

## THE SUMMER CANON AND ITS BACKGROUND

### II.

JACQUES HANDSCHIN

*Abbreviations :*

- AH. = *Analecta hymnica medii aevi*  
AM. = *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft*  
B. M. = British Museum  
CS. = *Scriptorum de musica medii aevi nova series*, ed. E. de Coussemaker, 1864  
D'TO. = *Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Oesterreich*  
EEH. = *Early English Harmony*, ed. by H. E. Wooldridge, I, 1897  
L.R. = F. Ludwig, *Repertorium organorum... et motetorum... I, 1*, 1910 (with part of I 2 which had been printed but not published)  
M. = Motetus  
Mo. = Montpellier  
Ms. = Manuscript  
Ro. Mo. = *Polyphonies du 13<sup>me</sup> siècle, Le manuscrit H 196 de la Faculté de Médecine de Montpellier*, publié par V. Rokseth (1936-1939)  
Samm. = *Sammelbände der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft*  
T. = Tenor  
Tr. = Triplum  
WMH. = *Worcester Mediaeval Harmony*, ed. by A. Hughes, 1928  
ZM. = *Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft*

*Note :* For the sake of convenience I have represented B natural by *h* and B flat by *b*.

Before continuing I shall remind the benevolent reader of the headings of my first six chapters which are : I. *The contents of the Ms.; handwritings* (p. 56) ; II. *The notation* (p. 69) ; III. *The question of binary rhythm* (p. 72) ; IV. *The historical position of the Summer Canon* (p. 78) ; V. *Does « rota » mean circular canon ?* (p. 82) ; VI. *The lost Reading collection ; Worcester and Montpellier questions* (p. 88). After which I ask him to make some corrections and additions (leaving aside the obvious misprints), since references were left blank and some additional information has since come forth.

P. 38, line 13 : Dr. Bukofzer appears to fall into the same confusion in his study on the Summer Canon, p. 88.

P. 57, line 4 : the calendar in B. M., Cotton Vesp. E V. Mr. B. Schofield has kindly informed me that he would not say that it is written by the same hand as the calendar in our Ms., B. M. Harley 978, as had been said, *Palaeographical Society* III 125, but he feels reasonably certain that they are contemporary.

P. 60, line 8 from bottom : the reference is to Vol. V p. 67 f.

P. 61, line 9 : the reference is to V p. 76 f.

P. 62, line 10 from bottom : the reference is to V p. 85 and 87.

P. 64, line 8 : the reference is to V p. 84.

P. 67, last paragraph : the distribution of handwritings in the musical section of our Ms. Mr. Schofield has informed me that he does not agree with me in this respect, although he would not like to commit himself to any final classification. Yet we are probably in agreement in so far as the handwritings are not far from each other in time. I fear that if I was inclined to assign one of these handwritings to the second half of the 13<sup>th</sup> c., it was under the influence of continental examples.

P. 68, line 7. Thanks to the kindness of Mr. Schofield I have had a photograph of f. 15'-16, i. e., the calendar. It seems to me impossible to assume that the script of the calendar is earlier than that (or those) of the musical section. At the same time there is a similarity in the writing style of the calendar and, say, f. 12 and 13.

P. 77, line 2. Instead of «look for the passage CS. I 244a to illustrate», please read : «seek in the passage CS. I 244a an illustration of».

P. 77, line 20 from bottom. Among the details of this transcription subject to discussion is this, whether it was right to write triplets.

P. 77, line 17 from bottom : the reference is to V p. 71.

P. 79, line 17 and 16 from bottom : I beg to cancel the passage «note ... Wales».

P. 80, line 13 : «by the archives».

P. 91, line 11 from bottom. Another correction of Ludwig's readings which I noted is *Ecce virgo jam completa* (3, 33), instead of *completa*.

P. 93, line 11 from bottom : the reference is to V p. 88.

P. 94, end of first paragraph. Mr. Schofield informs me that, as he sees no other solution to the abbreviation than «Ordo libri», which he takes as referring to the whole collection, he prefers alternative 2b to 2a.

P. 94, line 6 from bottom : the reference is to V p. 67 f.

After which we continue with our chapter VI.

#### Worcester questions.

Of course we cannot deal definitively with the Worcester fragments so long as their whole contents have not been analysed. I shall only return to the question of concordances between Wo. and other collections, provisionally reviewed in ZM. XIV 58-61. On the whole the list of these concordances is very limited and concerns mainly motets. WMH. No. 45 (whose beginning is, as noted by

Bukofzer, p. 108, *Candens crescit lilium*, not *Gaudens*) recurs in Cambridge, Pembroke 228 (fly leaves from ca. 1300). Yet we shall restrict ourselves to the concordances between Wo. and Mo.

A) The case of WMH. No. 20 being an earlier form of Mo. 8,339 has already been alluded to. This motet occurs in Wo. twice : 1) in the fragment Wo. XXVIII, photographs of which are included in Oxford, Bodl. lat. lit. d 20 (the page with our motet being there f. 9', part of which is reproduced in facsimile WMH. p. 71) ; 2) on f. c' of the fragment formerly contained in Oxford, Magd. Coll. 100, now transferred to Worcester Cathedral and marked as Add. XXXV («M» in WMH.). Both contain only the Tr. and the T., but the M. must not have been lacking, since it completes the Tr. by voice exchange. Both fragments seem to be from the early 14<sup>th</sup> c. While the text in Mo. is *Alle psallite cum luja* — tropic to the Alleluja and, therefore, applicable wherever the Alleluja was sung —, it is in Wo. a Marian text, *Ave magnifica Maria* ; the word Alleluja occurs in both Wo. Mss. only in the T. of the first part — the part precisely corresponding to the Mo. motet — and, as we shall see, in the continuation.

The form of this motet, as analysed by F. Ludwig (Samm. V 220), is :

Tr. :	a b	a <sub>1</sub> b <sub>1</sub>	a <sub>2</sub> b <sub>2</sub>
M. :	b a	b <sub>1</sub> a <sub>1</sub>	b <sub>2</sub> b <sub>2</sub>
T. :	c c	c <sub>1</sub> c <sub>1</sub>	c <sub>2</sub> c <sub>2</sub>

with a Coda of 3 bars set to the word Alleluja ; the periods b, b<sub>1</sub> and b<sub>2</sub> are melismatical, which is characteristic of the English «ron-dellus» (s. above, III p. 82 f). In «M» the composition does not extend further than this, but a continuation is evidently supposed. By the way, this version stands apart in so far as it is transposed to the upper fourth and to the g mode, yet it is possible that h has to be sung as b, and in this case it would be the d mode in transposed form. Fortunately the continuation is preserved in Wo. XXVIII. After the Coda of 3 bars (set here to the words *ave Maria* and ending on the note e, not d as in Mo.) follow three phrases rhyming with -io : *Alleluja Post et in puerperio* ; the T. to this is missing, but since the T. of the first part is provided only with the syllables *Alle-*, it is probable that the second half of the T. was written to -*luja* on the opposite page below the M. ; this part of the motet ends on d ; voice exchange seems no more to be used. As observed ZM. XIV 58, the T. of the first part looks like a paraphrase of the Gregorian Alleluja introducing the verse *Post partum virgo* ; since the text is in the first part ruled by the a- and in the second by the o-*assonance*, we may assume that both parts form a tropic motet, based on the Alleluja and the first three words of this verse (in which case the syllables set below the second part of the T. would

rather be *-luja Post partum virgo*). The relation between the T., of which we possess only the first part, and the liturgical melody is most interesting. We may doubt whether the composer who shaped the phrases marked above as *c*, *c*<sub>1</sub> and *c*<sub>2</sub>, took as model the whole of the Alleluja melody which is composed of four phrases, or single phrases of it; but that he was inspired by it is sure. It is curious that the method of making the consecutive phrases increase in length is realized already in the liturgical melody. At the same time the composer endows his T. with increased tonal stringency in ending it (i. e., the second part) on *d*, while the liturgical melody ends on *e*. Yet he has not failed to avail himself of the alternation of *d* and *e* as Finales, as is done in the liturgical melody. The Mo. version which represents only the first part, but in ending it on *d*, is in comparison to this an extract in which the tonal tendency is still urged.

But even these two parts seem to be in Wo. only part of a larger system. There follows the motet *Post partum virgo integra inviolata* with T. *Post partum virgo inviolata* (WMH. No. 28) — tropic only to the verse of our Alleluja, and to the whole verse; the T., of which again a part (corresponding to the words *permansisti dei genitrix*) is missing (since it was written on the opposite page), ends with *intercede ad dominum Jesum Christum*, instead of *intercede pro nobis*. The T. melody is clearly that of the verse and not even paraphrased, but rather subjected to free measured rhythm (an allowance must of course always be made for divergences of the melodic tradition). Yet the close of the T., beginning in the third syllable of *intercede*, is again paraphrase; it is related to the closing melism of the verse which is, as usual, the melism of the Alleluja; but the paraphrase is not the same as in the first part. This ends again on *d*, as against the liturgical close on *e*.

We may assume that after WMH. No. 28 No. 20 (or, then, the liturgical Alleluja sung in unison) was repeated. Both motets together form a remarkable example of polyphony inspired by the liturgical melody, thus foreshadowing methods of the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> c. and, at the same time, «tropic» in the old sense. Mo. 8, 339 is no more than a splinter of this system; we may assume that the first part of WMH. No. 20 with its voice exchange had aroused pleasure and curiosity and accordingly it was taken out from the whole and provided with a *passépartout* text, instead of one related to the given Alleluja verse.

The assumption of the English provenance of this motet (as to which cf. ZM. XIV 57 f.) is admitted with some hesitation by Ro. Mo. IV 90-92, 180 and 205. We may add that the device of providing an Alleluja with a tropic text of general character, as in Mo. 8, 339, was known in Worcester, as is shown by WMH. No. 29,

*Alleluja psallat hec familia*. (The version of this motet, as reproduced in WMH., may admit of some discussion, especially as concerns the text of the T.; yet it shows clearly that the structure is analogous to Mo. 8, 339, except that the melismatic Alleluja Coda is much longer).

B) Of the three concordances connecting Wo. with the 4<sup>th</sup> fascicle of Mo. one (already touched upon, III p. 94) concerns Mo. 4, 62. WMH. No. 27 is a «Choralbearbeitung» for three voices, different from the analogous Notre Dame composition, while the motet *Ex semine Abrahe* inserted in it uses the music of a part of a Notre Dame Choralbearbeitung. The Wo. version of this motet limits itself to set a new text under the two upper voices of the «Clausula». Other forms of this motet are: 1) one for two voices, leaving out the Tr. and contained in the Notre Dame Ms. F, 2) one providing the Tr. with a special text, Mo. 4, 62 (cf. LR. 113 etc.). Since both upper voices are rhythmically parallel, there was no need to give the Tr. a text of its own; we may therefore consider the Wo. version as the oldest, as it is nearest to the «Choralbearbeitung» in F. In this case Worcester would be tributary to Notre Dame and, at the same time, connected with a very old stratum of motet history. The period closes in the upper voices throughout coincide with closes in the T.

C) *Sed fulsit*, the M. of Mo. 4, 68, is (see WMH. No. 69) contained in the fragment Wo. XX (which seems to be from the early 14<sup>th</sup> c.) with a «Primus tenor», while in Mo. it is associated with the Tr. *Super te* and the T. *Dominus*. This motet was also contained in the lost Reading collection in whose register the Tr. is listed (see above, III p. 88). LR. 275, writing when the Worcester fragments were not yet known, doubted whether this Incipit would refer to our Tr., but he admitted it in AM. V 274<sup>2</sup>. The «Primus tenor» of the Wo. version is evidently not liturgical. We cannot be sure of whether the Tr. and the T., missing in Wo., were those present in Mo., yet both these voices as they stand here would, at least, fit those preserved in Wo. Ro. Mo IV 205 urges that the existence of two tenors, as supposed in Wo., would not be possible before «une date assez avancée du 14-me siècle»; but a motet with two tenors exists already in the Bamberg Ms. edited by P. Aubry (No. 92). Now looking at the chords of our motet, as it stands in Mo., we are struck by the large number of fourths, i. e., unsustained fourths which, at the same time, cannot be explained as appoggiaturas to the third (cf. below, p. 79); and precisely these fourths are sustained or «covered» in the Wo. version by the «Primus tenor». It seems therefore difficult to escape the conclusion that the Mo. version is a reduced one, although that may seem audacious and although the last chord would, in this case, be a full triad including the third

(cf. below, p. 79). There are some other characteristics which could point to the English origin of our motet (cf. Ro. Mo. IV 205): a certain freedom in the treatment of the liturgical melody in the *Dominus T.* (it is true that this does not go far: the melody being adduced twice, some notes are in the second exposition repeated or, on the contrary, the repetition of notes as standing in the melody is dropped); a rudiment of voice exchange in bars 1-4 and 25-28; an old-fashioned heavy conductus rhythm in the upper voices, where the music follows the third mode but the syllables are rather in the fifth mode, i. e., they coincide in general with the perfection. Ro. Mo. IV 180 and 205 seems not disinclined to admit the English origin of Mo. 4, 68 and, still more remarkable, F. Ludwig (AM. V 274<sup>2</sup>) had thought that the occurrence of it in two English sources, as well as its peculiarities, could indicate English provenance. Of these peculiarities he points out one which is curious: the text of the M. is just the continuation of that of the Tr. (a fact which, by the way, would support the assumption that the Tr. missing in Wo. was that preserved in Mo.); this reminds us of a predominantly English usage of the 15<sup>th</sup> c., according to which the Credo text was sometimes distributed between two voices (it is true that in these cases it is not one voice which sings the first half of the text and the other the second part, but the voices complete each other phrase by phrase; see, e. g., the Credo by Dunstable reproduced in J. Wolf's *Geschichte der Mensuralnotation*, No. 73).

There is an uncertainty concerning the rhythm of the «first T.» of Wo., since the M. is in third mode and the T. begins with a ternary and a binary ligature which, according to orthodox modal notation as elucidated by LR 44 ff., would indicate first mode. The difficulty may be evaded in different ways, among which we provisionally choose that of assuming unorthodox writing.

