

Ordering in the motet fascicles of the Florence manuscript

CATHERINE A. BRADLEY*

ABSTRACT. *Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut.29.1 (F) is considered the earliest extant manuscript to preserve a collection of motets, with two fascicles devoted to this new genre. Scholars have long emphasised the strict liturgical sequence of the first motet fascicle, in contrast to the seeming lack of order in the second. This article engages with questions of liturgical arrangement in F, exploring the possibility of a liturgical function for motets in this source. It undertakes a re-examination of the ordering of motets in F, proposing two new organisational principles applicable across both fascicles: first, that the arrangement of motets may have been influenced by an awareness of related clausulae and discant materials extant elsewhere in F; and second, that ordering of the collection reflects the relative dissemination or ‘popularity’ of motets and their related materials.*

The Florence manuscript (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut.29.1, hereafter: F) is the most elaborate and extensive surviving source of late twelfth- and early thirteenth-century music from Paris. Edward Roesner described F as ‘the prime example of Parisian book production’, observing that ‘its importance cannot be overstated’.¹ Copied by a single text scribe and a single music notator² in Paris in the 1240s,³ F has two substantial fascicles devoted to the new genre of the motet. The first (fols. 381r–398v, fascicle 8, containing three-part monotextual motets) is consistently arranged according to the sequence of motet tenor chants in the Church calendar.⁴ The ordering of the second (fols. 399r–414v, fascicle 9, containing two-voice and polytextual three-voice motets) is not strictly liturgical. This apparent

*catherine.bradley@queens.ox.ac.uk.

I wish to thank Wulf Arlt, Nicolas Bell, Elizabeth Eva Leach, Susan Rankin and the anonymous reviewers of this journal for generously offering many thoughtful comments and suggestions on earlier drafts. I gratefully acknowledge the support of the Arts and Humanities Research Council in the form of a doctoral award during which part of this research was undertaken. This article expands on material in my doctoral thesis, ‘The Earliest Motets: Musical Borrowing and Re-use’, University of Cambridge (2011). A list of manuscript sigla is provided in an appendix at end of this article.

¹ Edward H. Roesner, ed., *Antiphonarium, seu, Magnus liber de gradali et antiphonario: Color Microfiche Edition of the Manuscript Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana Pluteus 29.1: Introduction to the ‘Notre-Dame Manuscript’ F*, Codices illuminati medii aevi 45 (Munich, 1996), 14.

² *Ibid.*, 15.

³ Roesner, *Introduction to the ‘Notre-Dame Manuscript’ F*, 20–1. Barbara Haggh and Michel Huglo recently suggested that F was prepared for Louis IX, presented to him at the solemn dedication of the Sainte-Chapelle on 26 April 1248. See their ‘Magnus liber – Maius munus: Origine et destinée du manuscrit F’, *Revue de Musicologie*, 90 (2004), 193–230.

⁴ The term ‘monotextual motet’, coined by Darwin Scott, is used throughout to replace the more conventional, but confusing term ‘conductus motet’. Darwin F. Scott, ‘The Early Three- and Four-Voice Monotextual Motets of the Notre Dame School’, Ph.D. diss., University of California (1988), 16–17.

break away from liturgical ordering principles, along with an increase in motets without surviving related clausulae or passages of discant within organa and the appearance of polytextual 'double' motets in the second motet fascicle, has encouraged the view that the collection in F enacts a gradual process of secularisation.⁵

Yet connections between the two motet fascicles in F are closer than immediately apparent. Liturgical ordering is not simply 'given up' in fascicle 9:⁶ an internal group of fifteen motets is essentially in calendric sequence. Furthermore, Wulf Arlt, in an unpublished paper delivered in 1985, argued that the second motet fascicle contains groups of pieces that correspond to a liturgical function, supplementing and expanding the 'core' ('Grundbestand') of motets for the main feasts of the year presented in fascicle 8.⁷ No previous research, however, has uncovered underlying organisational principles for the motet fascicles of F other than those connected with the liturgical calendar and liturgical provision. This article undertakes a re-examination of the relationship between the two fascicles, investigating the potential for a closer alliance than is generally supposed, and reconsidering possible criteria for the ordering of motets in both fascicles.⁸ It explores the consequences of these observations for the function(s) of motets recorded in F and for the status of F as a source.

Motets and their related materials in F

The vast majority of motets in F (fifty-six out of a total of sixty-nine) have related musical material present elsewhere in the manuscript in the form either of a clausula, or of a passage of discant preserved within an organum. Clausulae are gathered in separate liturgically ordered fascicles devoted to this musical type,⁹ while passages of discant within organa are embedded in longer organal settings of a complete chant. Several scholars have regarded clausulae and passages of discant within

⁵ See Scott, 'The Early Three- and Four-Voice Monotextual Motets', 164, and Peter M. Lefferts and Ernest H. Sanders, 'Motet, §I: Middle Ages, 1. France, *Ars antiqua*', in *Grove Music Online*, ed. Laura Macy. Online: www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/40086pg1 (last accessed 15 April 2011).

⁶ This is stated incorrectly by Lefferts and Sanders, see 'Motet, §I: Middle Ages'. Roesner has also commented on the apparent lack of order and structure in fascicle 9. See his *Introduction to the 'Notre-Dame Manuscript' F*, 29–30.

⁷ Wulf Arlt, 'Zur frühen Geschichte der Motette', unpublished paper (1985).

⁸ Friedrich Ludwig's *Repertorium organorum recentioris et motetorum vetustissimi stili*, 2 vols. (Halle, 1910; repr. and ed. Luther Dittmer, 1964, 1972 and 1978), 1/1:102–12, 112–23 offers the only comprehensive discussion of ordering in these motet fascicles currently in print. Both Arlt ('Zur frühen Geschichte der Motette') and Rebecca A. Baltzer ('Performance Practice, the Notre-Dame Calendar, and the Earliest Latin Liturgical Motets') delivered papers relating to this topic at the *Das Ereignis Notre Dame* conference in Wolfenbüttel in 1985, but these papers remain unpublished. Scott also commented on ordering in F in his unpublished dissertation ('The Early Three- and Four-Voice Monotextual Motets', 110–77). I am most grateful to Professors Arlt and Baltzer for sharing their unpublished materials with me.

⁹ Such clausulae are often referred to as 'substitute clausulae', on the premise that they were introduced into organa as substitutes for other passages of discant. This stems from Ludwig, who described them as 'Ersatzkompositionen einzelner Teile des Magnus liber organi'. Ludwig, *Repertorium*, 1/1:23.

organa as synonymous, employing 'clausula' as a catch-all term.¹⁰ Admittedly, this distinction of musical type is not necessarily fixed across different manuscript sources: passages of discant preserved within organa in F, for example, may appear in an independent clausula fascicle in W1. Yet certain trends across the manuscripts W1, F and W2 suggest that particular material had quite a stable existence as one distinct type. W2, for instance, does not contain any independent clausulae (save a single four-voice clausula on MORS, fols. 5r–6r). Consequently, all discant passages are located within organa. The vast majority of these discant passages in W2 are also found within organa in F, rather than as independent clausulae.¹¹ Similarly, discant passages within organa in W1, are – when extant in F – almost always also presented within organa, rather than as clausulae.¹²

It seems, therefore, that particular passages of discant were conventionally transmitted, not as independent clausulae, but within the context of organa.¹³ While some musical material had a more fluid identity as one type or another, parallels evident across W1, F and W2 are sufficient to confirm this generic distinction as significant. The ordering of motets in F may also reflect an awareness of the particular type of related musical material recorded elsewhere in this manuscript.

Table 1 shows the sequence of motets in the first motet fascicle of F. Ludwig's number for each motet in F is given, followed by the number of voice parts, the motet text incipits and the type of related material in F. **C** indicates a related clausula in F, **D** a passage of discant within an organum in F and **X** shows no extant clausula or discant material in W1, F or W2. Ludwig's numbers assigned to chants for the Office (O) and the Mass (M) are provided, in addition to the feast at which this chant is sung,¹⁴ and the chant type (Office responsory, gradual responsory, or alleluia).¹⁵

The arrangement of motets in fascicle 8, which appear in the liturgical order of their tenor chants, was undertaken with care. At two junctures (fols. 387r–388v and fols. 389v–390r) a number of staves were left empty, presumably to be later filled with certain motets appropriate to this point in the sequence. The integration of blank staves within the fascicle suggests that the copyist placed much importance

¹⁰ The editions of motets by Hans Tischler, *The Earliest Motets (to circa 1270): A Complete Comparative Edition* (New Haven, CT, and London, 1982) and Thomas Payne, *Philip the Chancellor: Motets and Prosulas* (Middleton, WI, 2011) do not, for example, consistently distinguish between clausulae and passages of discant within organa. Others are more meticulous in this regard: Rudolf Flotzinger's numbering system in *Der Discantussatz im Magnus liber und seiner Nachfolge*, Wiener musikwissenschaftliche Beiträge 8 (Vienna, 1969), 19–55, differentiates clausulae, passages of discant and motet sources.

¹¹ See Flotzinger, *Der Discantussatz im Magnus liber*, 35–40, for a summary of passages of discant within organa in W2 and their concordances.

¹² See *ibid.*, 19–23 for a summary of passages of discant within organa in W1 and their concordances.

¹³ Fragmentary sources of organum (such as Aba, Ber, K, MüA and Si) are not considered in detail here, as they offer only a limited amount of data. However, cursory investigation suggests that the passages of discant they record are most often also found within organal settings in other manuscripts, rather than as independent clausulae.

¹⁴ Compiled in accordance with Craig Wright's table showing liturgical usage of the F Magnus liber. See his *Music and Ceremony at Notre Dame of Paris, 500–1550* (Cambridge, 1989), 259–62.

