomas.[252] In one case, Henry, a ten-year-old boy who had been ill since the age of two, drank the miraculous Canterbury water, fell asleep and then vomited a worm that was half a cubit in length, upon which he was instantly cured.[253] References to miracles of healing make their way into the Becket offices. In her 2004 book on liturgies in honour of Thomas Becket, Kay Brainerd Slocum provides the following example in the Becket office *Martir Thoma*, where the martyr's blood mixed with water is described as curing the illnesses of many people:[254]

Nam sancto prestante flamine Thome sanguis in potu aque Mortuos restituit vite	For with the holy priest presiding, The blood of Thomas in a potion of water Restores the dead to life.
V. Excite gentes undique Miraculorum fulgure Concurrunt afferents Munera, vota, preces.	V. The people come together from all sides, excited by the Gleaming of the miracles, Bringing tributes, vows, and prayers.

Healing properties of blood and the mingling of water and blood are powerful metaphors of Christ. On the cross, blood and water flowed from Jesus's heart when it was pierced with a lance; in the Mass, the re-creation of the sacrifice of the cross, communion wine is mixed with water in the chalice before being consecrated.[255] Medieval listeners could well have appreciated

---

[252] Stained glass windows in Canterbury Cathedral illustrate many scenes of the curing of those who drank St. Thomas Becket's blood.

[253] Slocum 2004, 93. There are several miracles of the sick vomiting worms, which were taken to be a symbol of Satan. It is possible that when the motet earlier speaks of Thomas as cleansing the sinner from the serpent ('a sentina serpentina gentes expiate') it is a reference of these miracles.

[254] Translation by Kay Brainerd Slocum. For more references to the healing Canterbury water in the liturgies of Thomas Becket, see Slocum 2004, 95-97.

[255] John 19:34. 'But one of the soldiers pierced His side with a spear, and at once there came out blood and water' (*The Bible,* English Standard Version).

the symbolism; the healing holy water and blood of Canterbury establishes Thomas Becket as a type of Christ.

Pilgrimage to Canterbury was not primarily made in petition but for thanksgiving post facto: in the majority of miracles attributed St Thomas Becket, the suffering faithful were too ill to leave their sickbeds. The trajectory of the typical pilgrim experience can thus be summarised as first, devotion to Thomas and prayers for his intercession as a Saint, then healing experienced through drinking martyr's blood, and finally, thanksgiving offered at the tomb in Canterbury. Even in the *Canterbury Tales*, the journey to the eponymous shrine is made in thanksgiving for the healing of those too sick to travel:

> Thanne longen folk to goon on pilgramages,
> And palmeres for to seken straunge strondes,
> To ferne halwes, kowthe in sondry londes
> And specially from every shires ende
> Of Englelond, to to Caunterbury they wende,
> The hooly blissful martir for to seke,
> That hem hath holpen whan that they were seeke
>
> Then folk do long to go on pilgrimage,
> And palmers to go seeking out strange strands,
> To distant shrines well known in sundry lands.
> And specially from every shire's end
> Of England they to Canterbury wend,
> The holy blessed martyr there to seek
> Who helped them when they lay so ill and weak

Alternatively, pilgrimages could also take the form of penance for sin. Henry II famously atoned for the murder of his former chancellor with fasting, public penance and a barefoot

pilgrimage to Canterbury.[256] Pilgrimages could be voluntarily undertaken by the penitent or, especially from the mid-thirteenth century, specific destinations might be imposed by ecclesiastical, inquisitorial and even secular authorities for crimes from poaching the game on a bishop's grounds to incest.[257] The graver the sin, the longer, more frequent and harder the pilgrimage imposed: expiation from mortal sin might require an overseas trip, the pilgrimage becoming in effect a temporary exile. Thus Canterbury remained a major pilgrimage site for heretics of the Languedoc inquisition (closer, French destinations were considered minor sites for lesser sins).[258] Pilgrimages in the Middle Ages could even be used to shuffle undesirable clerics from their parishes. In 1283, the archbishop of Canterbury, John Pecham, imposed a three-year penitential exile of pilgrimages to Santiago, Rome and Cologne to a sexually promiscuous priest.[259] In some cases, the wealthy could 'buy off' an imposed pilgrimage by giving a certain sum of money instead.[260] In the text of the motet *Thomas gemma*, even before the medicinal merits of Thomas' blood are mentioned, Thomas is praised as a saviour of sin, one who redeems the sinner from the serpent's filth and the bitter apple of original sin. One of the most poignant moments occurs at the near midpoint, or 'hinge' of the motet: the intersection of sin and salvation in the duplum and of sickness and healing in triplum. Here, malaise of soul and of body – the two main reasons for making a pilgrimage in the Middle Ages – literally intersect: as the melody of duplum moves above and back below the triplum so the

---

[256] Morris 1859, 348-52.
[257] Webb 2002, 50.
[258] Webb 2001, 51.
[259] Webb 2001, 58. After a number of offenses with various women, the licentious Roger, a priest in the diocese of Chichester, had promised in court to remain celibate, a vow which he promptly broke, in the Archbishop's words 'like a dog returning to its vomit'. The reasoning behind this particular penance was twofold. Pecham writes that it was imposed 'for the salvation of both the rector himself and the souls subjected to him, lest by his presence he should infect the Lord's flock'.
[260] Webb 2001, 55.

two voices in that tenor repetition carry equal resonance. An equation between the sin and physical suffering is typical to the medieval understanding of illness, which – much as it was in the time of Christ – was seen an outward sign or punishment of an inwardly sinful soul.[261] As a result, healing was the same as salvation: the person cured of sickness was forgiven by God. In this light, the double use of the word tremulo ('trembling') is significant. 'Tremulo' appears in two places: 'Romulus and Remus' are described as trembling in the duplum while, in the previous hocket, the duplum sings of how Thomas will save humanity from its trembling wrongdoing. It is just a conjecture, but it is possible to imagine that the text here is drawing a parallel between Romulus and Remus (secular authority) trembling and the trembling that comes from sin, for which Thomas, or pilgrimage to Thomas, will provide expiation. It is even possible that this is a reference to Henry, the secular ruler, receiving forgiveness after making pilgrimage to Canterbury.

Seen in this context, *Thomas gemma* is less about the Saints Thomas than it is about their tombs at Canterbury and Dover: the motet is a musical embodiment of the pilgrim experience. For roughly the first third of the composition (tenor repetitions 1-9), the upper voices unite in a song of devotion, praising St Thomas for his glorious death and place in heaven among the blessed. Tenor repetitions 10-15 then focus on the desperate condition of humanity (in its sick and sinful state) contrasted with the saving grace and healing power of Thomas's blood. This section is immediately followed in repetitions 16-26 with an emphasis on Thomas honoured on earth and depictions of the tomb in Canterbury dressed in jewels and gold, or the 'magnificent church' in Dover. Indeed the reuse of the word jewels 'gemmis' of shrine

[261] Scott 2011, 72-73.

highlights this moment as important for it echoes the very first phrase 'Thomas gemma Cantuarie'. Finally, the piece ends with a typical prayer of petition. All in all, the processional aspect of the music: first devotion, then suffering or wrongdoing, then healing, and finally thanksgiving and further petition take the listener through the stages of going on pilgrimage. It is natural to wonder what this kind of dramatization might have meant to audiences who heard the motet sung far away from Canterbury. *Thomas gemma* may have been a sort of substitute relic or a virtual musical experience of pilgrimage for those who could not afford to make the journey. It is possible to imagine many contexts for composition and performance. The composer may have been pilgrim himself (he certainly seems familiar with the shrine and pilgrim water of Canterbury). Perhaps the motet was a musical offering in thanksgiving for healing or atonement for sin, or even a form of almsgiving or payment in lieu of a trip to Canterbury. Maybe the music was even performed as pilgrim song en route to Canterbury. Whatever the original intent of the motet may have been, its staging of the pilgrim experience of sin, sickness, healing, redemption and thanksgiving would have made it an adaptable for many conceivable purposes.

3.4.2 Variants, errors, notation and primacy: which version is 'original'?

The primary interest in approaching paleographical, textual and musical anomalies is to understand the transmission, method and purpose behind them. From the perspective of contextualising an individual manuscript, contradictions between concordances are a fruitful source of information: the mistakes of a medieval scribe can be clues for the modern scholar.

Thus it may be considered fortunate that copying errors – both textual and musical—appear in all three sources of *Thomas gemma*. Errors are an opportunity to understand the mind of the copyist – determining not just what mistake a copyist made but why they made it can betray much about their skill or level of concentration, familiarity with music or Latin. If left uncorrected, errors can even be an unspoken commentary on the usage of the manuscript – as an extreme example, the plethora of parallel octaves and discordant sonorities of the GB-Cgc 512/543 copy means that it is unlikely that the manuscript saw much performance.[262]

Apart from differences in word choice that change the meaning of the text slightly (as in the triad of variants for the prayers of petition at the end of the motet), the texts of the three sources of *Thomas gemma* have two further differences. First, the two lower voices of GB-Cgc 512/543 are texted with guide-words taken from the upper voices of the manuscript – from the triplum for the primus tenor and from the duplum for the secundus tenor. [263] The majority of the remaining textual deviations can be ascribed to copying errors. Of the three sources, GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 has the fewest errors: only two spelling mistakes.[264] By contrast, GB-Cgc 512/543 has the most errors in its transmission of text – numerous spelling mistakes, especially wrong declensions, raising questions about the copyist's knowledge of Latin. He may well have been working from an exemplar with many abbreviations that he did not know how to expand or that was written in a hand he had trouble reading. Thus 'celo' becomes 'ceso' ('l' is read as a long 's'), 'tempestatis' replaces 'tempestate' (wrong ending/declension) and 'rogas' takes the

[262] It is possible that the manuscript was originally intended for performance but never corrected, or that it was copied as a collection of music that was read but not sung from by all four parts.
[263] Dittmer considers this to be evidence that the motet was conceived so that 'each upper voice should have its own respective pes'. Dittmer 1957, 47.
[264] These are 'rogas' instead of 'regis' and 'marido' instead of 'madido'.

place of 'regis' (wrong vowels supplied). Of course it is possible that the GB-Cgc 512/543 copyist had already inherited a bad version of the text. If the motet had a history of miscopying before GB-Cgc 512/543's exemplar, this might over time have garbled the original text (and music). However, in the context of the rest of the material in the same source, it seems that the scribe of GB-Cgc 512/543 was generally less competent than the copyists of US-PRu Garrett 119A and GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20. Other compositions also in GB-Cgc 512/543 contain similar mistakes with regard to Latin abbreviations so it does seem that the mistakes were made on the part of the copyist.[265]

Errors in US-PRu Garrett 119A seem to be of a different order, which could relate to the memorisation of performance. US-PRu Garrett 119A has a number of unexpected mistakes, changes that do not seem to be copying errors. For example, at the moment where the duplum is singing about Romulus and Remus, US-PRu Garrett 119A substitutes the word 'romulo' for 'rivulo' in the triplum. Thus the notator, while writing the triplum part, was clearly of aware of what was occurring at the same moment in the other voice parts. Such a clear conception of the moment's sonority raises the question of whether this particular copy was partially informed, or at least influenced by memory of a performance. Admittedly, it would be an unusual scenario – and there would likely be more differences between US-PRu Garrett 119A and the other two if it were written entirely from memory – but a memory of performance in the copying process would neatly account for some of the other errors in this particular version of *Thomas gemma.* For example, US-PRu Garrett 119A replaces 'tu perfectos et electos pie sublimatus', with 'tu perfectos et electos pie *sublimaris*', which echoes the earlier phrase '*sublimaris* curia regis'. Also,

[265] James 1907-8, 581-4.

unlike in GB-Cgc 512/543, where spelling mistakes might be the result of bad reading of abbreviations, those in US-PRu Garrett 119A are harder to explain away in similar fashion. They seem to be more aural errors in the sense that they sound similar to the original text – they have the same number and stress of syllables but in cases have quite different letters. For example, 'a sentina serpentina' is transmitted as '*sententia* serpentina'. Or again, 'a divina repentina mira caritate' is in US-PRu Garrett 119A, '*dimidia* repentina mira *claritate*', and 'in honore et decore pie laureatus' becomes 'in honore *que* decore *per te* laureatus'.

A scenario where the motet was copied from memory would also make sense of the musical individualities of US-PRu Garrett 119A versus the other two versions. In general, the musical variants between the three versions of *Thomas gemma* can be grouped into three categories:

1. Copying error, where it is clear the scribe miscopied from an exemplar – for example, where the copyist used the wrong line of the staff to write on, or misplaced a clef, resulting in musical nonsense or dissonance.
2. Alternate versions, where two variations are both valid – for example, a note might appear as a long in one copy and as two breves in another.
3. Voice swapping, where for as little as one note or as much as a few bars of music, the material of one voice part is exchanged for that of another.
4. Mimicry, where one variant uses musical material from another part of the composition.

It is the latter two types of that US-PRu Garrett 119A predominantly exhibits, particularly category 3. In no fewer than 12 instances, the primus tenor and secundus tenor in US-PRu Garrett 119A are exactly reversed from the other two sources, so that the notes of the primus tenor in GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 and GB-Cgc 512/543 are in the secundus tenor of US-PRu Garrett 119A, and *vice versa.* Significantly, in nine of these changes, US-PRu Garrett 119A puts the musical material with the lowest range in the secundus tenor, even when this means that the primus tenor must break from its typical repetitions to sing the higher notes. It would appear that the US-PRu Garrett 119A source portrays a conception of the musical moment that prioritises what might be called a 'vertical' rather than 'horizontal' understanding; the arrangement of a sonority from top to bottom trumps the clarity or sense of one voice from beginning to end. Thus the music is ordered so that the lowest notes are given to the secundus tenor, even at the expense of sacrificing the primus tenor's 29-section form and with it, the structural link to the 29 December feast of St Thomas Becket. A number of deviations of category 4 (mimicry) in US-PRu Garrett 119A also deviate from the versions in GB-Cgc 512/543 and GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 in a way suggestive of an unwritten tradition of transmission. To give but one example, the first hocket is not the same as the first hocket in the other two sources, but it is the identical musical material sung in hockets 2 and 3 of all three copies. Again, it seems that a concept of a 'vertical' structure (the hocketing form) prevails over the individuality of the phrases of each particular voice part. It might mean that the scribe of US-PRu Garrett 119A was more focused on the polyphonic structure than the melody of the individual voice part. Such peculiarities occur throughout the US-PRu Garrett 119A copy of the motet, and are deviations that seem to belong to different type of category than typical copyist's errors: its variants could be described as memorisation of performance, manifested in

what may be described as the aural memory of vertical sonorities, or polyphonic texture rather than the memory of a melodic line or individual voice part. Or, in other terms: the deviations may well have more to do with a performer's ear than a copyist's eyes.

By contrast, GB-Cgc 512/543 makes exactly the kind of category 1 changes that can be ascribed to the misreading of a copyist, including multiple instances of the notator choosing the wrong staff line, effectively copying the music either up or down a third, resulting in jarring dissonances. At tenor repetition 5, the secundus tenor is copied a repetition too early, creating uncorrected dissonances in the first half and parallel octaves with the duplum in the second half. Finally, at tenor repetition 11, the secundus tenor copies the primus tenor exactly for the first four longa. It is certain from the musical copying mistakes that, unlike the case of US-PRu Garrett 119A, GB-Cgc 512/543 copyist's errors were purely visual: misreadings while copying from an exemplar. Moreover, the multitude of uncorrected dissonances and parallel octaves in GB-Cgc 512/543 suggest that the copyist never reviewed his work after copying, and that the manuscript copy of *Thomas gemma* was not performed from, or if it was used for perfromance, that the performers corrected dissonances without marking changes in the manuscript.

Finally, the sources use different notations. In GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, the longa-brevis notation of the motet as it appears in US-PRu Garrett 119A and in GB-Cgc 512/543 is reduced in value to brevis-semibrevis. In the past, most scholars have agreed that the US-PRu Garrett 119A and GB-Cgc 512/543 versions of *Thomas gemma* are earlier than GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20. Both Levy and Dittmer cited the reduced notation of GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 as indicative of a later style,

concluding that GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 must have been the latest copy.[266] However, Sanders argued for the primacy of the GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 version in his edition in PMFC XIV, where he interpreted the notation as following an older tradition of interpreting the length of a given note based on its placement. He writes,

> The notation of *Ob 20* differs from that in the other two sources. What the latter expresses as long and breve (minims and crotches in transcription) the former notates as a pair of semibreves, which must be read like the identically shaped paired breves of the "English" notation of earlier decades, i.e. the first of any pair is twice as long as the second. Contrary to what has been asserted in earlier references for this piece, it seems *Cgc 512* and *US-PRu* represent later notational clarification.[267]

Moreover, one might argue that the GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 version sets the text better than its concordances. For example, at tenor repetition 21 (bar 91-94), the triplum part for 'preciosis 'que generosis' (or 'et generosis' in GB-Cgc 512/543) becomes 'preciosis generosis' (EXAMPLE 3.7). Of course it is possible that the GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 version merely omitted one word and simplified the music. However the opposite progression of change seems more likely: GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 might be considered the oldest version and Cambridge and Princeton sources as later versions which added a note and word, perhaps in mimicry of the earlier 'sublimaris curia regis' phrase. Indeed the Worcester (GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20) version places the strong syllable 'ge' of 'generosis' on the stronger beat; in US-PRu Garrett 119A and GB-Cgc 512/543,

---

[266] Levy and Dittmer also interpret the reduced notation as a binary version of the composition; however the *puncti divisionis*, which appear throughout the motet, would be completely unnecessary for a binary reading. Moreover, at the Triplum part of 'sublimaris curia regis pro fidelitate' (tenor repetition 8 and 9), the three breves in of the other two versions are exactly diminished as three semibreves in GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20. Levy referred to this anomaly in his 1951 article, and opted for a ternary reading of GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 in his transcription.

[267] PMFC XIV, 243.

it falls on the weak beat. As a result, the text setting is less consistent with that of the rest of the motet.

It is worth noting a particular point of paleography peculiar to the GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 version: despite being an addition over previously erased music, fol. 35 of GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 has been decorated by initial letters, line fillers and red text. These decorations were executed by the same limner (D1 from Workshop 3) and in the same style as Reconstruction II and the outer folios of Reconstructions I.[268] If we take Reconstruction I's traditional dating of around 1300 as reliable, then the Cambridge and Princeton copies can barely be older than the Worcester one, as Thomas Hale was only martyred in 1295.

However, even if it were possible to resolve definitively the dates of the manuscript sources themselves, it would still leave open the more difficult question of primacy – determining which of these versions preserves the truest version. GB-Cgc 512/543 is clearly error-riddled; otherwise, the relative merit of US-PRu Garrett 119A and GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 has been a matter of debate and can have much to do with the bias of the individual scholar. In introducing US-PRu Garrett 119, Levy stated that the Princeton copy was the 'most carefully noted' and therefore most authoritative copy. [269] Meanwhile Sanders considered GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, copied in English mensural notation, to be the most reliable source for transcription.[270] If a source's reliability is simply a numbers game, then Worcester – with the lowest percentage of textual errors and the fewest uncorrected dissonances – would be the clear

[268] See paleographical analysis of Reconstruction II in Chapter 2.2.4.
[269] Levy 1951, 230.
[270] PMFC XIV, 243.

winner. Of course the oldest copy of a piece may not necessarily represent the oldest or most reliable version. Editorial decisions based on stylistic consistency – choosing the variation that appears in greatest number of sources – might be defensible in the case of manuscripts preserved in many sources. For a motet in only three sources as is *Thomas gemma*, there is simply not enough data on which to base such an argument. It would be unwise to make a value-judgment of authority simply because one version appears in two copies and another only appears in one. Similarly, judgments based on musical style alone are hard to sustain. For example, if only one version of a composition is ornamented, the argument could be made either that the simpler version was later ornamented or that it is the reduction of a more complex version. Thus Levy argues for the primacy of the US-PRu Garrett 119A over GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 and GB-Cgc 512/543, making the case that the elaborate ornamentation of the former was lost in translation. Sanders uses the same material to argue the opposite – that the ornamental phrases in the lower voices are embellishments that reflect later adaptations of an originally straightforward structure.

