Hockets as Compositional and Scribal Practice in the
*ars nova* Motet—A Letter from Lady Music

ANNA ZAYARUZNAYA

*To Thomas Forrest Kelly in honor of his 70th year among Music’s beloved disciples.*

*Letters between Friends*

It must have been an *ars nova* motet that incited Rhetoric to send a note to her friend Music. After the usual pleasantries (“to the praiseworthy, venerable science of Music”), she voiced her objection “that the greatest corruption is committed by many singers... for they divide simple words by making sighs. Whereby I politely request that you attend to a remedy for these things.” Music, receiving the message and having evidently been at the same concert as Rhetoric, decided that something had to be done. So she wrote to her twenty favorite people (“dilecti subiecti”), all of them singer-composers of northern French extraction: “I desire each of you to heed your lessons, lest there be a false move against Lady Rhetoric [when] contrary to grammar, your tongue is tied in silence, severing words. Entirely avoid this vice. In melody, farewell.”

Something like this scenario is evoked by the whimsical upper-voice texts of the motet *Musicalis/Scienie*, where Rhetoric’s message serves as
the motetus text, and Music’s longer directive is set in the triplum (see the appendix for texts and translations). As the texts of both voices make clear, the false step that offended Rhetoric was the splitting of words with rests that occurs during hocket—that characteristic texture of late-Medieval song in which short notes and rests are exchanged between voices.¹

Heretofore Musicalis/Sciencie has been a focus of inquiry mainly because of the names in its triplum text—a list so interesting that it seems to warrant being taken out of context.² But the motet can do more than indicate who might have liked to think of himself as one of music’s darlings around 1350.³ It allows us to listen in on a debate about compositional practice. If some composer (Dilectus Primus?) is writing a motet that complains about the splitting of words with hockets, this means that some of his colleagues do and some do not think that this is an acceptable compositional choice. But here we run into a problem. A casual glance at the corpus of ars nova motets suggests that words are split frequently by hockets in attributed and anonymous works alike. The present study aims to explain this seeming discrepancy by exploring a possible disconnect between the intended text setting for these sections and the scribal problems involved in transmitting it. Recognizing a distinction between scribal and authorial text underlay can position us better to address the question of compositional camps. And beyond elucidating the context of Musicalis/Sciencie, I suggest that the clarification of text underlay in the hocketed sections of some motets can be its own reward. A new edition of Philippe de Vitry’s Petre/Lugentium shows the extent to which a motet can be transformed when the correct words are linked with the correct notes.

Letters between Notes

Lady Rhetoric is hardly alone in being bothered by hockets: injunctions against the device are evident by the thirteenth century if not earlier, culminating in Pope John XXII’s famous Docta Sanctorum of 1324/5,


² Or rather, it seems to warrant the creation of a context that places it at center stage—the “musicians’ motet”; see Harrison, Musicorum Collegio.

which details the abuses of those “certain practitioners of the new school, who . . . break up their melodies with hockets or lubricate them with discant.” 4 Musicalis/Sciencie, apparently a product of the 1350s, says nothing nearly as memorable. The texts of the motet make less polemical but more specific complaints. They do not inveigh against hocket in general—as frivolous or effeminizing—but rather against the division of words with rests. 5 Rhetoric tells Music in motetus ll. 11–12 that singers “dividunt simplicia, faciendo suspiria” (divide simplicia by making sighs). “Simplicia” are a grammatical concept—Priscian, for example, divides verbs into “simplicia” (cupio, taceo) and “composita” (concupio, conticeo). 6 Similarly, the triplum’s “incomplexa” refers to vox incomplexa, or single words, contrasted by Aquinas with vox complexa, or complex expressions. 7 Meanwhile, “suspiria” are in Music’s domain: soupir is still the French word for a quarter-note rest. Music also echoes music-theoretical language when she says in triplum ll. 32–3 that her beloved subjects err “secans incomplexa” (in cutting up simple words): the anonymous of St. Emmeram, for example, writes that hocketing is produced “per resectionem” (through the cutting-up of notes). 8 Later in the century, the author of the Quatuor principalia explicitly warns his readers of the text-setting difficulties attendant to hocket: “Above all, one must be careful lest a splitting of some word is made in the cantilenae on account of truncations.” 9

In short, Rhetoric is offended by cut-up words, not cut-up notes. That the two are separable is modeled by the hockets of Musicalis/Sciencie. Each of the motet’s seven taleae ends with a six-breve hocket section that carries


5 Hoppin and Clercx asked whether the motet might not come from the same milieu as the bull. Hoppin and Clercx, “Notes biographiques,” 65.


no text (ex. 1). As a result those singing it are in no danger of sinning against either Rhetoric or Grammar.\textsuperscript{10} Another way to avoid cutting up text with rests is to match word boundaries to the rhythmic contours of the hockets in question. For example, in Vitry’s \textit{Vos/Gratissima}, the hockets are made up of groups of one and three notes, and their corresponding text alternates between mono- and tri-syllabic words and phrases: “et | ut ro-sam,” “hanc | prespina,” “cum | ubere,” “o | rex regnum” (ex. 2).

Such text setting surely would not have angered Rhetoric—it is in fact quite rhetorically effective. But not all of Music’s disciples took the same approach. The pages of \textit{Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century} (PMFC) contain myriad passages in which words are split, and these appear just as much in motets attributed to Machaut or Vitry as in anonymous works that might be by some of the other eighteen “dilecti.” Examples 3–6 are representative.\textsuperscript{11}

What are we to make of this state of affairs? If everybody was setting text in this way, then the author of \textit{Musicalis/Sciencie} would hardly be making himself popular by referring to the practice as “maxima corruptio.” It is of course possible that the motet is a joke, that Rhetoric ventriloquizes a compositionally conservative voice complaining about a practice that is in fact ubiquitous, like the “No Drinking” sign in the pub.\textsuperscript{12} But in that case the listing of disciples would take on a slightly sarcastic air that is

\textsuperscript{10} Most of the examples in this article use a simplified form of ars nova notation in score with modern clefs. That system allows two or three minims (\(\bullet\)) to be in each semibreve (\(\bullet\)), two or three semibreves in each breve (\(\bullet\)), and two or three breves to be in each long (\(\bullet\)). The maxima (\(\bullet\)), which appears in example 1, is equal to two longs. Within each example, the number of minims and semibreves on each metric level remains constant. When triple divisions of notes are involved, imperfection and alteration may take place. In the former, a smaller note “takes” value from a longer one so that the two together can add up to three beats. Thus \(\bullet\bullet\bullet\) denotes a trochaic pattern, but if the minims were omitted, the semibreves alone would have the value of three minims each (compare triplum in mm. 13 and 15 in ex. 1). Imperfection is not indicated in the examples, but should be clear from context and vertical spacing. Alteration, which doubles the length of a note in order to fill out a group of three beats, is indicated in these examples by a plus (\(\dagger\)) above the note. Since these are editions using simplified ars nova notation rather than diplomatic transcriptions, ligatures and multi-measure rests have been silently broken up (unless otherwise indicated) to make alignment in score possible. Dots of addition (akin to modern dots) are represented, but some dots of division have been omitted, since bar lines do their work. A useful set of online tutorials for fourteenth-century French notation created by Elizabeth Eva Leach can be accessed at http://diamm.nsms.ox.ac.uk/moodle/login/index.php.


