

XIII

FRENCH POLYPHONY OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

By RICHARD CROCKER

Up to the stage at which the discant clausula was provided with a Latin text in the duplum, the development of polyphony at Notre Dame in Paris could be traced in relative isolation from other music of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. Chapter XII describes the features that set Notre-Dame organa style apart—consistent use of a cantus firmus from the Gregorian repertory of the archetype, very extended melismatic writing for two, three, or four voices, modal rhythm, and eventually overlapping phrases between tenor and upper parts. All of that development seemed to have a logic and momentum of its own, and the kind of music it produced in the organa and independent clausulas in Perotin's style were distinctly different from any other music we know of that time. Then, with the Latin textings of the clausula duplum, more similarities with other kinds of music appear; and from then on, in fact, the Notre-Dame style merged with other music, eventually losing its individuality.

The manuscript sources of thirteenth-century polyphony present us with many subtle variations in style and repertory. Study of these began source by source, and tended to group these sources by location; the result is the traditional distinction of French or continental polyphony from English polyphony, reflected in this chapter and the next. As study continued, however, more purely musical groupings and tendencies emerged, and it is now difficult to carry out the traditional ones. On one hand, polyphony with French texts remained more or less restricted to France and French sources, while developing certain styles of its own; on the other, polyphony with Latin texts appears not only together with the French but especially in English sources, and there exemplified some of the most important features of Latin polyphony on the Continent as well. To complicate the study of

Latin polyphony still further, the line of research on Notre-Dame polyphony founded by Friedrich Ludwig and so brilliantly carried out in his *Repertorium*¹ had the effect of emphasizing the 'central repertory' of Notre Dame and its role in the broader development. Against this notion of 'central', Jacques Handschin kept directing attention to what was going on before, around, and in spite of the Notre-Dame style.² The dialogue continues to affect the ways we see thirteenth-century polyphony.³

This chapter will focus primarily on polyphony with French texts, while keeping in view the repertories of continental Latin polyphony that appears alongside the French in the sources. French polyphony emerged early in the century, close to the Notre-Dame repertory but soon moving in its own direction; it developed rapidly, and dominated continental polyphony throughout the century. A piece of French texted discant came generally to be called a 'motet', but the term is not without ambiguity. Later in the century the term 'motet' more usually referred to a stich from a *roman*.⁴ Its application to French texted discant might be related to the frequent quotation of such stichs in these French texts. Sometimes the term 'motet' seems to be used to refer specifically to the duplum with its French text; and modern scholars regularly use the Latin form 'motetus' (coined in the thirteenth century) in this way. The motet repertory eventually included hundreds of items, which in the latter half of the century were collected in several large anthologies. Writing shortly after 1300, Jacques de Liège⁵ complained that whereas the old composers cultivated several different kinds of music—organum, discant, hocket, conductus—the moderns wrote 'almost nothing but motets and chansons', and that seems to some degree at least to characterize polyphony on the Continent from the mid-thirteenth century on.⁶

The interplay between the early Latin and French motet was intense and exceedingly complex. When we compare the French texted

¹ *Repertorium organorum recentioris et motetorum vetustissimi stili* (2nd edn. ed. Luther Dittmer, *Musicological Studies*, 7, 26, Institute of Medieval Music, 1964, 1978).

² In numerous studies from 1923 onward; see the bibliography in *MGG*, v (1956), cols. 1441–3.

³ Ernest Sanders, 'Peripheral Polyphony of the 13th Century', *JAMS*, 17 (1964), 261.

⁴ Klaus Hofmann, 'Zur Entstehungs- und Frühgeschichte des Terminus Motette', *AcM*, 42 (1970), 138.

⁵ *Speculum musicae*, vii, ed. Roger Bragard, *Corpus scriptorum de musica*, 3 (American Institute of Musicology, 1973), 89.

⁶ A comprehensive account of the motet in the thirteenth century by Yvonne Rokseth, *Polyphonies de xiii^e siècle*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1935–9), in particular iv, 'Études et Commentaires'. See also Sanders, 'The Medieval Motet', in Wulf Arlt, *et al.*, eds., *Gattungen der Musik in Einzeldarstellungen: Gedenkschrift Leo Schrade*, i (Berne, 1973); 'Motet. I. Medieval', *New Grove*, xii. 617.

discant—the French motet—to the repertory of early Latin texted discant as a whole, we find that a great many pieces exist with both a Latin text and a French one, as alternative settings. This situation persists far into the thirteenth century. If we know in any given case which text came first, we call the other a ‘contrafact’. In some cases this priority can be determined with reasonable assurance; but in many cases one can only guess, or draw believable conclusions from purely circumstantial evidence. Among early French motets are many contrafacts; but it is also true that many Latin motets throughout the century are contrafacts of French versions. While the earliest texting of Notre-Dame discant seems to have been with Latin texts,⁷ the French texts started soon after 1200, and the repertory of French motets seems to have established itself almost as fast as the Latin—in some respects faster.

We can discern some general tendencies (to be discussed) that distinguish the French motet from the Latin one. The question still to be answered is, to what factor or factors are those different tendencies due? The French texts themselves raise a series of questions concerning who made these texts and their music, who performed them, who heard them. Many (but not all) aspects of the French texts are related to the *trouvère* repertory, and that brings with it some musical factors different from those of Notre-Dame polyphony.

In social terms, Notre-Dame polyphony was a function of the urban cathedral, more specifically of the cathedral in its new Gothic form (and like that form, the new music first appeared in the Ile de France). The cathedral was the locus of the new style, and as such we need to compare its musical role to that of the other, more traditional loci, the monastery and the court. Medieval society being as complex as any other, only generalities can be offered here. Out in the countryside was the monastery with its musical performers, the cantor and choir, with the whole community participating in psalmody and hymns of the Office. Also often in the country, in some ways parallel to the monastery, in other ways opposed, was the manorial court; here the performer was the noble singer, supported and eventually supplanted by the professional musician—certainly in the case of instrumental performance, and perhaps for singing too. The monastery maintained the Gregorian repertory, and developed new repertories, up to and including the most recent one of the *versus*, representing modern music of the twelfth century. The court developed the repertory of *trouvère* songs during the same century. This repertory was taken to town, recorded in anthologies and performed there by

⁷ See Ch. XII.

professional musicians for the *haute bourgeoisie* in the thirteenth century. There was, however, another kind of patron, even creator, of vernacular song in town in the person of a high-ranking cathedral cleric; such persons, with cathedral-school education and frequently secular tastes, were to play an important if not decisive role in the development of the French motet.

The monastic life in its way also approached the town, through the medium of communities of secular clergy living under a rule—‘canons regular’ such as the Augustinians. These played an important role in the development of the twelfth-century sequence, among other things. The locus of twelfth-century polyphony is hard to specify: the new polyphonic experiments seem to turn up in a wide variety of places; yet all lay on the continuum between the monastery and the cathedral. The musical establishment at the cathedral was manned by a professional musician of clerical rank, at the head of one or more choirs. We can imagine a schema in which music from the monastery converges on the cathedral, hence on the town, from one side; and music from the court converges on the town, hence on the cathedral, from the other. They meet at the residences of the cathedral nobility.

A *trouvère* song, as preserved in the great anthologies, had typically between three and eight strophes; all strophes of a poem were of course on the same structure, except for a concluding *envoi*, consisting of between six and ten lines.⁸ Lines were typically of between six and eleven syllables long, with normally two rhymes in various patterns of alternation. A typical strophe began with a couplet (with lines three and four sung to the same melody as lines one and two). The lines following, usually with different melody, were of approximately the same length, with occasionally a single shorter line.

This large repertory of song texts was but a part of a much larger body of literature centred on the *roman*—a literature that was well known to the manorial aristocracy, and became well known to the bourgeois classes that now adopted the aristocratic culture. The favourite stichs that Friedrich Gennrich identified as refrains of *rondeaux* were only some of a vast repertory of stichs that he and others have identified simply as ‘refrains’—apparently quoted in a wide variety of contexts as current allusions to familiar themes, characters, situations, and stories.⁹ When refrains are quoted, their

⁸ See Ch. IX.

⁹ Friedrich Gennrich, ‘Rondeau’, *MGG*, xi (1963), cols. 867–72; *Rondeaux, Virelais und Balladen aus dem Ende des XII., dem XIII. und der ersten Drittel des XIV. Jahrhunderts, mit den überlieferten Melodien*, Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur, 43, i, Texts (1921); 47, ii, Commentary (1927). Nico H. J. Van den Boogaard, *Rondeaux et Refrains du XIIe siècle au début du XIVe, Bibliothèque française et Romane, Série D: Initiation, Textes et documents*, 3 (Strasbourg, Paris, 1969). See also Ch. IX.

text seems to be the more stable element, the melody less so; and in fact there seems to be relatively little quotation of secular melody. (Similarly in sacred chant, it is sometimes only the text of a chant that is quoted in a play or a farsed Office, without reference to the original melody; in the case of chant from the archetype of Mass or Office, however, the quotation usually seems to include the chant.) This use of the vernacular literature under the general heading of refrains is important for the text of the French motet. In this context the term does not imply a repetitive structure, only the use of a favourite stich.

Alongside the professional trouvère singers and composers, there were also professional instrumentalists; it is easier to document their purely instrumental performances than their participation in vocal performance. Some scholars believe that the monophonic trouvère songs were accompanied by instruments in a non-written tradition, but the evidence for this is under debate.¹⁰ In any case, we have but little specific idea of what an instrumental accompaniment would have been, and whether it would have resembled the tenor of a French motet. **The assumption is that the tenors of French motets were performed on instruments,** which might suggest that the instrumentalists exerted an influence on the French motet, contributing to its distinctive qualities as compared to the Latin motet.

