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In a treatise known as the *Ars musicae* (c. 1275), Master Johannes de Grocheio set out ‘to explain something in brief about musical teaching’¹. Grocheio’s project was ambitious. He believed that music could be categorised in the same way as natural phenomena, such as animals or motion, so he devised a method of categorising music based on methods of categorising natural things. Confining his remarks to music ‘according to the use of the people in Paris’, he divided music into three branches (*membra*): music of the people (*musica vulgalis*), measured music (*musica mensurata*) and music of the church (*musica ecclesiastica*) (Grocheio 2011: 61). Using this method, he was able to classify various musical genres experienced in a city in which musical teaching was very much at the margins of scholastic activity.

Behind the *Ars musicae* is an obscure figure who nonetheless engaged with his surroundings in predictable ways. At some point in his life, Grocheio gained enough insight into music to elucidate its finer points in a treatise, and his familiarity with the principles of natural science enabled him to describe music in natural-scientific terms. My purpose in this paper is twofold. Firstly, I consider Grocheio’s background and the circumstances surrounding the two surviving manuscripts of his treatise, contemplating his disputed role as a teacher in Paris. Secondly, I focus on the most overlooked aspect of his treatise, his teachings on music of the church, which have received little attention in the literature (Peraino 2001: 219–25; Dyer 1992: 107–11). I look at the social context surrounding the production of chant theory in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries and argue that Grocheio’s teachings on music of the church represent a new way of approaching the subject. At the same time, Grocheio documents chant practices specific to the city of Paris.

**Grocheio in Normandy: Lessay, Ardenne, La Perrine**

We know from his name that Johannes de Grocheio (John of Gruchy) was from one of the many Gruchys or Grouchys in Normandy (Page 1993: 18–19; Mullally 1998: 1 n. 1; Grocheio 2011: 3–5). The Latin *Grocheium* (*Grocheum, Grocheyum, Groceium*) appears in numerous documents connected with settlements in Normandy, including Gruchy to the north near Cherbourg, to the west near Caen and to the east near...
Figure 1. Places called Gruchy and local institutions connected with that name (image by Catherine Jeffreys)

Coutances (Fig. 1). Grocheio himself certainly knew Normandy. He spoke of a certain type of song *(cantilena)* that he had heard ‘in the west, namely in Normandy’ (Grocheio 2011: 69). Further, he spoke of a certain Clement, monk of Lessay (‘Clementem Exaquiensem monacum’) in Normandy, to whom he had relayed a sermon on the value of music in softening the ‘innate trials of humanity’ (Grocheio 2011: 67).

To date, researchers examining Grocheio’s Norman background have focused on which Gruchy he may have hailed from and have tended to leave things at that 2. These Gruchys, however, point to institutions that might have contributed to Grocheio’s early intellectual formation and perhaps even his later affiliations in Paris. An obvious case in point is the wealthy Benedictine Abbey of the Holy Trinity in Lessay in the diocese of Coutances 3. Links between Lessay, founded in 1056, and members of the Gruchy family date back to at least 1172 (Grocheio 2011: 4). We know from visitation records of Odo Rigaud, Bishop of Rouen, who visited Lessay three times between 1250 and 1266, that the Abbot of Lessay employed a secular master, possibly to educate local boys. On his third visit to Lessay, dated 23 September 1266, Rigaud found 31 monks, all but five of whom were ordained priests, and a ‘certain secular cleric named Master Gaufridus, who had enjoyed the complete value of the rents and profits of the abbey for many years’, Rigaud subsequently ordering that ‘one monk be attached to [Gaufridus], who might learn and be taught by this cleric about how the abbey was to be administered in secular affairs 4.

A partial list of manuscripts from Lessay, compiled by Bernardo de Montfaucon in 1739, includes conciliar and synodic decrees, ecclesiastical letters and Isidore of Seville’s *Commentary on Genesis* (Montfaucon 1739: 1361–2), indicating some of the intellectual
interests at the abbey. During the first half of the fourteenth century, successive Abbots of Lessay provided stipendiary church positions to four masters of arts, all graduates of the university in Paris. If Grocheio was educated at Lessay, he might have had access to the teachings of a secular master within an institution that emphasised ecclesiastical doctrine and provided livings to university graduates.

A small number of documents preserve the unusual orthography of Grocheio (or Grocheyo) given in the explicit to Grocheio’s treatise (“Explicit theoria magistri Johannes de Grocheio”). The Premonstratensian abbey at Ardenne founded in 1121 — not long after the order itself (Desbiolles 2007: 17) — in the diocese of Bayeux, received a number of donations from the Gruchy family, including one made in 1276 by Gaufridus Corsderry de Grocheio. The Premonstratensians provided for a master of novices (magister noviciorum) (Lefèvre and Grauwen 1978: 28), although it is unclear whether local secular boys were educated at Premonstratensian abbeys. Like the Abbot of Lessay, the Abbot of Ardenne provided livings for university graduates, including Nicolaus Peregrini, who claimed joint benefices from Lessay and Ardenne on 19 June 1342 (Courtenay 2002: 148–9). The Gruchy connection with this abbey raises the possibility that Grocheio may have had contact with the Premonstratensian order. If Grocheio was educated in a monastic environment, however, that environment would more likely have been the Benedictine abbey at Lessay, which housed a secular teacher, than the Premonstratensian abbey at Ardenne.

The Grocheio (or Grocheyo) orthography is found in a necrology from Sainte-Catherine at Le Perrine (approximately 40 km north-east of Coutances), a leper hospice founded in 1238 and administered by the military Order of the Trinitarians. The Trinitarian’s chief business was the ransom of captives. Before his death on 5 March (1343?), Guillelmus de Grocheyo, a squire (armiger), gave the hospice 15 pounds and a bed, and his brother, Robertus, who died that same day gave 30 shillings. Guillelmus had earlier given 100 shillings to the hospice, presumably for participating in the Trinitarians’ ransoming activities. Another Guillelmus de Grocheyo, who died of leprosy at the hospice on 27 September (1316?), donated 20 solidos. The connection between the Trinitarians and the Gruchy family is potentially significant, because not a small number of Gruchys are described as low-ranking military — armigeri (squires) or militi (soldiers) — in

---

**Figure 2.** Parochial houses in Normandy under the full or partial patronage of the Abbot of Lessay in 1251 (image by Catherine Jeffreys)
documents from the eleventh century to the fourteenth century (Grocheio 2011: 4, 20–1 n. 27). If the relationship between the Gruchi family and the Trinitarian hospice at La Perrine existed during Grocheio’s lifetime, it might have placed him in contact with the Trinitarians and their nearby house at Le Désert, founded in 1254.

Grocheio’s hints that his background included wide experience of diverse liturgical practices: ‘[c]onsideration of the parts of [music of the church] is difficult except for a man experienced in and very familiar with the diverse uses of churches’ (Grocheio 2011: 99). It is possible that Grocheio experienced such ‘diverse uses of churches’ around Lessay. In his Polyptychum from 1251, Johannes de Essey, Bishop of Coutances, listed hundreds of churches and chapels in the region, no fewer than 38 of which fell under the full or partial patronage of the Abbot of Lessay (Wailly, Delisle and Jourdain 1894: 494, 497, 501–2, 511–16, 518, 520, 528, 532) (Fig. 2). These parochial houses encircle Lessay such that, even if Grocheio’s early life was confined to the immediate area around the abbey, he still would have encountered plenty of discrete liturgical practices, enabling him to cultivate an appreciation of liturgical difference.

**Grocheio’s Conservers: Guy of Saint-Denis and Johannes de Botis**

Grocheio’s treatise survives in two parchment manuscripts: British Library Harley MS 281 and Darmstadt Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek MS 2663. Mews et al. have established that Harley MS 281 was the handwork of Guy (Guido), a monk of the Benedictine Abbey of Saint-Denis (Mews et al. 2008: 12) who may have been Guy of Châtres, Abbot of Saint-Denis (Mews 2010: 140–1). Compiled sometime after 1301, Harley MS 281 is devoted entirely to music theory, combining Guido of Arezzo’s oeuvre, the Cistercian Tonale Sancti Bernardi, Grocheio’s Ars musice, Petrus de Cruce’s Tractatus de tonis and Guy’s own Tractatus de tonis. Guy wrote his Tractatus for the instruction of fellow brethren of Saint-Denis (Guy of Saint-Denis 2017: 3), though Harley MS 281 was probably housed at the College of Saint-Denis rather than at the abbey 10 km north of Paris (Mews et al. 2008: 23). Grocheio is not identified in Harley MS 281 even though all other authors are named. Nonetheless, Guy includes numerous, albeit anonymous citations from Grocheio’s treatise in his Tractatus (Klundert 1998: 1: 45–55), in which he alludes to Grocheio as among certain others (quibusdam aliis) ‘who say that public and civil song ... and particularly measured song ... are neither subject to the tones nor regulated by them’ (Guy of Saint-Denis 2017: 8; cf. Grocheio 2011: 95), confirming Guy’s first-hand familiarity with the Ars musice if not its author.

