



A CRITICAL COMPANION TO
**MEDIEVAL
MOTETS**

Edited by Jared C. Hartt

STUDIES IN MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE MUSIC 17

A Critical Companion to Medieval Motets

Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Music

ISSN 1479-9294

General Editors

Tess Knighton

Helen Deeming

This series aims to provide a forum for the best scholarship in early music; deliberately broad in scope, it welcomes proposals on any aspect of music, musical life, and composers during the period up to 1600, and particularly encourages work that places music in an historical and social context. Both new research and major re-assessments of central topics are encouraged.

Proposals or enquiries may be sent directly to either of the editors or to the publisher at the addresses given below; all submissions will receive careful, informed consideration.

Professor Tess Knighton, Institutio Mila i Fontanals/CSIC,
c/Egipcíacues 15, Barcelona 08001, Spain

Dr Helen Deeming, Department of Music, Royal Holloway College,
University of London, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX

Boydell & Brewer, PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF

Previously published titles in the series are listed at the back of this volume.

A Critical Companion to Medieval Motets

edited by
Jared C. Hartt

THE BOYDELL PRESS

© Contributors 2018

All Rights Reserved. Except as permitted under current legislation
no part of this work may be photocopied, stored in a retrieval system,
published, performed in public, adapted, broadcast, transmitted,
recorded or reproduced in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission of the copyright owner

First published 2018
The Boydell Press, Woodbridge

ISBN 978-1-78327-307-2

The Boydell Press is an imprint of Boydell & Brewer Ltd
PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF, UK
and of Boydell & Brewer Inc.
668 Mt Hope Avenue, Rochester, NY 14620, USA
website: www.boydellandbrewer.com

A CIP catalogue record for this title is available
from the British Library

The publisher has no responsibility for the continued existence or accuracy
of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this book,
and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is,
or will remain, accurate or appropriate

This publication is printed on acid-free paper

Typeset in Adobe Arno Pro by
Word and Page, Chester

For the ζJ 's

CONTENTS

<i>List of Figures</i>	ix
<i>List of Music Examples</i>	x
<i>List of Tables</i>	xiii
<i>List of Contributors</i>	xiv
<i>Preface</i>	xv
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xvi
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xvii
Introduction: Approaching Medieval Motets <i>Jared C. Hartt</i>	1
1. The Genre(s) of Medieval Motets <i>Elizabeth Eva Leach</i>	15
2. Origins and Interactions: Clausula, Motet, Conductus <i>Catherine A. Bradley</i>	43
3. Tracing the Tenor in Medieval Motets <i>Alice V. Clark</i>	61
4. Isorhythm <i>Lawrence Earp</i>	77
5. Notations <i>Karen Desmond</i>	103
6. Thirteenth-Century Motet Functions: Views through the Lens of the <i>Portare</i> Motet Family <i>Dolores Pesce</i>	131
7. A Prism of its Time: Social Functions of the Motet in Fourteenth-Century France <i>Jacques Boogaart</i>	155
8. Motets, Manuscript Culture, Mise-en-page <i>John Haines and Stefan Udell</i>	175
9. Clerics, Courtiers, and the Vernacular Two-Voice Motet: The Case of <i>Fines amouretes</i> / <i>Fiat</i> and the <i>Roman de la poire</i> <i>Jennifer Saltzstein</i>	193
10. When Words Converge and Meanings Diverge: Counterexamples to Polytextuality in the Thirteenth-Century Motet <i>Suzannah Clark</i>	205
11. Motets in Chansonniers and the Other Culture of the French Thirteenth-Century Motet <i>Gaël Saint-Cricq</i>	225

12. Building a Motet around Quoted Material: Textual and Musical Structure in Motets Based on Monophonic Songs <i>Matthew P. Thomson</i>	243
13. The Duet Motet in England: Genre, Tonal Coherence, Reconstruction <i>Jared C. Hartt</i>	261
14. <i>Materia</i> Matters: Reconstructing <i>Colla/Bona</i> <i>Anna Zayaruznaya</i>	287
15. Machaut's Motet 10 and its Interconnections <i>Margaret Bent</i>	301
16. A Motet Conceived in Troubled Times: Machaut's Motet 22 <i>Sarah Fuller</i>	321
17. A Motet Ahead of its Time? The Curious Case of <i>Portio nature/Ida capillorum</i> <i>Emily Zazulia</i>	341
Bibliography of Works Cited	355
Select Glossary	373
Index of Cited Motets	377
General Index	383

FIGURES

Elizabeth Eva Leach, *The Genre(s) of Medieval Motets*

- 1.1. Shared refrain melody in **Mo** 66 and **Mo** 22 (BIU Montpellier/IRHT [CNRS]) 41

Karen Desmond, *Notations*

- 5.1. *A la cheminee/Mout sont vaillant/Par verite* in **W2**, fols. 212v–213r. Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel <http://diglib.hab.de/inkunabeln/14-astron/start.htm> 106
- 5.2. Excerpt of *Super/Presidentes* triplum in **Fauv**, fol. 1v (BnF) and **Br**, recto 115
- 5.3. Excerpt of [Triplum]/*Frontentibus florentibus silvis/Floret* motetus in **Ob** 7, p. ix. By permission of the Bodleian Libraries, University of Oxford 124

John Haines and Stefan Udell, *Motets, Manuscript Culture, Mise-en-page*

- 8.1. Layout of the opening page of motets in **Roi**, fol. 205r (BnF) 182
- 8.2. Layout of the opening page of motets in **Noailles**, fol. 179r (BnF) 183
- 8.3. Layout of *Mout me fu/Robin m'aime/Portare* in **Ba**, fol. 52v 184
- 8.4. Layout of *La mesnie fauveline/J'ai fait nouvelement/Grant despit* in **Fauv**, fols. 15v–16r (BnF) 186
- 8.5. Layout of Motet 10, *Hareu! hareu! le feu/Helas! ou sera pris confors/Obediens usque ad mortem* in **Mach C**, fols. 214v–215r (BnF) 188
- 8.6. Layout of *Portio nature/Ida capillorum/Contratenor/Ante thronum trinitatis* in **Ch**, fols. 61v–62r (image CNRS-IRHT, © Bibliothèque et archives du château de Chantilly) 190

Anna Zayaruznaya, *Materia Matters: Reconstructing Colla/Bona*

- 14.1. Hypothetical compositional plan for *Colla/Bona*, summarizing the coordination of text-lines in triplum (black circles) and motetus (white diamonds; hollow diamonds represent long untexted motetus passages) 296

Sarah Fuller, *A Motet Conceived in Troubled Times: Machaut's Motet 22*

- 16.1. M22, rhythmic periodicity map 330
- 16.2. M22, metric groupings in tenor and contratenor taleae 332

The editor, contributors, and publishers are grateful to all the institutions and persons listed for permission to reproduce the materials in which they hold copyright. Every effort has been made to trace the copyright holders; apologies are offered for any omission, and the publishers will be pleased to add any necessary acknowledgement in subsequent editions.

MUSIC EXAMPLES

Elizabeth Eva Leach, *The Genre(s) of Medieval Motets*

1.1. Hypothetical monophonic motet melody for D308 Mot4	29
1.2. Tenor and Duplum from Mo 21 with D308 Mot4 text underlaid	32
1.3. Tenor and Duplum from Mo 33 with D308 Mot6 text underlaid	36–7
1.4. Hypothetical monophonic motet version of D308 Mot6	38

Catherine A. Bradley, *Origins and Interactions: Clausula, Motet, Conductus*

2.1. <i>Latus</i> 4 clausula, W1, fol. 57r–3	47
2.2. <i>Latus</i> 5 clausula, W1, fol. 57r–4	48
2.3. <i>Homo quam sit pura/Latus</i> , F, fols. 385v–386r	50–1
2.4. <i>Latus</i> 4 clausula, F, fol. 158v–1	54

Alice V. Clark, *Tracing the Tenor in Medieval Motets*

3.1. M4 tenor, divided into taleae	69
3.2. M4, talea 1	70
3.3. Ballaam tenor organization	73

Lawrence Earp, *Isorhythm*

4.1. <i>O Maria/Veritatem</i> (first and last phrases). Châl, fols. 14r and 15r–v	80
4.2. <i>Agmina milicie/Agmina</i> (opening and excerpt). StV, fols. 258r and 258v	80
4.3. <i>Salve, salus/Et gaudebit</i> . F, fol. 409r	81
4.4. <i>Plus joliment/Quant li douz</i> (L1–L12). Mo, fol. 279r–v	83
4.5. <i>Se je chante/Bien</i> . Mo, fols. 357v–359v	84–5
4.6. <i>Solaris/Gregorius sol/Petre</i> (tenor and upper-voice periodicity). Onc 362, fol. 89r	89
4.7. Periodic structure in Vitry, <i>Tribum/Quoniam</i>	95

Karen Desmond, *Notations*

5.1. Transcription of first three phrases, L1–L24, of <i>A la cheminee/Mout sont vailant/Parverite</i> from W2, fols. 212v–213r	107
5.2. The ‘A la cheminee’ voice in Mo, fol. 40r and Ba, fols. 6v–7r, with the original note shapes indicated above each staff	109
5.3a. <i>Super/Presidentes</i> , triplum, L33–L41, transcribed from Fauv with ternary breves	116
5.3b. <i>Super/Presidentes</i> , triplum, L33–L41, transcribed from Fauv with binary breves	116
5.3c. <i>Super/Presidentes</i> , triplum, L33–L41, transcribed from Br in imperfect <i>tempus</i>	116
5.4. <i>Je cuidoe/Se j’ai folement</i> , L5–L10, transcribed with original note shapes	117
5.5a. <i>Je cuidoe/Se j’ai folement</i> , L5–L10, transcribed with ternary breves	117
5.5b. <i>Je cuidoe/Se j’ai folement</i> , L5–L10, transcribed with binary breves	117
5.6. <i>Rosa delectabilis/Regalis exoritur mater decoris/Regali ex progenie</i> , L1–L7, transcribed from Onc 362, fols. 90v–91r	122
5.7. Beginning of motetus <i>Frondentibus</i> , B1–B18, with a reconstruction of the original notation in the upper staff, and the updated notation in the lower staff	124
5.8. B1–B10 and B31–B50 of the cantus I voice of Johannes Ciconia, <i>O felix templum</i> , transcribed from Ob 213, with original notation indicated above staff	126

- 5.9. Excerpt from *Douce/Garison*, L₄–L₁₁, showing mensuration changes and coloration 128

Dolores Pesce, *Thirteenth-Century Motet Functions: Views through the Lens of the Portare Motet Family*

- 6.1. Melody and texts for the *portare/sustinere* chant segment 132
 6.2. Text Setting in **Ba** 19, perfections 34–45 143
 6.3. Reduction of **Mo** 81 148
 6.4. Reduction of **Mo** 142 150
 6.5. Rhythmic organization of **Mo** 322 tenor 153

Jennifer Saltzstein, *Clerics, Courtiers, and the Vernacular Two-Voice Motet: The Case of Fines amouretes/Fiat and the Roman de la poire*

- 9.1. *Fines amouretes/Fiat* 195

Suzannah Clark, *When Words Converge and Meanings Diverge: Counterexamples to Polytextuality in the Thirteenth-Century Motet*

- 10.1. **Mo** 127: *Quant define la verdour/Quant repaire la dolçor/Flos filius eius [et super hunc flo(rem)]* 210–11
 10.2. **Mo** 20: *Celui en qui je me fi/La bele estoile de mer/La bele, en qui je me fi/[Jo]han[ne]*. Bars 1–4 of duplum from *Ave, plena gratia/Johanne* 215–17

Gaël Saint-Cricq, *Motets in Chansonniers and the Other Culture of the French Thirteenth-Century Motet*