Against all of these possibilities is the fact that the French motet is a motet like the Latin one, embodying essential and distinctive features of the discant clausula; and these could have been drawn only from Notre Dame. In general, the early French motet makes much less use of ready-made discant clausulas than does the Latin: enough early French motets do this to demonstrate the close connection with Notre Dame, but a greater number do not, and their proportion rises rapidly as the repertory develops. Much more important to the composer of French motets was the fund of modal rhythms, and the contrapuntal experience of the kind of clausula associated with Perotin's style, in which the duplum's phrases can be staggered relative to the repetitive tenor. As shown in chapter XII, this style was a decisive development within the clausula repertory. Most important of all was the Notre-Dame tenor itself—the chant melisma cast into a repeating rhythmic pattern for use in a discant clausula. While the early French motet made relatively little use of Notre-Dame discant clausulas as such, it made heavy use of tenors from clausulas. Thus to the composer of the French motet the essential feature of the discant was the tenor, and best way to assure success was to build upon the tenor in adapting the new Notre-Dame style for use with French texts and new dupla.

¹⁰ See Ch. X.

The use of Notre-Dame tenors in clausula and motet shows a pattern of distribution familiar to us from the development of the Kyrie repertory, among others. There is alternatively (sometimes simultaneously) a concentration on a few favourite tenors, and a broadening of the selection to include a large number of tenors, even if only once or twice each. Scholars have often expressed the wish to know why a few tenors were favoured; several kinds of explanations have been advanced, with varying satisfaction.¹¹ For the French motet, at least, the 'liturgical' explanation seems the least useful. A more sophisticated structural analysis seems called for, but awaits the development of reliable ideas about melodic and contrapuntal structure in thirteenth-century polyphony (which in turn await the clear understanding of musical structure in twelfth-century chant as well as polyphony). In the mean time we can observe *ad hoc* that each tenor by nature embodies a very particular—unique, even—solution to musical form, one which we can consider appropriately case by case; and that repeated use of one tenor can be registered as fact, even when we cannot yet see the reason, which might be as pragmatic as, say, the more a tenor was observed to succeed, the more often it was used. One thing is clear: a tenor, typically an excerpt from chant, often does not end on the final of the chant, and the relationship of the tenor final to its structure is to be evaluated anew—and, in any case, not in terms of mode, which as a method of classification had little to do with melodic structure, as we have seen. About rhythmic structure, and especially about rhythmic mode, we can generalize a little further. All rhythmic possibilities of the clausula seem to be used in one motet or another. None the less, there is a distinct shift within the early and middle French motet sources from tenor rhythms on mode 5 based on groups of three perfect longs—the mainstay of the discant clausula—to tenor rhythms in modes 1 or 2, that is, in the same mode as the duplum.

We can approach this shift in tenor rhythms through the central matter of phrase structure—as important in the French motet as in the discant clausula with or without Latin text or as in the *trouvère* song, the *versus*, or any kind of medieval chant. The phrase structure of the French motet is usually of a different kind from the phrase structure on a *trouvère* song, and in order to grasp the difference we need to go a long way round. The long-short rhythm ('pre-modal trochaic', eventually first mode) of Notre Dame was probably developed within melismatic discant apart from syllabic considerations; phrases of discant were generated out of the long-short module apart

¹¹ See, for instance, Kurt Hofmann, *Untersuchungen zur Kompositionstechnik der Motette im 13. Jahrhundert*, *Tübinger Beiträge zur Musikwissenschaft*, 2 (Neuhausen-Stuttgart, 1972).

from considerations of any kind of verse. Yet when Latin text was laid under these rhythms and phrase shapes the result was very close to the twelfth-century Latin versus, with its immediate succession of multiple rhymes forming very short phrases. From this point of view, it is possible to understand the Latin motet as the direct result of the Latin versus, the whole of the Notre-Dame organa then being an irrelevant parenthesis; perhaps that is the way Handschin wanted us to understand it. From other points of view, however, Notre-Dame polyphony—discant in particular—was an essential step in the development of the motet. In the case of the French motet, anyway, a direct line of succession from the monophonic antecedent cannot be imagined, for the *trouvère* song did not show the short, irregular, but intensely rhyming lines of the Latin versus, and when these appear in the French motet it has to have had something to do with the Latin texted discant, or with the melismatic clausula, or just with the fact of its being a motet. It must be acknowledged that not all French motets have such a phrase structure; some have a phrase structure as regular or almost as regular as a *trouvère* song. In most realistic terms, the maker of a French motet was between the poles of a *trouvère* song and a discant clausula, so it is no wonder if at some time or other he tried all the possibilities within that range. Of these possibilities, however, that of irregular length verses is the one that cannot be easily explained by *trouvère* art.

Whether the short lines of irregular length (in Latin or French) came from the twelfth-century versus or were developed afresh out of the discant, the decisive, distinctive element in their polyphonic implementation was modal rhythm and *ordo* structure in the tenor. The modal rhythms in the texted duplum—the motetus—are of course important, and make possible the close integration of the duplum with the tenor. By themselves, however, (that is, without a tenor), the modal rhythms of the duplum would only inflect the phrase rhythms with additional intensity. It is the repeated pattern in the tenor (which as we saw is a modal pattern of a set length, that is, of a certain *ordo*) that adds the distinctively new dimension to the phrase structure. The tenor rhythmic pattern is typically shorter than all but the shortest phrases of the duplum. Thus many phrases of the duplum can be integral multiples of the tenor pattern in length, containing two, three, four, or more tenor *ordines*. This provides a powerful momentum to the longer phrases, and furthermore sets out a common denominator by which phrases of different length can be related: we hear such phrases as not simply different, but as consisting of various numbers of a common unit, whose incessant repetition provides

continuity and momentum. That is only the simplest possibility. Instead of consisting of an integral number of tenor ordines, a phrase can end in the middle of a tenor ordo, creating overlap or staggering of phrases. There is a whole range of possibilities between complete coincidence and noncoincidence of phrasing between tenor and motetus, as well as a complete range between regular and irregular phrasing in the motetus. The identity of any given motet is largely a function of its phrasing and patterns of coincidence. These relationships are made more intensive by the preference in French motet tenors for modes 1 and 2 over mode 5, since it is in these modes that the tenor tends to get even more involved in the rhythmic activity of the motetus. Staggered phrasing under these conditions has an especially intimate effect.

MOTET MANUSCRIPTS

The fact that the French motet is related on the one hand to the *trouvère* chanson and on the other to cathedral polyphony is reflected in the manuscript sources in which it is preserved. These are of several distinct types; and since modern scholarly editions of motets have so far been made according to the manuscript sources, we need to be aware of their nature.¹² Alongside—perhaps even before—the Notre-Dame source *W*₂ with its important collection of motets stands another ‘central’ source, Munich, Cod.gall.42,¹³ often referred to as Munich A (‘MuA’); it may reflect the earliest stage of the French motet. A third, somewhat enigmatic source is Paris, Bibl.Nat. lat.15139, the so-called St Victor melismata.¹⁴

There are among the many large *trouvère* chanson anthologies some that include French motets, either as separate sections or scattered throughout. These include the *Chansonnier du Roi*, Paris, Bibl.Nat. fr. 884 (‘R’), the *Chansonnier de Noailles*, Paris Bibl. Nat.fr.12615 (‘N’), and others.¹⁵ These have many interesting features; they may or may not include tenors of the motets, and some have only the texts.

Clearly distinct from the chanson anthologies are the motet anthologies, including the two large ones, *Codex Montpellier*, Bibl.Univ. H 196 (‘Mo’), and *Codex Bamberg*, Ed. IV 6; and two smaller ones, ‘La

¹² The entire early repertory of motets is edited by Hans Tischler, *The Earliest Motets (to circa 1270): A Complete Comparative Edition* (3 vols.) (New Haven, 1982), hereafter, Tischler, *EM*.

¹³ Luther Dittmer, *A Central Source of Notre Dame Polyphony* (Institute of Medieval Music, Brooklyn, New York, 1959).

¹⁴ Jürgen Stenzl, *Die vierzig Clausulae der Handschrift Paris Bibliothèque nationale latin 15139* (Berne, 1970).

¹⁵ Ludwig, *Repertorium*, pp. 285–305. A facsimile of R ed. Jean Beck, *Le Manuscrit du Roi, Corpus cantilenarum medii aevi*, 1st ser. 2 (Philadelphia, London, 1938).

Clayette' (Paris B.N.n.a.frç. 13521), and Turin, Bibl.reale, vari 42.¹⁶ Finally there are a number of sources that do not fit into any of these categories. Each contains one or a few motets, but although such sources may be very valuable for the transmission of individual motets, they do not tell us much about the repertory in general. The first three kinds of sources, taken in the order suggested by their contents as analysed by Ludwig and others, can give us a good idea of the development of the motet in the thirteenth century.

Concordances, that is, appearances of a given piece in another manuscript, are the most powerful lever we have to pry apart the blocks of material in the large anthologies and uncover the development of the repertory. The basic listing of concordances is Ludwig's *Repertorium*; subsequently scholars have studied in detail the concordances of individual motets in order to reconstruct the history of each of these separately, and on the other hand have scrutinized each manuscript collection in order to reconstruct *its* history—where its individual items have come from, how they came together. Two motets adjacent in two manuscripts might suggest a relationship; analysis of surrounding motets, taking into account direct or indirect concordances, may reveal a larger complex of related pieces. The circle can sometimes be widened still further through motets that have similar stylistic features but are found in other places.

FRENCH MOTETS IN 'MUNICH A'

The fragments that constitute MuA preserve, among other music indigenous to the Notre-Dame repertory, a small portion—about thirty—of what was once apparently an extensive collection of French and Latin motets. Judging from what remains, the motet collection was arranged in the order of the tenors as taken from the *Magnus liber*, that is, from the order of the chants in the Graduale; what is preserved is part of the Christmas cycle, including tenors for chants from Christmas and Epiphany. There are several motets on each of the tenors 'Omnes', 'Dominus', 'Manere', and others. The French motets themselves are not necessarily related in theme to the Latin tenors; hence the liturgical order reflects merely the closeness of this particular manuscript to the cathedral environment. Beyond that, over a third of the preserved motets use not merely tenors but entire

¹⁶ Codex Montpellier ed. Yvonne Rokseth, *Polyphonies du xiii^e siècle*, 4 vols. (Paris 1935–9; re-ed. Hans Tischler, *The Montpellier Codex*, 3 vols., Madison, 1978). Codex Bamberg re-ed. Gordon A. Anderson, *Compositions of the Bamberg Manuscript, Corpus mensurabilis musicae*, 75 (American Institute of Musicology, 1975). Antoine Auda, ed., *Les 'motets wallons' du manuscrit Turin: Vari 42* (Brussels, 1953). Anderson, *Motets of the Manuscript La Clayette, Corpus mensurabilis musicae*, 68 (American Institute of Musicology, 1975).

clausulas; they are, in effect, texted clausulas—and this is a relatively high proportion of such pieces compared with the other motet collections. Furthermore, and directly related to the use of a discant clausula, a substantial majority of these motets of MuA are close to Notre-Dame discant. This is especially apparent in the first series of motets (Nos. 2–19 of Dittmer's 'Complex A' in his edition of MuA).