By contrast, Grocheio is identified by name in Darmstadt MS 2663, both in the explicit to his treatise on folio 69v (‘Explicit theorica magistri Johannes de Grocheio’) and in the manuscript’s table of contents on folio T” (‘Musica magistri Johannes de Grocheio’). Darmstadt MS 2663 is a miscellany — each work is in a different hand and has a separate page layout (mise-en-page) — that was kept at the library of the Charterhouse of St Barbara in Cologne. Grocheio’s Ars musice is the only music treatise in the miscellany; all other works are liturgical (Grocheio 2011: 15–16).

Mews et al. have suggested that the music theorist Heinrich Eger von Kalkar (1328–1408), later abbot of the Charterhouse, may have brought the manuscript to Cologne after a period of study in Paris in the 1350s (Grocheio 2011: 15). A more probable explanation, however, is that Johannes de Botis de Colonia, a monk of the Charterhouse who claimed to have written the manuscript (‘Istum librum scriptis dominus Iohannes de Botis’), was responsible for bringing Grocheio’s treatise to Cologne after his own period of study in Paris, where he completed the first phase of his studies in arts in 1351. Botis’ writing of the manuscript entailed adding folio numbers, rubrics and the table of contents to the collection (Grocheio 2011: 15). Botis later left the Charterhouse to take up a position as a canon at Cologne Cathedral, collecting a pension of 6 florins in 1390. Deletions in the table of contents in Darmstadt MS 2663 (‘Istum librum scriptis dominus Iohannes de Botis monachus domus sancte Barbare Coloniensis ordinis Cathusianesis’) seem to reflect his departure from the Charterhouse (Fig. 3); the addition of ‘requiescat in pace amen’ at the end of the table of contents seems to signal his departure from this world.

The large number of abbreviations common to the two surviving parchment manuscripts of the Ars musice suggests that both were copied from a single exemplar (Grocheio 2011: 14–15). We do not know where Guy of Saint-Denis acquired this exemplar, but it is possible that he consulted manuscripts from the Sorbonne, which was a lending library (Jullien de Pommerol et al. 2000). Guy’s Tractatus de tonis incorporates extracts from Petrus de Alvernia’s sixth Quodlibet delivered in Paris in 1301 (Guy of Saint-Denis 2017: 211–2), including a
Figure 3. Johannes de Botis’ table of contents in Darmstadt Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek MS 2663, fol. Tv (Darmstadt, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek 2018), reproduced under Creative Commons BY-NC-SA licence, <creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>
reading replicated in BnF lat. 15851 (Jeffreys 2011: 160 n. 44), which was housed at the Sorbonne where Petrus was a master of theology. Guy’s Tractatus also includes a reading from Boethius’ De institutione musica found in Hieronymus de Moravia’s Tractatus de musica in BnF lat. 1666311, which Peter of Limoges bequeathed to the Sorbonne in 1306 (Delisle 1874: 168). The Sorbonne held a copy of the Cistercian Tonale and works by Guido of Arezzo, which Guy may have consulted while preparing Harley MS 28112. In addition, Guy spoke of searching for a ‘book about the tones’ by Gregory the Great, suggesting that he spent time looking for this book in local collections (other lending libraries in Paris included Saint-Victor (Guy 1999: 28) and Saint-Germain-des-Prés (Delisle 1874: 42–3)):

Certain musicians had asserted that the book about the tones was produced by him [Gregory], as was said above. Although I have looked for the work attributed to his name, I have been unable to find it ... Perhaps I have even held the very book and read it attentively amongst the many and various treatises that I have seen about this matter, yet unaware or not knowing whose it was (Guy of Saint-Denis 2017: 93).

Guy’s possible presence at the Sorbonne points to this area of Paris as a feasible locale for the circulation of an early copy of the Ars musice (Fig. 4). As a student of arts in the English Nation in Paris, Johannes de Botis would have been familiar with this same area — the Charterhouse (the Château de Vauvert), where Botis might have stayed while studying in Paris, was in the Faubourg Saint-Michel, adjacent to the Rue de Saint Jacques near the Sorbonne. At any rate, Guy’s and Botis’ presence in this part of Paris makes it the most likely place for both to have acquired the Ars musice.

Grocheio’s Magisterial Standing

The explicit to the Ars musice in Darmstadt MS 2663 (Fig. 5), which is written in the same hand as the rest of the text (Grocheio 2011: 114), reveals the name of the author and the fact that he was a teacher (magister). The word regens was added by a second hand (not Johannes de Botis)13. In the context of late thirteenth-century Paris, regens (regent) describes a person who held a position as a teacher (Teeuwen 2003: 329). According to the explicit in Darmstadt MS 2663, Grocheio was active as a teacher when he composed his Ars musice.

Below the explicit is an illegible word recorded as Parisius as early as 1887, when German historian F. W. E. Roth transcribed the colophon in Darmstadt MS 2663, indicating that Grocheio was a teaching master in Paris when he wrote his treatise:

‘Here ends the Theoria of Master Johannes de Grocheio’. Added in another hand in a paler ink, fifteenth century, ‘regens Parisius’. That was not the original handwriting; the first hand adds under this: ‘Scriptori flamen sacrum tribuat Decus Amen’. This author is unknown and has no affinity with Johannis de Muris, who also taught in Paris. The work is, to my knowledge, unpublished and worthy of note (Roth 1888: 51)14.

Christopher Page, however, has cautioned against accepting the evidence in Darmstadt MS 2663 that Grocheio was active as a teacher in Paris (even though Page accepted the Parisius reading in that manuscript). Mindful that the majority of students at the university in Paris did not obtain a degree and the licence to teach that came with it, Page has asserted that Grocheio’s description as ‘magistri … regens Parisius’ may have been a scribal guess, casting doubt on Grocheio’s magisterial standing and his location at the time he compiled the Ars musice:

There is no proof that [Grocheio] proceeded to take a degree, however (for this was not an automatic step), and it may be wise to keep an open mind about the note in the Darmstadt manuscript of the text where he is given the title ‘magister’ and named as a resident teacher at Paris (‘regens Parisius’); the scribe may have been guessing on the basis of what he had read in the treatise. (It is noteworthy that the word ‘Parisius’ is added in a later hand.) If modern scholars are agreed that the treatise was written in Paris then it is partly because Paris exerts an extraordinary magnetism in most areas of Ars Antiqua studies; one might well argue that it is a quintessentially provincial activity to classify and describe the musical forms and fashions of a capital. Viewed in this light, the [Ars musice] might have been written in any part of France (Page 1993: 18).
Admittedly, we lack definitive proof that Grocheio gained a degree and a licence to teach in Paris. Such proof might be Grocheio’s name on the list of magisterial deliberations for the Norman Nation, but this document is no longer extant (Courtenay 1991: 25–6), or his name on a scroll of supplication, but scrolls (rotuli) for Paris do not survive from before the mid-fourteenth century (Courtenay 2002: 1). Nor do we have evidence of his enrolment in a higher faculty for which an arts degree was a prerequisite and, on its own, the designation magister does not equate to graduate of the university (Kintzinger 2000: 173). We have, however, more proof that Grocheio was active as a teacher in Paris than we do for a great many masters and he certainly knew the works of Aristotle and others that were required reading in arts (Crossley and Williams 2011; Grocheio 2011: 6–9; Page 1989: 171), suggesting that he may have studied in that city. The title magister and the designation regens in Darmstadt MS 2663 involved two different scribes: the main text hand identified the author as a master, and a second hand asserted that the author was teaching. Further, Page’s suggestion that the Ars musica ‘might have been written in any part of France’ is problematic: Grocheio explicitly states that he had heard certain types of song ‘in the West, in Normandy’, confirming that, at the time of writing his treatise, he was in fact east of Normandy. The possibility that this location in the east was Paris is certainly bolstered by the ties that Guy of Saint-Denis and Johannes de Botis had to that city.