One of the pitfalls of trying to create an edition compiled from fragmentary sources is that the amalgamated version might come to be considered as an original version. It is important to present editions in a way that is accessible to performers, but not at the cost of historical accuracy. Sanders's performance-ready version, compiled from the three sources of *Thomas gemma* provided an excellent and much-needed complete version for performance and his notes mention what is missing and provide a list of variants. However it is not clear from his edition why at any given point, he chose textual or musical material from one copy over another, or

even which parts were altered or composed for the edition. This lack of distinction between what was original and what was newly-composed would have an impact on scholarship: Lefferts's division of *Thomas gemma*'s textual and musical structure analyzes the PMFC XIV edition's text and music – including those sections composed by Sanders – as though they were original, and does not consider the variant readings in the different sources, while recordings of the motet continue to use Sanders's edition without noting that it is a reconstruction, not representative of any one original copy.[271] The problem with Sanders' edition is not that it was a reconstruction, but that the division between what was original and what was newly-composed was unclear. The confusion could have been avoided with minor alterations to the score and supplementary text specifying which parts were taken from which source and what was newly-composed: Chapter 5 will look in more detail at alternate approaches to reconstructing fragmentary pieces. To some extent it is unavoidable that a reconstructed, performable copy of a motet should become more well-known than any original, incomplete (or in the case of GB-Cgc 512/543, complete but inaccurate) version. However it is important that when it comes to analysing compositions in scholarship and drawing conclusions of musical style, compositional structure and text setting that that all variations of a composition be considered.

3.4.3 Questions of provenance

Beyond the information gleaned from the music and text itself, and the paleographical observations about the manuscript sources and their variant copies, the history of the saints

[271] See for instance, Orlando Consort 1993 and Hilliard Ensemble 1983.

honoured and the political significance of their cults also contributes to understanding the context in which the motet would have been composed and performed. The relationship between the vitae of Thomas Hale, devotion to the saint, and his character as an exemplar of right living, and how this resonates with the devotion to and life of Thomas of Canterbury will help to clarify whether both saints or only one was the inspiration for the motet text. Thomas Becket of Canterbury is one of the most honoured saints in England's history. His *vita,* from his origins as the son of a London merchant to his appointment first as Chancellor to Henry II then as Archbishop of Canterbury, his many disagreements with the monarch that resulted in exile, and then eventually his martyrdom, is probably the most well-known of any English saint and does not need to be repeated here. That of Thomas Hale of Dover is far humbler than that of the Canterbury Archbishop. Little is known of his life other than that he was a model member of the priory. Indeed, Thomas Hale could not have been more opposite to the kind of monk that one usually encounters in a motetus text. He was so pious that he would spend nights praying in front of the altar of the Blessed Virgin and St Katherine the Martyr while the rest of the brethren were asleep.[272] He was austere towards himself and generous toward others, foregoing meat and even eating nothing but bread and water twice a week, secretly setting aside his food and clothing to distribute to the poor.[273] On the night of Tuesday 2 August 1295, the French landed with a fleet of 300 ships and set about to pillage and burn Dover. When the attackers reached the Priory, the monks hid (in the church, likely the bell tower) except for the

[272] Thomas Hales' main biographer is John of Tynmouth, a Benedictine monk of St. Alban's. His 1377 *Vita et passio Thomae de la Hale monacho de Dovere, anno 1295 per Gallos trucidati, auctore Johanne de Tynemouth*, written in Bury St. Edmunds, begins on fol. 798 of the GB-Ob MS Bodey 478. In addition, a shorter life of St. Thomas can be found in Capgrave's *Nova Legenda.* Charles Haines has published a translation of both *vitae* of Thomas from both sources, as well as a translation of the documents surrounding Thomas Hale's case for canonization. Haines 2016, 468-78.
[273] Ibid., 471.

elderly Thomas Hale who remained in the dormitory, either because he was unwilling to break the practice of a noon siesta or possibly to guard the hidden treasures, as the secret recess containing all the precious belongings of the Priory was just opposite Thomas's cell.[274] The French discovered the valuables but were met by St Thomas, who apparently undaunted reprimanded 'Ye abominable men', as it was sacrilegious to 'handle so irreverently with polluted and unworthy hands the consecrated reliquaries of God'.[275] Ignoring his threats of divine vengeance and excommunication, the soldiers demanded the 'old bald pate' hand over his own treasure or they would kill him, to which Thomas apparently responded that they could never rob him, for his true treasure, the Lord Jesus and his Virgin Mother Mary, were hidden in his heart. The soldiers responded by murdering him with swords and axes, leaving him lifeless on the floor, his brains exposed to view. A parallel of course could be drawn to the death of Becket and as a result, artistic representations of the two saints bear a resemblance (FIGURE 3.8). Thomas was honoured immediately as a martyr and saint, and buried by the altar of Mary and Saint Katherine, where he had spent so many nights in prayer. Reports of miracles at his intercession quickly sprang up, including the curing of heart disease, blindness and insanity, the restoration of lost limbs and the resurrection of four dead men and perhaps more uniquely, the calming of sea during storms and the safe return on ships in danger.[276]

By any consideration, the Worcester motet must have been a very early copy of the composition. Thomas Hale was martyred in just 1295; the Worcester copy was added in the

[274] Ibid., 244-246. Knyghton in Twysden, *Decem Scriptores*, 2502 states the other monks were hidden *in campanili ecclesiae*. John Tynemouth's *Vita Thome de la Hale* estimates that the soldiers stole valuables worth more than £1500 in total.
[275] Ibid., 244.
[276] Ibid., 247.

first years of the fourteenth century. It is tempting to reconstruct a narrative in which the new motet *Thomas gemma* honouring a martyred Benedictine monk in its duplum voice, fresh off the press, was added over erased archaic chant settings in a book of polyphonic music belonging to the Benedictine Worcester Priory. Even more compelling is the connection between the cult of Thomas Hale, martyred by French soldiers and the escalating tension with France in the early fourteenth century that would eventually erupt in the Hundred Year's War. The motet author was surely aware that in pairing the two saints in text and music, he was using the popularity of the national icon, St. Thomas Becket, to further the cause of a saint martyred by French soldiers. The 'enemy' that wounded and slew Thomas in the text of the duplum must refer to the French – an enemy not only of the English but of God and His holy saint.[277] That the English martyr was used as a political tool to fuel anti-French sentiment seems likely, given the timing of the popularity of his cult throughout the fourteenth century. Some seventy years after his death, indulgences would be granted by the archbishop of Canterbury to those who visited the tomb of Thomas Hale.[278] In 1380, King Richard II would write to Pope Urban VI to open the cause for Thomas Hale's canonisation.[279] In the end, the Saint of Dover was never canonised and his cult abated after the end of the Hundred Year's War, so it does seem his popularity in the fourteenth century was due more to political than to religious reasons.

The story of the thirteenth-century polyphonic book now known as Reconstruction II would thus include an updating of repertory reflecting current political sentiments and the new cult of

[277] Colton 2003, 266.
[278] John of Pont offered an indulgence for Thomas Hale in 1295. Grosjean 1954, 167-91.
[279] Ibid.

a Benedictine martyr. If indeed this is the case, the Benedictine connection strengthens the argument for an early Worcester ownership of Reconstruction II and – as the *Thomas gemma* addition was decorated by the same limner who worked on Reconstructions I and III – by extension, a Worcester ownership of the other two Reconstructions by the early fourteenth century. As to the provenance of the composition, the political ties to Thomas Hale might reflect a court connection. In his 1978 *JAMS* article, Hohler put forward a scenario where the motet would have been composed for the court.[280] Basing his argument on his assessment of the poorly written text, the popularity of the motet (which survives in three sources) and Thomas Hale's patriotic significance, he suggests that the four voiced motet 'should have been ordered at short notice in 1295 in a milieu where music and patriotism counted for much, and miracles and Latinity for very little'. [281]

There is another possible scenario presented by the fragments: that the motet was originally composed for Thomas Becket and only later adapted to fit the Benedictine martyr of Dover. Lisa Colton first suggested this alternate story of origin for *Thomas gemma* in her 2003 dissertation, pointing out that substituting (or even inserting) the appropriate name of the saint being celebrated on the day is a practice common to plainchant: an 'n' in the liturgical text would serve as placeholder for the particular saint's name.[282] Substituting saint names was common practice in polyphony as well; elsewhere in the Worcester Fragments, a marginal note

[280] Hohler 1978, 30.
[281] Hohler uses the motet and its supposed court provenance as a crux for his argument debunking the idea of a Westcuntre school of polyphony. His reasoning is not without problems – for example, regarding the palimpsests of Reconstruction II, he believes he saw 'no examples of surviving traces of the allegedly erased compositions' – but his reservations about a Severn valley provenance to the Worcester repertory were the first to truly challenge the concept of a 'Westcuntre' school of polyphony. Hohler 1978, 30-32.
[282] The use of commons is the quintessential example of one chant serving multiple feast days (common of martyrs, of virgins, etc.) Colton 2003, 111.

replaces a triplum text honouring Saint Catherine with Saint Edburga.[283] With minimal alterations to text, a motet could serve several feasts. Peter Lefferts postulates that some motets may have been prepared with a flexibility of interpretation in mind, some texts 'so general in reference [to be] suitable for any number of institutions'.[284] There is even evidence that substitution was done in compositions connected to St. Thomas Becket. For example, the fourteenth-century motet, *Opem nobis O Thoma/Salva Thoma/Pastor cesus*, demonstrably written for Thomas Becket, has been adapted in other sources for Saints Anthony, Bernard and Florentius.[285] Meanwhile Christopher Hohler has shown that the early fourteenth-century motet, *Excelsus in numine – Benedictus dominus*, which appears rubricated for St. Thomas Becket in the fragmentary polyphonic manuscript GB-Onc 362 was almost certainly written for St Thomas of Hereford.[286]

In the Worcester copy of *Thomas gemma*, the inconvenient loss of most of the duplum voice means that it can only be certain that the triplum text was written for St. Thomas Becket in this copy. The missing duplum text may or may not have been written for St. Thomas Hale. Only one part of the duplum text is clearly written with Thomas Hale in mind, and that is the phrase 'cesus in Doveria' ('slain in Dover'). A similar phrase appears in the triplum later as 'cesus in ecclesia' ('slain in the church'). As the two words 'ecclesia' and 'doveria' have the same syllable count and second-syllable stress, it is easy to imagine a scenario where the word

[283] GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxviii, fol. 1. The piece is the fragmentary three-voiced motet *Virgo regalis fidei/[Virgo regalis fidei]/Pes* (WF 12 and PMFC XIV, no. 51). In the top margin, the a substitution 'ut jubar in tenebris Eadburga refulsit in arvis' is offered for the original text 'ut jubar in tenebris Katerina refulsit in arvis' in the triplum of the motet below.
[284] Lefferts 1986, 117.
[285] Colton 2003, 112. See also PMFC 15, no. 241.
[286] Hohler 1978, 31.

'ecclesia' was replaced by 'Doveria' in the duplum text to convert a text originally in honour of Thomas Becket to one in honour of Thomas Hale. Of course, there are other instances where the two voices share texts that are only slightly different, so it is entirely possible that 'cesus in Doveria' and 'cesus in ecclesia' were both original.[287] However a few moments in the duplum text do not seem to have been written with the legend of Thomas Hale in mind – the 'ecclesia decora' where Saint Thomas lies buried would be more fitting to the magnificent Cathedral at Canterbury and St. Thomas Becket's pilgrim shrine, the tomb covered with jewels mentioned in the triplum voice. The Christlike depiction of the saint in the duplum voice as a saviour through the merits of whom the faithful are freed and certain specific mentions such as the stream of blood, serpent, and miraculous healing power are arguably more suited to the hagiography of St. Thomas of Canterbury. Triplum and duplum alike are divided into the following themes, in order:

1. Thomas as martyr and defender of the church
2. Thomas as a saint: elevated to the court of God
3. Thomas as a Christlike figure: through whom man is freed from ruin/death/sin/corruption
4. Thomas as miracle-worker/healer: a fount healing with miraculous curing power
5. Thomas as honoured among the holy: exalted with the elect over Remus and Romulus (possibly a reference to secular authority)
6. Thomas as honoured on earth: buried in magnificent church and gilded, jewelled tomb
7. Thomas as honoured in heaven: crowned with honour and grace, revered among the blessed

And finally, for the triplum only:

8. Thomas an intercessor: filled with burning love to help those still suffering on earth.

[287] For example, towards the end of the motet, the phrase 'cum decore vel honore' in the triplum is mirrored by 'in honore et decore' in the duplum.

In her book on the liturgical texts of Thomas Becket, Kay Slocum lists six aspects of Becket's life that biographers and liturgists alike emphasised. [288]

1. Thomas as *novus homo*
2. Thomas as *bonus pastor*
3. Thomas as defender of the Church
4. Thomas as a martyr
5. Thomas as a miracle-worker
6. Thomas as a type of Christ

Significantly, all but the first two of these aspects are reflected in the triplum and duplum text. Whether these themes are reflected in the liturgies of other saints or whether they are, as Slocum seems to infer, particular to Thomas Becket remains for other scholars to decide. Certainly their presence in the text of *Thomas gemma* does strengthen the argument that the original author of the poetry for both duplum and triplum voice was familiar with the *vita* of Thomas Becket and with his treatment in liturgical texts.

A few further points can be made in favour of the original iteration of the motet having been written for Thomas Becket in both voices. The reference to trembling Romulus and Remus in the duplum does not seem to fit into the life of St. Thomas of Dover but may be a reference to Henry II's contrition and reparation. Even if it is not, the names Romulus and Remus, as Lisa Colton has pointed out, find precedent in compositions written for the Canterbury saints,

[288] Slocum 2004, 4-8.

Thomas and Augustine.[289] Even the structure of the motet, the 29 repetitions after the feast day of St Thomas Becket on 29 December, links the music primarily to the Canterbury martyr. However, if these textual and musical references to the *vita* of Becket prove that the motet was composed for Becket; they do not prove that it was composed only for Becket. Indeed the text could be interpreted either way: that the duplum shows some indication of the hagiography of Thomas Becket or that its more generic text indicates that it was used for the vita of someone the author was less familiar with (i.e., Thomas Hale). Ultimately, it is the musical setting that perhaps provides the most compelling argument. The language of duality, the double-twinsong structure, the rivalry of the voices, each taking turns and yet equal (reflected and the highlighting of words such as 'primulo' 'emulo' and 'singularis' as discussed in the previous section), seem at the core to be setting up two individuals. And if it were originally composed as a pilgrim song, or pilgrim offering, then its attribution to two saints would make it widely performable.

Of course, even if the motet was originally composed only for Becket and later adapted for Hale, it is impossible to tell from the fragmentary state what the text of the triplum would have been. What the original dedication does affect is the dating of the motet: if it was initially composed with Thomas Hale in mind, it would have a *terminus post quem* of 2 August 1295, the date of the saint's martyrdom. Lisa Colton offers several possible dates of composition, including Stevens's date for the 100-year jubilee of the translation of Thomas of Canterbury

[289] There are references to Romulus and Remus in the literature of Thomas Becket and Augustine of Canterbury. For example, the late thirteenth-century motet (ca. 1300), *Solaris ardour Romuli*, written in honour of St Augstine, makes reference to the 'sunny warmth of Romulus' that 'melts the frost of Britain' as a metaphor for the papal influence on England's conversion. See Colton 2003, 270-272.

(1320), or alternatively, the Roman Jubilee of St. Thomas Becket in 1300, a year that was also the five-year anniversary of St. Thomas of Dover's martyrdom.[290] If, however, the motet was originally composed only for St Thomas Becket, then it could have been written earlier. The lack of any extant copy of such an earlier motet means that this line of inquiry must end here – it is questionable whether dating the motet from internal stylistic evidence alone could ever be convincing. At least it can be said with certainty that, whatever the original intention of the composer might have been, *Thomas gemma/Thomas cesus/ Primus Tenor/ Secundus Tenor* enjoyed years of popularity in the fourteenth century as a work in honour of both Saint Thomas Hale of Dover and Saint Thomas Becket of Canterbury.

3.5 Conclusions

The Worcester Fragments highlight the extent to which we allow codicology to define genre. Dom Anselm Hughes dubbed his re-constructed volumes of Worcester 'The Motet Book' and 'The Conductus Book' even though the sources contained many different compositional styles, and in fact motets do not even account for half the repertory of the 'Motet Book'. As musicologists, it is easy to understand the organisation of manuscripts such as I-Fl Plut. 29.1, which goes through a hierarchy of genres, and it is tempting to consider manuscripts that do not show such genre definition as disorganised. Yet such heterogeneous manuscripts may simply represent a different attitude towards genre: the various manuscript organisational styles of Reconstruction II and I suggest that for the thirteenth-century compiler, genre might have

[290] Colton 2003, 266-7.

had a more fluid use. The placement of *Sanctus et eternus Deus* among other troped Sanctus settings in Reconstruction II makes sense to twentieth-century historians, the inclusion of a troped Sanctus among a gathering of motets makes less sense. However, as we have seen, the new form of troped Mass Ordinary chants found in these reconstructions is much more than the troped setting of a liturgical chant. Pieces such as *Ave magnifica Maria/Ave mirifica Maria/Alleluya V. Dulce lignum* which incorporate intertextuality, pre-existing musical material and devotional symbolism (the Virgin Mary as synonymous with both Cross and Tree of Life) show that in England, at least for a period the influence of the motet became incorporated in older forms of composition rather than replacing them right away. The 'hybridization' of motet at chant settings is reflected in other insular manuscript – Amy Williamson's evaluation of the thirteenth-century insular sources shows that motets were often copied with troped chant settings, suggesting that 'no distinction between the genres really existed in the mind of the composer or copyist'.[291]

In the case of the Worcester Fragments, this may explain why, although the earlier Reconstruction II was copied with troped chant settings grouped according to chant tenor (Kyrie, Alleluia and Sanctus settings), the later Reconstruction I has troped chant settings and motets (as in the case of the *Sanctus et eternus Deus*) copied together. Meanwhile the palimpsest scribes of Reconstruction II inserted both motets and troped chant settings into the collection, suggesting that the medieval users of Reconstruction II might not have shared the modern scholar's distinctions of genre.

[291] Williamson 2016, 94.

It is no coincidence that the added motets of Reconstruction II have multiple concordances with English and Continental sources, while the original phase of production of trope chant settings with one exception only had concordances with Worcester Reconstruction I.[292] Thus the newer polyphonic Mass settings in Reconstruction II appear without tropes, while older stylistic forms in Worcester Reconstruction II were erased when they fell out of fashion. As a result, the individuality of the customised collection of new tropes was sacrificed for the popularity of new motets that reflected the current political and devotional climate.

Now that the paleography of individual fragments and the music of the repertory have been examined, it is possible to map the interrelationships between the various sources that make up the Worcester Fragments. TABLE 3.4 illustrates the connections between the various fragmentary sources. Blue shading represents the addition of music after the phase of production represented in white, blue arrowed lines represent shared musical concordances, and the red, green and yellow connecting lines show shared scribal concordances. A timeline at the top is meant as a rough guideline for the chronological relationship of copying dates between the fragments, taking into consideration the likely date of compositions (based on concordances and developments of style), and paleographic considerations such as script and notational styles to determine possible dates of copying. For example, it is likely that the original codex of Reconstruction II was produced before Reconstruction I, or at least before the outer gatherings copied by Workshop 3. All the compositions in Reconstruction II's original production phase date from the third quarter of the century, while Reconstruction I must have

[292] The one exception is of course the *Ave magnifica Maria/Ave mirifica Maria/Alleluya V. Dulce lignum* with a concordance in GB-Ob c. 400* and a concordance (with contrafact text) in F-MO H 196. *Candens crescit lilium* (GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 28) has concordances with GB-Cpc 228 and US-NYpm MS 978, while *Thomas gemma*, as we have seen, has two English concordances.

been later, as it includes compositions dating from the 1280s and 1290s in its original production phase. Moreover there is a noticeable gap in the repertory of Reconstruction II, from the compositions of the original production phase (1270) and ca. 1300 when the first motet, *Candens crescit lilium was* added.

The missing thirty years might account for the very different mise-en-page, scribal proficiency and decorative style in Reconstruction II vs. Reconstruction I, if they were from the same scriptorium or establishment but produced at different times. As we have seen in this Chapter, the repertory of the two Reconstructions certainly represent some common preferences in composition (such as the use of extended troping for Mass settings) and actual shared repertory (concordances *Ave magnifica Maria* and *Sanctus et eternus Deus*). Whether this sharing of material and compositional style occurred at Worcester is a question that needs further consideration.