MuA also contains, however, other kinds of French motets not so closely related to the Notre-Dame clausula, instead having connections to the *trouvères*. These motets tend to occur later in the first series (Nos. 22–8) and include two concordances with *trouvère* anthologies to be mentioned. Three motets, plus a fourth that was copied several times later in the century, all use mode 2 in the motetus, and either mode 5 or mode 2 in the tenor. They are not derived from Notre-Dame clausulas. Still another motet in this group, No. 26, uses mode 1 in the tenor. These rhythmic features were to be most characteristic of the French motet. No. 25 of this series, 'Dame vostre doz regart', T. 'Manere', (the one with several later concordances¹⁷) is a very attractive representative of this kind of piece, with mode 2 in both motetus and tenor (Ex. 214). The tenor, using a melisma on 'Manere', has the minimum *ordo* for mode 2, *brevis-longa-brevis*. The motet has mode 2 with almost continuous division of the *longa* into two *breves*, or of the *breves* into two *semibreves*, giving a lilting flow to the upper part. The phrase structure of the upper part seems to start a couplet:

Dame vostre doz regart (7)
 M'oci-ent qant de vos part (7)
 Ne je certes cele part (7)
 Ne me puis torner (5)

with regular seven-syllabled lines, rhyming; the melody of the third line is the same as that of the first line, and each of these first three lines includes two tenor ordines. This regularity is then broken by the short fourth line, which brings about the very characteristic 'head-to-tail' phrasing between motetus and tenor, used here only briefly but in many motets extensively. The phrasing continues now regular, now irregular, coinciding or not with the tenor ordines, and in particular bridging over the place where the tenor starts to repeat its melody. A special interplay occurs on 'aler, parler', where the head-and-tail phrasing combines with a habit of using unisons between the voices at their juncture.

¹⁷ Facs. in Dittmer, *A Central Source*, pp. 21–2; cf. Tischler, *EM* No. 142 (ii, p. 957), Mo 5, 90.

Ex. 214

Da - me vo - stre doz re - gart M'o - ci - ent qant

Manere
I

de vos part; Ne je cer - tes ce - le part

Ne me puis tor - ner, Q'il ne me soit tart

Q'a vos puis se re - tor - ner; Car sanz vos ne

puis dur - er Ne bien a - voir lon - gue - ment;

II

Qant ne puis so - vent A - ler par - ler

A vos a ma de - vi - se; Li maus d'a - mer

me de - bri - se Et la do - lor qe je sent.

The last pair of lines,

Li maus d'amer me debrise (8)

Et la dolor qe je sent (7)

is one of the refrains identified by Gennrich.¹⁸

The tenor moves in a locus around c, with excursions to the g above and the G below, but with a clear centre on c. Yet, since the chant melisma ends on a, with one of those seemingly off-hand descents at its phrase ending, the motet tenor comes to its final on a (which is not the final of the original Gradual) rather than the central note c. (The a is probably heard as *re* in spite of some b flats in the motetus in MuA.)

The net effect of these various procedures is to create a special and apparently new kind of accompaniment to the song. **The motet tenor has something of the quality of an ostinato**—a repeated figure, as if an animated drone. It is only the rhythmic pattern of the tenor that is literally repeated, for the pitches do not repeat with the ordo. The repetitive ordo helps give the tenor on the one hand its drone-like, subsidiary status, but on the other hand its independence from the rhythms, or at least from the phrasing, of the song. Similarly the

¹⁸ *Rondeaux, Virelais und Balladen*, No. 1421.

fragment of chant in the tenor makes it melodically subordinate to the lyric melody of the song, while simultaneously giving it independence. This accompaniment can move either in synchronized contrary motion with the song, thus very strictly ‘accompanying’ it through a series of dichords (as at the beginning of ‘*Dame de vostre doz regart*’); or it can alternate with the song, filling in the song’s phrases while continuing the song’s rhythmic motion and often its very line; or it can enter into a variety of relationships between these two extremes. A range of possibilities exists for this subordinate yet independent kind of accompaniment. The intimacy and flexibility of its relationships with the song must have been a strong attraction for chanson singer and professional instrumentalist alike. The particular kinds of relationship evident in the mid-century repertory seem more suited to these two performers at court or in the house of a high cathedral official than to cathedral singers in a cavernous Gothic choir. At any rate the techniques of the new discant, adapted in the ways described, gave impetus to a French motet repertory that proliferated much more vigorously than the Latin one.

FRENCH MOTETS IN THE CHANSONNIERS

The two chanson anthologies ‘Roi’ (R) and ‘Noailles’ (N) share a motet repertory that stands close to the beginning of the French motet; but R and N show the other side of the beginning, the *trouvère* song. These two chansonniers are among the dozen or so that preserve the *trouvère* repertory from the thirteenth century; after their chanson collections, R and N each includes a collection of motets—a small one in R and a larger one (that includes all of R) in N.¹⁹

Several features of these sources show how the motet appeared from the point of view of the chanson repertory. While chansons are usually attributed to a specific composer—meaning thereby, in the first place, the composer of the text—the motets in R and N are all anonymous. This can be taken to reflect on the one hand the pride the *trouvère* took in his chanson texts; and on the other hand the extensive use in motet texts of common material, popular stichs or refrains, along with a less individual and elevated style. Anonymity of motet texts continues the anonymity characteristic of the stichic tradition in general, and the anonymity affects specifically the text; as motets became attributed to composers (increasingly towards 1300), it seems to be the style of the music that prompts the attribution.

To the collector of chansons, then, motets seemed to be a less distinctive genre, at least as texts. And to this collector, whose primary

¹⁹ Ludwig *Repertorium*, pp. 285–305.

concern was the chanson and especially its texts, the motet appears as a song that included some other, not very well understood element—an accompaniment, in the form of a tenor. While the compiler of MuA used the tenor as the basis of the whole collection, the compiler of the chansonnier sometimes omitted the tenor altogether, or provided space but failed to enter it, or frequently notated the tenor in erroneous or incomprehensible ways. The scribes of the chansonnier met in the motet—in particular in its tenor—an unfamiliar kind of music.

The motet repertory of R and N includes about a hundred motets, mostly *a2*; the repertory is arranged in no particular order, but does fall into dimly perceptible groupings of different kinds and origins. The series N1–N24 includes motets well known in other later sources, representing the core of the early French motet repertory. The tenors are, with a few very interesting exceptions, standard Notre-Dame tenors. Only one is made of a Notre-Dame clausula, however. In other words, this series shows the distinctive features of the French motet as opposed to the Latin one. The rhythms of the tenors are frequently in modes 1 or 2, not so often in the mode 5 patterns so prevalent in the clausula repertory. The motets of the first series in R and N include one with very regular phrasing, ‘Qui loiaument sert s’amie’, T. ‘Laetabitur’ (Ex. 215).²⁰ The verses are 8 + 7, bi-hemistichs, rhyming consistently *a b*; there are five bi-hemistichs, the last being by exception 8 + 8—but this last hemistich is the conclusion of the refrain quoted in line 1:

Qui loiaument sert s’amie

Bien li doit sa joie doubler

which makes this motet a *motet enté* (see below, p. 653). Each hemistich fits exactly over a statement of the tenor rhythmic pattern; furthermore, the melody of the second bi-hemistich almost exactly repeats that of the first, forming a couplet, with open and closed endings. This motet represents a maximum accommodation of Notre-Dame technique to the ideal of trouvère song. Another example quotes the beginning text and melody of a well-known song, ‘Molt m’abellist’ (‘Mout m’abelist’) by the troubadour Folquet de Marseille.²¹ This is one of the few points of contact between motets and troubadours, and—perhaps not by coincidence—one of the few

²⁰ Facs. in Beck, *Le manuscrit de Roi*, fo. 197; cf. Tischler, EM No. 155 (ii, p. 1012); Mo 6, 209.

²¹ N 12; cf. Tischler, EM No. 212 (ii, p. 1182); Mo 5, 109; facs. of the song in Beck, *Le manuscrit du Roi*, p. 178b.

Ex. 215

Qui loi - au - ment sert s'a - mi - e, Ne li set que

Letabitur

de - man - der. J'ai bien la moi - e ser - vi - e,

Et loi - au - ment sans faus - ser. Et qui en - si

ne sert mi - e, pe - tit i doit con - quest - er,

Mais qui dei tot s'u - me - li - e Sans or - gueil et

sans van - ter, Je di bien que que nus di - e

Bien li doit sa joi - e dou - bler.

French motets using rhythmic mode 3 in motetus and tenor. Phrasing is regular up to the end with one verse of text set to two tenor patterns.