- 11.1a. *Mes cuers est emprisonés* (268a)/*Et pro* (M20a), **Noailles** no. 22, fol. 184r 230
 11.1b. *Alleluia: Surrexit pastor bonus ... ovibus*, **F-Arras 444**, fol. 147r 230
 11.2a. *Tres haute amor jolie* (1079), **fr.845** no. 3, fol. 184r 234
 11.2b. *Hé Deus! que ferai?* (1087), **fr.845** no. 11, fol. 189r 235
 11.3a. *Li dous termines m'agree* (593)/*Balaam* (M81), **Noailles** no. 8, fol. 180v 238
 11.3b. Song *Li dous termines m'agree* (RS 490), **Noailles** fol. 120v (above, and edition of the text), and **K p.** 133 (below, transposed a 5th higher) 239
 11.4. *Par main s'est levee la bele Maros* (528c)/*Florebit* (M53), **Noailles** no. 38, fol. 187r 240

Matthew P. Thomson, *Building a Motet around Quoted Material: Textual and Musical Structure in Motets Based on Monophonic Songs*

- 12.1. Analytical edition of *Onques n'amai tant/Sancte Germane*, based on **W2** fols. 219av–220r 246–7
 12.2. Opening of *Bien me doi/J'e n'ai que que/Kyrie fons* 249
 12.3. Analytical edition of *Par une matinee/O clemencie fons/D'un joli dart*, based on **Mo** fols. 355v–356v 256–60

Jared C. Hartt, *The Duet Motet in England: Genre, Tonal Coherence, Reconstruction*

- 13.1. *Jesu/Jhesu/Jesu*, L₁–L₁₀ 264
 13.2. *Jesu/Jhesu/Jesu*, L₃₄–L₃₇ 269
 13.3. *Jesu/Jhesu/Jesu*, L₅₄–L₆₄ 270
 13.4. *Rosa/[Regali]/Regalis*, L₁–L₁₄ 272–3
 13.5. *Rosa/[Regali]/Regalis*, L₅₂–L₆₀ 276
 13.6. *Majori vi leticie/[Missing Tenor]/Majorem intelligere* 278–9
 13.7. Comparison of the reconstructed tenor with 'Majorem caritatem nemo habet' 281
 13.8. *Majori vi leticie/[Majorem caritatem]/Majorem intelligere* 282–3

Anna Zayaruznaya, <i>Materia Matters: Reconstructing Colla/Bona</i>	
14.1. <i>Libera me de sanguinibus</i> , F-Pn lat. 10482, fol. 163v	289
14.2. <i>Colla/Bona</i> , tenor, borrowed chant notes and taleae marked (ligatures expanded)	294
14.3. <i>Colla/Bona</i> , breves 64–75	294
14.4. <i>Colla/Bona</i> , upper-voice blocks aligned, periodically repeating rhythms (taleae) shaded, boundaries of text lines indicated with bold box-tipped lines	299
Margaret Bent, <i>Machaut's Motet 10 and its Interconnections</i>	
15.1. <i>Hareu! hareu! le feu/Helas! ou sera pris confors/Obediens usque ad mortem</i>	303–5
15.2. The tenor of M10	308
15.3. Prominent motives in M10	308
15.4. Final cadences of M4, M10, and M15	314
15.5. Openings of M15 and M10, and the 'Amours' motive	317
Sarah Fuller, <i>A Motet Conceived in Troubled Times: Machaut's Motet 22</i>	
16.1. M22, introitus and T ₁ , L ₁ –L ₁₀	324–5
16.2. M22, color and tenor-contratenor, T ₁	328
16.3. M22, disruptive periodic rhythms, T ₃ , L ₅ to T ₄ , L ₁	329
16.4. M22, tonal outline	334
16.5. M22, approaches to C sonorities, T ₂ , L ₁ –L ₈	336
16.6. M22, salient triplum phrase and motive, T ₂ , L ₁₂ to T ₃ , L ₁	338
Emily Zazulia, <i>A Motet Ahead of its Time? The Curious Case of Portio nature/Ida capillorum</i>	
17.1. <i>Portio/Ida</i> , bars 1–6, readings in Iv and Ch	346
17.2. <i>Portio/Ida</i> , bars 43–6, motetus, readings in Iv and Ch	346
17.3. <i>Portio/Ida</i> , bars 89–93, edited from Iv	347

TABLES

Elizabeth Eva Leach, <i>The Genre(s) of Medieval Motets</i>	
1.1. Concordant motets in D308	20–1
1.2. Textual comparison of D308 Mot4 and Mo 21	28
1.3. Textual comparison of D308 Mot6 and Mo 33	34
Catherine A. Bradley, <i>Origins and Interactions: Clausula, Motet, Conductus</i>	
2.1. Text and translation of <i>Homo quam sit pura</i>	49
Lawrence Earp, <i>Isorhythm</i>	
4.1. Phrase structure of <i>Solaris/Gregorius/Petre. Onc 362</i> , fol. 89r	90
Karen Desmond, <i>Notations</i>	
5.1. Species, names, shapes, and durations of notes in the Franconian system	111
5.2. Manuscript sources of <i>Super/Presidentes</i>	113
5.3. Choices of transcription for breves subdivided into two or three	114
5.4. Semibreve patterns in <i>Rosa delectabilis/Regalis</i>	121
5.5. Italian <i>divisiones</i> , with the <i>divisio</i> names and common meter signatures indicated	123
5.6. The four mensuration combinations outlined in the Vitriacan <i>ars nova</i> treatises	127
Dolores Pesce, <i>Thirteenth-Century Motet Functions: Views through the Lens of the Portare Motet Family</i>	
6.1. Thirteenth-century motets based on the chant segment <i>portare</i> or <i>sustinere</i>	135
6.2. Poetic form in Mo 148	145
Jennifer Saltzstein, <i>Clerics, Courtiers, and the Vernacular Two-Voice Motet: The Case of Fines amouretes/Fiat and the Roman de la poire</i>	
9.1. Refrains shared between the <i>Roman de la poire</i> and the motet repertoire	200
Gaël Saint-Cricq, <i>Motets in Chansonniers and the Other Culture of the French Thirteenth-Century Motet</i>	
11.1. Thirteenth-century chansonniers with motets	227
11.2. The monophonic motets <i>entés</i> in fr.845 with their refrain-quotations	233
Jared C. Hartt, <i>The Duet Motet in England: Genre, Tonal Coherence, Reconstruction</i>	
13.1. Poetry and translations of <i>Jesu/Jhesu/Jesu</i>	265–6
13.2. Phrasing, sonorities, and cadences in <i>Jesu/Jhesu/Jesu</i>	268
13.3. Poetry and translations of <i>Rosa/[Regali]/Regalis</i>	273–4
13.4. Phrasing and cadences in <i>Rosa/[Regali]/Regalis</i>	275
Anna Zayaruznaya, <i>Materia Matters: Reconstructing Colla/Bona</i>	
14.1. Duration of poetic lines in <i>Colla/Bona</i>	293
Margaret Bent, <i>Machaut's Motet 10 and its Interconnections</i>	
15.1. M10, verses lined up with taleae	306

CONTRIBUTORS

Margaret Bent	Emeritus Fellow, All Souls College, University of Oxford
Jacques Boogaart	Associate Professor (retired), University of Amsterdam
Catherine A. Bradley	Associate Professor, University of Oslo
Alice V. Clark	Professor, Loyola University New Orleans
Suzannah Clark	Professor, Harvard University
Karen Desmond	Assistant Professor, Brandeis University
Lawrence Earp	Professor Emeritus, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Sarah Fuller	Professor Emeritus, Stony Brook University
John Haines	Professor, University of Toronto
Jared C. Hartt	Associate Professor, Oberlin College Conservatory
Elizabeth Eva Leach	Professor, University of Oxford
Dolores Pesce	Avis Blewett Professor of Music, Washington University in St. Louis
Gaël Saint-Cricq	Maitre de conférences, Université de Rouen
Jennifer Saltzstein	Associate Professor, University of Oklahoma
Matthew P. Thomson	Fitzjames Research Fellow, Merton College, University of Oxford
Stefan Udell	Ph.D. candidate, University of Toronto
Anna Zayaruznaya	Associate Professor, Yale University
Emily Zazulia	Shirley Shenker Assistant Professor, University of California, Berkeley

PREFACE

Music, like many art forms, underwent numerous changes and developments in the medieval period. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in particular, a genre of music – *motets* – emerged as a dominant vehicle for composers. In fact, many scholars would consider motets to constitute the most important genre of *polyphony*: that is, instead of penning a stand-alone melody (monophony), composers would write and/or arrange two or more melodies to be performed simultaneously (polyphony). Moreover, medieval motets are intrinsically involved in the early development of polyphonic music, especially in regards to the development of rhythm and its notation; the study of motets throughout the two centuries in question reveals a fascinating evolution of polyphonic experimentation and mastery.

Yet, it is nearly impossible to come up with a precise definition for the genre of medieval motets. Briefly put, beginning in the early 1200s, motets provided an outlet for composers to set poetry to music, but, intriguingly, composers often set two or more different poems to be sung *at the same time*. Frequently, these simultaneous poems would be sung against yet another melody, the tenor, which was almost always textless and in a lower register than the texted voices, and which was usually borrowed, sometimes from a chant source, sometimes from a vernacular popular tune. This description does not account for all medieval motets – for instance, there is a significant body of surviving monophonic motets – but it does sum up a good deal of the extant repertory.

The subject matter of motets varies widely. Some motets feature vernacular French poems that employ the conventional tropes of ‘courtly love’. These texts might be sung against a tenor of liturgical origin, thus inviting the listener and/or reader to draw connections between the meanings of the tenor source and the poetry. Other motets serve an admonitory function, perhaps warning or counselling a king about inappropriate behaviours, or perhaps lamenting the current political climate. Still others celebrate a particular feast day or a specific person or place. Latin texts were likewise common, and sometimes composers would even set concurrent French and Latin poems.

But why would a composer set two or even three different poems to be sung at the same time? How is the listener supposed to understand the text? Gleaning meaning from motets has resulted in abundant scholarship and differing viewpoints. Some argue that the motet poems might be read aloud or even sung individually before a performance of the complete texture so that the listener could more readily comprehend its subject matter. Others regard motet composition as a quasi-intellectual exercise for the composer and contend that the listener ought to simply enjoy the polyphonic, polytextual sound.

Unfortunately, the majority of medieval composers remain anonymous to us today. Not until Guillaume de Machaut (c. 1300–77) can a substantial body of motets be firmly attributed to a single composer. Due in part to this uncertainty, relatively little is known about motet patronage in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Thankfully, however, hundreds of motets survive in dozens of manuscripts, many of which are beautifully illuminated (and many of which are available online), and it is through these manuscripts that we are able to see and hear these gems today.

The Introduction first illustrates the breadth of the genre by briefly considering ten examples, then provides chapter summaries that highlight many of the (often thorny) topics approached by the

Companion's authors. The first eight chapters address issues of genre, relationships between the motet and other musico-poetic forms, tenor organization, isorhythm, notational development, social functions, and manuscript layout. The last nine chapters consist of case studies that address a variety of specific pieces, compositional techniques, collections, and subgenres. The volume as a whole explores the rich interplay of musical, poetic, and intertextual modes of meaning specific to the genre, and the changing social and historical circumstances surrounding motets in medieval France, England, and Italy.

The chapters below often employ specialized terminology. Curious readers can refer to the glossary that appears near the end of this *Companion*, as well as to the index, which points to the use of various terms in the context of specific pieces.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to Caroline Palmer, who approached me with the idea for this *Companion* some years ago at the International Congress on Medieval Studies in Kalamazoo, Michigan. I thank her for her guidance and tremendous enthusiasm throughout the entire process of bringing this book to fruition. I thank Jennifer Bain for her advice in the earliest stages of planning the volume, and Elizabeth Eva Leach for her support and wise words throughout all stages of the project.

I am also grateful to Oberlin College for financial support for the setting of the volume's music examples – executed beautifully by Timothy Symons (www.cantusfirmusmusic.co.uk) – and for funding a student assistant, Gregory Manuel, who helped in numerous ways during the last few months of getting the volume ready for publication.