Although elements of the Worcester repertory have been used by some scholars to argue an original connection to Worcester Cathedral, an examination of the music complicates rather than simplifies the provenance of the Fragments. A lack of many concordances is typical of insular manuscripts, and the few concordances that do exist do not have a coherent association with any one thirteenth-century source, though individual compositions or sets of compositions do link the Worcester Fragments to a few other notable English fragments, such as F-MO H 196 and GB-Ob. c. 60. Overall, there are more Dominican connections than Benedictine ones in the 'Worcester' repertory – there are two pieces with notable Dominican

ties (including one that echoes the sequence of St. Dominic, and another that honours an obscure Dominican saint), while the only piece that honours a Benedictine saint, Thomas Hale of Dover, is a later addition with many concordances that seems to have as much to do with the political sentiment of the time and the pilgrim experience than the veneration of a Benedictine martyr. While the majority of the compositions incorporate liturgical plainsong material in the tenors of both older troped Mass settings and newer motets, there is little correlation between the chants found in the Worcester Antiphoner GB-WOc F. 160 and the plainsong material in the polyphony of the Worcester Fragments – the chants used are not particular to the Worcester Antiphoner, the polyphonic settings are out order with the chants in GB-WOc F. 160, and there are differences (some very substantial) between all the chants of the Worcester Antiphoner and corresponding material used in the Worcester Fragments.[293] Even the individualised (and likely, newly-composed) tropes do not exhibit a particularly Benedictine spirituality. If the original codices were produced exclusively at and for the Worcester community, one might expect to find local saints, Benedictine connections and plainsong material reflective of Worcester chant sources. Of course, the presence of many musical sources found in the bindings of manuscripts with a known Worcester provenance indicates that the performance of polyphony was likely important for the community at Worcester Cathedral. Nonetheless, the evidence of even a few musical or textual elements that point away from Worcester Cathedral as an original provenance means that assumption that the Worcester Reconstructions were produced at or for Worcester must be thoroughly re-examined.

[293] Losseff gives a complete list of the identified plainsong material and the twelve connections between GB-WOc F. 160 and the repertory of the Worcester Fragments (Losseff 1994, 72-75).

4.

An Early History of the Fragments

> The survival of these fragments in the bindings of manuscripts of Worcester provenience attests to the fact that this music was sung in Worcester, undoubtedly at the Cathedral, from the beginning of the 13th century (the earliest fragments) to the middle of the 14th century…it would appear that Worcester was one of the most important centres for the cultivation of polyphonic art.[294]
>
> - *Luther Dittmer, 1957*

> [T]here is no evidence whatsoever to suggest that the music was copied at Worcester… There is nothing to suggest that the music was performed at Worcester either. In fact, apart from their preservation in volumes once at Worcester, there is absolutely nothing to connect the leaves or the music to Worcester Cathedral. [295]
>
> - *Amy Williamson, 2016*

For many years, the copying of the Worcester Fragments, and even the composition of some of the works they contained, was assumed to have been undertaken entirely at Worcester Cathedral.[296] Dittmer's claim in his dissertation that the music was 'undoubtedly' performed in Worcester was reiterating a view Anselm Hughes had expressed thirty years earlier: that Worcester was a major centre for the composition and performance of polyphonic music

[294] Dittmer 1957, 9.
[295] Williamson 2016, 5.
[296] Hughes 1928, 28-29; Dittmer 1957, 8-10.

throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Recent scholars have taken the opposite view that Worcester was neither the origin of composition nor were the fragments copied there, but that they were brought to Worcester very late, either as already complete 'anthologies of music' produced at a single scriptorium elsewhere or as material for the binding of books; in this latter scenario the music might never even have been performed at Worcester.[297] Thus far, a paleographical and musical analysis has led to a number of conclusions: that the manuscripts were originally produced by several workshops with various methods of copying, that the music in them reflects both insular attitudes towards genre and international developments in troping, and that concordances between the Worcester Fragments seem to point to a diverse story of origin for at least Worcester Reconstructions I and II. However, one part of the Worcester Fragments' 'biography' still needs to be considered: between their creation and reuse in binding lie over a hundred years of history. As the motet *Thomas gemma* has shown, later additions can illuminate the changing priorities of the people who were using the manuscripts, and it is even possible for a book to take on meaning in use and personal experience over time that the original creator never intended. It is precisely this study of the additions, marginalia, deletions and amendments to the Worcester Fragments that will provide a more accurate and complete picture of the music and manuscripts' origin and continued use, allowing for a re-assessment of the possibility of a Worcester provenance for the copying and even the musical composition of the Worcester Fragments. The purpose of Chapter 4 is thus twofold: first, to examine the history of the manuscript as an object, throughout its varied and continued life after production, and then to reconsider the provenance of the Worcester Fragments in the light of their production, musical content, and early use.

[297] Wibberley 1977, 36-7; Losseff 1994, 78; Williamson 2016, 5.

4.1 Tracing a History of Evolution and Reuse in the Fragments

The history of the Worcester Fragments is remarkable for the longevity of the original codices as complete collections. Reconstructions I, II, and III and possibly other 'Worcester Fragments' remained intact for over a hundred years. The presence of marginalia, erasures, and palimpsest compositions is an undeniable indicator of extended use and a valuable tool to follow the continued life of a particular source, or at least to designate a *terminus post quem* of dismantling.

4.1.1 Imitation and clarification – thirteenth-century additions

One the earliest examples of an amendment to an already-completed page in the Worcester Fragments occurs in the middle part of Reconstruction I (produced by Workshop 2). A fifth limner (D5) decorates only one composition: *Ave magnifica Maria* on GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxviii, fol. 4v. This new hand adds 'Alle' to the previously untexted tenor's initial notes and again at the verse 'Post partum virgo'. He also fills the lines with dense flourishes and the figures of a man's face and a bird.[298] The page had previously been decorated by D3, in the lighter red ink used elsewhere in the gathering, with red and blue initial for the top voice, minor red initials to the second voice and a simple line filler of a double helix with dots.[299] D5's additions in a darker red ink add more flourished line fillers, in one instance clearly imitating

[298]A third 'face' appears on the fifth line from the bottom – it seems to have an eye similar to that of the man's face on the last line of the page so it may also be humanoid. The result of these additional decorations is that the presentation of the page looks completely original. It is perhaps for this reason that Nicky Losseff thought it was an addition by hand not elsewhere in Reconstruction I. Losseff 1994, 153.

[299] This pattern of decorating the voices is entirely consistent with the other folios of the gathering.

the old limner in the figure of the double helix with dots, although the circles are broader and the dots are larger (FIGURE 4.1).

This addition is curious because it is the only time D5 appears in the manuscript; thus the obvious question is whether the single appearance of the limner is reflective of the significance of *Ave magnifica Maria* to its annotator. The limner's selection perhaps makes more sense in the light of the composition's rich history of transmission and rewriting. In the previous chapter, *Ave magnifica Maria's* connection to a contrafactum in the Montpellier codex was explored, as well as Reconstruction II's version with the *Dulce lignum* verse, in which the duplum's text echoed the *Dulcis virgo* contrafactum to the tenor's *Dulce lignum* melody. If, as proposed in Chapter 3, the *Ave magnifica Maria Alleluia v. Dulce lignum* was the original or better-known version, the limner might have wanted to highlight the tenor's text to make it obvious that it was a different version from the commonly-known one. In this scenario, the limner might be adding the text for himself, indicating a lack of familiarity between versions on his own part or he might have added it on the behalf of the other users of the manuscript, for whom the addition may have served as a preventative measure to avoid confusion. That clarification would be needed in turn suggests that the manuscript was not originally made for the people who were using it at this point, or at least that it was not made by them.

Another case where a clarification occurred also seems to suggest that the manuscript had changed hands between the time it was copied and its early use. On GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xiii, an annotator expanded the abbreviation for 'pes'(FIGURE 4.1) This is even more

interesting when considering that 'pes', a strictly insular term, is found in only a handful of sources. Out of the entire corpus of thirteenth-century insular polyphony, Williamson has identified just 20 compositions that label tenors 'pes'; 15 of these are found in the Worcester Fragments.[300] It is possible to narrow her identifications even further: all 15 'pes' tenors are in Reconstruction I, and all but 3 were copied by Workshop 2, including GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xiii. If the word 'Pes' was annotated by a medieval user less familiar with the term, this may mean that the manuscript was no longer in the same location where it was created; while the concentration of 'pes' in those gatherings produced by Workshop 2 seems to lend credence to the theory that the Workshops were not closely associated with each another, and that their copying habits reflect different influences and styles. But if Reconstruction I was not copied for its medieval users, then where might they have acquired it? If we look at the other instances where 'Pes' appears among insular manuscript, it is striking that two out the four remaining sources that use this term (GB-Ob c. 400* and GB-Lbl Harley 978) can be associated with Reading.[301] If Reconstruction I was used at Worcester, then a Reading- Worcester transfer of material would point to a sharing of music (possibly even musicians who brought the material with them) among Benedictine institutions. Moreover the fact that the term 'pes' appears nowhere else in the Worcester Fragments seems to imply that the Reconstructions (and further fragments) were not all commissioned for or created by the same institution, but reflect different attitudes towards genre and diverse copying habits.

[300] Williamson 2016, 174.
[301] For the provenance of GB-Ob c. 400*, see Losseff 1994, 64; for that of GB-Lbl Harley 978, see Taylor 2002 76-136; Wulstan 2000 and Deeming 2015.

4.1.2 The fragments in the fourteenth century

Only Reconstruction III has additions from the fourteenth century. The surviving incomplete gathering has no fewer than nine compositions in at least seven distinguishable hands of music and text. TABLE 4.1 gives a list of the compositions and numbers the fourteenth-century hands in the order in which they appear in the gathering (this is not necessarily chronological). Summers has elsewhere described and translated the fourteenth-century compositions so only a summary of the contents needs to be considered here.[302]

The first piece consists of two lines of music written on the final staves of fol. c2r; these may be a single voice part or two voices in score.[303] B1r contains a discant setting of a Sanctus for three voices, notated in score during the last half of the fourteenth century.[304] Another incomplete composition, the *Gloria laus et honor….tibi sit* was entered in the third and fourth three-stave systems of folio a1v, dating to the very last part of the fourteenth century.[305] A century later, a two-voice textless fifteenth-century piece was copied in void and black notation on the second three-stave system of the fol. a1v (not listed in TABLE 4.1). The Benedictus, Sanctus and Agnus Dei are also all late fourteenth-century additions.

---

[302] Summers 1983-5, 57-67. Summers does not distinguish between text and music hands but considers them as one, which is understandable since the text and music hands use the same ink and appear together in each composition in the same combination.

[303] Gilbert Reaney thought the notes might belong to an exercise in composition, but Summers believed the composition to be too carefully planned to be 'a hastily scratched practice exercise' and that it was more likely to be part of a longer composition that would have appeared on the facing page. Reaney 1966; Summers 1983-5, 63.

[304] Summers 1983, 61.

[305] Ibid. Summers's argument for dating includes the use of a cantus firmus at multiple pitch levels, a stylistic trait of late fourteenth-century compositions.

However the most curious addition is the cantilena on GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xix, fol. a1r-v, '…merenti modo scitienti', which seems to imitate the main hand of Reconstruction III (T1). Indeed, the similarities of these two hands led Wibberley to consider them to be the same scribe. The majuscules in particular are alike in form, frequently decorated with penwork on the interior of the letter. FIGURE 4.2 illustrates a few of the ways in which the hand mimicked its predecessor's initials: notice the similar styling between the capitals 'A', 'D' and 'G' of T1 and 'O' and 'P' of T33. Wibberley's interpretation of the hands is a cautionary tale not to read too much into superficial similarities and reflects the need for the thorough charting of a scribe's peculiarities of handwriting. While in an initial reading of the situation the two hands look very alike, closer study shows individualities in script especially in the 'i' and 'a' miniscules. Evidently one scribe was consciously imitating the other's majuscules to create a more unified look, almost a century later. This kind of imitative behaviour can also be found on the Continent during the fourteenth century. In connection to Italian music of the same period, John Nádas demonstrates that an intentional similarity of decorations or distinctive decorative letter forms often occurs where more than one scribe is working on a codex.[306] The situation seen in the Worcester fragments goes one step further: not only do scribes working together create a unified presentation, but later scribes also give a nod to their predecessors' work. As seen in the case of *Ave magnifica Maria*, imitation in style can extend to decorative work as well. Thus scribal imitation can be a useful tool for establishing shared provenance. While scribal concordance can establish that two pages were the work of one person, scribal imitation can show that two pages are part of the same source, or at least of two sources where the scribe of one had access to the other.

[306] Nádas 1985, 8-9.

4.1.3 Fifteenth-century marginalia

The fifteenth-century marginal musical compositions of the Worcester Fragments have barely received mention in recent scholarship, yet they offer a unique insight into the continuing use of Reconstructions I, II and III throughout the late Middle Ages.[307] Annotations can be examples of 'works in progress': compositional or pedagogical examples of musical life at an institution. For example, the marginal fifteenth-century annotations in D-W Cod. Guelf.1099 Helmst include compositions possibly intended for choristers, among them exercises in counterpoint that may have been written to aid the teaching of younger singers.[308]

In the Worcester Fragments, the marginal compositions across openings of Reconstruction I show that the codex was accessible to musicians well into the fifteenth century. The first of these to appear in the manuscript (in order of medieval foliation) occurs at the bottom of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. x, fol. 1v-2r. Across the last stave on fol. 1v and the last two staves on fol. 2r there is a short two-voiced setting of the *Beata viscera Marie*. It is likely that at the time this composition was written the manuscript was still bound in its original order, as *Beata viscera Marie* is on two facing folios. The piece is fairly straightforward: the opening words are sung by the tenor after which the two voices move together in simple note-against-note counterpoint written almost entirely in breves.[309] Perhaps, like the fifteenth-century additions in D-W Cod. Guelf.1099 Helmst, it was a counterpoint exercise intended for younger singers. Although it is

[307] Dittmer mentions them in passing. Summers and Lefferts include the pieces in their inventory as 'void notation'. Summers and Lefferts 2016, 35.
[308] Steiner 2013, 44.
[309] The text is from the votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin Mary after Nativity. The script reads 'Beata viscera Marie virginis que portaverunt eterni patris filium' (Blessed is the womb of the Virgin Mary that bore the Son of the Eternal Father).

a different musical setting, a text concordance of the *Beata viscera Marie* appears in Reconstruction III. These marginal compositions signal that the manuscript had once more changed its purpose and its audience: it was now used for composing or learning music.

What is significant about these musical additions is that the same fifteenth-century hands appear on folios of Reconstructions I, II and III. Thus, at least by the fifteenth century, the three codices must have been at the same location and accessible to these fifteenth-century musicians. Another piece of evidence that might place the fragments at Worcester by the fifteenth century can be found in the pencilled gloss on GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xli: 'Ave rex gentis Anglo[rum]'. As Thomson has pointed out, this text is the first line of an antiphon for St. Edmund of East Anglia.[310] That the same antiphon appears as the plainsong tenor of two early fourteenth-century motets found in books associated with Bury St Edmunds might be an indication that music was shared between these two English Benedictine communities.[311]

The Worcester Reconstructions are not the only manuscripts of possible Worcester provenance to contain fifteenth-century musical markings. A binding fragment from GB-WOc Q. 61 also contains a mid to late fifteenth-century composition (FIGURE 4.4). The manuscript is not traditionally considered one of the 'Worcester Fragments' but it has been proven to have a Worcester provenance.[312] A single folio contains an untexted three-voiced composition in strene

[310] Thomson 2000, 95.
[311] For a discussion of the fragments in Bury St. Edmunds, see Bukofzer 1950, 17-33.
[312] Thomson 2001. The manuscript contains pastedowns from monastic accounts which include Worcester, Laughern, Shurnock, Feckenham and Clafswall.

notation.[313] The use of strene notation is peculiar, because it has been closely associated with scribes less familiar with notation, as a compositional tool or a simplified notational system that was easy to read. This non-mensural system of notation uses symbols (such as a stroke or plainchant ligatures) to stand for the fundamental rhythmic value, while longer notes are indicated by repetition of the stroke or note. Margaret Bent has drawn a distinction between different forms based on the appearance of the fundamental unit as a 'simple stroke' or 'full' and 'void' forms using mensural breves, longs and ligatures.[314] Opinions are varied as to the reason for its short-lived span of existence. Andrew Hughes has suggested that it was a transitional tool during a period when the vocal forces of choirs were expanding.[315] Easily accessible even to musicians with limited reading ability, the simpler notation might have facilitated the incorporation of a whole chorus. If so, it must have been a temporary compromise, which the growth of established boys' choirs and the availability of choristers able to read mensural polyphony would have rendered obsolete for the next generation of singers.[316]

That strene notation was used at Worcester does not mean that the fifteenth-century additions in Reconstructions I, II and III might not also be written in Worcester. In the collection of fifteenth-century fragments under the shelfmark DDHU 19/2 held at the Archives and Records office in Beverley, Yorkshire, the same scribe uses mensural and stroke notation in one piece, possibly as a compositional shorthand.[317] The collection of fragments contains an

[313] For non-standard methods of notating mensural music such as 'stroke' and 'strene' notation, see Bent 1968, 137-56 and Bent and Bowers 1981, 1-27.
[314] Bent and Bowers 1981, 16.
[315] Bent 1968.
[316] Hughes 1963.
[317] Nyikos 2010.

untexted work in stroke notation that is almost undoubtedly the rough draft of a composition.[318] While it has been supposed that compositional simplicity in pieces with non-mensural notations is a result of a basic method of indicating note values, the reverse is equally possible: that mensural notation was not used purely because it was not necessary. The use of strene notation in Worcester may thus represent shorthand for composition, a tool for the pedagogy of choristers, or both. How exactly this would have occurred is a consideration that certainly needs further explanation. If such simplified notations were used as shorthand, was it to save space, and if so then why was material wanting? If it was a pedagogical tool, how exactly might it have been used? In the case of the Worcester Fragments and GB-WOc Q. 61, if the former were at Worcester with the latter, then the presence of both mensural notation and stroke notation might reflect an audience of both more-skilled and less-skilled musicians at the same establishment. The study of alternate notations and of compositional and pedagogical material is an area that is clearly ripe for study. Recent scholars have added to our knowledge of this topic both with regard to the kind of pedagogical tools used (such as vocal exercises, compositional sketches, mensuration tables or the Guidonian hand) and some of the individuals involved in teaching and learning music.[319] Further examination of such materials and users has the potential to offer the modern scholar a better understanding of medieval habits of composing, collecting, learning and copying music.

A final unexplained puzzle is the absence of late fourteenth-century musical additions in Reconstructions I and II – after those works copied in the very early fourteenth century, only

[318] Ibid.
[319] See especially Boynton 2008 and Owens 1995.

fifteenth century music appears after presumably a whole century of use. It may be that because Reconstruction III contained later compositions, it was used throughout the fourteenth century even when Reconstructions I and II were no longer used for performance. The marginal musical cameos seem to indicate that the manuscript was not kept in a library or displayed in the chapel, but were accessible to clerics, possibly even to choristers. At the very least, it can be said with certainty that the manuscripts must have still been intact in the fifteenth century, and that all three of the Worcester Reconstructions were in the same location by then.

The early history of the Worcester Fragments makes a perfect case study reflecting in microcosm the different attitudes of medieval users towards existing and new musical material in the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The ad hoc addition of fifteenth-century script compared to the more neatly-copied compositions of the late fourteenth century and the elaborately decorated early fourteenth-century additions traces a shift in the attitude towards writing music, made possible by the relatively inexpensive cost of paper.[320] As paper had become more readily available in the fifteenth century, we can presume that the labour of meticulously scraping down parchment for reuse was no longer profitable and so music was entered in the margins or on blank folios rather than as palimpsests. While the fourteenth-century scribes in the Worcester Fragments did not write in the margins, they did take advantage of blank folios to enter new compositions. This may explain why the fourteenth-century hands only appear in Reconstruction III: it may be that it was the only source of the three Reconstructions with blank folios. Certainly it seems unlikely that Reconstruction II

[320] By contrast, a medieval codex such as a large Bible would have cost 200 to 400 animals to produce. Morgan and Thomson 2008, 76.

would have had blank folios by the fourteenth century, given the extensive recycling of pages as palimpsests. Indeed the only folio with fifteenth-century compositions added to Reconstruction II was on a page that had previously been partially scraped down by the early fourteenth-century scribes.[321]

To summarise, the Worcester Fragments show three distinct attitudes to recycling and preserving, updating and copying music. Early fourteenth century additions preserve the appearance of the codex by saving pre-existing decoration, integrating new material into the old as seamlessly as possible. Care was given for presentation, even by less-skilled scribes. A large percentage of compositions entered have concordances (compared to the original material) so it seems that the added material was not composed by the copyists. Later fourteenth-century scribes took advantage of blank folios rather than scraping down existing pages of music. Some aesthetic imitation and integration with earlier material persisted, but increasingly less so further into the century. By the fifteenth century, new compositions or compositional fragments, musical 'ideas', 'sketches' and individual and incomplete voice parts appear. Copying music could now be used for pedagogical and compositional purposes. As a result, we see the rise of works-in-progress, compositional sketches, notation tables, and in the case of the Worcester Fragments, short compositions that might have served a number of purposes.