Other less regular, more typical examples predominate in this first series.²² Initial regularity of phrasing is typically dislocated later in the piece by a short verse standing by itself or tacked on to the preceding verse. As a corollary the coincidence with tenor pattern usually gives way to the typical staggered phrasing. The mode 2 rhythms of the motets often show division of the modal values, sometimes heavy, as in 'Aucun m'ont par leur envie', T. 'Angelus', where very few measures are left as simple short-long.²³

The repertory of R and N shows manifold contacts with the chanson repertory in the various manifestations of refrain and rondeau. A number of motets throughout R and N include refrains—stichic texts reminiscent of idioms from the vernacular literature. More specific, in some ways unique, to R and N, is the appearance of motets that either consist entirely of one refrain in the duplum (and hence are very short pieces even for motets) or that have a repetitive structure similar to what we know as a rondeau. The first kind of motet—'refrain motet'—appears at the end of R (Nos. 35–41; and N Nos. 66–72). The second kind—'rondeau motet'—appears in the middle of N (Nos. 25–9). Additional isolated instances occur at N 73, 'Aimmi aimmi' and N 89, 'C'est la jus'. Furthermore N 91, 'Cele m'a

²² N 4: Tischler, *EM* No. 133 (ii, p. 890); Mo 5, 89. N 6: Tischler, *EM* No. 152 (ii, p. 1001); Mo 6, 216. N 9: Tischler, *EM* No. 275 (ii, p. 1451); Mo 6, 213. N 10: Tischler, *EM* No. 276 (ii, p. 1454); Mo 6, 231. N 14: Tischler, *EM* No. 139 (ii, p. 936); Mo 5, 110. N 15: Tischler, *EM* No. 240 (ii, p. 1335); Mo 5, 128. N 22: Tischler, *EM* No. 136 (ii, p. 908); Bamberg No. 64.

²³ N 15; cf. Tischler, *EM* No. 240 (ii, p. 1334); Mo 5, 128.

s'amour', is made entirely of twelve refrains; it falls somewhere between the refrain motet and the use of only one or two refrains in a motet text. This type, of which there are a few other examples, is called a 'refrain-cento'.

These materials are as important as they are difficult to handle. Both R and N, especially R, have *lacunae* and often lack tenor notation; when present, the notation is often difficult if not impossible to interpret rhythmically without a concordance, and concordances—for these motets in particular—are often lacking, for they tend to be unica, as is a large portion of R and N. Those are the purely technical difficulties; there are other difficulties of interpretation both for refrains and rondeaux. As we have seen, refrains represent a perfectly believable stichic practice; but they are more often than not identified by their intrinsic verbal style rather than by actual documentation. A closing verse of a motet 'looks like a refrain', and is so identified, even if it appears in no other source. Even though the evidence supports the idea that motet texts frequently include quotations of favourite stichs, the identification of particular stichs is often provisional. While there are some instances of a refrain appearing in two different motets with the same melody, there are other instances where the same text has different melodies. Ludwig's attention was especially drawn to cases where the melody used for a motet refrain could be traced to the Notre-Dame clausula used for that motet; an important instance is in R 12–13, N 35–6, 'Quant revient'—'L'autrier jouer', T. 'Flos filius ejus'.²⁴ Such instances suggest that while the quotation of text depended upon the vernacular literature, that of the melodies depended upon the Notre-Dame repertory.

What concerns us here in R and N is that the entry of rondeau procedures into polyphonic music apparently took place through the motet—a relatively sophisticated musical form—rather than through simple discant settings, which occurred only later in the century in the works of Adam de la Hale and Jehan de Lescurel.²⁵ While many later rondeaux reflect this simplicity, examples can be found throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries that echo the paradoxical combination of simple folklike procedure and sophisticated counterpoint of the motet. And, as described in Chap. IX, the thirteenth-century rondeau is not yet the 'fixed form' of the fourteenth.

Early steps in the development of polyphony *en rondeau* can be

²⁴ Ludwig, *Repertorium*, p. 291; Tischler, *EM* No. 65 (i, p. 461).

²⁵ Ed. Nigel Wilkins, *The Lyric Works of Adam de la Hale, Corpus mensurabilis musicae*, 44 (American Institute of Musicology, 1967); *The Works of Jehan de Lescurel, Corpus mensurabilis musicae*, 30 (American Institute of Musicology, 1966).

traced in R and N.²⁶ Since only a very little music is involved in singing *en rondeau* (merely the music of the refrain), we can imagine the very short refrain motets of R and N being used in a manner exactly parallel to that of monophonic refrains, that is, with a leader supplying new verses. The only difference would be the presence of an accompanying tenor—and that we can imagine to be characteristic of the way the whole motet repertory appeared to those who cultivated secular song: it was a new way of performing a familiar kind of song.

A second step would be represented by the *rondeau* motet, in which the verses were written out in the motetus voice. When this happens in the early motet repertory (that is, in N 73 and N 89) it may not conform exactly to *rondeau* form, and therefore represents the variable procedure *en rondeau*. The relationship of the tenor to this procedure is the crux of the problem. We should note, first, that it is entirely characteristic of the motet as a genre that the tenor with its patterns does not simply coincide with the repetitions of the refrain melody in the motetus, for in general tenors do not systematically coincide with the phrasing of their dupla—indeed, their most characteristic use is in staggered phrasing relative to the dupla. Here we can see the essence of the tenor as an accompaniment: it is an independent accompaniment, something that is even more true and important for the secular musician than it is for the sacred one. Secondly, if and when the tenor is brought into some kind of synchronization with the repeats in the motetus, this is accomplished through the tenor ordines, and depends on their being short enough to be modular parts of the motetus phrasing—again, as throughout the motet repertory.

Relevant to this discussion, even if not so named in R and N, is the ‘graft motet’, *motet enté*.²⁷ This term appears in manuscripts of the same type, in particular Paris, Bibl.Nat.fr. 845, a chansonnier of the thirteenth century, and Oxford, Bodleian, Douce 308 (‘D’), a large text manuscript containing the lyrics of seven categories of songs. Paris 845, at the end of a large collection of chansons, has ‘Ci commencent li motets ente’, and then follow fifteen (originally more) motetus voices (no tenors). Typically the motetus text consists of a refrain that has been separated into two sections with new verses added in between; the refrain then forms first and last verses of a moderately long text. This recalls the use of a refrain *en rondeau*, but with several differences, including the fact that the refrain appears only at the beginning and end, and there may be no internal

²⁶ N 73; cf. Tischler, *EM* No. 315 (ii, p. 1511). N 89; cf. Tischler *EM* No. 324 (ii, p. 1521). Cf. Mo 6, 248.

²⁷ Ludwig, *Repertorium*, pp. 305–13; *EM* No. 324 (ii, p. 1521). Cf. Mo 6, 248.

repetitions of refrain melodies for verses. We should understand the *motet enté* as one of a cluster of stichic procedures, along with simple refrains and *en rondeau*, which were brought to the motet.

A much larger collection of *motets enté* appears as the seventh section of Douce 308, after 'Grans chans, estampies, jeux partis, pastourelles, ballettes, sottes chansons contre amours'. There are 101 texts in this seventh section, of which 64 are motet texts, almost all *motets enté*, with concordances in Paris 845. Although definitely motet texts, these have neither music nor tenors in this manuscript. The rest of the 101 texts are rondeaux; this mixture of motets and rondeaux in a fourteenth-century collection carries out the pattern set by R and N in the thirteenth, and is explicit in other similar sources. The large collection Rome, Vatican, Reginensis 1490 ('V') contains, after its 'chancons' and 'pastourelles', a section 'motet et rondel', followed by 'chansons de Nostre Dame', and 'partures'.²⁸

This mixture is characteristic, then, of chanson collections that include polyphony. It also occurs in the large fourteenth-century polyphonic anthology 'La Tremoille', of which only the index is preserved. There the mixture is problematic, for by that time motets and rondeaux are set in very different musical styles. But the earlier sources show us that the mixture is indigenous: it depends upon the fact that, to the chanson compiler, motet texts and texts *en rondeau* both involve stichs and refrains in a less individual and elegant style, hence both were treated as anonymous and grouped together, apart from the more elegant and elevated chansons. Interesting exceptions to this are provided by four cases in R and N of motetus voices entered in the chanson part of the manuscript (without any indication of tenor) and there all ascribed to composers. Hence for at least these motets we have a composer's name: 'Jehan Erars', '[Er]nous li [V]ielle', and 'Li moines de St. Denis'.²⁹

The instance in which the independent use of melody as well as text of a refrain is clear is provided by the rondeau motet N 89, 'C'est la jus en la roi pree', T. 'Pro patribus'. There was a Notre-Dame clausula on tenor 'Ne', used for two Latin motets and for the French motet 'En mai quant nest la rosee', which appears already in MuA.³⁰ The last bi-hemistich of this motet,

Cele m'a s'amours dounee
ki mon cuer a mon cors a

²⁸ Ludwig, *Repertorium*, Part 2 (Institute of Medieval Music, 1978), 569–90.

²⁹ Ludwig, *Repertorium*, p. 336.

³⁰ Ludwig, *Repertorium*, pp. 296 f.; Gennrich, *Rondeaux, Virelais und Balladen*, ii, p. 268; Tischler, *EM* No. 67 (i, p. 474), No. 324 (ii, p. 1521), and No. 1168 (ii, p. 1059).

with its melody as found in the motetus (and in the duplum of the clausula) provides the refrain of the rondeau motet 'C'est la jus en la roi pree' in N. The same refrain appears as the first of six refrains in the refrain-cento motet N 91, that is, as a stich quoted in a different function; the melody is the same as before. The same text and melody are also quoted in the middle of a triplum of the motet Mo 5,138, 'J'ai les biens d'amours', T. 'In seculum'; the motetus, 'Que ferai', is itself a rondeau in text and melody—one of the few in the older portion of Codex Montpellier that continues the experiments of R and N. Here the refrain 'Cele m'a s'amour dounee' has still a different function. Finally this refrain, for one, appears outside the motet repertory: it is used by Pierre de Corbeil as the concluding bi-hemistich—the 'refrain'—of the first strophe of his pastourelle, 'Pensis com fuis amorous', which appears in the main chanson section of R and N with the same melody. This is perhaps an exceptionally extensive use of a refrain, from which we should conclude only that it *could* happen in this way, not that it frequently did.