\textsuperscript{12} This type of argument has been made by Bernard Frischer with regard to Horace’s \textit{Ars poetica} in Bernard Frischer, \textit{Shifting Paradigms: New Approaches to Horace’s Ars poetica}, American Classical Studies 27 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991).
EXAMPLE 1. Anon., *Musicalis/Sciencie*, mm. 13–27; hocket section boxed
(brackets here and below indicate coloration, which renders notes duple)

EXAMPLE 2. Vitry, *Vos/Gratissima*, mm. 117–23; hockets boxed
EXAMPLE 3. Vitry, *Cum statua*/Hugo, mm. 106–14; split words boxed

EXAMPLE 4. Machaut, *Fons/O livoris* (M9), mm. 102–108; split words boxed

EXAMPLE 5. Anon., *Altissionis/Hin*, mm. 102–6; split words boxed
perhaps incompatible with the work’s broader laudatory function. Moreover, the hockets probably would split text in that case. It is perhaps better to understand *Musicalis/Sciencie* as ludic, but not necessarily facetious. Like the “Your Mother Does Not Work Here” sign over the departmental sink, it seeks to effect some change and reads like a targeted affair. Indeed, closer attention to the sources that transmit *ars nova* motets can clarify the situation to a considerable extent. Though hockets have been analyzed both from the point of view of compositional planning and from the perspective of performance, the special challenges they pose to scribes have not been explored before. In fact the coordination of text and notes in these sections is arguably the least stable aspect of motet transmission. An awareness of the varying scribal approaches to this texture can lead to a more nuanced understanding of the possible distortions in the sources—distortions that existing editions have often uncritically retained.

**Writing Hockets**

Compared with, for example, fifteenth-century masses and songs, *ars nova* motets present relatively few text-setting problems. This is because

---

their upper voices are mostly syllabic. Where the words are copied first—as was almost always the case in this repertory—syllabic settings allow easy placement of notes because syllables take up more space on the page than the breves, minims, and semibreves to which they are set. In figure 1, vertical lines mark syllable divisions in the beginning of Machaut’s *Quant/Amour* (M1) as it is preserved in *Fer*. The scribe has plenty of space here, both for single notes and for the two-note ligature over the antepenultimate syllable.

**Figure 1.** Syllabic texting at the beginning of Machaut’s *Quant/Amour* (M1), *Fer* 260v (this and further images from *Fer* used with permission)

But *ars nova* motets also include passages of melismatic writing and hocket, and it is here that alignment varies more from scribe to scribe. This emerges clearly from a comparison of text underlay (or more precisely, of note overlay) in one motet across several sources. Figure 2 collates text-note alignment for the motetus of the anonymous *Apta caro/Flos virginum*. This motet is an especially good candidate for such an analysis because it survives in four legible sources and includes syllabic

---


15 Frequently used manuscript sigla include Ch Chantilly, Musée Condé, MS 564 (olim 1047); Dur Durham, Cathedral Library, MS C.I.20, flyleaves; Fer Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, Ferrell-Vogüé MS. Private Collection of James E. and Elizabeth J Ferrell, on deposit at the Parker Library, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; Iv Ivrea, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS CXV[115]; Mod Modena: Biblioteca Estense e Universitaria, a.M.5.24 (Latino 568; olim IV.D.5); P2444 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fonds nouv. acq. latines 2444; and Pic Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Collection de Picardie 67.
passages as well as hocket and melismatic writing.\textsuperscript{16} It should be noted that the method of representing text-note alignment in the figure is not diplomatic. In order to record the alignment of text and music as faithfully as possible and to compare these across sources, note spacing has been standardized in the figure, while text has been stretched as necessary. This means that when a word is spaced out (t h u s), it is not written this way in the source, but rather the source has many notes squeezed over it. Figure 3 shows the motetus text “virginum decus” as it appears in figure 2 and in two sources. In \textbf{Mod} (on the right), the note overlay is not crowded; in \textbf{Dur} (on the left) it is. Thus crowded notes in the sources become spaced-out text in the figure.

Figure 3 also shows that \textbf{Dur} is much less precise in its text underlay for the passage—an observation that may be extended to the entire motet. While \textbf{Iv}, \textbf{Mod}, and \textbf{Ch} essentially agree in all details of text underlay for the syllabic sections of the motetus and of the triplum (not shown), the notes in \textbf{Dur} phase in and out of synchrony with their texts. As a result, words or parts of words are sometimes underlaid to rests, and the alignment of many passages is unclear. And yet the scribe does not bungle things completely. Especially in the more syllabic triplum, his underlay is actually quite close to that of the other three sources. Furthermore, it is clear that he copied from an exemplar that had good underlay, since the line breaks in \textbf{Dur} leave nothing to be desired and align perfectly with the text set in other sources for those passages. This would not have been the case if \textbf{Dur} were copied from a source like itself. In any case, a different set of priorities is arguably at play here.\textsuperscript{17}

\textbf{Dur} aside, there is clearly such a thing as more and less “correct” text underlay for the syllabic sections of the motetus voice, on which \textbf{Mod}, \textbf{Ch}, and \textbf{Iv} agree. That the sources differ more markedly during melismatic passages is not surprising: it is there that the notes take up more space than the words, and text scribes need to know where to leave extra space, and how much. The beginning of the motetus in \textbf{Ch} gives a glimpse of the challenges involved (fig. 4). The scribe has left space for the opening melisma on “flos,” but almost not enough, as the crowded notation

\textsuperscript{16} The sources consulted cover a wide geographic and temporal range: \textbf{Dur} is from the mid-fourteenth century and thus the earliest, but its English provenance renders it the most peripheral. The other three sources are French or Italian, but later: Karl Kügле has dated the copying of \textbf{Iv} to c. 1390. Anne Stone and Yolanda Plumley have placed \textbf{Ch} in the following decade, and \textbf{Mod} is from c. 1410. Two more sources—Cambrai, Médiathèque Municipale, B 1328 (olim 1176) and Florence, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Archivio Capitolare di San Lorenzo MS 2211—are illegible, or nearly so. The motet is also listed in the index to Paris, BnF nouv. acq. fr. 23190 (olim Angers, Château de Serrant, Duchesse de la Trémoïlle).