[321] GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 35v.

4.1.4 Sixteenth-century bindings

The extent of the fragments' reuse in so many Worcester bindings is a unique case: over sixty fragments from only a handful of original sources survive, indicating that the entire manuscripts were available to the bookbinders. Thomson writes in his introduction of several new binding fragments from Worcester:

> It is an odd fact that in these campaigns the music fragments provide the only instance in which pieces of the same original book were used in more than one surviving binding; all of the many other fragments so used were – or are today – unica. Why would this be so? I suggest that the other fragments were available to the monastic binders already detached from whole books, and perhaps kept in store precisely for use as binding material. The motet books, on the other hand, were present as whole, or nearly whole books which the binders themselves cut up.… It may also be relevant that the fragments, unlike all the others, came from books never likely to have been kept in the 'library' but in a vestry or treasury, along with other liturgical books, vestments and the like. There they might have lain, unused, for some time.[322]

Reconstruction II was taken apart and used in bindings in the mid-fifteenth century at Worcester, while the fragments associated with Reconstructions I and III were broken up by a Worcester monk and bookbinder, John Musard, in the first half of the sixteenth century and re-used sometime between 1527-31 in the bindings of ten surviving manuscripts.[323] Most of the 'host' manuscripts of the Worcester Fragments have been identified and a number of these sources have been found to have a proven Worcester provenance.[324]

---

[322] Thomson 2000, 94.
[323] Summers and Lefferts 2016, 35.
[324] Losseff 1994, 70-71; Wibberley 1977, 12-14. More detailed analysis of each manuscript can be found in Thomson 2001, Floyer and Hamilton 1906, and for the Oxford manuscripts, Ivor Atkins and Neil R. Ker 1944.

4.2 Reconsidering a Worcester provenance for the Fragments

The evidence of the Worcester bindings shows without a doubt that the fragments were in fact at Worcester by the sixteenth century; the shared scribal concordances of fifteenth-century additions puts them in the same location at least fifty years earlier. In order to be as thorough as possible in re-examining a Worcester provenance for Reconstructions I, II, III and the many other manuscripts that make up the 'Worcester' Fragments, the analysis will be divided into three parts. The first two will approach the question of provenance from opposite ends. First, the 'profiles' of the sources must be constructed. Building on the knowledge of the sources' early history just examined, this section will use the noticeable paleographical and musical influences, characteristics and priorities to determine what kind of community or institution would mostly likely have created or used the fragments. In constructing a 'profile' of distinguishing characteristics of the interconnected Worcester Fragments, it may be possible to propose a hypothesis about the owner, creator and user of this body of manuscripts. To complement this approach, the second part will consider the atmosphere at Worcester in the thirteenth century to determine what kind of musical activity or manuscripts one would expect to find there, gathering evidence from the profile of Worcester Cathedral Library and from the manuscripts of known Worcester provenance. Finally, the third part will explore several scenarios of origin, taking into consideration the possibility of multiple different provenances for the various Reconstructions (and further fragments) and the likelihood of any of these sources being in Worcester before the fifteenth century.

4.2.1 A source-based approach

Considered together, the musical contents, paleographical features and early history of the Worcester Fragments all help to create a 'profile' of the manuscripts as objects of use, one that can help narrow down the location where the Worcester Fragments may have been copied and the (possibly different) community where they were employed. From looking at the repertory contained in the fragments, it is certain that the Reconstructions and their related fragments were originally created for a religious institution (or institutions). All the compositions are suitable either for liturgical or devotional use, all texts are Latin and a large number are Marian. Not only are there devotional compositions to Mary but many of the Mass settings also have Marian tropes and could have been used for Lady Masses. Devotion to Mary was widespread across insular institutions, so this does not really narrow down the potential source of the Worcester Fragments, but it does help to situate them in the context for which they may have been created and in which they may have been performed. The troped Sanctus settings represent a collection that incorporated current trends in insular and continental sources, this and the presence of insular and continental concordances for several compositions says something about the openness of the institution who owned them to an international repertory, while the later addition of *Thomas gemma* shows a political awareness of the community which used the manuscript when the motet was added.

A number of the fragments must have belonged to substantial collections of music in their day. Worcester Reconstruction I originally contained over 136 folios (a comparable collection size to Old Hall, which was originally 137 folios or more). Reconstruction II and GB-WOc Add.

68, frag. xviii and frag. xxxv fol. 5 were physically massive: only 8 insular sources are larger than Reconstruction II and only 5 larger than frag. xviii.[325] The consistent page preparation and flourished initial letters of Reconstruction II point to its creation by skilled textual, musical and decorative hands. Meanwhile the later additions to all the manuscripts in the fifteenth century suggest that the manuscripts by that point were owned by an institution that supported the learning and maybe even the composition of music.

In order to determine the provenance of a source, it is necessary to isolate those characteristics that make a manuscript definably local. Inclusion of certain saints over others, the use of liturgies or plainchant material particular to an institution or order, and imagery and theology in the text of compositions that refers to particular historical events or expresses religious or institutional affiliations may all provide information about a source's original provenance and early use. Both the absence and presence of these kinds of individual features are important to consider. Reconstructing a history of use has as much to do with what is missing as what is present. For example, the cult of St. Simon de Montfort was most closely tied to Worcester in the mid-thirteenth century. The bishop of Worcester at the time, Walter Cantilupe, was one of the main advocates of St. Simon de Montfort both before and after his death in 1265, although this might be too early for the Worcester Fragments – apparently Simon de Montfort's cult had significantly diminished by the 1270s.[326] Meanwhile St. Oswald, St. Wulfstan and St. Dunstan (three former bishops of Worcester) and of course St. Benedict all receive special recognition in

[325] Summers and Lefferts 2016, 7.
[326] Lefferts 1981, 203-225, esp. 206.

GB-WOc F. 160.[327] Mention of these saints in the Worcester Fragments would certainly strengthen the case for an original Worcester provenance – if the compositions were copied at (or at least commissioned for) Worcester we might expect to see these saints. Alternatively, the absence of these saints and presence of others that do not fit with the liturgical calendar of Worcester might suggest an original provenance elsewhere.

Many of the saints mentioned in the Worcester Fragments were widely popular throughout the thirteenth century and might be expected in any insular source of the period. Such figures include St. Katherine (WF numbers 12, 15, 22, 32), St. Nicholas (WF no. 39) and Saints Peter and Paul (WF no. 40). However, the inclusion of motets honouring local Saints Wenefred and Edburga in Reconstructions I and II may support the case for an early use in Worcester. St. Wenefred is honoured in the four-part motet *Inter choros paradiscolarum/ Invictis pueris* in fragment xii (WF no. 79).[328] The mention of Saint Edburga, at least in the early scholarship on the Worcester Fragments, was accepted to be a reference to St. Edburga of Pershore abbey, a local saint that is included in the calendar at Worcester.[329] The marginalium 'iubar in tenebris Eadburga refulsit in Arvis', substituting St. Edburga for St. Katherine in the motet *Virgo regalis fideli,* appears at the top of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxviii fol. 1a^{v} with a spelling apparently

[327] To a lesser extent, the antiphonal also contains music for the English Saints Cuthbert and Guthlac of Crowland. The Worcester Offices for Cuthbert and Wulfstan are mentioned in Rankin and Hiley, eds. 1993, 257 and 279.

[328] Wenefred was particularly revered in Wales (she was from Wales) and Shrewsbury, where her relics were housed. Hohler uses this to argue for a Shrewsbury origin of those Worcester Fragments with a reference to Wenefreda, although it must be noted that Wenefreda does appear in the Worcester Antiphoner. Hohler 1978, 29.

[329] Hohler 1978, 25. More information on Edburga and her cult can be found in Bugyis et. al., ed. 2017, 153-157 and Lisa Colton 2016, 73-75.

typical of Pershore.[330] That the hand does not appear in the main corpus of Reconstruction I is suggestive: likely the attribution to Edburga was a later amendment that reflects the location of the manuscript's early use and not its original provenance. Lisa Colton has convincingly shown that the original composition was undoubtedly written for St. Katherine, so the most plausible explanation is that the main body of Reconstruction I was copied in a location that did not have a connection to St. Edburga, and later came to be used at an institution which venerated the saint.[331]

Another unexpected reference to a saint is that of the Dominican St. Peter Martyr in the motet *O decus predicancium/T. [Agmina]*.[332] The motet appears in Reconstruction I, on GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xi, fol. 2v. The editorial choice of a composition honouring this saint in a music book owned by Benedictines is surprising. As Hohler put it:

> But whereas it is theoretically possible to argue that it (Reconstruction I) may once have included items in honour of S.Benedict, S.Wulfstan and S.Oswald and could thus have been a truly Worcester book, it is very difficult, on any such theory, to account for the certain presence in it of a composition (no.37 *O decus predicantium — … — [Agmina])* in honour of S.Peter Martyr, the murdered Dominican inquisitor, canonised 1254. He was never in the calendar of Worcester Cathedral and indeed never enjoyed much consideration in this country outside his own order.[333]

Perhaps the most interesting designation of a composition in the Worcester Fragments – and one that has so far been overlooked by scholars – is the rubric indicating that the monophonic

---

[330] Hughes 1928, 106. See also Thomson 2000, 95.
[331] Colton 2003, 225-232.
[332] Hohler 1978, 24.
[333] Ibid.

Ad honorem summi regis be sung for St. Edmund of Abingdon, erstwhile Archbishop of Canterbury (not the more widely popular St. Edmund, king and martyr of Bury St. Edmunds' fame, who is ascribed several chants in the Worcester Antiphoner).[334] *Ad honorem summi regis* was traditionally sung for the feast of St. Oswald, Bishop of Worcester and the chant appears twice in the Worcester Antiphoner in connection to Oswald's feast.[335] Yet in GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xviii the rubric clearly indicates 'De sancto Edmundo *Archiepiscopo* et confessorem' (FIGURE 4.5). The dedication makes little sense if the musical manuscript was originally written for Worcester, as the composition would surely have been sung for St. Oswald of Worcester. The connection to St Edmund might indicate an original provenance of an institution with a devotion to St. Edmund of Abingdon, possibly Oxford or Canterbury.[336] However, a further examination of the Worcester Antiphoner shows that on fol. 285r of GB-WOc F. 160, there is a similar marginal annotation next to *Ad honorem summi regis*, that it be sung for the feast of 'Edmundo confessorem' (FIGURE 4.5). Thus while an initial analysis may point to a provenance outside of Worcester, the attribution of the chant to Edmund actually links GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xviii to the same practice in the only musical manuscript with a known Worcester provenance, illustrating the complexities of attempting to determine the provenance of a manuscript based on its inclusion (or absence) of significant saints.

---

[334] GB-WOc F. 160, fol. 405.

[335] GB-WOc F. 160 is of known Worcester provenance. The two original volumes were created at and for Worcester Cathedral Priory in the early thirteenth-century, while erasures of references to the pope and Becket in both the Antiphoner and Kalendar show that they were used after the Reformation. Thomson 2001, 108-109.The chants mentioned are in GB-WOc F. 160, fol. 285r and fol. 220. Oswald is one of the most venerated saints in the Worcester Antiphoner. Losseff missed examining the connection because her examination of chants in the Worcester Antiphoner was confined to the folios of Reconstructions I, II and III.

[336] Abingdon is 7 miles south of Oxford and Edmund was a lecturer in Oxford.

To summarise, the evidence of one saint's original inclusion (the Dominican St. Peter), the absence of others (St. Benedict, St. Wulfstan and most notably, St. Oswald), and later alterations (the St. Edburga marginalia, the palimpsest addition honouring St. Wenefred, the St. Edmund marginalia in both GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxviii and the GB-WOc F. 160 and a motet honouring a Benedictine martyr, Thomas of Dover) all seem to point to the same conclusion: that at least some of the Worcester Fragments were neither written at nor commissioned expressly for Worcester, but may have come to be used there by the early fourteenth century. As to where the fragments might have been copied, Oxford emerges as a strong contender given both the link with Edmund of Abingdon and the Dominican connections in *Sanctus et eternus Deus* and *O decus predicancium/T. [Agmina].* Alternatively, Hohler offers Shrewsbury (for the St. Wenefred connection) and London (for the political undercurrent of *Thomas gemma*).[337] It remains to be seen whether paleographical features and musical content will undermine or agree with the testimony of the saints.

4.2.2 A location-based approach

Thus far, it seems unlikely that Worcester was the original provenance of many of the 'Worcester Fragments', however it is worth considering the reconsidering the possibility of manuscript production at Worcester in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. Even if Worcester were not the place of creation for some of the Worcester Fragments, it may have been where the 'updates' or later compositions to the Reconstructions and their related

[337] Ibid.

fragments were added. Moreover the Worcester Cathedral Library was the home for many years of the Worcester Fragments and is undeniably a part of their history: if not in their first state, then at least as a part of their history of reuse in rebinding.

Compared to similar establishments in medieval England, the Worcester Cathedral Library was significant in several ways. The Benedictine community of Worcester itself was rather average in size ranging from some 50 to 60 monks between its peak in the twelfth century to its dissolution in the sixteenth.[338] However, with almost 300 manuscripts in its library, most surviving from the pre-Reformation priory, the Worcester Cathedral collection is second only to that of Durham among English Cathedral libraries. A further 124 manuscripts, held in archives across the UK, can also be ascribed a Worcester origin.[339] Unfortunately, unlike Durham, very little documentation about the library survives. There are no contemporary accounts, inventories, catalogues, records of purchase, donations, bequests or any similar documents that might give a clue to the size of its medieval collection. The earliest catalogue of the Worcester library dates back to 1622 and contains no mention of musical books.[340] Thomson's recent study of the library compares the Worcester cathedral collection to other similar collections of the time, estimating that it consisted of over a thousand books. If this

[338] Greatrex 1997, 754-6. The volume includes a register of Worcester Cathedral Priory from the time of the Norman Conquest to the mid-sixteenth century, compiled from contemporary sources.
[339] Gullick in Thomson 2001.
[340] Young 1944, Atkins & N. R. Ker, eds. Patrick Young's 1622/3 catalogue of Worcester Cathedral library is the oldest surviving one of the library, and the only pre-Restoration one. It originally belonged to Selden, and was one of a collection of five catalogues of Cathedral libraries compiled by Patrick Young for James I. The purpose of cataloguing the libraries seems to have been to identify those codices which the library had more than one copy of, so that the extra copies - the 'dubble maniscripts' as they are referred to in the correspondence between James I and Worcester - might be sent to the new library at Westminster Abbey. The catalogue is useful for ascertaining the losses Worcester library suffered in the seventeenth century, and also for giving a more complete view of what the library's original collection may have looked like.

were true, the books surviving today represent at most only a third of the library that once existed.[341]

Worcester Cathedral Library is significant for another reason, one that might explain why such a large proportion of English polyphonic music of the thirteenth century ended up in the bindings of its manuscripts. A decree made by the General Chapter of Benedictines in 1277 required that the monks replace outdoor manual labour with such indoor work as book production.[342] The decree had the effect of increasing the local copying of manuscripts, many of which were made in the Cathedral Priory, and which in some cases can be traced to a particular monk-scribe. Not only were many of the manuscripts produced in Worcester but – more significantly for this study of the Worcester Fragments – they were also reused in binding there. According to Michael Gullick, Worcester Cathedral Library houses one of the largest collections of medieval bindings in the UK and almost half of its extant medieval codices survive in original bindings.[343]

From the early fourteenth century, there are records of the work of the precentor. In other institutions of the period, the precentor was usually in charge of the monastic library; however at Worcester, the work seems to have had mostly to do with the purchasing and copying of service books. In the early fourteenth century, Bishop Maidstone allocated an annual amount of 40s to the copying and repair of books – the precentor's rolls from the fourteenth century record the purchase of parchment and ink for the production of service-books and for the

[341] Thomson 2001, xviii.
[342] Ibid., xxv.
[343] Ibid. The library contains over a hundred medieval bindings, most of which date from after 1200.

binding and repair of books, including a Processional, Psalters, Passionals, an Ordinal, a Diurnal and a Gradual.[344]Wages show that a single scribe worked in the precentory and the room also housed a bindery from the late fourteenth century.[345]

Accounts of musical books of the library are limited and are all much later than the original production of the Worcester Fragments. In 1398-9, the precentor's records show that four old books were acquired, 'in i. libro notando' – thus at least one of the books must have had musical notation, although it is not clear what kind of notation this would have been.[346] Much later, a note from Stephen Richardson, a chapter clerk in the 1660s records the destruction of certain manuscripts including a music book from which 'eighteen leaves were removed 'when it was in the hands of the committee' although the book still contains '48 leaves'. If Richardson meant that 48 leaves of the same musical book were preserved in the 1660s, then it seems that many more fragments of music were lost after the Civil War than previously thought.[347]

Starting from the late thirteenth-century, a number of books were acquired through the studies of monks in Oxford. Following the intellectual pursuits of the Dominicans before them, the General Chapter of the Benedictines issued decrees for the formation of a house of studies in Oxford in 1277, and in 1283 the new 'Gloucester College' was founded. From the 1291, Worcester supported at least two scholars annually at Oxford – indeed between 1291 until 1540 (the date of the dissolution of the Priory) at least 48 monks attended Oxford, which

[344] Ibid., xxxi.
[345] Ibid.
[346] Ibid., xxxii.
[347] Ibid., xxxiv.

represents no fewer than ten percent of all the monks in Worcester during that period. A number of the books in the Cathedral Library were acquired from monks reading at Oxford, some produced in Oxford, some collected there and a few that are the notebooks of the student-monks themselves. The intellectual life at Worcester Cathedral Priory and the number of university-educated scholar-monks in Worcester reached its peak in the early 1300s.[348]

The connection to Oxford is particularly notable when the dating of Reconstruction II, the main body of Reconstruction I and their related fragments are taken into account – they would have been produced in the late thirteenth century, and may well have been brought to Worcester from Oxford. This might account for the variable appearance in presentation of individual gatherings and sources, which may have been produced in various workshops and collected in Oxford. An Oxford provenance for Reconstruction I might also make sense of the inclusion of the Dominican St. Peter martyr (the Dominican's main house was in Oxford). Of course, Oxford and Worcester were not the only source of manuscripts for the Worcester Cathedral Library's collection. The library received donations of books from individuals and incorporated whole collections from the personal libraries of priors and bishops.[349] However, the dating of the Worcester Fragments and the fact that they were produced by different 'workshops' fits well with an Oxford dissemination, though the original place of production for the various books represented by the fragments must still be considered individually.

[348] Following the Dissolution, no further monks were sent to Oxford so the College became first the palace of the bishop of Oxford, then an annex of St. John's College and was finally incorporated into Worcester College in 1714. Thomson 2001; I. A. Doyle 1990, 1-19 and Patin, ed. 1931-7.
[349] Ker 1964, 61.

