

# Concerning the Genetic Relationship Between Notre Dame Clausulas And Their Motets

[1]

by

WOLF FROBENIUS

trans. Rob C. Wegman

## 1. A Discounted Question

The music historian Charles Edmond de Coussemaker established the foundation for historical motet research with *L'art harmonique au XIIe et XIIIe siècles* (Paris 1865), in which he transcribed, translated, and most knowledgeably commented upon a selection of fifty motets from the manuscript Montpellier. For more than four decades this selection served as virtually the only illustrative musical material for the genre.<sup>1</sup> Not only did it provide the basis for an extensive study by Oswald Koller,<sup>2</sup> but it was still commented upon – albeit from a different perspective – by Friedrich Ludwig in 1903/04.<sup>3</sup>

However, the subsequent course of nineteenth-century motet research would be determined largely by philologists, who focused their attention on the texts and edited these in grand style.<sup>4</sup> These scholars discovered that French motets regularly incorporate refrains; indeed, that these refrains often appear to have served as the compositional starting point and focus of the motet. In this connection they also emphasized that the word *motet*, in French romances from the thirteenth century, often had the meaning “refrain.”

G. Raynaud highlighted the refrains he had identified in motets by printing these in italics, a practice which K. Bartsch welcomed in his review of this edition.<sup>5</sup> H. Lavois delved more deeply into the question of refrains in his own essay:<sup>6</sup> he emphasized their frequency, distinguished the onomatopaeic ones from those that presented a complete phrase, and stressed that the respective tunes had found their way into the motets along with the texts themselves:

[2]

---

<sup>1</sup> While it is true that the first volume of H. E. Wooldridge's *Oxford History of Music* (Oxford 1901) contained several examples from the Florence manuscript, it was only P. Aubry's *Cent motets* of 1908 (below, note 18) that brought a decisive expansion of the available printed material.

<sup>2</sup> *Der Liedkodex von Montpellier*, VfMw IV, 1888.

<sup>3</sup> *Studien über die Geschichte der mehrstimmigen Musik im Mittelalter II: Die 50 Beispiele Coussemaker's aus der Handschrift von Montpellier*, SIMG V, 1903/4/

<sup>4</sup> G. Jacobsthal, *Die Texte der Liederhandschrift von Montpellier H 196*, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* III f., 1879f. (diplomatic edition); G. Raynaud, *Recueil de motets français des XIIe et XIIIe siècles . . . Suivi d'une étude sur la musique au siècle de Saint Louis par H. Lavoiz fils*, Paris 1882–84; A. Stimming, *Die altfranzösische Motette der Bamberger Handschrift nebst einem Anhang, enthaltend altfranzösischen Motetten aus anderen deutschen Handschriften*, Dresden 1906.

<sup>5</sup> *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* VIII, 1884, 457.

<sup>6</sup> See above, note 4.

“The Montpellier manuscript contains a large number of [refrains], whether stating a complete phrase or made up of meaningless words . . . Our manuscript abounds in such refrains, which carry their tunes along with them. I’m not even citing those which present a complete phrase. These double songs, so to speak, enter into the very composition of the counterpoint, which is equally as important as the tune.”<sup>7</sup>

K. Bartsch underlined the historical interest of refrain quotations in motets:

“There is no other genre, other than perhaps the romance and pastourelle, where so many popular elements found a home, [elements] that survive here as remains of a popular lyrical art that has otherwise perished for the most part . . . I want to focus attention particularly on this point [i.e. the use of refrains], precisely because it demonstrates the connection between motets and popular poetry.”<sup>8</sup>

And E. Schwan noted the fundamental significance of refrains for all forms of French polyphony in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries:

“French popular song possesses the characteristic feature, evident already in the oldest surviving examples (incorrectly called pastourelles), that every stanza contains one or more verses that regularly recur, and that stand out as especially characteristic both with regard to content and music, [verses] that we commonly refer to as ‘refrains’ but which are called ‘motets’ (little words) in courtly romances and pastourelles, where they are found scattered in large numbers. These ‘motets’ which (to judge from their frequent occurrence in isolation) were also sung apart from the song itself, formed the new element that was added to the secularized discantus voice part, and effected its musical and poetic recasting. For while the tenor resounded the festively measured notes of the cantus firmus, the top voice, once independent, was singing light, graceful ‘motets’ of this kind, for which reason that voice received the designation *motetus*, a name which was subsequently . . . transferred to the genre as a whole. . . .<sup>9</sup> Once the top voice became separate from the tenor, it was shaped ever more independently and extensively, and accordingly, the discantor, who until then had been only a musician, became a poet. But no matter in how many ways it was shaped, the foundation of his poem remained the old popular ‘motet,’ which brought polyphonic singing into the realm of vernacular art, and from which it received its name. A range of widely differing forms sprouted from this one germ; in all of them, the word ‘motet’ appears as the point towards which everything is aimed.”<sup>10</sup>

[3]

Questions were formulated and tasks set for future research. For Bartsch it was especially the rhythm and the verse articulation of the motet texts that continued to pose difficulties. It was hoped that the solution might come from the elucidation of the musical side of the motet:

<sup>7</sup> Page 274f.

<sup>8</sup> *Loc. cit.*, 456f. The hypothesis of the popular nature of the refrain was called into question by A. Jeanroy, who pointed out the numerous traces of courtly love theory that can be found in them (*Les origines de la poésie en France au moyen age*, Paris [1904] 1925, 119ff.). Neither are they still considered fragments at the present time. Rather, the refrain is reckoned as a genre in its own right, with this peculiarity that it persistently maintains a connection of symbiosis with other genres, whether these are likewise sung, such as motet, rondeau, and chanson, or not, like the roman (Boogaard [see below, note 50], p. 17; cf. still earlier Friedrich Gennrich, *Refrain-Studien* [see below, note 50], p. 374f.).

<sup>9</sup> For Bartsch, on the other hand, “the fact that refrains are often designated ‘motets’ when they are cited in poetic works may be explained by the frequent occurrence of the refrain in motets” (*loc. cit.*, 457); cf. also *id.*, *Geistliche Umdichtung weltlicher Lieder*: “. . . motet . . ., found not infrequently as a designation for refrains, and most naturally explained by the fact that refrains of popular songs were also often used in motets” (*ibid.* 573).

<sup>10</sup> *Die Geschichte des mehrstimmigen Gesangs und seiner Formen in der französischen Poesie des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts*, in: *Verhandlungen der 38. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Gießen 1885*, Leipzig 1896, 124.

The rhythmic side is most difficult, and cannot be separated from the musical side; it is especially the verse articulation that will often appear dubious: the question where to assume end rhyme, and where internal rhyme, can only rarely be answered with any certainty. Hopefully Jacobsthal's detailed work, which has been in preparation for years, will shed light on all these points.<sup>11</sup>

Interest in the textual forms of the motet guided also the philologist W. Meyer, who worked on the Latin motet,<sup>12</sup> a genre that had until then received much less attention:

When researching the forms of medieval Latin poetry, the texts of motets have given me such considerable difficulties that I came to a complete stop before them, and could only hope for the help of somebody else . . . Now, the motet manuscript Bamberg . . . has forced me to take up myself the problem whose resolution I had so hoped for from others. I do not understand anything about music, even though I do like to hear singing, and the labors of research were uncommonly great for me; still, I believe that I have resolved the problem in its essentials, and have recognized the origins and fundamental nature of the medieval motet.<sup>13</sup>

Meyer discovered that the motet originated within the framework of Notre Dame plainchant elaborations. And he viewed the creation of the genre as analogous to the creation of the sequence by Notker. Apparently the motet had come into being as the result of the addition of Latin texts to the top voices of discant sections ("Klauseln"; a designation introduced only by Friedrich Ludwig) in plainchant elaborations. It was this historical background that might explain, in his view, the "dithyrambic forms" and the trope-like character of the Latin motet.<sup>14</sup>

This conception of the origin of the motet seems to have sprung from a rash idea about the *Magnus liber* and the clausula fascicle of the manuscript Florence, rather than from an examination of the relationship between musically identical clausulas and motets. Meyer – unlike Fr. Ludwig – placed remarkably little emphasis on the determination of those musical identities. He neither documented them with references to the manuscript upon which he drew, Florence, where they would probably have been familiar to him (as, for example, with the motets [216], [231], [524] and [254/6]), nor did he avoid examples for which no clausulas were known at the time (as, for example, with the motets [692/3] and [129/30]).<sup>15</sup>

[4]

<sup>11</sup> *Loc. cit.*, 456f.; evidently G. Jacobsthal's study had not yet appeared.

<sup>12</sup> L. Gautier gave an assessment that was unavoidably still quite vague in *Histoire de la poésie liturgique au moyen âge: les tropes*, Paris 1896, 183–86; numerous texts from the manuscripts Florence and W[olfenbüttel]<sup>2</sup> were printed in G. M. Dreves and Cl. Blume, S. J., *Analecta hymnica medii aevi* XX, XXI, and II.

<sup>13</sup> *Der Ursprung des Motetts. Vorläufige Bemerkungen*, in: Nachrichten der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, 1898, expanded reprint in id., *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur mittellateinischen Rhythmik* II, Berlin 1905, 303 ff. (hereafter cited after this latter edition).

<sup>14</sup> *Loc. cit.*, 310–12. With the characterisation "dithyrambic forms" Meyer was surely not so much referring to motets with prosa texts that force asymmetric periods, but rather to the form of the motet in general: for this is not a "fixed" form like other musico-poetic forms, but must always take shape under the constraints of the cantus firmus setting.

<sup>15</sup> The motets mentioned here are treated *loc. cit.*, 313–15 and 318.

The hypothesis that the motet had its origin in the Latin texting of Notre Dame clausulas lacked adequate foundation at least in this regard, that there had been no consideration of the alternative possibility, that the distinctive form of the motet might perhaps be explained by the constraints of the cantus firmus setting, and that, when there are musically identical clausulas and motets, it might equally well be the latter that represented the original version (something which the source situation does not rule out by any means).

Also lacking in support was Meyer's view that the Latin motet was historically prior to the French motet, a view which he motivated only with his fundamental assumption that "he who wants to view the Middle Ages clearly . . . should begin with Latin and ecclesiastical texts."<sup>16</sup> Yet Meyer did not show in what specific ways sacred and secular matters were demarcated from each other in the thirteenth century (and that this is certainly a question worth asking is shown by the manuscript MüA, where the – by current norms "secular" – motets are arranged in liturgical order and accordingly could conceivably have been destined for liturgical use).<sup>17</sup> Aside from this there are plenty of examples of sacred adaptations of secular songs, examples that contradict Meyer's fundamental assumption and show it to have at least no universal validity. That the Latin motet historically preceded the French motet may still, to be sure, remain a fundamental assumption in more recent motet scholarship, yet to this day no compelling case has been made for it. This is true also of P. Aubry, who evidently ended up agreeing with Meyer:

And yet, while we have good reasons for believing that the Latin motet stands at the origin of the genre, we also lack reasons for denying the French motet very old ancestry. In fact the manuscript lat. 15139 of the Bibliothèque nationale at Paris [= the manuscript of the St Victor clausulas] supplies the incipits of French motets to melismas corresponding to organum sections in Florence and Wolfenbüttel. The motets with vernacular texts in the manuscripts franç. 844 and 12615 are

---

<sup>16</sup> *Loc. cit.*, 323.

<sup>17</sup> In favor of the liturgical use of French motets as well as Latin ones would seem to speak, obviously, the fact that they have liturgical tenors, and also the disapproval of the use of apparently French-texted motets by ecclesiastical authorities. On this point there are already the two attestations cited by Aubry: Archbishop Odon Rigaud of Rouen noted, in his church visitation protocol of 12 Dec. 1261, that the nuns in Montivillier celebrated the feasts of John the Evangelist, St Stephen, and the Holy Innocents, "with excessive merriment and with indecent songs, such as interpolations [in chants], conducti, and motets" (quoted after Aubry, [see note 18], p. 17 and 37; the emendation of "motulis" to "notulis," proposed by H. Spanke in *Tanzmusik in der Kirche des Mittelalters*, Neuphilologische Mitteilungen, XXXI, 1930, 168, must be rejected in view of the following parallel citations). In Guillaume Durand, *De modo generali concilii celebrandi* (c.1275, Lyon 1534), rubr. XIX, fol. 24v, we read: "And it be seen as most pious . . . that the irreligious and unruly songs of motets and such like are not performed in church." Rubrica LIV of the same work, not cited by Aubry (*De quinta negligentia circa officium: et ut distincte horis competentibus sine motetis dicatur: et quod nimis prolixum abreuiatur*), is even clearer (and this passage pertains to abuses "especially in parish churches," whereas "certain . . . cathedral churches of monastic and secular persons" are blamed rather for excessively long services): "For frequently they sing in church during the divine offices motets and irreligious songs and lascivious music" (f. 71vb).

written in a musical hand that is equally archaic as that of the oldest Latin motets. – Nevertheless, we feel that the French type must be a derivation from the Latin prototype.<sup>18</sup>

Meyer – like those who came after him – expressly held back from a critical engagement with received opinions about the history of the motet, which led to a deep rupture in the history of motet research: “It seems useful to me to publish the basic outlines of my views right away, and to do so for now without a discussion of existing views.”<sup>19</sup> Neither, for this reason, would there be a discussion of a major terminological problem in his hypothesis. Thirteenth- and nineteenth-century usage do not necessarily preclude that we speak of “Latin motets,” but for older motet scholarship (as also for the most recent scholarship) there was no question that the designation “motet” applied originally only to French-texted (secular) settings, and that the word can be explained by, or at least viewed in connection with, the refrains that are so often found cited in motets.<sup>20</sup>

If this etymology of the designation “motet” is indeed correct, then its application to Latin-texted settings must reflect a later understanding of the word, one that disregards the (for compositional technique essential) distinction between settings with and without refrain citations. Thus, if by *origin* of the motet we mean the origin of that particular thing whose development was accompanied from the beginning by the designation “motet,” then the word’s history itself points, in the first instance, to the realm of French-texted settings. Otherwise (and thus also with Meyer) we would be dealing with the origin of settings based on melismatic chant sections<sup>21</sup> in the tenor, and of top voices with a text of their own. In manuscript rubrics, Latin-texted settings tend to be designated as “prosaе” or “tropi”;<sup>22</sup> W1 classes them among the *conducti*, F and W2 cast them in part after the manner of the *conductus* (Anonymous IV even seems to expand the designation “*conductus*” to include French motets, when he speaks of “*conducti laici*”<sup>23</sup>). These terminological reflections need not keep us from speaking hereafter of Latin motets; yet they must surely be taken into account in discussions of the origins of the motet.

[6]

<sup>18</sup> *Cent motets du XIIIe siècle publiés d’après le manuscrit Ed. IV.6 de Bamberg III: Études et commentaires*, Paris 1908, 22.

<sup>19</sup> *Loc. cit.*, 304. It is only with Coussemaker that Meyer takes issue (*loc. cit.*, 323 and 325); and the novelty of Meyer’s approach is indeed especially clearly delineated against the background of Coussemaker’s work: whereas Coussemaker, constrained by the source situation of the time, focused on the motet, and particularly the French motet, Meyer was able, thanks to the manuscript F which he was the first to learn of, and whose contents he interpreted with the help of the descriptions of Anonymous IV after the example of Coussemaker, to view the totality of the Notre Dame genres (especially also the *conductus*), and to demonstrate that the motet had come into being in the context of Notre Dame chant settings. However, Meyer and those who came after him seem to have regarded a more intensive engagement with the results of his predecessors as superfluous—unjustly so.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. above, p. 2f and note 9. This derivation was recently defended again (apparently without awareness of Schwan’s argumentation [see note 10]) by Kl. Hofmann, *Zur Entstehungs- und Frühgeschichte des Terminus Motette*, AMI XLII, 1970, 138–50. Whereas Aubry, under the impact of Meyer’s hypotheses regarding the origins of the motet, already interpreted “motet” in the sense of “short poetic composition adapted for the tune of a primitive organum” (*Cent motets* III, 17), R. Damman understood the suffix -et of “motet” as an instrumental or functional one, and thus the word “motet” itself as “that which has been supplied with verses,” that is, the clausula supplied with a poetic text (*Geschichte der Begriffsbestimmung Motette*, AfMw XVI, 1959, 343–46), after which Hofmann pointed out “that ‘motet’ originally referred to this short, maxim- or motto-like refrain, and since this was the distinctive characteristic of the secular motet, the word eventually applied to the whole, that is, the secular motet itself” (*loc. cit.*, 141).