D) There is the remarkable case of Mo. 4, 51 (Tr. *Conditio nature defuit*, M. *O natio nefandi generis*, T. taken from the sequence *Mane prima sabbati*), being in relation to WMH. No. 37. My suspicion that the Mo. version could be English was with some reserve accepted by Ro. Mo. IV 180 and 204 f. The following peculiarities may be taken as indications:

a) the T. takes its melody from a sequence which is possibly English (cf. AH. LIV 217 f.) and this melody is freely treated, the arrangement being approximately this: sequence versicle 1 (motet bars 1-3), v. 2 (b. 4-6), v. 3 (b. 7-9), v. 1 and 2 in varied form (b. 9-12 and 12-15), v. 3 with appendix (b. 16-18 and 19-21); v. 4 (b. 22-24), v. 5 (b. 25-27), v. 6 (b. 28-30), v. 4 (b. 30-33), v. 4 in varied form (b. 33-36), v. 5 (b. 36-39), v. 6 (b. 39-42); v. 1 (b. 43-45), v. 2 (b. 46-48), v. 3 (b. 49-51), v. 4 (b. 52-54), v. 5 with transition

(b. 55-57) v. 6 with appendix (b. 58-61 and 61-63) (this is in substance the analysis given ZM. X 517 with some modifications proposed by Ro. Mo. IV 204 f.; the sequence melody may be found in C. A. Moberg's *Schwedische Sequenzen* II No. 8, where the variants must also be taken in account); the freedom which the composer takes with the sequence melody manifests itself also in the fact that his rests do not always coincide with a versicle close;

b) although the incisions of the voices do not coincide in the same manner as in *Ave gloriosa* (the English version of Mo. 4, 53, see above, III p. 64) and although both upper voices have a different text, there is a fundamental concordance of structure between M. and Tr. which has struck F. Ludwig (Samm. V 189 f. and 218): the texts of both have the same metrical form (one being a meditation upon the mysteries of Christ's birth and passion, the other a challenge to the Jews to be converted and at the same time, as has been noted by H. Villetard in *Rassegna gregoriana* IX 441, a paraphrase of II. Cor. 3 and reminiscent of the sequence *Letabundus*, both texts being therefore conveniently grafted upon a T. taken from an Easter sequence); the Tr. is throughout a double bar behind the M., this distance being filled by one melismatical bar in the Tr. at every start of the scheme (bars 1, 22 and 43); and since the M. and Tr. have in bars 21 and 42 simultaneous period closes in which the T. joins with them, the motet comprises three distinct parts, the third standing out the more, as it uses verses of 13 syllables and periods of 5 bars, as against verses of 10 syllables and periods of 4 bars in the first and second part (cf. above, III p. 63, as to the two contrasting parts in *Ave gloriosa*);

c) there is another curious coincidence: W. Niemann who dealt with this motet (*Ueber die abweichende Bedeutung der Ligaturen*, 1902, p. 138) finds in the notation of the third mode as practised here a detail which he explains, and which can indeed be explained, as a remnant of binary measure: where 2 notes fall on the 3<sup>rd</sup> element of the third mode formula, i. e., the «Brevis altera», they are sometimes written as a ligature «cum opposita proprietate» which signifies properly two Semibreves.

According to a survey of the ligature forms in Mo. by L. Dittmer, not yet published, the same phenomenon occurs in Nrs. 11 and 12 of our Mo. list (below, p. 76 f.) and in the following motets not included in our list: Mo. 4, 56, 5, 98, 5, 109, 5, 120, all these being in the third mode, while it occurs only once on the «Longa imperfecta» of the first mode (Mo. 2, 22) and twice in cases where some doubts as to the mode are possible (Mo. 3, 42 and 5, 98); it is mentioned by Pseudo-Aristotle, CS. I 274a, only in connection with the *Brevis altera*, i. e., the third mode. Our motet was, as noted by F. Ludwig, AM. V 203 f., written precisely in binary measure in the Darmstadt fragments (which were probably

written in Germany), but afterwards the binary third mode was changed to ternary. Indeed I do not see what this motet would lose when sung in binary rhythm. That it is an old one is confirmed by the fact that it is quoted in the oldest extant treatise about measured music, the *Discantus positio vulgaris*, CS. I 97, as an example of the third mode, ternary measure being, of course, presupposed. I refer to what has been said about binary rhythm above, III p. 73 ff. By the way, the name *Brevis altera* seems in itself to indicate that the third mode had been binary. I do not of course think that binary measure had not existed in France, cf. below p. 79 f, but the impression is that the mensural theory with its claim to exclusively ternary measure had there succeeded more in obliterating divergent features.

Turning to the version contained in the Worcester fragment Add. XXXV, f. b' (WMH. No. 37), we must state that the connection between both versions is relatively loose. F. Ludwig (AM. V 278) found that they have the Tr. text and the beginning of the T. melody in common; Dom Anselm Hughes, the editor of WMH., found them «different but not dissimilar». Again only the Tr. and T. are preserved in Wo. They are sufficient for showing that both versions manifest affinities and at the same time structural divergences. The T. which has no mark of provenance takes its material from the same sequence *Mane prima* as Mo. 4, 51, but even with more freedom: it is composed of only two periods which are Ostinato-like repeated throughout, the first being a modified contraction of the first two versicles, and the second corresponding to the third versicle enlarged by the close of the second versicle; both periods are of 5 bars and, since they differ in their first half, the second remaining identical, there is an affinity with the Estampie form. Both periods close on *d* and the effect of the incessant repetition would be intolerable if the Tr. formed its periods parallel with the T., but it bridges the closes of the T. periods according to the normal motet method. The text of the Tr. is the same as in Mo.; but while there the verses of 10 syllables correspond to periods of 4 bars and those of 13 syllables to periods of 5 bars as we have seen, here the length of the periods is variable; the period close does not always coincide with the end of the verse; sometimes it avails itself of the internal rhyme dividing the verse, and often syllables are stretched in the manner of the Conductus, with the result that the composition is of 80 bars, instead of 63 as in Mo. What the Wo. M. was we do not know, but it could not have been identical with that in Mo. As to rhythm the Wo. version presents an interesting problem. It is predominantly third mode, as Mo., and it might very possibly be binary. But at some period closes (*succubuit, profuit, nocuit*) appear small melisms which can hardly be interpreted otherwise than as first mode; now if our third mode is binary, that

would mean the transition from binary to ternary division in the Tr. and the simultaneity of ternary in the Tr. and binary in the T., the value of the Longa remaining the same; even if our third mode is ternary, these combinations would be sufficiently heterodox (cf. the notion of «metrical rhythmic» as suggested above, III p. 76 f). We have to remember that the question of binary rhythm in the Wo. fragments requires a special study (cf. ZM. XIV 55 and 57).

Without giving reasons Ludwig says that in the Wo. version «the Tr. text of an older motet has found a new musical form». It is very possible that the Mo. version is the older one, but the case being so peculiar, we had better postpone our judgment. At any rate, it seems probable that both versions are of English provenance.

#### Montpellier questions.

Leaving a definitive study of the Worcester fragments to a younger colleague, I beg now to turn to the question of the English contribution to Mo. We have quoted the following motets as having a claim to being considered as English:

1) *Ave gloriosa* (Mo. 4, 53) in the presumably older form it has in the Summer Canon Ms., B. M. Harley 978.

2) *Alle psallite* (Mo. 8, 339) in the presumably older form it has in Wo. (*Ave magnifica Maria*), but without excluding in this case the Mo. form.

3) *Sed fulsit* (Mo. 4, 68).

4) *Conditio nature* in both forms, that in Mo. 4, 51 and in Wo.

To these we may add (yet without any pretention to completeness) the following.

5 and 6) Mo. 8, 340 (Tr. and M. *Balaam inquit*, T. *Balaam* taken from the sequence *Epiphaniam domino*) and Mo. 8, 341 (Tr. and M. *Huic ut placuit*, T. *Huic magi* from the same sequence). They have been brilliantly analysed by Ludwig, Samm. V 220 ff. In the first whose T. is constructed as aab aab aab aab, the repetition aa is used for exchanging the upper voices and, moreover, the fourth part exchanges the upper voices with the third, thus superposing voice exchange to voice exchange. The first, third and fourth part are melismatic and only the second syllabic, yet even in the latter, syllabic in one voice coincides with melismatic in the other (see above, p. 67). In 8, 341 the T. being EEEE, the upper voices are AB CD BA DC' A being syllabic and the rest melismatic. Now the only other Ms. in which both motets occur is English: Oxford New College 362 (apparently from the early 14<sup>th</sup> c.), f. 86; as noted by Ro. Mo. IV 90, it contains only the M., both motets being written

as one. We have further to remember that the three motets Mo. 8, 339-341 are the only ones in Mo. where both upper voices have the same text — a feature that could seem «reactionary» in the light of the 13<sup>th</sup> c. and yet was «progressive» with regard to the music of the 15<sup>th</sup>. In our case the text is of course exchanged between the voices, with the corresponding melody. We may add that in one of the motets adduced below (Mo. 7, 300) the text is *nearly* the same in both upper voices (which, in musical respect, use rhythmical imitation instead of exchange); and in another, quoted above (p. 71, Mo. 4, 51), both texts have the same metrical structure, while in one case (Mo. 4, 68, above p. 70) the M. text continues that of the Tr. As to rhythmic, the upper voices of Mo. 8, 340 and 341 are rather «modern», since they largely use the sixth mode and often set two syllables to one Brevis.

My suggestion as to the English origin of Mo. 8, 339-341 was rather benevolently received by Y. Rokseth. She went on to interpret my words «Mo. 8, 339-341, to which Coussemaker, *L'art harmonique*, No. 25 (= Mo. 7, 300) and some *other* Mo. motets have possibly to be added» (ZM. XIV 58) as applicable to Mo. 7, 275, 8, 322 and 8, 343 (Ro. Mo. IV 88). As to these, I confess to be less confident about 8, 343 (see below, p. 77). As to the other six (339-341, 300, 275, 322) we may add that they had already been viewed as one group by H. Bessler (AM. VIII 180). We have now to look at 300, 275 and 322.

7) Coussemaker No. 25 is Mo. 7, 300 (not 8, 322, as stated by Ro. Mo. IV 88). Here both upper voices have nearly the same text, in so far as every verse recited by the M. is repeated by the Tr. in (textual) imitation and only the first verse lacks in the M. (with the consequence that the beginning of the M. text, *Salve sancta parens*, is just the continuation of the Tr. beginning *Salve virgo virginum*). The T. being repeated four times, the motet is divided into four parts, and of these the first and fourth are melismatic. As to the relation between the upper voices, one isolated note in one voice is opposed to a double bar in the other, as in the case mentioned above, p. 71; yet this time the method is applied in a more systematic way: both voices proceed by periods of 3 + 1 bars and they are reciprocally shifted by 2 bars, which produces rhythmical imitation (this being partly also melodic); yet in the fourth part they proceed by periods of 2 bars overlapping by 1 bar (cf. the analysis by F. Ludwig, Samm. V, 218-220). The T. is closely connected with the M., since 3 + 1 in the M. always coincide with 2 + 2 in the T., and in the fourth part 2 in the M. with 2 in the T., — the Tr. being shifted in relation to both lower voices, as we have seen. Taking the notion of «isoperiodical motet» as I think we must (i. e., meaning an analogous disposition of the periods

of the upper voices within every T. section, see below, p. 84 and 85), we see that our motet is isoperiodical in its first three parts.

The best way to illustrate these rhythmical circumstances would be by graphical figures (cf. my *Musikgeschichte*, p. 202). I must observe that the notion of «isoperiodicity», as applied here, is a relational one, the relation being between the rhythmical form of one section of the upper voices and that of one T. section; therefore «isoperiodical» has the meaning of «analogoperiodical». We do not exclude that the word may be applied also to one single voice which forms equal periods, or groups of periods, but that is not the isoperiodical *motet*; if, on the other hand, the rhythmical grouping of the T. is *identical* with that of the upper voices, we had better speak of motets with simultaneous incisions (cf. above, III p. 64) rather than of isoperiodical motets, since analogy is better realized when it does not confound with identity (logically the latter, which is embodied in some of our motets, may be included in the former as a special, or as an extreme case, they may even have a common root, yet we must nevertheless distinguish).

In this «primitive» stage of isoperiodicity the T. section taken as unity of measure corresponds to one T. «Durchführung», i. e., it is related not only to the rhythmical but also to the melodic structure of the T. Later on the isoperiodical section corresponded to a group of T. periods *not* coinciding with one T. «Durchführung»: in the example by Ph. de Vitry quoted *Musikgeschichte*, p. 201, there are three isoperiodical sections, each corresponding to a group of 4 T. periods, while there are two *Durchführungen*, each comprising 6 T. periods. Then, with G. de Machaut and his successors, the section is in general only one T. period and, consequently, part of a «Durchführung»; but at this epoch isoperiodical structure has already grown to isorhythmical, the T. periods have grown longer, and the «*Durchführungen*» superposed to them are mostly in different rhythm; yet «isorhythmical», as applied to the motet, remains still a relational notion. In our «primitive» stage, where the isoperiodical sections are at the same time isomelodic in the T., the method seems more intelligible and «natural» than afterwards. See below, p. 78 and 84 and 85 and 90.

8) In Mo. 7, 275 (Tr. *Jamjam nubes*, M. *Jam novum sidus*, T. *Solem*) the T. melody is again expounded four times, the first part of the motet being melismatic. The texts of the upper voices are not identical, yet similar and assonant. The rhythmical structure of this motet is exactly the same as in 7, 300, the difference being only that while there the first and fourth parts were melisms, here it is only the first. Again rhythmical imitation passes into melodic; there are even melodic affinities between both motets. Since most of the verses begin with *Jam* and this falls on the one bar periods which alternate with the three bar periods, the word *Jam* stands out like a textual *Leitmotiv*, quoted every two bars in one voice. It is interesting that in the Oxford Ms. quoted above, p. 73,



a motet with exactly the same texts occurs on f. 83 and, as observed by Ro. Mo. IV, 90, the syllable *Jam* is rendered prominent in the same way. The T. is missing in this Ms., but I am nearly sure that it was:

*d d c d f g f e d | g g f g a f e d c,*

these two phrases alternating according to the scheme ABABA; as every note falls on one Perfectio, there are five sections of 9 bars each, corresponding to 2 ½ «Durchführungen». Again the first of the five sections is melism; and in the central part, corresponding here to the second, third and fourth sections, 3 + 1 or, rather, 1 + 3 alternate in both voices at a distance of two bars, the word *Jam* standing out as in the Mo. motet. One cannot help finding in the mutual relation of these motets an analogy to that which exists between both compositions of *Conditio nature* (see above, p. 73). H. Anglès, who has edited the Huelgas version of Mo. 7, 275 (*El Codex de Las Huelgas*, No. 133), in his commentary finds the Oxford motet younger, and that is probable for rhythmical reasons.

9) Mo. 8, 322 (Tr. *Marie assumptio*, M. *Hujus chori*, T. not marked) has a great melism at the beginning and at the end; in this case the analogy to the Conductus is the more marked, as the introductory melism, the syllabic part and the postlude have each their own T. melody. In the prelude this is A, in the syllabic part BB, in the postlude cc dd ee ff; if there is a preexistent melody, it must be a secular or even an instrumental one, as the major tonality is conspicuous in it. In the middle part again one note in one voice is sometimes opposed to a double bar in the other.

10) The Tr. of Mo. 4, 70 (Tr. *In odorem fragrat*, M. *In odoris miro*, T. *In odorem*) is preserved also on the fly-leaves of Oxford, Corpus Christi 86, where it is incomplete and written in «English measured notation» (rhombs for Breves) probably in the 13<sup>th</sup> c. The Tr. text is addressed to Mary, the M. text to S. Andrew (a saint much honoured in Great Britain and especially in Scotland); since the T. is taken from an Alleluja devoted to S. Andrew, we may assume that our M. is the original one. The freedom in the treatment of the T. melody, alluded to by Ro. Mo. IV 180 and 205, is very limited: while in the liturgical melody *in* is represented by one element, a, and *odorem* by bb cc d, the T. is a bbb cc d. We have to add that the motet ends with a melism.