That Grocheio relied on an income through teaching is suggested at the opening of his treatise (Crossley and Williams 2011: 150), which he addresses to ‘certain young men, my friends ... [who] over a long time have given very great support for the necessities of my life’ (Grocheio 2011: 43). Even if these young men were illusionary, Grocheio still required financial support to meet the costs of composing a treatise on music (Grocheio 2011: 6), something that a family of squires and soldiers may not have been able to provide. In this regard, his financial situation might be compared with another master connected with Lessay, Magister Johannes de Corceyo (Wailly, Delisle and Jourdain 1894: 546). This Johannes was patron of the Church of Courcy some 30 km south of Lessay (Wailly, Delisle and Jourdain 1894: 496), suggesting that he, unlike Grocheio, had access to an income (from land holdings).
Figure 5. Darmstadt Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek MS 2663, fol. 59r (Darmstadt, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek 2018), reproduced under Creative Commons BY-NC-SA licence, <creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>
Mews et al. have suggested that Grocheio taught at the Benedictine College of Saint-Denis (Grocheio 2011: 5), which employed a master of the boys (magister pueros) and a master of the young men (magister iuvenum) from at least the 1280s (Nebbiai-Dalla Guarda 1985: 337). This accords with his possible Benedictine background at Lessay. Such an appointment may not have required a licence to teach, as would be required for a teacher in the faculty of arts in Paris, although we cannot rule out the possibility that Grocheio did obtain such a licence. Grocheio implies that his audience had access to ‘the gradual and the antiphonary and other ecclesiastical books’ (Grocheio 2011: 99), which is consistent with a collegial setting (for the liturgy at individual colleges in Paris, see Rico 2005: 308–10). The end of the explicit in Darmstadt MS 2663 includes an invocation to the scribe: ‘Scriptori flamen sacrum. tribuat decus amen’ (‘To the author may the sacred wind grant glory, amen’). This colophon is not replicated in any other manuscript that I am aware of — the colophon is not recorded in Bénédictins de Bouveret (1965–1982); nor does it resemble any of the pro forma colophons identified in Reynhout (2006). The reference to the flamen sacrum (the Holy Spirit), however, suggests that the copy of the Ars musica in Darmstadt MS 2663 was from a liturgical setting, Johannes de Botis later including it among liturgical works in his manuscript. At any rate, two hands in Darmstadt MS 2663 make it clear that Grocheio was active as a teacher when he composed his treatise, and his connection to Saint-Denis provides one possible locale for his teaching activities in Paris.

Chant Theory and the Nonchalant Churchman

Grocheio devotes the final section of his treatise to a liturgical subject, music of the church (musica ecclesiastica), which he describes as music ‘as far as it is necessary for a churchman [vir ecclesiasticus] and is ordered for the praise of the Creator and the service of God’ (Grocheio 2011: 93). He identifies three arts as ordained to this praise: grammar, computus and music. Grammar and computus (‘the way of calculating’) were taught alongside chant (cantus) and psalms (psalmos) as part of an early education in Frankish lands, as mandated by Charlemagne’s Admonitio Generalis from 789. Both were also taught in Paris, forming part of the curriculum for students of arts. Music, on the other hand, is not named in any documents outlining the required books for study in Paris; nor was it part of the ‘magisterial lecture or the formal academic dispute’ that formed the ‘public forums’ of the university (Dyer 2009: 204). Even so, masters of arts in Paris included musica in their introductions to philosophy from at least the 1230s, describing the first two books of Boethius’ Musica as customary (de forma) (Lafleur 1988: 203–9, 267–8, 326–8, 373–4). Students of arts in Paris would have found no curricular support to learn music as far as was necessary for a churchman, but they might have come across Boethius’ Musica.

A statute dated 1295 from the Synod of Winchester indicates that, 500 years after Charlemagne’s proclamation, chant (cantus) was not uniformly taught alongside the psalms in childhood. The statute encouraged parents to address this disciplinal deficit, lest boys later found themselves ‘unfit for divine service’:

In addition, let parents be induced, that their boys, after they know how to read the psaltery, let them also learn chant, lest after they have learnt better things perhaps, they may be compelled to return to this learning, or as inferior in this way, lest they are perpetually unfit for divine service (Leach 1911: 234).

Grocheio appears to echo this concern in the Ars musica, warning that ‘a churchman ought not to ignore’ grammar, computus and music (Grocheio 2011: 91), suggesting that some churchman did just that.

We do know that oblates intended for the monastic life and boys who sang in church and cathedral choirs received the sort of formal musical education that would ensure a sound knowledge of chant in adulthood (Boynton 2008: 37–9). We cannot assume, however, that every student in Paris was once an oblate or a choirboy who came to the city with a formal musical education behind him. Nor can we assume that every boy had developed sufficient mastery of chant in childhood to be fit for divine service in adulthood, particularly if the situation in Winchester was reflected across the channel.

During the 1260s and 1270s, a number of observers spoke of churchmen who were unfit for divine service. In Paris itself, measures were taken to keep future churchmen liturgically in check. In a statute dated 1270–74, the faculty of medicine began imposing financial penalties on bachelors who failed to attend liturgical services (Denifle and Châtelain 1889: 516) and in 1276 the papal legate to France
and future Pope Martin IV, Simon de Brion, threatened to excommunicate students who played dice and danced in circles (caroles) or worse, instead of attending liturgical services on feast days (Denifle and Châtelain 1889: 540–1).

This period also coincided with increasing centralisation of church appointments whereby the pope was petitioned directly for church livings (Smith 2015: 111). A decree of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) had warned bishops to

> diligently prepare and instruct those to be elevated to the priesthood in the divine offices and in the proper administration of the sacraments of the Church,

and

> [if] in the future they presume to ordain ignorant and unformed [rudis] men (a defect that can easily be discovered), we decree that both those ordaining and those ordained be subject to severe punishment (Schroeder 1937: 267).

By the mid 1260s, however, centralisation of church appointments meant that local patrons did not necessarily select their churchmen and by implication bishops were not always in a position to ensure the competency of clerical appointees. All the while, exasperated observers could do little but express their frustration at liturgical ineptitude among certain churchmen (and the indifference of their maladroit flocks).

Joseph Dyer once remarked that ‘[t]he last half of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century witnessed a sudden revival of interest in Gregorian chant theory’ (Dyer 1992: 99). Theorists who wrote afresh on chant theory include Lambert (before 1270), Amerus (1271), Hieronymus de Moravia (after 1272), Egidius de Zamora (fl.1280’), Petrus de Cruce (c. 1298), Guy of Saint-Denis (after 1301), Jacobus de Ispania (d. after 1330), Walter Odington (d. after 1330) and Engelbert of Admont (d. 1331). This is despite the elements of chant theory — such as the mathematical basis of music and the system of eight modes — remaining stable since the eleventh century. Grocheio was among these theorists who shared this renewed interest at a time when locally unvetted and musically under-schooled churchmen were increasingly taking up church appointments across France and elsewhere. Clearly, something inspired theorists to suddenly write anew about chant theory: a lack of musical knowledge among aspiring churchmen and the potential for this to not be discovered prior to acquiring a church position may have provided one such source of inspiration.

Aristotle and a New Kind of Chant Theory

New ways of thinking about the subject is another factor that may have inspired this new-found interest in chant theory in the late thirteenth century (Dyer 1992: 110–17). In this respect, Grocheio was at the forefront of innovative musical thinking. His method of describing music, based on Aristotle’s natural-scientific works, has been the focus of numerous studies (Bielitz 1985; Fladt 1987; Bielitz 1988; Eske 2000; Haines and DeWitt 2008), so I will confine my remarks here to the key concepts from these works that influenced Grocheio’s handling of music of the church.

At the core of the Ars musicæ is a way of proceeding (modus procedendi) based on Book I of Aristotle’s Physica. Grocheio initially explains that an analysis of a natural thing — in this case, music — should consider its governing principles before one delves into specifics:

> The way of proceeding will be first to consider commonalities, which are called principles, and then, one by one, issues arising from [principles] according to the nature of the subject matter. For thus all human knowledge proceeds, whether sensory or intellectual, as Aristotle says in the preface to the Physica (Grocheio 2011: 43).

For Grocheio, the basic principles (principia) that govern music of the church are tone (tonus), which he defines as ‘a rule through which one can recognize every ecclesiastical [chant]’ (Grocheio 2011: 95). Reworking a definition of tonus from the anonymous Dialogus de musica, Grocheio argues that each tone has three parts: a ‘beginning, a middle, and an end’, and that theorists who only consider the end or the middle and end of a tone ‘err in many ways’.
Grocheio’s tripartite definition of *tonus* reflects the definition of a whole (*totus*) from Book 1 of Aristotle’s *De caelo*, a work to which Grocheio alludes (Grocheio 2011: 6, 59). In the *De caelo*, Aristotle attributes to certain Pythagoreans the idea that a whole has three dimensions limited by a beginning, a middle and an end:

> [C]ertain Pythagoreans say that the whole and the thing are delineated by three dimensions: namely, the end, the middle and the beginning: and all things are certainly this number, and it signifies the number three in all things (Aristotle 1843: 40).

In the *Ars musicie*, the end (*finis*) of a tone is the note on which chants terminate, that is, one of the four finals (D, E, F, G). The middle (*medium*) of a tone is the limit of the ascent and descent characteristic for each tone, or the range associated with each. The beginning (*inceptio*) of a tone is the first note on which a chant of that tone begins, even though Grocheio concedes that ‘any tone can have many beginnings within the limits of its range’ (Grocheio 2011: 99). Grocheio seems to find fault with other theorists who rely on the end only or on the end and middle of a chant to classify a chant’s tone as neither scheme fully encapsulates the Pythagorean tripartite whole.