<sup>21</sup> This to distinguish it more precisely from applications of the designation “motet” to just any setting that consists of a liturgical tenor and a melodically independent upper voice with a text of its own (among which must be included the five simultaneous tropes from the sphere of St Martial; J. Handschin, *Über den Ursprung der Motette*, Kongr.-Ber. Basel 1924, Leipzig 1925) or even to plainchants whose melismatic sections are performed simultaneously with syllabic text interpolations (Cl. Blume, *Analecta hymnica medii aevii* II, Leipzig 1906, 214).

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Kl. Hofmann, *loc. cit.*, 145f.

<sup>23</sup> Ed. Fr. Reckow, *Der Musiktraktat des Anonymus 4 I: Edition* (BzAfMw IV), Wiesbaden 1967, 82,28.

Meyer's interpretation, which would prove so fateful for the history of motet research, received a more qualified judgement only from Riemann, it seems.<sup>24</sup> He aptly characterised the interpretation as "ideas."<sup>25</sup> Riemann agreed that the motet had originated within the framework of plainchant elaborations. Yet he remained sceptical about the view that the motet's genesis lay in the *a posteriori* addition of texts to clausulas:

Meyer assumes that the polyphonic elaborations of these bits of chant were at first textless, and that it was only the subsequent writing of poetry for the voices that called the poetic genre of the motet into being. Whether this was in fact the actual course of events will be hard to prove. It would surely be easier to assume that the motet did not have its origin in the addition of texts to musical settings of organum, but much rather that it was an independent genre of these firstlings of polyphony over extended chant melodies.<sup>26</sup>

Absolutely: this possibility, which Meyer left out of consideration, ought to be examined before his view of the origins of the motet is given out as established knowledge. That possibility, contrary to what Fr. Ludwig thought,<sup>27</sup> is not ruled out by the countless cases where a motet is musically identical with a clausula, for such identity by itself does not necessarily imply anything about the genetic relationship.

[7] Aside from [Riemann's response], Meyer's view of the genesis of the motets seems to have been received uncritically, for example by A. Stimming in the introduction to his (otherwise praiseworthy) edition of the French motet texts in the manuscripts Bamberg, W<sub>2</sub>, Mü, and Da.<sup>28</sup> Not even R. A. Meyer's copious appendix about the refrains in these motets seems to have raised questions for him.<sup>29</sup> Naturally it sufficed for R. A. Meyer merely to document the refrains, and he scarcely bothered to explore their more fundamental (constructive) significance for the French motet, something that would undoubtedly have been a possibility after E. Schwan's precedent.

Fr. Ludwig, too, embraced W. Meyer's view that the motet originated from the addition of Latin texts to discant clausulas, without considering that the case for privileging this view over conceivable alternatives was yet to be made. The very many cases of musical identity between Notre Dame clausulas and motets which he was able to demonstrate<sup>30</sup> might well have tempted him to such consideration.

<sup>24</sup> *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte V2: Die Musik des Mittelalters (bis 1450)*, Leipzig 1905, 189f.

<sup>25</sup> Page 189.

<sup>26</sup> Page 190.

<sup>27</sup> *Repertorium organorum recentioris et motetorum vetustissimi stili I/1*, Halle 1910, 23n.

<sup>28</sup> See above, n. 4.

<sup>29</sup> *Die in unseren Motetten enthaltenen Refrains*, *ibid.* 141 ff.

<sup>30</sup> The 140 motet melismas documented today (Notre Dame and St Victor clausulas) had already been discovered, with few exceptions, by Ludwig. All except the St Victor clausulas are listed in N. E. Smith, *From Clausula to Motet*, MD XXXIV, 1980. We are unable to recognize Sm(ith No.) 83; before or after Sm 31 one should add clausula F No. 97 which corresponds to motet voice [218], as was established already by W. G. Waite (*The Rhythm of Twelfth Century Polyphony: Its Theory and Practice*, New Haven 1954, 101n.).

But no, in all these cases he presupposed the genetic priority of the clausula, as if Meyer's discussions had made that conclusion all but unavoidable. It seems consistent with this rather less than careful handling of Meyer's theses, which have been foundational for the modern image of an entire music-historical epoch, that Ludwig made only the most fleeting references to Meyer's discussions.

Thus he invoked, in 1903/04, "the fundamental enquiry by W. Meyer on the *Ursprung des Motett's*" (stressing only that Meyer was the first to recognize the significance of the Florence manuscript),<sup>31</sup> in 1905 he spoke of the "genesis of the motet ... on liturgical soil," and referred to "the essay by W. Meyer, *Der Ursprung des Motetts* (6b),"<sup>32</sup> in 1905/06 he spoke of the origin of the "Latin motets in the polyphonic liturgical works ... a development which was correctly established for the first time by Wilhelm Meyer in his disquisition on the *Ursprung des Motetts* (1898)",<sup>33</sup> and finally in 1910 he wrote: "These compositions [i.e. clausulas] became even more important for this reason, namely, that they served in great numbers as musical sources for motets, in the first instance Latin motets, but later also French motets, albeit to a more limited extent. This fact, which Wilhelm Meyer discovered for the first time in 1898 with regard to Latin motets (*Der Ursprung des Motetts*), must assume central importance for the music history of the time around 1200."<sup>34</sup> He seems to have left no statement discussing the matter in greater detail.

[8]

Without any apparent basis, Ludwig also considered the so-called St Victor clausulas to have been the musical sources for the French motets whose incipits are written in the margins, and he explicitly ruled out the alternative possibility that these might rather be de-texted arrangements of those motets, even though their liturgical origin seemed dubious also to him:

But these melismas are indeed merely the sources of the French motets indicated in the margin, to whose texts the top voices of the melismas cannot be snugly fitted quite as easily as is usually the case with Latin motets; instead they frequently require considerable alterations in the melodic and rhythmic disposition of the top voices of the melismas. Among these du[pla] and tri[pla] we do not as yet find motet voices that are readily usable for the French motet texts, at least not for the most part – Nos. 15 and 40 are exceptions to the rule. If this explanation of the musical relationship between the melismas of St Victor and a greater number of French motets [i.e. the genetic priority of the former] were not to hold true for the majority of these melismas, then one would have to assume that the melismas are rearrangements, indeed successive and ever more deeply invasive rearrangements, of a series of French motets into liturgical melismas, something that seems to me to be completely out of the question.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>31</sup> On p. 178 of the article cited above, n.3.

<sup>32</sup> *Studien über die mehrstimmige Musik im Mittelalter I: Die mehrstimmige Musik der ältesten Epoche im Dienste der Liturgie*, KmJb XIX, 1905, 6b.

<sup>33</sup> *Studien über die Geschichte der mehrstimmigen Musik im Mittelalter III: Über die Entstehung und Entwicklung der lateinischen und französischen Motette in musikalischer Beziehung*, SIMG VII, 1905/06, 517.

<sup>34</sup> On page 23 of the work mentioned above, n. 27.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 144. Cf. also *id.*, *Die geistliche nichtliturgische, weltliche einstimmige und die mehrstimmige Musik des Mittelalters bis zum Anfang des 15. Jahrhunderts*, in G. Adler, *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte*, Berlin <sup>2</sup>1930, p. 239 and elsewhere. Ludwig's opinion is shared without qualification by, for example, Fr. Gennrich, *Rondeaux, Virelais und Balladen* (Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur XVIII, t. 43, 1921, and XXII, t. 47, 1927), *passim*, and G. Kuhlmann, *Die zweistimmigen französischen Motetten des Kodex Montpellier Faculté de Médecine H 196 in ihrer Bedeutung für die Musikgeschichte des 13. Jahrhunderts*

It is true that Ludwig himself referred to the many refrains that are found in the motets related to these clausulas. Yet he still proceeded strictly—both here, and in the many cases where a Notre Dame clausula agrees musically with a French motet in the more narrow sense—from the [assumption of the] priority of the clausula, without taking into account the older theory, according to which a French motet normally originated in a refrain<sup>36</sup> and thus would not have been derived from a clausula. He was also quite emphatic in tracing back the original refrain melodies to the clausulas:

[9] With the help of a few examples taken from this repertory, let us offer, at the end of this examination of the Saint Victor melismas, a contribution to the question of the musical origins of the melodies of the so-called “refrains,” [refrains] that pervade especially the French motets of this period. For there is a whole series of such “refrain” melodies which go back ultimately to musical phrases in the duplum melodies of the Saint Victor melismas, [melodies] which were at first conceived as [textless] melismas, but received refrain-like text underlay during the recasting of these works into motets, and which, with these texts, rapidly spread more widely as “refrains.”<sup>37</sup>

Because of Ludwig’s authority, which rested on exceptional repertorial knowledge and an immense research achievement, but also provided cover for apodictic pronouncements like this one, the hypothesis of the origin of the motet in the addition of Latin texts to Notre Dame clausulas became a veritable dogma, one that has received as little critical discussion as it has been properly argued.

On the other hand, Ludwig’s assumption of the genetic priority of clausulas before motets did not remain uncontested. Y. Rokseth, for example, in 1939 viewed the St Victor clausulas as draft versions for sacred motets, having been stripped of their secular texts, and she also expressly contradicted the view that the refrains in those motets can be musically traced back to the clausulas:

The “SV melismas” do not exactly present the same picture as the “Notre Dame clausulas” of the manuscript F, which did in fact serve the function of musical sources [for motets]. Wouldn’t it be a strange combination of events that while none of the “melismas” failed to generate its own motet, all those motets happened in fact to be secular? Such is not the case with the clausulas, of which many remained unused as motets, and which yielded Latin pieces just as well as French ones. Is it not odd, also, that all, or almost all, motets that are claimed to have been constructed after the “melismas” were known to the person who added the incipits of the corresponding motets in the margin next to each piece? The reverse hypothesis has a greater chance of having probability. A cleric who sought to enlarge the religious repertoire and who had already noted a certain number of sacred pieces in the first gatherings of SV, would naturally have kept only the music of forty French motets that were suited to being converted into pious works. . . .

If the “melismas of SV” are not musical archetypes of motets but rather, in conformity with my hypothesis, outlines drawn after the model of secular motets, with the aim of upgrading new motets into religious ones, then this would better explain the fact that they contain refrains of songs. Does one not find there, notably, the music (No. 6) of a motet which resulted from the

---

(Literaturhistorisch-Musikwissenschaftliche Abhandlungen, ed. Fr. Gennrich, I–II), Würzburg 1938, *passim*. Cf. also below, n.38.

<sup>36</sup> E. Schwan 1885, see above, p. 2f.

<sup>37</sup> *Loc. cit.*, 155.



expansion of a dance song already cited in a poem which dates from around the year 1200, the *Roman de la rose ou de Guillaume de Dole?* Lines 5092–97 of that roman (Servois edition, p. 152) do in fact constitute a stanza whose lines reappear, treated as a refrain, in a motet in W2 (fol. 243v; cf. Gennrich, *Rondeaux*, I, No. 16 and II, pp. 9–11), which in turn returns in SV without words, with only the designation *Immolatus* in the tenor. Eight melismas from the same manuscript, six of which are found also as motets in Mo, incorporate in this manner musical formulas that are otherwise known as refrains. It is impossible to explain this reasonably if one insists that the melisma must be a musical model chronologically prior to the text. If, on the other hand, it is a skeleton, divested of its text for ecclesiastical purposes, and somewhat simplified melodically, from a French motet, nothing strange remains.<sup>38</sup>

Naturally, in those cases where we possess, for refrains in motets, Notre Dame clausulas in the stricter sense of the term, Rokseth deferred to the dogma of the priority of the clausula, for which she provided as little underpinning as Fr. Ludwig: [10]

Sometimes, at the beginning of certain motets, more frequently as a kind of conclusion, though sometimes also in the course of the piece, one encounters a short phrase that accompanies one or more lines which deal with the subject of love in a general sense, and often assume a sententious tone. Since many of these lines reappear in other poems, in places that lend them the character of a quotation, or incorporated in rondeaux for they constitute the refrain, one has long taken as axiomatic that we are dealing, also in the motets, with refrains borrowed, along with their music, from dance rondets. Whether in fact a borrowing had taken place seems plausible in works composed in the second historical phase of the motet. The same is not true for motets generated from clausulas, where the music existed before words were added to them.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> *Polyphonies du XIIIe siècle. Le manuscrit H 196 de la Faculté de Médecine de Montpellier IV: Études*, Paris 1939, 70f. J. Handschin had already considered the possibility that we might be dealing with “sketches, musical designs for motets . . . which were complete except for the fact that they still needed texts” (*Choralbearbeitungen und Kompositionen mit rhythmischen Text in der mehrstimmigen Musik des XIII. Jahrhunderts*, Phil. Diss. Basel 1921 [typewritten], 18, quoted after J. Stenzl [see below, note 47], p. 165) – an interpretation adopted by Friedrich Ludwig (*Die geistliche nichtliturgische und weltliche einstimmige und mehrstimmige Musik des Mittelalters bis zum Anfang des 15. Jahrhunderts*, in G. Adler, *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte*, Frankfurt am Main 1945, p. 211) – but [Handschin] then made a case for the assumption that these are instrumental pieces (*Die Rolle der Nationen in der Musikgeschichte*, SJBmW V, 1931, 40f.). Rokseth’s interpretation was called into question by H. Husmann, to whom it appeared too complicated (*Das Organum vor und außerhalb der Notre-Dame-Schule*, Kongr.-Ber. Salzburg 1964 I, 35), and J. Stenzl (*loc. cit.*, 113–25), who points out that we do not have earlier sources for the tune of any of the refrains contained in the motets that correspond to the St Victor clausulas. Yet this seems little more a circumstantial indication at best; it could scarcely be deemed decisive, if one only considers the general difficulty of documenting motet refrains in other sources (for which, see below, note 58). Y. Rokseth’s interpretation, that the St Victor clausulas are French motets divested of their texts, received support from Kl. Hofmann, *Untersuchungen zur Kompositionstechnik der Motette im 13. Jahrhundert* (Phil. Diss., Freiburg 1968; Tübinger Beiträge zur Musikwissenschaft II), Neuhausen-Stuttgart 1972, p. 122n. Next to Stenzl, G. A. Anderson also provides an overview of the discussion of the St Victor clausulas in *Clausulae or Transcribed-Motets in the Florence Manuscript?* AMI XLII, 1970, esp. 310ff.

<sup>39</sup> *Loc. cit.*, 209.

In 1947, Rokseth considered eleven three-part clausulas in F and the hoquetus *In saeculum* to have been compositional sketches (*canevas*) for motets (and in nine of these cases we do in fact still have motets):<sup>40</sup>

I regard these eleven pieces as canvases for motets, canvases deliberately constructed on familiar tenors that were subjected to rhythmic games: repetitions and various recombinations. Such motivic repetitions in the tenor are among the distinctive traits of the motet during its first historical phase . . . If this interpretation of the clausulas is correct, then this group of works appears to represent a situation that is exactly the opposite of what we must assume for the “melismas” in the manuscript latin 15139 of the Bibliothèque nationale [SV], which should be regarded as drafts for religious motets, sketched on the model provided by secular motets.<sup>41</sup>

Of course the view of motet origins that is connected with these interpretations of the St Victor clausulas and the eleven clausulas in F, would be untenable in the case of genuinely French motets,<sup>42</sup> and lacks probability for motet contrafacts to the extent that these would have been easier to fashion after texted models than textless copies. This interpretation, too, can be understood, above all, as an attempt to clarify the function of clausulas, which has thus far remained contradictory, but is not, for that reason, any more convincing.

- [11] And W. G. Waite regarded twenty clausulas in F, on the grounds of their notation, as transcriptions from motets (and in sixteen of these cases we do in fact still have motets):<sup>43</sup>

These substitute clausulae seem to be in notation sine littera, i.e. they are written primarily in ligatures. However, they do not lend themselves easily to transcription and one can only transcribe them by the most arbitrary distortion of the laws of modal ligatures. The problematic nature of these pieces arises from a not very successful attempt to convert motets into substitute clausulae by omitting the text of the motets and changing the notation cum littera into the ligatures of notation sine littera . . . In these derivatory clausulae the treatment of the text as well as the notation points to an origin in the motet. In the motet the text of the tenor is usually written at the beginning of the piece rather than placing each syllable under the note to which it properly belongs. Accordingly, in the process of converting the motet into a clausula it would be necessary to realign the syllables of the text under their proper notes. The scribe has endeavored to do this but often quite carelessly.<sup>44</sup>

This view met with opposition from R. Flotzinger,<sup>45</sup> G. A. Anderson,<sup>46</sup> and J. Stenzl.<sup>47</sup> It is true that the problem of the genetic relationship between clausulas and motets can hardly be resolved on the

<sup>40</sup> Sm (= Smith [cf. above, note 30] No.) 18, 43, 48, 69, 81, 89, 97, and 100, and hoquetus *In saeculum*; as well as the three-part clausulas *In saeculum* F fol. 13r, *Eius* F fol. 11v, and *Domine* F fol. 11v for which to date no motets have been identified.

