

THE ORGANA AND CLAUSULAE OF MS *F* (*I-Fl Plut. 29.1*): THE FIRST FIVE FASCICLES OF THE FLORENCE CODEX

Edited by Thomas B. Payne

Introduction:

The annotated transcriptions offered here grew over many years. They originated out of my own curiosity in assessing and interpreting the contents of this most extensive of all the manuscript sources of “Notre Dame” music. In their present state they are intended primarily as a handy – and I hope useful – set of resources for scholars and performers. I originally posted earlier versions of these files on Academia.edu, and was exceedingly pleased in the early months of 2021 to be asked by the governing committee of the Digital Image Archive of Medieval Music (DIAMM – <https://www.diamm.ac.uk/>) to present them under their auspices, at which point I removed the files from the Academia site and set about to revise and correct them. I have consequently taken the several months since that point to comb over all this material multiple times in an attempt to present it in a reasonably consistent manner and to continue to eradicate remaining inaccuracies. I have attempted here to present the music as compactly and in as visually pleasing a fashion as I could muster. Of course, these examples do not come close to including the same range of information as in the complete critical edition of the *Magnus Liber Organi* published by L’Oiseau-Lyre. Nevertheless, despite the fact that they engage with the main content of the first five volumes of the *MLO* series, I would hope that users may find these documents worthwhile in terms of portraying the differing ways editors might respond to the material at hand.

The editorial principles used here rely also on the conventions of the greater *Magnus Liber* edition. A guide to the symbols and abbreviations found in the transcriptions is supplied in these accompanying materials. Except for one instance, MS *F* is the primary exemplar for all of the items contained herein. (The only outlier is Perotin’s *Sederunt principes* a4 – see the remarks on this piece for my reasoning in using the Madrid codex as its base source.) Critical commentary is in no way comprehensive, nonetheless on various occasions I have included different types of information as annotations to the scores. These notices generally appear within the transcriptions themselves, above the system at the place where they occur or signaled by an asterisk or dagger directing one to a comment at the bottom of the page or the end of a work. Such remarks may call attention to things like justifications for certain rhythmic interpretations, possibilities for performing whole pieces or their segments in other rhythmic modes, noteworthy instances of musical repetition, places where significantly differing readings may arise among the sources (sometimes these may appear as alternative renderings following the main entry), and other bits of information or items of curiosity I thought worthy to mention in a particular context. Musical concordances, when signaled here, usually delineate identities only within the four- and three-part repertoires and in the two-voice clausulae series in fascicles 5 and 3 of *F*. No systematic attempt, therefore, is made here to illustrate the vast, interwoven networks of relationships that arise within the repertory of *organa dupla*.

In the spirit of completeness, the three four-voice conductus that occur in fascicle 1 of *F* are also included. These particular works are handled differently from the presentation of the organa and clausulae, owing to their contrasting features and generic components. The poetry of these conductus appears separately after the musical setting and includes all known stanzas, an English translation in parallel columns, and some commentary featuring 1) a complete list of sources, 2) explanatory notes on the verbal texts, and 3) observations on the transcription as well as a listing of any variants from the main sources keyed to the lines and words of the poetry.

These transcriptions are offered openly to the general scholarly and musical community in a spirit of promoting collaboration and dialogue. I merely ask that, should you find them useful for your own work, you

acknowledge this resource, and please know that I welcome wholeheartedly any further corrections, clarifications, rectifications, or other improvements to what appears here.

Thomas B. Payne
William & Mary
18 June 2021