¹⁵ Folio numbers are available in Ludwig, *Repertorium*, 1/1:103–8.

Table 1 Motets in the eighth fascicle of F, fols. 381r-398v

No. in F	No. of voices	Motet text incipits	Related material	Ludwig no.	Feast/Use	Type of chant
1.1	3	Ad veniam perveniam/TANQUAM	C	O 2	Christmas	Office resp.
1.2	3	Formam hominis/GLORIA	D	O 2	Christmas	Office resp.
1.3	3	Qui servare puberem/[DOMI]NE	D ¹	M 3	St Stephen	Gradual
1.4	3	In Bethleem Herodes/IN BETHLEEM	D	M 8	Holy Innocents	Alleluia
1.5	3	Novus nove legis/[AUDIVI]MUS	C	M 11	Purification of BVM	Gradual
1.6	3	Deo confitemini/DOMINO	D	M 13	Easter	Gradual
1.7	3	Laudes referat/QUONI[AM]	D	M 13	Easter	Gradual
1.8	3	Gaudeat devotio/NOSTRUM	D	M 14	Easter	Alleluia
1.9	3	Nostrum est impletum/NOSTRUM	D 3 v	M 14	Easter	Alleluia
1.10	3	Radix venie/[IMMO]LATUS	D 3 v	M 14	Easter	Alleluia
1.11	3	Homo quam sit pura/[IMMO]LATUS	C	M 14	Easter	Alleluia
1.12	3	Scandit solium/[CAPTIVI]TA[TEM]	C	M 23	Ascension	Alleluia
1.13	3	Homo quo vigeas/ET GAUDEBIT	D & C 3 v	M 24	Ascension	Alleluia
			32 empty staves			
1.14	3	O natio que vitiis/HODIE PERLUSTRAVIT	C	M 25	Pentecost	Alleluia
1.15	3	Doce nos optime/DOCEBIT	X	M 26	Pentecost	Alleluia
			16 empty staves			
1.16	3	Veni doctor previe/VENI etc.	X	M 27	Pentecost Octave	Alleluia
1.17	3	Prodit lucis radius/MULIE[RUM]	X	M 29	St John the Baptist	Alleluia
1.18	3	O Maria mater pia/[VIR]GO	D	M 32	Assumption	Gradual
1.19	3	Flos de spina rumpitur/REG[NAT]	D	M 34	Assumption	Alleluia
1.20	3	Ad solitum/REG[NAT]	C	M 34	Assumption	Alleluia
1.21	3	Hodie Marie concurrant/REG[NAT]	C	M 34	Assumption	Alleluia
1.22	3	Et exaltavi plebis humilem/ET EXALTA[VI]	C 3 v	M 51	A Bishop Confessor	Alleluia
1.23	3	Ecclesie vox hodie/ET FLORE[BIT]	D	M 53	A Confessor not Bishop	Alleluia
1.24	3	Agmina militie celestis/AGMINA	X	O 40	St Catherine	Office resp.
1.25	3	O Maria maris stella/VERITA[TEM]	X	M 37	Assumption Octave	Gradual
1.26	3	In veritate/[VERITATEM] (Incomplete)	X	M 37	Assumption Octave	Gradual
			A lacuna of unknown length			

¹ This discant and motet are also related to the Benedicamus Domino cauda of the conductus *Columbe simplicitas* (F, fol. 329r).

on the complete and comprehensive nature of this collection of monotextual motets, and on the order in which the pieces appeared.¹⁶ The liturgical ordering of fascicle 8 is disturbed only at its conclusion: the final two motets (both on VERITATEM, M 37) should strictly have appeared slightly earlier in the fascicle, following other motets on Assumption tenors,¹⁷ and the antepenultimate motet for the feast of St Catherine (on AGMINA, O 40) might also have been expected to precede motets for the common of saints (1.22 and 1.23).¹⁸ It is striking that these final three motets (1.24–1.26) – all lacking related materials in W1, F or W2 – are instead grouped together at the point where the fascicle breaks off.¹⁹ The only other motets in fascicle 8 lacking extant related materials are also presented in series (1.15–1.17).²⁰ Within the liturgical structure of this fascicle, motets associated with passages of discant within organa in F are, in the main, clustered together (e.g., motets 1.2–1.4, 1.6–1.10 and 1.18–1.19). Similarly, a motet with a corresponding clausula in F is most often found alongside another motet of this type (e.g., motets 1.11–1.14 and 1.20–1.22). This suggests that awareness of the presence and type of related material preserved in F played an additional role in establishing the order in which motets were recorded.

In comparison with the strictly liturgical sequence of the first motet fascicle, the second motet fascicle appears, at first sight, much less meticulously arranged (see Table 2).²¹ Only a series of fifteen motets, 2.4–2.19, is internally ordered liturgically. This brief sequence begins part-way through the liturgical year, opening with a motet on a tenor chant for M 17 (2.4).

Yet, as in the first motet fascicle, the grouping of pieces might reflect an awareness of corresponding musical materials in F. Motets with no extant related clausulae or discant passages in W1, F or W2 are noticeably concentrated in the second half of

¹⁶ Haggh and Huglo have also commented on the presence of empty ruled folios on which no text or music was copied at the end of fascicle 10 in F. See their '*Magnus liber – Maius munus*', 215. They suggest that the eleven folios of blank staves at the end of this fascicle of monophonic conducti may indicate that the manuscript was compiled quickly in order to be ready for the dedication of the Sainte Chapelle. This does not, however, seem a plausible explanation for the empty staves in fascicle 8. As these blank staves occur mid-fascicle it appears more likely that they were subsequently intended to be filled than that the scribe simply ran out of time. Indeed, one might expect a scribe working under pressured conditions to compromise the comprehensive nature or the ordering of his motet collection, and simply to complete the fascicle with available pieces rather than leaving space for later insertions.

¹⁷ It is possible that these motets were intended not specifically for the Assumption, but more generally for the Common of Virgins or for Lady Masses. In that case, their placement at the end of the fascicle alongside other motets on chants for the Common of Saints would not be unusual.

¹⁸ This occurs in the fascicle containing three-voice organa, where the organum setting of the O 40 tenor (fol. 33v) precedes that of M 51 (fol. 36r).

¹⁹ The status of 1.24–1.26 as a group is enhanced by the fact that all of these motets also exist in the form of widely disseminated Latin double motets. Regardless of the relative chronological priority of the monotextual or double motet versions, it is possible that the compiler of F already knew these monotextual motets to exist also in polytextual versions and that this contributed to their placement side by side in fascicle 8.

²⁰ This was also noted by Thomas B. Payne, in his 'Poetry, Politics, and Polyphony: Philip the Chancellor's Contribution to the Music of the Notre Dame School', Ph.D. diss., 5 vols., University of Chicago (1991), 2: 548, n. 24.

²¹ Folio numbers are available in Ludwig, *Repertorium*, 1/1:112–17.

Table 2 Motets in the ninth fascicle of F, fols. 399r–414v

No. in F	No. of voices	Motet text incipits	Related material	Ludwig no.	Feast/Use	Type of chant
2.1	2	Mens fidem seminat/IN ODO[REM]	C 3 v	M 45	St Andrew	Alleluia
2.2	2	Doce nos hodie viam prudentie/DOCE[BIT]	C	M 26	Pentecost	Alleluia
2.3	2	Doceas hac die viam patrie/DOCE[BIT]	D	M 26	Pentecost	Alleluia
2.4	2	Ne sedeas/ET TENU[ERUNT]	D	M 17	Easter Octave	Alleluia
2.5–6	3	Mors que stimulo/Mors morsu/MORS	C 4 v	M 18	Easter Octave	Alleluia
2.7	2	Hostem superat/[CAPTIVITATEM]	C	M 23	Ascension	Alleluia
2.8	2	Salve mater fons ortorum/[CAPTIVI]TA[TEM]	C	M 23	Ascension	Alleluia
2.9	2	Crescens incredulitas/[VIR]GO	C 3 v	M 32	Assumption	Gradual
2.10	2	Rex pacificus/REG[NAT]	C	M 34	Assumption	Alleluia
2.11	2	Infidelem populum/REG[NAT]	C	M 34	Assumption	Alleluia
2.12	2	Deus omnium/REG[NAT]	C	M 34	Assumption	Alleluia
2.13	2	Mundo gratum veneremur/AD NU[TUM]	D	O 18	Nativity of BVM	Office resp.
2.14	2	Ex semine Abrahe/EX SEMINE	D 3 v	M 38	Nativity of BVM	Alleluia
2.15	2	Letetur iustus/SPERA[VIT]	D	M 49	One Martyr	Alleluia
2.16	2	Christe via veritas/[ADIU]TORI[UM]	D	M 51	A Bishop Confessor	Alleluia
2.17	2	Deum querite/[INQUIRENTES AUTEM]	D	M 40	Several Martyrs	Gradual
2.18	2	Tua glorificata Deus opera/DO[MINE]	C	M 41	Several Martyrs	Gradual
2.19	2	Quia concupivit/QUIA CONCUPIVIT REX	D	M 54	A Virgin or Matron	Alleluia
2.20	2	Non orphanum/ET GAUDEBIT	C	M 24	Ascension	Alleluia
2.21	2	Et exalta vi magna/ET EXALTA[VI]	C	M 51	A Bishop Confessor	Alleluia
2.22	2	Si quis ex opere/[CAPTIVI]TA[TEM]	D	M 23	Ascension	Alleluia
2.23	2	Mulieris marces venter/MULIE[RUM]	D	M 29	St John the Baptist	Alleluia
2.24	2	Locus hic terribilis/[CONFI]TE[BOR]	D ¹	M 12	Dedication of a Church	Alleluia
2.25	2	Alpha, bovi et leoni/DOMINO	D 3 v	BD VI	Benedicamus Domino	Benedicamus
2.26	2	In modulo/[IMMO]LATUS	C	M 14	Easter	Alleluia
2.27	2	Moriuntur oriuntur/IN ODOREM	X	M 45	St Andrew	Alleluia
2.28	2	Factum est salutare/DOMINUS	C	M 1	Christmas	Gradual
2.29	2	Fidelis gratuletur populus/SANCTO	D	O 16	Assumption	Office resp.
2.30	2	Audi filia ergregia/FILIA	X	M 37	Assumption Octave	Gradual
2.31	2	Salve salus hominum/ET GAUDEBIT	X	M 24	Ascension	Alleluia
2.32	2	Clamans in deserto/IOHAN[NE]	C	M 29	St John the Baptist	Alleluia
2.33–4	3	Stirps Iesse/Virga cultus/FLOS FILIUS E[IUS]	C 3 v	O 16	Assumption	Office resp.
2.35	2	Gaude, Syon filia/ET IHERUSALEM	D & C	O 1	Christmas	Office resp.
2.36	2	Prothomartir plenus/[DOMI]NE	C	M 3	St Stephen	Gradual
2.37	2	Exilium parat/IN AZIMIS SINCERITA	D	M 15	Easter	Alleluia
2.38	2	Veni salva nos/AMO[RIS]	C	M 27	Pentecost Octave	Alleluia
2.39	2	Immolata paschali victima/[IMMO]LATUS	C	M 14	Easter	Alleluia