\textsuperscript{17} On the possibly different listening priorities and generic preferences of English audiences vis-à-vis French \textit{ars nova} motets, see Anna Zayaruznaya, “Form and Idea in the \textit{Ars nova} Motet” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 2010), 63–66.
FIGURE 2. Comparison of note-text alignment for the motetus voice in four sources of Apta/Flos
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Mod  F  Los  virginum
Ch   fLös  Virginum
Iv   Flos  virginum
Dur  Flos  v i r i n u m  d e c u

A (continued)

B

470

---

Mod  ga vel auri radio Si gemmarum vespera scit dies te surgente
Ch   di ga  vel auri radio Si ge ma rum verperescit dies te surgente
Iv   dig na us  auri radio si ge marum vesperescat dies te surgente
Dur  vel au ri  |radio si gemmarum vesperescit dies te s u r g e

---

Mod  stix a r u m  sol scolar trabea  limbus ostrum quo tinxit
Ch   stix a r u m  sol scolar tra be a  Lumbus ostrum quo tinxit
Iv   sti x  atrum sol scolar tr a be a  limus ostrum quo tinxit
Dur  stix a r u m  ms scolar tra be a  l i m b u s  ostrum  quod tinxit

---

D

E

---

Mod  n u m e rorum non certa fili a Nati mater patris plue
Ch   nu merorum non certa fili a nati mater patris plue
Iv   nu mer orum non certa fili a nati mater patris plue
Dur  m o v u m  non certa fili a n a t i m a t e r p r i s plue
toward the end shows. On the other hand, he has left a touch too much space for “non” and “in-” of “indiga.” There is a further space deficit after the final syllable of the line, which is set to a crowded melisma. Clearly some calculation was required to achieve the correct text underlay here, and even that did not result in even note spacing.

The distribution of notes over “non indiga” is different in every source (fig. 2, box A). Some discrepancy also exists in shorter melismatic passages, such as “filia” (fig. 2, box D). Here Mod gives a semibreve to “fi-,” two ligated semibreves to “-li-,” and the rest (👀) to “-a,” and Ch gives two semibreves in ligature to “fi,” one to “li,” and, again, three notes to “-a.” In both cases the text setting is unambiguous. Iv seems to have the same text setting as Ch, but less clearly so because the spacing is more cramped. Only Dur does not allow three notes to “-a,” and this seems less a deliberate choice than a function of the more inexact approach already mentioned. (Strangely, Harrison followed the Dur texting of this passage in his edition.18) Further differences are evident

18 PMFC 5:22–3, mm. 76–77.
between sources concerning the assignment of notes to “plue pia,” but they are relatively small, Dur aside (fig. 2, box E).

The four sources of Apta/Flos are most divergent in their approaches to texting hockets. The motetus phrase “te surgente decor ipse” is indicative (fig. 5). Only Dur makes no allowance for the hocketed notes, writing them over the second half of “surgente” and “decor.” The remaining sources take two approaches: Ch and Iv both leave space by splitting the word “decor,” thus setting the hocketed notes to “de-” (figs. 5b and 5c). Mod, however, leaves space between “surgente” and “decor,” so that no word is split by the rests in the hocket (fig. 5a). Similar discrepancies exist between readings for a triplum passage that mixes syllabic declamation and hocket (fig. 6). Here Mod makes it clear that a four-syllable phrase (“tua[m] clio”) is surrounded by text-free hockets on either side (fig. 6a). Dur has a similar reading, though less precisely aligned (fig. 6d). The Ch scribe has also left space after “tuam” and “clio” but seems to set the former to the two hocketed minims, and Iv has a reading similar to Ch (figs. 6b and 6c).

Are all of these readings equally valid? Certainly all are performable, but arguably some of these text-note alignments are prescriptive, and others pragmatic. The scribe of Mod has made an effort in both cases to set unbroken text (“decor ipse,” “tuam clio”) to groups of notes that can accommodate it. He also does this for “candentem” and “poscente” (fig. 2, boxes C and F). In contrast, the solutions offered by Iv and Mod look more like means to an end: words are split or spaced out as necessary to ensure there will be enough room for the hockets. Then, notes
are added in an arrangement as close as possible to the desired text placement, but this still often means placing rests over syllables.\footnote{Thomas Schmidt-Beste has made an argument for an approach he calls “hoquetus” texting, in which hockets split not words, but syllables. He suggests that to cue this underlay, scribes intentionally write syllables under rests (Schmidt-Beste, “Singing the Hocket”). I do not believe that hoquetus texting applies in this case, nor that scribal underlay in the cases where it does apply is as careful as he suggests.}

In the case of the hockets shown in figures 5 and 6, \textbf{Mod} is most convincing because the rhythmic design of both voices points to this solution. This is easiest to see in the modern edition. Example 7 reproduces \textit{Apta/Flos} measures 32–43 with two different text-underlay options. The top row, in gray italics, reproduces the text placement as interpreted in \textit{PMFC}, which relies mostly on \textbf{Iv}; the bottom row, in black, gives the solution offered by \textbf{Mod}. In the latter case, “tuam clio” fits neatly under a four-note phrase between rests, and “litturam” goes with the \textit{SMS} phrase after the hocket. In measure 40, the first syllable of “decor” also belongs after the hocket, with the result that the entire phrase “decor ipse quo nichil gratius” is set syllabically, like corresponding phrases in other \textit{taleae}.