<sup>41</sup> *La polyphonie parisienne du treizième siècle. Étude critique à propos d'une publication récente* [H. Husmann, *Die drei- und vierstimmigen Notre-Dame-Organa. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, = P&M XI, Leipzig 1940), Les cahiers techniques de l'art I/2, Strasbourg 1947, 44bf.

<sup>42</sup> See below, p. 12f.

<sup>43</sup> These are the clausulas Nos. 14 (= Motet 641), 41 (62), 59/60 (100), 61 (102), 77 (122), 85 (135), 154 (165), 105 (233a), 106 (235), 131 (177), 141 (361), 150 (397), 156 (419), 163 (663), 283 (518), and *Domino* No. 12 fol. 88v (754), as well as the following clausulas, for which no corresponding motets have so far been documented: Nos. 50, 126, 146, and *Domino* No. 13 fol. 88v.

<sup>44</sup> In the work mentioned above, note 30, p. 100f.

<sup>45</sup> *Der Diskantussatz im Magnus Liber und seiner Nachfolger. Mit Beiträgen zur Frage der sogenannten Notre-Dame-Handschriften* (Wiener musikwissenschaftliche Beiträge VIII), Vienna, Cologne, Graz 1969, 68ff. Flotzinger certainly acknowledges “that individual clausulas are more melodically ornate

level of notational technique alone. Anderson puts forward, against derivation of clausulas from motets, the fact that the endings of clausulas feature, for the most part, transitional melodic figures that are lacking in motets, figures that have been known since Franco as “copula non ligata”: such figures [he objects] would have to have been added by the scribes of the clausulas. Absolutely – why shouldn’t they have? Firstly, we are dealing with movable bits of music that are highly stereotypical in nature, and that could scarcely be seen as substantially a part of the clausula itself; secondly, notators were by no means mere copyists, but generally acted also as editors of the pieces they wrote down (something that can be observed quite well, as it happens, in F; see below). This objection seems hardly insurmountable, then.

However, the hypotheses of neither Y. Rokseth nor Waite prompted a more wide-ranging reconsideration of Ludwig’s view that when clausulas and motets are musically identical, it is the former that are genetically prior. In the case of the St Victor clausulas this can be explained by the fact that with one (merely apparent) exception<sup>48</sup> they survive as *unica*, and might thus seem to represent an exceptional case. In the case of the eleven clausulas in F it can be explained by the fact that these belong to the later Notre Dame period, and might thus appear unrepresentative. In the case of the pieces cited by Waite it can be explained by his inadequate argumentation, which was waved aside without due consideration of the more fundamental problem signalled by Waite.

[12]

While Meyer’s and Ludwig’s hypotheses concerning the origins of the motet and the genetic relationship between musically identical clausulas and motets thus remain unproven at best, the older view that had been pushed aside—the view according to which French motets are usually rooted in a refrain—has gradually come to be newly elaborated. It is not just the identification and citation of the refrains by Friedrich Ludwig,<sup>49</sup> and above all Friedrich Gennrich,<sup>50</sup> that has

---

in the top voice and would be hard to renotate,” and he even mentions twenty-four further examples, for which there happen to be musically identical motets in fifteen cases. Yet he nevertheless proceeds: “But that doesn’t mean we should immediately go as far as to assume that these represent ‘back-transposed’ motets: it suffices to note (and will scarcely need further proof) that what is going on here is simply that these pieces were originally written, not in modal, but in mensural notation, and that, for the sake of consistency, and only with great difficulty, they were forced into modal notation, which means that they would in any case surely have come from outside Notre Dame” (p. 69; H. Husmann seems also to have posited mensurally-notated exemplars). Yet is there really greater plausibility to the idea that the melismas were available to the F scribe, and evidently also to the composers of the motets in question, in mensural notation? What speaks for Waite’s interpretation, in any event, is the fact that for most of these clausulas there exist motets. Of course his interpretation does compel a revision of the assumption that when clausulas and motets are identical, it is necessarily the latter that must have been derived from the former.

<sup>46</sup> *Loc. cit.* (see n. 38).

<sup>47</sup> *Die vierzig Clausulae der Handschrift Paris Bibliothèque Nationale latin 15139 (Saint Victor-Clausulae)* (Publikationen der Schweizerischen Musikforschenden Gesellschaft, Serie II, t. 22), Bern 1970, 117–19.

<sup>48</sup> Clausula SV 15 corresponds to clausula No. 130 in F (Sm 47). These clausulas must have originated independently from each other, as Y. Rokseth has already established (at the place mentioned above, n. 38), and as will be shown below.

<sup>49</sup> That is, the references in the motets of the St Victor clausulas in *Repertorium*, 155–57.

<sup>50</sup> *Musikwissenschaft und romanische Philologie*, Halle 1918; *Rondeaux, Virelais und Balladen II*, Göttingen 1927; *Refrain-Tropen in der Musik des Mittelalters*, Studi medievali N. S. XVI, 1943–50; *Refrain-Studien*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie LXXI, 1955; *Bibliographie der ältesten französischen und lateinischen Motetten*, Darmstadt 1957; *Bibliographisches Verzeichnis der französischen*

contributed to this, however useful these were in themselves. Much more groundbreaking have been Yvonne Rokseth's references to the melodic dependence of motets on the refrains they cite,<sup>51</sup> and above all Klaus Hofmann's insights into the constructive significance of refrains in French motets.<sup>52</sup> According to Hofmann, the refrain is

[13] evidently not just brought in quite casually, but rather forms the very starting point of the musico-poetic conception of the whole. Once the refrain has been chosen, it determines the theme of the poetry as well its formal details, in equal measure as it determines the essential traits of the motet setting—from the rhythmicization of the tenor sequence (which, after all, has to be shaped in such a way that refrain tune and tenor, together, make up a duo that is correct in terms of the techniques of polyphonic composition) up to the very details of the melodic and rhythmic elaboration of the top voice. The compositional difficulties that are characteristic of this refrain-tenor combination, in connection with the mostly sententious refrain turns of the texts, can be found also the many motets whose refrains are not attested elsewhere. Towards the end of the thirteenth century, apparently, every vernacular motet was normally given a refrain.<sup>53</sup>

Hofman also pointed to the significance that his conclusions might have for the question of the genetic relationship between Notre Dame clausulas and their motets:

The problem of the priority of the clausula will have to be reinvestigated, taking into account the refrain's compositional significance, in the truly manifold cases of clausulas and motets (both vernacular and Latin-texted) that differ with regard to their texts, but are musically identical.<sup>54</sup>

It is indeed true that it would be hard to derive a motet of the kind just described from a pre-existing setting that had been conceived independently from it. For 98 of the altogether 140 Notre Dame and Saint Victor clausulas we know of the existence of French motets. If these display signs of the mode of origin that we just described (the possibility of French contrafact cannot be *a priori* excluded<sup>55</sup>), then this will indicate their genetic priority over the respective clausula, just as it would for any Latin versions (which exist in 63 of those 98 cases).<sup>56</sup>

---

*Refrains des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts*, Langen bei Frankfurt am Main 1964. Important above all, next to this last title, is the second, since it presents where relevant also the melodies, which are after all an essential ingredient of the refrain and belong to its identity. On the other hand, the most recent directory of N. H. J. van den Boogaard, *Rondeaux et refrains du XIIIe siècle au début du XIVe*, Paris 1969, regrettably limits its scope to the texts alone, and can only be used in conjunction with Gennrich's work.

<sup>51</sup> *Polyphonies du XIIIe siècle* IV, 210 f.

<sup>52</sup> *Untersuchungen zur Kompositionstechnik der Motette im 13. Jahrhundert* (Phil. Diss. Freiburg 1968; Tübinger Beiträge zur Musikwissenschaft II), Neuhausen-Stuttgart 1972.

<sup>53</sup> *Zur Entstehungs- und Frühgeschichte des Terminus Motette*, AMI XLII, 1970, 141.

<sup>54</sup> *Untersuchungen*, 122 n.23.

<sup>55</sup> There appear to be such contrafacts in the case of motets [485] and [486]; cf. below, n. 81.

<sup>56</sup> What might also argue in favor of such a genetic relationship, between musically identical French and Latin motets, is the fact that when no corresponding clausula has survived, the French version is unanimously regarded as the original and the Latin version as contrafactum.

## 2. Clausulas With French Motets

As a matter of fact, it is possible to make a plausible case for the genetic priority of motets vis-à-vis clausulas in the case of at least 64 of the 98 clausulas for which there are French motets.<sup>57</sup> Among the relevant indications for this, aside from the presence of one or more refrains (which, to be sure, cannot always be established with certainty<sup>58</sup>),<sup>59</sup> are structural symptoms like: tenor manipulation<sup>60</sup> or particularities of tenor disposition that can be explained as originating in the motet rather than the clausula,<sup>61</sup> the trope-like structure of the motet,<sup>62</sup> divisions into periods that are evidently determined by the motet text,<sup>63</sup> the tendency for clausulas to obscure the clarity of those divisions,<sup>64</sup> the conceptual connectedness of motet voices (especially when that connectedness is not in evidence in the clausula),<sup>65</sup> the relationship between text and music,<sup>66</sup> the respective transmission of clausula and motet,<sup>67</sup> the notation of the clausula (which may preclude it from having served as a motet source),<sup>68</sup> the more advanced nature, in terms of its stylistic development, of the clausula vis-à-vis the motet,<sup>69</sup> and so on.

[14]

---

<sup>57</sup> They are gathered in a table on pp. 29ff. below. The following discussion refers to that table. For six of the motets only the incipit is known; one is transmitted incompletely. Consequently the number of demonstrable cases is thereby reduced to 91.

<sup>58</sup> The catalogues of Gennrich and Boogaard frequently part ways with respect to the recognition and delimitation of the relevant rows. This illustrates the difficulties inherent in the determination of refrains especially in the motet, where the refrain is not defined by context as it is in the rondeau, ballade, or virelai; after all, not all of the refrains have been documented in other sources. In this connection, the identification of refrains by different scholars must obviously involve a certain element of subjectivity, and is for that reason not necessarily always conclusive. Besides, there are in fact cases where only the text of the refrain was cited, and where its identification, consequently, tells us nothing about the genetic relationship between clausula and motet. If W. Arlt demonstrated, in his discussion of the songs of Jehannot de Lescurel, the considerable leeway in the accuracy of quotation – a state of affairs which is also very clearly in evidence in Gennrich's comparisons of different versions in *Rondeaux, Virelais und Balladen II* [see above, n. 50] –, and if Arlt also points out relatively extensive partial correspondences between different refrains (*Aspekte der Chronologie und des Stilwandels im französischen Lied des 14. Jahrhunderts*, Forum musicologicum III, Winterthur 1982, 224–27), then this ought not obscure the fact that the musico-textual identity of the refrain remains principally preserved in the realm of the motets discussed here, whereas in Jehannot de Lescurel one can observe a very different handling of refrains that has little to do with the older motet genre. (Besides, around the time of Jehannot de Lescurel, the motet itself, too, had long since jettisoned the refrain technique.)

<sup>59</sup> As in the motets Nos. 54, 62, 74/75, 78, 100, 122, 135, 144, 165, 217, 272, 327, 343, 347, 353, 358, 366, 384, 393, 397, 457/8, 480, 509/10, 515a, 519, 544/5, 638, 650/1, 657/8/9, 663, 666, 754, 756, 795.

<sup>60</sup> As in the motets Nos. 54, 100, 122, 135, 219, 237, 353, 397, 458, 544/5, 650/1, 663, 666, 761.

<sup>61</sup> As in the motets Nos. 361, 446, 447, 519, 750.

<sup>62</sup> As in the motet No. 115.

<sup>63</sup> As in the motets Nos. 250, 791.

<sup>64</sup> As in the motet No. 250.

<sup>65</sup> As in the motets Nos. 74/75, 437/8, 657/8/9.

<sup>66</sup> As in the motets Nos. 63, 217, 235/6, 349, 413, 415, 756.

<sup>67</sup> As in the motets Nos. 219, 402, 638, 663, 750.

<sup>68</sup> As in the motets Nos. 251, 272, 319, 401, 547, 666, 673.

<sup>69</sup> As in the motets Nos. 384, 821.

**Sm 2** OMNES No. 10 [L. 10]**[8]** *En mon chant deslou*

Thus, in **Sm 8**[8] the nine-fold statement of the cantus firmus, which functions as an ostinato, would seem to argue for the priority of the motet.

**Sm 19** VENIMUS No. 2 [L. --]**[54]** *Ja pour longue desirrée*

[54] is a refrain cento. The chant segment on which it is based has been modified through the omission of notes, and towards the end it no longer regulates the structure; the second statement differs from the first in that additional notes or rests have been inserted, and also with regard to the shaping of its ending. This favors the priority of the motet over the clausula **Sm 19**.

**Sm 8** DOMINE No. 5 [L. 7]**[62]** *En mai que naist la rosée*

In [62], the ending of the second tenor statement has been expanded to accommodate the citation of a widely transmitted refrain which is found, with the same melody, in motets [188] *J'ai les biens*/IN SECLUM, [403] *C'est la jus*/PRO PATRIBUS, and [433] *Cele m'a la mort*/ALLELUYA, as well as in the pastourelle R 2041 *Pensis com fins amouros* by Pierre de Corbie. This rules out the possibility that clausula **Sm 8** was the musical source for motet [62], something that was in itself already highly implausible, yet was assumed without question by Ludwig, Gennrich, and Kuhlmann.

**Sm 7** DOMINE No. 3 [L. 4]**[63]** *Tout le premier jour de mai*

In [63] it seems that the peculiar musical rhythm for verse 6 was determined by the text (which has the exclamation “É! las!”). Verses 7 and 11 are textually and melodically related, evidently because of the citation of a refrain. Gennrich, Boogaard, and Tischler disagree as to where, exactly, the quotation began and ended; yet they agree that verse 11, at least, must have been a part of it. This conclusion would seem to favor the priority of the motet over clausula **Sm 7**.

**SV 2** MANERE [L. 3]**[74]** *De la ville isoit pensant*; **[75]** *A la ville une vieille a*

What argues in favor of the priority of [74/75] over **SV 2** is the fact that the two motet voices are related in terms of their subject matter, that the tenor was freely rhythmicized, and that there is a refrain quotation at the end of [75], which evidently involved the melody as well (in [74] it seems that only the text of the refrain was quoted).

[15] **SV 3** MANERE [L. 11]**[78]** *En douce douleur de grief desirrée*

In [78] it is the refrain “Se je n'ai s'amor, / la mort m'iert donee, / je n'i puis faillir” (which was widely disseminated and used with the same melody in [46] *Tout leis enmi*/DOMINUS) that, with its metrical scheme A<sub>5</sub>B<sub>6</sub>C<sub>5</sub>, determined the structure of the motetus:

$$a_5b_6c_5a_5b_6c_5A_5B_6C_5$$

Its 10 × 3 measures are congruent with the 6 × 5 measures of the tenor. The evidently structural significance of the refrain argues in favor of the priority of the motet over **SV 3**.

**Sm 16** SURGE No. 4 [L. 4][100] *Quant li noviaus tans repaire*

In [100] the priority of the motet over clausula **Sm 16** is supported by the tenor disposition (involving the repeat of the more freely treated second half of the cantus firmus) and the quotation of a refrain.

**Sm 18** ET ILLUMINARE a3 [L. 1][104] *Entre Robin et Marot*; [105] *Je vous salu, Dame, selonc mon savoir*

**Sm 18** is related to [101] (Latin: *Et illumina eximia mater*), as well as [104] and [105] (French). What is noteworthy about the clausula is the fact that the tenor is stated twice and that the second statement omits the first five notes of the tenor. This cannot easily be explained as stemming from the composition of a clausula, but quite well from the composition of a motet. To be sure, [104] no longer allows us to determine the specific cause for this tenor disposition, for despite the refrains that have been identified (Boogaard 21, 99; Gennrich 1379, 1394, 1570), this motet has proved to be a contrafact. Yet the disposition described here is clarified by [101] as well as [105]: their texts both begin with the five tenor syllables ET ILLUMINA, and present their own texts only after this; and even from thence onward the tenor is stated twice. The 2 × 4 four-measure periods of the tenor correspond to the 2 × 4 melodic units, into which especially the motetus of [105] is thoughtfully articulated (whereas the articulation remains unclear in the clausula because of the absence of rests between phrases). In the Latin motet [101], which has two stanzas, the two statements (reckoned from the sixth note of the tenor) are actually even repeated. Still, the more distinctly articulated French motet [105] seems to be the original, and the Latin motet [101] the contrafact. The triplum of the clausula does little to call in question the priority of at least one of the motets over the clausula; Husmann 135 already considered it a later addition.