Table 2 *Continued*

No. in F	No. of voices	Motet text incipits	Related material	Ludwig no.	Feast/Use	Type of chant
2.40–1	3	Ypocrite/Velut stelle/ET GAUDEBIT	C	M 24	Ascension	Alleluia
2.42	2	Error popularis/DO[MINUS]	X	M 1	Christmas	Gradual
2.43	2	Virtus est complacitis/[VIR]GO	X	M 32	Assumption	Gradual
2.44	2	Liberator, libera/[LIBERATI]	X	M 7	Holy Innocents	Gradual
2.45	2	Virgo singularis/E[IUS] ²	C	O 16/BD I	Assumption	Office resp.
2.46	2	Gaude rosa speciosa/? (Incomplete)	X	—	—	—
A lacuna of unknown length						

¹ 2.24, on the tenor [CONF]ITE[BOR] for M 12, is related to a passage of discant in F (fol. 139v) on the tenor ET EXALTAVI, transmitted within an organum for M 51. This discant had a dual existence within M 12 and M 51, for it is transmitted within the context of both such organa in W2.

² This motet is related to a two-voice clausula on DOMINO in F (located in a group of Benedicamus Domino clausulae). The tenor melisma for BD I is the same as the melisma on FLOS FILIUS EIUS, O 16. The motet tenor indication, 'E' must stand for 'Eius', and the motet text is highly appropriate for the Assumption.

fascicle 9 (the first such piece is 2.27), often appearing side by-side (e.g., motets 2.30–2.31 or 2.42–2.44). Likewise, motets with corresponding clausulae are clustered together throughout (e.g., motets 2.32–2.36 or 2.38–2.40–1), as are motets with related passages of discant within organa (e.g., motets 2.22–2.25). This is particularly evident in the early part of the fascicle: a sequence of seven clausula-related motets (from the double motet 2.5–6 to 2.12) is directly followed by a sequence of five motets with related discant transmitted within organa (2.13–2.17).

The two fascicles differ regarding related musical materials in F. Of the twenty-six motets in the first motet fascicle, eleven are related to passages of discant transmitted within organa in F, eight to clausulae in F, six have no related materials in F, and one is related to musical material preserved as both a clausula and a passage of discant in F. There is, therefore, a perceptible emphasis on motets with related materials recorded in F as passages of discant within organa, as opposed to independent clausulae. In the second motet fascicle, however, twenty-one of the forty-three motets are related to clausulae in F, fourteen to passages of discant within organa, seven have no related material, and one has related material found as both a clausula and a passage of discant within an organum.²² The majority of motets in this later fascicle, then, have corresponding clausulae in the same source. A general progression from motets associated with passages of discant in F in fascicle 8 to those related to clausulae in F in fascicle 9 might also be perceptible on a more local, internal level. Table 3 presents in liturgical order all tenor chants employed in the eighth and ninth fascicles of F. Corresponding motets on each chant are indicated by their numbers and listed in the sequence in which they appear in F.²³ The presence and type of associated materials as found in W1, F and W2 is also shown, where a dash indicates no related material in W1 or W2. Motet numbers for the ninth fascicle and their related materials are italicised, and tenor chants first represented in fascicle 9 are italicised and underlined.

When a number of motets on the same tenor chant are recorded in fascicle 8, motets with corresponding clausulae in F invariably appear *after* a motet on the same tenor related to a passage of discant within an organum in F. Thus, 1.10 on the tenor [IMMO]LATUS (M 14) is associated with a passage of discant in F, and is followed by 1.11, on the same tenor, but with a corresponding clausula in F. Likewise, the two clausula-related motets on the tenor REG[NAT] (M 34), 1.20 and 1.21, follow a motet on this tenor, 1.19, associated with a passage of discant in F. This pattern is continued in fascicle 9, where motets related to clausulae are overwhelmingly on tenors for which fascicle 8 has already provided. Discant-related motets on the tenors REG[NAT] (M 34) and [IMMO]LATUS (M 14) appear in the first motet fascicle; the second provides a further three motets, all with related clausulae, on

²² The numbering system for motets in this fascicle does not correspond with the number of single pieces, since each double motet receives two numbers (each corresponding to a separately presented upper-voice text).

²³ Motet 2.46 is excluded from Table 3: its tenor is not extant in F and remains unknown.

Table 3 Motet tenors employed in F, their related motets in F, and related discant and clausula materials in W1, F, and W2

Ludwig no.	Feast/Use	Tenor chant	No. in F	Related materials in W1	Related materials in F	Related materials in W2
M 1	Christmas	<u>DOMINUS</u>	2.28 2.42	C –	C X	D –
M 3	St Stephen	DOMINE	1.3 2.36 ¹	C –	D C	– –
M 7	Holy Innocents	<u>LIBERATI</u>	2.44	–	X	–
M 8	Holy Innocents	IN BETHLEEM	1.4	C	D	D
M 11	Purification of BVM	AUDIVIMUS	1.5	–	C	–
M 12	Dedication of a Church	<u>CONFITEBOR</u>	2.24	–	D	D
M 13	Easter	DOMINO QUONIAM	1.6 1.7	– –	D D	D D
M 14	Easter	NOSTRUM IMMOLATUS	1.8 1.9 1.10 1.11 2.26 2.39	C D 3 v D 3 v C – –	D D 3 v D 3 v & 2 v C C C	D D 3 v D 3 v & 2 v – – –
M 15	Easter	<u>IN AZIMIS SINCERITA</u>	2.37	–	D	–
M 17	Easter Octave	<u>ET TENUERUNT</u>	2.4	–	D	–
M 18	Easter Octave	<u>MORS</u>	2.5–6	C 4 v	C 4 v	C 4 v
M 23	Ascension	CAPTIVITATEM	1.12 2.7 2.8 2.22	– C – –	C C C D	– – – D
M 24	Ascension	ET GAUDEBIT	1.13 2.20 2.31 2.40–1	C – – –	D & C 3 v C X C	– – – –
M 25	Pentecost	HODIE PERLUSTRAVIT	1.14	C	C	–
M 26	Pentecost	DOCEBIT	1.15 2.2 2.3	– C C	X C D	– – D

Table 3 *Continued*

Ludwig no.	Feast/Use	Tenor chant	No. in F	Related materials in W1	Related materials in F	Related materials in W2
M 27	Pentecost Octave	VENI SALVA NOS AMORIS ETC AMORIS	1.16 2.38 ²	– –	X C	– –
M 29	St John the Baptist	MULIERUM	1.17 2.23	– C	X D	– D
M 32	Assumption	<u>IOHANNE</u> VIRGO	2.32 1.18 2.9 2.43	– C – –	C D C 3 v X	– – – –
M 34	Assumption	REGNAT	1.19 1.20 1.21 2.10 2.11 2.12	C – C C – C	D C C C C C	– – – – – –
M 37	Assumption Octave	<u>FILIA</u> VERITATEM	2.30 1.25 1.26	– – –	X X X	– – –
M 38	Nativity of BVM	<u>EX SEMINE</u>	2.14	D 3 v	D 3 v & 2 v	D 3 v
M 40	Several Martyrs	<u>INQUIRENTES AUTEM</u>	2.17	C	D	–
M 41	Several Martyrs	<u>DOMINE</u>	2.18	–	C	–
M 45	St Andrew	<u>IN ODOREM</u>	2.1 2.27	C 3 v –	C 3 v X	– –
M 49	One Martyr	<u>SPERABIT</u>	2.15	C	D	–
M 51	A Bishop Confessor	<u>ADIUTORIUM</u> ET EXALTAVI	2.16 1.22 2.21	C – –	D C 3 v C	D ³ – –
M 53	A Confessor not Bishop	ET FLOREBIT	1.23	C	D	–
M 54	A Virgin or Matron	<u>QUIA CONCUPIVIT REX</u>	2.19	–	D	D
O 1	Christmas	<u>ET IHERUSALEM</u>	2.35	–	D & C	D

Table 3 *Continued*

Ludwig no.	Feast/Use	Tenor chant	No. in F	Related materials in W1	Related materials in F	Related materials in W2
O 2	Christmas	TANQUAM GLORIA	1.1 1.2	C C	C D	– –
O 16	Assumption	<u>EIUS/SANCTO</u>	2.29 2.33–4 ⁵ 2.45	– – –	D C 3 v C	D ⁴ – –
O 18	Nativity of BVM	<u>AD NUTUM</u>	2.13	–	D	D
O 40	St Catherine	AGMINA	1.24	–	X	–
BD VI	Benedicamus Domino	<u>DOMINO</u>	2.25	D 3 v	D 3 v	D 3 v

¹ This motet has been proposed as a contrafactum of an earlier French motet, and the related clausula may represent a transcription of this motet rather than its source. See Fred Büttner, 'Weltliche Einflüsse in der Notre-Dame-Musik? Überlegungen zu einer Klausel im Codex F', *Anuario musical*, 57 (2002), 19–37.