11) Mo. 4, 69 (Tr. *Ave parens prolis*, M. *Ad gratie matris*, T. *Ave Maria* taken from the Offertory). It is likely that, as LR 277 has assumed, an Incipit in the Reading list refers to our M. This motet displays a certain similarity with 4, 70; it has a small final melism. In this motet and the next one the same interesting notational anomaly occurs as in Mo. 4, 51 (see above, p. 71).

12) In Mo. 4, 72 (Tr. *Salve mater misericordie*, M. *Salve regina*,

T. *Flos filius*) the liturgical melody is handled with more freedom than in 4, 70, but with less than in 4, 53 (*Ave gloriosa*); it is the same melody as in 4, 53 (see above, III p. 60 f). In order to state it more clearly than does Ro. Mo. IV 204, we may say that the melody in the T. is disposed in this way: *flos filius ejus*, *-us ejus* (but in dropping a sequence of 5 notes), *-us ejus* (with modification of 3 notes and enlargement of the close). The rhythm of the M. (which borrows its text from the Antiphon) is, as to music, third mode, while the syllables follow rather the fifth mode (cf. below, p. 78). In one passage the M. passes over to the first mode, musical and syllabic, which may either be explained as misinterpretation of an original written in unmeasured notation, or be paralleled with a Worcester motet, quoted above, p. 72.

A propos of *Ave gloriosa* (Mo. 4, 53) with its paraphrased T., Ro. Mo. IV 205 had already observed that the T. is treated with some freedom also in Mo. 4, 68 and 70, and p. 204 she adduced in the same sense 4, 72; p. 205 she added that some motets of the group 4, 68 ff. (the 4<sup>th</sup> fascicle ends with 72) occur in English Mss. while exhibiting some common features (which?); and p. 180 she said that, some freedom existing in the T. arrangement of Mo. 4, 70, this may perhaps point to English provenance, and that the group 4, 67-70 have not only features in common (which?), but are connected with English Mss. by concordances. Now in looking at the list Ro. Mo. IV 100 (which is, of course, mainly compiled from Ludwig) we see that only 4, 68 is marked as appearing in an English collection and 4, 69 in the Reading list. In the whole the 6 motets 4, 67-72 may, then, be considered as «candidates». Among these, 68, 70 and 69 (Nos. 4, 10 and 11 in our list) are connected by concordances with English Mss. and 72 (No. 12 of our list) is marked by rather special features. The question of 4, 67 and 71 may be left in suspense.

As said above (p. 74), Y. Rokseth supposed also Mo. 8, 343 to be included in my «suspicion»; but although there is a melism at the beginning and at the end, I see no other argument pointing to English provenance.

Yet Ro. Mo. IV 85 f. made me a further present in formulating the hypothesis that 9 other motets from Mo. 8 may be English (304, 308, 315, 324, 326, 327, 329, 336, 344), and that for two reasons: they are rhythmically old-fashioned, since they do not use the innovations considered by H. Bessler as Franconian (the employment of another rhythmical mode in the Tr. than in the M., mostly the sixth mode, and the use of smaller note values); and in one of them (327) the text ends with *Nos regens in hac insula* which, as she thinks, would be difficult to explain otherwise than by English origin. I confess that neither of these arguments seems to me very strong (*insula* can refer not only to Great Britain, but to a house standing alone, i. e., a monastery). As to other indications pointing in this direction, we may note the following. In 308 the T. exhibits that coexistence of syllabic fifth mode with musical third which we have already met (cf. below, p. 78), yet the M. is regular third mode.

In 315 the T. contains 5 « Durchführungen » of 7 bars each and the Tr. has (except the first Durchführung) also periods of 7 bars, which are shifted by one bar in relation to the T.; this constitutes an element of « isoperiodicity » (cf. above, p. 75); but the M. is irregular. In 327 both texts have the same beginning, being at the same time assonant with the T. text-mark; this may at least be considered as old-fashioned. In 344 the T. has three « Durchführungen », each composed of three periods at 2 bars, and the structure of the M. is quite the same; in the first and second section the Tr. has its incisions in the third and fifth bar, in the third section in the first, third and fourth bars. Two of the motets listed (326 and 336) have French texts, but that would not wholly exclude English provenance. The question of this group may, then, be left in suspense.

\* \* \*

May, then, Mo. 4, 67 and 71 be included in our list or not? We have already sufficient reasons for assuming that there is at the end of Mo. 4 a group of motets which may be English; and, at the commencement of this fascicle, 4, 51 and 53 are in the same position. As is known, the second fascicle of Mo. contains French motets in 4 parts, the third Latin-French motets in 3, the fourth Latin motets in 3, the fifth French motets in 3, the sixth French motets in 2, while the contents of the seventh and eighth fascicles are mixed as to language; therefore motets of English provenance are more likely to occur in the fourth and in the last two fascicles. Of these the eighth is in our perspective more conspicuous than the seventh. Its mixed character has sometimes been observed; while the first six seem to be written in the neighbourhood of Paris and the seventh was, at any rate, early added to them, the eighth fascicle was originally independent (see Ro.Mo. IV 26 and 85). The seventh fascicle seems to be more distinctly French in character than the eighth, as it contains those motets whose Tr. engages farthest in the use of small note values; at the same time many Tripla of the seventh fascicle display, as noted by Ludwig (Samm. V 213 f.), a very irregular shaping of periods, while the eighth returns to greater regularity.

In general we may say that the motets which might be suspected as being of English origin are very often in the third mode, this mode appearing in many cases only in the note values, while the syllables follow the heavy rhythm of the fifth mode (see above, p. 70 and 77 and 77 and below p. 84 and 86); the texts are often addressed to the mother of Christ; and they are often anxious to preserve at the beginning and the close that assonance with the words originally belonging to the T., which points back to the old « tropic » motet (cf. above, p. 67 and 78; also our items Nos. 12 and 13 are conspicuous in this respect). Evidently the problem

which we have raised can be definitively solved only by taking in account the stylistic symptoms in connection with the provenance of the Mss.

One may perhaps wonder why I have not taken in account, as criterion, the relative rôle played by the third as consonance. Yet apart from the fact that my survey is incomplete, we must remember that a relative acknowledgment of the third is not exclusively limited to England but appears even in some French quarters, while it does not appear everywhere in England (as to the eleventh fascicle of W<sub>1</sub>, cf. *The Musical Times* 1933, 704). Among the Mo. motets of our list there are in reality only two which are relatively prominent in the use of the third and the triad, i. e., our numbers 10 and 11, and the same may be said to a lesser degree of No. 4 (as to which this peculiarity had been noted by W. Niemann in his study about ligatures, p. 140) and No. 13. We may remember that Anonymus IV (in CS. I) is not unlimitedly tolerant of the third; and from the way in which he speaks of Western Englishmen it is probable that he is an Easterner (cf. p. 358 « Westcuntre », 363b « homines occidentales »); that would agree with the fact that the Ms. in which his treaty is preserved, B. M. Royal 12 C VI, comes from Bury S. Edmunds, as well as with the names of English musicians which he quotes, cf. WMH. p. 27); now it is rather to the Westerners that he ascribes the licence of admitting the third as final chord (cf. p. 363b, 358b and 355a).

It is interesting to note that there are in Mo. a dozen of motets for 3 voices beginning with a third, yet in general the third plays no rôle in the continuation. One of the exceptions is a motet with two French texts, Mo. 5, 168, notable also with regard to its major tonality, its probably secular T. (inscribed *Valare* but till now not identified), the simultaneousness of period closes, and the rhythm (the syllables being mostly equivalent to Longae). Another dozen of motets beginning with the third are for 2 voices, and here the third sometimes alternates with the unison in the manner reminiscent of what has been described as Gymel (cf. Mo. 6, 179, which is also in a « popular » mood and has coinciding period closes). None of the motets of our list is among those beginning with a third.

We must add about 16 motets beginning with a fourth, 10 of them being for 2 voices and 6 for 3 (of course I mean the unsustained fourth, the one above the lowest voice). One could, it is true, assert that the unsustained fourth ought not to be paralleled with the use of the third but opposed to it, since the treatment of the fourth as consonance on equal rights with the fifth is an archaic feature, and it was precisely the rise of the third as a consonance which made the fourth to be considered as a dissonance. Yet in reality things are a little more involved. The initial fourth appears in many of our cases to be an appoggiatura « resolving » into the third. (See *Appendix III*). In general we may say that the motets characterized by the third or fourth as initial chord are often of the category of those representing a « popular » mood.

Among those motets beginning with a fourth is Mo. 5, 164, a motet with Chanson T. and two French texts in the upper voices, remarkable



furthermore because it has long since been recognized as being in binary rhythm. Here is also No. 3 of our list, in which, however, the numerous fourths seem to be merely the result of a missing fourth voice (cf. above, p. 69 f).

What has been said does however not exclude the value of the third as a criterion in other cases, thus if we are, e. g., engaged in a first attempt to single out the English contribution to the contents of the « Notre Dame Ms. » W<sub>1</sub>.

\* \* \*

13) I think that we may yet extract from the motets beginning with a fourth a further one which may be suspected to be English: Mo. 4, 65 (in which both upper voices begin with *Si vere vis adherere*, while the T. is *In seculum*), although there is no English source to record (or, then, we must consider a Boulogne Ms. as « nearly English »). The upper voices (whose texts are largely assonant) pause simultaneously (but not simultaneously with the T.). The syllables proceed, as in Mo. 4, 68 (above, p. 70), largely in Longae, i. e., in fifth mode; the affinity of the fifth mode with the third is in this case not so apparent, since the splitting up of the Perfectio concerns not only the second, but also the first Longa of the double bar. Another peculiarity of Mo. 4, 65 is that there is a passage in first mode (bars 5-6), as in the Worcester pendant to Mo. 4, 51 (cf. above, p. 72). Not only the fourth leading to the third occurs several times, but also the third at places where it is not usual.

14) The last items of our list will be, one from the seventh and one from the fourth fascicle. The first, Mo. 7, 285 (Tr. *Ave regina*, M. *Alma redemptoris*, T. *Alma*), was already proposed by me as a candidate in *Acta* VI 109 (where a misprint occurred in line 11, as Bamberg No. 77 and not 74 is meant). Ro.Mo. IV does not seem to take notice of this, although H. Besseler had already been inclined to suppose non-French origin of this motet (AM. VIII 117 f.); he thinks however of Franco of Cologne, in which I cannot join with him. The characteristics which induced him to assign to this motet a special place are, a certain affinity with what he calls the Conductus-type (cf. above, III p. 64) and, mainly, a marked tendency to major and functional tonality; it is true that the latter is in some degree a consequence of the character of the T. melody, but it is more apparent here than in other motets with this T. The features which I added, *loc. cit.*, were: the presence of Marian Antiphon texts in M. and Tr., the influence of the T. melody on the upper voices, and a tendency to melodic repetition in the upper voices, parallel to the four repetitions of the T. melody. We shall not

urge too much the latter circumstance, since the problem of « isomelodicity » is till now insufficiently explored (cf. below, p. 106). But it seems remarkable that the T. melody is reflected in the upper voices. This is again, in some measure, due to the community of harmonic atmosphere, yet the fact remains that the ascent from *f* to *c* and the ascent from *c* to *f* with return to *c*, both characteristic of the T. melody, often recur in the upper voices. That reminds us of the melodic community of T. and M. existing in two other motets of which one at least is English (cf. below, p. 86 and 90), although the circumstances are in our case not the same.

15) Although the fact that a motet recurs in an English Ms. is not in itself conclusive, we may note that Mo. 4, 58 (Tr. *Res nova*, M. *Virgo decus*, T. *Alleluja*) is to be found on the fly-leaves of Cambridge Trinity O 2.1 (Catalogue No. 1105), probably written in the early 14<sup>th</sup> c. in « English measured notation », f. 230' (a page which is much damaged); it occurs also in a Boulogne Ms. and in one which may be English or French (cf. F. Ludwig, AM. V 210 f.). There is no concordance of rhythmical pattern between T. and M. But the second part of the M., i. e., that corresponding to the second « Durchführung » of the T., is nearly a repetition of the first, and the M. has twice a melismatic close, as noted by LR. 394 f. In the version of the Cambridge Ms. the M. is as in Mo., but the Tr. has another melody and sings the same text as the M. The T. melody, marked with *Alleluja* in Mo. and not marked in Cambridge, has not yet been identified; indeed it does not look like a liturgical melody (cf. above p. 76).

The fact deserves our attention that in English Mss. the T. (if not fitted with a real text destined to be sung) very often lacks the mark of provenance, which it regularly has in French Mss. (cf. above, III p. 61 and this volume, p. 72). This is probably not only an external feature, but may in many cases point to a freely composed T., or one which handles the liturgical melody with freedom.

\* \* \*

We may yet add that Mo. 4, 57 (Tr. *In salvatoris nomine*, M. *In veritate comperi*, T. *Veritatem*) occurs in the same Cambridge Ms. on f. 230, where it precedes Mo. 4, 58, as it does in Mo. Both upper voices of this motet are analogous as to structure, and their period closes coincide nearly in all cases with the closes of the T. Yet there are two circumstances which do not seem compatible with English origin: this motet stands in F, where it has the same M. and another Tr. (sung to the same text as the M.); and there are indications that the text of the M. is by a Parisian author (cf. LR. 253 and Ro.Mo.

IV 227 and 262). The Tr. in Cambridge is again different from that in F, although sung to the same text as the M. In W<sub>2</sub> and Huelgas our motet is without Tr. (some of these versions may be seen in H. Anglès' Huelgas edition, No. 140).

#### VII. PARIS, ARSENAL 135.

There are 7 Mo. motets occurring in a rather problematic Anglo-French Ms. : Paris, Arsenal 135, known by motet specialists as *Ars A*. It is an English missal of late 13<sup>th</sup> c. which was probably brought to Poitou by Englishmen (cf. *The Sarum Missal*, ed. by J. W. Legg, 1916, p. VIII). This Ms. contains, as an addition from the 14<sup>th</sup> c., a collection of motets (s. Ludwig, AM. V 212 f.), and the question is, where they came from and by whom were they inserted. The motets stand on leaves 290, 291, 316 and 317; it seems that 316 and 317, which continue 291', were separated from it by a fault of the binder. Apart from the motets, the main interest of the Ms. rests upon a collection of songs of the Ordinarium Missae, mostly tropic, and sequences, written in the liturgical order on f. 228-298'; from these H. M. Bannister has drawn sequence texts for AH. XI.

The conclusion that the Ms. had been brought to the region of Poitiers was drawn in the Catalogue of the Arsenal Mss. from the presence of the local saints Pecinna and Maxentius in the calendar (f. 1-6'), where they were inserted during the 14<sup>th</sup> c. No further contribution to this question has come forth from abbé Leroquais' magnificent inventory (*Sacramentaires et Missels*, II 132 ff.), nor from La Laurencie's and Gastoué's catalogue of the musical Mss. of the Arsenal Library. We may add that in prayers inserted on f. 146' Hilarius, the Poitiers saint, is prominent, and that a note added on f. 223, where a liturgical Ordo is written, refers to Poitou or Poitiers uses (« Pict. dicunt : ... »). But the calendar additions refer also to saints connected with other French localities (Eutropius — Saintes, Sulpicius — Bourges, apart from S. Louis, the king). Then there are the entries *S. Flavie virginis et martyris*, under the fifth of October, referring to Flavia or Flaviana from Auxerre (*Acta Sanctorum*, third October volume; cf. the second October volume, p. 388), and *Flavie virginis*, under the seventh of May, referring to Flavia Domitilla (*Acta Sanctorum*, third May volume), a Roman saint, relics of whom were at Limoges, S. Augustine's (*loc. cit.*, p. 6). The latter entry deserves special attention, since our Ms. contains among its 14<sup>th</sup> c. additions a proper office of this saint (f. 305'-315'), which draws its lectures precisely from the *Vita* printed in the *Acta Sanctorum*. We may nevertheless keep to the Poitou theory in assuming that the Flavia office had been imported to Poitou from Limoges. The name of one Juteau who owned the Ms. in 1584 is, as my French colleague F. Lesure has kindly informed me, from the Poitou or Charente.