**Sm 23** HEC DIES No. 4 [L. 4][115] *Ne quier d'Amours a nul jour chanter*

Clausula **Sm 23** (transmitted only in F) was unequivocally a derivation from one of the motets, in all probability from the sacred French (Marian) motet [115]: the tenor HEC DIES is stated four times, with the verse endings sharing assonance, first on the vowel e, then on the vowel i, and then, finally, it is the syllable -es that resounds on the repeated last note of the cantus firmus; so we are dealing here with a trope to the “Hec dies” of the tenor that was structurally conceived as such, involving a redistribution of the tenor text: “Hec” is heard during the first and the beginning of the second statement, “di-” in the continuation until the end of the fourth statement, and “-es” on the repeated final note.

**Sm 24** HEC DIES No. 5 [L. 5][122] *Hui main au douz mois de mai*

The priority of [122] over clausula **Sm 24** (once again a setting transmitted uniquely in F) is indicated by the fact that the third statement is incomplete (a compositional choice for which there could have been no compelling reason in a clausula), as well as by the harsh sonorities when the refrain is quoted.

**Sm 27** DOMINO ... QUONIAM No. 7 [L. 8][135] *Quant froidure trait a fin*

The priority of [135] over clausula **Sm 27** (which is transmitted only in F) is supported by the quotation of a refrain, which evidently necessitated the introduction of a six-measure unit in the otherwise consistently four-square periodization of the motetus, and probably also the change of mode in the tenor, and not least the unusual tenor disposition (repetition of the DOMINO part before continuing with the QUONIAM part).

**SV 5** IN SECULUM [L. 15]**[144]** *Trop m'a Amours assaillie*

The notation of **SV 5** alone would seem to argue in favor of the priority of [144], and additionally also the circumstance that the refrain quotation necessitated the introduction of six-measure periods in the otherwise four-square periodization, with a corresponding orientation of the second statement. Kl. Hofmann used [144] as an example of tenor scrambling necessitated by the refrain,<sup>70</sup> for the influence of the refrain on the shaping of the text,<sup>71</sup> and for the attempt to accommodate a metrically divergent refrain.<sup>72</sup>

**[16]** **Sm 28** IN SECULUM No. 3 [L. 5]**[165]** *Lonc tens ai mon cuer assis*

What would seem to argue in favor of the priority of motet [165] over clausula **Sm 28** is the fact that the clear six-measure periodization was obscured in the clausula through the functional redefinition of the first note into some sort of “initium” (which corresponds to the “copula” [in the Franconian sense] at the end of the clausula).<sup>73</sup>

**Sm 32** NOSTRUM a3 [L. 1]**[217]** *Hui matin a l'ajournée me levai*

The priority of motet [217] over clausula **Sm 32** is suggested by the a text-music relationship as well as the quotation of a refrain; motet [216] may, on the other hand, have been created through the addition of text to **Sm 32**, since its text-music relationship seems characteristic rather of a later period.

**Sm 31** NOSTRUM No. 4 [L. 6]**[218]** *Qui d'Amours bien jöir* **[219]** *Qui longuement porroit jöir d'Amours*

The priority of [218]/[219]/NOSTRUM over **Sm 31** (= F 98) [and F 97] is suggested by its transmission (the putative three-part clausula that is supposed to have served as motet source has not come down to us: there are only two two-voice clausulas), and also by the cantus firmus manipulations that were evidently necessitated by the refrain (insertion of notes, omission of the final two notes, conclusion on F rather than E).

**Sm 37** IMMOLATUS EST No. 9 [L. 9]**[233a]** *Mout soloie chant et joie*

The priority of motet [233a] is suggested by the quotation of a refrain (transmitted with the same melody also in motet [642] *L'autrier en mai/TANQUAM*), which with its five measures evidently occasioned the departures from the clear-cut four-measure periodization of this motet.

**Sm 38** IMMOLATUS EST No. 10 [L. 10]**[235]** *Quant voi le douz tens venir*; **[236]** *En mai, quant rose est florie*

Clausula **Sm 38**, which likewise survives only in F, cannot possibly be the musical source for [235]. The first setting in the surviving complex was probably motet [236], which was as yet still structured in a straightforward “square” fashion. Its chronological priority is suggested also by the refrain (which is

<sup>70</sup> *Op. cit.*, n. 52, p. 49.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, 125f.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, 129. [144] serves *ibid.*, 120, as an example of the differentiation of ouvert-clos and the creation of formal symmetries; cf. also *ibid.*, 141 ff.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, 127 and 129. Hofmann does not enter into the problem of the genetic relationship with the clausula.



transmitted with the same melody in motet [813] *M'amie a douté/DOMINO*), for whose sake the last tenor period was expanded. (This, too, argues against the priority of the clausula, since there would have been no compelling reason for such expansion in a clausula alone). The motetus voice [235] might have been added later on as a triplum: it seems stylistically more recent, and it apparently quotes only the text of the refrain (transmitted also in R 73 V, *Ier matin pensis chevauchai*), whose subsequent removal could have produced clausula **Sm 38**. The priority of motet [235] (which is of course identical to the first stanza of Robert de Rains's three-stanza song R 1485, *Quant voi le dous tans venir*) over clausula **Sm 38** is indicated also by the song-like articulation, metrically if not melodically speaking, of the top voice (verse and rhyme scheme:

$$\begin{array}{cccc} a_7 b_5 a_5 & a_7 b_5 a_5 & a_1 a_7 a_1 a_7 & a_3 c_7 a_4 a_7 c_6 d \\ (= 4 & 3 & 3 & 4 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 4 & 1 & 4 & 2 & 4 & 2 & 4 & 4 \text{ measures}) \end{array}$$

Likewise, the precise formal correspondence between text and music, especially in the echo verses (which are musically demarcated by rests), would seem to confirm that text and music were conceived at the same time.

### SV 6 IMMOLATUS

#### [237] *Que demandés vous, quant vous m'avés*

The priority of [237] over **SV 6** is suggested by the fact that the refrain quotations (which are melodically always identical) occur persistently at the beginnings of the tenor statements, and that the third tenor statement was continued only as far as was necessary to accommodate the third refrain quotation.

### Sm 41 ET TENUERUNT No. 3 [L. 3]

#### [250] *Quant voi la flour en l'arbroie*

The priority of [250] over clausula **Sm 41** (which survives only in F) is suggested not only by the refrain quotations (which P. Aubry even regarded as fragments of a French popular song<sup>74</sup>), but also by the circumstance that the clear four-measure periodization of the motet, which undoubtedly belonged to the original conception, became heavily obscured by the recasting of the opening into an introductory clausula formula (corresponding to the transitional melodic gesture at the end).

### SV 7 ET TENUERUNT [L. 4]

#### [251] *Ne sai ou confort prendrai*

[251] is, to judge from the melodic correspondence between the first and last verse, a "motet enté" (that is, a motet created through interpolation between the two phrases of a refrain), as Tischler recognized, something which in itself already argues for the motet's genetic priority over clausula **SV 7**; the refrain is not the one indicated by Gennrich and Boogaard, but rather "Ne sai, ou confort prendrai / puisqu'ele ne me veut amer" (the melodically identical verse at the beginning of the second statement "Ne d'aillors mieux aventurer" surely cites only the refrain tune and does not textually belong to the refrain). The priority of the motet is moreover indicated by the fact that the second statement breaks off after the refrain quotation has been completed.

### SV 35 PORTARE [L. 3]

#### [272] *Douce dame sans pitié*

Anomalies (octave parallels) in the musical setting of the refrain quotation, the two-measure phrase which interrupts the otherwise four-measure periodization, evidently to complement the refrain, and the notation in SV (see below), argue for the priority of [272] over **SV 35**.

<sup>74</sup> *La chanson populaire*, p. 7 (quoted after Kuhlmann [see n. 35] II, 233).

[17] **Sm 49/SV 15** ET GAUDEBIT [L. 2]  
**[319]** *Al cor ai une alegrance*

What speaks in favor of the priority of motet [319] over clausula **SV 15** is the notation of the latter, which in this case also concerns (especially at the ends of phrases) the melodic content (for other notational peculiarities in the St Victor clausulas, see below, p. 17f.). As Y. Rokseth already observed,<sup>75</sup> **SV 15** and **Sm 49** must have been created independently from one another; **Sm 49** follows the motet much more closely, and much better clarifies the periodization in particular.

**Sm 14** IN BETHLEEM No. 2a [L. 2a], No. 2b [L. 2b]  
**[326]** *De jolif cuer doit venir*; **[327]** *Je me cuidai bien tenir*

What speaks in favor of the priority of [327] (and [326]) over **SV 14** is the fact the setting is based on three cantus firmus statements, of which the third is incomplete. This would be difficult to explain in an original clausula composition, but readily so in a motet that closes with a pre-existing refrain which agrees harmonically only with one particular section of the cantus firmus. In the motet, the melody also appears to be shaped more compellingly and coherently than in the clausula, where it is to some extent lacking in musical sense. The clausula is surely an awkward reduction of the motet, hardly its model.

**Sm 54** HODIE PERLUSTRAVIT No. 4 [L. 4]  
**[342]** *Quant voi iver repairier*; **[343]** *Au douz tens plaisant*

The priority of [343] (and [342]) over clausula **Sm 54** (once again a piece uniquely transmitted in F) is suggested by the refrain quotation in [342], which appears with the same melody in the rondeau-motet [754] *Ne m'oubliés mie/DOMINO*. The treatment of the tenor (involving the two-fold statement of the second part of the cantus firmus) argues in favor of the priority of the motet as well.

**Sm 57** DOCEBIT No. 6 [L. 6]  
**[347]** *Pour coillir la flour en mai*

The priority of [347] over clausula **Sm 57** (likewise transmitted uniquely in F where, due to the loss of a number of folios, only a small part of it survives) is proved by an extensive quotation from a refrain (“lai”).

**SV 8** ILLE VOS DOCEBIT  
**[352]** *Je m'estoie mis en voie*

The priority of motet [352] over **SV 8** is suggested by the fact that after a complete statement of the cantus firmus, a smaller portion of it is repeated to accommodate the quotation of a refrain (which was used with the same melody in motet [509] *Ne sai ou confort trouver/ET SPERAVIT*<sup>76</sup>) and then elaborated up to the end in freely-composed fashion.

**SV 9** DOCEBIT [L. 7]  
**[353]** *Pour quoi m'avez vous doué*

The priority of motet [353] over **SV 9** is indicated by the easily recognizable design of the “motet enté,” and by tenor manipulation that would have been pointless in a setting conceived from the beginning as a clausula (the first statement begins with the third note of the melisma – CEBIT, the second presents VOS DOCEBIT).

<sup>75</sup> *Polyphonies* [see n. 38] IV, 71n.

<sup>76</sup> For this motet, see below, p. 20.

**SV 11 DOCEBIT** [L. 9]**[358]** *Encontre le nouvel tans d'esté*

The priority of [358] over **SV 11** is suggested by the refrain quotation and the omission of a group of three cantus firmus notes from the tenor, which proceeds in longas without rests.

**Sm 59 AMORIS** No. 2 [L. 3]**[361]** *Hé (Dieus), quant je remir son cors le gai*

The priority of [361] (and possibly also [362] and [363]) over clausula **Sm 59** (once again a piece transmitted only in F) is suggested by the tenor arrangement, involving four cantus firmus statements whose rhythmicization is conditioned by the constraints of the refrain quotations.

**SV 12 AMORIS** [L. 6]**[366]** *Amours m'a assëuré de gent secours*

The priority of [366] over **SV 12** is suggested by the quotation of a refrain (which is transmitted also in R 13 III *Quant li dous tens*).

**Sm 58 AMORIS** No. 2 [L. 3]**[368]** *A cele ou j'ai mon cuer mis*

Arguing in favor of the priority of [368] over clausula **Sm 58** are the tenor manipulations (the specific order of the tenor notes is not only repeated, with omissions and insertions, as in the cantus firmus, but appears four times, the fourth of which accompanies the quotation of an adage, and remains incomplete beyond that quotation; the end of the melisma is appended in the clausulas as a tenor for the transitional closing formulas).

**SV 22 JOHANNE** [L. 6]**[384]** *Pour noient me repret on*

The priority of [384] over **SV 22** is indicated not only by the refrain quotation, but also by the circumstance that the motet is cast in the (stylistically older) first mode, whereas the clausula proceeds in the more recent second mode.

**SV 21 JOHANNE** [L. 5]**[393]** *Mainte dame est desesperée*

The priority of [393] over **SV 21** is suggested by the quotation of a refrain, which also appears in melodically identical fashion in motets [342] (see above) and [754] *Ne m'oubliés mie/DOMINO*.

**Sm 64 PRO PATRIBUS** No. 3 [L. 3]**[396]** *Se j'ai servi longuement; [397] Trop longuement m'a failli*

Refrain quotations and tenor manipulations (in the second cantus firmus statement, notes 19–22 have been replaced by five other notes) argue in favor of the priority of [397] and [396] over clausula **Sm 64**, which is transmitted only in F.

**SV 23 PRO PATRIBUS****[401]** *Je n'amerai autrui que vous*

In favor of the priority of motet [401] over clausula **SV 23** would seem to argue the notation of the latter, which, as so often in this manuscript, obscures the original melodic articulation—to be discussed in what

follows by way of example. There is no question that the articulation as found in the motet must be the original one. If that articulation was meant to be conveyed also in the clausula (which need not be the case by any means, for there appears also to have been a – historically later – aesthetic aimed precisely at the avoidance of four-square structures), then the dashes between binaria and ternaria (322. . .2'322. . ., thus at the end of verses 2 and 4) are to be interpreted not as rests, but rather in the sense of the later “signum perfectionis” (not  $\underline{d} \underline{d} | \underline{d} \underline{d} | \underline{d} \underline{d} | \underline{d} \underline{d} | \dots$  but  $\underline{d} \underline{d} | \underline{d} \underline{d} | \underline{d} \underline{d} | \underline{d} \underline{d} | \dots$ ). If the notation in SV was historically prior, then we would have to attribute a very peculiar “musicality” to its users, which we surely cannot reckon with without question.

[18]

**Sm 65** PATRIBUS No. 4 [L. 4]  
**[402]** *L'autrier quant me chevauchoie*

The priority of [402] over **Sn 65** is suggested by the quotation of the refrain, which appears also in melodically identical fashion in motet [406] *Se longuement ai/BENEDICTA*, the clausula's more advanced style compared to the motet (a structure made up of smaller parts, and a tendency to level the play of melodic correspondence), and its transmission (the putative motet source does not match even half of the motet): evidently the notator of F never finished the reworking of the motet into a clausula.

**Sm 67** VIRGO No. 2 [L. 4]  
**[413]** *Deduisant m'aloie hier matin*

As far as clausula **Sm 67** is concerned, the priority of one of the three motets [411] *O Maria mater pia*, [412] *Virgo plena gracia*, or [413] is already indicated by the circumstance that the cantus firmus is stated twice. Yet there is also textual sense to the way the two-measure period, right after the beginning of the second statement, shifts the four-measure pattern in the second statement in all three motets on the interjection “O!” which suggests that the connection with a text was there from the beginning. And it is in fact the French text that appears to be the original one; the Latin texts come across rather as somewhat amorphous sequences of attributes.

**Sm 69** VIRGO a3 No. 2 [L. 2]  
**[415]** *Pour conforter mon corage*

The priority of the two-stanza motet [415], ascribed to the trouvère Ernoul le Viel de Gastinois as song R 19, over the three-voice clausula **Sm 69**, which survives only in F, is indicated by the twofold statement of the cantus firmus, the fact that the second statement is incomplete (something for which there would be no obvious reason in a setting conceived from the beginning as a clausula), and above the song structure with its three-fold parallelism in the Aufgesang of the meter and also of the melody in an approximate sense, after the manner of the lai, and with its arrangement of the refrain-based Abgesang at the end:

|                                     |                                 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |   |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| Aufgesang . . . . .                 |                                 |  |  |  | Abgesang . . . . .                           |  |  |  |   |
| α                                   | β                               | π  | β'   | μ  | μ  | σ  | Π γ  | Π γ'   | Ω |
| a <sub>7</sub> b <sub>5</sub> '     | a <sub>7</sub> b <sub>5</sub> ' | c <sub>3</sub> c <sub>3</sub> b <sub>5</sub> ' | d <sub>3</sub> d <sub>3</sub> b <sub>5</sub> ' | e <sub>3</sub> e <sub>4</sub> e <sub>8</sub> | f <sub>3</sub> f <sub>4</sub> f <sub>8</sub> | g <sub>3</sub> g <sub>3</sub> g <sub>5</sub> ' | R <sub>3</sub> e <sub>7</sub> R <sub>3</sub> | h <sub>5</sub> i <sub>7</sub> h <sub>5</sub> |   |
| 8                                   | 8                               | 8  | 8  | 8  | 8  |  | 3 4 2  | 3 4 4  |   |
| measures                            |                                 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |   |
| cantus firmus statement I . . . . . |                                 |  |  |  | cantus firmus statement II                   |  |  |  |   |

What speaks also in favor of an original connection between text and music is the fact that the two series of longas appear compositionally motivated by the onomatopoeitic vowels. The clausula, by the way, must be derived from the French motet, as shown by the careful preservation of feminine and masculine phrase endings, and not from the Latin contrafact [414] *Crescens incredulitas* which is freer in this respect.