² This motet has been proposed as a contrafactum of an earlier French motet, and the related clausula may represent a transcription of this motet rather than its source. See Bradley, 'The Earliest Motets', 179–89.

³ The discant in W2 is on the text ADORABO, preserved within an organum for M 12.

⁴ This discant in W2 is on the text EIUS rather than SANCTO.

⁵ This motet has been proposed as a contrafactum of an earlier French motet, and the related clausula may represent a transcription of this motet rather than its source. See Bradley, 'The Earliest Motets', 202–17.

the Assumption tenor REG[NAT], and a further two motets, both with related clausulae, on the Easter tenor [IMMO]LATUS. Indeed, out of the twenty-one motets in fascicle 9 associated only with clausulae in F, just five (2.1, 2.5–6, 2.18, 2.28 and 2.32) are on tenor chants (for M 45, M 18, M 41, M 1 and M 29, respectively) that are neither represented in fascicle 8, nor already furnished with a discant-related motet in fascicle 9.

By contrast, twelve out of the fifteen motets in fascicle 9 with corresponding passages of discant within organa in F are on previously *unrepresented* tenors. Only three of these fifteen motets employ tenor chants already provided with motets in the eighth fascicle: 2.3, 2.22, and 2.23. Significantly, none of the fascicle 8 motets on these tenors (DOCEBIT, M 26; CAPTIVITATEM, M 23; MULIERUM, M 29; respectively) were associated with passages of discant within organa. Thus *all* fifteen of the discant-related motets in the ninth fascicle are on tenor chants for which no discant-related motet is recorded in the eighth fascicle. Furthermore, of the nineteen tenor chants making their first appearance in the second motet fascicle (shown in italics and underlined in Table 3), the majority (twelve) have corresponding passages of discant within organa. Just five of these tenors are first represented by motets with related clausulae, and only two (for M 7 and M 37) by motets with no clausulae or discant materials.

In summary, there is a predominance of motets related to passages of discant within organa in F in fascicle 8, while the majority of motets in fascicle 9 are related to clausulae in F. In addition, almost all of the motets related to passages of discant within organa in the ninth fascicle are on tenor chants *unrepresented* in the eighth. The motets in fascicle 9 for previously represented feasts, by contrast, usually have related clausulae in F. Of the forty different tenor chants employed in the motet fascicles of F, the majority (twenty-six) have at least one motet with a corresponding passage of discant within an organum in F.²⁴ On only two occasions (both in the second motet fascicle, on the tenors CAPTIVITATEM, M 23 and DOCEBIT, M 26) does a discant-related motet appear *after* a motet with an associated clausula presented earlier in the same fascicle. Most often, therefore, at least one motet related to a passage of discant within an organum in F is provided for each tenor chant, usually presented *before* any motets with corresponding clausulae in F or lacking related materials.

The progression from motets associated with passages of discant within organa in F to those with corresponding clausulae can be seen particularly clearly in the case of the two most heavily represented feasts in the motet fascicles of F: Easter and Assumption, both of the highest rank of annual feasts (along with Christmas and Pentecost) in the Notre Dame calendar.²⁵ Tables 4 and 5 present the motets that could be sung at Mass on Easter Day, and at the Office and Mass on the feast of the

²⁴ This is all the more significant given that clausulae in F vastly outnumber passages of discant within organa.

²⁵ The feast of the Assumption belonged, atypically, to annual rank as a consequence of the dedication of Notre Dame not only to the Blessed Virgin, but specifically to her Assumption. See Wright, *Music and Ceremony at Notre Dame*, 253.

Table 4 Motets in F with chant tenors for Easter Day

No. in F	Motet text incipits	Related material	Ludwig no.	Chant incipit	Liturgical function
	M 13				
1.6	Deo confitemini/DOMINO	D	M 13	<i>Hec dies. Confitemini</i>	Gradual
1.7	Laudes referat/QUONI[AM]	D	M 13	<i>Hec dies. Confitemini</i>	Gradual
	M 14				
1.8	Gaudeat devotio/NOSTRUM	D	M 14	<i>All. Pascha nostrum</i>	Alleluia 1
1.9	Nostrum est impletum/NOSTRUM	D 3 v	M 14	<i>All. Pascha nostrum</i>	Alleluia 1
1.10	Radix venie/[IMMO]LATUS	D 3 v	M 14	<i>All. Pascha nostrum</i>	Alleluia 1
1.11	Homo quam sit pura/[IMMO]LATUS	C	M 14	<i>All. Pascha nostrum</i>	Alleluia 1
2.26	In modulo/[IMMO]LATUS	C	M 14	<i>All. Pascha nostrum</i>	Alleluia 1
2.39	Immolata paschali victima/[IMMO]LATUS	C	M 14	<i>All. Pascha nostrum</i>	Alleluia 1
	M 15				
2.37	Exilium parat/IN AZIMIS SINCERITA	D	M 15	<i>Epulemur</i>	Verse 2 Alleluia 1

Table 5 Motets in F with chant tenors for the Office and Mass of the Feast of the Assumption

No. in F	Motet text incipits	Related material	Ludwig no.	Chant incipit	Liturgical function
	O 16¹				
2.29	Fidelis gratuletur populus/SANCTO	D	O 16	<i>Stirps Iesse. Virgo</i>	Resp. 1 Vespers
2.33–4	Stirps Iesse/Virga cultus/FLOS FILIUS E[IUS]	C 3 v	O 16	<i>Stirps Iesse. Virgo</i>	Resp. 1 Vespers
2.45	Virgo singularis/E[IUS]	C	O 16/BD I	<i>Stirps Iesse. Virgo</i>	Resp. 1 Vespers
	M 32				
1.18	O Maria mater pia/[VIR]GO	D	M 32	<i>Benedicta. Virgo dei</i>	Gradual
2.9	Crescens incredulitas/[VIR]GO	C 3 v	M 32	<i>Benedicta. Virgo dei</i>	Gradual
2.43	Virtus est complacitis/[VIR]GO	X	M 32	<i>Benedicta. Virgo dei</i>	Gradual
	M 34				
1.19	Flos de spina rumpitur/REG[NAT]	D	M 34	<i>All. Hodie Maria</i>	Resp. 2 Vespers & All. Sun. in 8ve ²
1.20	Ad solitum/REG[NAT]	C	M 34	<i>All. Hodie Maria</i>	Resp. 2 Vespers & All. Sun. in 8ve
1.21	Hodie Marie concurrent/REG[NAT]	C	M 34	<i>All. Hodie Maria</i>	Resp. 2 Vespers & All. Sun. in 8ve
2.10	Rex pacificus/REG[NAT]	C	M 34	<i>All. Hodie Maria</i>	Resp. 2 Vespers & All. Sun. in 8ve
2.11	Infidelem populum/REG[NAT]	C	M 34	<i>All. Hodie Maria</i>	Resp. 2 Vespers & All. Sun. in 8ve
2.12	Deus omnium/REG[NAT]	C	M 34	<i>All. Hodie Maria</i>	Resp. 2 Vespers & All. Sun. in 8ve

¹ Tenor melismas on SANCTO, EIUS and DOMINO are identical, and the tenor texts of clausulae, passages of discant within organa and motets are subject to variation between sources.

² See Wright, *Music and Ceremony at Notre Dame*, 253–4.

Assumption respectively, grouping them under Ludwig's numbers for the Office and Mass chants in the order in which they are arranged in F.²⁶

It appears that such patterns in the ordering of motets in F are not purely coincidental, but were deliberately created and cultivated by those compiling the motet collections in this manuscript. As already noted, the presentation of musical material in the form of either a passage of discant within an organum or a clausula can vary slightly between manuscript sources. If the motet fascicles of F are arranged with a view to the presence, absence and type of related material in the same manuscript, then the order in which the motets appear must be, to some extent, specific to this source. Were these pieces to have been copied from an existing motet collection already in this order, then it is unlikely that concordances with material which had the particular status of clausulae or passages of discant within organa in F should match up so neatly.²⁷

An arrangement of the motet fascicles accounting for related musical materials in the same source would be consonant with the state of the contents of F more generally, characterised by Roesner as 'highly organized, with several modes of organization operating simultaneously'.²⁸ F avoids any duplication of material within or across the two motet fascicles, while in W2 (the four motet fascicles of which were the work of three different scribes) the same motet can reappear in a different guise in a new fascicle.²⁹ In F, it is striking that two two-voice motets on Pentecost tenors (2.2 and 2.3) – precisely the feast for which provision seems to have proved problematic in fascicle 8, where empty staves were left unfilled – are copied almost immediately at the beginning of fascicle 9.³⁰ This points towards an awareness of material across the motet fascicles. Given that the entire contents of F, unlike W2, were copied by a single music scribe, such consciousness of the motet collection as a whole is perhaps unsurprising. And it is plausible that this consciousness extended also to the *manuscript* as a whole, encompassing related musical materials in the form of both clausulae and passages of discant within organa.

²⁶ Motets suggested by Baltzer as suitable for performance at the Vigil Mass for the Assumption and for use at the Benedicamus Domino for First Vespers are not included here. See Rebecca A. Baltzer, 'Aspects of Trope in the Earliest Motets for the Assumption of the Virgin', in *Studies in Medieval Music: Festschrift for Ernest H. Sanders* (New York, 1990), ed. Peter M. Lefferts and Brian Seirup = *Current Musicology*, 45–7 (1990), 5–42, at 11–12.