Yet the fact remains that it is a missal of the Sarum rite, and as such it could serve only in an English milieu. We must remember that Poitou had been till 1203, and was again 1356-1369 under English rule, the town Poitiers being retaken by the French only in 1372. Our supposition is supported by the English character of the script which appears in many of the notes added on the margin, as also in the entry of S. Louis in the calendar and in the note on f. 223, quoted above, from which we conclude that this English community took note of local uses and adopted them.

That is the milieu in which the motets were entered. F. Ludwig says (*loc. cit.*) that the motets are « apparently » written by a French hand, an assumption repeated in the affirmative by Ro. Mo. IV 75, without reasons given for it. The fact, stated by Ludwig, that they are written in pseudo-aristotelian measured notation, is no reason in itself, since marked features of this notation occur also in England (cf. J. Wolf, *Geschichte der Mensuralnotation* I, 1904, p. 7 f.) (as to Pseudo-Aristoteles see below, *Appendix II*).

Our collection contains, as mentioned, 7 motets occurring also in Mo. : Mo. 3, 40, 4, 52, 4, 56, 7, 283, 7, 282, 4, 46, 3, 38, and one which is an *unicum*. Only the last is for 3 voices. The others comprise only M. and T., while they have a Tr. in Mo. The Tripla with which our motets are associated in Mo. 3 are French and, moreover, the Tripla of 3, 38, 3, 40, 4, 52 (and partly that of 7, 283) are in that later style using the sixth mode and sometimes putting more than one syllable to one breve. Was, then, the omission of the Tripla caused by linguistic or stylistic reasons? This is possible but not sure, since some of these motets are known to have existed with Latin Tripla of a more modest style. We may also think of a general tendency to simplification, as it has often manifested itself in the omission of voices.

We may, first, note that all our motets are Marian songs. As to structure, and especially the relation of the M. to the T., the following may be observed.

In *Virgo gloriosa*, T. *Letabitur* (with French Tr. in Mo. 3, 38) this relation is analogous to that existing in *Ave gloriosa* (Mo. 4, 53, see above, III p. 63) : both voices form simultaneously periods of 4 bars each, and every M. period corresponds to one verse, the verses being of 6 and 5 syllables as in *Ave gloriosa*, or of 7, in one case of 8 (in this case two syllables fall upon one breve). The close is a melism. The liturgical melody in the T. is : *letabitur rex* (taken from the *Alleluja Dominus in virtute*), then (from bar 55) the first half of this melody, and a Coda taken from *-tur*.

In *Mellis stilla*, T. *Domino* (with French Tr. in Mo. 3, 40) the M. forms long periods of 7 bars, with 13 syllables in each; the T. has, in concordance with this, periods of 7 bars decomposed in 2 + 2 + 3.

This motet occurs also in an English Ms., Cambridge Corpus Christi 8. The latter contains, apart from the fly-leaf mentioned by W. H. Frere (*Bibliotheca musico-liturgica* II 136), still other fragments of the same 13<sup>th</sup> c. Ms. In that which precedes f. 256 I read the end of our M. text and the rubric *Tenor de Mellis stilla*, this being written in red with music above. Unfortunately the Ms. is greatly damaged and, when I saw it, I did not care to note whether music, and what kind of music, is written above the M. text.

In *Beata viscera*, T. *Beata* (with French Tr. in Mo. 3, 46) the M. borrows its text from the Communion whose melody is in the T. (an interesting «dédoulement»!). This text is furnished with tropic interpolations and, as L.R. 402 f. has observed, its liturgical sections proceed generally in the heavy fifth mode (cf. above, p. 78), the interpolations being in the third. The incisions of M. and T. coincide often, but not in all cases. The rhythm to which the Communion melody is subjected in the T. is irregular.

In *O Maria maris stella*, T. *In veritate* (with Tr. *O Maria virgo davidica* in Mo. 4, 52) M. and T. form together periods of 4 bars. This motet exists already in F, where it has a Tr. singing the M. text.

In *Salve virgo rubens rosa*, T. *Neuma* (with Tr. *Ave lux luminum* in Mo. 4, 56) the T. forms periods of 2 bars throughout, while the M. has in general 4-bar periods coinciding with two T. periods; yet in the middle four binary periods of the T. are opposed by 3 + 2 + 3 in the M., and just here the T. begins its second «Durchführung»; it is clear that the M. ceased to associate one 4-bar period with two 2-bar periods of the T., only in order to bridge the transition from the first to the second exposition of the melody in the T. In so far there is an element of «isoperiodicity» (cf. above, p. 75).

The assumption of F. Ludwig, AM. V 213, that the order of M. and Tr. is reversed in Mo., is confirmed by our analysis, since the Tr. has irregular periods independently from the T. expositions, as well as by the position of the Tr. as uppermost in the initial and final chord, and by the fact that both voices are in the right order in *Ars B* (s. loc. cit. 209). The M. with the T. is further contained in Bologna, Liceo Q 11, f. 7', where both voices are written in one system and the T. is adapted to the M. text by splitting of notes, as was the case in the Harleian version of Mo. 4, 53 (see Ludwig, AM. V 220, and above, III p. 63).

In *Descendi in hortum*, T. *Alma* (with Tr. *Anima mea* in Mo. 7, 282) the period closes of M. and T. coincide only partially, yet those of the M. and the Mo. Tr. coincide throughout. H. Besseler who edited the Mo. version of this motet, AM. VIII 242, assigned it to the Conductus type (AM. VIII 179, cf. above, III p. 64). L.R. 443 supposes plausibly that the form which this motet has in Mo. 7

is the original one. The texts of both upper voices are taken from Antiphons.

In *Marie preconio devotio*, T. *Aptatur* (with Tr. *Amor vincens omnia* in Mo. 7, 283) the T. forms periods of one double bar and therefore it is impossible for the incisions of the M. not to coincide with those of the T., in so far as the M. periods are multiples of a double bar. But the disposition must also be considered in the light of «isoperiodicity» as defined above, p. 75. The T. comprises three «Durchführungen», each of eight periods of a double bar, plus the beginning of a fourth exposition, and in these the disposition of the M. is analogous: it forms periods of 2 double bars; but as the first of them comprises 3 bars, every fourth of these periods bridges the transition from one T. exposition to the other; the Tr. of Mo. fits even more easily into this scheme, as it opposes periods of 3 + 2 + 3 to every T. exposition. Thus, in every T. section the incisions of all the voices coincide in the third and fifth double bar. L.R. 444 hailed this motet as the first representant of isorhythmical (I should say: isoperiodical) disposition (cf. Samm. V 217 f. and H. Besseler, AM. VIII 179), but the cases quoted above, p. 74 f and 75, may not be less old, and that quoted on p. 84 (which is confined to the M.) is even older. Another remarkable feature of this motet, already observed by P. Aubry (*Cent motets*, 1908, ad No. 39) is that the M. is to the sequence *Marie preconio serviat* (ed. in *Revue du chant grégorien* IV 103 ff.) as a trope: the first verse of the sequence, with its melody, is the beginning of the M., the second appears at the limit of the first and second T. exposition, the third verse within the third, and the fourth at the very end. That reminds us of the case mentioned above p. 84; but since here the melody is also involved, we are furthermore reminded of cases of «double paraphrasing» as those quoted above, III p. 62, and below, p. 87; or rather it is double «Durchführung», since the given melodies are not modified and only the passages of the T. are sought out where the sequence fragments could be fitted in. The Mo. Tr. is connected with the M. in so far as its first word is the last of the M. As appears from the edition in Ro. Mo., our Poitou Ms. would write two breves in bar 20 as semibreves (we should, then, think of «English mensural notation»), yet the fact is only that a ligature of 2 notes occupying the place of a *perfectio* has been written *cum opposita proprietate*, and since the notation of our Ms. is for the rest advanced measured notation, that can only be a fault of the copyist and further conclusions cannot be drawn from it. The transcription of the version in B. M. Add. 27630 (a German Ms. from ca. 1400 which contains only the M. and T.) given by H. Anglès in his Huelgas edition as supplement to No. 127, is in binary rhythm. What were the reasons which induced the learned editor to choose that method? I do not

see why we could not as well choose ternary rhythm. Even in this case the German Ms. would represent an interesting change of rhythm: the second mode formula of Mo. being changed to fifth mode and more than one note having in the second mode version fallen mostly upon every second syllable, the result is this combination of the fifth mode, syllabical, with the third, musical, which we have met several times (s. above, p. 78). It seems quite possible that this was the original rhythm of the motet and that in the Mo. version the fifth (or third) mode is contracted to the second. (By the way, in the German Ms. the T. is not inscribed *Tenor sancte Marie*, but *Tenor super Marie*).

\* \* \*

The most remarkable item of our collection is that which does not occur elsewhere: the motet with Tr. *Regina celi*, M. *Ave regina*, T. *Ave*. Ludwig had already pointed out that both Tr. and M. borrow their texts from an Antiphon, that the beginning of the Tr. quotes the respective melody, and that the T. melody is taken from the same Antiphon as the M. text (AM. V 213; cf. above p. 84, as well as p. 80); Bessler who published the motet (AM. VIII 243), observed (p. 180) that the M. in its turn quotes the melody corresponding to its text in bars 9-12 and 15-16; and it is easy to see that the Tr., as well as the M., contains even more reminiscences of the respective liturgical melodies. (Bessler adds that we know of no earlier case of the use of liturgical melodies in upper voices; Bukofzer, in his dissertation, p. 115, parallels with it a *Sanctus* of English provenance which may be slightly older and has in the uppermost voice a liturgical *Sanctus* as cantus firmus; yet I should think that the important thing is not so much the presence of a cantus firmus in an upper voice but its free paraphrase-like handling and, especially, the fact that a liturgical melody situated in the T. radiates into an upper voice; in this sense we may quote as parallel the case mentioned above p. 81, which is possibly not later than this). At the same time this motet is a perfect example of the Conductus type in Bessler's sense (cf. AM. VIII 179 f.), since all the voices pause simultaneously after every 4 bars. Rhythmically it is very conservative, as not more than 3 notes fall upon one *perfectio*.

I think however that these 3 notes, when written as conjuncture, ought to be interpreted in the sense of Pseudo-Aristoteles (s. above, p. 83) as ♪♪, not ♪♪♪, since the latter rhythm is indicated in the normal way. Another detail in which I do not quite agree with the quoted

transcription is the close of the M. where I should interpret the notes above *exora* thus:

♪♪ (with *plica*) ♪.♪.

which produces a dissonant appoggiatura of the type mentioned by Anonymus IV, CS. I 358b (cf. *Acta* XV 3).

The T. is an *ostinato* repeating the 7 notes *c b a h g a c*. We may consider this as « free » treatment of the liturgical melody, not only because only one motive (corresponding to the word *Ave*) is taken from it, but because the close juxtaposition of *b* and *h*, harsh and attractive as it is, is absent in the Antiphon melody, the liturgical Mss. exhibiting in this passage either twice *b* or twice *h* (cf. Dom Pothier in *Revue du chant grégorien*, XI 120). At the same time this fragment may be considered as a spirited epitome of the Antiphon as a whole, which (in the version of the *Editio Vaticana*) has this motive twice with *b* and another one which is nearly the same, twice with *h*; (as to a rapid transition from *b* to *h* which must alter the « character » of the other notes, cf. above, III p. 67 and a passage in the middle of the M. of our next musical example). At the beginning of our composition the M. doubles this motive at the fifth, then it opposes still new fragments of the Antiphon melody to the first motive repeated by the T., while the Tr. inserts from time to time a bit of the *Regina celi* melody. Indeed the purpose of the *Ascendit Christus*, mentioned above, III p. 62 f. as taking its material from two Marian Antiphons, has already been surpassed here.

\* \* \*

We cannot escape the impression that there is an English « flavour » in this last motet. Was it, then, rather imported from England or composed by an English musician in Poitou? At any rate, this motet stands quite apart in relation to the French music of the epoch in which it was written down.

The question of the other 7 motets of our collection is more complicated, since many continental Mss. are involved, and we are not sure what was their original form. As we have seen, the form without Tr. was, at least in some cases, not the original one; as to the three motets contained in Mo. 3, we may add that the Latin Tripla with which they are associated in the Bamberg Ms. are probably later than the French ones which they have in Mo. (see below *Appendix IV*); but much more cannot be said. Indeed there seem to exist between those 7 motets some common features, but they appear not very significant, except the case of the last two (*Marie preconio* and *Descendi in hortum*, Mo. 7, 283 and 282). The fact

that all the Moteti are in honour of Mary could be explained by the sympathies of the collector. As it seems, none of them goes back to a Notre Dame Clausula, but that is only a negative criterion.

And what about the relation of this group to the last motet? In one case (*Descendi in hortum*) there is an affinity, in so far as this motet also uses in its complete form two Antiphon texts; but it does not display the art of musical quotation or paraphrase. In another case (*Marie preconio*) there are also some indications of English provenance. But being reduced to two voices, these motets must belong to a different historical stratum.

Conservative rhythmic are also a connecting link between the last motet and the preceding seven, and in so far there is a community of taste. But this taste manifests itself, on the one side, in a creative effort applying a special technique, on the other rather in preserving remnants of a bygone evolution. Both these activities are however compatible with a milieu as that which we have assumed. Since we know all these motets were written down after the middle of the 14<sup>th</sup> c., we should be compelled to look for a «peripheral» milieu, even if we should know nothing about the provenance of the Ms.

\* \* \*

Now I should like to add, parenthetically, a parallel to the last motet from Arsenal 135 that is surely English. It displays characteristics pointing to a later origin; yet the Ms. in which it is written is not later and perhaps even earlier. We may take this parallel as a work of the early 14<sup>th</sup> c. It stands in the Ms. Cambridge, Gonville and Cajus 512, f. 258<sup>r</sup>, the same Ms. from which I extracted the trumpet-like Conductus *Gemma nitens* (*Der Toncharakter*, 257 f., and *Musikgeschichte*, 213 f.). I think now that the collection containing our example was written down in the early 14<sup>th</sup> c., while *Gemma nitens* was written a little later.