Finally, I thank all seventeen contributors, without whom, of course, the *Companion* would not be possible. I greatly appreciate their responsiveness to my countless emails and queries, and thank them all for their unwavering commitment to the project.

ABBREVIATIONS

CITED MANUSCRIPTS CONTAINING MOTETS

ArsB	Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, 3517
Ba	Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Lit. 115
BarcA	Barcelona, Biblioteca Nacional de Catalunya/Biblioteca Central, BM 853
Bes	Besançon, Bibliothèque Municipale, I, 716 (lost; only index survives)
Boul	Boulogne-sur-mer, Bibliothèque municipale, 119
Br	Brussels, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, 19606
C	Bern, Burgerbibliothek, 389
Ca	Cambrai, Mediathèque municipale, A 410 (olim 386)
CaB	Cambrai, Mediathèque municipale, B 1328
CaB 165	Cambrai, Mediathèque municipale, Inc. B 165
Cgc 512	Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 512/543
Ch	Chantilly, Bibliothèque du Château de Chantilly, 564
Châl	Châlons-en-Champagne, Archives départementales de la Marne, 3.J.250
Cl	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, nouv. acq. fr. 13521
Cpc 228	Cambridge, Pembroke College, 228
D308	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 308
DRc 20	Durham, Cathedral Library, C.I. 20
F	Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 29.1
Fauv	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 146
Ferrell 1	Kansas City, private library of James E. and Elizabeth J. Ferrell
fr.845	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 845
fr.1589	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 1589
GB-OH	London, British Library, Add. 57950
GB-Ir 30	Ipswich, Suffolk Record Office, HA 30: 50/22/13.15
Graz	Graz, Universitätsbibliothek 409
H	Modena, Biblioteca estense universitaria, α.R.4.4
Ha	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 25566
Her	Leuven, Universiteitsbibliotheek, two parchment flyleaves
Hu	Burgos, Monasterio de las Huelgas, 9
I-Gr 224	Grottaferrata, Biblioteca del Monumento Nazionale, Kript. Lat. 224
I-MFA	Montefiore dell'Aso, Biblioteca-Archivio di Francesco Egidi, s.s. Egidi
Iv	Ivrea, Biblioteca Capitolare, 115
K	Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, 5198
k	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 12786
Lbl 1210	London, British Library, Sloane 1210
Lbl 24198	London, British Library, Add. 24198
LoA	London, British Library, Egerton 2615

LoB	London, British Library, Egerton 274
LoC	London, British Library, Add. 30091
LoHa	London, British Library, Harl. 978
Ma	Madrid, Biblioteca nacional, 20486
Mach A	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 1584
Mach B	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 1585
Mach C	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 1586
Mach E	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 9221
Mach F-G	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 22545 and 22546
McVeagh	London, British Library, Add. 41667
Mesmes	Chansonnier de Mesmes (lost)
Mo	Montpellier, Bibliothèque interuniversitaire, Section de médecine, H.196
Mod	Modena, Biblioteca Estense, α.M.5.24
MüA	Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, gallo-rom.42
MüB	Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, lat. 16444
NL-Lu 342a	Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Fragment L.T.K. 342a
Noailles	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 12615
NYpm 978	New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, 978
O	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 846
Ob 7	Oxford, Bodleian Library, E Mus 7
Ob 20	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Latin liturgical d. 20 (includes fragments formerly catalogued as Ob Auct F. inf. 1.3, Ob Bodl. 862, Ob Hatton 31, and photographs of non-Bodleian fragments)
Ob 213	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Canon. Misc. 213
Ob 271*	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 271*
Ob 594	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 594
Onc 362	Oxford, New College, 362
Oxf Add.	Oxford Bodleian Library, Add. A. 44
P	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 847
Pic	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Collection de Picardie 67
Pn 571	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 571
Pru	Princeton, University Library, Garrett 119
Ps	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 11266
Q15	Bologna, Museo Internazionale e Biblioteca della Musica di Bologna, Q15
R	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 1591
Reg1490	Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 1490
Robertsbridge	London, British Library, Add. 28550
Roi	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 844
S	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 12581
Sab	Rome, Convento di Santa Sabina, Biblioteca della Curia generalizia dei Domenicani, XIV L 3
Str	Strasbourg, Bibliothèque municipale, 222 C. 22 (lost)
StV	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 15139
To	Toledo, Biblioteca Capitular, BCT 98.281
Tort	Tortosa, Biblioteca de la Catedral, C 97

Trém	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, nouv. acq. fr. 23190
Troyes 1949	Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, 1949
Tu	Turin, Biblioteca Reale, vari 42
TuB	Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, J.II.9
U	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 20050
V	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 24406
W1	Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 628 Helmst.
W2	Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 1099 Helmst.
WoC	Worcester, Dean and Chapter library, Add. 68.
X	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, nouv. acq. fr. 1050

OTHER CITED MANUSCRIPTS

F-Arras 444	Arras, Médiathèque municipale, 444
F-Dm 526	Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, 526
F-LA 263	Laon, Bibliothèque municipale, 263
F-Pn f. fr. 372	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 372
F-Pn f. fr. 837	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 837
F-Pn f. fr. 1593	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 1593
F-Pn f. fr. 2186	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 2186
F-Pn f. fr. 23111	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 23111
F-Pn f. fr. 24729	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, f. fr. 24729
F-Pn lat. 1112	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 1112
F-Pn lat. 7378A	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 7378A
F-Pn lat. 10482	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 10482
F-Pn lat. 13091	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 13091
F-Pn lat. 14452	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14452
F-Pn lat. 14741	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 14741
F-Pn lat. 15181	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 15181
GB-Cu 710	Cambridge, University Library, Add. 710
GB-Mr [96] 66	Manchester, John Rylands University Library, [96] 66
GB-Ob 264	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 264
I-Rvat 307	Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. lat. 307

OTHER ABBREVIATIONS

B	breve
C	color
DIAMM	Refers to <i>Digital Image Archive of Medieval Music</i> at http://www.diamm.ac.uk . Login required.
Grove	Refers to <i>Grove Music Online</i> at http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com . Author and entry information is provided in the text itself or a footnote. When a print edition is referred to specifically, a complete citation appears in the bibliography.
L	long
M	minim
mo	motetus

S	semibreve
T	talea
tr	triplum

It has become standard in scholarship of the thirteenth-century motet to refer to tenors, texts, trouvère songs, and refrains not only by name but also by number. Accordingly, upon first mention in each chapter, motet tenors and texts are identified by the numbers assigned to them in Ludwig 1910–78 and Gennrich 1957. For tenor voices, if identifiable, an M indicates a chant segment used for the Mass while an O indicates a chant used for the Office. Songs are identified with RS numbers provided in Spanke 1955. Refrains are identified with vdB numbers provided in van den Boogaard 1969.

It has also become customary to identify the motets of the fourteenth-century composer Guillaume de Machaut by number. M₁, for instance, refers to his Motet 1, *Quant en moy vint premierement Amours/Amour et biauté/Amara Valde*. These M-numbers are distinct from those that identify tenors of thirteenth-century motets; throughout the volume, the intended meaning of each M-number is clarified by its surrounding context.

Authors refer to specific pitches by using the following in italics: *A B C D E F G a b c d e f g a' b' c' d' e'*, in which *c* corresponds to C₄ (middle c). Non-italicized, upper-case letters are used to refer to a pitch in general, without specific reference to octave.

INTRODUCTION

Approaching Medieval Motets*

Jared C. Hartt

THE TITLE OF THIS VOLUME may seem rather straightforward, but it has been deliberately chosen to reflect one of the book's main points. *A Critical Companion to Medieval Motets* – rather than *A Critical Companion to the Medieval Motet* – signals that the motet, essentially, cannot be regarded as a single thing: not only do motets change drastically throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (and beyond), but even motets that are contemporaneous with one another often exhibit such wildly different characteristics that one would be hard-pressed to come up with a suitable definition for the genre.

What then are medieval motets? Combing through various musical dictionaries and textbooks, one will typically find the motet defined as a polyphonic composition with two differently texted upper voices operating over a pre-existing tenor line drawn from chant.¹ To be sure, there exist hundreds of medieval motets that fit this description. But there also exist hundreds of motets that do not. Perhaps the most effective way to convey a sense of the sheer breadth of the genre is through a glance at a handful of contrasting examples discussed throughout the volume; these motets range from the first decades of the thirteenth century to the onset of the fifteenth century, the scope of the *Companion*.

Take for instance the subgenre of two-voice motets. *Salve salus, hominum/Et gaudebit* is a short work that appears in F, one of the earliest motet sources. As shown in Example 4.3 (p. 81 below), the melody of its tenor, *Et gaudebit*, is drawn from the Alleluia for the feast of the Ascension and proceeds in a pattern that alternates long and short notes. The motet's texted Latin upper voice (the motetus or duplum, interchangeably) is declaimed in the same basic rhythms with poetic lines that are almost all of the same length. Like the majority of medieval motets, its composer remains unknown to us today. We can compare this with another two-voice motet, *Fines amouretes/Fiat*, that appears in the slightly later W2 manuscript. As is illustrated in Example 9.1 (p. 195), its upper voice is in French and contains a refrain in lines 9, 10, and 11 (enclosed in quotation marks) that

* I extend my sincere thanks to Gregory Manuel, a student from my undergraduate Medieval Motets course in 2016, who very enthusiastically read all of the volume's chapters in May and June 2017 and provided written responses to each. Since this *Companion* is aimed not only at specialists in the field, but also at upper-level undergraduate students interested in medieval motets, as well as graduate students of all levels, Greg's summaries, reactions, and questions were immensely helpful in formulating this introduction; indeed, many of Greg's insightful observations appear throughout.

¹ See, for instance, the 'Motet' entry in the *Harvard Dictionary of Music*: 'The term motet denoted a particular structure: a tenor derived from chant that serves as the foundation for newly composed upper voices; the resulting composition is heterogeneous both in the musical style of the individual voices and in their texts'. Randel 2003, 589.

also appears within the allegorical verse narrative *Roman de la poire*; this motet exhibits the close relationship between the genres of motet and secular song. Just a few pages earlier in **W2** appears another two-voice motet, *Onques n'amai tant/Sancte Germane*, provided in its entirety in Example 12.1 (pp. 246–7). Again, its motetus is in French, but this entire voice is borrowed, having already existed as the first strophe of a monophonic song. Although its tenor incipit may suggest the tenor melody was drawn from a liturgical source as in the other two motets just discussed, it was almost certainly composed afresh to provide appropriate counterpoint with the secular upper voice.

A large number of motets, however, possess more than two voices: one such motet is *Celui en qui je me fi/La bele estoile de mer/La bele, en qui je me fi/[Jo]han[ne]*, which appears in the second fascicle of the so-called Montpellier codex (**Mo**), the most extensive source of thirteenth-century motets. A look at Example 10.2 (pp. 215–17) reveals that three different French poems are sung simultaneously above the tenor, thereby exhibiting a decidedly polytextual texture.² The last fascicle of **Mo** contains the motet *Par une matinee/O clemencie fons/D'un joli dart* (Example 12.3, (pp. 256–60)). Its tenor is not liturgical, but rather a borrowed secular song, and the refrain-ABABX-refrain structure inherited from this song serves to organize the entire motet. Moreover, its two upper voices proceed in different languages: French in the triplum, Latin in the motetus. The upper-voice rhythms of both of these motets are much freer in nature than the predominantly modal rhythms of the earlier examples.

In stark contrast to all the aforementioned works stands *Tres haute amor jolie*, shown below in Example 11.2a (p. 234), an instance of a monophonic motet. This brief piece appears alongside fourteen others in its source – the chansonnier **fr.845** of non-Parisian origins, from either Picardy or Artois – preceded by a rubric naming the pieces as ‘motets’. And sixty-three motets of this hitherto largely ignored subgenre appear in another chansonnier, **D308**, from Metz. Continuing to move even further from Paris and returning to polyphonic textures, *Jesu fili Dei/Jhesu fili virginis/Jesu lumen veritatis* is a motet of English origins from the early fourteenth century whose beginning appears in Example 13.1 (p. 264). Its tenor occupies instead the middle register, while the two outer voices are declaimed homorhythmically.