Significantly, \textbf{Iv} does not transmit the proposed reading. In this case, that is not much of a problem because another source does. The same
EXAMPLE 7. Anon., *Apta/Flos*, triplum and motetus mm. 32–43; texting from *Iv* in gray italics; **Mod** texting in black (*Iv* texting as interpreted in *PMFC* 5, 19–20; bracketed A not in sources)
may be said in several other cases where \( \text{iV} \) and another source disagree. For example, the seven hockets in the second half of the motet \( \text{In virtute/Decens carmen} \) are clearly meant to carry no text. This texture is important to the overall design of the work, since the triplum voice here describes a chimera whose disparate body parts the hockets act to separate temporally in the manner of ellipses: woman’s head . . . horse’s neck . . . fish tail . . . , etc. \[^{20}\] But this scheme is more obvious in the motet’s other surviving source, a Parisian fragment (\( \text{P2444} \)), than it is in \( \text{iV} \). In the former, the scribe has left enough space between the words to accommodate most of the hockets. Figure 7a shows the relevant passage from the end of the motetus, with the hocket rhythms \( \text{(\( \bullet \bullet \bullet \))} \) boxed. Only in the third hocket does text infringe on these spaces in any significant way, and in hockets 4–7 the empty space has been filled in with red and blue doodles. These have no prescriptive function—they were added at a slightly later stage of copying. Rather, since they also decorate the space under the tenor and contratenor voices, they attest to the scribe’s perception of these areas as void of text and therefore subject to decoration. In contrast, the \( \text{iV} \) scribe usually allows a letter or two to overlap vertically with the hockets (fig. 7b). Relying too mechanically on Ivrea’s text underlay in these instances leads to a counter-intuitive edition. \[^{21}\] It is also worth noting that \( \text{P2444} \) ends the motet with untexted material after the final hocket, whereas \( \text{iV} \) places the final syllable at the end. Ligature patterns confirm that the choice is deliberate in both cases, but the solution provided by \( \text{P2444} \) is more convincing given that hockets do not split words elsewhere in the work, and that both “marinum” and “meretur” fit comfortably into the \( \text{SSB} \) rhythm before the hocket (ex. 8).

This is not to suggest that the effect of \( \text{In virtute/Decens} \) would be spoiled in a performance from or guided by \( \text{iV} \). It is easy enough to reconstruct the correct text-note alignment for the hockets from this source. Nor would it be too difficult to deduce the same underlay even from a much less careful source like \( \text{Dur} \). Elizabeth Randell Upton recently critiqued editorial reliance on scribal text underlay as based on “the [incorrect] assumption that a medieval manuscript is a score in the modern sense.” \[^{22}\] Indeed, these are not scores, and singers would

\[^{20}\] See Zayaruznaya, “Form and Idea,” 251–54. I undertake a fuller analysis of \( \text{In virtute/Decens} \) and an exploration of the importance of such disjunct musical and zoological forms to \text{ars nova} aesthetics in my \textit{The Monstrous New Art: Form and Idea in the Late Medieval Motet} (Cambridge University Press, forthcoming).

\[^{21}\] See, for example, the rendering of measures 76–77 in PMFC 5:97–98.

\[^{22}\] Elizabeth Randell Upton, “Aligning Words and Music: Scribal Procedures for the Placement of Text and Notes in the Chantilly Codex,” \textit{A Late Medieval Songbook and Its Context: New Perspectives on the Chantilly Codex} (Bibliothèque Du Château De Chantilly, Ms. 564), ed. Yolanda Plumley and Anne Stone (Turnout: Brepols, 2010), 115. In arguing that the Chantilly scribe was often more interested in the symmetry of page-layout resulting from
FIGURE 7. In virtute/Decens, motetus, hockets during second color boxed

a) P2444, 48

b) Iv, 55v
not have treated them as such. Still, the alignment between text and music is a more nuanced matter in the hands of some scribes than of others. As figure 2 shows, Ch gives a clearer picture of Apta/Flos than Iv and Dur. And some scribes are better still: the unique source of Musicalis/Sciencie—the rotulus fragment Pic—not only makes it quite clear that the hocket sections are untexted, but manages to align them vertically (boxed in fig. 8). Granted, untexted hockets are particularly important for this piece, given the contents of Rhetoric’s and Music’s letters, but not every scribe would know that. If Musicalis/Sciencie had survived uniquely in Iv instead, it is likely that it would have had text underlaid to some of its hockets. (This in turn could have led to rather different modern reception of the motet: the ironic nature of a work that does not follow its own instructions would not have been lost on twentieth-century commentators.)

The transmission of Apta/Flos is indicative of a broader pattern: note-text alignment in hockets is among the least stable aspects of motet transmission. It may also be fair to say that the Iv scribe—or a majority of the scribes of his exemplars—seems less attuned to the problems presented by hockets than we might like.\footnote{Karl Kügle notes that “the variance and inconsistent use of the notational symbols suggest that Scribe B [Ivrea’s main music scribe] refrained from editing the notation of his exemplars more than was absolutely necessary.” Karl Kügle, The Manuscript Ivrea, Biblioteca} This is important because
**Figure 8.** *Musicalis/Sciencie*, motetus in Pic, hockets during second color boxed

**Iv** is the unique source for a significant fraction of *ars nova* motets. If we trust its redactions, it would indeed seem that everybody is committing crimes against Grammar. But if we allow our newly fostered suspicion of **Iv**’s modus operandi to prompt editorial emendations to text underlay, the picture changes dramatically.

Hockets Decluttered—Petre/Lugentium

The most striking example of a motet with misplaced hocket text is Philippe de Vitry’s Petre/Lugentium, written on the occasion of Pierre Roger’s election to the papacy as Pope Clement VI in 1342.\(^24\) If we believe Iv, the only complete source for the motet, all of its hockets split words. But in each case the syllables that were loosely underlaid to hockets by the scribe and subsequent editors can be snugly added after them, where there is often exactly enough space. Example 9 compares two ways of setting text to the last two taleae of the motet.\(^25\) The top row, in gray italics, follows Schrade’s edition, based on Iv.\(^26\) In the black, bottom row of text under each voice, syllables are shifted on the premise that here, as in Flos/Celsa, Iv’s loosely texted hockets result from a scribe making sure to leave enough space for the notes, and do not indicate exact word-tone alignment. The second row of text is an underlay supported by no source, or at best supported by a hypothetical one: we might imagine that the motet could have looked something like this in the hand of the Mod scribe. The top row is given only where it differs from the editorial text underlay in the bottom row; where only the black row of text is present, the editorial text placement agrees with Iv’s.