It is a motet with textless T., the upper voices being *Doleo super te* and *Absalon fili mi*. When looking at the Antiphon *Rex autem David* as reproduced in *Paléographie Musicale* XII pl. 165, we see that the first two T. periods agree with *fili mi* in the Antiphon; where the rest of the T. may come from I do not see (if it is not the melody of *super te frater* in the Antiphon *Doleo super te* which we shall presently refer to). As to text and melody, the M. is the second half of the Antiphon *Rex autem* (including *fili mi*) in a somewhat adorned form; to this a close is added which is, as to text, a narrative epilogue replacing in a way the first half of the Antiphon and, as concerns melody, apparently free (apart from a slight affinity to the beginning of the Antiphon). We could therefore ask whether the real T. is not the middle voice; but rhythmically the lowest voice has the character of a T. and, moreover, it is instrumental (i. e., written without text). The Tr. takes its text from the Antiphon *Doleo super te* which precedes ours in Pal. Mus. XII 165 and which is

♩ = d

Do-le-o su-per te, fra-ter mi Jo-na-tha, a-ma-bi-lis

Ab- -so- lon, fi-li mi,

val-de su-per a-mo-rem mu-li-e-rum; si-cut ma-ter (\*)

fi-li mi, Ab- -so-

u-ni-cum a-mat fi-li-um, i-ta te di-li-ge-bam;

lon, quis, mi-hi det

sa-git-ta Jo-na-the nun-quam ab-i-it re-tror-sum

ut e-go mo- -ri- ar- pro te,

(\*) Ligature of three Breves in Ms.





nec de- cli- na - vit e- jus cli- pe - us a bel lo, et has- ta su- a

fi - li mi, Ab - -

non est a - ver - sa. Plangit David Ab- so - lon pul - cher - ri - mum.

so - - lon? Plangit David Jo- na- than ca - ris - si - mum.

(\*) Longa in Ms.

a pendant to it, since in the latter David laments his friend and in the former his son; to this the Tr. adds the same epilogue as the M., but this time referring to Absalon, as the close of the M. does with Jonathan; (frankly we should have expected the reverse!). Thus the composer starts from two Antiphons, one being David's complaint about his son and the other that about his friend; he makes these complaints to be sung simultaneously and to finish with one narrative phrase: an ingenious disposition even textually. Melodically the Tr. may be considered as free, although there are perhaps some analogies to the Antiphon *Doleo*. Yet it displays affinities to the T. and M. (thus, bars 26-27 of the Tr. anticipate bars 30-31 of the other voices and the descending figure at the beginning of the Tr. recurs in the M.). As to affinities between M. and T., we could compare bars 8-9 of the M. with the first two T. periods; and bars 30-32 form a sort of « simultaneous imitation ».

The T. is composed, as normally, of two expositions, and the M. more or less joins it in this respect (this repetition existing already in the Antiphon melody), as does also the Tr., but with even greater freedom. The rhythm is likewise repeated, in the T. exactly and more or less so in the upper voices; thus isorhythmicity is confounded with isomelodicity. The Tr. has a character which might be described as monodic and declamatory. The fact that it begins alone is exceptional in the older motet (cf. *Acta VI* 106; Mo. presents only the case of 5, 157, since in 5, 162 it is doubtful whether the rhythm is not rather  $\text{♪♪♪}$  than  $\text{♪♪♪♪}$ ; see further

WMH. No. 25). The M. does not constrain itself to set the accentuated syllable (or a syllable whatever) at the beginning of the bar and therefore it reminds us of the sliding rhythmic of the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> c. The Tr. freely sets two syllables to one breve, the *tempus* being binary and the *modus* ternary. The accidentals, as written in our transcription, correspond to the original.

In applying the art of varied repetition this motet is a predecessor of some English compositions of the 15<sup>th</sup> c. which have been analysed by R. von Ficker in *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft XI*. There is, moreover, an analogy between it and the famous 4-voice motet *Veni sancte spiritus* by Dunstable, in which the T. uses two melodic phrases derived from the hymn *Veni creator*, while the uppermost voice uses the melody of this hymn at large by paraphrasing it. (This voice does not employ only the beginning of the hymn, as stated by Riemann in his important analysis and repeated by me in *Musikgeschichte*, p. 251, and it does not use the hymn melody only in the introductory duet sections, as stated by M. Bukofzer, *Musical Quarterly XXXV* 42, although these sections in which the T. is silent are prominent in this respect). At the same time in the uppermost voice there appears a certain analogy between the three parts corresponding to the threefold exposition of the cantus firmus in the T., an analogy which can be symbolized as A A<sub>1</sub> A<sub>2</sub> and as to which the question is, in how far it is conditioned by the melodic repetition in the T., or rather by aesthetic purpose.

Compositions like the *unicum* from the Poitou Ms. and this motet anticipate likewise the tendency of the *a cappella* style of the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> c. to supply the different voices with the same melodic material; but what was there more and more becoming a uniform technique, has here the character of caprice and experiment.

#### VIII. ENGLISH MATERIAL EVEN IN THE MS. F?

There is at the end of the second motet fascicle in F, which contains mainly two-voice Latin motets, on f. 413-414' a group of rather « heterodox » motets (Nos. 42, 43 and 44 according to L.R. 116 f., while No. 45 is rather « normal » and No. 46 cannot be classified since only part of the M. is preserved). We find here characteristics which have several times aroused our attention: simultaneity of period closes (throughout, including No. 45 and probably even No. 46, since the M. periods in the latter are of 8 beats each; it is true that only 2 voices are involved); melisms (No. 43); the absence of text mark in the T. (No. 44); the beginning with a third (No. 42); a modification of the T. melody in the repetition or second exposition (Nos. 42 and 43); assonance between the M. text and the T. word (No. 44); closes with tone repetition, reminiscent of lai melodies (Nos. 46 and 45; cf. above, III p. 62). L.R. notes that none of these motets is known to have its musical « source » in a Notre Dame

Clausula, with the exception of No. 45 (for which we can confirm his supposition). But he does not seem to be much interested in them, since his commentary to the second motet fascicle (L.R. 117 ff.) centres on the appearance of some motets with 2 upper voices and different texts, which he views in the perspective of « progressiveness ».

We have already seen that single characteristics as those mentioned are not more than a clue which may be taken up for further investigation, and therefore the question of the provenance of these motets may for the moment be left in suspense.

By the way, there is at the end of the first motet fascicle which contains motets with 2 upper voices and 1 text, also a group of three (Nos. 24-26 according to L.R. 106 ff.) which stand in a way apart. One corresponds to Bamberg No. 6; it is published in different versions also by F. Gennrich in ZM. XI 484 ff. and by H. Anglès in his Huelgas edition, No. 89, from which we see that simultaneity of period closes is very marked, yet, on the other hand, the text has been ascribed to a Parisian author. The remaining two correspond to Mo. 4, 52 and 4, 57, which have been taken into consideration above, p. 84 and 81.

Here we shall adduce only an argument to show that the presence of English material in F is not *a priori* ruled out. This argument comes from the domain of the Conductus. As is known, some of the Conductus contained in F refer to historical events and can therefore be assigned to a definite time and place, which has provisionally been done by L. Delisle in *Annuaire-bulletin de la Société de l'histoire de France*, 1885. He found that these historical texts refer to events and persons from England and Northern France, towards the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> c. and in the first 4 decades of the 13<sup>th</sup> (*loc. cit.* 103 f.; it was, therefore, rather surprising that he assumed them all to have been composed « on the banks of the Seine and the Loire »). There are, e. g., Conductus on the death of Henry II and the accession of Richard I in 1189 (*In occasum sideris* and *Redit etas aurea*, both for 2 voices) and on William of Longchamp, bishop of Ely, who was regent of the kingdom during Richard's crusade 1189-1192 (*Divina providentia*, for 1 voice). Another specimen, not mentioned by Delisle, is *Nulli beneficium*, a two-voiced Conductus which has many analogies with *Redit etas aurea* and which was very probably addressed to the rival of W. of Longchamp, Geoffrey, the natural son of Henry II, who was appointed by Richard I in 1189 as archbishop of York; it seems to refer to the beginnings of Geoffrey's activity as bishop of Lincoln (about 1175 or a little later; cf. *The Musical Times* 1932, 512).

Giraldus Cambrensis who wrote a sympathetic biography of this Geoffrey (cf. the complete works of Giraldus, IV 355 ff.), mentions that he was once solemnly received at York, his father still living:

*cum hymnis et canticis usque in ecclesiam cathedralem perductus est et a toto communiter tam clero quam populo cum gaudio magno atque tripudio susceptus*; and, more interesting, he mentions (p. 427) in a rather hostile sense that William of Longchamp maintained, when in the zenith of his power, minstrels from France and singers of verse who praised him (*joculatores de regno Francorum et cantores rhythmici ab eo conducti in laudem sui nominis epigrammata plurima et cantica praeconiosa fingere consueverant*), while after his fall men of high standing and literary ability composed writings and songs in which his fate was represented as a warning to others (*viri magni et literati... scripta non pauca et carmina composuerunt*). Another old writer (quoted by H. J. Chaytor, *The troubadours and England*, 1923, p. 2 f.) says that when W. of Longchamp was appointed as chancellor in 1190, *quidam carmina, quidam cantilenas et alias hujusmodi, quae non multo constabant, magnifice offerebant, ut ubertate frugum alterius seminum suorum inopiam sublevarent*. These testimonies are characteristic of the way in which the Conductus poetry and music was mingled with political life. *Divina providentia* is precisely a song of praise like those which are ironically referred to by Giraldus, whereas *Nulli beneficium*, addressed to Geoffrey, is in the character of a serious and dignified admonition.

The third is rather conspicuous in those polyphonic Conductus which we have mentioned as referring to events of English history (*In occasu, Redit etas* and, in a lesser degree, *Nulli beneficium*). *Christi miles*, on the death of Thomas of Canterbury (1170), contained in F f. 373', also has « gymel »-like passages; there is, moreover, at the close of the upper voice, a leap leading to a cadence on the upper octave, which may be interpreted as the entry of a third voice, as was noticed in some compositions of the 11<sup>th</sup> fascicle of W<sub>1</sub> (*Schweiz. Jahrbuch für Musikwissenschaft* I, 1924, p. 59). The other Conductus on Thomas Becket, *Novus miles* (F f. 230, for 3 voices), has thirds only at a few verse closes. (As to *Eclipsim patitur*, composed on the death of Geoffrey, duke of Bretagne, 1186, and contained in F as in W<sub>1</sub>, we may doubt whether it must be considered as English or French; thirds are not conspicuous in it). These Conductus on Thomas Becket would show that a composition may be English even if contained in F and not in W<sub>1</sub>; yet normally the fact that a Conductus is present only in W<sub>1</sub> and thirds play a marked rôle in it, would point to English provenance. This is the case of *A deserto* (W<sub>1</sub> f. 143, this being distinct from another composition with the same words, F 316' and W<sub>1</sub> 174), *Adjuva* (W<sub>1</sub> 144'), *Festa januaria* (W<sub>1</sub> 80'), *Luto carens* (W<sub>1</sub> 80, the version in F 463' being for one voice), *O quotiens* (W<sub>1</sub> 109'), *Si quis* (W<sub>1</sub> 120; here the third appears only at a few verse closes). A further step in this hypothetical direction would be to add *Porta salutis*, a Conductus quite similar to *Adjuva* and particularly rich in thirds (these appearing in the version of W<sub>1</sub> 70 even more than in that of F 361'); both are, by the way, among the small group of Conductus with prose

texts. Again, *Magnificat* (W<sub>1</sub> 129' and F 301') and *Sursum corda* (W<sub>1</sub> 172 and F 342') form a pair, since not only the third is prominent in them, but the text is in both cases the paraphrase of a liturgical one and the formal structure is similar; moreover the latter has an English affinity in so far as there exists another composition of this Mass Canon paraphrase in the Worcester fragments (WMH. Nr. 5), and the former, in so far as it is among the few cases where W<sub>1</sub> (apart from its 11<sup>th</sup> fascicle) employs a lozenge as isolated note, instead of a square. Another pair is formed by *Procurans* (F 226) and *Purgator* (W<sub>1</sub> 80), both being different compositions based on the same melody; in this case both compositions are probably English, that in F being older (cf. *Musikgeschichte*, p. 165); the third is more conspicuous in the latter, whereas in W<sub>1</sub> only a few parallel sixths appear. This investigation can of course only be brought to a close by taking in account the whole stylistic and paleographical evidence. For the moment I shall add two further items. One is *Sol sub nube latuit* of which again two compositions, based on the same melody, exist; here it is the version contained in W<sub>1</sub> 119' and F 354' which is conspicuous in relation to the third, not that contained in St. Gall 383, 169. *Veri floris* which is for one voice in St. Gall 383 and for three in F, W<sub>1</sub> and W<sub>2</sub>, has only in the last Ms. (f. 39') a final melisma, and in this nearly all the chords are thirds except, of course, the last one. (See Note 1).

Yet the question is not only that of the presence of compositions of English origin in Notre Dame manuscripts, but of the actual influence which English music may have exerted in France even before the days of Martin le Franc and Dufay. In this sense we cannot overlook a testimony brought forth by F. Chrysander (in *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* 1882, p. 343, where, however, no reference is given; it is, as established by F. M. Padelford, *Old English musical terms*, p. 12, from the *Vita* of Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, written by a contemporary and edited by J. C. Robertson, *Materials for the history of Thomas Becket*, p. 30 f.). This Thomas who was afterwards canonized was in 1159 sent by Henry II to Paris to ask for marriage of the daughter of Louis VII with Henry's son. This mission was equipped lavishly and, when entering the French towns and villages, it was preceded by 250 young fellows of foot (*garciones pedites*) who, walking in groups of 6 or 10, or more, «sang something in their language in the manner of their country» (*aliquid lingua sua pro more patriae suae cantantes*). We may imagine that, if not Perotinus in his youth, Leoninus was among those gazing at this scene; thus Parisians and Northern Frenchmen had ample opportunity to become acquainted with a specifically English kind of music. We may surmise that this was in the manner of the Summer Canon and that the groups of 6, 10 or more singers represented each one voice, thus producing choral polyphony, a kind of music which was at this epoch probably very little known in France.

This may, then, have been a channel by which stylistic elements of a rather «popular» character (canonic imitation, voice exchange) won the favour of Parisian musicians. Yet we must not think that polyphony in itself was at that time unknown in Paris: one of the polyphonic Conductus in the Ms. of S. James at Compostella is ascribed to one «Magister Albertus Parisiensis» (cf. AH. XVII 8). Perhaps the Paris Cantor (Praecentor) Albertus is meant whose name occurs in charters between 1147 and 1173 (cf. Guérard, *Cartulaire de Notre Dame* II 175, etc.); at all events the name of this Paris dignitary is connected with the history of the Conductus, since he bequeathed to Notre Dame two «versaries», by which we can scarcely understand something other than Conductus Mss. (*dedit nobis missale, lectionarium, antiphonarium, graduale, psalterium cum hymnis, duos troperios, duos versarios, loc. cit.* IV 118; cf. *Acta* IV 5).

It would be interesting, but it would be beyond our present scope to compare the musical characteristics of Conductus like those which we have quoted, with other Conductus from the Notre Dame Mss. We return to the domain of the motet and here our question is, how it may be explained that the Ms. W<sub>1</sub>, written in the late 13<sup>th</sup> century, contains only 6 motets of a rather old-fashioned type, while English circles were, as we have seen, busy with many-sided motet work already about the middle of the 13<sup>th</sup> c. The explanation must, as I think, be sought in the fact that Scotland and S. Andrews, where W<sub>1</sub> was probably written, are in geographical respect «peripheral», while those circles which had earlier contributed to the history of the motet, must have been active in the South of England; it is therefore likely that if a «Notre Dame Ms.» had survived in this region, it would be older than W<sub>1</sub>. (See Note 2).