On the continent in the fourteenth century, three further examples will suffice to continue illustrating the broad scope of the genre. Guillaume de Machaut's *Hareu! hareu! le feu/Helas! ou sera pris confors/Obediens usque ad mortem* (**M10**) is provided in its entirety in Example 15.1 (pp. 303–5), as well as in Figure 8.5 (p. 188), a reproduction of the folios that contain the motet in Machaut's earliest complete works manuscript, **Mach C**. Significantly, Machaut was one of the first motet composers to ensure his name would be remain firmly associated with his compositions. The lengthy tenor melody, stated twice but with shorter note values the second time, is divided and organized into regularly repeating rhythmic patterns, as indicated by the annotations in the example. The upper-voice poems, written by Machaut, are sung in much faster rhythms than the tenor, and express the courtly love rhetoric typical for motets of the period. This motet stands in contrast to his later *Tu qui gregem/Plange regni respublica/Apprehende arma et scutum/Contratenor* (**M22**), in which the upper voices are both Latin and address current political events of the late 1350s. As shown in Example 16.1 (pp. 324–5), **M22** begins with an extended introitus, sung first by the motetus voice only, then joined by the triplum. Only later does the entire four-voice texture begin; the fourth voice here is not a texted quadruplum, but is instead an untexted contratenor that shares its range and much slower note values with the tenor. Finally, *O felix templum/O felix templum* is an Italian motet from c. 1402 whose two upper voices share a single text honoring a

² Bars 1–4 of the example provide the Latin duplum as it appears in a two-voice version of the motet.

bishop of Padua; the freely composed tenor, which is not organized into repeating rhythmic units, serves more as an accompaniment to the dueting upper voices. Excerpts from the uppermost voice are illustrated in both original and modern notation in Example 5.8 (p. 126).

With just a quick glance at these ten specimens, the extensive variety that exists within the genre is thus evident. Medieval motets are not necessarily polytextual. Nor are they necessarily polyphonic. Nor do they necessarily feature a pre-composed tenor. As such, plausibly the most accurate – albeit unsatisfyingly general – definition appears in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*: ‘a style of vocal composition that has undergone numerous transformations through many centuries’.³ Although this definition also accounts for motets beyond the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and while it could actually describe musical genres beyond the motet as well, it captures the broad scope of the motet genre that is made abundantly clear in the chapters and myriad music examples comprising this *Companion*.

The ‘motet’ entry in *Grove* seems to accommodate the majority of the motets from our group of ten; however, it still excludes the monophonic, English, and Italian examples. The entry also offers a summary of the genre’s origins:

It originated as a liturgical trope but soon developed into the pre-eminent form of secular art music during the late Middle Ages. The medieval motet was a polyphonic composition in which the fundamental voice (tenor) was usually arranged in a pattern of reiterated rhythmic configurations, while the upper voice or voices (up to three), nearly always with different Latin or French texts, generally moved at a faster rate.⁴

Thus, we are told about the motet’s liturgical origins and its polyphonic texture, as well as the ‘fundamental’ role of the tenor, which also implies the tenor’s chronological priority within the motet composition process.

The *Companion*’s seventeen chapters make clear, however, that we have moved from this once fairly well-agreed-upon history of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century motets to a much more plural understanding that is contested in certain key areas. We now have varying viewpoints on the origins of the genre that resist, challenge, and sometimes even invert the standard teleological narratives of the genre’s history. The previously assumed trajectories from clausula to motet, sacred to secular, and Latin to French, are all questioned, often through engagement with a substantial body of songbook motets frequently overlooked in scholarship. The bias toward not just French, but more specifically Parisian, sources and their repertoires is both highlighted and corrected in many chapters. Motets of English provenance are brought back into play in current scholarship through discussions of their unique generic and notational characteristics.

The determinacy and foundational role of the tenor is also contested in several instances. The fraught terms ‘isorhythm’ and ‘isorhythmic motets’ are reconsidered. The development of notation – intrinsically linked to the development of the motet – is presented in a new light. The overriding general fixation with polytextuality in scholarship is addressed and rectified.

Dividing into two broad sections, the *Companion*’s first eight chapters address several of the aforementioned fundamental topics individually, delving into questions of genre, the motet’s origins, the role of the tenor, isorhythm, motet notations, the various functions of motets spanning both centuries in question, and aspects of manuscript layout and culture. The second section consists of nine chapters we might consider case studies; these chapters exhibit a variety of

³ See <https://www.britannica.com/art/motet>.

⁴ See ‘Motet, §I: Middle Ages’ by Ernest H. Sanders and Peter M. Lefferts in *Grove*.

musical, textual, and musico-textual approaches to a broad range of the repertoire spanning the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in both France and England.

In Chapter 1, Elizabeth Eva Leach considers issues of genre and origins through the lens of the substantial motet collection in **D308**, a chansonnier copied in Metz. As Leach points out, that the sixty-three motets in this manuscript have been largely ignored to this point is significant, yet perhaps unsurprising since they are recorded only as texts without musical notation. Reflecting on the fact that **D308** is the sole extant source to contain motetus texts with concordances in both polyphonic motet sources as well as in sources of notated monophonic motets *entés*, Leach ponders several questions: what can the collection in **D308** tell us about the genre of motets? How might these motets have been performed? What would the scribe or readers of **D308** have called these pieces? And perhaps most tantalizingly, through a detailed look at two **D308** motets specifically, does this large group of pieces indicate that there were actually a greater number of monophonic motets than previously thought – in short, did some motetus voices known to us today only in their polyphonic contexts first exist in monophonic forms?

In considering the origins of ‘motet’, both as a genre and as a term, Leach argues that the word came to encompass polyphonic liturgical works only later through analogy, and suggests that the pieces typically referred to as ‘motets’ today are best regarded as a hybridization of pieces arising through the retrofitting of monophonic French pieces with a tenor and (often) upper voices, and those arising from the addition of words to melismatic liturgical polyphonic *discant* (*clausulae*). Her chapter thus pushes back against some of the most common narratives surrounding motet origins discussed above – in particular, the notion of the motet’s genesis as a polyphonic elaboration on liturgical chant segments, and the notion of its historical progression from sacred Latin texts to eventually including secular French texts – and at the same time, through her discussion of how a monophonic motet might be adapted into a polyphonic work, Leach challenges the presumption of the tenor as necessarily being the foundation of a motet.

With a similar penchant for disrupting tidy origin stories, Catherine A. Bradley demonstrates in Chapter 2 that the traditional view of motets as derived from *clausulae* is too simplistic. Disputing any totalizing chronological approach, she does not argue conversely that *clausulae* necessarily tend to come from motets, but rather that the written transmissions of motets and *clausulae* fail to fully capture the complex ecology of their performances, and that we should therefore approach genre distinctions with greater flexibility.

Working with the motet *Homo quam sit pura/Latus* and its corresponding *clausula Latus 4*, Bradley compares various existing versions of the *clausula* (in **F** and **W1**) to suggest that *Latus 4*’s own circulation must have been influenced by the motet’s circulation. In surveying other *clausulae* in these manuscripts, she concludes that most *clausulae* in fact serve as rather poor rhythmic indicators for their motets, therefore discouraging the conclusion that these *clausulae* were designed for the purpose of serving as rhythmic guides. Moreover, she argues that *clausulae* are often not as necessary as one might think for the accurate rhythmicization of a motet; rather, concrete tenor rhythms, vertical harmonies, syllable stress, and familiarity with performance practice might have made it fairly easy for experienced singers to work out the rhythms despite notational ambiguity.

Bradley also demonstrates the slippage between *conductus*, *conductus motets*, *motets*, and *clausulae* in order to show the various modes of transforming one genre into another. Instead of reading the particular ordering of the early motet manuscripts by genre as a sign of generic fixity, she instead suggests that this ordering represents a kind of struggle against generic flexibility, and that scholars have taken these distinctions too literally. Through her consideration of issues of performance, ephemerality, and the problems with the written archive, Bradley, in essence, reads the motet manuscripts as much for what they hide as for what they show.

Alice V. Clark, in the third chapter, considers varieties and functions of the tenor in medieval motets, foregrounding the tenor's development and varying roles in the compositional process. Clark focuses on the tenor in France, but also usefully considers the frequently differing tenor functions in motets of English and Italian provenances. While many of the *Companion's* chapters aim to show different ways in which the tenor and upper voices are mutually implicated and intertwined, Clark instead steps back and highlights the ways in which the tenor differs sonically and organizationally from the other motet voices, regardless of whether or not the tenor comes first in a given compositional process.

To begin her tracing of the tenor in the thirteenth century, Clark considers motets derived from *clausulae*, which already contain a rhythmicized and organized tenor and upper voice. She explains that the departure of motets from *clausulae* allowed for motets to expand further beyond the meaning of their chants, and allowed for the selection of tenors from sources beyond solo portions of responsorial chants, even including, at times, secular sources. She argues that there is an important distinction between a thirteenth-century framework in which upper-voice material tropes the tenor in order to expand on its local meaning and its liturgical context, and a fourteenth-century framework in which the tenor itself is selected to expand, often via a shared word, on the material of the upper voices. Clark shows that a tenor might be selected by a motet composer not only to accord with the upper-voice poetry (as outlined somewhat ambiguously in Egidius de Murino's oft-cited treatise), but also that tenors are sometimes carefully selected to afford opportunities for composing cadences. Clark highlights the difficulty modern listeners face in hearing the lengthy repeating tenor structures as the fundamental organizational principle of motets, yet argues that one can learn to hear these structural, repeating patterns with practice.

In Chapter 4, Lawrence Earp provides a thorough historical contextualization of 'isorhythm', addresses the term's shortcomings, and offers instead a new framework through which fourteenth-century motets ought to be considered and analyzed. He suggests that usage of both 'isorhythm' and 'isorhythmic motet' precipitates a tendency to read fourteenth-century motets that do not happen to employ precise rhythmic repetition as somehow less developed, and furthermore, that the term makes it difficult to account for the kinds of repetition present in thirteenth-century motets. Earp demonstrates how poetic declamation served as an instigator for rhythmic content in much of the earlier motet repertory, and that isoperiodicity in English motets – some of which date well into the fourteenth century – has its origins in such declamation patterns. This sets the English concept of isoperiodicity apart from French isoperiodicity, which instead emerged through a deprioritization of poetic declamation.

In outlining Friedrich Ludwig and Heinrich Bessler's use of the term within their narrative of motet development, Earp intervenes by arguing that the fourteenth-century motet is more appropriately characterized by the aesthetic impulse to saturate all levels of a work with meaning; this semiotic operation has been obscured by the overuse of the term 'isorhythm', which prioritizes exclusively precise rhythmic repetition and reifies such repetition as a narrative endpoint. Accordingly, through analysis of a number of specific motets, Earp demonstrates the variety of methods through which composers might embed a certain meaning within all levels of a motet's organization. Prioritizing this kind of semiotic saturation as a core principle of the fourteenth-century motet, he argues that literal isorhythm is but one of many ways through which meanings might be embedded. Earp proposes that the general task of analysis, from this point, is to survey both the range of motet subject matter and the range of techniques through which this subject matter is rendered musically.

Karen Desmond, in the next chapter, traces the development of rhythmic notation in medieval motets. She shows how the evolution of the motet placed various demands on notational systems,

precipitating a cycle in which notational ambiguities continually arose and attempts to address them engendered new kinds of ambiguities – eventually resulting in the direct correspondences between specific visual signs and specific rhythmic durations that characterize modern notation. Desmond argues that this clarity, however, comes at the cost of the flexibility and nuance of the earlier, more ambiguous notation. Consequently, she suggests that we should not be too eager to accept later scribes' versions of earlier motets as definitive; their more precise notations might obfuscate some of the rhythmic play afforded by the ambiguity of the earlier versions.