Once the principles of music are in place, Grocheio turns his attention to its particulars, the many and various forms (*formae*) or genres of church music. First, he divides the whole that is ecclesiastical service not into the typically bipartite division of the Mass and the Office but into three branches (*membra*): ‘Matins, the Hours, and the Mass’, reflecting a division of divine praise — whereby Matins and Lauds are one praise alongside the six other Hours and the Mass — mentioned by William of Auxerre (d. 1231) in his widely circulated *Summa de officiis ecclesiasticis* (William of Auxerre 2013: Prologus 5):

> Those dividing up ecclesiastical service generally reduce the whole to 3 branches, namely Matins, the Hours, and the Mass. They call Matins that service which occurs and is said in religious houses or cathedral churches at around midnight or in public churches before Prime in the morning ... They call the Hours that service which is said at fixed hours, namely at Prime, Terce, Sext, None, Vespers, and Compline ... They call the Mass that glorious service in which the greatest and the divine mysteries are achieved (Grocheio 2011: 93).

Grocheio contends that each branch comprises parts (*partes*), some of which overlap between branches (for example, the antiphon and hymn are sung in Matins and the Hours):

> And they call [Matins’] parts [*partes*] the invitatory, the Venite, the hymn, the antiphon, the psalm, the reading, the night responsory with its versicle, and finally the prayer ... [the Hours’] components [*particulares*] are the hymn, the antiphon, the psalm, and the responsory, and the prayer ... [the Mass’] parts [*partes*] are the *officium* or introit, the *Kyrie eleison*, the *Gloria in exelsis Deo*, the prayer, the epistle, the responsory, the alleluia, the sequence, the Gospel, the *Credo in Deum* [sic] the offertory, the secret, the preface, the *Sanctus*, the canon of the Mass, the *Agnus*, the communion, [and] the post communion (Grocheio 2011: 93).

In defining these parts and components, Grocheio evokes Aristotle’s method for understanding animals:

> But awareness of all these [different branches of music] is from three things: first from universal knowledge, which is had through definition or description; secondly from perfect knowledge, which consists in distinguishing and knowing the parts [*partes*]. But thirdly it is had from the last, which is had through knowledge of composition. For thus natural things are known ... In this way Aristotle passes on knowledge about animals in the book which is called *De animalibus* (Grocheio 2011: 67).

In applying this threefold classificatory method to music of the church, Grocheio describes each liturgical part (*pars*) in order (‘definition or description’), he relates how the parts differ from one another (‘distinguishing and knowing’), and he explains how they are made up (‘knowledge of composition’). Grocheio’s aim is not to document the full diversity of chant but to separate out the parts that comprise the liturgy to the point that each is fully differentiated from all other parts. In the process, he reverses a centuries-old tradition in chant theory of grouping chants first by tone or mode and then by genre, instead grouping chants first by genre and then by tone.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feast</th>
<th>Chant</th>
<th>Genre (+ tone)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Sunday of Advent</td>
<td>Laetentur caeli</td>
<td>Responsory (tone 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audite verbum</td>
<td>Responsory (tone 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conditor alme</td>
<td>Hymn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ad te levavi animam meam + Vias tuas</td>
<td>Introit + versicle (tone 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Sunday of Advent</td>
<td>Rex noster</td>
<td>Responsory (tone 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O sapientia (17 December)</td>
<td>O sapientia</td>
<td>Antiphon (tone 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Sunday of Advent</td>
<td>Ecce apparebit</td>
<td>Responsory (tone 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qui venturus</td>
<td>Responsory (tone 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bethlehem civitas</td>
<td>Responsory (tone 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity (25 December)</td>
<td>Christus natus est pro [sic] nobis</td>
<td>Invitatory (tone 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hodie nobis</td>
<td>Responsory (tone 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Puer natus</td>
<td>Introit (tone 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laetabundus</td>
<td>Sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John the Evangelist (27 December)</td>
<td>Adoremus regem</td>
<td>Invitatory (tone 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septuagesima Sunday</td>
<td>De profundis</td>
<td>Tract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Sunday of Lent</td>
<td>Non sit vobis</td>
<td>Invitatory (tone 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Monday of Lent</td>
<td>Participem me fac + Aspice in me</td>
<td>Responsory + versicle (tone 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Tuesday of Lent</td>
<td>Domine refugium</td>
<td>Introit (tone 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Sunday of Lent</td>
<td>Dominum qui fecit nos</td>
<td>Invitatory (tone 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Wednesday of Lent</td>
<td>Ego autem</td>
<td>Introit (tone 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter Sunday</td>
<td>Resurrexi</td>
<td>Introit (tone 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter Monday</td>
<td>Surexit</td>
<td>Invitatory (tone 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night before Pentecost</td>
<td>Sicut cervus</td>
<td>Tract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecost Sunday</td>
<td>Veni creator</td>
<td>Hymn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Sunday after Pentecost</td>
<td>Respicie in me</td>
<td>Introit (tone 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John the Baptist (24 June)</td>
<td>Regem precursoris</td>
<td>Invitatory (tone 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ut queant lapsis</td>
<td>Hymn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption (15 August)</td>
<td>Venite adoremus</td>
<td>Invitatory (tone 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O quam glorifica</td>
<td>Hymn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gaudeamus + Eructavit</td>
<td>Introit + versicle (tone 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octave of the Assumption (22 August)</td>
<td>Salve sancta parens</td>
<td>Introit (tone 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Denis (9 October)</td>
<td>Regem regum</td>
<td>Invitatory (tone 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Martin (11 November)</td>
<td>Martinus ecce</td>
<td>Invitatory (tone 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro defunctus</td>
<td>Regem cui omnia vivunt</td>
<td>Invitatory (tone 8) (usually tone 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common of Martyrs</td>
<td>Alleluia Laetabitur iustus</td>
<td>Alleluia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blessed Virgin Mary</td>
<td>Benedicta es caelorum</td>
<td>Sequence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the course of describing the parts of ecclesiastical service, Grocheio names chant examples from the proper of Matins, the Hours and the Mass, noting the ‘specially appointed times in which [one] ought to praise his Creator’:

Of such a kind are the season of the glorious Nativity of Christ, and the season of Holy Lent with the season of his Passion, and Resurrection and Ascension, and the feasts of holy men and women which are laid down by the masters and the makers of the law (Grocheio 2011: 91).

Grocheio’s chant examples illustrate these specially appointed times. He names chants from Advent, the Nativity, Lent, Easter and Pentecost, punctuated with major feast days of holy men and women (John the Baptist, John the Evangelist, the Blessed Virgin Mary), including two martyred bishops of Paris: Saint Martin and Saint Denis (Table 1).

Grocheio’s documentation of widely known chants from major feasts for both the temporale and the sanctorale reflects Aristotle’s advice on the use of examples as explained in the *Topics*, a work that Grocheio does not mention, although it was required reading for students in arts in Paris from at least 1255 (Denifle and Châtelain 1889: 278):

> For clarity, you should adduce examples and illustrations. And the examples should be familiar ones, drawn from things we know, as in Homer, not as in Choirilos; for in this way what is put forward would be clearer (trans. Ierodiakonou 2002: 14).

Grocheio’s use of the ‘things we know’ suggests an innovative approach to chant examples. The chants are not intended as a record of a specific liturgical practice but rather are expressions of the typical and the commonplace to aid comprehension of the broad operation of the liturgy, in this case, ‘according to the use of the people in Paris’.

**Chant ‘according to the use of the people in Paris’**

In order to confirm that Grocheio’s discussion of music of the church is ‘according to the use of the people in Paris’, I compared his chant examples with liturgical practices that he may have encountered in that city: Saint-Denis (Grocheio may have taught at the college), Notre Dame (the Church of Paris), the Trinitarian house of Saint-Mathurin in Paris (Grocheio may have had familial ties to the Trinitarian order) and the Sorbonne (near where Grocheio’s treatise may have been initially circulated). The appendix to this paper gives the location of each chant within select manuscripts.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, all of Grocheio’s chant examples were known at Saint-Denis, reinforcing his association with that college or abbey. All but three chants (*Regem regum*, *Regem cui omnia vivunt*, *Benedicta es caelorum*) survive in manuscripts from Notre Dame, all but three chants (*Regem regum*, *Regem cui omnia vivunt*, *Laetabundus*) survive in manuscripts from the Trinitarian house in Paris and all Mass chants but one survive from the Sorbonne (*Benedicta es caelorum*). All chants except *Regem regum*, *Regem cui omnia vivunt*, *Benedicta es caelorum* and *Laetabundus* survive in a single manuscript, BnF lat. 1022 from the Trinitarian house of Saint-Mathurin in Paris, Barbara Haggh noting that this manuscript ‘shares some of its content’ with several Parisian sources (Haggh 2000: 15).

As Mews et al. have pointed out, Grocheio names two chants particular to Saint-Denis: *Regem regum*, an invitatory of the first tone for Saint Denis (9 October) and *Regem cui omnia vivunt*, an invitatory of the eighth tone for the dead (*pro defunctus*) (commonly tone 6) (Grocheio 2011: 22 n. 35). Invitatories of tones 1 and 8 are rare, although examples of invitatories of these two tones are found in chant theory from the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. *Benedicta es caelorum* was incorporated into the liturgy at Saint-Denis some time before c. 1350, the date of London, Victoria and Albert Museum MS 1346–1891 in which it is preserved (Robertson 1991: 184, 406). This sequence was also known to the Trinitarians in Paris — it is preserved in Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 430, an early sixteenth-century missal from Saint-Mathurin (Blume 1915: 396). Grocheio’s mention of *Benedicta es caelorum* indicates that it was known in Paris much earlier than implied by these sources.