For the most part, the second row of text underlay in example 9 diverges from Iv only during hockets and melismatic sections. The situation is not unlike that summarized by the four rows of text in figure 2, which represent the differences between real sources. This is no coincidence: figure 2 has served as a guide in the creation of example 9. But together the two remind us that there is relatively little wiggle room in text placement for an ars nova motet and what there is is limited to melismas and hockets. Often, especially around hockets, a particular solution recommends itself because the syllables seem to click into place like puzzle pieces. In other cases, primarily within melismas, there seems to be more room for experimentation. Indeed, performers may have


\(^{25}\) Insofar as it is safe to assume that similar-looking rhythms that fall at analogous places in a majority of taleae are in fact identical rhythms, the Ivrea scribe has been somewhat irregular in his notation of mode-two patterns at the minim level when they are followed by a semibreve. In some cases he correctly uses altered minims, while in others he seems to break the rule similis ante similem perfecta. For example, the triplum rhythm, which leads into the hockets, is written four times as \(\text{M+M}|\text{SS}\) (mm. 54, 87, 120, and 219) and three times as \(\text{MS}|\text{SS}\) (mm. 21, 153, and 186). Because example 9 is an edition that uses ars nova notation rather than a diplomatic transcription, I have rendered the questionable notes as altered minims in all cases.

\(^{26}\) PMFC 1:102–103.
EXAMPLE 9. Vitry, *Petre/Lugentium*, mm. 179–end, with reconstructed text underlay in black. Where Iv’s underlay differs, it is given in gray italics.

**Note:** Ligatures in Iv are indicated for the triplum and motetus but not for the tenor. Ligation in Iv is not considered as a strong indication of text underlay in mm. 95 and 248ff. because, as the example of the final motetus passage of *In virtute/Decens* in example 8 above indicates, scribes could adjust ligatures to accommodate or prescribe the text underlay as they understood it. Different text readings in Iv are only shown where they impinge on matters of underlay.
decided on the go where to sing the text of these passages, depending on which words they wished to emphasize.\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{27} It is worth noting that we do not know what such emphasis would look like. Two possibilities—that important words could be stretched so as to take up more space, and that important words could be declaimed more quickly, so as to be more audible—seem equally plausible. On the expressive potential of declamation in the fourteenth century, see Earp, "Declamatory Dissonance," which borrows methodology from Boone, \textit{Patterns in Play}. 
In some places example 9 diverges from Iv in its version of the text. This is because we now have the benefit of better readings that survive in a collection of sermons from 1340s Avignon. As Andrew Wathey has

Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (A-Wn), MS 4195, fol. 157. The texts were printed by Michael Denis in a 1795 library catalogue and more recently brought to light by Andrew Wathey, who evaluates them as “versions considerably more accurate than those of Ivrea”; Andrew Wathey, “The Motets of Philippe de Vitry,” 124. The text is printed in David Howlett’s edition in ibid., 136–37. Note, however, that due to a printer’s error the
convincingly argued, this text-only source probably stems from a copy with music, since it labels all three voices of the motet and even provides the text of the tenor. The re-emergence of these texts alone makes

Latin motetus and triplum texts switch places partway through. The triplum also appears in a fifteenth-century literary miscellany (F-Pn lat. 3343, fol. 50) with an attribution to Vitry. See ibid., 123.

Ibid., 126n16.
a new edition of *Petræ/Lugentium* desirable. A full edition of the motet is available among the online supporting materials for this article.\(^{30}\)

It is interesting, though not surprising given the provenance of the source (Vitry was in Avignon in 1342), to note that in cases of syllable-count discrepancy, the newly discovered texts are a better fit for the music transmitted in *Iv* than the texts in *Iv*. In example 10, which gives

measures 21–30 of *Petre/Lugentium*, “tenuit” and “suscepisti” are both longer than *Iv*’s readings, “temnunt” and “superes,” but both fit exactly into the post-hocket rhythms in measures 27–28.

Only in one case do words placed under hockets by *Iv*’s scribe have a hard time fitting into the measures directly following them: in *talea* II, the triplum does not have enough notes for the words “carmentina pegas pedibus.” The rhythm available for this text, with bar lines added for reference and “+” indicating the altered breve, is:

```
S 33M 33M |
S 33M 33M |
SSS |
SS + |
B |
```

Clearly, there is no way to fit ten syllables to the material that follows the hocket. Accordingly, Thomas Schmidt has used this passage as a litmus test whose results question the validity of the broader solution I propose. Instead, he suggests that the composer’s intention was for all words to be split during all of the motet’s hockets.31

---

31 Schmidt-Beste, “Singing the Hiccup.”
It is worth noting, however, that the decisive measure in this passage is isorhythmically irregular. The upper voices of *Petre/Lugentium* are not strictly isorhythmic: some sections of each of the work’s seven *taleae* are more rhythmically congruent than others. But as is true of *ars nova* motets more broadly, all of the hockets are isorhythmic, and other occurrences of isorhythm are found in their vicinity. The triplum’s rhythms for breves 13–17 of each *talea*, which bridge the hocket and the ensuing texted section, are given in table 1. Of these five breves, the first, fourth, and fifth (a, d, and e in table 1) are the same in each *talea*. The second breve (b) exhibits the most variety: in three cases, it is divided into three perfect semibreves (*taleae* I, II, and VI), and in the other four, at least one and sometimes all of these semibreves are further divided. But the third measure of this sequence (c) is the one that shows the strangest variant: here six of seven cases have the rhythm $S$. $MS\ MS$, which, along with the breve that follows, is the perfect conduit for the final six syllables of each phrase—“felix ac omnia,” “deserta syria,” “marmor et gemula,” etc. (ex. 9, mm. 194 and 227). In contrast, *talea* II has two semibreves, of which the second is altered. It is because of this difference that “pegasi pedibus”

---

32 Kugle describes the upper voices of *Petre/Lugentium* as “almost completely isorhythmic,” Kugle, *The Manuscript Ivrea*, 112.
does not fit. The six-against-one evidence suggests that there may be a textual corruption and that notes may be missing here, as they are in other passages. \(^{33}\) In my edition of the work I therefore emend measure 62 in \textit{talea} II (ex. 11). Changing the notes to accommodate the words may seem like a step in the wrong direction in a music-focused discipline, but in this case the design of the motet vis-a-vis its text is arguably clear enough to warrant the change, which is further justified by the agreement of the other \textit{taleae} in corresponding measures.