Desmond selects several motets for examination, each of which is present in at least two different sources corresponding to different stages of the development of notation. In so doing, she demonstrates some of the methods through which motet scholars can reconstruct rhythms from ambiguous notation – harmonic considerations, for instance, might resolve some of these ambiguities – all the while invoking contemporaneous theoretical writings. Desmond also considers the rhythmic notations in fourteenth-century English motets, noting in particular the variety of notational practices often found within a single source. She likewise describes Italian notation, highly influenced by the French *ars nova* style, and compares two versions of a specific motet extant in both an Italian notation style and in *ars nova* style. Her discussion of mensuration indications rounds off her contribution; she considers motets that play with differences in mensuration, either between voices or as a structural marker. Her myriad examples (in both 'original' and 'modern' notation), tables, and figures are particularly instructive as her argument unfolds.

To address the various functions of motets in the thirteenth century, in Chapter 6 Dolores Pesce inspects several works in a family of motets based on the *portare* tenor. In the process, Pesce introduces ways in which diverse musical, sonic, literary, and textual concerns are synthesized in motet composition in order to form a cohesive whole. She demonstrates the means through which the Marian and Christological associations of the *portare* tenor have been elaborated and allegorized by upper-voice material. She also shows how the tenor can likewise serve as a source for sonic content, outlining how upper-voice syllables often mirror the vowel sounds of the tenor and coincide assonantly at important points, thereby unifying a motet. Moreover, she illustrates how vernacular refrains may have been chosen for their assonant sounds matching those in the motet voice(s), and furthermore, that a motet itself could be the source of refrain material for a vernacular devotional work. In contemplating that many motet refrains were not in fact quotations, she argues that motet composers rather aimed to make such 'pseudo-refrains' appear as if they were quoting another work in order to perform a certain learnedness, often through citing a general literary tradition of drawing connections between divine love and courtly love.

Pesce also addresses issues of textual audibility, demonstrating methods through which composers might ensure textual clarity at key moments – an important issue considering the performativity of learnedness that she elucidates from the citational tendencies of motet texts. Turning to how the motet can function as a site of musical exploration for a composer, Pesce considers tonal aspects of motet composition; in particular, she demonstrates how cadential strength and weakness might be employed in order to shape a motet into a cohesive whole.

Pesce thus offers a firm foundation for the kinds of devotional and courtly love themes that Jacques Boogaart takes as a starting point in Chapter 7, in which he highlights political commentary as a new function for fourteenth-century motets. To explore this thematic possibility, Boogaart begins with a discussion of the motet *Scariotis falsitas/Jure quod in opera* from the manuscript of the interpolated *Roman de Fauvel* (**Fauv**). Like Pesce, he argues that the audience of such motets would likely have needed to be well learned in order to understand the allegories and quotations obfuscated by the polytextual context; moreover, he draws on existing writings by theorists that support the notion that fourteenth-century motets were appropriate for erudite audiences and

that singers of motets were revered for their high degree of musicianship. He suggests that motets may have been performed and critiqued as part of a society of learned musicians, and outlines the function of the motet as a means to praise or admonish certain nobles within ceremonies, mentioning only a limited number of functions of motets within the liturgy.

Boogaart discusses how the admonitory function of many fourteenth-century motets was gradually replaced by a more celebratory one, a trend that continued into the fifteenth century. The fact that more composer attributions have been made in the fourteenth century – either directly as in Machaut's case, or less directly as in many motets composed by his slightly older contemporary Phillipe de Vitry – allows Boogaart to consider another function of fourteenth-century motets: as personal, intellectual endeavors by their composers. He addresses this function by discussing a few motets by Machaut that engage with earlier motets attributed to Vitry and shows that the two composers often come to different personal conclusions about topics such as love. In particular, Boogaart discusses Machaut's M10 and its engagement with Vitry's motet *Douce playsence/Garison selon nature/Neuma quinti toni*, and entertains the intriguing possibility that such a dialogue between the two motets may have come about from in-person discussions.

In Chapter 8, John Haines and Stefan Udell introduce many of the most important manuscript sources for motets, and consider the shifting cultural contexts in which they were produced as well as the specifics of their organization and layout (*mise-en-page*). Through discussion of several sources – accompanied by numerous full-page reproductions of select folios containing complete motets often also discussed in other chapters in the volume – they demonstrate that, in contrast to the 'sameness' typical of printed works, variations in presentation of the same material in different manuscripts can be especially informative. They likewise show how layout in a single source can lend a further layer of meaning to a motet.

After outlining the process of manuscript production, Haines and Udell argue that medieval motet sources were created at a midway point in the history of the manuscript in general, which, they state, was transitioning from a 'sacred object' to a commodity circulating among a growing urban bourgeois class. In particular, they point to Arras, the home of the **Roi** and **Noailles** chansonniers – two sources of great import that are focused upon and viewed in a different light later in the volume by Gaël Saint-Cricq – as exemplifying the trend of book manufacturers catering to growing numbers of bourgeoisie and university students. The authors also argue that manuscripts such as **Fauv** were partly intended as tools of edification, with various linkages of meaning unfolding across the manuscript. Their discussion of a specific motet in **Fauv**, *La mesnie/J'ai fait*, demonstrates how layout itself can be a meaningful compositional parameter. Haines and Udell additionally describe the kinds of information imparted by erasures – they show that errors are often of a sort suggesting that scribes were copying visually from an example rather than notating from musical memory – and also consider questions of patronage.

In Chapter 9, Jennifer Saltzstein provides the volume's first exemplum chapter with a multifaceted study of a thirteenth-century two-voice motet, *Fines amouretes/Fiat*. Two-voice motets have received much less scholarly attention than their multi-voiced counterparts, largely due to their lack of contrasting upper-voice texts which often provide ample opportunity for intertextual play. Saltzstein, however, shows that, far from presenting an escape from intertextual play, this motet presents an opportunity to focus on another kind of intertextuality – that unfolding between a motet and its borrowed refrain.

Noting that *Fines amouretes/Fiat* features a refrain introduced in the motet text as a song performed by the speaker, Saltzstein turns to Thibaut's *Roman de la poire*, a romance that features this same refrain among many other lyrical insertions. While Saltzstein does not aim to

fully resolve the chronological questions of which came first – the motet or the romance – she is interested in the heretofore under-considered possibility that Thibaut may have quoted these refrains from the motet repertoire. In particular, she enables this possibility through drawing on Bradley's argument that some of earliest Latin motets were most likely contrafacta of French originals, with which Thibaut may have been familiar. Thibaut's possible familiarity with the motet repertoire is further reinforced by verses that conjoin multiple borrowings from different motet texts. She explores the notion that this compositional process might recall the genre of the motet *enté*, thereby indicating another possible point of connection between Thibaut's romance and the motet repertoire. Saltzstein likewise uses the two-voice motet to unsettle the presumption of an exclusively educated audience. She demonstrates that vernacular culture saturated the lives of motet composers in important ways, and speculates as to the musical value of these works even for listeners not learned in their intricacies.

Suzannah Clark, in Chapter 10, considers two motets, *Quant define/Quant repaire/Flos filius eius* (Mo 127) and *Celui en qui/La bele estoile de mer/La bele, en/[Jo]han[ne]* (Mo 20), for three and four voices, respectively. Despite the decidedly polytextual aspects of these motets, Clark illustrates how *monotextual* interplay between the upper voices features prominently. Intriguingly, she argues that these monotextual moments are not about sameness but rather emphasize difference, and thus resonate with the polytextual aesthetic underpinnings of the genre.

Clark suggests that Mo 127 requires an 'ecological listener': the motet conjures two diametrically opposed landscapes at once, and asks listeners to hold this tension in their head as these landscapes pivot on shared words. She thus argues that textual listening here is not simply about picking up on a few key words that stick out of the texture, as is the case in many other polytextual motets. Turning to Mo 20, she outlines the vast network of motets to which it belongs, a network that also includes two- and three-voice versions in both Latin and French. Contrary to prior scholarship, she demonstrates that the French texts preceded the Latin iterations, and that the two-voice version in fact constitutes a nucleus that was in turn expanded, rather than the four-voice version having been stripped of its voices. Clark shows that the quadruplum (the last added voice) and motetus, both poems in which the protagonist professes his love for his lady, are unified through several monotextual moments, but the quadruplum is likewise unified with the triplum, a Marian address, through the sharing of musical material and parallel voice leading. Thus, while the quadruplum's text on its own addresses the earthly lady, by being joined musically with the triplum, it likewise addresses the Blessed Virgin.

In Chapter 11, Gaël Saint-Cricq turns to thirteenth-century motets found in *trouvère* chansonniers as a way of providing insight into the genre's circulation outside of Paris. These songbooks of borderland provenance offer a substantial repertoire of over 200 different motets. Noting the high degree of motets that circulate only in chansonniers and do not correspond to motets in the major Parisian polyphonic repertoire, Saint-Cricq demonstrates that these motets come from a culture of their own, separate from the clerics in Paris, and instead part of the world of the provincial *trouvères*. Thus, the more typical narratives of a liturgical-to-secular trajectory and the determinacy of the tenor are insufficient to account for the non-Parisian repertoire found in *trouvère* chansonniers.

Beginning with *Noailles*, the thirteenth-century chansonnier of Artesian origins containing the greatest number of motets, Saint-Cricq shows that the motets in this manuscript are well integrated with the other genres in terms of visual presentation and shared scribal hands, and thus were not simply additions to the manuscript, but instead were explicitly intended for inclusion. He argues that *rondeau*-motets combine the polyphonic structure of the motet with the repetition schemes of the *chanson*; as such, *rondeau*-motets undermine the presumption that the

tenor is necessarily the determining voice. Turning to the fifteen monophonic motets in **fr.845**, Saint-Cricq raises the possibility that musical repetition might underpin the meaning of the term motet *enté* (in which case different words would be ‘grafted’ onto the same music), but suggests that both quotation and musical repetition are important to the subgenre. Like Leach, he notes how these pieces have received very little prior attention, and in turn advocates for the position that these monophonic pieces in fact constitute a significant part of the motet genre in general. Saint-Cricq also offers a typology of borrowings between motets and chansons, and concludes by arguing that the mutual imbrication of motet and chanson material allows us to reconsider the motet as a firm part of local *trouvère* practices, and that questions of *trouvère* authorship thus become relevant to motet scholarship.

Matthew P. Thomson, in Chapter 12, focuses on one specific type of motet-song interaction outlined by Saint-Cricq – when a stanza of a monophonic song is used to create a motet – and provides three case studies with three different emphases. Moreover, Thomson uses ‘otherness’ as an analytic optic through which to view the finished motet and the ways in which it integrates, or decidedly does not integrate, its quoted material.

In *Onques n’amai tant/Sancte Germane*, chosen to illustrate how musical elements of a quoted upper voice shape the motet’s texture, Thomson shows that the tenor, unusually, is freely composed, which allows it to accommodate the borrowed motetus. Demonstrating that the level of detail of correspondence between the tenor and the borrowed song goes further than the general structure of the song form in question, he argues that the quoted nature of the motetus is readily perceptible because it is so determinate of the tenor content; its compositional centrality makes its status as a borrowing or insertion audible. Thomson then discusses *Bien me doi/Je n’ai que que/Kyrie fons* to illustrate various means through which the text of a pre-composed monophonic song (the motetus) can influence the structure and content of the motet’s other voices. He argues that unlike *Onques/Sancte*, the quoted material in this motet is integrated in a way that is harder to detect; instead, it is intertwined imperceptibly with the triplum text. *Par une matinee/O clemencie fons/D’un joli dart* is then examined to demonstrate ways that a motet can expand both musically and textually on its quoted song, which here constitutes the tenor. Thomson details the various kinds of alterations necessary to accommodate the presence of a voice that is structured as a song and argues that the three voices are all differentiated, and thus that the quotationality or ‘otherness’ of the tenor is foregrounded through its structural compositional centrality.