Grocheio may even allude to an unusual practice particular to the Church of Paris. He describes the *Credo in deum* and *Symbolum Aspystalorum* (the Apostle’s Creed) as ‘the credo of the mass’. Mews et al. (myself included) assumed that Grocheio was mistaken and
that he should have cited the Credo in unum deum and Symbolum Nicaenum (Grocheio 2011: 127 n. 171). Statutes from the Synod of Paris under Bishop Sully in 1208, however, order that priests must ‘always exhort the people to be declared at Sunday prayer and the Credo in Deum and the Salutatione Beate Virginis’ the same version of the Credo that Grocheio identified as part of the Mass in Paris (the Synod of Cambrai under Bishop Guiard de Laon (1238–1248) mandated a similar practice (Avril 1995: 57)). On folio 18r of a missal of Notre Dame, BnF lat. 1112 from around 1220 (Wright 1989: 81), the incipit Credo in deum is set to the melody for Credo I for the feast of the Nativity at Mass at the cockcrow (In gallicantu Missa). This is the only noted Credo incipit in the manuscript — all other incipits simply read ‘Credo’ — but it clearly reads ‘Credo in deum’, not ‘Credo in unum deum’.

Grocheio indicates that the Credo in deum is ‘sung in the manner of a ductia’ (from the Latin ductus, ‘to lead’), a genre of music of the people that he earlier describes as ‘arous[ing] the spirit of man to move decorously’ (Grocheio 2011: 73). Rather than being a mistake, Grocheio’s assertion that the Credo in deum is part of the Mass seems to reflect a practice of leading the congregation in the recitation of the Credo in deum, one example being early in the morning on the feast of the Nativity at Notre Dame. Judith Peraino has suggested that Grocheio’s treatise ‘blurs’ sacred and secular categories, bridging the ‘social gulf between the laity and the clergy’ (Peraino 2001: 225). Grocheio appears to take this bridging a step further: the clergy and the laity are physically brought together through recitation of the Credo in deum ‘according to the use of the people in Paris’.

Conclusion

In this paper, I have attempted to trace Johannes de Grocheio’s progression from Norman student to Parisian author of the Ars musice. His early education was most likely at Lessay, which was encircled by parochial houses representing a diversity of chant practices. At some point, Grocheio read Aristotle’s natural scientific works, possibly as a student of arts in the Norman Nation in Paris. It is most likely in Paris that Grocheio wrote his treatise while employed as a teacher, probably at the College of Saint-Denis. Indeed, the Ars musice only survives because two monks in Paris chose to preserve it. Grocheio’s treatise shows that musical teaching had a place within the educational milieu in Paris. The novelty of thinking about chant in the same way as animals would not have been lost on a graduate of arts who knew his Aristotle, such as Johannes de Botis. Grocheio’s reflections on music of the church confirm his first-hand familiarity with chant practices in Paris, specifically at Saint-Denis and possibly at Notre Dame. At the very least, we no longer have grounds to exclude him from the educational milieu of Paris to which he rightly belongs.

ENDNOTES

1. Modern editors have given the Ars musice various titles. Grocheio’s first editor, Johannes Wolf, called it Theoria after an explicit (Wolf 1899: 69). Ernst Rohloff, who edited the Ars musice twice, adopted the title De Musica based on Grocheio’s own descriptions (Rohloff 1972: 171, supported by Page 1993: 17 n. 1). The title Ars musice is used by DeWitt (1973) and Mews et al. (Grocheio 2011) following Heinrich Besseler, who adopted the title from an incipit (Besseler 1949: 230). Scholars generally support a date c. 1300 for the Ars musice (Wolf 1899: 67; Besseler 1949: 230; DeWitt 1973: 6–7; Page 1993: 17). Rohloff initially dated the Ars musice to before 1300 (Rohloff 1943: 15) but later revised the date to 1275 (Rohloff 1972: 171–2). Mews et al. demonstrate that nothing in Grocheio’s treatise points to a date later than 1275 (Grocheio 2011: 10–12).

2. Christopher Page has suggested that Grocheio belonged to the ‘distinguished Norman family of de Grouchy’, near Rouen (Page 1993: 18). Mullally and Mews et al. have argued that Grocheio hailed from the Gruchy in Blainville-sur-Mer, claiming that this is the Gruchy nearest Lessay (Mullally 1998: 1 n. 1; Grocheio 2011: 4). Grouchy and Gruchy near Periers are both closer to Lessay than Gruchy Blainville-sur-Mer (see Fig. 1).

3. Odo Rigaud recorded annual incomes of 1,400 livres (6 September 1250) and 1,005 livres (6 June 1256) for the abbey at Lessay (Bonnin 1845: 88, 249). To put this in perspective, the value of an annual pension in 1250 was ‘around 20 livres’ (‘Debent pensiones circa xx libras’) at the Benedictine Abbey of Saint-Sauveur-le-Vicomte, approximately 20 km north of Lessay (Bonnin 1845: 88). The abbey at Lessay held lands as far afield as Boxgrove Priory near Lincoln in England (Lattay 1941: 151–2).

4. ‘Quidam clericus secularis, videlicet, magister Gaufridus, receperat multum annis omnem valorem reddituum et proventuum abbacie … ordinavimus quod unus monachus adiungeretur eidem, qui disceret et instrueretur per ipsum clericum, quomodo abbacia in temporalibus regebatur’ (Bonnin 1845: 554). My thanks to Constant Mews for his translation of this passage.
5. The Abbot of Lessay received petitions for church positions from Guillelmus Maletectus (3 February 1331), a cleric of Coutances and master of arts; Nicolaus Peregrini (19 June 1342), a cleric of Bayeux and master of arts; Radulphus de Bullone (22 May 1349), a cleric of Coutances and master of arts; and Guillelmus Baston (19 June 1342), a cleric of Coutances and master of arts who defered his position in order to remain in Paris as a teaching master while studying medicine, confirming his benefice as a deacon and master of arts and medicine on 21 May 1349 (Courtenay 2002: 60, 139–40, 148–9, 301, 360).

6. ‘Donation par «Gauffridus Corserrey, de Grocheio», à l'abbaye, d'un seiler de froment de rente, mesure dud. lieu (1276)’ (Bénet 1905: 202). Earlier, in 1176, Philippa, unmarried daughter of Hugo de Rosello, bequeathed 10 and a half acres of her holdings in Gruchy to the abbey (Bénet 1905: 201–2).

7. Additionally, Johannes Perier, a master of arts and cleric of Bayeux, claimed a living from Ardeen on 19 June 1342 (Courtenay 2002: 145). Anne Bondéelle-Souchier's list of surviving documents from Ardeen includes charters, a Bible and abbatial correspondence (Bondéelle-Souchier 2000: 43–8). Odo Rigaud visited Ardenne several times during the 1260s, but he did not comment on its day-to-day operations (Bonin 1845: 94, 261, 576). The Premonstratensian order had a house of study in Paris for students at the university: see John (1953).

8. ‘Obitut Guillelmi de Grocheyo, armigeri, qui dedit xv libras cum uno lecto fornitio; et Robertus, frater eius, dedit triginta solidos’ (Dubosc 1878: 62); ‘Guillelmus de Grocheyo, armiger, dedit nobis centum solidos pro participando’ (Dubosc 1878: 88). ‘Obitus Guillelmi de Grocheyo, qui dedit xx solidos’ (Dubosc 1878: 91). Mews et al. (Grocheio 2011: 21 n. 27) dates the obituary entry for Guillelms and Robertus Grocheio to 1270, which is the date of the adjacent entry. In a nineteenth-century copy of documents from La Perrine in BnF fr. 4900, the year 1343 is given in the margin for this entry but 1383 is given in the entry itself: ‘1343 [in marg.], an 1383 obit guillelms de Grocheio armige et robusterus frater eius’ (fol. 243).

9. ‘Botis’ has been transcribed as ‘Bocis’, leading to his identification as from Booze in Belgium (Knaus, n.d., 1; Marks 1974: 44). As c’s and t’s are interchangeable in medieval Latin, this name can be read as ‘Botis’, which is Spyra’s reading in the catalogue entry for Darmstadt MS 2663 on Manuscripta Mediaevalia (Spyra 2012). Denifle and Châtelain (1894: 975) identified Johannes de Botis as Johannes de Bothen (or Boethen), also known as Johannes de Hardewost, from central Cologne. ‘Dominus Johannes de Botis de Colonia’ determined in arts in 1351, paying a bursary of 7 solidi to his teacher, Henricus de Minda (Denifle and Châtelain 1894: col. 149). If Johannes de Botis was Johannes Hardewost, dictus of Botis, he would have gained his licence to teach in 1352 (Denifle and Châtelain 1894: col. 156) and incepted in that same year (Denifle and Châtelain 1894: col. 161). Heinrich Eger von Kalkar determined in 1355 (Denifle and Châtelain 1894: col. 178) and gained his licence to teach the following year (Denifle and Châtelain 1894: col. 196).