Once the syllables around hockets have been shifted, three distinct kinds of writing emerge in \textit{Petre/Lugentium}. Perhaps the most salient is the one that opens example 9, in which the upper voices take turns delivering passages of text four and six syllables in length (“consoletur”—“non au-gentur”—“tristis Armenia”). Since one upper voice usually rests while the other sings, this could be described as slow hocket \textit{cum littera} (with text). It occurs twice in the course of each \textit{talea} and accounts for about one-third of the motet (ex. 9, mm. 179–83, 196–201, 211–16, 230–34). Another texture is represented by the faster, untexted hockets that occupy six breves near the beginning of each \textit{talea}. The third texture, truly polytextual and avoiding rests in both voices, serves as a glue between the two hocket types.

The online materials that accompany this article include two recordings of the motet’s final \textit{taleae}. The first track uses the somewhat mechanical

\(^{33}\) For instance, see triplum (m. 240) and tenor (mm. 240–45) in example 9.
interpretation of Iv as it appears in PMFC, and the second employs the text setting in example 9. In both cases, several decisions about performance practice were made. Track 1 uses a modified version of Schmidt’s “hiccup” principle, according to which rests split syllables, not words, so that a hocketed “consoletur” might be rendered “co|-on-so|-o-le|-e-tur.” Any syllable can be stretched to any length, and there is always a vowel to sing. In contrast, the approach on track 2 has forced us to face the perennial question: What exactly do we sing when we are not singing text? We opted for a neutral vowel, keeping in mind that the tenor is singing such a vowel throughout. Thus, during their fast hockets (and occasional long notes in the motetus), the upper voices might seem to team up with the tenor, joining a sound world which that voice always holds in reserve for them. The fact that the tenor participates in the hockets with its own short notes lends credence to this choice.

To a large extent, the motet’s contrasting textures come through in both tracks because they are supported by strong rhythmic motives. But
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allowing each of the three to have a different status with regard to text heightens their contrast. Specifically, the neutral vowels used for the untexted hockets bring those sections even more to the sonic forefront, distinguishing them from the slower, texted hocket sections. Meanwhile, the repositioning of text guarantees that each note in those texted hocket sections carries its own syllable, reinforcing a device that is strongly supported by the highly profiled rhythmic motives \( \text{SSS B} \) and \( \text{MS MS B} \). Making a set of text underlay changes thus renders \textit{Petre/Lugentium} an essay in contrasting textures.

To some ears the result might be too much contrast, but such sudden textural breaks may in fact be an aspect of the compositional aesthetics that underlie some \textit{ars nova} motets. Jacobus hints at this effect in the course of the famously polemical book VII of his \textit{Speculum musicae}. Returning frequently to the idea that modern singers are interested in too few genres, he praises the ancients for singing various kinds of organum, beautiful conductus, and “duplex, contraduplex, triplex, and quadruplex hockets.” In contrast, the moderni limit themselves to cantilenae (songs) and motets. The only exception to this—which Jacobus notes twice—is the hocket: “Do not the moderns use motets and chansons almost exclusively, except for inserting hockets in their motets?” Here and in another nearly identical formulation of this exception to the narrow generic purview of the moderns, the verbs “inserunt” and “interserunt” evoke the idea of a foreign element entwined or inserted into a motet. Certainly Jacobus was not in the business of making unnecessary concessions in favor of modern practice. But for him, writing (and listening) around 1330, it seems that the hocketed sections of motets were a sort of graft from a different genre. In performance, they may well have acted as windows into a different sound world.

\textit{Hocketed Text and Compositional Practice}

After looking closely at the hocketed sections of \textit{ars nova} motets, it is my impression that there are very few loosely or haphazardly texted hockets

\[36\] “Moderni nonne quasi solis utuntur motetis et cantilenis nisi quod in motetis suis hoketos interserunt? Sed cantus alios multos dimiserunt quibus in propria forma non utuntur, sicu fecerunt Antiqui, ut cantus organicos mensuratos vel non ubique mensuratos ut est organum purum vel duplum de quo forsan pauci sciant Modernorum; item conductos, cantus ita pulchros, in quibus tanta delectatio est, qui sunt ita artificiales et delectabiles, duplices, triplices et quadruplices: item hoketos similiter duplices, contraduplices, tripllices et quadruplices.” \textit{Jacobi Leodiensis Speculum musicae}, ed. Roger Bragard, Corpus scriptorum de musica 3/7 ([Rome]: American Institute of Musicology, 1973), 89. See also the very similar sentiment voiced earlier: “[Moderni] … a se repellunt cantus antiquos organicos, conductos, motellos, hoketos duplices, contraduplices et tripllices, nisi quod aliquos illorum inserunt in motetis, vel motellis suis,” 22. On the thirteenth-century hockets to which Jacobus refers, see most recently the discussion and bibliography in Mary Wolinski and Barbara Haggh, “Two 13th-Century Hockets on \textit{Manere} Recovered,” \textit{Early Music} 38, no. 1 (February 2010): 43–57.
in the repertory. Usually, hockets either have words or they do not. When they do, it is often obvious because the poetry is written to accommodate them. A clear example of this approach is Vitry’s *Vos Gratissima* (ex. 2).

And when hockets are untexted, any text that a less careful scribe might place under them usually fits well into the notes that immediately follow. This is the argument I have made for *Flos Celsa* and *Petre Lugentium*, and, following Fer, Margaret Bent has made a similar correction to the PMFC rendition of Machaut’s *Fons O livoris* (ex. 4).37

While the majority of examples fall into one or the other of these categories, Schmidt-Beste recently made a case for a third approach: some authors who split text do so in a methodical way, extending syllables through the notes that follow rests when those notes are minims on weak beats. Among his most persuasive examples is the motet *O Philippe O bone dux*, which opens *Iv* (ex. 12).38 Here, finally, are the split words, but they are far less common than the sources would seem to suggest.