In Chapter 13, I consider motets in England, which have been much less studied than their French counterparts. Focusing on a representative subgenre, the duet motet with *medius cantus* – that is, unusually, the tenor lies in the middle rather than lowest voice position – I discuss and analyze three such motets and propose a reconstruction of the missing tenor for the third. Although duet motets with *medius cantus* constitute just one of several kinds of the motet in England, and although this subgenre is not paradigmatic of the entire English motet practice, these motets do illustrate many of the genre’s most salient characteristics. Further, this specific type of motet is generally not found on the continent, and thus constitutes an interesting subgenre ripe for examination.

Jesu fili Dei/Jhesu fili virginis/Jesu lumen veritatis and *Rosa delectabilis/[Regali ex progenie]/Regalis exoritur* share many features, including isoperiodicity, assonance, and sacred Latin texts. Both motets are also tonally coherent, often centering on F, but both also feature different intermediary competing tonal centers. After having detailed the common characteristics of these two motets, and in response to the fact that the tenor of the recently discovered motet *Majori vileticie/Tenor/Majorem intelligere* is missing, I draw upon the pervasive features of the genre in order to offer a reconstruction of this tenor and in turn suggest a potential match. Noting how

the outer voices of duet motets with medius cantus often unfold in consistent ways (in terms of rhythm, phrase lengths, and counterpoint) I consider whether such motets might have been improvised around their middle-voice tenors. I interrogate the propensity to read these works only in comparison to continental motets and suggest that we instead view English motets as a functionally distinct repertory.

Returning to the continent in Chapter 14, Anna Zayaruznaya reconsiders the role of the tenor and the process of tenor construction in *Colla iugo subdere/Bona condit cetera/Libera me*, composed by Philippe de Vitry. Like A. Clark, Zayaruznaya draws on Egidius de Murino's theoretical writings that suggest that composers had some sort of *materia* in mind before selecting their tenors; however, Zayaruznaya emphasizes that we cannot be sure whether the word *materia* refers to a general topic or theme, musical elements, already-composed upper-voice texts, or perhaps a combination of these things. In addressing this uncertainty, Zayaruznaya takes interest in *Colla/Bona* because the repetition structure of its tenor differs from that of the upper voices. She then details an instructive hypothetical reverse-engineering of *Colla/Bona*.

In imagining how one might work with the *Libera me* tenor were it to have preceded the composition of the upper voices, Zayaruznaya argues that the tenor would be most suitable for a penitential motet or a lament, of which *Colla/Bona* is neither. The alternative compositional narrative she offers is that Vitry began with the topic of condemning courtiers in favor of a simpler life (a topic that also features in some of his other works) and then proceeded to write the upper-voice texts. Thus, Zayaruznaya proposes that the motet's structural concerns were largely worked out before the selection of the tenor; in other words, significant upper-voice *materia* had already been developed before the tenor was selected. As such, Zayaruznaya makes an important intervention into the presumption that tenor material comes before upper-voice poetry and structuring. But at the same time, her piece also makes evident the complexity of synthesizing – rhythmically and structurally – multiple poems and pre-existing musical material into a fourteenth-century motet.

In Chapter 15, Margaret Bent performs an in-depth analysis of *Hareu! hareu! le feu/Helas! ou sera pris confors/Obediens usque ad mortem* (M10), a motet composed by Vitry's slightly younger contemporary, Guillaume de Machaut. Although Bent mostly focuses on this single motet (M10), her chapter offers – through demonstration – various analytical frameworks with which one might approach any of Machaut's twenty-three motets, and by extension, *ars nova* motets in general.

Bent begins with the same issue of *materia* explored by A. Clark and Zayaruznaya but here demonstrates that the mutual interdependence of the tenor material and the upper-voice material complicates simplistic understandings of the tenor as merely preceding the upper voices. In particular, Bent points out that Machaut's tenors were often not taken from the beginning of their sources, but rather borrow specific words that resonate with upper-voice texts. At the same time, she complicates the issue by showing ways in which upper-voice material is dependent on tenor material in M10. In other words, Bent's and Zayaruznaya's chapters complement each other because – while both argue for a complex understanding of the interface between tenor and upper-voice material – Zayaruznaya demonstrates how the tenor is dependent on the upper voices, and Bent demonstrates how the upper voices are dependent on the tenor (which is not to say that the tenor necessarily came first). Neither author presumes that one aspect of a motet wholly or completely precedes the other; they are more interested in the complexities and intricacies of compositional processes. Bent makes this mutual complexity clear in her discussion of the difficulty of placing monosyllabic lines of poetry in the upper voices in order to have hockets coincide with *talea* division points in the tenor.

Bent does not subscribe to a methodological divide between analyzing text and music and turns instead to the interplay between musical motives and words as a subtle kind of ‘word painting’. Further, recalling her article that has since influenced several scholars in their use of the term ‘isorhythm’ (an influence that is evident throughout this *Companion*), Bent again intervenes in the overuse of the term in favor of a more discerning analysis of repetition, difference, play, and meaning.

In the next chapter, Sarah Fuller turns to a four-voice Machaut motet, *Tu qui gregem/Plange regni respublica/Apprehende arma et scutum/Contratenor* (M22). Both upper-voice poems take the form of political exhortations; this motet thus provides an example of the new political function of fourteenth-century motets discussed in Chapter 7 by Boogaart. After outlining the historical context surrounding the motet – a time characterized by war with the English, siege, nearby peasant revolts, and weak leadership – Fuller takes a specific analytical approach, one that explores how various musical aspects reinforce textual meaning and mirror this time of crisis.

Fuller outlines some unusual aspects of the tenor and suggests that the rupture of its expected pattern reinforces the upper-voice texts through mirroring the political crises of the time. Also, eschewing the term ‘isorhythm’, Fuller instead argues that periodicity is a useful concept for articulating the design of a motet. Her in-depth consideration of instability/stability as not only a structural parameter of the motet but also a textually/politically meaningful one is likewise significant; in her mapping of the motet’s tonal structure, she shows how musical instability and stability follow the text in hinting at an interplay between anxiety and hope. She likewise maps the upper-voice poetry, which is itself fairly regular; however, its structure is obscured by differing musical periodicities. Fuller also highlights audible, meaningful moments in the triplum text, as well as Machaut’s manipulation of the motetus range, which, at one significant moment, occupies the highest register in a passage expressing hope. She discusses the relationship between modern analytical visual presentations of motets (she calls this the ‘score illusion’), the part-by-part presentation of motets in the original manuscripts, and the real-time experience of listening to or performing this music. Even though Fuller engages with structural details, she cautions against seeing motets as ‘frozen architecture’ – her focus on stability and instability serves as one way of understanding how some of these structural details might translate into affective experience.

While Machaut’s M22 may be securely dated to 1358–60 due to its internal political references, the motet *Portio nature/Ida capillorum* – the subject of Chapter 17 by Emily Zazulia – cannot be dated with any type of certainty: as Zazulia elucidates, the motet, which lauds St Ida who lived some 200 years before the motet’s conception, may have been composed as early as 1342 but as late as 1376. Compounding the issue is that the motet contains stylistic features that seem to contradict external evidence as to its date of origin. As such, Zazulia confronts the difficulty of weighing stylistic evidence against the kinds of evidence provided by the motet’s sources, attributions, and texts.

Zazulia demonstrates a range of methods that have been used by scholars for dating a motet, and considers the potential shortcomings of each of those approaches. She also elucidates how the motet makes use of a homographic tenor: drawing on Bent’s critique of the overapplication of the term ‘isorhythm’, Zazulia argues that the tenor here is not isorhythmic and its unfolding instead comprises two distinct processes not reducible to isorhythm: mensural reinterpretation and diminution. In the end, she does not arrive at an answer as to the date of *Portio/Ida* – but this is not her point. Instead, this uncertainty serves as a useful way of troubling an overreliance on any single form of evidence, whether stylistic or external. In particular, Zazulia shows that what seems like ‘hard’ evidence – the ascription of the motet to a named composer, for instance – may in fact be much more ambiguous than it appears upon a closer look, and that the details of both the music and other historical sources may complicate the picture.

As the chapter summaries above illustrate, several broad themes recur throughout the volume in addition to the major contested areas mentioned toward the beginning of this introduction. For instance, many chapters engage with the various tools through which a motet composer might craft a cohesive or unified work from such seemingly disparate parts. Earp proposes that, for the *ars nova* motet, cohesion might come about through the use of a single governing concept that permeates every layer of the work. He also invokes the potential for periodic structures to function as a unifying device, pointing out that overlapping periods prevent simultaneous phrase endings and therefore delay cadences in order to sustain momentum. In my chapter, I highlight composers' use of isoperiodicity in the motet in England as a similar means of achieving compositional cohesion. The issue of tonal coherence is discussed in Pesce's chapter with regard to thirteenth-century motets, in my chapter with regard to the motet in England, and in Fuller's chapter with regard to a fourteenth-century *ars nova* motet. Sonic convergences, yet another means of achieving compositional unity, are discussed in Pesce's and S. Clark's chapters. Leach and Thomson consider the intricacies involved in aligning various kinds of borrowed or quoted material within a cohesive whole.

Another recurring theme involves the ways in which motet composers might represent textual meaning musically. Bent invokes the concept of 'word painting' in her analysis of a Machaut motet and demonstrates how a recurring melodic motive comes to represent 'amours'. More generally, upper voices often expand upon the meaning and context of the tenor, as is evident in several of the motets in the chapters below. As Zayaruznaya shows, though, this does not necessarily mean that the tenor is compositionally foundational or originary; rather, the tenor might be selected later in the composition process in order to mirror existing upper-voice words or phrases. And yet another way in which textual meaning might be imparted is discussed by Haines and Udell: in looking at **Fauv** in particular, they show how meaning might be represented visually, through *mise-en-page*.

While a great deal can be learned through looking at manuscripts, several scholars also discuss the problems associated with the written archive. Bradley demonstrates that layout tends to blur the generic fluidity exhibited between motets, *clausulae* and *conductus*. Desmond argues that the updated notation of subsequent motet versions should not necessarily be taken at face value, as the original rhythmic flexibility may be obscured. Fuller discusses the differences between a motet as found on the page as compared with a motet in performance. And while Zazulia cautions against an overreliance on composer ascription in the case of one particular motet, Boogaart, on the other hand, precisely because of composer attributions, is able to speculate on the possibility that Machaut and Vitry may have shared ideas with one another.

The concept of borrowing likewise arises throughout much of the volume, an unsurprising fact given the common practice of using pre-composed tenor melodies. But it is not just the tenor that is frequently borrowed; as many chapters attest, the refrain plays a crucial role not only in the geneses of particular motets, but also in the development of the genre as a whole. Leach, for instance, prioritizes the use of refrains in her genealogy of the genre. Saltzstein, Pesce, S. Clark, and Saint-Cricq all illustrate the importance and prevalence of refrains in motets. And as Thomson has shown, an entire song strophe may be borrowed and serve as the 'foundation' to which a tenor is added, similar in some ways to one of the *portare* motets discussed by Pesce, whose motetus voice is structured as *rondeau*, which in turn led the motet creator to structure the tenor along similar lines.

These instances of borrowing – or when works simply share material – often necessarily bring up questions of chronology. For example, in Leach's chapter, chronological questions arise concerning the relationships between *trouvère* refrains and motets in D308, as well as between D308 motets

and their concordances in *Mo*. Bradley shows the fluidity present in the relationships exhibited between motets and clausulae. Saltzstein entertains the possibility that secular romances might have quoted from a motet repertoire that would have been familiar to the *trouvères*. And issues of chronology likewise arise when motets do not necessarily share material; for instance, when comparing works with one another in attempt to date a motet, Zazulia demonstrates the thorny issue of using style for the purposes of dating, and elucidates the potential dangers in doing so.