**SV 31 VIRGO [L. 16]****[424]** *En tel lieu s'est entremis*

The priority of [424] over **SV 31** is indicated already by the refrain, which appears with identical melody in [388] *La bele en cui*/JOHANNE.

**SV 30 VIRGO [L. 15]****[426]** *Je les ai tant quises le loiaus Amours*

The priority of [426] over **SV 30** is indicated by the quotation of the refrain, for whose sake the ending of the second cantus firmus statement was expanded.

**Sm 70, 71 REGNAT Nos. 2, 3 [L. 2, 3]****[437]** *Flos de spina rumpitur*; **[438]** *Quant repaire la verdor*

The clausulas **Sm 70** and **Sm 71** (REGNAT No. 2 and 3 [W<sub>1</sub>,F]) cannot in any way be the musical source for motet [437], but rather are discant settings resulting from the detexting of the latter. It is no coincidence that they are always copied together. Also, it is not the two-part (in F three-part) motet [437]/REGNAT that should be regarded as the original version, but rather the three-part motet [437]/[438]/REGNAT (which survives in this particular arrangement only in **Mo**). This follows from the fact that the periodization in [438] – this voice belongs to the same stylistic layer as [437] – settles in metrically “better” places at least at the beginning, and that [437] is metrically “shifted.” Apart from this, [438] contains several refrain quotations that could hardly have been incorporated afterwards.

**SV 34 REGNAT [L. 22]****[446]** *Dusque ci ai plus Amours honorée*

The priority of [446] over **SV 34** is indicated by the refrain (which occurs in melodically identical fashion also in [433] *Cele m'a la mort donée*/ALLELUYA, [445] *Nus ne sait*/REGNAT, R 157 I *Pour mon cuer*, and R 1509 IIa *Main se leva*) and by the tenor disposition, in which it is not just the incompleteness of the second cantus firmus statement that attracts notice, but also the overall arrangement.

**SV 26 PROPTER VERITATEM****[458]** *Quant se siet bele Ysabeaus*

The priority of [458] over **SV 26** is indicated by the tenor manipulations and the refrain quotation.

**SV 1 ET VIDE ET INCLINA****[479]** *Dieus, je fui ja prés de jöir*; **[480]** *Dieus, je n'i puis la nuit dormir*

In favor of the priority of [479]/[480] over **SV 1** argue the easily recognizable design of the “motet enté” in [480] and the departures from the order of the notes in the tenor during the quotation of the refrain.

**SV 36 ET SPERABIT [L. 5]****[510]** *Que por moi reconforter*

The priority of [510] over **SV 36** is suggested by the quotation of the refrain, which appears also in melodically identical fashion in [509] *Ne sai ou confort trouver*, and which rules the double motet [509]/[510]/ET SPERA in its totality (see especially the ending) and shows it to be a single conceptual entity.

**Sm 86** QUI CONSERVARET No. 7 [L. 7]**[515a]** *Quant l'aloete saut et monte en haut*

The priority of [515a] over clausula **Sm 86** (once more a setting surviving only in F) is argued by the quotation of the refrain, which appears in melodically identical fashion in [84] *Au dous tans/MANERE*.

**SV 38** ET EXALTAVI [L. 8]**[519]** *Bele sans orgueil et jone sans folie*

The priority of [519] over **SV 38** is suggested already by the quotation of a refrain at the end, a refrain that appears with identical melody also in [433] *Cele m'a la mort donée/ALLELUYA*. The motet's beginning probably also involves the quotation of a refrain (cf. Boogaard 642); that beginning does, in any event, set itself apart, with its seven measures, from the subsequent four-measure periods, and only finds its complement in the five-measure period before the refrain at the end.

**SV 40** AGMINA [L. 2]**[537]** *L'autrier cuidai aber druda*

Ludwig already expressed doubts about the priority of clausula **SV 40** over [537] (or [535]), because of the generally "idiosyncratic nature of the St Victor clausulas" and because "the expansion of the two-voice melisma into a three-part motet by means of an added middle voice (motetus) would not have remained singular but involved, as customary elsewhere, a new top voice (triplum)."<sup>77</sup>

**SV 25** ET IN FINES [L. 2]**[544]** *Amours qui tant m'a grevé; [545]* *Desconfortés ai esté longuement*

Tenor manipulation (reordering and repetitions in the cantus firmus) argues in favor of the priority of [544] (and [545]) over **SV 25**.

**SV 24** ET SUPER [L. 1]**[547]** *D'Amours sont en grant esmai; [548]* *Renvoisiement irai/ET SUPER*

What speaks against the priority of **SV 24** over [547] is the clausula's notation (cf. above, under [401]) and the motet's quotation of a refrain that occurs with the same melody in [288] *Si com aloie jouer/SUSTINERE* (in variant form in [190] *Se griés m'est au cors/IN SECULUM*). The double motet [548]/[547]/ET SUPER should surely be regarded as the original.

**Sm 97** TAMQUAM No. 12 [L. 1]**[637]** *Quant naist la flour en la pré; [638]* *Debonairement attendrai merci; [639]* *Que voudroit feme esprouver*

The priority of [637] and [638] (and possibly also [639]) over **Sm 97** (whose triplum was not written out, and which therefore remains incomplete) is indicated not only by the clausula's peculiar state of transmission, but also by the refrain quotations.

**Sm 100** FLOS FILIUS EIUS *a3* No. 3 [L. 3]**[651]** *L'autrier jouer m'en alai*

What argues against the priority of **Sm 100** over [651] is the refrain at the end of the motet, which is found with the same melody in Guillaume d'Amiens's rondeau No. 9 (Gennrich Rondeau No. 49, Boogaard

---

<sup>77</sup> *Repertorium*, p. 107.

Rondeau No. 92), and also by the tenor manipulation: of the cantus firmus FLOS FILIUS EIUS, the section EIUS by itself is stated twice, with an expansion of the last notes to accommodate a refrain quotation.

**SV 28** FLOS FILIUS EIUS [L. 10]

[657] *Hé! bergier, si grant envie j'ai de toi;* [658] *Par un matinet l'autrier;* [659] *Hé! sire, que vous vantés*

What speaks against the priority of **SV 28** over [657] is the fact that the complex [658]/[659]/[657]/EIUS represents a single conceptual entity. The quadruplum [658] ends with a refrain which, with the same tune, also frames the “motet enté” [671] and constitutes the ending of the quadruplum [798] *Cest quadruple sans raison*. The triplum [659] concludes with a refrain which is found also in R 962 VI *L'autrier par un matinet*. The motetus [657] is also transmitted as pastourelle R 1139 *E bergiers si grant envie*.

**Sm 99** FLOS FILIUS EIUS No. 4 [L. 8]

[663] *En mai, quant rose est florie;* [664] *Amours qui me font souffrir peine a*

It is, once again, the state of transmission that points to the priority the motet [663] (and [664]) over the only partially transmitted clausula **Sm 99** (erased at several places by the notator and evidently never finished) (cf. above under [638] and [650]/[651]). The ending of the second cantus firmus statement is slightly different from that of the first. In [663] a refrain has been incorporated at the beginning of the second cantus firmus statement, a refrain which also frames the “motets entés” [1105] *Dont vient li maus d'amer* and [1106] *Bel jouer fait a s'amie* (which unfortunately survive without musical notation).

**SV 27** FLOS FILIUS EIUS [L. 9]

[666] *On dist que j'ai amé*

The quotation of a refrain which is found with the same melody in R 1963 III, *A la virge qui digne est de s'amour*, argues in favor of the priority of [666] over **SV 27**, as does the tenor manipulation which would have appeared unmotivated in a setting conceived from the beginning as a clausula (the section EIUS from the cantus firmus FLOS FILIUS EIUS is restated, and the ending –IUS treated more freely at the end), and the notation of the clausula (cf. above, under [401]).

**SV 29** FLOS FILIUS EIUS [L. 10]

[673] *Quant de ma dame part après toutes douçours*

What argues against the priority of **SV 29** over [673] is the notation of the clausula (cf. above under [401]), the cantus firmus (two-fold statement of the melisma on the syllable E[IUS] minus the first note), and the arrangement of the second statement as well as the refrain at the end, which is repeated more than once. [673] could well be a “motet enté”; for the opening “Quant de ma dame part” corresponds to the verse “Dolent m'en part,” which precedes the refrain in the other three traditions and apparently belongs to it. If this interpretation, which is also musically more convincing, were to be correct, then this would speak for the priority of the motet.

**Sm 105** DOMINO No. 14 [L. 14]

[750] *Hier main trespensis d'Amours m'en alai*

What would argue in favor of the priority of [750] over clausula **Sm 105**, which survives only in F, is the tenor design at the very least (which would appear unmotivated in a setting conceived from the beginning as a clausula: the cantus firmus is stated incompletely at first, and then stated completely).

**Sm 104** DOMINO No. 12 [L. 12][754] *Ne m'oubliés mie, bele et avenant*

The priority of [754] over clausula **Sm 104** (once again a piece surviving only in F) is demonstrated by the applications of refrains, which are especially spectacular in this case: the twelve-measure refrain at the beginning is found with the same melody at the end of [567] *La plus bele riens vivant*; and the refrain at the end is found with the same melody also at the end of the triplum [342] (see above) and the motet [393] (see above). Gennrich and Boogaard perceived the rest of a rondeau (Boogaard No. 111) in the last four verses of [754].

**Sm 106** DOMINO No. 16 [L. 16][755] *Pucelete, bele et avenant*; [756] *Je langui des maus d'Amours*

The priority of [756] (and [756]?) over clausula **Sm 106**, which survives uniquely in F, is indicated by the text-music relationship (expressive musical rendering of the text) and the treatment of the cantus firmus (note repetitions and insertions).

**Sm 107** DOMINO *a3*[764] *Hier matin a l'enjournée toute m'amblëure*

Motet [764] is an especially problematic case. Refrain, text-music relationship (the hocket passages have the same text in all four versions, and four-square periodization in the first, but unsquare periodization in the second cantus firmus statement), and tenor repetitions argue in favor of the priority of the motet over the clausula **Sm 107**. The hocket passages would however suggest that the piece was originally in three parts; yet no triplum text is known to us. Fr. Ludwig already suspected that the – Latin – motet [762] *Alpha bovi et leoni* was originally a three-part setting, because of its position in Ma and because the clausula is in three parts;<sup>78</sup> accordingly he places it chronologically before the clausula.<sup>79</sup> Yet in view of the unusual setting, with its numerous note repetitions and triplications and its half-hocketings in the triplum, it seems also possible that this is not the original triplum, but rather one composed afterwards for the chant setting. That is to say, the composer would have incorporated the motet (without the triplum, which might already have been lost at that stage) into the chant setting and have added a new triplum. The tone repetitions and half-hocketings mentioned earlier would also, however, allow the possibility that the setting was originally in four parts. Still, what speaks for the completion *a posteriori* of the triplum is the fact that it does not partake in the four-square periodization of the motets, but rather covers it over, and that the chant setting, as a result, is quite homogenous.

**SV 19** FIAT [L. 3][791] *En espoir d'avoir merci qu'a meschief atent*

The priority of the the motet [791] over **SV 19** is indication by the number of cantus firmus statements, and the arrangement as well as the elongation of the notes at the end of the refrain quotation. The clausula is barely intelligible, even without the help of the motet.

**SV 18** FIAT [L. 2][792] *Merci, de qui j'atendoie secours et äie*

The priority of [792] over **SV 18** is suggested by the tenor treatment (cf. above under [791]), especially the elongation of the notes at the end, to which a refrain is sounded. Whether this refrain is complementary to the refrain at the beginning of the motet, discovered by Boogaard as well as Gennrich, and whether, consequently, this could be a “motet enté,” must remain an open question.

<sup>78</sup> Ed. Husmann, *Notre-Dame-Organa* [see n. 41], p. 124.

<sup>79</sup> *Repertorium*, pp. 34, 63, 115.



**SV 17** FIAT [L. 1][795] *J'ai trouvé qui m'amera*

The priority of [795] over **SV 17** is indicated by the easily recognizable design of the “motet enté,” and the three-fold statement of the cantus firmus FIAT, FIAT, with an expansion at the end of the third statement.

**Sm 84** IUSTUS No. 2[821] *A grant joie chevauchois*

The priority of motet [821] over clausula **Sm 84** (which survives only in F) is indicated by the conclusion, unequivocally clear from the point of view of the history of style, that the motet reveals a four-square structure when verses and music are precisely matched to one another, but that the clausula features an asymmetrical structure (limping rhythm), which is later from the viewpoint of rhythmic history. The addition of a transitional formula at the end seems consistent with its functional redefinition as a clausula.

Since we may assume a uniform process of creation for the St Victor clausulas (that is, derivation from the motets cited in the margin), the “unproved” cases in this manuscript only add to the case; similarly, whenever a clausula is transmitted uniquely in F (especially in the clausula fascicles), the possibility would seem especially attractive that the clausula was created *ad hoc* by the scribe of the manuscript (that is, through the de-texting of motets), something that can be observed especially clearly in the clausulas to motets [402], [638], and [663]. Only the Magnus liber in  $W_1$  has no explicit connection to the French motet (only for one of its 118 clausulas a corresponding Latin motet has been documented); yet the clausula fascicle of this manuscript (which comprises 101 items altogether) already contains eleven clausulas for which there are French motets, while the Magnus liber in F contains fourteen (seven in the Magnus liber of  $W_2$ ) and the clausula collections in F altogether 43; and there are 39 French motets for the so-called St Victor clausulas.<sup>80</sup> If the genetic relationship between clausula and motet, made plausible by the indications cited here, were to be correct, then it would appear that the clausula repertory had fed increasingly on the melismas of French motets.<sup>81</sup>

[21]

<sup>80</sup> At **SV 37** the scribe wrote the incipit of the lost Latin motet [494] *In invicibus*.

<sup>81</sup> There are of course settings for which the priority of the corresponding French motets is improbable. This is the case in **Sm 77** (*Ex semine* from Perotin's *Alleluia Nativitas*): here, the clausula could well have been the original, being at first texted in Latin (motet [483] *Ex semine Abrahe*). Motet [485] *Se j'ai amé* appears to be a contrafact of the Latin motet, and [486] *Hier main trespensis* a contrafact of the Latin or French motet. The refrain pointed out by Gennrich (Boogaard does not recognize it) is quoted textually in all cases. The new ending of the motet is noteworthy: Perotin's clausula ends with a copula (in the Franconian sense), which transitions into the following sustained-note section, yet the motet ends in the style of discant. Yet neither counter-examples of this kind, nor the many undecided cases, cannot disprove the hypothesis represented here; they merely suggest that the received picture of the genetic relationship between clausula and motet should not be turned mechanically into its opposite.

### 3. Clausulas With Latin Motets Only

In the case of the forty-two clausulas to which only Latin motets are known to correspond<sup>82</sup> (one need hardly reckon with excessively large losses of French versions) it is far more difficult to establish unambiguous evidence as to the genetic relationship between clausula and motet, since refrain construction drops out of the picture now. Still, here, too, there are convincing examples of the priority of the motet.

**Sm 9–12** MANERE Nos. 3–6 [L. 6–9]

[69] *Serena virginum*; [70] *Manere vivere*

[22]

Thus the motet [70] ([69], as J. Handschin determined, is a contrafact<sup>83</sup>) was undoubtedly not created by the addition of texts to four mutually independent clausulas (**Sm 9–12**), but rather these four clausulas were created by stripping texts from the motet. That these four clausulas originally constituted a single entity, and that text and music were conceived together, is shown by the beginnings and endings of the altogether five cantus firmus statements of the motet, which are quite conspicuously crafted (highlighted in their immediate context, and for the most part identical melodically), with the beginnings of statements always rhyming with the ending of the preceding statement; only the transition from the penultimate to final statement was cast as a connection (for which reason these two statements together constitute a single clausula).