²⁷ Roesner is also of the opinion that the first fascicle of motets was compiled for F, observing that 'the irregularities in copying towards the end of the collection in fascicle 8 [presumably the unfilled staves] suggest ... that this cycle was only then in the process of being compiled'. *Introduction to the 'Notre-Dame Manuscript' F*, 29.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 24.

²⁹ *Gaudeat devotio*/NOSTRUM, for example, appears twice in W2: once in a three-voice version (fols. 131v–132v) and once with only its respective motetus and tenor parts (fol. 148r–v). Different texted versions of the same musical material are also copied in W2: the pair of motets *Sederunt inique principes*/[DOMI]NE (W2, fol. 185v) and *En mai qe nest*/[DOMI]NE (W2, fol. 226v), for instance.

³⁰ This was also noted by Arlt in 'Zur frühen Geschichte'.

A liturgical function for the motets in F?

The proposed arrangement of motets in F might prove revealing in terms of their possible function. Clearly, the organisation of motets according to the liturgical calendar alone need not necessarily indicate a liturgical performance context. What survives of the manuscript MüA, for example, demonstrates that the arrangement of its motets depended on their tenor chants. But the inclusion of both Latin and French motets within a liturgically ordered sequence suggests that the grouping of motets by tenor according to the Church calendar was, in this case, more an abstract organisational principle than evidence of liturgical performance.³¹

The motet fascicles of F, largely arranged according to the liturgical calendar, betray other signs of possible liturgical influence. The initial twenty-three motets of fascicle 8 basically cover the church year, providing one motet for each tenor chant, and duplicating only motets on the tenors NOSTRUM, [IMMO]LATUS and REG[NAT], for two of the annual feasts, Easter and the Assumption respectively. Fascicle 9 supplements these important feasts, expanding the motets for Christmas and Pentecost, while also offering motets on tenors for lesser feasts absent from the eighth fascicle, and, in particular, for the Common of Saints (see the tenor chants first represented in the ninth fascicle, as highlighted in Table 3). The relatively small number of motets for the Christmas season (with just two motets for M 1, two for O 2 and two for the feast of St Stephen, M 3) might seem contrary to the liturgical importance of this time. However, this could easily be explained, as proposed by Arlt in his unpublished 1985 paper, by the suggestion that the need for such motets was limited, given the rich provision of music for Christmas and the feast of St Stephen elsewhere in the *Magnus liber*, including the famous four-voice *Viderunt* and *Sederunt* organa. Finally, the sheer number of different tenor chants represented in F (forty different tenors in sixty-nine motets) may indicate that the motet collection attempted to furnish quite a wide range of liturgical feasts with appropriate settings.

Given that organa and clausulae are thought to have been performed liturgically, a seeming preoccupation with their relationship to the motets in F might point towards the use of motets in the liturgy, and the precedence given to motets related to passages of discant in F could reflect a liturgical concern. It is generally accepted that clausulae were intended for substitution into organa, yet they must have had additional functions or performance contexts. There are, for example, a number of clausulae in F lacking host organa in the same source,³² or on tenors drawn from the

³¹ Luther Dittmer also thought it 'improbable' that 'secular' French motets could have been used in the liturgy, declaring their arrangement in MüA 'comprehensible only if the motets had only recently sprung from the clausulae, and that they had consequently preserved their order'. See his *Eine zentrale Quelle der Notre-Dame Musik [MüA]: Faksimile, Wiederherstellung, Catalogue raisonné, Besprechung und Transcriptionen*, Publications of Medieval Manuscripts 3 (Brooklyn, NY, 1959), 39–40, at 40.

³² See the discussion of two-, three- and four-voice clausulae lacking host organa in Hans Tischler, 'How Were Notre Dame Clausulae Performed?', *Music and Letters*, 50 (1969), 273–7, at 274–5. It is, however, possible that clausulae lacking host organa were still performed liturgically, simply inserted into a host chant rather than into a polyphonic organum.

choral portions of responsory melismas that were not normally set polyphonically.³³ Liturgical usage seems unlikely for the famous NUSMIDO clausula (F, fol. 150v), which presents its DOMINUS tenor in retrograde, and might be more plausibly understood as an ingenious musical pun. Certain clausulae in F have, furthermore, been identified as transcriptions of French motets containing widely cited refrain melodies, casting doubt on their liturgical suitability, and raising questions about their purpose.³⁴ Thus, while there is little reason to doubt that passages of discant within organa were performed in a liturgical context, the liturgical status of clausulae is occasionally more ambiguous. The primary provision of motets with corresponding passages of discant within organa in F might, then, reflect the closer ties of this musical material to a liturgical context.

That motets could actually have been sung within organa, in place of passages of discant or of substitute clausulae, would further explain the ordering of the collection in F. Though there has been little detailed consideration of the practicalities of such a performance practice, it is generally accepted as a possibility.³⁵ Baltzer has drawn attention to the 'sectionalized' nature of organa, which encourages a 'pasticcio treatment', concluding that the substitution of a motet for a discant passage 'would not have posed insurmountable difficulties to singers experienced in this repertory'.³⁶ An important piece of potential evidence to support the hypothesis is offered by the Copenhagen fragment (K), discovered in the 1980s. K contains a copy of an organum for the Easter Day Alleluia (M 14), with the words 'Gaudeat devocio' – the opening of the motet related to this passage of discant on NOSTRUM – copied at the beginning of the discant between the tenor and duplum staves (fol. 4r).³⁷

³³ For instance, two neighbouring clausulae – on the tenors CLEMENTIA[M] (F, fol. 184r–v), from the responsory *Qui cum audissent* for St Nicholas (O 25a), and TE (F, fol. 184v), from the responsory *Sancte Paule Apostole V. Ut digni* (O 4a) for St Paul the Apostle – employ chant melismas from the choral portions of their host responsories.

³⁴ Gordon A. Anderson initially rejected the hypothesis that clausulae in F might be transcriptions of motets; see his 'Clausulae or Transcribed Motets in the Florence Manuscript?', *Acta musicologica*, 42 (1970), 109–28. However, Wolf Frobenius, in 'Zum genetischen Verhältnis zwischen Notre-Dame-Klauseln und ihren Motetten', *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft*, 44 (1987), 1–39, declared a majority of clausulae with related motet versions to have originated as motets. Frobenius's general reversal of the traditional clausula–motet relationship was not widely accepted. See, for example, Norman E. Smith, 'The Earliest Motets: Music and Words', *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 114 (1989), 141–63, at 145–6. Yet a small number of clausulae in F have recently been re-proposed as transcriptions of French motets. See Fred Büttner, 'Weltliche Einflüsse in der Notre-Dame-Musik?' *Anuario musical*, 57 (2002), 19–37; Bradley, 'The Earliest Motets', 179–226.

³⁵ See Lefferts and Sanders, 'Motet, §I: Middle Ages', where it is suggested that the earliest motets 'may have been used within their appropriate organa'. See also Wright, *Music and Ceremony at Notre Dame*, 342–4.

³⁶ Baltzer, 'Performance Practice'.

³⁷ John Bergsagel concluded that this rubric might indicate the chronological priority of the motet over its related discant, possibly providing evidence to support the then recent proposals by Frobenius ('Zum genetischen Verhältnis'). Bergsagel, 'The Transmission of Notre-Dame Organa in Some Newly-Discovered "Magnus liber organi" Fragments in Copenhagen', in *Atti del xiv congresso della società internazionale di musicologia: trasmissione e ricezione delle forme di cultura musicale*, ed. Angelo Pompilio et al., 3 vols. (Turin, 1990), 3:629–36, at 634–5.

However, the evidence of this fragment and the likely performance of motets within organa are questionable on several counts. It is difficult to judge the extent to which K might represent a widespread practice, and the presence of a motet incipit within an organum could serve merely as an indication that there was a motet text associated with this music rather than a performance direction. Significantly, two motets recorded in F lack appropriate host organa in the same source. Motet 1.24, *Agmina militie celestis/AGMINA* (fols. 396v–397v) for the feast of St Catherine (O 40), employs a melisma from the responsory *Virgo flagellator V. Sponsus amat* that, as a non-soloistic part of the chant, is not furnished with polyphony in the three-voice organum setting of this responsory.³⁸ Similarly, motet 2.24, *Locus hic terribilis/[CONFI]TE[BOR]* (fols. 406v–407r, M 12) is associated with passage of discant in F, but one which is transmitted within a different organum (M 51), on the tenor ET EXALTAVI. In addition, Arlt observed that, for many of the Latin motets in F that are also recorded in W2, there is *no* suitable host organum preserved in W2.³⁹ It is also noteworthy that the majority of three-part motets in F lack corresponding three-part organa: of the twenty tenor chants employed in three-voice motets in F, only five (M 14, M 32, M 51, O 2 and O 16) receive three-voice organal settings.⁴⁰ There remains, moreover, the difficult question as to whether certain Latin motet texts can be considered suitable for liturgical use.⁴¹

Conclusions about the liturgical performance of motets, potentially within the context of organa, must always remain speculative. Yet there is an additional explanation for the ordering of motets in F that need not rely solely upon a liturgical

³⁸ Motet 1.24 could be performed within the two-voice organum for the *Alleluia Corpus beate virginis* (M 65) found in StV (fol. 286v), the only extant organum to set polyphonically the melisma on *Agmina*. Friedrich Ludwig named M 65 as the source of the *Agmina* melisma; see *Repertorium* I/1, 107. In his 2011 edition of this motet, Thomas Payne gave both M 65 and O 40 as possible chant sources (*Philip the Chancellor: Motets and Prosulas*, 59). Recent research by Franz Körndle suggests that O 40 is the more likely source. Körndle has emphasised that the M 65 *Alleluia* is entirely unique to StV, and may have been a chant newly created specifically for the two-part organum in this source by a process of centonisation, borrowing the melisma on *Agmina* from the responsory *Virgo flagellator*. See Franz Körndle, 'Von der Klausel zur Motette und zurück? Überlegungen zum Repertoire der Handschrift *Saint-Victor*', *Musiktheorie*, 25 (2010), 117–28, at 120.