Another prominent topic concerns textual audibility and inaudibility. Although the purported inaudibility of words within polytextual motets has received a lot of scholarly attention, Saltzstein in particular corrects the general lack of attention to the two-voice motet, the text of which necessarily does not need to compete with others in order to be heard. Pesce demonstrates procedures employed by thirteenth-century composers for ensuring that key words are audible in a three-voice setting. S. Clark challenges an interpretation of monotextual convergences as being simple moments of heightened audibility and demonstrates that the meanings of shared words can in fact be diametrically opposed. Such concerns regarding audibility and inaudibility are pertinent not only to textual aspects of motets but also to structural aspects: A. Clark points to the difficulty modern listeners have in hearing talea structures as the fundamental organizational principle of motets, yet she argues that one can learn to hear these patterns. Bent states that tenor talea organization can be made audible through hockets in upper voices, which often mark talea junctures. Yet Earp argues that rhythmic repetition is but one technique among many that elaborate on the core theme of a motet, and that we should not presume rigid 'isorhythm' to be necessarily foundational to the motet or the endpoint of the genre's development. It therefore remains contested whether 'isorhythm' is a foundational compositional principle that we should learn to listen 'for', or whether the concept tends to function as a kind of scholarly red herring, leading us to overlook more sensuous or specific local features of a given motet.

In sum, this book is partly a debate genre, and partly a polyphonic motet of its own making. The *Companion* is multi-voiced – with seventeen different voices, in fact – and can be synthesized using allegory and analogy, but this can be difficult. Much like a section of hocket, its voices pop up and say their own thing, but still remain part of a larger overall texture.

The Genre(s) of Medieval Motets

Elizabeth Eva Leach

MARK EVERIST began the final chapter of his 1994 monograph with the statement that ‘The motet is a genre’.¹ Certainly, musicologists broadly seem able to agree that certain musical pieces are medieval motets when they encounter them. Nonetheless, the questions of whether *the* medieval motet is a genre, and if so, how this genre arose and what characteristics define it, have become more difficult to answer in recent years, not least on account of the ongoing work of Everist and those who have studied with him. As many of the contributions to this volume attest, there is significant flexibility and generic porousness between clausulae and motets, conductus and motets, and songs and motets.² This chapter suggests that this might be because those things termed motets today are themselves a hybridization of other genres whose transmission history – comprising items largely collected retrospectively after significant use, adaptation, and further hybridization – makes it difficult, perhaps impossible, to uncover the multiple pathways through which this universe of medieval motets came about. Observing the shapes of galaxies in still images allowed astronomers to develop a taxonomy³ and then to model galaxy formation using physical laws, deriving a dynamic history for each object based on present observations.⁴ The frozen snapshot offered by surviving manuscripts might seem analogous to these telescope images, but musicologists have no such firm laws from which to track back, so are forced to make more speculative arguments from close readings, musical and notational analysis, and assumptions about chronology. This chapter will look again at issues of genre, origins, and evolution using the evidence of the large motet collection in D308. Lacking notation, this collection has been generally disregarded, yet it provides the sole meeting point for two kinds of motets that never otherwise appear together: examples of the so-called motet *enté*, a monophonic subgenre only otherwise found in fr.845, and the motetus texts of a number of widely transmitted ‘mainstream’ polyphonic motets.

To read most textbooks or dictionaries of music is to be told that the motet as a genre arose through the trope-like and mainly syllabic Latin texting of the upper voice(s) of a discant clausula, a polyphonic and rhythmically patterned elaboration of a melismatic section of liturgical chant. As such a genre, the motet’s defining features might be polyphony, polytextuality, and rhythmic patterning. This narrative implies, too, that the earliest motets were Latin, with parental clausulae; later developments encompass a *vernacularizing* move (as French texts were combined with or

¹ Everist 1994, 148.

² See the chapters by Catherine A. Bradley, Gaël Saint-Cricq, and Matthew P. Thomson below.

³ Hubble 1936.

⁴ Lintott *et al.* 2008.

replaced Latin ones), and a related *secularizing* move from the ecclesiastical to the courtly orbit, eventually visible in a *compositional* move to use some other tune as a tenor, either appropriated from secular repertoires or newly composed.

This neat teleological story has looked suspect and ragged, especially around its edges, for almost as long as it has been told. Various figures, starting with Yvonne Rokseth in the late 1930s and including scholars such as William Waite, Wolf Frobenius, Fred Büttner, Franz Körndle, Wulf Arlt, and most recently Catherine A. Bradley, have questioned both the universal trajectory from *clausula* to motet and the idea that Latin texts necessarily preceded French ones.⁵ Nearly all more recent discussions by specialists hedge their retelling of the classic version of events with manifold caveats and exceptions.⁶ In addition, the generic subdivisions within the motet as a historical genre have been questioned, refined, and even dismissed, while modern emphasis on the alluring polytextual play in three- and four-voice motets has arguably skewed our interpretative view of motets, of which a large number survive in only two parts.⁷

While the standard narrative doubtless correctly describes the generation of many thirteenth-century polyphonic pieces that we today call motets, this chapter will problematize it further by focusing on the significant collection of motets copied in D308. With no indication of any tenors, these motets are copied purely as poetic texts; each consists of a single voice part, all motetus parts where this can be ascertained through concordances. They are short texts with refrains, often split between opening and closing lines, sometimes additionally internally, and sometimes only at the end; some texts have more than one refrain. In asking what kind of a collection the unnotated motetus texts in D308 present, this chapter will raise the prospect that a greater witness to the monophonic motet genre than has hitherto been suspected may lie hidden within the mainstream polyphonic transmission.

THE MEANING(S) OF 'MOTET'

It is now widely accepted that the term 'motet' is a diminutive of the French 'mot' ('word'). Michael Beiche, in his entry on the term in the *Handwörterbuch der musikalischen Terminologie* (Dictionary of Musical Terminology), notes that the earliest Latin witnesses do not provide reliable evidence as to the origins of the musical use of the term.⁸ In an article first published in German in 1970, Klaus Hofmann reflects on then-recent studies of the etymology of the term 'motet(us)'. He argues that far from originating as a Latin polyphonic genre, the genre called 'motet' was, at its outset, a short, vernacular, monophonic genre – basically a song snippet, or what we would today call a refrain.⁹ This is not a refrain in the sense of a repeating refrain found

⁵ For a useful summary, see Catherine A. Bradley's chapter in the present volume.

⁶ See, for example, Peraino 2011, 195.

⁷ Everist (1994, 149) dismisses the 'straightforwardly taxonomic' subgenres of *rondeau-motets* and motets *entés* as either 'so general, or identify[ing] so small a portion of the repertory, that they leave a large part of the repertory undifferentiated' and goes on to propose a theory of modes, drawing on Alistair Fowler and Iurii Tynianov as a way of talking about musical features. Roesner (2007) analyses a single two-part motet that he places at the boundary of motet and accompanied song, while noting its typicality. See Jennifer Saltzstein's chapter below where she stresses the importance of the two-voice motet repertory.

⁸ Beiche 2004, 2.

⁹ Hofmann 1970. The prominence of this article in scholarship has been increased by the availability of an English translation by Rob C. Wegman; see https://www.academia.edu/3335701/Hofmann_Klaus_On_the_Origins_and_Early_History_of_the_Term_Motet. See also Beiche 2004, 6–7.

identically at the end (and/or beginning) of each stanza in a refrain-form song. Instead it is a refrain in the sense of those bits of quotable text to a catchy tune that circulated in and out of narratives, motet voices, and songs in the long thirteenth century.¹⁰ This earliest use of the term would thus explain the sense of 'motet' in the designation 'motets *entés*' ('grafted motets') as rubricated in fr.845. While admitting the motet *enté* as a genuine subgenre of the motet, Everist does not find the classification particularly meaningful since it pertains to only fifteen pieces, mostly *unica*, and with no concordances in the mainstream motet repertoire.¹¹ Even by extending the subgenre to include motets transmitted monophonically in other sources (but not labeled 'motets *entés*' or necessarily defined by refrain usage), Judith Peraino comments that the number in the group are 'too large to be simply aberrations and too small to suggest a coherent "genre"'.¹²

Hofmann argues that the term became extended to refer to the motet-carrying melody in its entirety (the 'motetus' voice), and at the same time – *totum pro parte* – to any whole polyphonic piece of which that melody was part.¹³ While this trajectory is supported and elaborated by Beiche, he notes in addition the astonishingly small number of witnesses to the terminological usage in Latin music treatises given the large number of surviving musical pieces.¹⁴ Hofmann explains this paucity by positing that the term did not originally apply to the Latin-texted pieces of which the music treatises mainly speak and which dominate the earliest notated musical transmission. Instead, he argues that Latin-texted pieces that operated musically (and musico-poetically) in a similar way to the vernacular motet eventually came to be called motets by analogy in later thirteenth-century music theory, with this terminological change being completed by the time Johannes de Grocheio was writing.¹⁵ Thus, although a central reference source like *Grove* might give the motet a simple origin in a liturgical trope that 'soon developed into the preeminent form of secular art music during the late Middle Ages' it seems instead that its origins are much more complex.¹⁶ two separate genres developing jointly in the early thirteenth century – a Francophone musical genre setting a single-stanza poetic expansion of a short poetic refrain text (the 'motet') and an entirely different genre that saw the textual troping of the upper voices of Latin clausulae – were retrospectively yoked together under the term 'motet' in second half of the same century, perhaps because they both used some form of textual expansion/troping, and also because they had already interacted and hybridized musically with each other on account of already being themselves hybrid forms.

Before the application of the term 'motet' was universalized, the earliest examples of what we would now consider Latin motets are labelled as tropes or prosulae in the sources, if they have any designation at all; early theorists who discussed their compositional and notational aspects considered them a variety of discantus and thus not in need of any further label, and referred to the voice part as a duplum.¹⁷ So, while by labelling these earliest Latin polyphonic and polytextual

¹⁰ See the extensive treatment of the refrain in Butterfield 2002 and Butterfield 2003.

¹¹ Everist 1994, 75–89: ch. 4, 'The motet *enté*'.

¹² Peraino 2011, 192.

¹³ Hofmann (1970, 144) mentions that by the time of Jean de Meun's continuation of the *Roman de la Rose* (c. 1270) the term was used for both the duplum part and the whole polyphonic complex. See also Beiche 2004, sections III–IV.

¹⁴ See Beiche 2004, 8. Beiche does not cite or discuss Hofmann 1970 in this regard but only in passing on p. 3 in connection with a translation of Odington's phrase 'motus brevis cantilena' as the strophe of a short song (rather than relating to the idea of movement).

¹⁵ Hofmann 1970, 148–9; 148 cites *Discantus positio vulgaris* applying 'mothetus' to both the duplum and the motet setting as a whole, and giving examples of both with Latin texts.

¹⁶ For the *Grove* quotation, see the entry 'Motet, §I: Middle Ages' by Sanders and Lefferts.

¹⁷ See Hofmann 1970, 149.

compositions ‘motets’ we may be replicating a terminological usage that is medieval, the label is probably not as early as the ‘motets’ in question themselves. Hofmann’s arguments imply that refrains, not Latin motets, are really ‘the earliest motets’ in the term’s contemporaneous sense, and those polyphonic pieces that came to form one early subset of the genre were originally an unrelated form of discantus, included only later, by casual or analogical back-application of what had become a rather general term, under the generic label of ‘motet’.