**Sm 14** IN BETHLEEM No. 2a–b [L. 2a–b]

[98] *In Bethleem Herodes iratus*; [99] *Chorus innocentium*

Against the priority of clausula **Sm 14** over motet [98] argues the tenor disposition (two statements of the cantus firmus and repetition of the first two notes at the end), which could scarcely be explained if the music was conceived as a clausula from the beginning, but is clearly connected with the conception of the motet (textual-musical parallelism between the transition from the first to second statement, on the one hand, and the ending of the motet, on the other). The three-part motet [99]/[98]/IN BETHLEEM should be considered the original; [99a] *Amours mi font rejöir* is surely a contrafact of [99], for it lacks the latter's thematic connection with the other voices and is apparently without a refrain. That the original was originally conceived in three parts is apparent not only from the very close thematic connection between [99], [98] and the tenor, but also the fact that the triplum joins the other voices in creating the connection between the endings of the first and second statements, thereby revealing itself to be a part of the original conception. This connection between the endings of the two statements would also seem to argue for the priority of the motet over the clausula, or more correctly, the clausulas. For the clausulas in W<sub>1</sub> and F were evidently created independently from each other: W<sub>1</sub> follows the chief tradition in the endings of the statements, but involves modal transmutation from the fifth mode to the first; F, on the other hand, follows its own version of the motet (without modal transmutation).

<sup>82</sup> Sm(ith No.) 3, 6, 9–12, 14, 20, 25b, 26, 29, 30, 34, 35, 36, 39, 43, 44, 45, 46, 56, 61, 63, 66, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79, 80, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 95, 98, 101, 102, 103, SV, 37.

<sup>83</sup> *The Summer Canon and its Background*, Musica Disciplina V, 1951, 96. For this motet as well as the other five motets transmitted in W<sub>1</sub>, see also the summary and continued discussion in W. Arlt, *Ein Festoffizium des Mittelalters aus Beauvais in seiner liturgischen und musikalischen Bedeutung*, Cologne 1970, II, 275–300.

**Sm 20** AUDIVIMUS No. 4 [L. 4]**[108]** *Novus nove legis nuncius*

Priority of motet [108] over clausula **Sm 20** is indicated not only by the fact that there are two cantus firmus statements, but also by the close rhythmic-motivic fit of the text, a fit that could hardly have been achieved after the fact.

**Sm 26** DOMINO ... QUONIAM No. 7 [L. 8]**[133]** *Virgo gignit genitorem prolis sue filia*

What argues in favor of the priority of motet [133] over clausula **Sm 26** is the tenor disposition (repetition of the tenor section DOMINO before continuing with the section QUO-), which is characteristic of the composition of motets, but difficult to explain in terms of the clausula, the irregularity of the tenor rhythm at the end of the second statement of DOMINO, and the notation of the clausula, which involves a few rest strokes that are hard to explain. In  $W_2$  the tenor continues with two notes beyond the duration of the motet: was the scribe of this manuscript (or its exemplar) the composer? Noteworthy is the structure of the setting: it begins firmly four-square and ends likewise, but in the middle parts there are structures that deviate, and introduce irregularities.

**Sm 25** DOMINO No. 2 [L. 3]**[131]** *Deo confitemini qui sua clemencia*

The section DOMINO of clausula **Sm 25** DOMINO QUONI-, transmitted in the Magnus liber of F and  $W_2$ , is taken to have been the musical source for motets [131] (Latin) and [132] (French: *Mout est fous qui femme croit*), and its section QUONI- as the musical source for the Latin motet [140] *Laudes referat*. Yet these two sections are stylistically quite heterogeneous: DOMINO is kept in a four-square style, whereas QUONI shows irregular periodization. That **Sm 25** was not a single, unified composition is confirmed by the transitional melisma between the two sections, which is inserted in F. Against the priority of the clausula version of DOMINO over the first of its motets (surely the French one, to which the scribe of  $W_2$  actually refers in the margin of the Latin version) would argue the two-fold statement of the cantus firmus; the same holds for the section QUONI-.

**Sm 29** IN SECULUM No. 9 [L. 11]**[141]** *In serena facie sol splenduit glorie*

What argues in favor of the priority of [141] over **Sm 29** is the twofold cantus firmus statement. The motet is a trope, whose text is made to utter the syllables IN SE- -CULUM in exact synchronicity with the tenor during the first cantus firmus statement (whereas these syllables make up the conclusion in the second statement).

**Sm 30** NOSTRUM No. 1 [L. 3]**[215]** *Gaudeat devotio fidelium*

In favor of the priority of [215] over **Sm 30** argues already the arrangement of the tenor (two cantus firmus statements, of which the second omits the last three notes, and after the first of which half a rhythm period is abandoned for the sake of a rhythmically identical repetition).<sup>84</sup> The precise agreement between the textual and musical structures also pleads in favor of the simultaneous creation of text and musical setting, and thus of the priority of the motet.

---

<sup>84</sup> An extensive analysis of the setting is offered by Fr. Reckow, *Processus and structura*, Musiktheorie I, 1986, 22–24.

**Sm 35** IMMOLATUS EST No. 5 [L. 5]**[228]** *Latex silice mel petra profluit*

[23]

Of the four-part motet [228] in F, the three upper voices are by themselves alone better-sounding and for this reason – as H. Tischler<sup>85</sup> and J. Handschin<sup>86</sup> assumed because of the harsh sonorities that are heard when the tenor is included – was classed as such [i.e. a three-part tenorless piece] among the conducti in  $W_1$  (consistent with this genre are also the three strophes and the final melisma after the manner of the conductus “cauda”). Since clausula **Sm 35** supposedly formed the basis for the tenor-motetus setting, the three scholars regard the triplum and quadruplum as later, and possibly English, additions to the motetus as a fundamental voice. E. H. Sanders, against this, views the  $W_1$  version as the original; the tenor in F would have been added afterwards, as the harsh sonorities would seem to indicate as well, and the clausula created later through the de-texting of the tenor-motetus setting.<sup>87</sup> W. Arlt in turn objects that the tenor-motetus setting is quite normal in its dissonance treatment, and was evidently crafted quite carefully; undoubtedly it would have been the first to have been created.<sup>88</sup> Quite so – but not in the formal shape of a clausula (as Handschin and Arlt assume), but in the formal shape of a two-part motet. What speaks in favor of the latter’s priority over the clausula is the fact that the peculiar structure of this setting can only be explained with reference to the text: the tenor, taking careful account of the textual structure, first presents three groups of three longas with rests, then three groups of four longas (without rests), and then again three times three groups of three longas with rests (only the last note of this grouping is extended into a sustained note for the melisma, which functions as the conductus “cauda”, and which consists of four four-measure periods and a concluding five-measure period). The clausula in F, by the way, leaves out two measures (along with the corresponding three cantus firmus notes) whereas the setting is complete in  $W_1$ . That F would assign this scrambled tenor to the three upper voices of the motet could possibly indicate that the exemplar for this manuscript was a tenorless version just as in  $W_1$ .

**Sm 34** IMMOLATUS EST No. 4 [L. 4]**[231]** *Homo quam sit pura*

The text of the three-stanza motet [231] (for which there is a four-stanza contrafact [232] *Stupeat natura*) is attributed to Chancellor Philip. Ludwig rejected the possibility that the musical setting by Heinrich of Pisa (c.1243–45), reported by Salimbene,<sup>89</sup> might have been identical with motet [231], since the latter was obviously created [or so he assumed] through the addition of text to a clausula. However this may be, the text was conceived as a trope to *Alleluia Pascha nostrum* over the melisma -LATUS, and this in the simplest formal way: the eighteen three-note groups of the LATUS melisma correspond to the eighteen verses of the strophe. The product is characterised by such musical monotony that it would be easiest to explain as being conditioned by the formal conception of the text, something that in turn would argue for the priority of the motet over clausula **Sm 34**.

**Sm 39** IN AZIMIS SINCERITATIS [L. 2]**[244]** *Exilium parat transgressio*

The two statements in motet [244], which is musically identical with **Sm 39**, appear originally to have been independent – two motets or two clausulas? The first motet is not among the earliest examples of the genre (mode 6). The second is characterized by such a close relationship between musical and textual form that these seem to have been conceived together, something that would seem to argue in favor of the priority of the motet. In that case there would have been a successful detexting, in the Magnus liber of F, of the motet that comprises both statements.

---

<sup>85</sup> *English Traits in the Early 13th-Century Motet*, The Musical Quarterly XXX, 1944.

<sup>86</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 96 and 98.

<sup>87</sup> *Peripheral Polyphony of the 13th Century*, Journal of the American Musicological Society XVII, 1964, 283 f.

<sup>88</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 289 f.

<sup>89</sup>

**Sm 43** MORS *a4* [L. 1][254] *Mors que stimulo*; [255] *Mors morsu nata*; [256] *Mors a primi patris*

The case of the clausula *Mors* (**Sm 43**) and its motets is particularly interesting. The motets reveal in drastic fashion – in the combination of a long-limbed, slow-moving motetus [255] and a short-sectioned, fast-moving triplum [254] – that the composition is a work of that already advanced phase in which it became customary to differentiate the upper voices with regard to rhythm and tempo. Was the quadruplum [256], which moves mostly in synchrony with the triplum and seems textually relatively weak, a later addition? Was the motet [254]/[255]/MORS the original (as would seem to be indicated by the conspicuously good text-music relationship)?

**Sm 45** CAPTIVITATEM No. 3a–b [L. 3a–b][308] *Hostem superat et infernum reserat*

What speaks in favor of the priority of [308] over **Sm 45** are the tenor disposition (two cantus firmus statements, of which the second uses only 36 of the 49 notes; arrangement in five-note groups) and the textual form.

**Sm 46** CAPTIVITATEM No. 6 [L. 6][309] *Salve, mater, (virgo), fons hortum*

The priority of [309] over **Sm 49** is suggested by the rigid four-square “Quadratismus,” which corresponds precisely with the text, and by the disposition in two statements.

**Sm 44** CAPTIVITATEM No. 1 [L. 1][310] *Si quis ex opere propriam laborat querere gloriam*

The priority of [310] over **Sm 44** is suggested by the text-music relationship.

**Sm 56** DOCEBIT No. 2 [L. 2][345] *Doce nos hodie viam prudentie*

What pleads in favor of the priority of [345] over **Sm 56** is the twofold cantus firmus statement in different arrangements (in which the first becomes irregular at the end) and the general character of a declamatory setting (unison-chains in the fourth period of the second statement).

[24]

**Sm 61** MULIERUM No. 3 [L. 3][376a] *Mulier misterio sterilis mire fit in senio fertilis*

The character of a declamatory setting is also apparent in [376a], something that would seem to argue in favor of its priority over clausula **Sm 61**.

**Sm 63** PATRIBUS No. 1 [L. 1][400a] *Patrum sub imperio status stat ecclesia*

The priority of [400a] over **Sm 63** is indicated by the twofold presentation of the cantus firmus, which comprises 27 notes, in successive groupings of seven notes whose repetition transgresses the boundaries of a single statement, with the second statement inserting two notes and having a different ending from the first, and also by the somewhat monotonous “Quadratismus” in the clausula, which could be explained as arising from the text.

**Sm 66** TUIS No. 2 [L. 1]**[1049b/405d]** *Tu, claviger etheris magister ceteris*

What argues in favor of the priority of motet [1049b/405d] over clausula **Sm 66**, which survives uniquely in F, is the threefold statement of the cantus firmus (with pitch variations). The tenor – consisting of a series of “simplices” – has been articulated in agreement with the upper voice, which closes five times on *c* and then four times on *e* or *f* and which constantly proceeds – in accordance with the dactylus-like meter of the text – in a powerful third mode.

**Sm 76** REGNAT No. 13 [L. 13]**[439]** *Ad solitum vomitum ne redeas*

The priority of [439] over clausula **Sm 76**, which is transmitted only in F, is suggested by the tenor disposition: the cantus firmus is stated twice and cast in the third mode, and consists of twice ten two-measure periods. The motetus which is likewise cast in the third mode, reflecting the dactylic text, comprises – in accordance with the textual articulation – seven three-measure periods, then two four-measure ones, then three two-measure ones, and finally on three- and one two-measure period.

**Sm 74** REGNAT No. 7 [L. 7]**[441]** *Hodie Marie concurrant laudi mentes pie*

The priority of [441] over **Sm 74** is indicated by the fact that the melodic articulation of the cantus firmus was adopted by the motetus in its own melodic and textual articulation.

**Sm 72** REGNAT No. 4 [L. 4]**[442]** *Rex pacificus unicus matris unice honorifice*

What argues for the priority of [442] over **Sm 72**, aside from the twofold statement of the cantus firmus, is the construction of the top voice, which resembles that of [439] and evidently follows the textual form.

**Sm 75** REGNAT No. 8 [L. 8]**[443]** *Infidelem populum, amam ad patibulum*

The “Quadratismus” of [443] was surely a response to the text, which would appear to favor the priority of this motet over **Sm 75**.

**Sm 73** REGNAT No. 6 [L. 6]**[444]** *Deus omnium turba gentium circumstantium*

The priority of motet [444] over clausula **Sm 73** is indicated by the “Quadratismus” and the echo relationship, which corresponds to the rhyme, between the first and second halves of the phrase.

**Sm 78** INQUIRENTES AUTEM No. 2 [L. 2]**[487]** *Deum querite deum totis viribus*

In **Sm 78**/[487] it seems that the tenor was articulated in response to the needs of the motetus, which for its own part musically observes the textual form (especially its parallelisms). This correspondence of textual and musical structure is no longer maintained even in motet [488] *Iuste vivere*, which is evidently a contrafact of [487]. This would seem to indicate the priority of [487] over **Sm 78**.

**Sm 79** DOMINE No. 2 [L. 3]**[490]** *Tua glorificata, Deus, opera*

The priority of [490] over clausula **Sm 79** (which is transmitted only in F) is indicated not only by the twofold statement of the cantus firmus, but also by the fact that the clausula, in the second statement, employs, instead of the stylistically older first mode (as in the motet), the second mode that was more often preferred at a later time.

**Sm 85** ET SPERABIT No. 2 [L. 2]**[505]** *Letetur justus, gloriatur in Domino*

The priority of [505] over **Sm 85** is suggested not only by the twofold cantus firmus statement, but also by the close correspondence between textual and musical structure. The parallelism between the two statements (which open in different arrangements, but in the last third jettison their formulas in favor of a concluding section that is identical in both statements, and is noteworthy for its rhythm) corresponds to the textual parallelism especially of the final lines (“veneretur lux hodierna” – “ubi nos serenat lux aeterna”; “lux” being marked off, on both occasions, by rests).

**Sm 93** ET IHERUSALEM No. 2 [L. 2]**[632]** *Gaude Syon filia regis in presentia*

What argues against the priority of clausula **Sm 93** over motet [632] in F = [633] in MüA (the text of [632] is declaimed here in the triplum) is, firstly, the fact that the clausula comprises only one cantus firmus statement (whereas the motet – at least in MüA – is based on two statements plus a continuation of the cantus firmus [in F there is, instead of the second statement and the continuation of the cantus firmus, a sustained note, as also in the clausula to the melisma on the penultimate note]). Composition of the motet would have required here, apart from the purely poetic activity of texting the clausula, the compositional task of extending the musical setting. Secondly, it seems that the clausula (just as the two-part motet transmitted in F) consists of the tenor and triplum (not the motetus) of the original setting, which we evidently still possess in the MüA version. Whether this setting was originally bi-textual, as in MüA, or, as possibly in the exemplar for F, monotextual (a motet type that is, after all, represented in large numbers in F and W<sub>2</sub>), may be left open here.

[25]

#### 4. Results and Conclusions

Of course there are also cases where a known clausula setting could have been functionally recast as a motet through the addition of text.<sup>90</sup> Yet purely from the statistical point of view, these could scarcely represent the normal state of affairs; it seems similarly unlikely (even if it cannot be ruled out completely) that the genesis of the motet (“motet” in its later, expanded sense, discussed above<sup>91</sup>) was rooted in this practice.<sup>92</sup> More plausible, it seems, would be to assume a practice of

<sup>90</sup> See above, note 81. The practice of adding texts is attested in motets [2], [3], [57] and [58]. Yet these need not be taken into account here, since they are based not on discant clausulas but on sustained-note sections.

<sup>91</sup> P. 5 f.