In two latter portions of the repertory of R and N (the two portions are separated by the group of refrain motets) there is a high proportion of motets not represented in any other manuscript, and—among the same pieces—a high proportion of concordances with the puzzling source Paris Bibl.Nat.lat. 15139, known as the 'St Victor clausulae', or 'St Victor melismata'.³¹ This is a section of a manuscript containing forty pieces of melismatic discant (two *a3*, thirty-eight *a2*), some over Notre-Dame tenors. Most have the incipits of French motets entered in the margin; indeed these pieces represent melismatic notation of motets found elsewhere with French texts, especially in R and N. While most observers agree, however, that the melismatic notations of discant pieces in F (discussed in the previous chapter) represent melismatic performance of clausulas in the course of a Gradual or Alleluia (or Office Responsory) and hence probably an existence prior to the texted form we call motet, there is no such agreement about the St Victor melismata. It is possible that the St Victor melismata are simply a melismatic notation of pieces composed as motets, an alternate form of recording such pieces, much as sequences had been notated in two forms, one syllabic the other melismatic. A possible reason for such recording in two forms is that melismatic notation can give more specific information, especially in the case of discant and modal rhythms, for the ligatures of the melismatic notation are at this stage the only means of notating the rhythm. While St Victor melismata turn up as motets frequently in other manuscripts as well

³¹ Stenzl, *Die vierzig Clausulae*.

(but sporadically—only once, for instance, in the first series in MuA) the connection with R and N seems especially close, all the more because many of the pieces involved appear nowhere else as motets. It seems reasonable that this early collection of secular motets, standing outside the Notre-Dame sphere and reflecting the approach of the secular musician, should have as counterpart a melismatic source that also stands outside the Notre-Dame sphere.

Alongside its various manifestations of secular song, the repertory of R and N also contains some of the earliest examples of the motet *a3* with two different French texts, the 'double motet'. This type, consisting of two voices (triplum and motetus) each with its own text, over a tenor, became the dominant one after the mid-century, and since it was preceded by the very impressive repertory of Notre-Dame organa *a3* of Perotin, there is a tendency to take the three-voiced double motet for granted. In this moment of its emergence, however, we should not take it for granted, and in particular the designation 'double motet' should make us pause. If there is a 'double motet', what is a 'single' one? A motet, then, in the most specific sense, is a voice, the motetus, with a French text, accompanied by a tenor. This is the phenomenon we have been tracing in MuA, and in R and N. While a few examples come from melismatic clausulas *a2*, most are newly composed over Notre-Dame tenors. A double motet must then be two such voices over an instrumental tenor. The five cases of double motets in R and N witness the wide variety of approaches to development of this new form.³²

1. N 7–8 'Hare hare hie Goudalier'—
 'Balaan Goudalier', T. 'Balaam'
2. N 16– 'Le premier jour'—'Par un matin'—
 18 'Je n'i puis plus', T. 'Justus germinabit' (Mo 2,32)
3. R 12– N 35–6 'Quant revient'—
 13 'L'autrier jouer', T. 'Flos filius' (F fo. 11, *a3*; Mo 2,21)
4. R 17– N 40–41 'De la ville'—
 18 'A la ville', T. 'Manere' (St V *a3*, Mo 4,61)
5. N 79– 'Se valors'—
 80 'Bien me sui', T. 'Hic factus est' (Mo 5,149)

These five vary tremendously in almost every respect, showing clearly a developmental stage. Three appear only in N, not R. Only No. 3 uses a three-voiced clausula as source. Only No. 4 has a St Victor concordance. The Notre-Dame tenors vary from much used to little

³² N 7–8: Tischler, *EM* No. 131 (ii, p. 876); N 16–18: Tischler, *EM* No. 143 (ii, p. 962); N 35–6: Tischler, *EM* No. 65 (i, p. 461); N 40–1: Tischler, *EN* No. 144 (ii, p. 973); N 79–80: Tischler, *EM* No. 135 (ii, p. 904); W2, fo. 201^v; Mo 5, 149.

used. Taken together, these four double motets and one triple motet represent the spectrum of possibilities found in the motet repertory at large. No. 2 has mode 2 in tenor and motetus (and quadruplum), mode 6 in the triplum—an important instance of this use of mode 6, found also in certain other early double motets. Phrasing is staggered and occasionally irregular. The motetus is a *motet enté*. No. 3, a double motet that appears in Montpellier with a quadruplum, is the one that uses a famous clausula *a3*, 'Flos filius eius', which with Latin texts was one of the three double motets in F. It uses mode 1 throughout, with staggered and irregular phrasing. No. 4 is a relatively isolated piece (appearing with fragmentary Latin texts in Mo 4,61), with regular song-like phrasing in motetus, phrasing at first synchronized then staggered; mode 1 is used throughout. It is a short, simple piece. No. 5 has mode 2 throughout, with heavy divisions in motetus and triplum, very irregular phrasing, densely staggered. Of the five it perhaps best represents the style the double motet took around the mid-century (Ex. 216).

Thus the chansonniers R and N give us a picture of the first stages of the French motet, a picture different in important ways from that of the large anthologies later in the century, which have to some extent been cleansed of earlier peculiarities. The basic posture of the motet collections R and N is embodied in their first motet, 'Onques n'amia tant com', T. 'Sancte Germane'. We should note that the first item in a series of medieval motets, or other pieces in anthologies, is often selected with some care, although the rationale varies from case to case and needs to be determined by inspection. The text of the motetus is the first strophe of a chanson by Richard de Fournival (c. 1190–1260, from at least 1240 canon at Amiens). Taken together with the motetus melody, it appears as a perfect example of trouvère art, in its form, with an opening couplet and freer continuation, in its elevated text, and in its flowing, independent melody. The tenor, for its part, is not a Notre-Dame tenor, and Ludwig had not even identified its liturgical use, even though it seems to be from a Latin chant (possibly a melisma for an Office responsory for St Germain). It is not notated in a repetitive pattern. There is only one concordance (W_2). As an emblem, then, of their new motet collections, the compilers of R and N selected what for all intents and purposes is a fine trouvère song, with an accompaniment in the guise of a melisma taken from some convenient or appropriate source, and treated casually like a tenor in the new style of cathedral polyphony.

FRENCH MOTETS IN W_2

With the French motet collections contained in W_2 , we encounter a

Ex. 216

Se va - lors vient d'estre a - mo - rous et gay,
 Bien me sui a - per - ce - us Qe de vi - vre

Hic factus

A tout jors se deu plect la main ten - drai
 en joie m'est grans bien ve - nus. Mes ge men sui

Si je sai c'est bien drois qu'en voi - sie soi - e
 trop te - nus, Ce poi - se moi d'a - ler ou ma

Qant ce - le s'a - mor m'o - troi e qe pru-miere a -
da - me voi-e Qar ne doi jo - ir se par

mai. Ne ja ne m'en par - ti - rai Por mal ne
li n'en joi. Dieus tant m'es tart que je soi - e

por dou - lor mes de cuer vrai.
Tant en ai grant fain! Trop



more stable state of the repertory, and simultaneously seem to be closer to the Notre-Dame orbit. W_2 is the third great Notre-Dame source, containing conductus (now decreasing in number), organa $a3$ and $a4$, the *Magnus liber organi*, Latin motets (increasing) and French motets—these for the first time in Notre-Dame sources, except for those in MuA .³³

The very first collection of motets in W_2 includes motets $a3$ with the same text in duplum and triplum, encountered in F as the first type of Latin motet $a3$, the so-called 'conductus motet'. This first collection in W_2 includes five French motets of the same type, a very interesting phenomenon, but apparently with no further results. It presumably reflects the same early stage of development, and in case of the French motet another failed experiment. All five go back to well-known antecedents in clausulas or Latin motets, and none of the five remained important in the later repertory.

After the large collection of eighty Latin motets $a2$, arranged in three alphabetical series (plus additions), come the collections of French motets. First is a small series of one motet $a4$ and twenty-two double motets $a3$, in no discernible order. This is the oldest *collection* of its type (the five in R and N are not a collection), and one of the most central, with numerous concordances to all sectors of the repertory at large. Next comes a large collection of eighty-eight French motets $a2$, arranged in two alphabets with the beginning of a third, and a short supplement. Each alphabet tends to have its own characteristics, but the full description of these (started by Ludwig), the relationship with other manuscripts, and the stylistic implications have yet to be fully worked out. For instance, in the first alphabet, with nineteen French motets $a2$, about half go back to a clausula of

³³ French motets in W_2 are listed in Ludwig, *Repertorium*, pp. 178–80, 198–222, and edited in Tischler, *EM*. Many are also edited and discussed in Anderson, *The Latin Compositions of Fascicles 7 and 8 of W2*, and many appear also in Codex Montpellier.

Latin motet, and half do not, appearing here as original French motets. Several have concordances in R and N, one in MuA, none in the St Victor melismata. In the sixty motets of the second alphabet, ten appear in St Victor melismata, yet there are relatively fewer concordance with R and N; even so, Ludwig emphasizes the relationship to the chansonniers and the use of refrains in this second alphabet. The first alphabet shows frequent use of mode 2 in both motetus and tenor, and overall heavy use of mode 1 and 2 in tenors, with little use of mode 5. The first alphabet begins with the justly famous French version 'A la clarté', of a clausula and Latin motet in mode 6.³⁴ The much larger second alphabet shows more use of mode 5 tenors, but still with modes 1 and 2 prevailing, in the custom of French motets.

The twenty-three double motets *a3* (and one *a4*) that begin the French collection in W_2 are well connected with the repertory at large, including Notre-Dame clausulas, St Victor melismata, Latin motets in W_2 , the collection in R and N; and many items were taken up in Montpellier and Bamberg, attesting to their continued popularity. A few motets use tenors in mode 5, but the large majority, again, are in modes 1 or 2. The tenors are mostly Notre-Dame tenors—but not completely, and the collection even includes French tenors of the kind that became important much later in the century.

Each motet continues to have its own subtle individuality. In general we can see two ways in which the voices (in particular motetus and triplum) can be related. Either these two voices can be synchronized, both phrasing together, with verses of the same number of syllables in triplum as in motetus, or the phrasing may be staggered by using phrases of different lengths, in triplum and motetus. The early conductus motet with the same text in both voices of course had synchronized phrasing, and we might hence conclude that the type of motet with two texts in synchronized phrasing might logically be the earlier. On the other hand, the examples in R and N more often showed irregular and staggered phrasing. By the time of W_2 , in any case, all the alternatives are current, and materials can be so easily adapted that we probably cannot reconstruct such a chronology reliably. Furthermore, motets *a3* are frequently formed by adding a triplum to an existing motetus and tenor, or even—according to an old hypothesis of Ludwig's—by discarding an old triplum, and replacing it with a new one.