10. Historisches Archiv der Stadt Köln, Domstift, Best. 210, U 1/1371, 737A: ‘Dietrich v. Ubach, Kanonikus an St. Aposteln, quittiert dem Domkanonikus licence to teach the following year (or Boethen), also known as Johannes de Hardewost, from central Cologne. ‘Dominus Johannes de Botis de Colonia’ determined in arts in 1351, paying a bursary of 7 solidi to his teacher, Henricus de Minda (Denifle and Châtelain 1894: col. 149). If Johannes de Botis was Johannes Hardewost, dictus of Botis, he would have gained his licence to teach in 1352 (Denifle and Châtelain 1894: col. 156) and incepted in that same year (Denifle and Châtelain 1894: col. 161). Heinrich Eger von Kalkar determined in 1355 (Denifle and Châtelain 1894: col. 178) and gained his licence to teach the following year (Denifle and Châtelain 1894: col. 196).


12. The Tonale and works by Guido of Arezzo are listed in Richard de Fournival’s Biblionomia (Delisle 1874: 527). Richard’s collection passed to Gerald de Abbeville (d. 1272) and upon Gerald’s death to the Sorbonne. This means that the Tonale and works by Guido of Arezzo were at the Sorbonne in 1301, the terminus post quem for Guy’s Tractatus.

13. Darmstadt MS 2663 gives ‘reges’ with a curved tilda above the second ‘e’. This word has been expanded as regens, which does not agree grammatically with magistri. The punctus after grocheio suggests that regens is grammatically separate from the rest of the explicit.

Magister Johannes de Parma’s *Practica*, a pharmaceutical treatise written c. 1300: ‘Quoniam quidam de melioribus amicis meis, quos habere videor, me rogaverunt, ut eis in scriptis redigerem breviter omnes medicinas digestivas et evacuativas’ (*Johannes de Parma 2002: 6*). The Latin version of the *Practica* survives in at least 50 manuscripts, including one from the Sorbonne prepared in 1313–1314 (BNF lat. 16189). Johannes de Parma has been identified as Giovanni da Parma, an Italian medical doctor active in Bologna and Brescia who made a will in 1299 and who died before 1336 (*Bacchelli 2001*).

16. Statutes from 1215 and 1255 outlining required reading for students of arts in Paris include Prician’s *Ars minor* and *Ars maior* and Donatus’ *Barbarismus* (*Denifle and Châtelain 1889: 78, 278*). A statute from 1252 lists these texts as required in arts for students of the English Nation in Paris (*Denifle and Châtelain 1889: 228*). A statute from 1350 lists mathematics, which incorporated *computus*, as required in arts in Paris (*Denifle and Châtelain 1891: 678*), although treatises on *computus* were produced in Paris during the previous century (*Thormidke 1954: 224*). *Computus* was considered useful for churchmen in order to calculate the date of Easter and other feast days. Grocheio describes *computus* as ‘that art which transmits the distinction of times and their computation … which is subject to natural philosophy or astronomy’ (*Grocheio 2011: 91*).

17. Jacobus de Ispania famously recalled how he had heard lectures on the first two books of Boethius’ *Musica* while in Paris (*Jacobus Leodiensis 1961: 136*). Margaret Bent’s discovery of an Italian inventory listing Jacobus as Magister Jacobus de Ispania brought into question his long-standing identification as Jacobus de Liège (*Jacobus Leodiensis*), Bent tentatively identifying Jacobus with James of Spain (*Bent 2015: 81–91*). Wegman (*2016: 253–6*) points out that the name ‘Hispania’ is a variant of ‘Hesbaye’, a region of the Low Countries that included Liège.

18. ‘Inducantur insuper parentes puerorum quoq ipsos pueros postquam psalterium legere legere scierent cantum addiscant ne postquam forte maiora didicerint ad hoc discendum redire cognantur, vel tanquam huius inscii ad divinum obsequium sint suo perpetuo minus apti’ (*Leach 1911: 234*).

19. For example, the archdeacon of Bayeux Henri de Vezei’s record of visitation to churches near Caen in 1268 refers to dirty, missing and illegible chant books at a number of parochial houses (*Delisle 1893: 463–6*). In his *Collectio de scandalis ecclesiae*, compiled for the Council of Lyon (1274), Guibert of Tournai (d. 1284), a Franciscan friar who studied and taught in Paris, complained of secular clerics who sang the liturgy ‘indevoutly’ and who refused to even turn up to church unless monetary gain was on offer: ‘Nec redrunt debita servitia: indevote psallunt et rotuli’ (*Mansi 1780: col. 13*).

20. This system was affirmed by Clement IV in 1265 (*Licet ecclesiarum*) and later ratified by John XXII in 1316 (*Ad regimen*). Under this system, the University of Paris petitioned the pope directly on behalf of masters in arts, medicine, canon law and theology for ecclesiastical benefices, collective scrolls of supplication (rotuli) for students in Paris surviving from the fourteenth century (*Courtenay 2002: 1–4*).

21. ‘De scribunt autem tonum quidam, dicentes eum esse regulam que de omni cantu in fine iudicat’ (*Grocheio 2011: 94*). Compare the Dialogus: ‘Tonus vel modus est regula, qua de omni cantu in fine iudicatur’ (*Pseudo-Odo 2007: 100*). The Dialogus was often circulated as part of the corpus of works by Guido of Arezzo, as is the case in Harley MS 281 (*Mews et al. 2008: 17*). Nicholas of Lyra (d. 1340), a Franciscan friar and exegete who studied theology at the Sorbonne, declared that ‘one need not pay much attention to the words of Guido [of Arezzo], since he is without authority’ (*Dyer 2009: 203*). If Nicholas’ was a prevailing view among masters in Paris, it is perhaps not a coincidence that Grocheio makes no mention of Guido of Arezzo in the *Ars musicae* but rather draws on the anonymous Dialogus.

22. ‘Certi certain people describe tone by calling it a rule that decides about every [chant] by its end. But these people seem to err in many ways … Those who extend the given description, saying that tone is a rule through which we recognize the middle and the end of any tune, still seem to err in something … Therefore, let us try to describe this in a different way and let us say that tone is a rule through which one can recognize every ecclesiastical [chant] and decide about it by paying attention to the beginning, middle, and to the end … And placing a differentiation between these 8 modes through specification — end, middle, and beginning — they have called them by a common name and numeral, namely first, second, third etc. [to eight]’ (*Grocheio 2011: 95, 97*).

23. ‘[Q]uidam dicunt Pythagorici, quod totum et res terminantur tribus dimensionibus; fine scilicet, medio et principio: et hic quidem est numerus omnis rei, et significat trinitatem rerum’ (*Aristotle 1843: 409*).

24. Other theorists who refer to the three dimensions of *tonus* include Amerus (*1777–77*): ‘Regula octo tonorum: tonus quidem regula que de omni cantu in principio, medio, in fine iudicantur’; Guy of Saint-Denis (*2017: 4*): ‘Hoc siquidem in quibusdam per usum fieri potest aliqualum, sed non in omnibus. nec etiam scientifice vel artificialiter, cum sicut dictum est in iudicandis cantibus non solum principium considerare oporteat immo

25. For example, in defining and introducing the introit, Grocheio states that the introtit of the Mass, or the officium, is a [chant] directly ascending and descending according to any of the tones’ (Grocheio 2011: 107). In distinguishing and knowing the introit, he states that this [chant] is diversified according to the 8 tones, just like the others. Now of the first tone, there are such as Gaudeamus and its versicle, namely Eustachif with Gloria patri following the same intonation; of the second, such as Salve sancta parens; of the third, such as Ego autem; of the fourth, Resurrexit; of the fifth, Domine refugium; of the sixth, Respice in me; of the seventh, Puer natus; of the eighth, Ad te levavi animam meam. The versicle Vias tuas with Gloria patri is intoned in the same mode and with other verses’ (Grocheio 2011: 107). He does not describe the composition of individual chant genres, but rather describes the process of composing chant collectively: ‘in composing the above-mentioned parts, the artist ought to receive text or material from another, for instance, a theologian or a jurist. And after this, the musician ought to apply the requisite form to them’ (Grocheio 2011: 113).