³⁹ Arlt, 'Zur frühen Geschichte'. There are no corresponding organa in W2 for those motets on tenors for M 15, M 17, M 18, M 24, M 25, M 27, M 34 and M 38. This lack of correspondence between organa and motets in W2 could result partly from the copying of the respective fascicles by different scribes.

⁴⁰ The lack of correlation between the number of voices in a motet and a host organum might not, however, be significant, since the highest voice of a three-part monotextual motet could easily be omitted. Many of the three-voice monotextual motets in F are transmitted in sources such as MüA, Ma and W2 without their associated tripla. And in K, the 'Gaudeat devocio' rubric is copied above a two-voice discant passage lacking the associated motet triplum.

⁴¹ In 'Performance Practice', Baltzer's concept of a liturgically appropriate motet was very narrowly defined, to include only motets that directly and specifically refer to the feast in question, and excluding those with purely hortatory or polemical texts. Arlt's conception (in 'Zur frühen Geschichte') of a liturgically appropriate motet was, however, more broadly construed. Baltzer later relaxed her criteria to include Marian motets on non-Marian tenors (see 'Why Marian Motets on Non-Marian Tenors? An Answer', in *Music in Medieval Europe: Studies in Honour of Bryan Gillingham*, ed. Terence Bailey and Alma Santosuosso (Aldershot, 2007), 112–28). On questions of troping and liturgical suitability, see also Susan A. Kidwell, 'Elaboration through Exhortation: Troping Motets for the Common of Martyrs', *Plain-song and Medieval Music*, 5 (1996), 153–73.

justification. The clustering together of clausula- and discant-related motets, and the precedence awarded to motets associated with passages of discant within organa, could also arise from an awareness of the relative dissemination or status of these related materials.⁴² The decision to present certain discant passages within organa might reflect a perception of these passages as 'older' or more widely transmitted than the music of certain independent clausulae. Many of the independent clausulae in W1, for instance, are located within organa in F, perhaps confirming that discant within organa in F comprises an earlier layer of musical material than clausulae.⁴³

Of the twenty-seven passages of discant transmitted within organa related to motets in F, only two are unique to this manuscript. By contrast, a majority of the clausulae with corresponding motets in F – eighteen out of a total of thirty-one – are recorded only in F. Such patterns of dissemination are typical of F as a whole: clausulae are more often unique to this manuscript than passages of discant within organa. This is unsurprising, since F contains by far the largest collection of clausulae in any extant manuscript (with 462 clausulae in fascicle 5 alone). However, even allowing for the possible loss of other sources with similarly extensive collections of clausulae, patterns of transmission and dissemination for clausulae and discant evident across surviving thirteenth-century manuscripts are sufficiently pronounced to remain significant.

Patterns of dissemination: unica clausulae and the motets at the end of the ninth fascicle in F

That the relative dissemination of musical materials could have influenced the organisation of motets in F is supported by closer examination, particularly of the pieces at the end of fascicle 9. Motets with related materials exclusive to F are often clustered together, and the majority appear late in the collection (see Table 6). Only four motets in the eighth fascicle have related materials unique to F, while in the ninth, sixteen have related materials found in F, but not in W1 or W2. This increase in motets with related materials recorded only in F towards the end of the

⁴² This could additionally account for two of the five anomalous clausula-related motets on previously unrepresented tenors in the ninth fascicle. The double motet 2.5–6 is related to the very widely transmitted four-voice MORS clausula (M 18). Similarly, motet 2.1, which opens the ninth fascicle, has a corresponding three-voice clausula on IN ODOREM (M 45), transmitted in both W1 and F.

⁴³ Organica dupla are thought to represent one of the oldest extant layers of the Magnus liber repertory, pre-dating organica tripla, quadrupla and clausulae. See Rebecca A. Baltzer, ed., *Les clausules à deux voix du manuscrit de Florence, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Pluteus 29.1, fascicule V, Le magnus liber organi de Notre-Dame de Paris*, 5 (Monaco, 1995), xlv, and Edward H. Roesner, ed., *Les quadrupla et tripla de Paris, Le magnus liber organi de Notre-Dame de Paris*, 1 (Monaco, 1993), lxix. Norman E. Smith also organises his catalogue of clausulae so that two-voice passages of discant within organica are numbered first, as befits their 'proper position of primacy'. See his 'The Clausulae of the Notre Dame School', Ph.D. diss., 3 vols., Yale University (1964), 1:25. Edward H. Roesner, in 'Who "Made the Magnus liber?"', *Early Music History*, 20 (2001), 227–66, has, however, emphasised the complexity of chronological relationships in this repertory, drawing attention to the multiple re-workings of organica dupla by independent organistae or 'abbreviators'. Thus, although organica dupla may represent an early layer of the Magnus liber repertory, they could be preserved in textual states that are relatively late.

Table 6 Motets with related clausulae and discant preserved in F, but not in W1 or W2

No. in F	Motet text incipits	Ludwig no.	Related materials in F
1.5	Novus nove legis/[AUDIVI]MUS	M 11	C
1.12	Scandit solium/[CAPTIVI]TA[TEM]	M 23	C
1.20	Ad solitum/REG[NAT]	M 34	C
1.22	Et exaltavi plebis humilem/ET EXALTA[VI]	M 51	C 3 v
2.4	Ne sedeas/ET TENUE[RUNT]	M 17	D
2.8	Salve mater fons ortorum/[CAPTIVI]TA[TEM]	M 23	C
2.9	Crescens incredulitas/[VIR]GO	M 32	C
2.11	Infidelem populum/REG[NAT]	M 34	C
2.18	Tua glorificata Deus opera/DO[MINE]	M 41	C
2.20	Non orphanum/ET GAUDEBIT	M 24	C
2.21	Et exalta vi magna/ET EXALTA[VI]	M 51	C
2.26	In modulo/[IMMO]LATUS	M 14	C
2.32	Clamans in deserto/IOHAN[NE]	M 29	C
2.33–4	Stirps lesse/Virga cultus/FLOS FILIUS E[IUS]	O 16	C 3 v
2.36	Prothomartir plenus/[DOMI]NE	M 3	C
2.37	Exilium parat/IN AZIMIS SINCERITA	M 15	D
2.38	Veni salva nos/AMO[RIS]	M 27	C
2.39	Immolata paschali victima/[IMMO]LATUS	M 14	C
2.40–1	Ypocrite/Velut stelle/ET GAUDEBIT ¹	M 24	C
2.45	Virgo singularis/E[IUS]	O 16/BD I	C

¹ This clausula is also extant in StV, fols. 289v–290r, with the marginal incipit ‘Al cor ai une alegrence d’un fol dol enescurade’.

Table 7 Motets without related materials in F

No. in F	Motet text incipits	Ludwig no.
1.15	Doce nos optime/DOCEBIT	M 26
1.16	Veni doctor previe/VENI etc	M 27
1.17	Prodit lucis radius/MULIE[RUM]	M 29
1.24	Agmina militie celestis/AGMINA	O 40
1.25	O Maria maris stella/VERITA[TEM]	M 37
1.26	In veritate/[VERITATEM] (Incomplete)	M 37
2.27	Moriuntur oriuntur/IN ODOREM	M 45
2.30	Audi filia ergregia/FILIA	M 37
2.31	Salve salus hominum/ET GAUDEBIT	M 24
2.42	Error popularis/DO[MINUS]	M 1
2.43	Virtus est complacitis/[VIR]GO	M 32
2.44	Liberator, libera/[LIBERATI]	M 7
2.46	Gaude rosa speciosa/? (Incomplete)	—

ninth fascicle is accompanied by an increase in motets without surviving related materials (see Table 7). The motets towards the end of fascicle 9, then, often lack related materials or have related clausulae and discant unique to F. Significantly, many of these motets *themselves* are also unique to F. Not a single motet in the first motet fascicle of F is a *unicum*: the vast majority are also transmitted in W2 (sometimes in reduced-voice versions) and, less often, in Ma. The second motet fascicle, however, contains thirteen *unica* (see Table 8).

Table 8 Motets that are *unica* in F

No. in F	Motet text incipits	Ludwig no.	Related materials & ms sources
2.7	Hostem superat/[CAPTIVITATEM]	M 23	C in W1 and F
2.11	Infidelem populum/REG[NAT]	M 34	C <i>unicum</i> in F
2.12	Deus omnium/REG[NAT]	M 34	C in W1 and F
2.18	Tua glorificata Deus opera/DO[MINE]	M 41	C <i>unicum</i> in F
2.21	Et exalta vi magna/ET EXALTA[VI]	M 51	C <i>unicum</i> in F
2.22	Si quis ex opere/[CAPTIVI]TA[TEM]	M 37	D in W1, F & W2
2.30	Audi filia ergregia/FILIA	M 37	X
2.31	Salve salus hominum/ET GAUDEBIT	M 24	X
2.37	Exilium parat/IN AZIMIS SINCERITA	M 15	D <i>unicum</i> in F
2.39	Immolata paschali victima/[IMMO]LATUS ¹	M 14	C <i>unicum</i> in F
2.43	Virtus est complacitis/[VIR]GO	M 32	X
2.45	Virgo singularis/E[IUS]	O 16	C <i>unicum</i> in F
2.46	Gaude rosa speciosa/? (Incomplete)	—	X

¹ The beginning of text only of this motet is extant in Da, fol. 58v.