With this general schema laid out, we can return to the question of compositional camps. Who has offended Rhetoric? Any answer to such

---


38 Schmidt-Beste, “Singing the Hiccup,” example 4, with slight modifications. I am grateful to Professor Schmidt-Beste for permission to reproduce this example.
a question is of course partial and contingent, given the impossibility of attributing the majority of *ars nova* motets. And it is certainly possible that most singers and composers were occasionally guilty of “cutting up” words—after all, *Rhetoric* does attribute the error to “multis.” But even given these caveats, some general observations can be made. Vitry generally does not split words with rests. At least five of his motets have no hockets; in the rest, his approaches vary. In *Vos*/Gratissima and *Tuba*/*In arboris*, poetic and musical design are coordinated. In other cases, hocket sections remain untexted. This is the argument I have made for *Petre*/Lugentium, and it holds also for *In virtute*/Decens. More dramatic is his inclusion, in at least two motets, of untexted hocket sections of twenty to forty breves that take up an entire final color. Whether the hockets are carefully texted or entirely text-free, words are left intact. The only exception from the secure Vitry corpus is *Cum statua*/Hugo. Here, hockets in the final two taleae methodically split every word. The purpose is possibly to illustrate the speaker’s stupefaction, since this section is introduced by “stupeo et eo” (ex. 3). As I have suggested, the crumbling words in these hockets may also evoke the shattering of Nebuchadnezzar’s statue, described in detail in the triplum of the motet. A further clue to the deliberateness of this move is the splitting of “Hugo”—the name of Vitry’s adversary—on the opening two notes of the motetus. What better way to put someone down than to cut up his name? We might say that these are sins against *Rhetoric* for rhetorical ends. In any case, the device

39 *Rhetoric* speaks to “multis canentibus,” and her list consists, as far as we can tell, of singer-composers. Even if singers and composers were not always identical, only a collaboration between both parties would ensure that words were not cut up, since singers could willingly or inevitably perform an underlay other than what composers intended, and would indeed probably have done so given the ambiguity introduced by scribes.

40 For the purposes of the present study, I will conservatively consider the Vitry corpus to consist of the eleven motets that are part of the first two categories in Bent & Wathey’s Works List in *New Grove* 2, which are headed “securely or plausibly attributable works attributable through contemporary testimony or attribution, or internal evidence” and “attributable through relationship with known works and/or biography, textual content.” “Vitry, Philippe de,” *Grove Music Online*, Oxford Music Online, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/29535 (accessed July 26, 2012). I add a twelfth to the list: *In Virtute*/Decens, which I have argued belongs in the second category; see Zayaruznaya, “Form and Idea,” 235n3 and 334. Of these twelve motets, the following five have no hockets: *Douce*/Garison, *Tribum*/Quoniam, *Aman*/Heu Fortuna, *Floret*/Florens, and *Garrit*/In nova. For edition information, see Bent & Wathey, “Vitry, Philippe de.”

41 In both cases the sections involved are in a final faster color: Impudenter*/Virtutibus*, measures 103–145 (PMFC 1:95–96); *O canenda*/Rex, measures 97–120 (PMFC 1:109). The only other occurrence of this device is in the final color (mm. 129–188) of Pictagore*/O terra*, a work from the 1370s that survives in Ch (PMFC 5:128–35). The paucity of the fully untexted, hocketed color statement in the mid-century repertoire also suggests that the fragmentary motet *Beatius*/Cum humanum may be attributable to Vitry. I discuss this work in Zayaruznaya, *The Monstrous New Art*.

is striking only because of Vitry’s pronounced avoidance of split words elsewhere in his securely attributed works.

In the broader corpus associated with Vitry, the pattern is not vastly different, though the motet Flos ortus/ Celsa cedrus—a work attributed on stylistic grounds—is best understood as employing “hiccup” texting during its hockets.43 It is possible that the text is corrupt, or that good Homer nodded. Or maybe this divergence from what seem to be his usual texting practices could argue against Vitry’s authorship. In any case we can say with some confidence that Vitry’s general tendency is to keep words together, whether by closely matching the structures of hockets and text or by leaving hockets entirely untexted.

Unsurprisingly, since they comprise the work of multiple composers, anonymous motets are more likely to split text than those we can associate with Vitry. The situation in Altissonis/ Hin principes, excerpted in example 5, is by no means unusual. Here, three-syllable words are split by two-note hockets (boxed). Clearly no editorial emendation is possible, since the texting is syllabic throughout. The same can be said of the hockets in O Philippe/ O bone dux, given in example 10. There is no way to fit the four-syllable “tiranidis” into this hocket without breaking it up. And there are several other examples of anonymous motets in which no reasonable editorial shifting-around of text can keep “suspiria” from slicing up “simplicia.”44

What of Machaut? It is true that some of the words he seems to split are the victims of editorial or scribal misreadings—as noted above, the hocketed text in Motet 9 (ex. 4) should obviously move one syllable to the right, as the important Fer manuscript confirms.45 But for every split word in Machaut’s motets that can be easily emended by moving a syllable from one note to the next, there is another passage in which no emendation is possible—or prudent—and for which multiple sources confirm the split. In some cases, everything is syllabic, and there is no wiggle room: see “vos-tre” in figure 9a, which comes from the motetus of Quant/ Amour

43 Schmidt-Beste, “Singing the Hiccup.” If a singer wanted to avoid cutting words up in this motet, she would find plenty of three- and four-note passages in the hocket sections, and only one word—“miraculorum” around measures 100–101—would have to be split (see PMFC 5:45). But for this motet the “hiccup” texting is the more methodical one.

44 The two Iv motets that seem to systematically split words are the first two compositions: O Philippe/ O bone dux (PMFC 5:1–6) and Altissionis/ Hin (PMFC 5:7–12). See also the numerous pertinent passages in Trop/ Par sauvage (PMFC 5:104–07). Motets that occasionally split words but whose text-design still shows a clear awareness of their hockets’ structures are Febus/ Lanista (PMFC 5:13–16) and Tant/ Bien (PMFC 5:70–73). In some motets only one word is split: “carni” in measures 86–87 of Apta/ Flos (PMFC 5:23), “chasteus” in measures 84 of A vous/ Ad te (PMFC 5:77), and “tenebres” in measure 39 of Mon chant/ Qui (PMFC 5:81).

45 See fols. 268v–269. High-resolution color images of the MS Ferrell-Vogüé can be consulted on the Digital Image Archive of Medieval Music (http://www.diamm.ac.uk/).
(Motet 1). Similarly, in the passage from the triplum of Aucune/Qui (Motet 5) reproduced in figure 9b, the three-syllable “voudroie” is set to hockets. An even more obvious example is given in figure 9c. Here, the scribe has drawn lines connecting each syllable of “si desnature” to its proper note, with the result that “desnature” is interrupted by two minim rests. Each of these three examples comes from a different manuscript, and there are many others like them; Machaut’s motets are full of spots where words are interrupted by rests. 46 To put this in perspective: if we