It needs to be emphasized that this series of twenty-three motets in

³⁴ Tischler, *EM* No. 149 (ii, p. 332); Mo 6, 189.

W₂ is not only the earliest documented collection of French double motets; it is the earliest such of any kind of double motet. Not counting the conductus motets in F, that important source includes only three Latin double motets, all important but isolated ('Mors', the 'Flos filius' motet mentioned earlier, and the very famous 'Hypocrite'—'Velut stellam', T. 'Et gaudebit'.³⁵) As far as the sources go, we have to deal with the French double motet as an established repertory before the Latin double motet. This becomes an especially important consideration in view of the extensive re-texting of motet voices to make French texts into Latin and vice versa. Definite priorities can be assigned only in individual cases, if there. The process as a whole cannot be said to go one way or the other, and without urging that it does so, it can be emphasized that what the sources show us is the role played by the French motet in the development of the mid-century motet repertory in general.

Considered as a collection, the twenty-three double motets in W₂ are a fascinating cross-section. The first, 'Encontre le tans', 'Quant feillant', T. 'in odorem', is emblematic and important, although not necessarily typical: it goes back to a clausula *a3*, one of three or four that do so here. The upper voices are in mode 1. There is a strong tendency for the voices to phrase together, with a phrasing that seems indigenous to versus and hence Latin discant texting. (The motet appears earlier in W₂, *a2*, with Latin text.) The work is long and impressive, recalling to some observers the style of Perotin himself. The second piece of the collection is a French contrafactum of 'Hypocrite'. Next come, in grotesque contrast, a curious unicum and 'Hare, hare' from N. All the five double motets from R and N are included here, scattered throughout the series. The next five, all found later in Montpellier fascicle 5, are more typical. A pair of motets, reappearing as a pair in Montpellier, represent both regular and irregular phrasing.³⁷ 'Lonc tans', 'Au commencement', T. 'Hec dies' appears *a2* in R and N. It is hard to say which version came first. The phrasing of the motetus is song-like but irregular and complex. The triplum consistently overlaps, except at two important internal cadences. 'Se j'ai servi', 'Trop longuement', T. 'Pro patribus' is also *a2* in R and N. The double motet has a triplum whose phrasing almost exactly coincides with the very lyric motetus and tenor in mode 2.

The picture of the French double motet that emerges from this

³⁵ Tischler, *EM* No. 71 (i, p. 493).

³⁶ Tischler, *EM* No. 129 (ii, p. 849).

³⁷ Tischler, *EM* No. 132 (ii, p. 881); for 'Se j'ai servi' see *ibid.*, No. 133 (ii, p. 890).

collection is one of a work with either rhythmic mode 1 or mode 2 in all three voices, with occasionally heavy division of longa or brevis in up to three semibreves (almost always neumatic, however, with only one syllable to the modal long or brevis). The tenor may have longer notes in addition to its modal values, and a moderately long ordo. The phrasing of the motetus is often more regular than that of the triplum, and often includes an integral number of tenor ordinates. It is the triplum that often provides the overlapped phrasing by being itself irregular. Both upper voices may, however, contribute to the irregularity, and either or both may be regular and coincide—but this is less and less characteristic.

In all this we can see the tremendous importance of the tenor ordo—the truly seminal innovation of Perotin. It is the repetitive rhythmic pattern in the tenor that makes it possible to co-ordinate the relatively regular phrases of motetus with relatively irregular ones of the triplum (or, on occasion, vice versa), hence to bring these intensely individual parts together into a whole. Regular or irregular, an upper voice may do nothing not already known from the monophonic versus or the *trouvère* chanson, although (to take up an earlier point) there is no vernacular model for such irregular phrasing as appears in the French motet. But it is the Notre-Dame tenor that combines them and opens up possibilities for new kinds of combinations. It seems, however, that the maker of French motets was more sensitive to these possibilities than cathedral singers. At any rate, he contributed a great deal of new music to the motet repertory.

MOTETS IN THE CODEX MONTPELLIER

The most extensive, most important collection of motets of the whole century is the Codex Montpellier, as important for its wide concordances as for its large number of unica. So massive is the whole (also in its modern editions³⁸) that it is difficult to think of it not as one series of 345 pieces, but rather as eight separate collections (fascicles) each with its own individuality and each, considered by itself, far more characteristic of other thirteenth-century collections than is the whole.

These other collections need to be briefly recapitulated here as context for the Codex Montpellier. The collection in R and N includes roughly a hundred French motets, mostly *a2*, but with five *a3* and one *a4*. The collections in *W*₂ include twelve Latin motets *a3* (one text), four Latin double motets, and eighty Latin motets *a2*; five French motets *a3* (one text), twenty-three French double motets (including

³⁸ Rokseth, *Polyphonies du xiii^e siècle*; Tischler, *EM*.

one triple motet) and eighty-eight French motets *a2*.³⁹ The collection La Clayette has fifty-five motets, mostly with at least one of the texts in French, and largely French double motets; there are a dozen motets *a4*, and a few Latin double motets.⁴⁰ The lost collection Besançon had presumably fifty-seven motets, about half French double motets, about half French-Latin double motets, and a few French triple motets *a3*.⁴¹ Codex Bamberg, from later in the century, has a hundred motets, of which fifty are French double motets, forty-one are Latin double motets, and nine French-Latin double motets.⁴² Turin has thirty-one motets.⁴³

Each of the fascicles of Montpellier (after the first, which contains a 'Benedicamus', a conductus, three hockets, and five organa—two by Perotin), can be compared to one or the other of the collections just reviewed, as follows (taking the Montpellier fascicles in an order that presumably represents a chronological development):

(fascicle 6): a collection of seventy-five French motets *a2*, comparable to the eighty-eight French motets *a2* in the tenth fascicle of *W*₂, or to the roughly one hundred French motets in the motet fascicle of the chansonnier N;

(fascicle 5): a collection, central to the Codex, of one hundred French double motets, comparable to the fifty-five motets of La Clayette, or the fifty-seven motets of the lost codex Besançon, or the later collections of one hundred motets in Bamberg or the thirty-one in Turin; only those of La Clayette, or the twenty-three motets of the ninth fascicle of *W*₂ would be earlier;

(fascicle 2): a unique collection of seventeen triple motets *a4*—all French but one; a number of these appear also *a3* in the earlier stages;

(fascicle 4): a collection of twenty-two Latin double motets, the earliest such collection, analogous in size to the twenty-three French double motets in *W*₂, but similar only to the Latin component of Bamberg;

(fascicle 3): a small group of eleven double motets, each with one French and one Latin text, comparable, again, only to Bamberg; with several curious features, this group provides a transition to the two later fascicles of the codex;

(fascicle 7): a collection of thirty-nine double motets, mostly French, some Latin, a few mixed, from near the end of the century, with an appendix of

³⁹ These and all numbers following are to be taken as approximate; they are drawn from Ludwig's enumeration in the *Repertorium*, but subsequent research occasionally proposes changes in the enumeration by, for instance, showing that two separately numbered items constitute really one motet, or by showing that a motet should be counted *a3* instead of *a2* (or vice versa). There is also the problem of how to reckon the texted voices that had tenors added or taken away.

⁴⁰ Anderson, *Motets of the Manuscript LaClayette*.

⁴¹ Ludwig, *Repertorium*, pp. 505–13.

⁴² Anderson, *Compositions of the Bamberg Manuscript*.

⁴³ Auda, *Les 'motets wallons'*.

eleven more; comparable in size with La Clayette and Besançon, this one reveals a period of development rather than of stabilization in the repertory;

(fascicle 8): a collection of forty-two double motets, largely French but with an important group of Latin motets; as a collection this comes from the first decade of the fourteenth century.

Up to (but not including) fascicle 7, the Notre-Dame tenors continue to function as guidelines of the contrapuntal web; and during these stages of development, the multiple uses of 'In seculum', 'Omnes', 'Portare', 'Veritatem' accumulate. This raises the question of the tonal structure of motets, a question that can best be approached through the repertories contained in Montpellier and Bamberg, for these extensive collections, being preserved more or less intact (unlike, for instance, MuA), offer a broad base for generalities and one that we can assume to be representative.⁴⁴ Fascicle 5 of Montpellier, containing one hundred motets *a3*, or the hundred motets *a3* in Bamberg, would be the best place to study tonal procedures in the mid-century motet. We can hear in the motets *a2* of Montpellier fascicle 6 the wealth of lyric melody as well as the intricacy between motetus and tenor—between song and contrapuntal accompaniment; but because the texture *a2* is more transparent, we are more sensitive to the linear qualities and less struck by the overall tonal design. In the motets *a3* we experience these same linear qualities rather as intensity of texture; and by the same token we are confronted by a steady stream of three-note sonorities, whose overall organization requires attention.

In this organization the tenor is the starting point of the tonal organization. Each of its pitches, taken by itself, helps to determine (through choice of concord) the coincident pitches of motetus and triplum; and the *succession* of pitches in the tenor helps to determine the succession of three-note sonorities in the piece as a whole. Typically motetus and triplum are at the fifth and the octave above the tenor. If this were consistent, of course, the piece would consist of nothing but a tenor melody doubled at the fifth and the octave. While this concept of consonance is essential to discant, just as essential is that of contrary motion, and motet counterpoint is an endless series of compromises between these two principles. So the tenor's succession of pitches is only the starting point of the tonal organization.