The correspondence between the dissemination of motets and the dissemination of their related materials apparent in Table 8 is striking. And the coincidence of motets unique to F with no related materials, or related materials also unique to F, is even more marked if one also considers the motets that are not strictly *unica* in F, but which appear in a particular texted version found only in this manuscript.⁴⁴ Amongst the final motets in F, before the ninth fascicle breaks off, are eight pieces of this type: motets with texts unique to F, but whose musical material is otherwise widely disseminated and, in three cases, cited in examples by the theorist Franco of Cologne.⁴⁵ These *quasi-unica* are interspersed with genuine *unica* at the end of fascicle 9, and almost all such motets have no related materials, or are related to clausulae (or, in just two instances, passages of discant) preserved in F, but not in W1 or W2. In fact, the specificity to F of the final fifteen motets in the ninth fascicle might allow these pieces to be considered as a distinct group,⁴⁶ the beginning of the group marked by the first appearance in the collection of a pair of motets unique to F with no extant related materials (Table 9).⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Hans Tischler also noted in passing the concentration of *unica* texts in the later part of the second motet fascicle of F. See his 'Latin Texts in the Early Motet Collections: Relationships and Perspectives', *Musica Disciplina*, 31 (1977), 31–44, at 34.

⁴⁵ For an edition of Franco's *Ars cantus mensurabilis musicae*, see André Gilles and Glibert Reaney eds., *Franco de Colonia: Ars cantus mensurabilis musicae*, Corpus scriptorium de musica 18 (Rome, 1974).

⁴⁶ Tischler states that the second motet fascicle in F 'clearly contains two separate collections' ('Latin Texts in the Early Motet Collections', 34), placing the beginning of his 'second collection' a little earlier: at motet 2.25 (*Alpha bovi et leoni/DOMINO*), rather than 2.30. He observes that this opening motet begins, appropriately, with the letter 'A', but his reasons for declaring an intentional and clearly defined 'second collection' at this point in the fascicle are otherwise unclear. The distinction between Tischler's two 'collections' seems to rely chiefly on patterns of concordance and transmission. On these grounds, the case for a distinct group of pieces beginning at motet 2.30 is stronger, and also takes account of the existence and transmission of related clausula and discant materials.

⁴⁷ Sources giving only text incipits of widely transmitted motets are not listed here. The number of voice-parts in each related motet is provided in brackets, and includes the tenor part unless otherwise indicated.

Table 9 The final fifteen motets of the ninth fascicle in F (possible contrafacta are underlined)

No. in F	Motet text incipits	Related materials & ms sources	Related motets: their ms sources & texts
2.30	Audi filia ergregia/FILIA	X	<i>Unicum</i> in F
2.31	Salve salus hominum/ET GAUDEBIT	X	<i>Unicum</i> in F
2.32	Clamans in deserto/IOHAN[NE]	C, F	W2: <i>Cecitas arpie</i> (2vv) Fauv: <i>Veritas arpie</i> (2vv) W2, LoC, Mo: <i>Ne sai que je die</i> (2vv) Mo, Ba: <i>Quant vient en mai/Ne sai que je die</i> (3vv) Franco, Ex. 69: <i>Arida frondescit</i> (2vv)
<u>2.33–4</u>	<u>Stirps Iesse/Virga cultus/FLOS FILIUS E[IUS]</u>	C 3 v, F	W2, LoC: <i>Candida virginitas</i> (2vv) W2, R, N: <i>Quant revient/l'autrier jouer</i> (3vv) Mo, Cl: <i>Plus bele que flors/Quant revient/l'autrier jouer</i> (4vv) Ca: <i>L'autrier jouer</i> with text of <i>Virgo viget melius</i> copied above (3vv) Hu, Ba: <i>Claustrum pudicie/Virgo viget melius</i> (3vv) Bol: <i>Virgo viget melius</i> (motetus only) Franco, Ex. 6: <i>Virgo viget melius</i> (motetus only) Franco, Ex. 73: <i>Virgo viget melius</i> (2vv)
2.35	Gaude, Syon filia/ET IHERUSALEM	C, F D, F & W2	MüB: ... <i>ni nubit numini caro/[Gaude, Syon filia] ... gracia prestans</i> (fragmentary) (3vv)
<u>2.36</u>	<u>Prothomartir plenus/[DOMI]NE</u>	C, F	W2: <i>Sederunt inique principes</i> (2vv) W2, MüA, Mo: <i>En mai quant nest la rosee</i> (2vv)
2.37	Exilium parat/IN AZIMIS SINCERITA	D, F	<i>Unicum</i> in F
<u>2.38</u>	<u>Veni salva nos/AMO[RIS]</u>	C, F	Cl, Mo: <i>Por vos amie/He, quant je remir</i> (3vv) Ba, Mo, Tu: <i>Dame de valour/He Dieus, quant je remir</i> (3vv) Lille: <i>O quam sollempnis legatio</i> (motetus only but with legend 'Cuius tenuram tenet AMOR') Franco, Ex. 68: <i>Virgo Dei plena</i> (2vv)
2.39	Immolata paschali victima/[IMMO]LATUS	C, F	<i>Unicum</i> in F (beginning of text preserved in Da)

Table 9 *Continued*

2.40-1	<u>Ypocrite/Velut stelle/ET GAUDEBIT</u> ¹	C, F & StV	Ch: <i>O quam sancta</i> (3vv monotextual motet) Hu, LoC, ArsB: <i>O quam sancta</i> (2vv) Ma, Ba: <i>Ypocrite/O quam sancta</i> (3vv) Mo: <i>El mois d'avril/O quam sancta</i> (3vv) Cl: <i>El mois d'avril/O Maria mater pia/O quam sancta</i> (4vv) W2: <i>El mois d'avril/Al cor ai</i> (3vv) W2: <i>Memor tui creatoris</i> (2vv) W2: <i>Virgo virginum regina</i> (2vv)
2.42	<u>Error popularis/DO[MINUS]</u> ²	X	W2, MüA, Mo: <i>Fole acostumance</i> (2vv)
2.43	<u>Virtus est complacitis/[VIR]GO</u>	X	<i>Unicum</i> in F
2.44	<u>Liberator, libera/[LIBERATI]</u> ³	X	W2, StS1: <i>Exaltavit sydere</i> (music a 5th higher) (2vv)
2.45	<u>Virgo singularis/E[IUS]</u>	C, F	<i>Unicum</i> in F
2.46	<u>Gaude rosa speciosa/? (Incomplete)</u>	X	<i>Unicum</i> in F

¹ This motet was proposed as a contrafactum by Arlt, in 'Zur frühen Geschichte der Motette'. Rebecca A. Baltzer did not take account of this hypothesis in her later article on this motet family, 'The Polyphonic Progeny of an *Et Gaudebit*: Assessing Family Relations in a Thirteenth-Century Motet', in *Hearing the Motet: Essays on the Motet of the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, ed. Dolores Pesce (New York and Oxford, 1997), 17–28.

² Evidence for this motet as a contrafactum is provided in Bradley, 'The Earliest Motets', 152–64.

³ Evidence for this motet as a contrafactum is provided *ibid.*, 283–95.

All fifteen motets at the end of the ninth fascicle are either unique to F or appear in a particular version unique to F. Only two of these motets have related materials found outside F, and both are rather special cases. The clausula in F on ET GAUDEBIT, related to the double motet 2.40–1, is also transmitted, not in W1 or W2, but in the later ‘St Victor’ collection of clausulae copied with French motet incipits.⁴⁸ Similarly, for motet 2.35, the conclusion of the discant on ET IHERUSALEM in W2 differs substantially from the corresponding clausula and discant in F. In fact, motet 2.35 appears to have been created by conflating the clausula and discant versions of its related materials as they are preserved in F, and thus this unusual piece has a particular specificity to F.⁴⁹

Caution must naturally be exercised when the presence or absence of motets and clausulae in certain sources is awarded significance: *unica* motets and clausulae could have been copied in manuscripts now lost, and widely transmitted motets may, owing to the vagaries of source survival, be documented in a single source only. Patterns of concordances for the motets in F and their related clausulae and discant, however, seem too pronounced simply to be coincidence. The concentration at the end of fascicle 9 of motets preserved in a form unique to F, either with no related materials or with related materials unique to F, stands in such stark contrast to fascicle 8 that it can hardly result from pure chance.

In terms of compositional method, the motets at the end of the ninth fascicle are a heterogeneous collection: several of them may be textings of pre-existent clausulae or passages of discant within organa. Some are contrafacta, while others do not seem to have borrowed any existing material, but may be ‘newly composed’. The interspersions of *unica* and very widely disseminated pieces at the end of fascicle 9 puzzled Darwin Scott, who admitted that he sought ‘in vain to discover any underlying method of organisation’.⁵⁰ Arlt, too, found the ordering of these final pieces in the motet collection of F difficult to reconcile, observing that their arrangement with regard to calendric ordering and liturgical provision appeared to be ‘arbitrary’.⁵¹ The common specificity of these works and their related materials (where extant) to F might explain why such a seemingly disparate group of diverse pieces was clustered together at the end of the motet collection.

‘Old’ and ‘new’ in F

An organising principle reflecting the relative dissemination of musical textual materials is not unheard of in motet fascicles. Roesner has observed that ‘presentation by relative popularity seems to obtain in some of the individual motet fascicles

⁴⁸ Fred Büttner has recently prosed that this clausula in StV represents a transcribed motet. See his *Das Klauselrepertoire der Handschrift Saint-Victor (Paris, BN, lat. 15139): Eine Studie zur mehrstimmigen Komposition im 13. Jahrhundert* (Lecce, 2011), 306–12.