There remains to examine these 6 motets contained in W<sub>1</sub>. They are all contained also in F. 1) *Serena virginum* has 3 voices singing the same text, and T.; 2) *Latex silice* is in the same situation; the rest are for 2 voices singing the same text, and T.; 3) *Deo confitemini*, 4) *Laudes referat*, 5) *Gaudeat devotio*, 6) *Qui servare puberem* (cf. LR. 35, 39-41, 99, 103-104). But while the T. is present in F, it is omitted in W<sub>1</sub>. What is, then, the historical position of these motets, and what is the meaning of the T.-less version contained in W<sub>1</sub>?

F. Ludwig considered this motet type to be the oldest existing or, as we had better say, the oldest in the domain of motets derived from Clausulae or constructed after the model of Clausulae. His main argument was precisely that this type is the only one represented in W<sub>1</sub> but, alas, he did not know that W<sub>1</sub> is younger than F and that it is insular, i. e., peripheral and therefore not conclusive in his sense. When I came to the conclusion that W<sub>1</sub> is English, I was myself perplexed by the upheaval to Ludwig's historical

constructions that it would imply; and I think that till now the adjustment has not been completed. As concerns these 6 motets we must first compare the F and the W<sub>1</sub> versions.

Are these motets, as they stand in W<sub>1</sub>, really meant to be sung without T.? I think so. The first-class inventory given by I.R. shows that the missing T. could not in all cases be supplied from Clausulae present in the same Ms; and in the case of 1) the last T. note must be *c* (as it is in the motet T. in F), while the Clausula T. ends on *a*. We could even find that the omission of the T. is not so great a loss, since if all the 4 voices of 1) and 2) are taken together, the result is rather harsh which is not the case, if only the 3 upper voices are sung, or only the T. with the M. That does not of course exclude that the Tr. and Quadruplum were composed to be sung with the T., but it makes it probable that they were composed after the M. The omission of the T. is a catastrophe only in this respect, that it is this voice which gives the key for a correct rhythmical interpretation of the upper voices.

It is true that Ludwig thinks the full-voiced form of our motets to be the original one; but there are still other circumstances which make that unlikely. Thus, the words *tollite* and *bibite* in 1) produce a sort of tonal contrast in the T. and M., which is frustrated by both other voices. We must add that not only the majority of our motets have in the Ms. W<sub>2</sub> only T. and M. (that would in itself not prove much), but the two-voiced version of 1) has in W<sub>2</sub> another text than in F and W<sub>1</sub>, *Manere vivere*, and this text must be the original one since it is tropic to the T. word, whereas the text of F and W<sub>1</sub> is simply a *Benedicamus domino* paraphrase gloryfying Mary (by the way, this gives the explanation, sought by I.R. 35, of the fact that this motet is in W<sub>1</sub> consecutive to a *Benedicamus domino*; and the Beauvais Ms. which we shall quote below mentions also that this motet was sung after a tropic *Benedicamus*, cf. I.R. 235; as to the 3 following Conductus, we may remember that the Conductus, even when not ending with the words *Benedicamus domino*, stood often at the end of the office). On the other hand, the text of 2) as it stands in F and W<sub>1</sub> is tropic to the T.

In respect to form both four-voice motets present a peculiarity. 1) takes its material not, as usual, from one Clausula, but from 4 Clausulae set to the same T., and since the fourth has two T. expositions, this motet comprises five expositions which makes it unusually long; the text is nevertheless not divided into five equal strophes, since the period disposition of the upper voices is not the same in the five expositions. 2) has as close a large melism, and to it are added further strophes to be sung with the same music; thus it is, as far as form is concerned, quite like a Conductus. But the only other Ms. where 2) is known to exist with music, Stuttgart H. B. I

Asc. I 95, f. 30' (cf. I.R. 319), in which only the M. is preserved, lacks this melism. It is, then, probable that the melism was composed at the same time at which the two other voices were set above the M. and this reminds me again of the Conductus, in whose domain a melism was sometimes added when a one-voice piece was transformed into a polyphonic composition, thus adding the horizontal adornment to the vertical.

It seems that 1) also underwent a transformation at the moment at which the two voices were added, and that is precisely the change of text which has already been mentioned: it is probable that the *Benedicamus* text *Serena virginum* was substituted for *Manere vivere* simultaneously with the addition of the Tr. and Quadruplum, because it has as close the words « *Plausu leti trino Benedicamus domino* ».

Yet we must consider that 1) there exists also in a three-voice form comprising T., M. and Tr., in the Beauvais Ms. B. M. Egerton 2615 (cf. I.R. 240 and 242; and this form has again been deprived of the T. in a Spanish Ms.). Therefore the question is whether « *plausu trino* » has not rather to be referred to this form. Must, in other words, the T. be included in the number of real singing voices or not?

As is known, in the 13<sup>th</sup> c. the general tendency was to transform the T. from a voice which was (melismatically) sung into a (probably) instrumental one; and this is partly confirmed by the fact that the syllables of the T. text were first set at their proper place below the notes (as in F) and afterwards written all at the beginning, as a simple mark of provenance (which is the case in W<sub>2</sub>, Mo., Bamberg etc.; P. Aubry, *Cent motets* III 148, had asserted the instrumental character of the T. with the argument that it is mostly written in ligatures, but that is in itself not conclusive). That does not of course exclude that motet Tenors were even in later times sung, and, on the other hand, a vocal rendering of the T. may not always have been considered as necessary even in F (cf. *Schweizerisches Jahrbuch für Musikwissenschaft* V 41, note 2; we must e. g. concede that in the F version of our 1) the recitation of the word *Manere* in the T. is rather senseless since the text of the upper voices is no longer tropic).

There are indeed testimonies indicating that the T. was not considered as a voice on the same footing as the upper ones. In W<sub>2</sub> there is on f. 145, at the beginning of a series of motets for two parts, a miniature showing only one singer (cf. *Acta* IV 9 f., note). As to literary testimonies, we see that they do not distinguish between « vocal » and « instrumental » as we should like it, but rather « with text » (*cum littera*) and « without text » (*sine littera*), the latter category including melismatic singing. Yet we discern at the same time a tendency to push the T. into the background. Thus, *cum dupplici littera* in the Reading list must signify three-voice motets with different texts in the upper voices and *cum una littera et dupplici nota* two-voice motets (cf. I.R. 274-276). Accordingly I think that theoreticians like Pseudo-Aristoteles and W. Odington pass over the T. in rubricating the motet simply as a composi-

tion *cum littera* (CS. I 248a, 269b). Franco takes, on the contrary, the presence of *different* texts as characteristic of the motet (CS. I 130a): *cum diversis litteris fit discantus, ut in motettis qui habent triplum vel tenorem, quia tenor cuidam littere aequipollet*; we see that he includes the T. only in order to make the two-voice motet also agree with his definition, and that the reference to the T. is in weakened form (*aequipollet*). But his inclusion of the T. does not seem to have pleased everybody; for this passage is repeated in unmodified form only by Anonymus I (CS. I 302 a/b), while the *Speculum musicae* restricts Franco's definition: (*cum littera*) *diversa, ut in motettis triplum habentibus* (CS. II 395a), and S. Tunstede has: *cum diversis litteris ... ut in motettis qui habent triplum cum tenore, in quibus tenor aequipollet litterae* (CS. III 361b = IV 294b) — a classification which is not very clear but seems to restrict the definition to those motets in which the T. was really sung (and such continued to exist). The unscholastic Johannes de Grocheo says (in the edition of J. Wolf, *Samm.* I 106): *Motetus ... est cantus ex pluribus compositus habens plura dictamina vel multimodam discretionem syllabarum ... ibi sunt tres cantus vel quatuor, plura autem dictamina, quia quilibet debet habere discretionem syllabarum tenore excepto*; and further (*Samm.* I 110, with the correction given by H. Müller, *Samm.* IV 367): *cum in motettis plura sint dictamina*. That gives the impression that the T. is mostly textless and in some cases with text (the latter may indeed be referred to a special class of motets, those with a French Chanson as T.).

It seems therefore that «*plausu trino*» in the text of 1) must refer to the three upper voices of the version in F. Accordingly the order of the versions would be: 1. motet *Manere* for 2 voices, as in *W*<sub>2</sub>; 2. motet *Serena* for 4 voices, as in F; 3. motet *Serena* for 3 voices, as in the Beauvais version. We could, then, find that in the last the words «*plausu trino*» are out of place. Yet it is quite possible that in this version the T. had to be sung to the same text as the M. and Tr. since, as L.R. 242 states, all the voices are exceptionally written in score, with the text *Serena* beneath the lowest voice, which may signify a splitting of the T. notes, as in one version of *Ave gloriosa* (cf. above, III p. 63; I regret not to have at hand a photograph of the Beauvais version).

That these 6 motets are not English as to their fundamental structure, i. e., T. and M., results from the fact that they are all derived from Notre Dame Clausulae, be these single or incorporated in «*Choralbearbeitungen*». In this sense we shall not omit to note that the lai-like close with tone repetition occurs several times in the M. of 2). The question could only be whether the addition of Tr. and Quadruplum (or, in four cases, the addition of a Tr.) could have been the work of an English musician; but that we may leave to the future Notre Dame historian to determine.

#### IX. GENERAL REFLECTIONS; CONCLUSION.

In many of those motets which can be suspected as being English we have noted that the incisions in the upper voices coincide with those of the T. (above, III p. 63 f, and this volume, p. 86). Now it is true that this peculiarity occurs also in motets which are preserved in F, as it occurs in many Clausulae (i. e., those parts of *Choralbearbeitungen* which, by fitting their upper voices to a new text or texts, could be transformed into motets). But it seems that, the Notre Dame *Choralbearbeitung* embodying both possibilities — conformity or non-conformity of the upper voices to the T. as to period closes —, the English motet of the 13<sup>th</sup> c. has in a larger measure cultivated the former style, reminding of the syllabic parts of the Conductus; and the same seems to have been the case of that variety of the French motet which we could consider as «*popular*» (cf. above, p. 79); thus appears a gradation analogous to that which set in the 15<sup>th</sup> c. the Carol and Frottola against a more artistic or artificial method of composition.

Turning to the melodic aspect I feel induced to come back to a certain discussion about «*paraphrase*» which has taken place and which is not yet at its close. As I pointed out in ZM. X, 1928, p. 541-555, there occur in the 14<sup>th</sup> c. compositions of the Ordinary of the Mass, in which a procedure stretching from quotation to paraphrase is applied to liturgical melodies of the Ordinary and which, is so far, anticipate methods of the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> c. Among them was a composition contained in the «*Fragment Coussemaker*» which was then considered to be lost, but which I found soon afterwards at Brussels, and this Ms. proved to contain still another composition in which this method is applied; it seems to be English (cf. *Acta* VII, 1935, p. 160 f.).

I repeat that the order of the parts of the composition printed ZM. X 544-547 has been inverted by the printer; it must be restored according to the order of the melody reproduced *loc. cit.* 543 f. I must leave to those especially concerned with the music of the 14<sup>th</sup> c. to judge whether these are isolated examples or not (cf. *Revue belge de Musicologie* I 97). R. von Ficker in *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft* VII 22 had preceded me in relation to two of the compositions concerned. H. Bessler, ZM. XI 3, opposed arguments which I am ready to take into consideration, but which do not seem to me to do away with the question, since the melodic concordances which struck me occur on the same words, in the liturgical melody and the polyphonic setting, and the fact is that my examples were not chosen *ad hoc*, but they were such as I had just come across. On the other hand, M. Bukofzer accepted my claim as it was advanced (s. his dissertation, 1936, p. 116), while he disavowed it in *Musical Quarterly* XXXIV 527-529, even interpreting his previous consent as a dissent.



The argument which he adds to those of Bessler is that the treatment of liturgical melodies in the Old Hall Ms., an English collection of the 15<sup>th</sup> c., is not the same as in my examples — a fact which I admit with some reserve, but which does not exclude that other composers may have proceeded otherwise. (See Note 3). Dom Anselm Hughes, in the Introduction to the third volume of the Old Hall Ms. edition, p. XIII-XV, had described the treatment to which the liturgical melody is there subjected in terms not implying such a sharp contrast; yet he did not refer to my respective papers. I still await that which a systematic survey of the polyphonic Ordinary of the 14<sup>th</sup> c. will in this respect produce.

In comparison with such 14<sup>th</sup> c. compositions the motets which we have quoted as using liturgical melodies in the upper voice, are forerunners, and they are, in one respect, even more interesting, since we see here the *T. melody* intrude into the upper voices. Perhaps we must, within those motets, establish a chronological gradation, a freer treatment of the given melody in the T. having been first, and its radiation into the upper voices second. The freer handling of the melody in the T. has, by the way, a parallel in some settings of the Ordinary of the Mass in Worcester (cf. ZM. X 519 f.). I had tried, in ZM. X, to connect the polyphonic Ordinary of the 14<sup>th</sup> c. with the old art of tropes which, on the one hand, combined heterogeneous melodies with the liturgical ones and, on the other, tended to develop the latter by ornament and variation; and now it seems that we have approached that old art by *two* intermediating links. Of course a filiation of this kind does not exclude differences of physiognomy and of aesthetic aim. Yet the principle in itself is important, since it supposes a melodic inventiveness which dared to interfere with the liturgical melodies precisely because some inner community continued to exist with them (respectively, in France, it came again to exist), these melodies not (or no longer) being perceived as something dead, obsolete or extraneous.

If, as it is our impression, this sort of «conservativeness with progressive results» was the affair of England rather than of France, this would be in accord with the fact that the art of «trope» (which, of course, I take in the melodic and not, as is often done, in the textual sense) continued to flourish in England in the 13<sup>th</sup> c., and even the early 14<sup>th</sup>, in passing over into the realm of polyphony; we see this by the polyphonic tropes of English provenance contained in W<sub>1</sub> and other English Mss. (among them the Worcester fragments). That does not mean that the French motet of the first half of the 14<sup>th</sup> c. which developed from «isoperiodical» to «isorhythmical» arrangement (s. above, p. 75), was devoid of melodic substance, but here it is rather secular and vulgar music which seems to stand in the back ground (cf., e. g., the motet by Ph. de Vitry, J. Wolf, *Geschichte der Mensuralnotation*, No. 78, or that by G. de Machaut,

*loc. cit.*, No. 15). It is true that English polyphony is likewise often inspired by vulgar song. Nevertheless it remained more than in France in inner community with the liturgical melody and, by the way, the vulgar in English music has a more heavy character than in France. This community having better survived in England, had then to be revived in France, a process which seems to have begun in the second half of the 14<sup>th</sup> c. and which continued in the 15<sup>th</sup>. Indeed it seems that the Franco-Flemish art of the 15<sup>th</sup> c. was indebted to England not only as to «fresque concordance», i. e., harmony, but also in this respect.

We must, however, leave to those especially concerned with the polyphony of the 15<sup>th</sup> c., to give the true history of this interesting compositional device, the paraphrasing of a given melody. Our aim was only to note some antecedents.