There is a substantial number of manuscripts from the Worcester Cathedral Library contemporary with the various scribal copying phases found in the Worcester Fragments. The majority of these are still held at the Worcester Cathedral Library, although there is a sizeable collection in the British Library in London as well. TABLE 4.2 shows all extant manuscripts dating from the period of the Worcester Fragments that were part of the library of Worcester Cathedral before the Reformation. Those manuscripts earlier than 1200, those written after 1500, and those that were added to the Worcester Cathedral Library after the Reformation have been excluded. The information for their selection and dating has been compiled from Young's catalogue, Rodney Thomson's catalogue, The British Library Catalogue, the Medieval Libraries of Great Britain Project (MLGB3) and private communication with Mr. David Morrison, Worcester Librarian.[350] Several of the sources were produced in Italy and France, but the majority were made in England, and a number were definitely created at Worcester. Those with specific content to suggest creation for – even at – Worcester (such as the inclusion of local saints), or that the manuscript was in Worcester at an early date (marginal notes or early additions to the manuscript) are marked in bold. Those manuscripts that were almost certainly produced in Worcester are underlined, and those that were likely produced or at least acquired in Oxford appear in red. The majority of these are professionally made but some (GB-WOc F56, F65, F69, F73, F118 and F128) were produced by students, most likely Worcester monks studying at Oxford's Gloucester College.[351] Books acquired in Oxford are the largest subsection of the 13th and 14th century books, substantially larger than the number of surviving

[350] Young 1944; Thomson 2001.The MLGB3 project, directed by James Willoughby and Richard Sharpe can be found online at http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/about/. Some of the British Library manuscripts have been digitized; these listed online at http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/. Descriptions of the majority of the manuscripts at Worcester can be found in Thomson 2001.

[351] For example, GB-WOc F97 was brought to Oxford from Italy.

manuscripts that were definitely produced in Worcester. This represents a change from the twelfth century, when many more books (at least from the surviving collection) were produced in Worcester.[352]

Having examined the majority of manuscripts with a definite Worcester provenance and a number of further Worcester manuscripts from the Bodleian Library, the British Library and Worcester Cathedral Library, a number of observations can be made. First, the books from the earlier thirteenth century (contemporary with the Worcester Antiphoner) show a more consistent style of illumination than those from the latter half of the century. There are two limners in particular that may have been professional scribes employed by the Cathedral (though not necessarily at the Cathedral), for their hands appear on several otherwise unrelated books of Worcester provenance.

Decoration style 1: Alternating light blue and red painted initials, with simple, floral embellishments branching off the stems of letters. The colour of the blue ink is different from other manuscripts of this period; it has an almost purple-tinted hue.

Decorative style 2: Very elaborate red and blue initial letters and line fillers. Red and blue penwork initials can be seen everywhere in thirteenth-century manuscripts, but these are of a very high quality.

[352] Thomson estimates that about fifty of the surviving books were made at Worcester in the twelfth century. Thomson 2001, xxii.

The beginning of the Worcester Antiphoner (GB-WOc F. 160) is decorated by this second style, not only the large flourished initials but also the smaller, interior initial letters correspond to other, non-musical manuscripts produced at Worcester at the same time (FIGURE 4.6). Thus at least in the first half of the thirteenth-century, the connection between Worcester musical and non-musical manuscripts is apparent. The text and music hands of the fragments from the thirteenth century tell a different story. None of the main identified hands from Reconstructions I, II and III can be found in thirteenth-century manuscripts produced at Worcester, and the original decorations are very different. Even the foliation where it occurs looks nothing like the foliation of Reconstruction I. FIGURE 4.7 shows the medieval foliation from Reconstruction I paired with another Worcester binding fragment, taken from a thirteenth-century Bible, GB-WOc MS PF11.[353] It might be argued that the creators of musical manuscripts would not necessarily be the same scribes as those who created the purely textual sources – that it would be less likely that there would be a correlation of hands between non-musical and musical sources because the scribes of the latter would have to be musically proficient. However, an institution such as Worcester was not large enough to have two separate 'workshops' of scribes operating completely independently of each other, and even if the text and music hands of the musical manuscripts had been copied by different people than the other codices of the Worcester Library, at least the decorative hands might be expected to be the same.

[353] It must be noted that foliation can often occur considerably after a manuscript has been assembled, and so is not always a reliable indicator of original scribal provenance; however in Reconstruction I, it does seem that one of the limners (D1) also foliated the volume.

Thomson has previously called attention to the difference between professionally-acquired manuscripts and those produced 'in- house' at Worcester from the late thirteenth century until the Dissolution – those manuscripts produced locally have, as Thomson describes it, 'a distinctly "home-made" and homely appearance' with a low-grade parchment and anglicana script or low-grade gothic rotunda bookhand, with no decoration.[354] As we have seen, littera textualis is used throughout the Worcester Fragments, in both semi-quadrata and rotunda bookhand form that is generally of a more professional ilk than the 'in-house' Worcester manuscripts. However, there is also evidence that the monks were not the only copyists at Worcester. A letter from the Prior of Worcester to Evesham's abbot dated 1306 appears to reference a paid professional scribe in the Priory's employ, and there is evidence that the precentor had a paid scribe as well.[355]

Another observation that can be made about the non-musical manuscripts that formed a part of the Worcester Library in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, is that they had a long history of reuse; among those that were either produced in Worcester or were there at an early date, many contain various 'layers' of additions comparable to those seen in Reconstruction II. Earlier, more professionally decorated manuscripts have later (possibly local, less-experienced) hands added in a more informal script and with simpler limning. Some of the manuscripts that were not created at Worcester were added to or annotated there. GB-WOc F. 37, for example,

[354] This is in contrast to the scriptorium of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries at Worcester which was much more skilled and provided decoration such as the initials seen in the GB-WOc F. 160. Thomson 2001, xxv; Gullick 1998, 1-24.
[355] Thomson 2001, xxv. The scribe was copying a manuscript of Aquinas's Commentary on Luke, lent by the Abbot of Evesham.

was professionally produced in England – probably at Oxford – but later annotated by Worcester monks.[356] It has a long history of annotations in hands from 1300-1500. One advantage of studying these books is that many are complete or in a near-complete form: one can study how they were compiled over time, and 'updated' both in content and appearance. The most interesting case is the addition of text to GB-Ob Bodley 828, a manuscript with marginal annotations that show that it was in Worcester at least by the fifteenth-century. The limner appears to be the same as the one who decorated 'Ad honorem summi regis' in GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xviii (FIGURE 4.8). Not only are the shape of initial letters similar, but the floral decorations that fill them bear a striking resemblance to those of frag. xviii, and the unusual blue-green pigment is identical, as is the slightly orange-tinted red penwork: these similarities stand out when compared to a substantial number of other sources of the period. Moreover, it is significant that these initials in Bodley 828 represent a later addition to the manuscript. The earlier, main section is decorated with red and blue penwork initials typical of earlier thirteenth-century Worcester manuscripts, such as those depicted in FIGURE 4.6. If frag. xviii was produced at Worcester, it would be entirely consistent with other manuscripts known to have been produced in Worcester during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries: the earlier books with a more elaborate decoration and professional script, the later, written and decorated more informally. Of course the consequences of such identifications only directly affect frag. xviii, as the fragment does not share scribal concordances with the other Worcester Fragments. However it does raise questions about whether the kind of decoration of added material seen in frag. xviii is something that is particular to Worcester, and if so, what implications that might

[356] Thomson 2001, 24.

have for Reconstruction II and GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 23-24 which, as seen before, show a similar attitude towards decorating later additions.

A similar history of use is also true for the Worcester Antiphoner (GB-WOc F. 160). While the original production phase was professionally executed, later additions were in a more informal hand. Among these, there is a possible scribal concordance with the Worcester Fragments. The text and music hands of the added Magnificats on fol. 285v and 286r of GB-WOc F. 160 are similar to the work of T4 and M4 (Workshop 3) although there is just enough difference between the scripts to warrant a cautious reading of the similarities (FIGURE 4.9). Note especially the shape of the 'c' clef, the 'scooped' appearance of the right hand side of noteheads from the curved penstroke and the long, thin tails for longae which can occasionally veer to the left. The nib of the pen for the music hand (both shape and the size of the stroke for the noteheads) seems to be similar as well. For the text hand, some characteristic forms include suspensions with stems, the 'g' with a trailing descender, the angle of the 'e' and the flagged majuscule 'A'. As seen in before, this hand changes significantly over the folios that it appears on, adopting more formal or informal styles depending on whether the hand was entered on blank parchment or palimpsests. The presentation in GB-WOc F. 160 seems to be between the two versions previously outlined in Chapter 2; it is not as beautifully copied as GB-WOc Add 68., frag. xxxv, fol. 5, but is more cleanly executed than the copies in the Worcester palimpsests. It is impossible to tell whether this is the work of one scribe with several slightly different hands, or multiple scribes imitating each other. But the varied nature of hand may indicate a less-skilled scribe. Professionals had distinctive styles, and spent years developing

techniques, but someone copying locally may not have developed as distinctive or 'codified' style and so it would not be surprising to see more variety in the hand. In the end it really does not matter which of the two scenarios is accurate. As the late thirteenth-century hand D5 and the early fourteenth-century hand T33 have shown before, imitation can be as indicative of shared provenance as scribal concordance – the appearance of a style of script and decoration in a manuscript or several manuscripts can either because they were produced in the same scriptorium or came to be used in the same location. Whether the scribe who entered new music and text into the Worcester Antiphoner was the same one who produced certain folios of the 'Worcester Fragments', or whether the former was imitating the latter (or vice versa) does not really matter. What is significant is that there is a similar form of presentation in music script, text hand and (to some extent) decoration that is too alike to be merely a coincidence.

Additionally, of the four compositions this hand copies in Reconstruction II, two have either some connection to the Benedictine order in general (*Thomas gemma* honouring Thomas Hale) or to Worcester specifically (*Inter choros paradiscolarum* in honour of St. Wenefred). That these additions, and possibly the Magnificats in F. 160, should have been copied by a monk at Worcester is a tantalising idea. However, only a few preliminary observations about the copyist can be made on the basis of the compositions surviving in his hand. That he copied motets and troped chant settings into a book of troped chant settings might show that he had a more fluid concept of genre (as explored in Chapter 3), while the high number of compositions with concordances (a quarter of the material he copies) suggests that he was not composing, but rather collecting musical material. Meanwhile the palimpsest additions to Reconstruction II show an innovative reuse of old decorative elements and lead to further questions about the

relationships between the Reconstructions. The only palimpsests in the Worcester Fragments appear in Reconstruction II (extensively) and on GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20, fol. 24v. While it is clear that Reconstruction I was also edited, it does not have any palimpsest texts. Moreover it is obvious from later fourteenth-century additions to Reconstruction III, that there were folios of ruled staves but not text. This might mean that Reconstruction I and III were not available to T4/M4, and that the similar hand in Reconstruction III (discussed in Chapter 2) belonged to a different scribe. The palimpsests could represent the value of the book to its owner, as the later additions were decorated with red and blue initials similar to those of the original pages. Chapter 3's look at the customised Sanctus settings (customised in the sense that the tropes are poetical, extensive and newly-composed rather than popular widely-used tropes) might suggest that the book had particular significance to the institution that owned it and was preserved and decorated in such a manner because it was commissioned for the institution that updated it. Alternatively, it could simply be that the book was preserved because of its monetary value. The only specific connection among the original compositions is the Dominican reference in *Sanctus et eternus Deus*. If the updates did occur at Worcester – which seems likely given the reference to Wenefred and Thomas Hale and the possible scribal concordance with GB-WOc F. 160 – then the more likely interpretation is that Reconstruction II was collected rather than commissioned by Worcester and, as it was not compiled with the Worcester community in mind, contained a lot of material that was not used and could be replaced.

A preliminary comparison with the majority of thirteenth-century polyphonic sources of the period has revealed that T4 and M4's attitude towards copying palimpsest text is unusual,

although not unique. Only two other fragments decorate their additions to the same extent that the T4 and M4 do. In GB-Lbl Add. MS 50120, a chant setting added to a book of polyphony is decorated with red and black flourished initials and simple line fillers. Other than that it is a decorated addition, it bears no resemblance to the Worcester palimpsests. GB-ABnlw 22857 E, fol. 4, on the other hand, shares many similarities with the additions to Reconstruction II. It is a palimpsest copied over an Alleluia setting, the palimpsest text has a concordance with one of Reconstruction II's palimpsests (*Regnum tuum solidum* in GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xii, fol. 1r) and the decorative hand embellishes the Tenor in the same way that D1 does for *Thomas gemma* and *Inter choros paradiscolarum* (FIGURE 4.10).[357] The decorative figure at end of the tenor part on GB-ABnlw 22857 E, fol. 4 does not match those found in the Worcester Fragments, but does look like the one from the lost leaf found on offset of the board of GB-Ob Bodley 862 which has been connected to the Worcester Fragments.[358] It must be pointed out that despite these similarities, the dissertation does not consider GB-ABnlw 22857 E to be scribal concordance with Worcester, the similarities do show that it is right to be cautious about assigning the Bodley offset too quickly with the Worcester Fragments, and the appearance of the double-helix line filler in GB-ABnlw 22857 shows that line fillers alone are not a reliable scribal identifier. While it is clear that the attitude of the palimpsest hands of Reconstruction II is not entirely unique, it is rare. And thus far at least, it seems the reuse of decoration as seen with the recycling of a 'K' as an 'I' is unique to Reconstruction II.

[357] The fragment has no reliable provenance although Summers and Lefferts date its original copying to the third quarter of the century and palimpsest text to ca. 1300; these correspond to Reconstruction II's original and palimpsest copying dates (Summers and Lefferts 2016, 12). All that is known of its provenance is that, bizarrely enough, it was used 'in the stuffing of the cushion of a 16th-century chair in Machynlleth' after having been the cover of a small document.

[358] Most recently by Summers and Lefferts 2016, 35.

The paleographical and musical evidence of both the Worcester Fragments themselves and other contemporary Worcester manuscripts indicates that the fragments were not produced at Worcester but that at least GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xviii and Reconstruction II were probably brought to Worcester by the early thirteenth century – and by extension, Reconstruction I and III if the scribal concordances (marked in TABLE 3.7 with dotted lines) are correct. Christopher Hohler surmised as much forty years ago, when he hypothesised about the origin of the Worcester Fragments:

> They were manifestly choirmaster's books; and it is a fair guess that they were lumber from the Cathedral singing school. But how old they were when they arrived, and how soon they were left to gather dust in cupboards, are really not questions to which the surviving fragments can provide any answers… and if the song school at Worcester is indeed the source of the books whence these fragments came, I should guess that they had been left there by professional singing masters, hired by the Priory, who had brought them with them.[359]

Hohler may not have been able to say how old the manuscripts were when they arrived and for how long they were used, but the evidence of the Worcester Fragments' early history shows that they were used throughout the fourteenth century, were all at the same institution in the fifteenth century, and were kept in complete form into the sixteenth century, right up until they were dismantled and used in binding. The repertory in the main body of Reconstruction I and Reconstruction II dates to the 1270s and 80s so it is possible that those manuscripts were

[359] Hohler 1978, 23-24.

ten to twenty years old already by the time T4 and M4 added new material to them, although of course copying date cannot be determined by date of compositions alone. The continued use and editing of the manuscripts as shown by their early history suggests that at least at least Reconstructions I and II were performed from and adapted to a particular community, probably one to whom the cult of saints Eadburga and Thomas of Dover was significant.

4.2.3 Further theories of provenance

In the light of discoveries on the paleographical and musical composition of the Worcester Fragments, it is worth re-examining the probability of a centre of polyphonic composition and performance in Reading and Worcester, or the 'Westcuntre'. For ease of reference, FIGURE 4.11 gives a map with the main locations included in the following discussion. In all, the manuscript evidence points to an early use at Worcester, although the original locations of composition and copying still need to be considered. Reconstruction I (specifically, the group of middle folios produced by Workshop 2) was altered in ways that suggest that it was not originally composed for the institution that ended up using them, as clarifications were needed for the tenor texts and the designation 'pes'. Reconstruction II shares possible concordances of script and decoration with a manuscript of known Worcester origin, but only in the case of its palimpsest additions and not for its original phase of production, which tells us that it was probably edited but not produced at Worcester. In addition, we know from both the documentation about the copying of manuscripts at Worcester and the surviving examples of manuscripts produced at Worcester that the output of manuscript production in the thirteenth

century was fairly modest, and manuscripts produced during the mid to late thirteenth century were not professionally made and were decorated either minimally or not at all.

In this, Worcester was like other monastic institutions of the time. By the end of the twelfth century, the copying of manuscripts was generally not done by the monks but rather, monasteries employed professionals to do their copying work for them.[360] On the other hand it is clear that some manuscripts (including music manuscripts) were copied and even composed in other Benedictine intuitions of the period. The list of lost compositions in GB-Lbl Harley 978 includes polyphony by Robert Burgate (the Abbot of Reading) and a certain 'W. de Wic' is given as the composer of several Alleluia settings in the list; he is generally accepted to be the same person as William of Wicumbe, a scribe and composer active in the Severn Valley during the late thirteenth century.[361] As the precentor of Leominster Priory in the 1270s, he copied a number of books, including a collectarium for the subprior of Reading Abbey, a precentor's troper and processional, a book of Marian Mass settings written on 'his own parchment', a 'summary' and a treatise on music, a history of St. Margaret written by a Hugo de Wicb to which W. de Wic added music, and two polyphonic rotuli.[362] One of the rotuli of GB-Ob c. 400* contains a History of St. Margaret as described by W. de Wic, and scholars have

[360] Ker 1960, 10-12. At Reading, there is nothing to suggest that large-scale copying occurred after the end of the twelfth century. Taylor 2002, 94.

[361] References can be found in Gb-Ob Bod.125 attest to his stay at the priory, a copy of the *Collationes* of Octo of Cluny dating to the twelfth century. On fol. 98v-99r, a Brother 'W. de Wicb' describes completing copying tasks assigned to him during his time at Leominster, some of which he considered onerous. Losseff 1994, 66. Taylor 2002, 93, 116.

[362] Sanders believes that W. de Wic compiled the list of the books he copied. Sanders 1980, 552.

connected the manuscript as being the rotulus to which the Reading scribe referred.[363] Sanders has suggested the composer might even have been behind the famous Reading rota *Sumer is icumen in*, hypothesising that it might be 'even conceivable that W. de Wic composed the rota itself, a good many years before he was sent to Leominster'.[364]

The manuscript most closely associated with the idea of a 'Westcuntre school' is of course GB-Lbl Harley 978, which contains not only the famous 'Summer Canon' but also a number of other polyphonic compositions and monophonic songs along with its non-musical contents. Various hypotheses of ownership have been put forth for this collection: that it was the property of an itinerant teacher who only later joined the community at Reading; that it was a private collection acquired in Oxford and owned by William of Winchester, a monk of Reading notable for his taste in music and lascivious behaviour, whose name can be found on fol. 160v along with a list of compositions; or that it was the work of 'a small group of educated enthusiasts' with an interest both in literature and music who assembled the collection of texts and music at Reading.[365]

The hypothesis that GB-Lbl Harley 978 should have been produced at Oxford, possibly by multiple workshops, is of particular interest when considering the case of Worcester

[363] See Dittmer, 1954 and Losseff, 1994. Losseff points out the difference between language in 'W. de Wic's copying of the music for the History of St Margaret and the rest of the contents of the rotuli. He uses 'scripsit eciam' for the rolls but 'notam cantus ipse W. imposuit' to describe the music for St. Margaret, suggesting that the rest of the music in GB-Ob c. 400* was not composed by W. de Wic.
[364] Sanders 1980, 53.
[365] Hohler 1978; Taylor 2002, 76-136; Deeming 2015, especially 139-140.

Reconstruction I, which seems to be produced by separate 'workshops' of trained professionals who each had a different system of page preparation, pricking, ruling, copying order and decoration. With regard to GB-Lbl Harley 978's production, Andrew Taylor has shown that it was the work of three main scribes, each independently producing different parts of the miscellany, with no scribal overlap.[366] He proposes that GB-Lbl Harley 978 was either prepared by Oxford scriveners on commission, or that it was compiled from booklets that the scriveners had already produced and were selling separately to private buyers.[367] Neither of these is entirely convincing in the case of GB-Lbl Harley 978, since the preparation of the pages and ruling is constant for all but one of the sections.[368] Taylor interprets this similarity by saying that the individual sections may have come from the same workshop or all from the scriveners of Catte Street. It does seem more likely that they were produced at the same workshop, given the consistency of format, but still does not explain why the main hand of the manuscript copies a calendar and obits for the use of Reading, and even calls for prayers for 'our brother' John Fornset.[369] Moreover, Helen Deeming has shown that there is evidence that an international repertory of songs was available in Reading and that the edits to the songs in GB-Lbl Harley 978 suggest that its owners composed not only polyphony but were also responsible for composing some of the monophonic songs in the manuscript.[370]

---

[366] Taylor 2002, 95-8.
[367] Ibid., 99.
[368] Taylor 2002, 88.
[369] Ibid., 99.
[370] The many unique and 'musically reworked' items lend credence to theory of local composition for some of the songs. Deeming 2015, 139.