<sup>92</sup> Every attempt, by the way, to prove in terms of overall chronology that the texting of clausulas was preceded the origins of the motet (in the broader sense), would be hampered at least by the fact that text-additions to clausulas are hard to date even without external dating (unlike in the case of original motets, the assignment of the music on the basis of style would yield only a “Terminus post quem”). –

troping, as H. Riemann already did,<sup>93</sup> in which the motet is composed not only as a poem but also fashioned, just like the clausula alone would otherwise have been, as a musical setting (for there should be no doubt that the motet, even the French-texted one, was originally a trope).<sup>94</sup>

[26]

What needs to be reconsidered as well is the prevailing view of the chronology of Latin and French motets. It is not that tropes of the kind discussed a moment ago cannot possibly have been Latin-texted (what might actually even speak in favor of this possibility is the fact that of the 42 Latin motets that do not appear to be contrafacts, a greater percentage also features the evidently more archaic four-square periodization than is the case with the 98 French motets); yet as far as we can determine from stylistic criteria, the French motet does not, by any means, seem appreciably later than the Latin motet.<sup>95</sup> Above all, the French-texted form stands at the center of interest right from the beginning, whereas the Latin motets are made up almost two-thirds merely of contrafacts of French motets. What seems to confirm the more powerful creative impulse behind the French motets is that fact there are twice as many clausulas that can be traced back to French motets rather than Latin ones. The large number of contrafacta of French motets

---

Fundamentally one should consider that poet-musicians, among the composers of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, were less the exception than the norm, as for example Adam de la Hale, Petrus de Cruce, Jehannot de l'Escurel, Philippe de Vitry, Guillaume de Machaut, and so on; and that was probably no different before Adam de la Hale. As far as our problem is concerned, we should reckon not so much with texted clausulas but rather with, on the one hand, unified poetic-musical compositions and, on the other, with purely textual contrafacta of already existing motets. – Philip the Chancellor exemplifies very well the role division of poet and composer: the musical settings of his works sound quite monotonous without text, and are intelligible only in terms of the textual form. Those who were only poets achieved better results with contrafacts of already existing motets, less so with the creation of texts that were yet to be set to music, no matter whether these were, in themselves, as important as those of Philip (this applies specifically with regard to the production of motets).

<sup>93</sup> *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte*, cited above, p. 6.

<sup>94</sup> The considerations offered here do not imply that clausulas were generally derived from motets (this is ruled out in the case of only 140 motet melismas among the more than 500 clausulas, and it is contradicted also by the Magnus liber of W<sub>1</sub>, which contains only a single motet melisma), but does indicate that the need for clausulas, which had grown to a conspicuous extent by the middle of the thirteenth century, was increasingly covered also by motet melismas. (Conceivably this rather abrupt need for clausulas had the same cause as the creation of Latin contrafacts from French motet: the banishment of French motets from the church [on this point, see below, 26]).

<sup>95</sup> The French motet can be grouped in five categories (two degrees of four-square, uncertain, two degrees of asymmetric). The oldest ones seem to be motets Nos. 48a, 55, 79, 100, 102, 132, 135, 144, 250, 272, 326/27, 338, 368, 370, 380, 384, 401, 413, 415, 437/38, 485, 537, 547, 663, 764, 972, and 817. The second group of slightly younger motets consists of Nos. 104, 122, 217, 218/19, 230a/240, 233a, 235/36, 249, 314, 343, 402, 458, 509/10, 666, 750, and 821. Difficult to categorize are motets Nos. 634 and 803. The group that represents the penultimate stage in this apparent chronological development is made up of motets Nos. 115, 165, 251, 318/319, 408, 424, 426, 519, 650/51, 673, 754, and 756. The most recent motets seem to be Nos. 5–7, 8, 54, 62, 63, 74/75, 78, 111, 139, 237, 258, 307a, 323/24, 328, 336a, 341, 344a, 347, 351, 352, 353, 358, 361, 366, 393, 397, 419, 430, 446, 447, 479/80, 515a, 527, 544, 638, 641, 657/58/59, 791, and 795. The same holds true for the originally Latin-texted motets. Those that are cast in rigid, smithcraft-like “four-square” periodization are the motets No. 43, 59, 133, 231=233, 309, 400a, 443, 444, 494a/310a, 516, 517, 524, 635, 643, 655, and 698. Still using the methods of “Quadratismus” are 108, 215, 228, 244, and 697. More or less asymmetrical are 70=69, 98, 104, 141, 234, 254/255/256, 308, 310, 345, 376a, 405d/1049b, 439, 441, 442, 487=488, 490, 494, 505, 518, 529, and 632=633.



that are found among the Latin pieces in the repertoire treated here could be explained by this scenario, namely, that the (at last by current norms) often too “worldly” French motets fell victim,<sup>96</sup> to the extent that they were sung in church, to more rigorous tendencies and were replaced by unoffensive Latin contrafacta.

So the received view of a closed repertoire of clausulas from the Notre Dame period, of which more and more parts would supposedly have been converted to motets at a later date, must be revised: the clausula repertoire is evidently neither closed, nor merely the supplying party in the compositional exchange; rather, it fed to a considerable extent on the dramatically flourishing motet production of the thirteenth century;<sup>97</sup> and in every case its contents extend right up to the copying dates of the manuscripts in which they survive, whose notators evidently help create that repertoire at least in part (not least through the de-texting of motets). And the Notre Dame manuscripts, which, as well known, were not copied before the middle of the thirteenth century,<sup>98</sup> are not just late examples because of some fluke of transmission, but represent, at every historical stage, the then current state of the repertoire.<sup>99</sup> That the late date of the Notre Dame manuscripts is not due to an accident of transmission, but that they mirror the state of production and its notation at every time, may also have ramifications for our view of the history of notation. According to that history, mensural notation as notation “cum littera” and modal notation as notation “cum littera” existed side by side for a long time, until finally the notation sine littera was reformulated in the sense of mensural notation; mensural notation certainly did not develop out of modal notation.<sup>100</sup> Finally, for the history of Notre Dame chant elaborations the following

[27]

<sup>96</sup> See above, n. 17.

<sup>97</sup> Following this line of reasoning one could roughly distinguish two states in the known history of the Magnus liber: that of  $W_1$  and that of F (to which the one in  $W_2$  agrees). The first of these has – with the exception of a clausula used twice – no point of contact with the motet repertoire; the latter has numerous points of contact. Similarly one could posit two historical states for the clausula repertoire: one without points of contact with the motet repertory (as in the fourth and fifth groups in F) and one with numerous points of contact with it (as in  $W_1$  and in the first, second, third, and sixth groups of F). In the first clausula repertoire, Office chants are well represented, comparatively speaking, but in the later repertoire only weakly so. (The motet repertoire involves about 3.7 times as many Mass chants as Office chants.) The points of contact between clausula and motet repertoires were admittedly known to Ludwig, but have never been considered in an attempt to clarify the historical development of the Magnus liber.

<sup>98</sup> For the manuscript F, R. A. Baltzer has established a dating in the decade between 1245 and 1255 (*Thirteenth-Century Illuminated Miniatures and the Date of the Florence Manuscript*, JAMS XXV, 1972, 15), for  $W_2$  “around 1250–1275” (*ibid.*, 17);  $W_1$  has been assigned, since Handschin, to the fourteenth century.

<sup>99</sup> The first fascicle of Mo, which is well known to still transmit the most prominent Notre Dame compositions, should also be understood in this sense. That the production of Notre Dame manuscripts continued even into the late thirteenth century is confirmed by the Basel fragment which was recently published by W. Arlt and M. Haas (*Pariser modale Mehrstimmigkeit in einem Fragment der Basler Universitätsbibliothek*, Basler Jahrbuch für historische Musikpraxis IV, 1980).

<sup>100</sup> Whereas mensural **rhythm** (which according to Lambertus and Franco rested on the lasting construction of identical time value totals with, in principle, free interiors) should be regarded as unequivocally the historical successor of modal rhythm (which according to Garlandia was premised on a regular alternation between long and short notes), mensural **notation** (as a writing system of signs for various note values) did not derive from modal notation (which indicates rhythm by means of the grouping

conclusions may be drawn: not only were the chant arrangements made to incorporate, again and again, pieces that already existed as motets at the time; but the non-mensural initia and transitional formulas at the end (“copulae” in the Franconian sense, which tellingly were first described only by him) were inserted, so that one must speak of a process of creation and rearrangement that continued during the entire time frame whose music is transmitted here (as mirrored by the Notre Dame manuscripts).

---

of notes). Rather we are dealing with two different principles of notation, of which one was admittedly abandoned, along with modal rhythm itself, as being specially tailored to that rhythm, whereas the other, less specialised method continued to exist, but which principles of notation were, for the time being, used side by side as notations “sine littera” (modal notation) and “cum littera” (mensural notation). After the above conclusions as to the genetic relationship between Notre Dame clausulas and their motets, the designation “sine littera” can no longer be maintained as primary and “cum littera” as secondary; the opposite, in most cases, seems nearer the truth, so that the simultaneous (rather than historically successive) existence of both notational manners seems securely established.

Regarding the following tables [reproduced in the following pages directly from the original German article]: [28]

Settings are arranged in the order of the motet numbers (column 6).

Column 1 identifies the relevant clausula by its number in N. E. Smith, *From Clausula to Motet*, MD XXXIV, 1980, or – in the case of the St Victor clausulas – by its number in Fr. Ludwig, *Repertorium organorum recentioris et motetorum vetustissimi stili* I,1 Halle 1910, 148–52.

Columns 2–5 show the transmission of these clausulas; among the places where they are found are the versions of the Magnus liber in F (abbreviation FML, column 2) and W<sub>2</sub> (abbreviation W<sub>2</sub>ML, column 3), the clausula collections in W<sub>1</sub> (abbreviation W<sub>1</sub>Cl, column 4) and F (abbreviation FCl, column 5) as well as other locations mentioned specially.

Column 6 cites the motet number after Ludwig (*op. cit.*, *passim*) and Fr. Gennrich, *Bibliographie der ältesten französischen und lateinischen Motetten*, = *Summa musicae medii aevi* II, Darmstadt 1957. Multiple identifications of a motet are marked by an oblique stroke “/”; musically (but not textually) identical motets by equals signs “=”; the hypothetical original is always listed as the first.

Column 7 cites the motet number in the collected edition by H. Tischler, *The Earliest Motets (to circa 1270)*, New Haven and London, 1982.

Columns 8–10 cite the numbers of the refrains identified in the motets, after N. H. J. v. d. Boogaard, *Rondeaux et refrains du XIIe siècle au début du XIVe*, Paris 1969, and Fr. Gennrich, *Bibliographisches Verzeichnis der französischen Refrains des 12. un 13. Jahrhunderts*, = *Summa musicae medii aevi* XIV, Langen 1964, as well as refrain attestations elsewhere after Boogaard. In the latter, references like **R 1975 II** indicate the second stanza of the song listed under number 1975 in G. Raynaud, *Bibliographie des altfranzösischen Liedes*, newly revised and updated by H. Spanke, Leiden 1955; references like **M 403** indicate the motet (voice) listed by Ludwig and Gennrich under number 403; **rond 164** points to the rondeaus in Boogaard; **Galeran** to Jean Renart’s *Galeran de Bretagne* (c.1200); **Poire** to Messire Thibaut’s *Li romanz de la Poire* (c.1270), **Pris** to Baudouin de Condés *Prison d’Amours* (c.1270); **Sal I** to the *Salut d’Amours*, ed. P. Meyer, *Bibl. de l’École des Chartes* XXVIII, 1867, 154–62; **Sal II** to the *Salut d’Amours*, ed. A. Jubinal, *Nouveau recueil de contes, dits, fabliaux et autres pièces inédites des XIIIe, XIVe et XVe siècles*, Paris 1842, 235 ff.; **Prov H** to *Proverbia . . .* of the manuscript Hereford, Close P.3.3.; **Guill** to Jean Renart’s *Le Roman de la Rose ou de Guillaume de Dole* (c.1212); **Jal.** to *D’Amors et de Jalousie*; **Viol.** to Gerbert de Montreuil’s *Le Roman de la Violette ou de Gérard de Nevers* (zwischen 1225 and 1229); **Ovide** to *Traduction de l’Ars amandi d’Ovide en prose avec commentaire*; **Ren.** to Jacquemart Giélée’s *Renart le Nouvel* (c.1290); **Chauv.** to Jacques Bretel’s *Le tournoy de Chauvency* (1285); **Best.** to Richard de Fournival’s *Li Bestiaires d’Amours*.

Superscript numbers refer to the annotations to the table.

*Translator’s note:* I translated portions of this article for a Graduate Seminar on Ars Antiqua polyphony at Princeton University in the Fall of 2011. I decided to complete the translation as a personal tribute to the late Professor Wolf Frobenius, a scholar whose work I greatly admire, and am circulating it in the fervent hope that his work on the genetic relationship between clausula and motet may receive a more thoughtful response in Anglo-American scholarship than it has found to date. As far as I am concerned there are no restrictions to the non-commercial, scholarly use of my translation, but nothing about this text is meant to prejudice the rights of the copyright holder of the original German article.

Die Klauseln mit französischen Motetten

| 1       | 2      | 3                    | 4                    | 5                    | 6              | 7     | 8                   | 9                           | 10  |
|---------|--------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------|-------|---------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Klausel | FML f. | W <sub>2</sub> ML f. | W <sub>1</sub> Cl Nr | FCI Nr               | Motette Nr     | Ti Nr | Refrain Nr<br>Boog  | Genn                        | auch in   |
| Sm 1    | 100v   | 64                   |                      |                      | 5<br>6<br>7    | 206   | 1481                | 1513                        |   |
| Sm 2    |        |                      | 25                   | 8                    |                | 244   | 364                 | 1988                        |   |
| Sm 4    |        |                      | 37                   | 48a/51a <sup>1</sup> |                | 247   |                     |                             |   |
| Sm 19   |        |                      | 64                   | 54                   |                | 249   | 1118<br>1382<br>310 | 355<br>1517<br>1423<br>1360 | R 1975 II   |
| Sm 5    |        |                      | 38                   | 55                   |                | 251   | 570                 | 1536                        |   |
| Sm 8    |        |                      | 41                   | 62=60=61             |                | 67    | 314                 | 9                           | M 403 =<br>rond 164<br>R 2041 I<br>M 188<br>M 433           |
| Sm 7    |        |                      | 14                   | 40                   | 63             | 254   | 825                 | 1980<br>1982<br>1320        |   |
| SV 2    |        |                      |                      |                      | 74=76<br>75=77 | 144   | 97<br>1151          | 1476<br>59                  | Galeran 6976  |
| SV 3    |        |                      |                      |                      | 78             | 259   | 1685                | 865                         | M 46<br>Poire 1424<br>Pris. 2745<br>Sal. II 21<br>prov. H 3 |

| 1       | 2  | 3           | 4           | 5         | 6                               | 7     | 8    | 9    | 10                                   |
|---------|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-------|------|------|--------------------------------------|
| Klausel | FML f.   | $W_2$ ML f. | $W_1$ Cl Nr | FCl Nr    | Motette Nr                      | Ti Nr | Boog | Genn | auch in                              |
| Sm 13   |  |             |             | 46        | 79                              | 257   | 285  | 975  | rond 9 =<br>Guill. 1583<br>R 1509 Vb |
| Sm 16   |  |             |             | 80        | 100                             | 192   | 210  | 1347 |                                      |
| Sm 17   |  | 68          |             | 61<br>217 | 102                             | 149   |      | 1609 |                                      |
| Sm 18   |  |             |             | f. 45     | 105=101=104                     | 123   |      |      |                                      |
| Sm 21   |  | 71          |             |           | 111=110                         | 56    |      | 1524 |                                      |
| Sm 22   |  |             |             | 72        | 113 <sup>1</sup> =112=112b/113b | 114   |      |      |                                      |
| Sm 23   |  |             |             | 76        | 115=116                         | 122   |      |      |                                      |
| Sm 24   |  |             |             | 77        | 122                             | 179   | 153  | 1486 |                                      |
| Sm 25   | 108v   | 71v         |             |           | 132=131                         | 16    |      | 1585 |                                      |
| Sm 27   |  |             |             | 85        | 135                             | 195   | 1110 | 1400 |                                      |
| SV 4    |  |             |             |           | 139 <sup>1</sup>                | 84    |      |      |                                      |
| SV 5    |  |             |             |           | 144=145                         | 200   | 405  | 695  | R 503 IV<br>Sal. II 1                |
| Sm 28   |  | 72          |             | 94        | 165                             | 81    | 553  | 1433 | Jan. 13                              |
| Sm 32   | ( $W_1$ f. 87v, F f. 24,<br>$W_2$ f. 22v)                                    |             |             |           | 217=216                         | 19    | 223  | 1298 |                                      |
| Sm 31   |  |             |             | 97<br>98  | 218=221=223<br>219=225=222=224  | 137   |      | 1620 |                                      |
| Sm 33   | ( $W_1$ f. 88, F f. 24, $W_2$ f.<br>23; 2st. FML f. 109v,<br>$W_2$ ML f. 72) |             |             |           | 229<br>230a/240=230             | 20    |      |      |                                      |