In literary sources, the word ‘motet’ was often employed within a narrative to introduce the performance of a borrowed refrain. The need to denominate a piece would not have applied, however, to notated sources of those musical pieces we now designate Latin motets, which therefore would have had less of a need to provide generic labels. Is it possible, then, that these pragmatic concerns account for the chronological lag between the usage of ‘motet’ in early literary sources and its later usage with regard to sacred polyphonic musical sources? That is to say, might the traditional caveat that absence of evidence is not necessarily evidence of absence be pertinent here? Perhaps this is the case, although I am not necessarily convinced by a rigid distinction between literary and musical sources. A literary work that describes the singing of musical interpolations whose texts it also provides in full is arguably also a musical source, especially when musical notation of that refrain was planned, as evidenced by features of layout (whether or not it was executed). One might go further and suggest, as I have done elsewhere for the whole of *D308*, that verbal notation alone is sufficient to prompt singing when one knows the song, which seems especially plausible in the case of a short, interpolated vernacular ‘motet’ (that is, a refrain).¹⁸ Thus, any assumption that manuscripts of *Méliacin*, *Renart*, and *L’Art d’amours* are not musical motet sources relies on an already accepted definition for the motet as necessarily polyphonic.

Ardis Butterfield has closely linked the refrain and the motet and pointed out the preponderance of motet-based refrains among refrain-interpolated narratives.¹⁹ Jennifer Saltzstein has shown that the refrain did not originate, as once thought, in *rondets de carole*, and that there is a whole host of refrains that only ever circulate in different motet voices.²⁰ Peraino has studied monophonic motets that she notes ‘represent a sustained collective interest in creating songs that cross-pollinate monophonic and polyphonic repertoires’.²¹ Nonetheless, the persistent standard narrative has been difficult to shake off. Peraino, observing that ‘for a medieval audience of vernacular song, the word “motet”, perhaps more often than not, signaled the quotation of a refrain rather than polyphony’, does not go on to argue that therefore the monophonic motet is rather closer to the original sense of the term than any of the musical complexes that musicologists now term motets.²² In her essay in the present volume, Saltzstein uses Thibaut’s quoting of refrains from French motets as evidence that vernacular motets came ‘closely on the heels’ of the Latin origins and argues that *D308*’s reuse of motet lyrics in other song genres suggests enthusiasm for motet texts among late thirteenth-century courtiers at considerable remove from the scholastic circles that apparently created the motet genre in early thirteenth-century Paris’.²³ Her ‘apparently’ would be overcautious if those scholastic circles did not create the motet genre as such, but merely created some musical pieces that could later be readily subsumed under that label. That what we think of as the earliest motets might only

¹⁸ See Leach 2015.

¹⁹ Specifically in *Chauvency*; see Butterfield 2012. See also Butterfield 2002 and Butterfield 2003.

²⁰ See Saltzstein 2013b.

²¹ Peraino 2011, 192.

²² Peraino 2011, 195, 197.

²³ Saltzstein in the present volume, pp. 199 and 202.

have become termed motets by analogy with a parallel genre, whose origins were vernacular and monophonic, could be a reality obscured by this retrospective application of ‘motet’.²⁴

Both Gaël Saint-Cricq and Peraino have stressed that the existence of the monophonic motets in a number of songbooks, and the devotion of entire gatherings to them in three of these sources, should in itself not merely lead us to note the broad remit of the word ‘motet’, but also dissuade us from treating the motet genre as being by definition a polyphonic one.²⁵ The idea that pieces with distinct and separate origins might lurk below the smooth surface of the single genre of ‘the medieval motet’ is already hinted at by the notated musical sources, which show a bifurcation between motet books and songbooks. Saint-Cricq points out that when songbooks transmit a corpus of motets they are not ‘exogenous additions oddly tacked onto songbooks: they were intended for the original program of the *trouvère* anthologies’.²⁶ And yet over half of the motets that are copied in songbooks are never copied as part of what Saint-Cricq terms ‘the central tradition’, that is, the motets in motet books from a principally Parisian orbit; and the collections in songbooks show a far greater proportion of *unica*. These observations hold true for D308, where the motets are copied by the same scribes as the six genres of the *trouvère* song collection that precede them (making the motets part of the manuscript’s original contents), yet forty-four of sixty-three texts are *unica*.²⁷ As shown in Table 1.1, nineteen motets in D308 have concordances, but I will be forced to ignore Mot24 since its other copying context is unclear, as is the relation of the notation to the text, which is fragmentarily transmitted.²⁸ Among the remaining eighteen concordant motets, five occur both in songbooks and in motet sources (shaded dark grey in the table), while four occur elsewhere only in the motets *entés* of fr.845 (shaded light grey) and nine occur elsewhere only in polyphonic motet books.²⁹ The comparative statistics adduced in Saint-Cricq’s chapter in the present volume show that D308 is relatively large for any motet source, and that it is typical of the songbook sources for motets in its inclusion of motets within its planned contents and its high degree of *unica*.³⁰ Atypical, however, is that D308 has concordances not only with texts in the polyphonic motet repertoire of the non-chansonnier sources, but also with the monophonic motets of fr.845 that are labeled motets *entés*. This fact is significant because it

²⁴ The early vernacular meaning of ‘motet’ did not immediately disappear when the term began to be applied to a broader selection of musical pieces. Vernacular literary sources that cite refrains continue to refer to them as motets, whether in a narrative or lyric context. Nor did the extended usage of ‘motet’ as referring to the entire monophonic piece in which a short refrain text featured disappear either, although, as mentioned above, the number of monophonic motets that are copied as such is relatively small.

²⁵ See Peraino 2011, 194–5 and Saint-Cricq’s chapter (p. 231) below.

²⁶ See Saint-Cricq in the present volume, p. 228.

²⁷ See the statistics giving proportions of *unica* in both motet and songbook sources in n. 13 of Saint-Cricq’s chapter below.

²⁸ *C’est la jus condist au lai praielle* (Mot24) is on the back guard leaf of Ca, which has two identical lines of musical notation, one each above the first and second quatrains of text. These are non-mensural, each containing 5+9 pitches, separated by a stroke as if they each set a short and then a long poetic line. It is unclear, however, how they might relate to the text, which has lines of 9, 7, and 6 syllables (9 ‘a 7b 6b 6 ‘a 9 ‘a 7c 6c 6 ‘a), although it tantalizingly implies that this is a copy of this work as a monophonic motet. I thank Gaël Saint-Cricq for helping me with queries about this source.

²⁹ Typically for D308 the pieces with concordances in the given genre subsection cluster around a particular part of the subsection, usually the beginning, while the later parts of the subsection tend to be more densely populated with *unica*.

³⁰ See Table 11.1 in Saint-Cricq’s chapter below.

Table 1.1. Concordant motets in D₃₀₈

No.	Incipit	Motet voice	Tenor	fr.845	Roi	Noailles	Regi490	Mo	W2	Other polyphonic motet sources	Max no. of voices	Refrain (vdB)	Melody also pre-served with Latin texts?	Clausula in F?
1	Trop suix joliette	722	Aptatur (O46)	-	-	-	-	X	-	Ba; Ps	4	[1126] (absent from D ₃₀₈)	-	-
2	Trop longement m'ait faillit	397	Pro patribus (M30)	-	X	X	-	X	X	Ba; Cl; [Her]; Ps	3	411	X	X
4	L'autrier juer m'an alai	651	Eius (O16)	-	X	X	-	X	X	Ca; Cl	4	338	X	X
6	Bone compaignie	91	Manere (M5)	-	-	-	-	X	-	[Bes no53]	4	370	-	-
9	Biaus Deus revairai je jai	1091	-	no.15	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	538	-	-
14	Dex, je ne puis la nuit dormir	480	Et vide et inclina aurem tuam (M37)	-	-	-	-	X	X	Ba; StV (marginal incipit only)	4	535	-	-
15	Sor tous les malz est li malz d'amors	579	Alleluya (M78a)	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	2	(1747)	X	-
18	É Amors! Morai je por celi	10	Omnes (M1)	-	-	-	X	X	-	Ba	3	504; 796	-	-

19	Amors qui tant m'ait grevei	544	Alleluia: Domine (M66)	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	3	(not in vdB)	X	-
20	Mercit de cui j'atandoie	792	Fiat (O54)	-	-	X	-	X	X	StV (marginal incipit only)	2	1308	X	-
21	Biaus cuers desireis et dous	477	Audi filia (M37)	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	2	216	-	-
22	Quant li noviaus tans replaire	100	Surge et illumina<re> (M9)	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	2	210	-	X
23	Ne puet faillir a honor	570	Descendentibus (M74)	-	-	-	-	X	-	Ba	3	158; (457); 785; (1364); 755	-	-
24	C'est la jus condist au lai praielle	1102	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	[Ca back guard leaf]	1?	(1837)	-	-
28	Mesdixans creveront	1082	-	no. 6	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1322	-	-
30	E[n] non Dieus, c'est la raige	271 = RS 33	Ferens Pondera (M22)	-	X	X	-	X	X	-	2	665; 1447	-	-
44	Hé Diex! je n'i puis durer	1089	-	no. 13	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	(818)	-	-
50	Douce dame debonaire	1077	-	no. 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	604	-	-
52	J'ai trovei	167	Seculum (M13)	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	2	(984)	-	-

seems to provide an otherwise entirely missing link between the motets *entés* and the ‘mainstream’ motets transmitted in large thirteenth-century polyphonic, polytextual collections like **Mo**.

THE MOTET SUBSECTION OF **D308**

Overall, **D308** is a large complex book copied in early fourteenth-century Metz, containing French narrative poetry, prose, and an extensive chansonnier divided into eight genre subsections.³¹ The first six of these genre subsections have similarities in their copying. All six are subject to an internal table of contents at the head of the chansonnier section of the manuscript, which lists incipits and gives each item a number. After the table of contents, each of the first six genre subsections begins at the top of a recto, the previous subsection ending with blank lines and even blank pages as necessary in order to achieve this layout. Except the first subsection (the *grans chans*), each has an initial illumination. The last two genre subsections, however, are not introduced in these ways. The motet section starts on fol. 243v with no rubric or illumination, after only three blank lines following the final *sotte chanson*; the first rondeau follows without any break on fol. 247v. The motet and rondeau subsections do not feature in the internal table of contents for the chansonnier section and are not numbered by the rubricator. Otherwise, however, the section looks similar to the others, with the texts copied as prose with large red or blue initials for each new piece, and by the same scribes as the rest of the chansonnier.³²

Mary Atchison argues that, because the layout of **D308** provides ‘no indication of the shift from the motets to the rondeaux, except through the poetic forms of the texts’, the manuscript therefore presents the two genres as a unified group.³³ However, the exception Atchison notes seems rather salient, since the formal distinctiveness of the rondeau texts, with their heavily repetitious structures, would make the shift clear to any reader. Moreover, the rondeau repetitions are generally written out in full, making them easily visible. No other genre subsection could have been so readily signalled by its form alone, since all of the other sections show a wider variety of formal types. Therefore, the motets and rondeaux actually continue the arrangement by genre, setting aside the minor issue of there being one motet text in the rondeau subsection. And far from these two subsections being somehow separate from the rest of the chansonnier, there is textual as well as scribal evidence that they are well embedded within the book as a whole.

Questions remain, though. Why is there no rubricated label for the motet and rondeau sections? And what, if they had labeled the motet section, would they have called it? This omission is frustrating given that **D308** alone contains a mixture of things labeled ‘motet *enté*’ transmitted monophonically and only in **fr.845** and the motetus texts of more regular polyphonic, polytextual motets in the ‘mainstream’ tradition. The generic organization of **D308** implies that all of these items fall within the same genre. This might help situate the seemingly isolated motets *entés* of **fr.845** more squarely within the overall motet tradition of which they have been considered barely a part. In a more radical interpretation, pursued here as a thought experiment building on some suggestive – but far from conclusive – hints in the textual variants between **D308**’s **Mot4** and **Mot6** and their concordances, we might also consider the possibility that some (perhaps even many?) of the motetus parts known to us today only in their polyphonic settings could have begun their lives as monophonic motets *entés*.

³¹ See Leach 2015.

³² Complete images are available online at <http://digital.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/inquire/p/dd9d1160-196b-48a3-9427-78c209689c1f>.

³³ Atchison 2005, 80.