While the Oxford workshop hypothesis may thus be problematic in the case of GB-Lbl Harley 978, it makes much more sense for Reconstruction I, which shows a greater division between sections in that not only includes scribal hands and decorations, but different habits of page preparation and ruling, styles of notation, and even attitude towards genre, as seen in the inclusion (or not) of the designation 'pes' for tenor. We might draw a comparison here to Cuthbert's work on Italian fragments of the same period. The 'Paduan fragments', a collection of Trecento fragments produced at the scriptorium in St. Giustina, show such a degree of similarity in page preparation, format, folio size, pricking and ruling that, even where the fragments are not part of the same codex, it is possible to ascribe them to the same workshop.[371] If the Worcester Fragments had been produced at same workshop, we might expect to see such similarities. Conversely, the fact that there is a consistent treatment of format, page preparation and ruling in the gatherings belonging to each Workshop strengthens the theory that these sources may have been produced by professionals who had honed their craft and were thus more consistent in creating manuscripts than, for example, the palimpsest hands T4 and M4 who copy in a variety of different scripts and formats. This fits well with the idea that the individual gatherings of manuscript of Reconstruction I might have been collected from several scriveners in Catte Street, whose notations and styles might not exactly have corresponded with those that the Worcester musicians were familiar with, leading to clarifications to notation (as seen in the *Sanctus et eternus Deus*) and tenor parts (as seen in the *Ave magnifica Maria* and 'pes' tenors). The idea of multiple 'workshops' in a similar location (even the same street) also means that these independent gatherings might have been collected at a similar point in time; that they did not circulate independently for long is obvious from the lack of the kind of wear on

[371] Cuthbert 2006, 205-229.

the outer edges of folios and the first and last folios of gatherings that one might expect from 'fascicle manuscripts' that circulated independently for an undetermined time.

An alternate idea, one preliminarily put forth in Chapter 2, is that some manuscripts might have circulated with text only, been commissioned (or bought) from professional workshops and the music added later. As seen before, insular manuscripts that are incomplete seem to point to an order of copying where the text was often first and music last, meaning that it is poissible that the manuscript could have been collected or commissioned with text and decoration only. In the case of GB-Ob c. 400* the process was never taken further; in the case of GB- GB-Cjc QB 1, the text and decoration were clearly done by professionals before the music was entered. If these kinds of copying transmissions occurred, it would allow more flexibility for the hiring of scribes and the acquiring of materials because, while the notation of polyphonic music was a specialist skill, professionally-copied texts could be copied more widely. The absence of any contemporary documentation of this practice (other than the testimony of unfinished manuscripts) leaves a lot of questions unanswered. Who dictated what pieces were copied – were compositions commissioned and some kind of text exemplar sent to the professional scribe or did musicians collect already-produced fascicles containing the text of musical compositions? The latter might make sense if the compositions found in Reconstruction II had more concordances, but it does not fit well with what we know from Chapter 3 about newly-composed, unique 'supercharged' tropes. Moreover, given the perfect text setting and often custom-ruled staves of Reconstruction II, it is clear that the text scribe must have been made aware of layout of the compositions. Alternatively it could be argued that

text scribe's lack of familiarity with the text (as seen in the miscopied, erased and corrected 'pleni sunt celi' section mentioned in Chapter 2) shows that the copyist was encountering these particular new tropes for first time, while the neatly executed script speaks to the work of a professional. Whether the music was also entered professionally cannot be answered from the copying phase alone, except that it is clear that text hand and ruler worked together. The extensive re-writes of music shown in Chapter 3 might be interpreted either way – that the notator was editing his own work might speak to a professional with high standards or conversely, someone who was still honing his ability to notate music. This might be why the music scribe was dissatisfied with his work and extensively rewrote sections (as opposed to the text hand, who only corrected the mistake mentioned earlier). The section where a fragment of staff was entered in a different ink (highlighted in Chapter 2) shows that, unlike the text scribe, the notator did not have a close relationship with ruler and leaves open the possibility that the music may have being copied elsewhere. It might even lend credence to the theory that the music hand was not a professional; otherwise he might be expected to have equipment to rule staves himself.

By contrast, the multiple hands of Workshop 2 (the middle gatherings of Reconstruction I) seem to point to a group of scribes working in collaboration, with decoration occurring as a last stage: in the case of GB-WOc Add. 68, frag. xxviii, fol. 2v, the decorations were added to all four text and music hands on the folio. In all, the multiple different presentation styles seem to support the idea that the gatherings of Reconstruction I were collected from several different 'workshops'. Meanwhile the fact that the additions to the Reconstructions have a higher percentage of concordances than the original content would seem to discredit the idea of a

'Worcester school of polyphony' and leave room for the interpretation that the medieval users adding to the fragments were collectors and performers, rather than composers.

Previously Anselm Hughes also proposed the idea of a Worcester-Oxford connection, but he believed the 'school of polyphony' moved from Worcester to Oxford:

> As to the subsequent fate of this Worcester school, it may possibly be lawful to conjecture that it shifted about the close of the fourteenth century to Oxford, where Walter de Odington, of Evesham, had paved the way a hundred years earlier, where many other eminent theorists had taught, among them John de Muris and John de Gadandia, perhaps. We may believe some kind of extinction or reaction to have occurred at Worcester, to account for the contemptuous way in which the musical MSS were sent to the hinders' workshop, at a date well before the Dissolution; and that some sort of a gap occurred before the second or later school, the repertoire of which has been quoted above, arose in the late fifteenth century…This later school was presumably in closer touch with the rest of the musical world than was the former, for knowledge was by now becoming more widely diffused, and less likely to be concentrated in favourable centres.[372]

From the troped Sanctus settings of Reconstruction II, it is clear that the Worcester Fragments represent an awareness of international attitudes towards troping and the wider insular trend of genre 'hybridisation', so the idea of an isolated school of polyphony can be put to rest. A more plausible explanation for the 'gap' (if these collections were indeed being used at Worcester) is that Worcester simply stopped collecting books for a period, not that the school of polyphony moved away and then back again in the fifteenth century. The dearth of fourteenth-century polyphony might be on account of changing priorities of musicians at Worcester (although there is no documentary evidence of this) or it is possible that there were fourteenth-century manuscripts, but that for some reason they were not used in the Worcester binding campaigns

[372] Hughes 1928, 28.

(or not used in the extant books from these campaigns) and thus have not survived to the present day. Given that only a minority of English fourteenth-century polyphonic sources have survived – most in a fragmentary state – it would be unwise to take the current absence of music manuscripts as an indication that no fourteenth-century music manuscripts were used at Worcester.

Hohler also proposed a London or Oxford origin for many polyphonic thirteenth-century sources, with London as a main source of production and Oxford as a main locus for dissemination of liturgical polyphony, including the Worcester Fragments. Hohler considers that the evidence of musical content in the Worcester Fragments (specifically the inclusion of Dominican saints) means that the Dominicans were more likely to be involved in the Fragments' production; that 'Benedictines had in general less to do with the matter than Dominicans'.[373] He ascribes a number of the Reading-associated music manuscripts (including GB-Lbl Harley 978) to a wider geographical area, including Salisbury, Shrewsbury, and especially London and Oxford and further asserts that there is no evidence for the professional production of polyphonic books in the West of England, nor indeed for a particularly influential 'school' of composition. This London-Oxford hypothesis is further built around the idea that Anonymous IV was not employed at Bury St Edmunds, but that the theorist was instead attached to Oxford:

[373] Hohler 1978, 28.

> It is usually assumed that Anonymous IV had returned home from Paris to Bury. But this does present difficulties. His tract, which looks like notes for his own lectures ('etc' meaning 'expand this if necessary') rather than notes taken by a pupil, implies an audience familiar, from hearing them, with a number of items from the Notre Dame repertory, and wishing to know how it was done. This is not at all likely to have been the case at Bury, where, assuming he taught there at all, he would pretty certainly have had to recast his course drastically. Moreover, his references to music in England touch the West Country, the Court, London, and Winchester. He is noticeably silent about the Severn Valley and East Anglia. I should myself attach more importance to his citing the Arithmetic of an eminent Dominican than to the survival of his tract at Bury……I should on the contrary suppose that his course was intended for delivery at Oxford and that he stood in some sort of relationship to the Dominicans there.[374]

Hohler's dismissal of a musical culture at Reading is not supported by the manuscript evidence – as mentioned previously, there is reason to believe that music was both composed and copied by Reading monks – however, his reluctance either to assign Anonymous IV to Bury St. Edmunds or to view the treatise as a student's notes seems well-founded, not the least because assigning the composition of a work based on the provenance of only two fragmentary surviving copies does not leave room for the possibility that other copies of the manuscript may have circulated elsewhere. Just as it is not enough to ascribe compositional provenance on the bases of manuscript provenance alone, or the attribution of one saint to a specific location when one copy might (in the case of Eadburga and Katherine) have changed its meaning from the original, so too any assessment of fragmentary evidence should leave room for the possibility that it is not the original or only copy. Moreover the treatise is in a separate libellus and written in a hand that is distinct from the rest of the compiled book, while the table of contents – the only reference which links the manuscript to Bury St. Edmunds – was copied in the 1380s, so it can only be said that Bury St. Edmunds owned a copy of Anonymous IV's

[374] Ibid., 17-18.

treatise a hundred years after it was written.[375] There are also reasons to suppose that Anonymous IV's work is not that of a student but of a master: the comprehensive language and 'sheer number of facts' in the description of music in Anonymous IV's writing, have the kind of detail that speaks to a planned work rather than ad hoc notes.[376] While twentieth-century musicologists almost unanimously accepted the assumption that Anonymous IV was a Benedictine monk at Bury St. Edmunds who studied at Paris before returning to the Eastern English abbey, recent scholars have taken a more cautious approach in ascribing Anonymous IV to Bury St. Edmunds merely because a copy of his treatise was kept in the abbey's library.[377] Meanwhile Anonymous IV's connection to a renewed interest in mathematics and a particular type of scientific study suggests a possible connection to Oxford.[378] If Anonymous IV was at Oxford he would have been writing his treatise in the 1270s or 1280s exactly the same time that Reconstruction II and the middle gatherings of Reconstruction I were being copied. The activities of the Catte street scriveners are well documented, but it is clear that more work needs to be done on the community of music scholars and composers as well as the copyists at Oxford. Margaret Bent's recent work on 'Magister Jacobus de Ispania' sheds some light on the musical activity of the Dominicans in Oxford during the late thirteenth century.[379] The Dominican references in Reconstruction I and II (particularly for the 'supercharged' troped

[375] Pinegar, 1991; Haines 2006, 416.
[376] Haines 2006, 384.
[377] Hughes 1928, 27; Reckow, ed., 1967; Dittmer 1957a; Flotzinger 2002, 81-98.
[378] Haines 2006, 375-425.
[379] The *Speculum musicae* cites the writings of Robert Kilwardby, Regent of Oxford and provincial prior of the English Dominicans in the late thirteenth-century. Jacobus follows the classification of music given by Kilwardby in his *De ortu scientiarum*, in which music is counted among the speculative sciences. Bent 2015, 144-145. Kilwardby was prior from 1361. Jacobus also seems to have a connection to Jerome of Moravia, a Dominican music encyclopdist active around 1290. While Jacobus may not himself have been at Oxford as Bent argues – Rob Wegman has shown that the term 'de Ispania' in contemporary texts was frequently used to mean 'from Hesbaye' an area that included Liège, and that certain references in the *Speculum* seem to confirm the author's personal familiarity with the musical practices of Liège (Wegman 2016, 253-74) – he was clearly familiar with the work of the Oxford Dominicans.

*Sanctus et eternus Deu*s, which reflects continental influences and a fluid concept of genre) would make sense in the context of a scholarly and innovative community of Dominican musicians at Oxford.[380] Moreover, as seen in Chapter 3, the repertory transmitted by the Worcester fragments has more concordances outside the 'Westcuntre' school than within it, so the music of the Reconstructions must thus have been drawn from a wide area, including continental concordances and continental influences, possibly collected from elsewhere before coming to rest in Worcester. As seen before, the student-monks at the Benedictine Gloucester College at Oxford acquired many manuscripts during their time there, so it is conceivable that part or all Reconstruction I and all of Reconstruction II were originally Dominican manuscripts from Oxford. In any case it is clear that much work remains to be done both on the musical scene at Oxford in the thirteenth century and on the relationships (and possibly the sharing of musical material) between the Benedictine and Dominican communities in England.

4.3 Conclusions

Examined piece by piece, the evidence for a 'Westcuntre' school of polyphony centred on the Benedictine institutions of Worcester, Reading and Leominster must give way to a more nuanced understanding of how musical material was shared, one that takes into consideration

[380] When removed from the context of the Benedictine houses in the West Country, the Dominican influences on the Worcester Fragments may be significant, especially considering the absence of Benedictine saints in the musical repertory and the fact that the inclusion of Dominican influences and saints reflected in the Worcester Fragments are not found in monophonic music of known Benedictine provenance (such as GB-WOc F. 160).

that a manuscript could have been used (and edited) by multiple owners, rather than being made for one institution and spending its entire life there. In reference to a number of manuscripts of the period, Andrew Taylor writes that they provide to the modern scholar 'not some absolute origin but rather a testimony to the complexity of textual production and a measure of the difference between our cultural categories and those of earlier times'.[381] The same might be said of the Worcester Fragments: their 'biography' does not seem to follow a straightforward trajectory such as that of a manuscript commissioned for and owned by one person or establishment. Rather, the Worcester Fragments represent diverse methods of copying, collecting and editing, showing influences from more than one religious community and reflecting more than one attitude toward genre. Further work needs to be done on the relationship between composers, copyists and readers: future scholars may be able to make sense of multiple influences in each manuscript source, such as Reconstruction I's connections both to Dominicans and possibly – given the 'pes' references – to Reading as well.[382] There is evidence that English miscellany manuscripts travelled between networks of musical and monastic communities: further work might pursue how polyphonic manuscripts were shared between monastic orders in particular, and music communities more generally.[383] This study of the Worcester Fragments has but opened the door to the possibilities of interpretation that their folios hold: I am sure more connections will be made in the future, ones that will hopefully shed light on the distinctive habits of such individuals as the Worcester palimpsest scribes.

---

[381] Taylor 2002, 9.
[382] To give but one possible interpretation: it may be that the manuscript was collected in Oxford but spent time in Reading before ending up at Worcester.
[383] For example, GB-Ob Ashmole 1285 was owned first by the brother of Hugh of Wendover, and later given to Southwark priory. Deeming 2015, 123.

For now, having reconsidered a Worcester provenance for the independent sections of the Worcester Reconstructions and their related fragments, it can be said that the Severn Valley remains a possible candidate for the original provenance of Reconstruction II (if its Alleluias were composed by W. de Wic), an early home for Worcester Reconstruction II (and possibly Reconstruction I) and an eventual home for all of the fragments. There certainly seems to be evidence of the performance of polyphony in the Benedictine institutions in the 'West Country', but the evidence of the manuscripts produced at Worcester shows that the 'in house' workshop was not equipped for the production of such a well-executed volume as Reconstruction II and even the middle fascicles of Reconstruction I. Thus Oxford in particular remains a possible candidate for the original provenance of the independently-produced fascicles of Reconstruction I and the entirety of the original Reconstruction II. It may never be possible to tie together every loose end, especially since the manuscript evidence of musical activity in thirteenth-century England is so fragmentary. However, at the very least, it is finally possible to say with some certainty that the connected fragments with scribal concordances were indeed at Worcester, that, at least by the early fourteenth-century the music of the 'Worcester Fragments' was being sung and heard there, and that there really is paleographical evidence to call these scattered manuscripts the 'Worcester' Fragments.

5.

The Legacy of Reconstruction

If there is one word that characterises scholarship on the Worcester Fragments it is 'reconstruction'. From their earliest study, the fragments fell prey to the desire of researchers to combine them as a kind of resurrected English Magnus liber. Hughes in particular was fascinated by the idea of a lost English source of polyphony. Inspired no doubt by the words of Anonymous IV and early twentieth-century nationalism, he tried to re-create an English counterpart to the continental collections of the day. At the Bodleian, the compilation of fragments and photostats resulted in a physical reconstruction, a reconfigured medieval manuscript, entitled *The Worcester Motet Book*. Dittmer's editions reconstructed and completed fragmentary pieces by supplying lost voices from concordances, constructing missing sections from similar passages of the same piece or adapting liturgical chants for missing tenors. Drawing on connections with Reading sources and a composer with connections to Reading and Leominster, Dittmer established the image of a 'Worcester school of polyphony'.

In the case of the Worcester Fragments, perhaps the presence of so many pages with original foliation presented a puzzle that was tempting to reassemble. Yet the danger of accepting

scholarly 'reconstructions' as urtext is evident in the scholarship of the Worcester Fragments. Wibberley refers to the bound copy of GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 as a 'main corpus' or the 'Oxford codex', as if it were a single original source.[384] His analysis of the volume, using the foliation system of GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 has the troubling tendency to refer to both the manuscript and photostat pages of the Oxford reconstruction as if it were a foliated medieval codex. Elsewhere, the legacy of Hughes and Dittmer's 'Motet Book', 'Large-format Volume' and 'Conductus Book' has created a false dichotomy between the Worcester Reconstructions and fragments not belonging to the Reconstructions, the latter of which barely receive attention in scholarship. Thus, when Losseff compared sources of plainchant between the Worcester Antiphoner and Worcester Fragments, she only considered the music of Reconstructions I, II and III. Meanwhile Sanders' edition of *Thomas gemma* in PMFC XIV poses a different kind of problem: his interpretation of the motet is a new creation – a reconstruction combined from three individual sources – which does not mark in its score the newly-composed sections. While Sanders mentions in the accompanying notes what the variants and missing parts are for each of the three original sources, he does not indicate which sections of the composition are newly-composed, or from which source was each section of the compiled composition taken. As a result, Lefferts missed considering the sources separately when he provided a detailed analysis of the composition. In his dissertation, Lefferts analysed the musical structure not by looking at the original sources, but by following Sanders's edition, which in many cases included interpreting sections of the tenor that had been newly composed by Sanders into a discussion of the composer's structure of the motet. *Thomas gemma* may be a reminder of how historical accuracy can be compromised when a performance-ready edition reconstructed from

[384] Wibberley 1977, 31.

fragmentary sources is not treated as a scholarly exercise but as a fully-formed medieval composition. There are a number of alternatives that would avoid such confusion. Pedro Memesldorff has highlighted the problematic nature of newly-composed sections of musical reconstructions which, in trying to be the most conservative estimate the composer's intention, often prove to be blander in nature than the original – as a solution to this he places some value in the performance of fragments as they are (leaving moments of silence for the missing musical sections).[385] As another approach, I offer the reconstruction of US-Coc MS 5, a three-voiced Gloria in a fragmentary state but with complete concordances for the cantus in one manuscript and for the tenor and contratenor in another, allowing for a reconstruction of all three voices.[386] In my transcription (co-authored with Michael Scott Cuthbert) the combined composition included both surviving versions of 'Amen', giving the performer a chance to choose which version to follow. Those sections that were newly-composed were marked in both the score and accompanying notes, while it was made clear on the page what was missing from each source. The result was a performance-ready edition that preserved the variance of the original copies and even left the choice of which version to use up to the performer, so that any one version might not be 'codified' over another. The addition of a few ossia passages and in-score clarifications of newly-composed material is a fairly minor change that allows editors to present music in an uncluttered, performable copy, but one that is less likely to be confused with a definitive version of the composition.

[385] Memelsdorff 2010, 49.
[386] Cuthbert and Nyikos 2010.