Several procedures characteristic of the mid-century motet can be observed in the fifth fascicle of Montpellier. In the typical tenor in mode 1 or 2, some tenor notes have clear consonances above them, others do not. The composer's choices in this regard reflect his

⁴⁴ See the tables in Rokseth, *Polyphonies du xiii^e siècle*, iv, pp. 143–98.

conception of the tonal plan implied by the tenor—what its central pitch is, for instance. We should note that these tenors from Gregorian melismata embody the kind of melodic motion characteristic of that ancient repertory (and not of more recent medieval chant) with much decorative, seemingly random, back and forth motion within a locus, with occasional, but equally unpredictable, strong moves outside the locus, up or down, within the melisma or sometimes at its conclusion. One option open to the motet composer is to reinforce the note at the centre of the locus with fifth-octave consonance. Another means of reinforcement is the way the tenor rhythmic pattern is superimposed on the pitches of the melisma, which sometimes has the effect of, say, making a central pitch consistently fall on a long duration. No rule is observable, but the composer's concern for interesting and fruitful arrangements is abundantly evident—as is the complex interdependence of the factors of pitch and duration in the relationship of tenor and upper voices. The net effect of this possible confluence of factors can be to present one particular pitch with persistent fifth-octave consonance at the tonal centre of the piece. We can observe that when this happens, it is usually on *fa-ut* or *re*, less often on *sol-ut*, seldom on *mi* or *la*.⁴⁵

Out of this confluence can emerge an overall tonal organization, sometimes remarkably stable. Just as the tenor melody moves *through* this organization, without every one of its pitches basic to it (especially in the French motet tenors in modes 1 and 2), so upper voices sometimes follow a characteristic procedure of moving through a stable sonority with animated melodic motion. In a C-G-c sonority, for instance, the triplum may supply the upper c, then descend by step to supply the G in the next bar, while the motetus, in contrary motion, supplies the G in the first bar, the c in the second. This very simple model is followed again and again in endlessly complex ways, and there are many other procedures for maintaining a relatively slow, stable succession of sonorities with rapid contrary motion in animated rhythms. This leads to the phenomenon of 'motivic repetition' in the upper voices of motets, but we must bear in mind that the upper voices in general move in restricted pitch sets, and that the rhythmic motion consists of modal longs and breves, or conventionalized divisions of them, so that 'motivic' repetition is almost unavoidable.

The whole complex also leads to the idea that the French motet is 'contrapuntal' in the sense of having several simultaneous, independently active voices, which in turn suggests to some observers an

⁴⁵ Identification of a *mi* final, usually on a, is sometimes indeterminate because of an optional b flat; but there may be a dozen cases of *mi* final in Codex Montpellier.

opposition to tonal structure in the sense of overall organization of sonorities into 'harmonies' or 'keys'. But if we take 'tonal organization' in the broader sense of planned relationships among tones or pitches, including simultaneously sounding intervals, and succession of intervals, a very clear concern for tonal organization is apparent in all but some inept or corrupt motets. And anyway, 'counterpoint' always meant a balance between independently active voices and overall organization, especially in medieval polyphony. The balance may sometimes seem to be a compromise, at other times a mutual reinforcement, but is almost always present. Medieval research still needs to discover the appropriate terms in which to conceive and describe this balance.

The relationship of tonal locus (as embodied most obviously in a central pitch, if there is one) to the final of a motet tenor is often a problem for us, and was perhaps for the medieval musician too; at least we can observe a variety of solutions. In general we can say that, like clear central pitches, finals are most often *fa/ut* or *re*, sometimes *sol/ut*, seldom *mi*. In any given motet, however, the final may be different from the central note or lie outside the locus. The most frequent reason for this is an abrupt terminal descent at the end of the melisma: the classic case is 'In seculum', which drops from a central *c-fa/ut* to an *F-fa/ut* in its last tenor ordo. In the chant, of course, this fall is no cadence, but rather the truncation of a penultimate descent that soon returns to *a* for its cadence. It is the fate of motets, however, to inherit a non-final chant tone for their final. But before concluding that this and similar endings show how motet counterpoint exemplifies purely linear considerations without regard for overall tonal plan, we need to observe that the motet composer can and does change a tenor to suit his purposes; that he can and does supply his own final by dropping the motetus below the tenor's final; and that he did not have to use 'In seculum' instead of, say, 'Omnes', with its close on the same *fa/ut* that is central throughout. However, he did use 'In seculum', and even more frequently than 'Omnes'. We can more profitably imagine reasons why he did so, and some of these might be that 'In seculum' allows both a concentration on a tonal centre and a fresh, distinctive ending, approached through a fall. (A fruitful subject of study is the treatment of the drop to *F* in 'In seculum' in the middle of motets that repeat the melody in the tenor.) The fall to the *F* is through *G*; and the progression *G-F* in the tenor is accompanied by *b* natural and *e* over the *G*, *c* and *f* over the *F*. Not only is this the cadence that became standard in the fourteenth century, it occurs in the relationship expressed by the 'split signature' of *b* flat in tenor, *b* natural in upper

voices, which is frequent in that century. Clearly the encounters with 'In seculum' were one of the sources for these seminal constructions.

More generally, the Notre-Dame tenor guided the motet composer to successful plans and stimulated him to create others. The composer of medieval chant, of course, had long since carried out very stable tonal plans on his own; so had the composer of polyphonic conductus, without benefit of a cantus firmus. The long-range effect of the curious intrusion of these Notre-Dame tenors, with their old fashioned Gregorian contours, was to generate tonal plans more intricate, more complex than those inherited from medieval chant and used in common discant. These will provide an important term of comparison when we survey thirteenth-century English polyphony, which shared many of the techniques of Notre-Dame polyphony but made less use of a tenor cantus firmus. In English polyphony we can watch the composer constructing his own tenor to suit an independently conceived tonal plan and we may wonder how often the French composer actually did likewise.

From its beginning, the Latin double motet, as we have seen, tended to develop in complex ways, producing multiple versions of a given motet, and much exchange of individual voices among versions. On the one hand, there was much contact with the clausula repertory (clausulas *a2* as well as *a3* were involved); on the other hand, there was contact with the French motet, in contrafacts made from both directions, and in the very particular form of new tripla added to a Latin tenor-duplum pair, perhaps after an original Latin triplum had been discarded. Following Ludwig's lead, much attention has been paid to various stages of motet construction, and various prior or intermediate stages, no longer represented by extant works, have been hypothesized for individual motets or groups of motets.⁴⁶

Because of the process of adding a triplum to a tenor-duplum pair, or of replacing one triplum with another, and because of the importance of cantus firmus construction specifically within the Notre-Dame school, it has often been thought that medieval polyphony by nature consisted of laying one independent voice upon another—a duplum on a tenor, a triplum on top of that. This idea has tended to obscure the fact that what the medieval composer is composing is a two-part framework, complete in itself in a piece *a2*, and basic to a piece *a3* or *a4*. This is the significance of using clausulas *a2* for motets: the borrowed clausula represents a particular successful solution to a contrapuntal problem posed by the tenor. On the other hand, when

⁴⁶ Anderson, *The Latin Compositions in Fascicles 7 and 8 of W2*, i, pp. 115–17, 294–6, 311–13, 331, etc.

the French motet composer uses only a tenor (which is the more frequent case), he feels free to reshape it rhythmically—even melodically—to create a new two-voice framework as the basis for further motet composition.

The fifth fascicle of Codex Montpellier, containing a hundred French double motets (of which about half are unica) shows relative stylistic solidity and stability compared to the fourth fascicle with its twenty-two Latin double motets—which represent, as we have seen, the first substantial collection of such works. This fourth fascicle has been studied at length in an effort to untangle the web of stylistic factors represented in its heterogenous contents.⁴⁷ The most cautious assessment sees a broad spread of combinations, stylistic features, and possible provenance (but all continental) in the first part of the fascicle (Nos. 51–61), with more specifically English sources, or at least pieces, represented towards the end of the fascicle. There are relatively few unica, and some motets have broad concordances. Some stand close to the rhythms and textures of the French motets, while a relatively high proportion of the others are mode 3 (seldom used for French motets), possibly representing the older ‘alternate third mode’ of Perotin’s time. Some stand close to the Latin discant *a3* with one text in the duplum and triplum. At the other extreme, a few show a style that is to become more important as the century goes on. Precisely these pieces also show a very strong tenor-duplum pair, one that seems to have a life of its own.⁴⁸ ‘O Maria maris stella’, T. ‘Veritatem’, with a complex history in motet repertories, appears here (as Mo 4,52) with its triplum, ‘O Maria virgo davitica’, a classic case of mode 6, with breaking of the initial breves of certain ordines into two syllabic semibreves. The next motet (Mo 4,53) has the ubiquitous ‘Ave gloriosa mater’ with tenor ‘Domino’—another classic case of fashioning a strong two-voice framework without too much regard for antecedents. The triplum here is ‘Ave virgo regia’, also in mode 6 with semibreves. Similar rhythms appeared in the fifth fascicle too: there, however, in three unica, and seemingly more at home among French motets.⁴⁹ Two more important cases occur in the third fascicle of Montpellier. This, the smallest and most problematic of all the motet fascicles in Montpellier, contains eleven motets with Latin dupla over mostly Notre-Dame tenors, and French tripla. Once these were taken by modern observers to reveal bizzare medieval combinations of sacred and secular elements; more recently, they are regarded rather in

⁴⁷ See Sanders, ‘Peripheral Polyphony’.

⁴⁸ Anderson, *Latin Compositions*, i, pp. 18–29.

⁴⁹ Mo 5: 102, 103, 143; Mo 5, 77 = Bamberg, No. 70.

terms of a stylistic revision of older works with tripla in a newer style. Whatever the provenance or rationale of these combinations, they certainly have to be dealt with case by case, allowing no generally valid conclusions; and it is a small group, after all, not representative of any broad moment in the history of the motet. Included are two motets with faster tripla. The tenor-duplum pair 'Mellis stilla', T. 'Domino', very solid is its rhythmic-tonal shape, has the charming triplum 'Par une matinee' with an animated interjection by 'Marot' (Marie) in the middle (Mo 3,40). Similarly, 'Flos de spina', T. 'Regnat' (a very important tenor-duplum pair) has the triplum 'Quant repaire', which begins with normal long-short rhythms but becomes more animated later (Mo 3,44).

These and similar motets constitute a mid-century group of perhaps a dozen or so; they turn up also in the La Clayette collection and (becoming more numerous) in the later Bamberg collection. This is contemporaneous with the seventh fascicle of Montpellier, and here the faster style of triplum is the link to the remarkable group of motets associated with Pierre de la Croix. This 'Petronian' style of motet is the most prominent and one of the most advanced of Montpellier; but there are other important types as well.