26. Grocheio also applies the tripartite division of ‘beginning, middle and end’ to the intonation of the psalm’ (i.e. the psalm tones), whereby the beginnings and the middles of the eight psalm intonations are rendered in sol-fa using aides-mémoires (Lebedev 1997: 100–1; cf. Lambert 2015: 45). Grocheio becomes unstuck, however, when describing the end of psalm intonations, the short snippets of chant known as differentiae (‘differences’). As each differentia represents an end in and of itself, the task of documenting differentiae to the point that each is fully distinguished from all others would involve documenting each and every known differentia, an exercise Grocheio views as repugnant: ‘But according to the part of the end [psalm intonations] differ in many ways, and these differentiae they call Seculorum Amen. For they differ according to diverse modes, and further they differ in the same tone according to diverse uses of churches and also according to the beginnings of diverse antiphons. It would be an odious task to explain these diversities at present’ (Grocheio 2011: 105). Grocheio’s repugnance reflects the countless differentiae used in churches in Paris, including the highly localised Benedictine practices that incorporated extremely numerous differentiae (the Dominicans and the Cistercians limited the number of differentiae in their liturgies, something that Grocheio did not take advantage of in documenting differentiae in his treatise, suggesting that he did not belong to either religious order). In a personal communication, Constant Mews suggested that Guy of Saint-Denis undertook what Grocheio was loath to do, documenting hundreds of differentiae in use at Saint-Denis. Heinrich Eger von Kalkar, who, in 1366, became a Carthusian monk at the Charterhouse in Cologne, reports a similar view to Grocheio’s in his Cantuagium: ‘And because different dioceses, colleges and religious institutions usually have these differentiae of different modes, it is not possible to specify a fixed number of these and not fall under the [weight of] the art’ (‘Et quia diversae dioeceses, collegia et religiones usualiter habent differentiae illas diversimodas, non potest ipsarum poni certus numerus nec sub arte cadunt’) (Eger von Kalkar 1952: 61–2).

27. In lieu of antiphons for tones 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, Grocheio cites Latin intonation formulas (short chants that summarise the characteristics of each of the eight modes) that were widely circulated in tonaries at the time (see Bailey 1974: 27–31). Grocheio mentions one antiphon only. O sapientia, which is the first of the seven great O antiphons set to the same melody sung on the seven days before Christmas Eve (Hiley 1995: 98). O sapientia was also sung on one of the days that a new rector, a master in arts, of the university was elected by his peers in Paris (Denifle and Châtelain 1891: 715). Grocheio misidentifies the tone 4 invitatior Venite adoremus as tone 2, and he misnames the tone 4 invitatior Christus natus est nobis as Christus natus est pro nobis.


29. The manuscripts used for comparison are BnF lat. 17296 (twelfth-century antiphonal of Saint-Denis); BnF lat. 1107 (thirteenth-century missal of Saint-Denis); BnF lat. 103 (eleventh-century psalter and hymnal of Saint-Denis); Harley MS 281 (early fourteenth-century copy of Guy of Saint-Denis, Tractatus de tonis); Paris, Bibliotheque Mazarine 526 (thirteenth-century ordinary of Saint-Denis. Foley, ed. 1990); Victoria and Albert Museum 1346–1891 (c. 1350 missal of Saint-Denis, cited in Robertson (1991)); BnF lat. 15181 and 15182 (c. 1300 breviary of Notre Dame); BnF lat. 1112 (early thirteenth-century missal of Notre Dame); BnF lat. 1022 (thirteenth-century breviary and missal of Saint-Mathurin); Paris, Bibliotheque Mazarine 430 (early sixteenth-century missal of Saint-Mathurin, cited in Blume (1915)); BnF lat. 15613 (thirteenth-century winter breviary of the Sorbonne); and BnF lat. 15615 (thirteenth-century missal of the Sorbonne). No thirteenth-century Premonstratensian source from Paris is known. I compared Grocheio’s chant list with several Premonstratensian manuscripts, including BnF lat. 833 (twelfth-century missal) and Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek CLM 17010 (fourteenth-century antiphonal), but the uses represented therein do not correspond with Grocheio’s examples. The Premonstratensian order aspired to liturgical uniformity between houses, but the level of uniformity in practice remains unclear (Hiley 1995: 614).

30. The Trinitarian rite is based on the use of Saint-Victor (Lebique 2010). Laetabundus is included in manuscripts from Saint Victor, for example, folio 141v of BnF lat. 14452, a thirteenth-century missal from the abbey; ‘In secunda missa nativitatis domini et de beata maria’. BnF lat. 1022 does not include a second Mass for Christmas or for the Blessed Virgin Mary.

31. In his Tractatus de tonis, Guy of Saint-Denis cites Tu es pastor as an example of a tone 1 invitatior (it is usually tone 2) and Regem cui omnia vivunt as an example of a tone 8 invitatior (Guy of Saint-Denis 2017: 116, 202). Guy notates Regem cui omnia vivunt beginning on G, remarking
that this invitatory is tone 6 when notated on F but tone 8 when notated on G (Guy of Saint-Denis 2017: 202). Guy further notes that the tone 8 invitatory Preoccupemus is given as an example by Petrus de Cruce, who ‘particularly observed the practice of the church of Amiens’ (Guy of Saint-Denis 2017: 203). In his Tractatus de tonis, Petrus de Cruce gives Tu es pastor as an example of a tone 1 invitatory and Preoccupemus as an example of a tone 8 invitatory (usually tone 7), as reported by Guy of Saint-Denis (Petrus de Cruce 1976: x, xxiv). Jacobus de Ispania also gives Tu es pastor as a tone 1 invitatory (Jacobus Leodiensis 1973: 256). For tone 8, he gives two versions of the invitatory Regem cui omnia vivunt, one ending on F, which is tone 6, and one ending on G, which is tone 8, reflecting Guy’s notation of the same invitatory (Jacobus Leodiensis 1973: 293–4). Like Jacobus and Petrus, Amerus gives Tu es pastor as an example of a tone 1 invitatory, but he gives Laudemus Christum, usually a tone 2 invitatory, as an example for tone 8 (Amerus 1977: 50, 63).

32. Benedicta es caelorum has the same melody as the sequence Benedicta sit beata trinitas, included in French sources from the eleventh century. Benedicta es caelorum is preserved in thirteenth-century manuscripts from Normandy, including one from the abbey at Lyre (Évreux, Bibliothèque municipale MS 23).

33. Harley MS 281 gives ‘Credo in deum’ (fol. 48r), ‘Credo in deum’ (fol. 51v) and ‘symbolum apostolorum’ (fol. 51v). Darmstadt MS 2663 gives ‘Credo in deum’ (fol. 65ra), ‘Credo in deum’ (fol. 68rb) and symbolum apostolorum (fol. 68rb). The relevant passages in the Ars musice are: "[t]hey call the Mass that glorious service in which the greatest and the divine mysteries are achieved … [among] [its parts [is] the … Credo in Deum’ (Grocheio 2011: 93). "The Credo in Deum is a [chant] lightly ascending or descending in the manner of a ductia, differing a little in the parts. I say ‘differing a little’ etc., since it has many parts exactly similar in the [chant]. This [chant] is called the Apostle’s Creed, and it is sung directly after the Gospel, perhaps because it seems generally to agree in meaning with the Gospel. For in general there all the articles of Christian faith are expressed” (Grocheio 2011: 111).

34. ‘Exhortentur populum semper presbyteri ad dicendam dominicam orationem et «Credo in Deum» et «Salutationem Beate Virginis»’ (Pontal 1971: 74).
## Appendix