Sometimes restoration can come with a price. When Godfrey Driver removed the many endleaves (flyleaves and pastedowns) of GB-Omc 100, he exposed the oak board, leaving the binding in a perilous state. Ironically the 'restoration' or 'reunion' of Magdalen flyleaves left the original binding weakened and damaged. Historians and restorers alike must sometimes make difficult decisions about how to change the current state of an artifact. For instance, restorers of the Sistine Chapel had to choose whether or not to uncover the nudity of Michelangelo's original version by removing the censoring clothes painted in the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, additions which, while not part of the artist's original design, were the familiar version that the world knew.[387] With fragmentary sources, it can be difficult to find a balance between leaving something in a fragmentary state or contextualizing it to facilitate a better understanding of the nature of the original. Restorers of the Russian frescos in Lublin's Holy Trinity Chapel compromised by leaving only the shape, outline or idea of the missing painted structures, visually filling in the gaps left by the fragmentary frescos with a similar colour palette so that that the appearance of the chapel was unified, but done in a way that the onlooker would be well aware of what was missing, perhaps more so because buildings were empty and figures half-finished (FIGURE 5.1).[388]

With the advent of digital photography and photo manipulation software, reconstructions can be done on digital images of folios without affecting the original manuscript. Wegman's recent digital interpretation of Worcester Q19 depicts a digitally drawn image of a badly-damaged

[387] Colalucci 2016, especially 252-4. The final decision was a compromise to remove the eighteenth-century clothes but leave the sixteenth-century ones.
[388] For more on the history of the chapel, see Piotrowski 2011, 96-8. The photographs are my own.

manuscript that makes an otherwise hard-to-read folio immediately accessible to any scholar.[389] DIAMM's current project on the Sadler Partbooks is a collaborative 'digital restoration' that intends to produce a visual representation of the partbooks in their 'original' sixteenth-century state, (before the degrading of acidic ink) using various techniques in Photoshop including colour adjustments and cloning to show what the pages would have looked like before they were damaged.[390] This dissertation used similar techniques in Photoshop and Lightroom to bring out the erased texts in the images of the palimpsest pages of Reconstruction II and, in the case of the initial 'K', used cloning and image manipulation to digitally 'reconstruct' what the erased 'K' might have looked like. Used in this context, image editing software can be a useful tool for scholars, allowing them to visually present an interpretation a manuscript's original state rather than a representation of its current condition and, particularly in the case of palimpsests and badly-damaged folios, can help uncover what was otherwise hard to read on the unedited image.

As a useful tool for understanding original manuscript organization, this dissertation has also adopted the concept of combining fragments into 'Reconstructions', although with specific changes to the allocation of a fragment to one Reconstruction over another as outlined in TABLE 2.1. The term is preferable to the 'Volumes' of Dittmer or 'Books' of Hughes as it self-conscious: a 'reconstruction' does not pretend to represent an original volume but is a scholarly interpretation of available evidence. Regardless of how decisions are made to reconstruct, it is important that scholars still come back to the original sources (in their fragmentary and

[389] Wegman 2017.
[390] https://www.diamm.ac.uk/about/collaborators/the-sadler-partbooks-project/

incomplete states) to make paleographical judgments. Thus, 'reconstructions' can be an invaluable tool for researchers and performers alike, as long as they are used in conjunction with reference to the original material.

Turning to a palaeographical analysis of the Worcester Fragments, there emerges another pattern of re-assembly, of the recopying of independent elements being brought together. The person (or people) responsible for producing the compilation of Reconstruction I was doing something not so different from what the Bodleian Library did 700 years later – taking independently ruled, written and decorated sections, reordering them, binding them together and foliating them. The outward appearance of similarity from the medieval foliation has meant that, until this study, scholarship has conflated the dimensions, ruling and decorations of Reconstruction I so that independently-produced gatherings were considered as a single project from one workshop.

In the musical settings, we see the reuse and preservation of old material by recombining individual elements into new pieces, as in the case of the intertextuality of the *Dulcis virgo* contrafact text, *Dulce lignum* tenor and 'psalite deo nostro' melody in *Ave magnifica Maria Dulce lignum*, the blurring of the line between genres in pieces such as the embedded motet in an organum in *Alleluia V. Nativitas gloriose virgi[nis] Marie. Ex semine Habrahe* and the updating of older styles with new poetry and modern influences, even when they were out of use on the Continent, as in the poetry of *Sanctus et eternus Deus* and the related Sanctus tropes in Reconstruction II. Additions of new pieces representing political development and older

compositions co-exist in the same volume. Far from dismantling and discarding the old entirely to make room for the new, the additions are even styled to fit the original volume in text, music and decorative script. Finally, the early history of the manuscripts in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries shows that the codices continued intact, probably until just before they were broken up to serve as material for the Worcester bookbinders.

With regard to the provenance of the fragments, early twentieth-century musicologists were eager to prove that the Worcester Fragments were from Worcester. Inspired by the idea of a 'Westcuntre' school of polyphony, scholars in the first half of the twentieth century (Handschin, Hughes, Dittmer and Sanders) found links to connect the fragments to sources in Leominster and Reading, while those in the latter part of the century (Hohler, Losseff and Williamson) worked to discredit the idea of a repertory exclusive to the western part of the country. Ultimately, the paleographical evidence, musical content and the situation at Worcester in the 1300s suggest that the truth lies somewhere in between. The Worcester Fragments' original provenance is just one part of their 'biography'. Equally important is the institution where they were eventually used: an Oxford provenance for the copying of Reconstructions I and II, for example, is not mutually exclusive with the idea of an active musical community at Worcester – as the palimpsest scribe's additions and later annotations in the fifteenth century show, music probably was being copied at Worcester, although not on a large scale.

'Reconstruction' then has been a recurring theme for this study, not just in connection with the three Worcester Reconstructions, but in the Worcester Fragments' own early usage. The pitfalls of modern reconstructions can be seen with case of GB-Ob Lat. lit. d. 20 and the confused legacy it left later scholars or in the combined edition of a work like *Thomas gemma*, where the creation of a performance-ready composition obscures the variety of its individually transmitted versions. Meanwhile in the early history of the manuscript, the concept of reuse and preservation included the compilation of independently-created sources and the addition of new music *in situ*. In Worcester (or at whichever institution the manuscripts came to be used) there seems to have been a tradition of preservation at least in the early fourteenth century. Older books were not discarded, or even dismantled and reused as working manuscripts for musicians, but kept bound and probably even performed from long after their creation. It remains to be seen how this attitude towards reusing and reconstructing material compares with other sources of the period. Is the idea of preserving the old in such a distinctive manner linked to the Worcester Fragments or can similar cases be found in the larger insular tradition? The fragmentary nature of surviving thirteenth-century sources in England may not be able to answer every question conclusively, however if the repertory of the Worcester Fragments is indicative of the body of lost contemporary English manuscripts, then insular music of the period included the best of both the old and new music of the thirteenth century.

Bibliography

Apel, Willi. 1953. *The Notation of Polyphonic Music, 900-1600*. 5th ed. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Mediaeval Academy of America.

Atkins, Ivor. 1918. *The Early Occupants of the Office of Organist and Master of the Choristers of the Cathedral Church of Christ and the Blessed Virgin Mary, Worcester*. London: Mitchell Hughes and Clarke.

Atkins, Ivor and Neil R. Ker. 1944. *Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Wigorniensis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Atkinson, Charles. 1992. 'Text, Music and the Persistence of Memory in *Dulcis est cantica.*' In *Researches nouvelles sur les tropes liturgiques*, ed. Wulf Alrt and Gunilla Björkvall. Stockholm: SLS, 95-117.

_____. 1993. 'Music and Meaning in *Clangat* hodie.' *Revista de Musicología* 16 (2): 790-806.

Baltzer, Rebecca A. 2008. 'The Manuscript Maker of W1: Further Evidence for an Early Date.' In *Quomodo cantabimus canticum? Studies in Honor of Edward H. Roesner*, ed. David Butler Cannata. Wisconsin: American Institute of Musicology, 103-120.

Barron, Caroline M. and Jenny Stratford, eds. 2002. *The Church and Learning in Later Medieval Society: Essays in Honour of R. B. Dobson*. Donington: Shaun Tyas.

Bent, Ian. 1963. 'The English Chapel Royal Before 1300.' *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association* 90: 77-95.

Bent, Margaret. 1968. 'New and Little-Known Fragments of English Medieval Polyphony.' *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 21: 139-41.

_____. 1973. 'The Transmission of English Music 1300-1500: Some Aspects of Repertory and Presentation.' In *Studien zur Tradition in der Musik: Kurt von Fischer zum 60 Geburtstag*, ed. Hans Heinrich Eggebrecht and Max Lütolf. München: E Katzbichler, 65-83.

_____. 1981. 'Rota versatilis: Towards a Reconstruction.' In *Source Materials and the Interpretation of Music: A Memorial Volume to Thurston Dart*, ed. Ian Bent. London: Stainer & Bell, 65-98.

_____. 1994. 'Editing Early Music: The Dilemma of Translation.' *Early Music*, 22 (3): 373-392.

_____. 1998. 'The Grammar of Early Music: Preconditions for Analysis.' In *Tonal Structures in Early Music*, ed. Cristle Collins Judd. New York: Garland Publishing, 15-59.

_____. 2002. *Counterpoint, Composition, and Musica ficta*. London and New York: Routledge.

_____. 2015. *Magister Jacobus de Ispania, Author of the Speculum Musicae*. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.

Bent, Margaret and Roger Bowers. 1981. 'The Saxilby Fragment.' *Early Music History* 1: 1-27.

Bevilacqua, Gregorio. 2013. 'Conductus or Motet? A New Source and a Question of Genre.' *Musica Disciplina* 58: 9-27.

Boe, John. 2001. 'Sanctus Tropes in South-Italian Manuscripts, A.D. 1000-1250: The Repertory from Benevento, Montecassino, and Rome.' In *Essays in Honor of John F. Ohl: A Compendium of American Musicology*, ed. Enrique Alberto Arias, Susan M. Filler, et al. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 29-48.

Boos, Elizabeth L. 1971. 'Alleluia cum psallite.' *Musica Disciplina* 25: 93-98.

Bowers, Roger. 1975. 'Choral Institutions within the English Church: Their Constitution and Development 1340 – 1500.' PhD diss., University of East Anglia.

Boynton, Susan and Eric Rice, eds. 2008. *Young Choristers 650-1700*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press.

Bradley, Catherine. 2011. 'The Earliest Motets: Musical Borrowing and Re-Use.' PhD diss., University of Cambridge.

_____. 2015. 'Re-workings and Chronological Dynamics in a Thirteenth-Century Latin Motet Family.' *The Journal of Musicology* 32 (2): 187-199.

Braswell, Laurel. 1971. 'Saint Edburga of Winchester: A Study of Her Cult, AD 950-1500, With an Edition of the Fourteenth-Century Middle English and Latin Lives.' *Mediaeval Studies* 33: 292-333.

Brownrigg, Linda L., ed. 1990. *Medieval Book Production: Assessing the Evidence.* Los Altons Hills: Anderson-Lovelace.

Bugyis, Katie Ann-Marie, A.B. Kraebel, and Margot Fassler, eds. 2017. *Medieval Cantors and their Craft: Music, Liturgy and the Shaping of History, 800-1500*. York: York Medieval Press.

Bukofzer, Manfred. 1950. 'Two Fourteenth-Century Motets on St Edmund.' In *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Music*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 17-33.

Büttner, Fred. 1990. *Klang Und Konstruktion in Der Englischen Mehrstimmigkeit Des 13. Jahrhunderts: Ein Beitrag Zur Erforschung Der Stimmtauschkompositionem in Den Worcester-Fragmenten*. Tutzing: Hans Schneider.

Colalucci, Gianluigi. 2016. *Michelangelo and I: Facts, People, Surprises, Discoveries in the Restoration of the Sistine Chapel*. Milan: 24 ORE Cultura.

Colton, Lisa. 2003. 'Music and Sanctity in England, C. 1260 - C. 1400.' PhD diss., University of York.

_____. 2016. *Angel Song: Medieval English Music in History*. London: Routledge.

Colton, Lisa and Tim Shephard, ed. 2017. *Sources of Identity: Makers, Owners and Users of Music Sources Before 1600*. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers.

Connolly, Margaret and Raluca Radulescu, eds. 2015. *Insular Books: Vernacular Manuscript Miscellanies in Late Medieval Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cooper, Barry. 1981. 'A Thirteenth-Century Canon Reconstructed.' *The Music Review* 42: 85-90.

Crocker, Richard L. 1959. 'Review: *The Worcester Fragments. A Catalogue Raisonné and Transcription* by Luther A. Dittmer; *Auszug aus The Worcester Music-Fragments* by Luther Albert Dittmer.' *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 12 (1): 71-74.

_____. 1966. 'The Troping Hypothesis.' *Musical Quarterly* 52: 183-203.

_____. 1990. 'Polyphony in England in the Thirteenth Century.' In *The Early Middle Ages to 1300*: *New Oxford History of Music* Vol. 2, ed. Richard Crocker and David Hiley. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 679-720.

Croenen, Godfried and Peter F. Ainsworth. 2006. *Patrons, Authors and Workshops: Books and Book Production in Paris Around 1400*. Louvain: Peeters.

Cook, James Heustis. 1978. 'Manuscript Transmission of Thirteenth-Century Motets.' PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin.

Cumming, Julie E. 1994. 'The Aesthetics of the Medieval Motet and Cantilena.' *Historical Performance* 7 (2): 71-83.

_____. 2000. 'Motet and Cantilena.' In *A Performer's Guide to Medieval Music*, ed. Ross W. Duffin. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 52-82.

_____. 2003. *The Motet in the Age of Du Fay.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cuthbert, Michael Scott. 2006. 'Trecento Fragments and Polyphony Beyond the Codex.' PhD diss., Harvard University.

Cuthbert, Michael Scott and Elizabeth Nyikos. 2010. 'Style, Locality and the Trecento Gloria: New Sources and a Reexamination.' *Acta Musicologica* LXXXII/2: 185-212.

Deeming, Helen. 2004. 'Music in English Miscellanies of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries.' PhD diss., University of Cambridge.

_____. 2006a 'Observations on the Habits of Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Music Scribes.' *Scriptorium* 60: 38-59.

_____. 2006b 'The Song and the Page: Experiments with Form and Layout in Manuscripts of Medieval Latin Song.' *Plainsong and Medieval Music* 15: 1-27.

_____. 2015a. 'An English Monastic Miscellany: the Reading Manuscript of *Sumer is icumen in*.' In *Manuscripts and Medieval Song: Inscription, Performance, Context*, ed. Helen Deeming and Elizabeth Eva Leach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 141-62.

_____. 2015b. 'Preserving and Recycling: Functional Multiplicity and Shifting Priorities in the Compilation and Continued Use of London, British Library, Egerton 274.' In *Manuscripts and Medieval Song: Inscription, Performance, Context*, ed. Helen Deeming and Elizabeth Eva Leach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 141-62.

Denis, Muzerelle. 1985. *Vocabulaire codicologique. Répertoire méthodique des termes français relatifs aux manuscrits* Rubricae I. Paris: CEMI.

Derolez, Albert. 2003. *The Palaeography of Gothic Manuscript Books: From the Twelfth to the Early Sixteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. 2011. 'The Codicology of Late Medieval Music Manuscripts: Some Preliminary Observations.' In *The Calligraphy of Medieval Music*, ed. John Haines. Turnhout: Brepols, 23-36.

Dittmer, Luther. 1953. 'Binary Rhythm, Music Theory and the Worcester Fragments.' *Musica Disciplina* 7: 39-57.

_____. 1954. 'An English Discantuum Volumen.' *Musica Disciplina* 10:19-58.

_____. 1957a. *Auszug aus The Worcester Music-Fragments.* Brooklyn: The Institute of Mediaeval Music.

_____. 1957b. 'Beiträge Zum Studium Der Worcester-Fragmente.' *Die Musikforschung* 10: 29-39.

_____. 1957c 'The Dating and the Notation of the Worcester Fragments.' *Musica Disciplina* 11:5-11.

_____, ed.1957d. *The Worcester Fragments: A Catalogue Raisonné and Transcription.* Musicological Studies and Documents 2. New York: American Institute of Musicology.

_____, ed. 1959. *Worcester Add. 68, Westminster Abbey 33327, Madrid, Bibl. Nac. 192*, Publications of Mediaeval Musical Manuscripts 5. Brooklyn, NY: Institute of Medieval Music.

_____, ed. 1960. *Oxford, Latin Liturgical D 20, London, Add. MS 25031, Chicago, MS 654 app.*, Publications of Mediaeval Musical Manuscripts 6. Brooklyn, NY: Institute of Medieval Music

Doyle; I. A. 1990. 'Book Production by the Monastic Orders in England (c. 1375-1530): Assessing the Evidence.' In *Medieval Book Production: Assessing the Evidence* ed. L. Brownrigg and M. Smith, ed., Anderson-Lovelace, 1-19.

Duffin, Ross W. 1988. 'The Sumer Canon: A New Revision.' *Speculum* 63:1-21.

Dunstan, Peta. 2009. *The Labour of Obedience: The Benedictines of Pershore, Nashdom and Elmore, a History.* Norwich: Canterbury Press.

Everett, Paul. 1983. 'The Application and Usefulness of "Rastrology", with Particular Reference to Early Eighteenth-Century Italian Manuscripts.' In *Musica E Filologia*, ed. Marco di Pasquale. Verona: Edizioni della Società Letteraria, 135-58.

Everist, Mark. 1984. 'A Reconstructed Source for the Thirteenth-Century Conductus.' In *Gordon Athol Anderson (1929–1981): In memoriam von seinen Studenten, Freunden und Kollegen*, 2 vols., ed. Luther Dittmer. Musicological Studies 49. Henryville, Ottawa and Binningen: Institute of Mediaeval Music, 97-118.

_____. 1992. 'Anglo-French Interaction in Music, c1170-c1300.' *Revue belge de Musicologie / Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Muziekwetenschap* 46: 5-22.

_____. 1990. 'From Paris to St. Andrews: The Origins of W1.' *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 43 (1): 1-42.

_____. 2000. 'Reception and Recomposition in the Polyphonic "Conductus cum caudis": The Metz Fragment.' *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 125 (2): 135-163.

Fassler, Margot E. 1987. 'The Role of the Parisian Sequence in the Evolution of Notre-Dame Polyphony.' *Speculum* 62: 345–374.

_____. 1992. 'The Disappearance of Proper tropes and the Rise of the Late Sequence: New Evidence from Chantres.' *Cantus Planus* IV: 319-335.

_____. 2011. *Gothic Song: Victorine Sequences and Augustinian Reform in Twelfth-Century Paris*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.

Fenlon, Iain, ed. 1981. *Music in Medieval and Early-Modern Europe: Patronage, Sources, and Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____, ed. 1982. *Cambridge Music Manuscripts, 900-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Flotzinger, Rudolf. 2002. 'Johannes de Garlandia Und Anonymous IV: Zu Ihrem Umfeld, Ihren Persönlichkeiten Und Traktaten.' In *Gedenkschrift Für Walter Pass*, ed. Martin Czernin. Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 81-98.

Floyer, John K., and Sydney G. Hamilton. 1906. *Catalogue of Manuscripts Preserved in the Chapter Library of Worcester Cathedral*. Oxford: James Parker, for the Worcestershire Historical Society.

Frere, Walter Howard, ed. 1967. *Bibliotheca musico-liturgica: A Descriptive Handlist of the Musical and Latin Liturgical Manuscripts of the Middle Ages Preserved in the Libraries of Great Britain and Ireland*. Reprint. Hildesheim: G. Olms.

Fuller, Sarah. 1990. 'Early Polyphony.' In *The New Oxford History of Music, Vol. 2: Early Medieval Music up to 1300,* ed. Richard Crocker and David Hiley. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 485-556.

Gillespie, Alexandra and Daniel Wakelin, eds. 2011. *The Production of Books in England 1350-1500*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gittos, Helen, and Sarah Hamilton, eds. 2015. *Understanding Medieval Liturgy: Essays in Interpretation*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Gullick, Michael. 1987. 'The Great and Little Domesday Manuscripts.' In *Domesday Book Studies* ed. Ann Williams and R. W. H. Erskine. London: Alecto Historical Editions, 93-112.

_____. 1998. 'Professional Scribes in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century England.' *English Manuscript Studies* 7: 1-24.

Greatrex, Joan. 1997. *Biographical Register of the English Cathedral Priories of the Province of Canterbury C. 1066-1540*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Grosjean, Paul. 1954. 'Thomas de La Hale, Moine et Martyr À Douvres En 1295.' *Analecta Bollandiana* 72: 167-91.

Grout, Donald Jay. 1960a. *A History of Western Music*. New York: Norton and Co.

_____. 1960b. *Music in Western Civilization*, New York: Norton and Co.

Haines, Charles Reginald. 2016. *Dover Priory: A History of the Priory of St Mary the Virgin and St Martin of the New Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haines, John. 2004. 'Erasures in Thirteenth–Century Music.' In *Music and Medieval Manuscripts: Palaeography and Performance*, ed. John Haines and Randall Rosenfeld. Aldershot: Ashgate, 60-88.