Another significant aspect of the 15<sup>th</sup> c. evolution and, more so, of that of the 16<sup>th</sup> c., is the increasing tendency to nourish the voices of a polyphonic composition with the same melodic stuff. In this respect the last motet from Arsenal 135 and that from the Cambridge Gonville Ms. may be considered as forerunners (cf. above, p. 91), but that applies in another way also to some of those compositions of the Ordinary where the «paraphrase» may involve some «wandering» of the given melody from one voice to another. I should add that the idea of submitting different voices to the influence of one given melody does not necessarily imply imitation, although the latter is also a means of linking up the voices.

As to compositions of the early 15<sup>th</sup> c., a remarkable example is Dufay's *Anima mea liquefacta est*, DTO. XXVII 1, 20. Cf. A. Orel in *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft* VII, 1920, p. 87, as to this, and p. 62-63 and 82-84, as to other compositions.

There is yet a side-line of the evolution represented by compositions in which one preexistent melody gives the material for one voice and another for another. This method is, of course, kindred to that just mentioned: whether they are «stuffed» from one or from different sources, the voices are stuffed, and there are indeed transitions between both methods. There is also a clear affinity between this method and that, mentioned formerly, of adorning or paraphrasing a given melody, since the coexistence of two given melodies involves in general a freer treatment of them; indeed the last motet from Arsenal 135 and that from Cambridge Gonville may be considered in each of these three aspects. The *Ave gloriosa mater salvatoris* from the Summer Canon Ms. seems to be an antecedent going back far into the 13<sup>th</sup> c.

We shall not forget that the combination of two preexistent melodies, implying mutual or one-sided accommodation, was also known in France: cf. F. Ludwig, *Samm.* V 215 as to Mo. 7, 265, whose M. is a Rondeau melody and whose T. uses a liturgical fragment, while the Tr. quotes passages from another motet Tr. (thus, three melodies are even drawn upon simultaneously). Yet we have here more than in our English examples the impression of ingenious combination and less of melodic paraphrase.

As concerns the 15<sup>th</sup> c., both examples mentioned above (III p. 62 f) are English, but we ought again not to forget five examples which A. Orel adduced in his valuable study devoted to Trent motets (*Studien zur Musikwissenschaft* VII 67 and 69), of which none is English (or, at least, none ascribed to an English composer). One of these is Dufay's motet *Ecclesie militantis* which has since appeared in D<sup>T</sup>O. XL, and the Dufay edition of the American Institute of Musicology. (Orel had supposed that even three cantus firmi are employed, but that does not seem to be confirmed and the reason given by Orel for the third is, indeed, not sufficient; cf. the Critical notes in the edition, fascicle 2, p. xxxi, by G. de Van, where two cantus firmi are identified, as they were already by R. von Ficker in D<sup>T</sup>O.; there are, then, two Tenors, each with its own cantus firmus, and there is no « paraphrase »). Another case is that of the anonymous *Alma redemptoris*, D<sup>T</sup>O. XXVII 1, 37; (here Orel is right in observing that the upper voice is an adorned version of the Antiphon *Alma* and the second half of the T. is a somewhat less adorned version of the first half of the Antiphon *Ave regina*, but he does not seem to have noticed that the first half of the T., marked with *Et genitorem* in the edition, is nothing else than the melody of *tuum sanctum genitorem* from the same Antiphon *Alma* and is, thus, in substance the same as the melody to these words in the middle of the upper voice; the first half of the T. quotes this melody twice and adds a development based on the same melody). It is true that when it concerns the Franco-Flemish art of the first half of the 15<sup>th</sup> c., the question is always how far it may have already been influenced by English art. Again, we leave it to specialists of the 15<sup>th</sup> c. music to study in detail the technique of combining different Cantus firmi in one composition. As is known, the future belonged not to this method, but to that deriving the material of all the voices from one source, while the former was pushed into the position of a curiosity or joke (the « Quodlibet »).

\* \* \*

The question may then remain in suspense as concerns the rôle played by English musicians in the transformations going on in the first half of the 15<sup>th</sup> c., transformations which concerned the rhythm, melody, counterpoint and, last but not least, the harmony. We have at any rate seen that England was more active in the field of the motet than one had supposed, and this at the very epoch

when the compositions of Mo. 4 originated, i. e., in the middle of the 13<sup>th</sup> c. or even earlier. This does not on the other hand exclude that it remained a characteristic of English musical production not to have devoted itself to the motet so exclusively as did the « progressive » circles in France. While the *Speculum musicae*, composed at Liège in the early 14<sup>th</sup> c., deplors that *cantus organici* (« Choralbearbeitungen ») and Conductus have fallen into disuse and only the motet and the Cantilena are in use, England continued to cultivate those genera and, as history has shown, one procedure has proved to be fertile as the other.

Since several motets of English provenance are present in Mo. 4, we must conclude that not only England displayed in this field its own taste very soon after the disappearance of the Notre Dame School, but also notice of that was taken on the Continent. The general trend of English taste in the second half on the 13<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 14<sup>th</sup> c. can, in comparison with French, be described as less reflective and studied, more bent on aesthetic perceptibility, tending to compact vocal sonority and to establishing a close relation between the voices, and preferring melodic to rhythmic inventiveness (though one must not lay too much stress on such generalizations, and there were surely also in France circles which were less « up to date »). Perhaps there is on the English side also more complaisance towards tendencies coming from the field of non-learned music. In this respect the Summer Canon is an impressive example which, at the same time, shows that the vulgar in England is not quite the same as the vulgar in France. If it is permitted to condense a series of impressions in one word, I should take the German word « bieder » (which can be translated only by the combination of two English words, namely, « honest » and « simple ») for characterizing English behaviour as against French within the culture of that epoch; or, as a translator of a French poem at the beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> c. expressed it:

Have me excused, my name is John Lidgate,  
Rude of language, I was not born in France.

The attempt to delimit the English contribution to the Notre Dame Ms. W<sub>1</sub>, which I undertook in *The Musical Times* of June, 1932, and August, 1933, concerned 1) compositions belonging to the classical Notre Dame genera, *Choralbearbeitung* and Conductus; 2) polyphonic tropes to the Ordinary, which, on the one hand, apply methods used in the *Choralbearbeitung* and, on the other, display characteristics proper to the Conductus; (here I leave aside the 11<sup>th</sup> fascicle of W<sub>1</sub>, whose position is a special one, see above, III p. 89 f). It is not sure whether there is at all an English contribution in the field of the motet and, at any rate, the motet occupies in this Ms.

a position which is, at the same time, insignificant and assimilated to the Conductus — a fact which I have tried to explain in chapter VIII.

By tight scientific handling of the material we shall once be probably able to bring such motets as we have dealt with into their true historical relation to the varied contents of *W*<sub>1</sub>, as well as to the lost Reading collection and the Worcester fragments. All this is a task not less important or attractive, than to distinguish the rôle of France (France in the old sense, i. e., Northern France) from that played by England in the field of Gothic architecture. A comprehensive study of 13<sup>th</sup> c. music will of course have to take in account also that which happened in other countries, as Italy, Spain, and Western Germany; yet the main « international » problem seems to be that of the Franco-English relations.

In returning to the Summer Canon I think that the indications of vigorous English activity in the middle of the 13<sup>th</sup> c., appearing in the older part of *Mo.*, make the appearance of the piece at that epoch seem less strange. As to its binary rhythm, our survey seems likewise to produce some support (cf. above, p. 71 and III p. 74), quite apart from the fact, long since known, of the occurrence of a French motet in binary rhythm in *Mo.* 5 (cf. above, p. 79 f; I should say that if this could happen in France, it is the less surprising in England). As to the canonic device itself, we may remember cases of textual or rhythmic imitation bordering with melodic imitation, as cited above (p. 74 and 75). It is true that these cases concern *Mo.* 7, i. e., a later part of *Mo.*; yet I am not at all of the opinion that direct canon must be later than veiled or eluded canon. It has sometimes been observed that canonic sections occur « already » in Notre Dame compositions; yet I am not at all sure that in this case the « invention » of the device must be ascribed to the learned musicians of Notre Dame.

However, as has been said, the Summer Canon preserves still a degree of isolation. As to chronology (cf. above, III p. 56 f), one of the results of the reconsideration of the problem, provoked by Bukofzer's challenge, is that the paleographers who has said « ca. 1240 », taking both Reading calendars as evidence, had better said « probably between 1240 and 1260 ».

The latter is, as far as I see, also the opinion of Mr. Schofield. I see from N. Pirrotta's paper in *Musica disciplina* II 205 ff., that we have independently of each other felt the impulse to give an echo to the interesting papers by M. Bukofzer and B. Schofield. I am glad to see that I am nearly in agreement with him as to one idea: that the Summer Canon, not being in the line of « normal » evolution as reflected by musical theory, cannot exclusively be subjected to criteria taken from this quarter. In a broader sense it is the problem of « progressiveness » which is at stake, this problem to which N. Pirrotta devotes some pertinent remarks

and which I have at other occasions touched upon in a rather sceptical mood; (at the very beginnings of my scientific career I already opposed a conception of history which seems to me too one-sidedly « linear »: *Schweizerisches Jahrbuch für Musikwissenschaft* I, 1924, à propos of the 11<sup>th</sup> fascicle of *W*<sub>1</sub>). The general question is, how much England and Italy, whose positions were in a way peripheral, have, besides « central » France, contributed to the changes going on in the music of the 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries. (I have yet to express my thanks to the Rev. Anselm Hughes who, with his habitual kindness, has helped me to get some Worcester photographs.)

#### APPENDIX I: THE HUELGAS MS.

Another source in which motets of English provenance could be looked for is a Spanish Ms. of the first half of the 14<sup>th</sup> c., edited by H. Anglès under the title *El Codex musical de Las Huelgas* (1931, the first volume containing the introduction, the second the facsimile and the third the transcription).

In noting those of the *Mo.* motets which we have in the first place singled out as being possibly English (i. e., those enumerated above p. 73 ff.), we find that the following are contained in *Hu.* (= Las Huelgas):

- Mo.* 4, 53 (above, III p. 60 ff.) is *Hu.* No. 101;
- Mo.* 4, 58 (above, p. 81) is *Hu.* No. 107;
- Mo.* 7, 275 (above, p. 75) is *Hu.* No. 133;
- Mo.* 7, 285 (above, p. 80) is *Hu.* No. 121.

We might yet add that *Mo.* 4, 62 and *Mo.* 4, 57 (quoted above, p. 69 and 81 as occurring also in English Mss.) are *Hu.* No. 128 and 140; and *Mo.* 3, 40, 4, 52, 4, 56 and 7, 283 (quoted above, p. 83 ff. as occurring in Arsenal 125) are *Hu.* No. 157, 104 = 137, 125, 127. The reader may accordingly profit from Anglès' commentaries to these motets. It is interesting that *Mo.* 7, 284 and 285 follow each other in *Hu.* (No. 120 and 121), as they do in *Mo.*, while *Mo.* 7, 283 and 282 are adjacent in Arsenal 135 (Nos. 6 and 7).

We shall not enter a comparison of the different versions concerned and shall pass over to another composition, *Hu.* No. 134, considered by the editor as a double Conductus, which seems to be most conspicuous with regard to our problem. It is a « rondellus » as described above (III p. 82 f.) for 2 voices. It begins with a melism of 3 treble bars, after which a period of 5 bars,  $\frac{A}{B}$ , is repeated as  $\frac{B}{A}$  and a period of 4 bars,  $\frac{C}{D}$ , is repeated as  $\frac{D}{C}$  (the correspondences go farther than stated by H. Anglès, although there is no complete identity); the close is a melismatical and, in part, hoketing *Amen*.

This structure is enriched in so far as the period of 5 bars, as well as that of 4, contains a partial repetition. Another feature of this composition whose voices, according to Anglès, « sing marvellously », is the skilful design of the text which begins all its verses with C in one voice and D in the other ; I wonder whether that is not a monogram. We cannot yet be sure that this composition is English ; but it stands apart in its surroundings, and some corrupt passages which occur in the music as in the text, indicate that it did not originate in the milieu where it was written down. It is true that Hu. contains also a *Benedicamus domino* in 3 parts, which is wholly based on voice exchange and taken from the Notre Dame repertory (Hu. No. 40, cf. p. 132 in H. Husmann's edition *Die 3- und 4-stimmigen Organa*) ; yet this is not the same category and form type.

This composition is precisely preceded in Hu. by a motet which has attracted our attention, Mo. 7, 275 = Hu. No. 133. Now in extending this neighbourhood and considering, on the one hand, Hu. No. 132 and, on the other, Hu. No. 135, we again meet pieces whose characteristics may arouse our « suspicion ». They are motets known hitherto only from this Spanish Ms.

Hu. No. 132 is a motet for 3 voices with two different (yet assonant) texts in the upper voices which, however, could have been sung to one text, since they are in conformity as to rhythm. The T. has its pauses simultaneously with the upper voices. Its melody comprises two periods of 4 bars and is repeated five times ; it has no liturgical provenance mark and is, as thinks Anglès, possibly secular (cf. above, p. 76 and 81). Anglès speaks of voice exchange. Now in symbolizing the upper voices

accompanying the first T. exposition by  $\begin{matrix} a & b \\ c & b_1 \end{matrix}$ , I should rather say that the phrase b recurs several times simultaneously with the second T. phrase, as do a and c, but less frequently, in conjunction with the first T. phrase. It is a step in the direction of « isomelodicity » (cf. above, p. 80f.), and we may doubt about how far such repetitions are the result of aesthetic tendencies or of lack of inventiveness. Another remarkable feature of this motet is its binary rhythm which proceeds by semibreves and breves in the regular scheme of the (diminished) third mode (if we should imagine the squares of the breves provided with tails, it would be « English mensural notation »).

Hu. No. 135 has, above a T. melody repeated four times whose source is again unknown, two voices whose incisions coincide often one with another and with the T. One of the upper voices frequently has a melism simultaneously with a syllabic passage in the other voice, a feature which reminds us of the English « rondellus ». The close is a melismatic *Amen*. The Tr. text is that of a Sanctus trope which had also been utilised as sequence.

Before attaining conclusive results Hu. must evidently be subjected to a more extensive study in comparison with English collections, as also with other Spanish collections as, e. g., Barcelona, Orfeo 1. The result will very possibly be that the music of « peripheral » areas as England and Spain had some characteristics distinguishing it from that of the Paris area and, in general, a more « conservative » trend. Yet that does not exclude that musical material and methods of composition may have wandered from England to Spain.

#### APPENDIX II : PSEUDO-ARISTOTELES (cf. above, p. 83)

J. Wolf (*Geschichte der Mensuralnotation*, 1904, p. 8) has observed that the « conjuncture » of three rhombs the first of which has at the left an obliquely descending stroke, occurs in the Summer Canon Ms. on f. 8' (yet it occurs even in the Canon itself). (See Note 4). Therefore he concludes too hastily (p. 13) that the treatise of Pseudo-Aristoteles (CS. I 251 ff.) must be dated to ca. 1240, and (*Handbuch der Notationskunde* I 243) that Pseudo-Aristoteles was an Englishman. H. Sowa (*Ein anonymes Musiktraktat*, 1930, p. xvii) is more right in dating it as ca. 1275. At the same time Sowa substantiates a supposition uttered by W. Niemann, according to which Pseudo-Aristoteles would be identical with one Lambertus mentioned by Johannes de Grocheo (Samm. I 102).