Two of Pierre's motets lead off the seventh fascicle.⁵⁰ Both have very firm tenor-duplum pairs, combining mode 5 with mode 1; the first is on *G-sol/ut*, the second on *F-fa/ut* (with *b* natural) (Ex. 217). The breve is subdivided as far down as seven 'semibreves', although usually only to two or three 'semibreves'. More important seem the new style of melody and the new ways of matching melodic phrases with text lines and rhymes. These tripla do not resemble trouvère chanson in melodic style; rather, their style is born of the polyphonic motet. Yet we should not think of it, on the one hand, as simply declamatory or 'parlando'—the melodic movement is far too carefully fashioned for that—nor on the other hand as completely a product of its contrapuntal environment. Rather, this seems indeed to be a new style of melody, one that depends on the firm foundation of traditional tenor-duplum pair. It has often been noticed that the texture is really one of melody and accompaniment; this texture, always latent in the French motet, here comes out in the open. All that would be required to turn this into the polyphonic song style of the fourteenth century would to play the duplum rather than sing it (a matter of performance option), and release the tenor from a modal or ordinal

⁵⁰ Mo 7,253, triplum 'S'amours eust point de poet'—'Au renouveler', T. 'Ecce'; 7,254, triplum 'Aucun ont trouve'—'Lonc temps', T. 'Annuntiantes'. Similar works in Mo 7: 255, 264, 289, 297, 299; Mo 8: 316, 317, 330, 332. Ex. 217 = Mo 7,254, fo. 273^r.

Ex. 217

Au-cun ont trou-ve chant par u - sa - ge, Mes a moi en donne o - choi -

Long tans me sui

Annun[tiantes]

son A - mours, qui res-bau-dis mon cou-ra - ge, Si que m'e -

te - nu de chan - ter,

stuet fai - re chan - çon, Car a - mer me

Mes or ai rai - son

fait da - me bele et sage Et de bon re - non.
de joi - e me - ner,

Et je qui li ai fait hou-ma-ge, Pour li ser-vir tout mon
Car bonne

a - a - ge De loi - al cuer sans pen ser tra - hi -
a - mour me fait de - si -

son Chan-te - ral Car de li tieng un si douz he-ri-ta -

rer La mieus

ge, Que joi-e n'ai se de ce non; C'est la pen-se-e

en - se - gni - e K'on

que mon douz malm'a - sou - age Et fait es-pe-rer ga - ri - son

tout le mont trou - ver

Ne pour quant seur moi puet cla-mer hau - sage A- mours et

A li

moi tout mon vi- vant te - nir en sa pri - son

ne doit on nule au - tre com -

Ne ja pour ce ne pen - se-rai vers li me - pri - son;

pa - rer. Et

II (etc.)

pattern, which happens more and more frequently elsewhere in the seventh and eighth fascicles of Montpellier. (In actual fact, however, the fourteenth-century song texture was not generated in this way, but rather directly out of the tenor-duplum pair, now as cantus-tenor, provided with a 'triplum', i.e. upper instrumental part, or 'contra-tenor', i.e. lower instrumental part, or both.)

The seventh and eighth fascicles of Codex Montpellier contain essentially the same kind of repertory; both include a small number of independent works in the individual style of Pierre de la Croix; both contain a larger number (in relation to the older repertory, a *much* larger proportion) of French motets with song tenors, sometimes rondeaux, but other kinds as well; and both fascicles include well-defined groups of Latin, characteristically Marian, double motets. In addition, or among the types listed, numerous special forms or techniques are represented in both fascicles, showing end of the century experimentation along a broad front. The seventh fascicle tends to have concordances with either Bamberg or Turin, or scattered, isolated concordances, or none, for a substantial number of its motets are unica. In the eighth fascicle almost all are unica, the main exception being the English ones at the end (339, 340-1). One never knows, of course, in the case of an unica fascicle, whether that reflects lack of extant sources or a truly unique repertory—a collection assembled, or even written, by one composer, or works known only in his circle. If so, it would go well with the frequently experimental quality of these works. They are, however, important for the future, which means either that they were part of a larger repertory not preserved, or that the circle from which they came was extremely important, even if small.

The motets in the style of Pierre de la Croix involve two very different rhythmic levels (a slow one in the tenor—and to some extent in the duplum—and a fast one in the triplum). This difference became a basic feature of the fourteenth-century motet, and the gradual appearance of this difference in the thirteenth-century motet can be taken as a moment of great significance, especially since it ran counter to the basic trend of all but the oldest thirteenth-century motets to place the tenor in mode 1 or 2 as an accompaniment. The motets on song tenors, for their part, have little rhythmic differentiation.⁵¹ These tenors, being songs, however, show no tendency to become accompaniments, and the result can be three more or less equal voices, a kind of simultaneous polymelody often attributed to thirteenth-century

⁵¹ Mo 7: 256, 260, 271, 272, 280, 295, etc. Mo 8: 319, 321, etc.

discant but not really there until this moment. The emphasis is on density, linearity, continuity: small wonder that the song forms (sometimes *en rondeau* but more often individually structured) are hardly supported at all by the other voices. Song forms, whether already 'forms' in the fixed fourteenth-century sense, or still only procedures, as *en rondeau*, are to be sought rather in the monophonic medium, or in the simple discant settings *a3* of Adam de la Hale or Jehan de Lescurel.⁵² Motets, in contrast, are by nature continuous and use song forms only as ingredients. Adam de la Hale, incidentally, has two motets in the seventh fascicle,⁵³ and these, along with several tenors presumably by professional instrumentalists,⁵⁴ testify to the primary secular and vernacular nature of these collections. The two series of Latin motets are relatively conservative in spite of certain idiosyncrasies;⁵⁵ they can hardly be liturgical music for the cathedral itself, but devotional music in the households of cathedral hierarchy.

It has long been obvious that between the use of the brevis in Perotin as a relatively fast—indeed, 'short'—note and the use of the same shape in 1600 as a relatively long note in common time, there extended an historical continuum characterized by a gradual slowing-down of tempo relative to notation; the slowing-down was persistent, even though often interrupted or deflected in complex ways. Within the thirteenth and fourteenth century there is some direct evidence concerning the slowing-down, such as the remark by Jacques de Liège that semibrevis and brevis now go approximately as fast as the former brevis and longa. Heinrich Bessler once proposed an interpretation of what such evidence might mean in terms of actual tempos.⁵⁶

Perhaps more important than absolute tempo is the clear existence, at the end of the century, of several different tempi associated with different kinds of notation and different styles of music. At least, it is clear from internal evidence as well as from theorists' comments that such different tempi were used, even though it is not yet clear exactly which were which. Some pieces, such as certain of the hockets at the end of the Bamberg collections, the textless, presumably instrumental, pieces in Brit. Lib., Harley 978,⁵⁷ certain pieces of English polyphony of *c.* 1300, and certain of the motets—especially Latin ones—in

⁵² See n. 25.

⁵³ Mo 7,258,279.

⁵⁴ 'Tassin'—Mo 7,292,294; 'Loyset'—Mo 7,297.

⁵⁵ Mo 7, 282–7, 300–2; Mo 8, 326–31, 339–41, 343–4.

⁵⁶ 'Studien zur Musik des Mittelalters II: Die Motette von Franko von Köln bis Philippe von Vitry', *AMw*, 8 (1926), particularly p. 214. See also the tempi and discussion in Willi Apel, *The Notation of Polyphonic Music, 900–1600* (5th ed., Cambridge, Mass., 1953) 342–3; further, pp. 320–4, 340–1.

⁵⁷ See chap. XIV.

Montpellier fascicles 7 and 8, continue to use *longa* and *brevis* as primary rhythmic values, with relatively little breaking of the *brevis* into *semibreves*; these, when they do occur, are ornamental and seem to be very quick. Clearly such pieces were intended to be performed at a tempo much faster than the motets of Pierre de la Croix, if we use the duration of the *brevis* as the basis of comparison. It is in this context that the theorists' comments can be taken, in the most general sense, to refer to a slow, medium, and fast performance of the *brevis*, based largely on the extent to which the *brevis* is subdivided into *semibreves*.

Franco of Cologne is credited with one of the first attempts to rationalize and stabilize the subdivision of the *brevis*, and this along with his other rationalizations of notation constitutes what scholars refer to as 'Franconian notation', which is taken to mark a new epoch in thirteenth-century music.⁵⁸ Franco's teaching about *semibreves* can be interpreted to mean that the *brevis* is subdivided into three equal parts, no more; and that if three *semibreves* replace a *breve* they are equal in duration, but if only two, then the second is twice as long as the first. The important point is that until after 1300 *semibreves* are all written alike in French notation, with diamond-shaped notes; but they could be performed with various relative durations, shorter or longer. The performer could follow the manner of *semibreve* performance of some leading musician such as Franco or Pierre de la Croix. Some of these manners of performance are described in treatises; they differ among themselves, and obviously represent personal styles.⁵⁹ Thus when we read in the *Speculum musicae* of Jacques de Liège that composers subdivided the *brevis* into as many as seven (or nine) *semibreves*, we should not take this as a merely theoretical subdivision; but as a style of performing *semibreves*. Unfortunately the account is not precise enough to tell us the relative durations of these *semibreves* (at least, scholars do not agree about its interpretation), but perhaps no amount of durational precision would inform us about the actual style of performance, which is the most important aspect. This level of rhythm was called *prolatio*, which means 'bringing forward' or 'delivery'. When this level, in turn, became rationalized in the fourteenth century, *prolatio* then acquired a specific meaning analogous to the terms for the upper rhythmic levels, *tempus* and *modus*. Within the thirteenth century, however, we can think of the *semibreves* as subject to the performer's ideas about 'delivery', and we need to determine for each piece which set of ideas might govern its

⁵⁸ See Apel, *Notation of Polyphonic Music*, pp. 310–18.

⁵⁹ See Apel, *Notation of Polyphonic Music*, p. 320.

performance. This may in some cases be indeterminable; the closely related question of the proper tempo may be easier to determine, once the various comments by theorists have been sorted out and connected to various styles of notation.⁶⁰

⁶⁰ The most penetrating recent study is Ernest Sanders, 'Duple Rhythm and Alternate Third Mode in the 13th Century', *JAMS*, 15 (1962), 249–91.