_____. 2006. 'Anonymous IV as an Informant on the Craft of Music Writing.' *The Journal of Musicology* 23 (3): 375-425.

Hamilton, Elina. 2015. 'Walter of Evesham Abbey and the Intellectual Milieu of Fourteenth-century English Music Theory.' PhD diss., Bangor University.

Hanna, Ralph. 2005. *London Literature, 1300-1380*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Handschin, Jacques. 1928. 'Zur Frage der melodischen Paraphraseirung im Mittelalter.' *Zeitschrift für Musikwissenshaft* 10 (9): 513-59.

_____. 1931-2. 'Review: *Worcester Mediaeval Harmony.' Zeitschrift für Musikwissenshaft* 14: 54-61.

_____. 1949. 'The Summer Canon and its Background.' *Musica Disciplina* 3: 55-94.

_____. 1951. 'The Summer Canon and its Background: II.' *Musica Disciplina* 5: 65-113.

Harrison, Frank Ll. 1960. 'English Church Music in the Fourteenth Century', in *New Oxford History of Music III: Ars Nova and the Renaissance 1300-1540,* ed. Gerald Abraham and Anselm Hughes London: Oxford University Press, 88-94.

_____ (ed.) 1963a. *Early English Church Music*. London: Stainer & Bell.

_____. 1963b. *Music in Medieval Britain*, London: Norton and Co.

_____. 1978. 'Polyphonic Music for a Chapel of Edward.' *Music & Letters* 59 (4): 420-428.

_____ (ed.) 1980. *Motets of English Provenance: PMFC XV* Monaco: L'Oiseau-Lyre.

Harrison, Frank Ll. and Wibberley, Roger, eds. 1981. *Manuscripts of Fourteenth Century English Polyphony: A Selection of Facsimilies.* Early English Church Music 26. London: Stainer and Bell.

Heale, Martin. 2004. *The Dependent Priories of Medieval English Monasteries.* Woodbridge: Boydell Press.

Hiley, David. 1982. 'Some observations on the interrelationships between trope repertories.' In Gunilla Iversen, ed. *Research on Tropes Proceedings of a Symposium Organized by the Royal Academy of Literature, History and Antiquities and the Corpus Troporum*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 29-37.

_____. 1986. 'Ordinary of Mass chants in English, North French and Sicilian manuscripts.' *Journal of the Plainsong & Mediaeval Music Society* 9: 1-128.

_____. 1991. 'Cluny, Sequences and Tropes.' In *La Tradizione Dei Tropi Liturgici*, ed. Claudio Leonardi and Enrico Menestò. Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 125-138.

Hilliard Ensemble. 1983. *Medieval English Music.* Harmonia Mundi HMA 901106, [compact disc].

Hohler, Christopher. 1978. 'Reflections on Some Manuscripts Containing Thirteenth-Century Polyphony.' *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 1: 2-38.

Horstmann, Carl, ed. 1901. *Nova Legenda Anglie*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hughes, Andrew. 1963. 'English Sacred Music (Excluding Carols) in Insular Sources, 1400-C.1450.' DPhil diss., University of Oxford.

_____. 1966. 'Mensural Polyphony for Choir in 15th-Century England.' *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 19 (3): 352-69.

_____. 1969. 'The Choir in Fifteenth-century English Music: Non-Mensural Polyphony.' *Essays in Musicology in Honor of Dragan Plamenac*, ed. G. Reese and R.J. Snow, 127-37.

_____. 1982. *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office: A Guide to Their Organization and Terminology*. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press.

Hughes, Dom Anselm, ed. 1928. *Worcester Medieval Harmony of the Thirteenth & Fourteenth Centuries*. Worcester: Phillips & Probert Ltd.

_____. 1951. *Medieval Polyphony in the Bodleian Library* Oxford: Bodleian Library.

_____. 1959. *Septuagesima,* London: The Plainsong and Medieval Music Society.

_____. 1962. 'The Topography of English Mediaeval Polyphony.' in *Memoriam Jacques Handschin*, ed. Higinio Anglès. Strasbourg: P. H. Heitz, 127-39.

Hughes, Meirion and Stradling, Robert. 2001. *The English Musical Renaissance 1840-1940: Constructing a National Music*, 2nd ed. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Huot, Sylvia 1997. *Allegorical Play in the Old French Motet: The Sacred and the Profane in Thirteenth-Century Polyphony*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Iversen, Gunilla. 1989. 'On a Group of Compositions added to the "*Osanna* in excelsis"' in László Dobszay, ed. *IMS Study Session on "Cantus Planus", Tihány, Hungary 19-24 September 1988*. Budapest: Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Musicology, 275-296.

_____. 1992. '*Splendor patris*. On Influence and Genre Definition.' *Cantus Planus* IV: 427-444.

_____. 1993. 'The Mirror of Music: Symbol and Reality in the Text of "Clangat Hodie."' *Revista de Musicología* 16 (2): 771-789.

_____. 2007a. 'Biblical interpretation in tropes and sequences' *The Journal of Medieval Latin*, 17: 210-225.

_____. 2007b. '*Osanna Vox Laudabilia*. Vocabulary and Compositional Forms in Sanctus Tropes in Iberian Liturgical Manuscripts.' In *Hispania Vetus. Musical-Liturgical Manuscripts from Visigothic Origins to the Franco-Roman Transition (9th-12th Centuries),* ed. Susana Zapke. Bilbao: Fundación BBVA, 141-157.

James, Kristopher. 2011. *Ultimate Guide to The General Prologue: Canterbury Tales*. New York: Ultimate Publishing.

Jander, Owen. 1967. 'Staff-Liner Identification, a Technique for the Age of Microfilm.' *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 20 (1): 112-16.

Johnston, Michael and Michael Van Dussen, eds. 2015. *The Medieval Manuscript Book: Cultural Approaches*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Kehrein, Joseph. 1873. *Lateinische Sequenzen des Mittelalters,* Mainz: Druck und Verlag von Florian Kupferberg.

Ker, Neil. R. 1964. *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books*, 2nd ed. London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society.

Lefferts, Peter. 1981. 'Two English Motets on Simon de Montfort.' *Early Music History* 1: 203-225.

_____. 1986. *The Motet in England in the Fourteenth Century*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press.

Levy, Kenneth Jay. 1951. 'New Material on the Early Motet in England: A Report on Princeton Ms. Garrett 119.' *JAMS* 4 (3): 220-239.

Losseff, Nicky. 1994. *The Best Concords: Polyphonic Music in Thirteenth-Century England*. New York: Garland Publishing.

_____. 1993. 'A Thirteenth-Century English Motet.' *Leading Notes: Journal of the National Early Music Association* 3: 8-13.

Ludwig, Friedrich. 1910-61. *Repertorium organorum recentioris et motetorum vetustissimi stili, vol. 1: Catalogue raisonné der Quellen*. Pt. 1: *Handschriften in Quadrat-Notation*. Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1910. Reprinted, ed. Luther Dittmer. New York: Institute of Mediaeval Music, and Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1964. Pt. 2: *Handschriften in Mensuralnotation*, ed. Friedrich Gennrich. Summa musicae medii aevi, vol. 7. Langen bei Frankfurt, privately published, 1961.

Lütolf, Max. 1970. *Die Mehrstimmigen Ordinarium Missae-Sätze Vom Ausgehenden 11. Bis Zur Wende Des 13. Zum 14. Jahrhundert, vol. 1*. Bern: Komm. Paul Haupt.

Malyshko, Olga. 1998. 'Three Newly-Discovered Fragments at Worcester: "Another Magnus liber organi" Flyleaf.' *Scriptorium* 52 (1): 66–82.

Memelsdorff, Pedro. 2010. '"Lacuna": The Restoration of Past Sound.' In *Coping with the Past. Creative Perspectives on Conservation and Restoration*, ed. Pasquale Gagliardi, Bruno Latour and Pedro Memelsdorff. Firenze: Olschki, 47-79.

Michael, Michael A. 2008. 'Urban Production of Manuscript Books and the Role of the University Towns'. In *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain II: 1100-1400*, ed. Nigel Morgan and Rodney M. Thomson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 168-94.

Montague, Rhodes James. 1907-08. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Gonville and Caius College.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morgan, Nigel and Rodney M. Thomson, eds. 2008. *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain II: 1100-1400.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 168-94.

Morris, John. 1859. *The Life and Martyrdom of St Thomas Becket: Archbishop of Canterbury, And Legate of the Holy See*. London: London, Brown, Green, Longman's & Roberts.

Muzerelle, Denis. 1985. *Vocabulaire Codicologique. Répertoire Méthodique Des Termes Français Relatifs Aux Manuscrits*. Paris: CEMI.

Nádas, John. 1985. 'The Transmission of Trecento Secular Polyphony: Manuscript Production and Scribal Practices in Italy at the End of the Middle Ages.' Ph.D. diss., New York University.

Nyikos, Elizabeth. 2010. 'The Beverley Fragments.' MPhil first-year diss., University of Oxford.

Orlando Consort. 1993. *Worcester Fragments – English Sacred Music of the Late Middle Ages*. Wotton-Under-Edge, Glos.: Amon Ra Records [compact disc].

Owens, Jessie Ann. 1997. *Composers at Work: the Craft of Musical Composition 1450-1600*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Page, Christopher. 2000. 'Around the Performance of a 13th-Century Motet.' *Early Music* 28: 343-57.

Parkes, Malcolm B. 2008. *Their Hands before our Eyes: A Closer Look at Scribes*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Patin, William Abel, ed. 1931-7. *Documents Illustrating the Activities of the General and Provincial Chapters of the English Black Monks 1215-1540*. Camden Soc., third series. xlv, xlvii, lvi.

Patterson, Sonia. 1969. 'Paris and Oxford University Manuscripts in the Thirteenth Century' B.Litt. Diss., University of Oxford.

_____. 1972. 'Comparison of Minor Initial Decoration: A Possible Method of Showing the Place of Origin of Thirteenth-Century Manuscripts.' *The Library* 5 (27): 23-30.

Payne, Thomas B. 1991. 'Poetry, Politics and Polyphony: Philip the Chancellor's Contribution to the Music of the Notre Dame School.' Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago.

Pesce, Dolores. 1986. 'The Significance of Text in Thirteenth-Century Latin Motets.' *Acta Musicologica* 58: 91-117.

_____. 1990. 'A Case for Coherent Pitch Organization in the Thirteenth-Century Double Motet.' *Music Analysis* 9: 287-318.

_____. 1997. 'Beyond Glossing: the Old Made New in *Mout me fu grief/Robin m'aime/Portare*.' In *Hearing the Motet: Essays on the Motet of the Middle Ages and Renaissance,* ed. Dolores Pesce. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 28-51.

_____, ed. 1997. *Hearing the Motet: Essays on the Motet of the Middle Ages and Renaissance.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Pickwoad, Nicholas. 2001. 'The Use of Fragments of Medieval Manuscripts in the Construction and Covering of Bindings on Printed Books.' In *Interpreting and Collecting Fragments of Medieval Books* ed. Linda L. Brownrigg & Margaret M. Smith. London: The Red Gull Press, 1-20.

Pinegar, Sandra. 1991. 'Textual and Conceptual Relationships among Theoretical Writings on Measurable Music of the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries.' PhD diss., Columbia University.

Piotrowski, Andrzej. 2011. *Architecture of Thought*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Planchart, Alejandro Enrique. 2009. *Embellishing the Liturgy: Tropes and Polyphony*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Pollard, Graham. 1976. 'Describing Medieval Bookbindings.' In *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to Richard William Hunt*, ed. J. J. G. Alexander and M. I. Gibson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 50-65.

Rankin, Susan. 2000. 'The Study of Medieval Music: Some Thoughts on Past, Present, and Future.' In *Musicology and Sister Disciplines: Past, Present, Future*, ed. David Greer. New York: Oxford University Press, 154-68.

Rankin, Susan and David Hiley, eds. 1993. *Music in the Medieval English Liturgy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Reames, Sherry L. 2005. 'Reconstructing and Interpreting a Thirteenth-Century Office for the Translation of Thomas Becket.' *Speculum* 80 (1): 118-170.

Reaney, Gilbert, ed. 1966. *Manuscripts of Polyphonic Music 11th-Early 14th Century.* RISM Vol. B IV. 1. Munich: G. Henle.

Reckow, Fritz, ed. 1967. *Der Musiktraktat Des Anonymus 4 Vol.1*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

Reese, Gustave. 1940. *Music in the Middle Age: With an Introduction on the Music of Ancient Times*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Rothenberg, David J. and Benjamin Brand, eds. 2016. *Music and Culture in the Middle Ages and Beyond: Liturgy, Sources, Symbolism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Salisbury, Matthew Cheung. 2008. *The Use of York: Characteristics of the Medieval Liturgical Office in York.* York: Borthwick Institute, University of York

_____. 2015. *The Secular Liturgical Office in Late Medieval England.* Turnhout: Brepols.

Sanders, Ernest H. 1962. 'Duple Rhythm and Alternate Third Mode in the 13th Century.' *JAMS* 15 (3): 249-91.

_____. 1963. 'Medieval English Polyphony and its Significance for the Continent.' PhD diss., Columbia University.

_____. 1965a. 'Cantilena and Discant in Fourteenth-Century England.' *Musica Disciplina* 19: 7-52.

_____. 1965b. 'Tonal Aspects of 13th-Century English Polyphony.' *Acta Musicologica* 37: 19–34.

_____. 1966. 'Continuity in English Music.' *Music & Letters* 47: 187-189.

_____, ed.1979. *English Music of the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries. PMFC XIV* Monaco: Editions de l'Oiseau-Lyre.

_____. 1980. 'W. de Wycombe'. In *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. xx (1 ed.) ed. Stanley Sadie. London: Macmillan, 552-553.

_____. 1985. 'Conductus and Modal Rhythm.' *JAMS* 38: 439-69.

_____. 1998. *French and English Polyphony of the 13th and 14th Centuries: Style and Notation*. Variorum Collected Studies Series, Vol. 637. London: Ashgate.

_____. n.d. 'Worcester Polyphony.' *Oxford Music Online*: http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com:80/subscriber/article/grove/music/30564. Accessed 11/19/2015.

_____. n.d. 'Sources, MS, IV: English Polyphony 1270-1400.' *Oxford Music Online*: http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com:80/subscriber/article/grove/music/50158pg6. Accessed 11/19/2015.

Sanders, Ernest, Frank Ll. Harrison and Peter M. Lefferts, eds. 1983-1986. *English Music for Mass and Offices PMFC XVI and XVII*. Monaco: Editions de l'Oiseau-Lyre.

Scott, Robert A. 2011. *Miracle Cures: Saints, Pilgrimage, and the Healing Powers of Belief*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Scott-Fleming, Sonia. 1989. *The Analysis of Pen Flourishing in Thirteenth-Century Manuscripts*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Slocum, Kay Brainerd. 2004. *Liturgies in Honour of Thomas Becket*. Toronto; Buffalo, N.Y. and London: University of Toronto Press.

Steiner, Katherine Kennedy. 2013. 'Notre Dame in Scotland: W1 and Liturgical Reform at St. Andrews.' PhD diss., Princeton University.

Stevens, Dennis. 1975. 'The Worcester Fragments.' *Musical Times* 116: 784-85.

Strohm, Reinhard. 1992. 'Center and Periphery; Mainstream and Provincial Music.' In *A Companion to Medieval and Renaissance Music,* ed. David Fallows and Tess Knighton. London: Dent, 55-9.

Summers, William J., and Peter M. Lefferts, eds. 2016. *English Thirteenth-Century Polyphony: A Facsimile Edition. EECM Vol. 57*. London: Stainer & Bell.

Summers, William J. 1983-5. 'Unknown and Unidentified English Polyphonic Music from the Fourteenth Century' *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle* 19: 57-67.

_____. 1990. 'English 14th-Century Polyphonic Music: An Inventory of the Extant Manuscript Sources with Reference to Facsimile and Performing Editions.' *The Journal of Musicology* 8 (2): 173–226.

Szirmai, J. A. 1999. *The Archaeology of Medieval Bookbinding*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Taruskin, Richard. 2005. 'Music for an Intellectual and Political Elite: The Thirteenth-Century Motet.' In *The Oxford History of Western Music vol. 1.* New York: Oxford University Press, 207-46.

_____. 2010. *Music from the Earliest Notations to the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, Andrew. 2002. *Textual Situations: Three Medieval Manuscripts and Their Readers* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Taylor, Andrew and Coates, A. E. 1998. 'The Dates of the Reading Calendar and the Summer Canon.' *Notes and Queries* 243: 22-24.

Thannabaur, Peter Joseph. 1962. *Das einstimmige Sanctus der römischen Messe in der handschriftlichen Überlieferung des 11. bis 16. Jahrhunderts.* München: W. Ricke.

Thomson, Rodney M., 2000. 'Newly Discovered Fragments of Music at Worcester Cathedral: A Preliminary Account' in Linda L. Brownrigg & Margaret M. Smith, eds. *Interpreting and Collecting Fragments of Medieval Books*. London: The Red Gull Press, 89-96.

_____. 2001. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts in Worcester Cathedral Library*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.

_____. 2008. 'Monastic and Cathedral Book Production.' In *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain II: 1100-1400*, ed. Nigel Morgan and Rodney M. Thomson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 136-168.

Tillos, Dianne. n.d. 'The History of D' http://medievalwriting.50megs.com/scripts/letters/historyd.htm. Accessed 04/09/2016.

Tischler, Hans. 1944. 'English Traits in the Early 13th-Century Motet.' *Musical Quarterly* 30: 458-76.

_____. 1985. *The Style and Evolution of the Earliest Motets (to circa 1270).* 2 vols. Henryville: Institute of Mediaeval Music.

Van Deusen, Nancy. 1995. *Theology and Music at the Early University: the Case of Robert Grosseteste and Anonymous IV.* Leiden: Brill.

Vlhova-Woerner, H. 2006. 'Genitor summi filii: A Remarkable Career of a Sanctus Trope.' In *Papers Read at the 12th Meeting of the IMS Study Group 'Cantus Planus', Lillafüred/ Hungary, 2004. Aug. 23-28*, ed. László Dobszay. Budapest: Institute for Musicology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 753-766.

_____. 2011. *Repertorium troporum Bohemiae Medii Aevi III, Tropi Ordinarii Missae Sanctus* Praha: Editio-Bärenreiter.

Wathey, Andrew. 1988. 'Lost Books of Polyphony in England: A List to 1500.' *RMA Research Chronicle* 21: 1-19.

_____. 1993. *Manuscripts of Polyphonic Music: The British Isles, 1100-1400*, RISM B/IV/1-2 supplement. Munich and Duisberg: G. Henle Verlag.

Webb, Diana. 2001. *Pilgrims and Pilgrimages in the Medieval West.* London: I.B Tauris & Co Ltd.

_____. 2002. *Medieval European Pilgrimage, c.700 - c.1500.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wegman, Rob C. 2015. 'The World According to Anonymous IV.' In *Qui Musican in Se Habet: Studies in Honor of Alejandro Enrique Planchart*, ed. Anna Zayaruznaya, Bonnie Blackburn, and Stanley Boorman. Middleton, WI: American Institute of Musicology.

_____.2016. 'Jacobus de Ispania and Liège.' *Journal of the Alamire Foundation* 8: 253-74.

_____.2017. 'Worcester Cathedral Library, MS Q19,' n.p. http://www.academia.edu/28166368/Worcester_Cathedral_Library_MS_Q19_Reconstruction Accessed 13/5/17.

Wibberley, Roger. 1977. 'The English Polyphonic Music of the Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries: A Reconstruction, Transcription, and Commentary.' Ph.D. diss., Oxford University.

_____. 2000. 'Ave Virgo Mater Dei: Towards a Reconstruction', *Plainsong and Medieval Music* 9: 41-49.

Williamson, Amy. 2016. 'Genre, Taxonomy and Repertory in Insular Polyphony of the "Long Thirteenth Century" (c. 1150-c.1350).' PhD diss., University of Southampton.

Wolinski, Mary E. 1992. 'The Compilation of the Montpellier Codex.' *Early Music History* 11: 263-301.

Wulstan, David. 2000. 'Sumer is icumen in: A Perpetual Puzzle Canon?' *Plainsong and Medieval Music* 9:1-17.

Young, Patrick. 1944. *Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Wigorniensis: Made in 1622-1623*, ed. Ivor Atkins and Neil R. Ker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.