I found in the Ms. Paris, B. N. lat. 5185CC, f. 356', a curious ordinance from 1282 which may refer to our author : « Item super quarto articulo (capituli), videlicet de quodam scriptore Aristotile nomine, capto extra claustrum et terram ecclesie Parisiensis per officialem Parisiensem, qui dicebatur tunc esse de familia domini Johannis Moreti canonici Parisiensis : pronuntiamus, statuimus et ordinamus : episcopum seu officialem Parisiensem non teneri ad restitutionem dicti Aristotelis, cum non sit probatum dictum Aristotilem scriptorem tunc esse vel fuisse de familia dicti domini Johannis ». It appears therefrom that Pseudo-Aristoteles who had sought « liberty » outside of the Paris Notre Dame cloister, had been seized by the episcopal judge, but the claim of the chapter to his restitution was not admitted by the bishop, since it had not been proved that he was, at least at the moment when he was seized, a member of the « family » of canon Johannes Moretus.

APPENDIX III: THE QUESTION OF APPOGGIATURA  
(cf. above, p. 79)

While considering in chapter VI some Mo. motets, we were faced with the question of whether a fourth preceding a third could have been intended as an appoggiatura. That leads naturally to a question of a more general character: to what extent had the notion of appoggiatura come to the consciousness of musical theory in the 13<sup>th</sup> c.?

I discussed once a passage from Anonymus IV (CS. I 358b) which clearly refers to the sustained final appoggiatura of the second, as practised in Notre Dame music (*Atti del terzo congresso intern. di musica, Firenze 1938, 1940, p. 52 f.*). Yet the theoretician who stands foremost in this respect is Johannes de Garlandia. One passage from him has indeed been adduced in this connection — that reproduced in CS. I 107a; yet in reality it is not more applicable to appoggiatura than to passing dissonance. The following passage, printed CS. I 106b, seems more to the point: « Sic apparent VII discordantiae, et quae earum magis discordant et quae minus. Et notandum quod omnis discordantia ante perfectam concordantiam sive mediam aequipollet mediae. Et haec proprie sumitur ante unisonum vel diapason. Sciendum est quod nunquam ponitur discordantia ante perfectam concordantiam nisi causa coloris musicae. Haec de consonantiis sufficient ». (I follow S. M. Cserba's new edition of Garlandia's treatise as incorporated in that by Hieronymus of Moravia, p. 211; just as Coussemaker does, so also the new editor utilizes only the Paris Ms., that where the Garlandia treatise is preserved as part of that of Hieronymus).

This passage, however, implies a logical lacuna: where is the « improprie » completing the « proprie »? It seems contradictory that the appoggiatura has, on the one hand, its proper place before the unison or the octave and that it is, on the other hand, admitted before these intervals only in the way of a licence.

We turn now to Rome, Vat. lat. 5325, a Ms. of French provenance from the 13<sup>th</sup> c., in which the Garlandia treatise is written down in its own right and not within that by Hieronymus, yet without the author's name. Coussemaker has reproduced from this Ms. only f. 12'-19' (CS. I 175-182) which is a variant version to a part of the treatise, while he neglected to make use of f. 20-30' where other parts of it are represented by variant versions.

We may note by the way that the Discantus chapter of the treatise (CS. I 106-114) stands in the Vaticana Ms. on f. 23'-30' (where it breaks off with the words « Par contra imparum », CS. I 112b), and that this version does not contain the musical examples

reproduced by Coussemaker (and Cserba) according to the Paris Ms., but only examples which have been left blank, the staves having been drawn. In opposition to the textless examples of the Paris version, these have been furnished with one text, but this seems rather paradoxical, since the combination of different rhythmical modes, which was to be illustrated by the examples, would in general suppose a text for every voice.

The appoggiatura passage, corresponding to CS. I 106b, stands on f. 23-23' of the Vaticana Ms. The Coussemaker version having closed the first paragraph of 106b with « X ad octo » (it must, of course, be « IX ad VIII », as in the Cserba edition), our Ms. continues in replacing the passage quoted above by the following. « Et hoc sufficit ad praesens de consonantiis, sive discordantiis vel concordantiis in numeris. Sciendum est quod omnis dissonantia ante perfectam concordantiam sive mediam aequipollet concordantiae mediae, et hoc proprie dicitur scilicet ante unisonum et diapason ». (Here space is left for two examples, the staves having been drawn; below them is written: *Ante unisonum tonum* and *Tonus ante diapason*). « Et sic de singulis. Et improprie sumitur ante mediam, sed multum invenitur in multis partibus organi, ut tonus ante diapente, ut in hoc exemplo ». (Space for two examples, one being subscribed *Semitonus ante diapente* and the other *Tonus ante diapente*). (f. 23') (Space for one example, subscribed *Tonus ante diatessaron*). « Et sciendum quod nunquam dissonantia aliqua ante imperfectam concordantiam, nisi sit causa coloris sive pulchritudinis musicae. Et hoc sufficit de perfectis sive imperfectis sive mediis ad praesens ». The next paragraph is: « Sequitur de discantu. Habito superius de modo, scilicet quid modus est et quot sunt, de figuris vel notis, de pausionibus, de consonantiis, modo habendum est de discantu. Unde discantus est... » (as in Coussemaker and Cserba).

In comparing this version with that of the Paris Ms. it appears that the former represents a complete system. A dissonance preceding a perfect concordance (i. e., unison or octave) or a medium one (fifth or fourth) is by principle (by a rather scholastic principle) assimilated to a medium one; the proper place of this dissonance is before the unison and the octave (indeed in this case its rôle is most obvious and clear); improperly it can be used before the fifth or fourth (it is a pity that the examples illustrating this are lacking); before an *imperfect* concordance (i. e., the major or minor third) this dissonance ought not to be made use of, except in the way of a special embellishment.

I am not sure that the author has in view ascending appoggiatura as well as descending; but supposing this to be the case, the subscriptions to the examples point to the following:





—, the half-tone appoggiatura being applied only to the fifth, not to the unison, the octave and the fourth. However not all of these appoggiaturas are dissonances or discordances; according to the author's classification, 4. b) c) and 5. a) b) c) d) would be consonant appoggiaturas. Had the author really all these cases before his eyes? It is, at any rate, probable that he had a glimpse of a consonance being shifted to the function of a dissonance. As to the appoggiatura to the third, not represented in the examples, it can be only the fourth or second in descending, and the second or fourth in ascending.

It would be interesting to compare this system to what we find in practice, especially in Notre Dame and S. Martial polyphony. That is again a task which we leave to the future; yet we may provisionally note that the appoggiatura plays here an important rôle, that to the unison, the octave and the fifth being prominent and that to the fourth and third appearing in a less decided way. The fact that our author takes into consideration the appoggiatura to the third as that to the fourth (things which, in our « historical » perspective, would seem to exclude each other, cf. above, p. 79), shows how two-faced and unstable the perception of consonance was at this stage (already at this stage!).

#### APPENDIX IV: THE SACRED AND THE SECULAR.

The relation between sacred and secular music has been several times touched upon in this survey, but without entering into the essential of the distinction between them. This would, indeed, require a special study and, as historians, we must be careful not to consider the question from our point of view only, but to inquire how it may have been viewed by the period in question. I think that the first musical historian to have considered the question in a critical way was H. Abert, in his paper « Geistlich and Weltlich in der Musik » (*Zeitschrift für Aesthetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* XIX, 1925, 397 ff.). When handling this subject we must further distinguish such shades (« nuances ») as: the sacred — the ecclesiastical — the liturgical — the spiritual and (eventually) the

religious. It is known that in the middle ages the « secular » had intruded into the realm of the « ecclesiastical » in a surprising way (indeed, this sort of expansion seems to have taken place at all times), and ecclesiastical writers have often opposed this tendency (yet exactly what they mean is always subject to study). It seems that, within the ecclesiastical chant proper (the liturgical), the Ordinary of the Mass has experienced this influx in a particular degree (I may quote, as example, the Sanctus *Sussen grunt*, the Sanctus *Meientalle* and the Sanctus *Rosengarten*, contained in a late mediaeval gradual at Bamberg, R. B. 169); and the Mass Ordinary is, at the same time, that department of liturgical melody which was by preference subjected to the methods of polyphonic and measured music, from the late middle ages onwards; (a curious example of secular song intruding into a polyphonic setting of the Credo is mentioned in *Revue belge de musicologie* I 97). At the same time we have to consider the application of measured rhythm (and notation) to the Ordinary *without* involving polyphony, a practice for which examples are furnished by continental, as well as by insular Mss. There is accordingly nothing surprising in the fact that some melodies, discovered by H. M. Bannister in a 15<sup>th</sup> c. Ms., which were taken by F. Ludwig as motet Tenors and which gave me the impression of dance melodies (*Acta* X 29), were afterwards found by M. Bukofzer to occur elsewhere (and even to have, probably, been composed) as Kyrie melodies; (what surprises me is rather the pleasure which this writer takes in speaking of an « abortive » discovery; furthermore, he alleges that these melodies were taken by me as basses-dances, which is not the case; cf. his *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Music*, 1950, 191). But the problem is puzzling also within the field of the motet and here we meet the case, not yet sufficiently explained, of the bilingual motets with each a secular and a sacred text, contained in Mo. 3 (Nos. 36-46). Are they to be understood as an incursion of secular poetry (represented by the Tr.) into the church, or of sacred poetry (represented by the M.) into the field of secular music? A third alternative would be to suppose that they could have been sung within the service with removal of the Tr. text, i. e., in singing the Tr. without text, but that is not probable since the Tr. is, in some cases, very declamatory in style. As between the first two alternatives, the second appears at first sight to be more plausible. But what may have been in this case the motive for this strange combination? I think it may be summarily described as the idea of placing worldly love in the perspective of heavenly love, and that gives us a glimpse of the philosophy of the epoch. Indeed 8 of the 11 Latin Moteti glorify the holy Virgin-Mother; one is a warning against false men (No. 37), one a glorification of the Cross as source of real (definitive) joy (No. 41, where an

actual contrast may have been intended), and one a paraphrase of the Lord's promise to send the Holy Spirit for comforting us after his Ascension (No. 42). Yet in one of these Tr. texts there is no question of love at all (No. 46: a complaint about the falsehood of the world). The love texts in general lay stress on loyalty; or they tell of a love which has failed; and even the enumeration of the physical qualities of the beloved, as in the Tr. of No. 38, may have been related to the epitheta bestowed on Mary in the M. We have, then, the impression that an author who had attained a certain degree of contemplation took pleasure in such parallels in which secular love is placed into an aspect of relativity. It is true that we are not sure whether the bilingual form of this music is its oldest motet form, but this inner correlation would exist also if the Tr. had been associated with a preexistent M. (the Tr. text in the Mo. version seems, at any rate, to be older than the Latin Tripla associated with some of the Moteti in the version of the Bamberg Ms., cf. LR. 404-406 and Ludwig in AM. V 200). We may add that the T. appears also in several cases to have been fittingly chosen: *Et gaudet* (Nos. 36 and 42), *Letabitur* (No. 38), *Sustinere* (No. 41, with the M. celebrating the Cross), *Regnat* (No. 44: the Tr. tells of a girl who, by fidelity to her friend, refuses the proposals of the narrator and the M. glorifies Mary in whose bosom the faithful will find the peace of God, Mary who «reigns» in the heaven with her son); perhaps even the Easter T. *Hec dies* in No. 45 is related to the spring picture given by the lover in the Tr. For the rest we must remember that, as F. Ludwig has pointed out (Samm. V 187), such bilingual motets are relatively rare; these 11 examples form the largest extant collection, and while 10 of them recur in the Bamberg Ms., only 4 have retained their bilingual form. On the other hand, we have to remember the *Ite missa est* motet which closes the «Mass of Tournai». Notwithstanding its French secular Tr. text, it can hardly be denied that this motet was sung in that form at the close of the Mass (cf. *Acta* IV 51 f. and *Revue belge de Musicologie* I 97). The Latin text in the M. is an admonition very fittingly directed at this moment to the rich to help the poor, while the Tr. speaks of love in a very courtly manner.

## ADDITIONAL NOTES

<sup>1</sup> (Referring to p. 94) With regard to the compositions quoted in this paragraph I should add some references. A passage from *Adjuva* has been published in *The Musical Times* 1933, 702. *Luto* is published by L. Ellinwood in *The Musical Quarterly* XXVII 191, without regard to the accentuation of the rhyme syllable. *Sursum corda* contains an early example of «double counterpoint», of which the oldest case I have seen is a troped *Benedicamus* in an English Ms. of the early 13<sup>th</sup> c., Cambridge Un. F I 17, reproduced in EEH. pl. 26 (examples occur also in Notre Dame Tripla which bear no indications of English origin as, e. g., the

Responsory *Virgo*, F f. 33', and the verse to the Responsory *Exiit*, F f. 18'; the cases adduced by Y. Rokseth in *Mélanges... La Laurencie*, 1933, 5 ff., are from ca. 1248). *Procurans* and *Purgator* were already given by F. Gennrich in facsimile and in a transcription in 2. mode, ZM. XII 332 ff. *Sol sub* was published by Ellinwood, *loc. cit.* 192, but as to this I must observe that it is only the version of F and W<sub>1</sub>, not that of St. Gall 383, in which the upper voice is at variance with the sequence form of the lower voice. We might also add *Quid tu vides Jeremia* of which two different three-voice compositions exist, both having the same melody in the lowest voice: of these the version in F is much less «tonal» as to harmony than that contained in W<sub>1</sub> and W<sub>2</sub> and, of the latter, W<sub>1</sub> has some parallel perfect chords (L. Ellinwood, *loc. cit.* 194, thinks that the composition in F differs from that contained in W<sub>1</sub> and W<sub>2</sub> only in the uppermost voice, but that is not my opinion; his transcription again does not have regard to the accentuation of the rhyme syllable; needless to say I cannot agree with the rubrics which this writer uses for grouping his material: «Vers-Hymns», «Chanson-Hymns», etc.).

<sup>2</sup> (Referring to p. 95) It is to the credit of W. Apel (*Notation*<sup>4</sup> 200) to have doubted the attribution of W<sub>1</sub> to the 14<sup>th</sup> c. (an attribution which goes back to the catalogue of Wolfenbüttel Mss., by O. von Heinemann), yet I should not go so far as to date it from the middle of the 13<sup>th</sup> c., i. e., the same epoch when F was probably written. The palaeographer whom I consulted, Prof. H. G. Wackernagel, was of the opinion that W<sub>1</sub> might be later than F by one generation, and he found its script also later than that of the Summer Canon. At the same time he warned me against uniform dating, since the evolution was different in different localities and therefore a definite dating would require a survey of the Mss. of the given area. We see that it is the same in palaeography as in music history. Catalogue compilers have often been anxious to «play safe» by too late dating.

<sup>3</sup> (Referring to p. 100) Cf. further M. Bukofzer, *Studies...*, 1950, p. 52.

<sup>4</sup> (Referring to p. 107) We may add that this form of Conjunction occurs, in W<sub>1</sub>, in the 11<sup>th</sup> fascicle and in some Conductus (f. 80' and 175-176), and also the English theoretician Alfredus knows it (cf. J. Kromolicki, *Die Practica artis musicae des Amerus*, 1909, p. II and 27).

Basel