|             |      |                         |     |              |              |                    |
|-------------|------|-------------------------|-----|--------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Sm 37       | 105  | 233a=233                | 58  | 1699         | 1376         | M 642              |
| Sm 38       | 106  | 235 <sup>2</sup><br>236 | 224 | 1149<br>1671 | 1542<br>1383 | R 73 V<br>M 813    |
| SV 6        |      | 237 <sup>3</sup>        | 191 | 1562         | 826          | Guill. 5106<br>557 |
| Sm 40       | 111v | 249=248                 | 38  |              |              |                    |
| Sm 41       | 208  | 250                     | 194 | 1832<br>701  | 1955<br>2047 | =1590              |
| SV 7        |      | 251 <sup>3</sup>        | 298 | 337          | 1440         |                    |
| Sm 42       | 112v | 258=259                 | 151 |              | 1560         |                    |
| SV 35       |      | 272                     | 171 | 623          | 1535         |                    |
| Sm 47       | 122  | 307a=307=307b           | 22  |              |              |                    |
| Sm 48       | 116v | 314=313                 | 23  |              |              |                    |
|             |      | 318=316                 | 71  | 47           | 1483         |                    |
|             |      | 319=315=317=320=321     |     | 175          | 1558         |                    |
| SV 15/Sm 49 | 130  |                         |     |              | 1943         |                    |
|             |      | 323                     | 52  | 302          | 1591         |                    |
|             |      | 324=322                 |     | 1247         | 1315         |                    |
| Sm 51       | 246  |                         |     |              | 1305         |                    |
|             |      | 326                     | 134 |              |              |                    |
| SV 14       |      | 327                     |     | 548          | 1593         |                    |
| Sm 50       | 131  | 328                     | 177 |              |              |                    |
| Sm 52       | 117v | 336a                    | 261 |              |              |                    |
| Sm 53       | 25   | 338=337=339             | 24  | 106          | 1378         |                    |
| SV 13       |      | 341                     | 301 | 95           | 550          | Viol. 110          |
|             |      |                         |     | 74           | 58           | Viol. 719          |

| 1                  | 2      | 3                    | 4                    | 5      | 6                             | 7     | 8                        | 9                               | 10       |
|--------------------|--------|----------------------|----------------------|--------|-------------------------------|-------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|----------|
| Klausel            | FML f. | W <sub>2</sub> ML f. | W <sub>1</sub> Cl Nr | FCI Nr | Motette Nr                    | Ti Nr | Boog                     | Genn                            | auch in  |
| Sm 54              |        |                      |                      | 342    | 262                           | 287   | 339                      | M 754<br>= rond<br>111<br>M 393 |          |
| Sm 55              | 118v   | 75                   | 26                   |        | 344a=344                      | 37    |                          | 2048                            |          |
| Sm 57              |        |                      |                      | 462    | 347                           | 158   | 749<br>1412              | 1151<br>1600                    |          |
| SV 10              |        |                      |                      |        | 350                           | 313   | 1721                     | 1281                            |          |
| SV 8               |        |                      |                      |        | 352                           | 85    | 78                       | 1436<br>=1605                   | M 509    |
| SV 9               |        |                      |                      |        | 353 <sup>3</sup><br>354       | 86    | 1514                     | 2000<br>+1481                   |          |
| SV 11              |        |                      |                      |        | 358                           | 263   | 1000                     | 1395                            |          |
| Sm 59              |        |                      |                      | 141    | 361=360=364=365<br>362<br>363 | 69    | 851<br>709<br>834<br>140 | 1334<br>1324<br>106             |          |
| SV 12              |        |                      |                      |        | 366                           | 290   | 1008                     | 955                             | R 13 III |
| Sm 58              | 119v   | 67                   |                      |        | 368                           | 80    |                          | 1944                            |          |
| Sm 60 <sup>5</sup> | 120v   | 75                   | 65                   |        | 370=369                       | 55    |                          |                                 |          |
| Sm 62              |        |                      |                      | 148    | 380=379=381=383<br>382        | 64    |                          | 586<br>1665                     |          |
| SV 22              |        |                      |                      |        | 384                           | 189   | 846                      | 1588                            |          |

|          |       |                       |     |            |                      |   |
|----------|-------|-----------------------|-----|------------|----------------------|---|
| SV 21    |       | 393                   | 307 | 287        | 339                  | M 754<br>= rond 111<br>M 342  |
|          |       | 396=399               | 133 | 1054       | 1307                 |   |
| Sm 64    | 150   | 397=398=400           |     | 411        | 1963<br>1998<br>1095 | rond 38<br>= Sal. I 10  |
| SV 23    |       | 401                   | 305 |            |                      |   |
| Sm 65    | 151   | 402                   | 319 | 237        | 1521                 | M 406   |
| Sm 82    | 137v  | 408                   | 203 |            |                      |   |
| Sm 67    | 123   | 413=411=412           | 28  |            |                      |   |
| Sm 69    | f. 11 | 415 <sup>6</sup> =414 | 42  | 1154       | 1066                 |   |
| Sm 68    | 156   | 419=420               | 183 | 1794       |                      |   |
| SV 31    |       | 424                   | 291 | 1327       | 1341                 | M 390<br>M 388  |
|          |       | 425                   |     | 717        |                      |   |
| SV 30    |       | 426                   | 326 |            | 1399                 |   |
| SV 32    |       | 430 <sup>1</sup>      | 89  |            |                      |   |
| Sm 70/71 | 126   | 75/76                 | 29  | 236<br>470 | 1418                 |   |
|          |       |                       |     | 751        | 1468                 |   |
|          |       |                       |     | 1729       | 1402                 |   |
|          |       |                       |     | 1848       |                      |   |
| SV 34    |       | 446                   | 295 | 1402       | 306                  | R 1509 IIa<br>R 157 I<br>M 1088<br>M 445<br>M 433<br>Pris 32<br>Ovide 82d |



| 1       | 2   | 3                    | 4                    | 5      | 6   | 7               | 8          | 9                            | 10  |
|---------|---|----------------------|----------------------|--------|---|-----------------|------------|------------------------------|---|
| Klausel | FML f.  | W <sub>2</sub> ML f. | W <sub>1</sub> Cl Nr | FCI Nr | Motette Nr                                | Ti Nr           | Boog       | Refrain Nr                   | auch in   |
| SV 33   |   |                      |                      |        | 447                                       | 318             | 949        | 1345                         |   |
| SV 26   |   |                      |                      |        | 458                                       | 321             | 1264       | 1501                         |   |
| SV 1    |   |                      |                      |        | 481<br>479=481a<br>480 <sup>b</sup> =481b | 140             | 535        | 1952<br>1953<br>362          | Ovide 77c<br>Jal. 16                                |
| Sm 77   | 129v<br>(3 st. W <sub>1</sub> f. 11, F<br>f. 32, W <sub>2</sub> f. 16v, Mo f. 11) |                      |                      |        | 485=483=486                               | 111             |            | 1373                         |   |
| Sm 81   |   |                      | f. 91                | f. 45  | 496                                       | 129             | 547<br>247 | 1913<br>2035<br>1919<br>1597 |   |
| SV 36   |   |                      |                      |        | 509<br>510                                | 90              | 78<br>784  | 1615<br>944                  | M 352<br>rond 72<br>M 569<br>Ren. 6698<br>Poire 284 |
| Sm 86   |   |                      |                      | 197    | 515a                                      | 269             | 1157       | 1602                         | M 83<br>M 84  |
| SV 38   |   |                      |                      |        | 519<br>520                                | 229<br>vgl. 642 | 885<br>642 | 1523<br>1515<br>=2005        | M 433   |
| SV 39   |   |                      |                      |        | 527 <sup>1</sup>                          | 92              |            |                              |   |

|        |   |                            |  |
|--------|---|----------------------------|--|
| SV 40  | 535<br>536=538<br>537'=532              | 34                         | 1297<br>1571   |
| SV 25  | 544=546=546a/952<br>545                 | 163                        | 1494   |
| SV 24  | 547<br>548                              | 170<br>750                 | 1406<br>M 288<br>M 190                                       |
| Sm 94  | 634                                     | 243                        |  |
| Sm 97  | f. 10v<br>637=640<br>638=636<br>639     | 138<br>1069<br>300         | 1495   |
| Sm 96  | 641                                     | 207                        |  |
| Sm 100 | f. 11<br>650=647=653<br>651=648=649=654 | 65<br>148<br>388           | 1387<br>M 716<br>rond 92<br>R 1197 III<br>R 2072 I           |
| SV 28  | 657 <sup>8</sup> =660<br>658<br>659     | 141<br>659<br>1540<br>1424 | 1520<br>1248<br>M 798<br>M 671 enté<br>R 962 VI<br>Jal. 3    |
| Sm 99  | 664<br>663=665                          | 233<br>595                 | 51<br>M 1105 enté<br>M 1108 enté<br>Chauv. 1382<br>Ren. 6790 |
| SV 27  | 666                                     | 186<br>1111                | R 1963 III<br>Sal. II 9                                      |
| SV 29  | 673 <sup>9</sup>                        | 327<br>13                  | 283<br>R 227 IV<br>R 1700 V<br>R 1995 VI                     |

| 1       | 2  | 3                    | 4                    | 5      | 6                   | 7     | 8           | 9                            | 10                                  |
|---------|--|----------------------|----------------------|--------|---------------------|-------|-------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Klausel | FML f.   | W <sub>2</sub> ML f. | W <sub>1</sub> Cl Nr | FCI Nr | Motette Nr          | Ti Nr | Boog        | Genn                         | Refrain Nr<br>auch in               |
| Sm 105  |  |                      |                      | f. 89  | 750                 | 153   |             |                              |                                     |
| Sm 104  |  |                      |                      | f. 88v | 754 <sup>10</sup>   | 78    | 1361<br>287 | 1356<br>339                  | M 567<br>M 342<br>M 393             |
| Sm 106  |  |                      |                      | f. 89  | 756                 | 79    | 87          | 1532                         |                                     |
| Sm 107  | (W <sub>1</sub> f. 11v, F f. 42, W <sup>2</sup> f. 28) |                      |                      |        | 764=765=762=763     | 57    | 343         | 1599                         | R 491a<br>=Mir. III, 292<br>= M 765 |
| SV 19   |  |                      |                      |        | 791                 | 176   | 1105        | 637                          | R 157 VI<br>M 721                   |
| SV 18   |  |                      |                      |        | 792=793             | 187   | 1308        | 1514<br>=1544<br>(1. Hälfte) |                                     |
| SV 17   |  |                      |                      |        | 795 <sup>3</sup>    | 328   | 983         | 1396                         |                                     |
|         |  |                      |                      |        | 796                 |       | 506         | vgl. 1289                    |                                     |
| SV 20   |  |                      |                      |        | 803 <sup>1,11</sup> | 88    |             |                              |                                     |
| Sm 91   |  |                      |                      | 286    | 817/528e=818/528f   | 166   |             |                              |                                     |
| Sm 84   | 138  |                      |                      |        | 821                 | 164   |             |                              |                                     |

Die Klauseln mit ausschließlich lateinischen Motetten

| 1       | 2   | 3                    | 4                    | 5      | 6                     | 7     |
|---------|---|----------------------|----------------------|--------|-----------------------|-------|
| Klausel | FML f.  | W <sub>2</sub> ML f. | W <sub>1</sub> Cl Nr | FCl Nr | Motette Nr            | Ti Nr |
| Sm 3    |   | 63                   | 5                    | 26     | 43                    | 60    |
| Sm 6    | 101v  |                      | 15                   |        | 59                    | 13    |
| Sm 9-12 |   |                      | 16-19                | 42-45  | 69=70                 | 9     |
| Sm 14   | 105   | 68                   | 20                   |        | 99=99a<br>98          | 14    |
| Sm 20   |   |                      |                      | 66     | 108                   | 15    |
| Sm 26   |   |                      |                      | 84     | 133                   | 125   |
| Sm 25   | 108v  | 71v                  |                      |        | 140                   | 17    |
| Sm 29   |   |                      |                      | 91     | 141                   | 116   |
| Sm 30   | 109   | 72v                  | 54                   |        | 215                   | 18    |
| Sm 35   |   |                      | 57                   | 101    | 228                   | 8     |
| Sm 34   |   |                      | 56                   | 104    | 231=232               | 21    |
| Sm 36   |   |                      |                      | 102    | 234                   | 70    |
| Sm 39   | 110   |                      |                      |        | 244                   | 68    |
| Sm 43   | (W <sub>1</sub> f. 6v, F f. 7, W <sub>2</sub> f. 5, Ma f. 21) |                      |                      |        | 254<br>255=257<br>256 | 39    |
| Sm 45   |   |                      | 63                   | 123    | 308                   | 40    |
| Sm 46   |   |                      |                      | 121    | 309                   | 41    |
| Sm 44   | 116   | 74                   |                      |        | 310                   | 54    |
| Sm 56   |   |                      | 27                   | 138    | 345                   | 110   |
| Sm 61   |   |                      |                      | 146    | 376a                  | 104   |
| Sm 63   | 121v  |                      |                      |        | 400a                  | 102   |
| Sm 66   |   |                      |                      | 260    | 405d/1049b            | 82    |
| Sm 76   |   |                      |                      | 173    | 439                   | 30    |
| Sm 74   |   |                      | 78                   | 167    | 441                   | 31    |

| 1       | 2      | 3                    | 4                    | 5      | 6                                   | 7     |
|---------|--------|----------------------|----------------------|--------|-------------------------------------|-------|
| Klausel | FML f. | W <sub>2</sub> ML f. | W <sub>1</sub> Cl Nr | FCl Nr | Motette Nr                          | Ti Nr |
| Sm 72   |        |                      | 30                   | 171    | 442                                 | 43    |
| Sm 75   |        |                      |                      | 166    | 443                                 | 44    |
| Sm 73   |        |                      | 77                   | 165    | 444                                 | 45    |
| Sm 78   | 131v   |                      | 81                   |        | 487=488                             | 49    |
| Sm 79   |        |                      |                      | 185    | 490                                 | 50    |
| SV 37   |        |                      |                      |        | 494 <sup>12</sup>                   | 91    |
| Sm 80   | 133v   | 87                   |                      |        | 494a/310a                           | 98    |
| Sm 85   | 138    | 83                   | 90                   |        | 505                                 | 47    |
| Sm 87   | 139    |                      | 96                   |        | 516                                 | 48    |
| Sm 89   |        |                      |                      | f. 46  | 517                                 | 32    |
| Sm 88   |        |                      |                      | 283    | 518                                 | 53    |
| Sm 90   | 141    |                      | 102                  |        | 524                                 | 33    |
| Sm 92   | 141v   | 85v                  |                      |        | 529                                 | 51    |
| Sm 93   | 65     | 47                   |                      | 1      | 632F=633MüA<br>632MüA <sup>13</sup> | 66    |
| Sm 95   |        |                      | 35                   | 9      | 635                                 | 11    |
| Sm 98   | 66     |                      | 2                    |        | 643                                 | 12    |
| Sm 103  |        |                      |                      | f. 88v | 655                                 | 75    |
| Sm 101  | 76     |                      |                      |        | 697                                 | 61    |
| Sm 102  | 76v    | 52                   |                      |        | 698                                 | 46    |

Anmerkungen zur Tabelle

<sup>1</sup> Nicht erhalten.

<sup>2</sup> = R 1451 I (Robert de Rains).

<sup>3</sup> Enté.

<sup>4</sup> Unvollständig.

<sup>5</sup> Als Duplum und Tenor der dreistimmigen Diskantpartie *quasi tuba* des *Alleluia. Vox sancti Bartholomei* in Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, F X 37, Bl. II.

<sup>6</sup> = R 19 I.

<sup>7</sup> = P.-C. 461,146 (P.-C. = A. Pillet u. H. Carstens, *Bibliographie der Troubadours* [Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Sonderreihe, III], Halle 1933).

<sup>8</sup> = R 1139.

<sup>9</sup> = 1. Teil des Schlußmelismas des Conductus *Iherusalem accipitur*.

<sup>10</sup> = rond 111.

<sup>11</sup> = 2. Teil des Schlußmelismas des Conductus *Iherusalem accipitur*.

<sup>12</sup> Nicht erhalten.

<sup>13</sup> [632] in F entspricht musikalisch [633] in MüA, während der Text von [632] mit einer anderen Stimme verbunden ist.