⁴⁹ See Fred Büttner, ‘Eine süddeutsche Motettenaufzeichnung des 14. Jahrhunderts und ihr Verhältnis zur älteren französischen Überlieferung’, *Musik in Bayern*, 32 (1986), 91–107, and Bradley, ‘The Earliest Motets’, 274–83.

⁵⁰ Scott, ‘The Early Three- and Four-Voice Monotextual Motets’, 164.

⁵¹ Arlt, ‘Zur frühen Geschichte der Motette’.

in Montpellier H196'.⁵² Similarly, Mary Wolinski has noted an analogous progression in the motet fascicles of W2, remarking that the 'first alphabets of French and Latin motets in W2 contain the ... most widely transmitted pieces, while the last alphabets have ... *unica* and *contrafacts*'.⁵³ It seems plausible, then, that motets recognised at the time of copying as specific to F, and not considered to be widely disseminated or 'popular', might appear towards the end of the collection. Indeed, an awareness of the pieces at the end of the ninth fascicle as particular to F could further suggest that these motets may have been newly created and re-worked specifically for F. If this were the case, such motets might represent a separate layer of pieces which were not already in general circulation and perhaps more recent than motets presented earlier in the collection.

It would be appropriate that works relatively 'new' at the time when F was compiled should appear near the end of the collection. This has been noted already by Roesner:

There is also an overall progression from old to new, with the more recent genre of the motet appearing late in the manuscript (in fascicles 8 and 9) and, again, the presumably relatively modern refrain songs coming at the end (fascicle 11). Similarly, within the strictly liturgical section, the *clausulae* that for the most part represent reworkings of an earlier corpus of *organa* are placed after their respective repertories.⁵⁴

The association of motets at the end of fascicle 9 predominantly with independent *clausulae* – which apparently did not circulate widely outside F – rather than passages of discant transmitted within *organa*, could be further confirmation of their relative dissemination and novelty.

Lacunae in the motet fascicles of F

These observations about the nature of the motet collection in F might shed further light on the possible lacunae in this manuscript. Both fascicles 8 and 9 are incomplete, breaking off mid-motet at the end of the single gatherings that constitute each fascicle. The original foliation of F ends in the middle of fascicle 7, therefore it remains unknown how many further gatherings of motets, if any, may have been intended. As the extant contents of fascicle 8 span the entire liturgical year, would

⁵² Roesner, *Introduction to the 'Notre-Dame Manuscript' F*, 29. Roesner goes on to remark that 'the criterion of relative popularity does not apply to the [motet] collection in fascicle 9 [of F], since these are among the most widely disseminated works in the repertory, and also among the most reworked' (29). He is seemingly unaware that many of these widely disseminated works appear in F in a version extant only in this source and that they are interspersed with *unica*.

⁵³ Mary Wolinski, 'Review of Rebecca A. Baltzer ed., *Le magnus liber organi de Notre-Dame de Paris V: Les clausules à deux voix du manuscrit de Florence*, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Pluteus 29.1, fascicule V (Monaco, 1995)', *Notes*, 33 (1997), 973–6, at 975.

⁵⁴ Roesner, *Introduction to the 'Notre-Dame Manuscript' F*, 25. Internally, however, fascicle 5 may enact a progression in the opposite direction. Baltzer has noted that 'the newest and largest collection is given pride of place, and the second and third/fourth series betray increasing age'. See *Les clausules à deux voix du manuscrit F*, xlv.

this cycle have simply broken down if the fascicle continued (as it seemingly begins to do at the end of the first gathering)? Or would there have been a second supplementary liturgical cycle of motets, in the same manner as the clausula cycles recorded in fascicle 5? And would a second gathering at the end of fascicle 9 have continued to present motets that were perhaps relatively recent or specific to F as a source? Roesner has also emphasised that F may conceivably be missing not only gatherings of motets but also entire fascicles, which would, he suggests, most likely have recorded Latin double motets and could even have contained motets with French texts.⁵⁵

It is arguable, however, that the motet collection as now extant in F is, in fact, essentially complete. Perhaps the scribe did not wish to waste an entire new gathering simply because the piece(s) intended for the end of these fascicles did not fit onto the final verso.⁵⁶ It is difficult to imagine how fascicle 8 could have continued: the idea of a second gathering that did not follow the liturgical calendar may be unlikely in view of the strict liturgical organisation of the first. From the evidence of surviving thirteenth-century sources, there are few monotextual motets not already included in F that could have made up such a second liturgical cycle. As Scott has noted, the eighth fascicle of F 'uniquely preserves as an entity nearly the complete extant Parisian repertory of this type of motet'.⁵⁷ Norman Smith has also emphasised the comprehensive nature of the motet collection in F, observing that this manuscript records 'all but seven of the first-mode Latin clausula-based repertory motets'.⁵⁸ Furthermore, if the motets at the end of fascicle 9 comprise a group of works specific to F, then their appearance at the end of the collection would be appropriate, and it is questionable whether another further gathering could have been filled with many more such pieces.

It seems also relatively improbable that fascicles of double or French motets may be missing from F. Had there been a gathering devoted to double motets, then the three pieces of this type recorded amongst the two-voice motets in fascicle 9 would surely have appeared here instead. F as a whole does not contain any vernacular texts and principally employs ordering systems more commonly associated with purely Latin liturgical sources. Indeed, the presence in F of a number of widely transmitted French motets in versions with unique Latin contrafacta might indicate that the better-known French texts were deliberately avoided in this manuscript. Such propositions necessarily remain hypothetical, but they are supported by the nature of F as a source, and the organisational conventions and patterns of transmission in its motet fascicles.

In conclusion, it appears that the two fascicles containing monotextual, two-voice and polytextual three-voice motets in F were ordered very carefully, under a number

⁵⁵ Roesner, *Introduction to the 'Notre-Dame Manuscript' F*, 30.

⁵⁶ Admittedly, this does not seem to occur elsewhere. All other fascicles in F end with unfilled folios, save fascicles 2 and 5, which break off mid-clausula (but where it is evident from the original foliation that leaves are now missing).

⁵⁷ Scott, 'The Early Three- and Four-Voice Monotextual Motets', 13.

⁵⁸ Smith, 'The Earliest Motets: Music and Words', 147.

of shared organisational principles. Both motet fascicles exhibit the influence of the liturgical calendar, and both appear to reflect an awareness of the presence and type of related clausula or discant material recorded elsewhere in the manuscript. This could be interpreted as evidence of a liturgical function for the motets of F. Yet it might also be explained by the proposition that those compiling F were mindful of the relative age of musical material: of the motets themselves *and* their related passages of discant transmitted within organa or clausulae. Ideas of age and 'popularity' may, therefore, have further influenced the arrangement of the motet fascicles in F, which broadly enact an over-arching progression from old to new, from widely disseminated motets with widely disseminated related materials to those whose music and/or texts are specific to this source.

Such findings have considerable consequences for the study of thirteenth-century manuscripts preserving organa, clausulae and motets. They underline the importance of the generic distinction between clausulae and passages of discant within organa, and the association of concepts of relative age and dissemination with these different musical types. Sensitivity to chronological layers evident in the compilation of F also supports the generally accepted hypothesis that this manuscript post-dates much of the musical repertoire it contains:⁵⁹ the relative popularity of motets, clausulae and passages of discant within organa was evidently already established by the time F was created in the 1240s. It remains to be seen whether the remarkably assiduous arrangement of motets in F is particular to this source. The very fact that F was copied by a single music scribe sets it apart from W1 and W2, both products of multiple copyists.⁶⁰ Was such a high degree of organisation an idiosyncratic concern of those producing F? If so, this scribal care and consistency might reflect the importance and prestige of F, a consequence perhaps of its close connections with the cathedral of Notre Dame, or of its possible status as a *Magnus liber organi*.

Appendix: list of manuscript sigla

- Aba: Aberdeen, University Library, King's College MS 2379/1
- ArsB: Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, 3517–3518
- Ba: Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Lit. 115 (formerly Ed.IV.6)
- Ber: Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, lat. 4° 523
- Bol: Bologna, Civico Museo Bibliografico Musicale, Q11
- Ca: Cambrai, Bibliothèque communale, A 410
- Ch: Châlons-sur-Marne, Archives départementales, 3.J.250
- Cl: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, nouv. acq. fr. 13521, 'Manuscrit La Clayette'
- Da: Darmstadt, Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek, 521
- Fauv: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, fr. 146, 'Roman de Fauvel'
- Hu: Burgos, Monasterio de Las Huelgas, 9 (formerly no shelf mark)

⁵⁹ See, for example, Roesner, *Introduction to the Notre-Dame Manuscript F*, 15.

⁶⁰ Ma is (save later additions) also the product of a single text scribe and a single music notator.

- K: Copenhagen, Det kongelige Bibliotek, 1810 4^o
- Lille: Lille, Bibliothèque municipale, 316
- LoC: London, British Library Add. 30091
- Ma: Madrid, Biblioteca nacional, 20486 (formerly Hh 167)
- Mo: Montpellier, Bibliothèque interuniversitaire, Section de médecine, H.196
- MüA: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Mus.ms.4775 (gallo-rom.42) and fragments in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Musikabteilung 55 MS 14 (formerly in the private library of Johannes Wolf, Berlin)
- MüB: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, lat. 16444 (Musikfragmente E III 230–31)
- N: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, fr. 12615, 'Noailles chansonnier'
- R: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, fr. 844, 'Manuscrit du Roi'
- Si: Silos, Santo Domingo de Silos, Biblioteca de Monasterio, Fragmentos Musicales 27
- StS1: Stary Sącz, Konwent Swaty Kingy, D.2
- StV: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 15139, 'Manuscrit St Victor'
- Tu: Turin, Biblioteca Reale, vari 42
- W1: Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 628 Helmst. (Heinemann no. 677)
- W2: Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 1099 Helmst. (Heinemann no. 1206)