### Table 2. Selected Manuscripts from Paris that Include Grocheio’s Chant Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chant, genre (tone specified in the <em>Ars musice</em>), feast (Cantus ID)</th>
<th>Saint-Denis</th>
<th>Notre Dame</th>
<th>Saint-Mathurin</th>
<th>Sorbonne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BnF lat. 17296</strong> (12th-century antiphonal of Saint-Denis)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15181 &amp; BnF lat. 15182 (c. 1300 breviary of Notre Dame)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 (13th-century breviary and missal of Saint-Mathurin)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15613 (13th-century winter breviary of the Sorbonne)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BnF lat. 1107</strong> (13th-century missal of Saint-Denis)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1112 (early 13th-century missal of Notre Dame)</td>
<td><strong>Bibliothèque Mazarine 526</strong> (13th-century ordinary of Saint-Denis, Foley ed. 1990)</td>
<td><strong>BnF lat. 15615</strong> (13th-century missal of the Sorbonne)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BnF lat. 103</strong> (11th-century psalter and hymnal of Saint-Denis)</td>
<td><strong>Harley MS 281</strong> (Guy of Saint-Denis, <em>Tractatus de tonis</em>)</td>
<td><strong>Bibliothèque Mazarine 430</strong> (early 16th-century missal of Saint-Mathurin)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bibliothèque Mazarine 526</strong> (Guy of Saint-Denis, Foley ed. 1990)</td>
<td><strong>Victoria and Albert Museum 1346–1891</strong> (c. 1350 missal of Saint-Denis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regem regum</strong> Invitatory (tone 1)</td>
<td><strong>BnF lat. 17296 fol. 227r</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saint Denis (9 October) (–)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chant, genre (tone specified in the <em>Ars musice</em>), feast (Cantus ID)</td>
<td>Saint-Denis</td>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>Saint-Mathurin</td>
<td>Sorbonne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Venite adoremus</em> [regem regum] Invitatory (tone 2) Assumption (15 August) (001177)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 17296 fol. 206v (tone 4)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15182 fol. 305r (tone 4)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 144v</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Martinus ecce</em> Invitatory (tone 2) Saint Martin (11 November) (001103)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 17296 fol. 246v–247r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15182 fol. 433r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 167v</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Regem precursoris</em> Invitatory (tone 3) John the Baptist (24 June) (001140)</td>
<td>Harley MS 281 fol. 85v; Bibliothèque Mazarine 526 fol. 163v (Foley ed. 1990: 598)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15182 fol. 207r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 127v</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Christus natus est pro [sic] nobis</em> Invitatory (tone 4) Nativity (25 December) (001055)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 17296 fol. 19v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15181 fol. 142r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 15v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15613 fol. 79r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Adoremus regem</em> Invitatory (tone 4) John the Evangelist (27 December) (001013)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 17296 fol. 32r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15181 fol. 395r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 102r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15613 fol. 310v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dominum qui fecit nos</em> Invitatory (tone 5) 3rd Sunday of Lent (001066)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 17296 fol. 313r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15181 fol. 240v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 37r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15613 fol. 187r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Surrexit [dominus vere]</em> Invitatory (tone 6) Easter Monday (001166)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 17296 fol. 138r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15181 fol. 299v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 49v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15613 fol. 242r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Non sit vobis</em> Invitatory (tone 7) 1st Sunday of Lent (101110)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 17296 fol. 97r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15181 fol. 219r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 33r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15613 fol. 167v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chant, genre (tone specified in the <em>Ars musicae</em>, feast (Cantus ID))</td>
<td>Saint-Denis</td>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>Saint-Mathurin</td>
<td>Sorbonne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Regem cui omnia vivunt</em> Invitatory (tone 8) Pro defunctus (–)</td>
<td>Harley MS 281 fol. 95v; Bibliothèque Mazarine 526 fol. 70v (Foley ed. 1990: 414)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Conditor alme</em> Hymn 1st Sunday of Advent (008284)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 103 fol. 150v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15181 fol. 106r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 7r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15613 fol. 41r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ut queant lapsis</em> Hymn John the Baptist (24 June) (008406)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 103 fol. 155v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15182 fol. 206v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 127v</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>O quam glorifica</em> Hymn Assumption (15 August) (008362)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 103 fols 154v–155r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15182 fol. 305r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 144v</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Veni creator</em> Hymn Pentecost Sunday (008407)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 103 fol. 154v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15181 fol. 346v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 63r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15613 fol. 289v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ecce apparebit</em> Responsory (tone 1) 3rd Sunday of Advent (006578)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 17296 fol. 9r–v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15181 fols 120v–121r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 11v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15613 fol. 55r–v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Laetentur caeli</em> Responsory (tone 2) 1st Sunday of Advent (007068)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 17296 fol. 3v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15181 fol. 110v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 8v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15613 fols 45v–46r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Audite verbum</em> Responsory (tone 3) 1st Sunday of Advent (006149)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 17296 fol. 3r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15181 fol. 109r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 8r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15613 fol. 44v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rex noster</em> Responsory (tone 4) 2nd Sunday of Advent (007547)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 17296 fol. 8r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15181 fol. 117v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 10v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15613 fol. 49r–v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chant, genre (tone specified in the <em>Ars musice</em>), feast (Cantus ID)</td>
<td>Saint-Denis</td>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>Saint-Mathurin</td>
<td>Sorbonne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hodie nobis</em> Responsory (tone 5) Nativity (25 December) (006858)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 17296 fol. 20v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15181 fol. 143r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 16r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15613 fol. 80r–v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Qui venturus</em> Responsory (tone 6) 3rd Sunday of Advent (007485)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 17296 fol. 9v–10r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15181 fol. 121v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 11v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15613 fol. 56r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bethlehem civitas</em> Responsory (tone 7) 3rd Sunday of Advent (006254)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 17296 fol. 9v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15181 fol. 121r–v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 11v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15613 fol. 55v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Participem me fac</em> + Aspice in me Responsory + versicle (tone 8) 1st Monday of Lent (007353)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 17296 fol. 100v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15181 fol. 225r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 33v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15613 fol. 173v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>O sapientia</em> Antiphon (tone 2) (December 17) (004081)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 17296 fol. 13v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15181 fol. 13v–134r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 13r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15613 fol. 69v–70r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gaudeamus</em> + <em>Erectavit</em> Introit + versicle (tone 1) Assumption (15 August) (501004)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1107 fol. 257r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1112 fol. 186r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 353r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15615 fol. 284r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Salve sancta parens</em> Introit (tone 2) Octave of the Assumption (22 August) (g01408)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1107 fol. 322v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1112 fol. 187v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 354r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15615 fol. 285v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ego autem</em> Introit (tone 3) 3rd Wednesday of Lent (g00763)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1107 fol. 68r–v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1112 fol. 48r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 259v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15615 fol. 66r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chant, genre (tone specified in the <em>Ars musice</em>), feast (Cantus ID)</td>
<td>Saint-Denis</td>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>Saint-Mathurin</td>
<td>Sorbonne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurrexi Introit (tone 4) Easter Sunday (g01007)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1107 fol. 144r–v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1112 fol. 105v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 296v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15615 fol. 147r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domine refugium Introit (tone 5) 1st Tuesday of Lent (g00696)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1107 fol. 51v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1112 fol. 38v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 253v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15615 fol. 43r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respinge in me Introit (tone 6) 3rd Sunday after Pentecost (g01145)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1107 fol. 181r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1112 fol. 133r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 312v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15615 fol. 191r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puer natus Introit (tone 7) Nativity (25 December) (g00553)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1107 fol. 19v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1112 fol. 19v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 239v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15615 fol. 16r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad te levavi animam meam + Vias tuas Introit + versicle (tone 8) 1st Sunday of Advent (g00489)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1107 fol. 1r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1112 fol. 9r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 233r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15615 fol. 1r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleluia Laetabitur iustus Alleluia Common of one martyr (g02236)</td>
<td>Bibliothèque Mazarine 526 fol. 20r (Foley ed. 1990: 314)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1112 fol. 207r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 357r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15615 fol. 310r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laetabundus Sequence Nativity (25 December) (508017)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1107 fol. 342r–v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1112 fol. 20v</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15615 fol. 355v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chant, genre (tone specified in the <em>Ars musicae</em>)</td>
<td>Saint-Denis</td>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>Saint-Mathurin</td>
<td>Sorbonne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>De profundis</strong> Tract (tone 8) Septuagesima Sunday (g00634)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1107 fol. 36r–v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1112 fol. 28r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 361v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15615 fol. 342r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sicut cervus</strong> Tract Night before Pentecost (g02374)</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1107 fol. 138v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1112 fol. 124v</td>
<td>BnF lat. 1022 fol. 306r</td>
<td>BnF lat. 15615 fol. 131v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In this paper, I examine the background of music theorist Johannes de Grocheio and the circumstances surrounding the production and preservation of his only known treatise, the *Ars musice* (c. 1275). I survey three institutions in Normandy — the Benedictine monastery at Lessay, the Premonstratensian monastery at Ardenne and the Trinitarian hospice at La Perrine — that Grocheio may have been associated with in his youth. I consider the two monks responsible for preserving his only known treatise: Guy, a monk of Saint-Denis, whose role in this regard is well established, and Johannes de Botis, a monk of the Charterhouse in Cologne, whose role has only now come to light. I then look at Grocheio’s disputed magisterial standing in the university city of Paris and review the evidence for his employment as a teacher in that city. I also focus on Grocheio’s treatment of chant theory, which has received scant attention in the literature compared with his remarks on secular music and his Aristotelian method of describing the subject of music. I contemplate the social context for writing anew on chant theory in a city known for not stipulating music in its arts curricula and reflect on the influence of Aristotle’s writings on Grocheio’s treatment. I end the paper with a survey of the chants that Grocheio names in the *Ars musice*, confirming that his examination of chant is ‘according to the use of the people of Paris’.

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

I would like to extend my gratitude to Professor Constant Mews, Director, The Centre for Religious Studies, School of Philosophical, Historical and International Studies, Monash University, for his invaluable feedback on a draft of this paper and for his assistance with — and provision of — Latin translations.

**Keywords.** Ardenne, Aristotle, *Ars musice*, chant theory, College of Saint-Denis, Darmstadt Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek MS 2663, faculty of arts in Paris, Sorbonne, Guy of Saint-Denis, Johannes de Botis, Johannes de Grocheio, Lessay, Le Perrine, Trinitarians, University of Paris

**ABOUT THE AUTHOR**

Catherine Jeffreys is a research affiliate in The Centre for Religious Studies, School of Philosophical, Historical and International Studies, Monash University. She completed a PhD in musicology at the University of Melbourne in 2000 on the devotional-song repertory of Hildegard of Bingen. She has published on twelfth-century German plainchant, late-thirteenth-century plainchant theory in Paris, and the early adoption of Aristotle’s *Politics* in music theory in the Latin west. She is part of a Monash-based multidisciplinary editorial team that has published a Latin edition and translation of Johannes de Grocheio’s *Ars musice* (2011) and Guy of Saint-Denis’ *Tractatus de tonis* (2017).

Received by the editors 4 June 2017; accepted for publication (in revised form) 7 February 2018.

© Catherine Jeffreys (2018)