46 Since multiple manuscripts attest to text underlay in Machaut, we can be more sure that split text is deliberate here than in the case of Iv. In Machaut, too, the underlay is sometimes more pragmatic than prescriptive, while at other times Schrade has simply misplaced the syllables in PMFC when a more intuitive solution exists in one or more (or all) sources. This applies to: multiple passages in Fons/O livoris (Motet 9): Amours/Faus (Motet 15), which in fact seem to me to split no text; “Quo’nques” in j’ai tant/Lasse (Motet 7, mm. 61–63); and Tant/Eins (Motet 13, mm. 52–53). It seems that Machaut intended to split multiple words in nine of his motets: Quant/Amour (Motet 1, motetus m. 111ff); Tous/De souspirant (Motet 2, m. 102II); S’il estoit/S’amours (Motet 6, mm. 45–46, 77–80); Tant/Eins (Motet 13, mm. 40–41, 68–69); Maugre/De ma dolour (Motet 14, mm. 22–23, 27, 82–83, 117–18); Martyrum/Diligenter (Motet 19), Christe/Veni (Motet 21); Tu/Plange (Motet 22); Felix/Inviolata (Motet 23). Isolated words are split in He! mors/Fine (Motet 3, m. 103); De bon/Puis (Motet 4, mm. 114–19); j’ay tant/Lasse (Motet 7, m. 126); Fons/O livoris (Motet 9, mm.
were to pretend that all of the anonymous motets in \textit{Iv} were written by one person, Machaut might still be the more frequent culprit in the eyes of \textit{Dilectus Primus}.

In light of this it may be worth noting a possible intertext in taleae IV and V of \textit{Musicalis/Sciencie} (ex. 13). Reading along the motetus voice here (that is, singing the part of Rhetoric), but allowing the triplum to peek through when the motetus is not singing or when it holds a long note, results in the following:

\begin{verbatim}
quod maxima corruptio
fit a multis canentibus
atque de Machau Guillelmo
in nostris dictaminibus
\end{verbatim}

D’Orbendas and Du Pont are in the wrong case (or rather, they are not declined), and in a rhyme-schema that belongs to the triplum text (appendix 1.21). Furthermore, they share the stage with a longa in the motetus. Conversely, Machaut’s name pops out of the texture while the motetus rests (m. 105) and works right into the motetus text. “Guillelmo” (dative because greetings are being sent to him by Music) doubles as an ablative of agent governed by “a multis canentibus.” The result is:

\begin{verbatim}
quod maxima corruptio the greatest corruption is committed
fit a multis canentibus by many singers
atque de Machau Guillelmo (and by Guillaume de Machuat)
in nostris dictaminibus. in our writings.
\end{verbatim}

To be fair, many intertexts are available in this motet, and a subset of them probably will be meaningful. But the possibility that Music and Rhetoric target Machaut may help to explain a peculiarity in the triplum text. Suzanne Clerx and Richard Hoppin long ago asked why Machaut’s name only appears in seventeenth place, while Vitry and Johannes de Muris are near the top, and suggested that this seemingly strange order could be the result of poetic considerations.\footnote{Clerx and Hoppin, “Notes biographiques,” 66–7.} Rhyme alone cannot explain the decision, since most of the letter’s recipients are in the dative case. Indeed, rhyme-scheme would not prevent Machaut from being right after Philippe de Vitry instead of “Normann Dyonisio.” Such an order would be more in line with the proximity accorded to the two composers in other lists, such as the anonymous \textit{Règles de la seconde Hareu!} / \textit{Helas!} (Motet 10, mm. 96–98; \textit{Fer} version shown in fig. 9c above). In three more motets there are no hockets: \textit{Qui/ Ha! Fortune} (Motet 8); \textit{Lasse!/ Se j’aïm} (Motet 16); and \textit{Quant/O series} (Motet 17). The remaining six motets have hockets to which the text is keyed and which in no case split words.

\footnote{135–36): \textit{Hareu!} / \textit{Helas!} (Motet 10, mm. 96–98; \textit{Fer} version shown in fig. 9c above). In three more motets there are no hockets: \textit{Qui/ Ha! Fortune} (Motet 8); \textit{Lasse!/ Se j’aïm} (Motet 16); and \textit{Quant/O series} (Motet 17). The remaining six motets have hockets to which the text is keyed and which in no case split words.}
rhetorique and Gilles li Muisis’s Méditations. Perhaps the enabling of an intertext is the poetic consideration that accounts for Machaut’s place in the text. Maybe Machaut is the one not doing the dishes.

The idea that Music and Rhetoric would team up to administer gentle censure to Machaut (among others, to be sure) is especially attractive in light of his Prologue—a text in which both women, in the company

---

48 For the mention of both composers in the Règles de la seconde rhétorique, see Ernest Langlois, Recueil d’arts de seconde rhétorique (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1902), 12. The pertinent section of the Méditations is cited and translated in Nigel Wilkins, Music in the Age of Chaucer (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1979), 1.
of Sens, are sent to him as Nature’s gifts. The Prologue likely post-dates Musicalis/Sciencie by a decade or more, and there is no reason to push hard for any connection between the two. But if we want to read a hint of reactionism into Guillaume’s rather smug self-presentation at the start of his livre, Musicalis/Sciencie emerges as an amusing precedent.

All these would have been inside jokes, and the sole surviving source of Musicalis/Sciencie is a perfect venue for them. Pic is a rotulus, which iconographic evidence suggests was the preferred medium for performance. Large enough to be seen by several people, undecorated, accurate, and bearing signs of use (erasures and corrections to text and music), this is


50 One pertinent depiction of informal performance from a rotulus can be found at the head of the motet section of BnF fr. 1584 (Machaut MSA) where several lay and clerical men gather around a wine keg to sing and drink (fol. 414v). See also Domenic Leo, “Authorial Presence in the Illuminated Machaut Manuscripts” (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 2005), 109–17. The atmosphere evoked here is distinct from the “archaizing, and thereby particularly earnest and solemn qualities associated with a rotulus” adduced by Kügle for the Brussels rotulus; Karl Kügle “Two Abbots and a Rotulus: New Light on Brussels 19606,” Quomodo cantabimus canticum? Studies in Honor of Edward H. Roesner, ed. David Butler Cannata et. al. (Middleton, WI: American Institute of Musicology, 2008), 154.
exactly the kind of source that seems to pertain more to singers than their patrons. The possibility that Pic is close to a composer or composers also explains the care taken with the hockets of *Musicalis/Sciencie* and the unusual fact that the motetus is laid out in a way that highlights its isorhythmic structure.\(^{51}\) *Musicalis/Sciencie* keeps good company here. Several popular *ars nova* motets precede it (*Amer/Durement, Garrit/In nova, Fortune/Madolour*), and it is immediately followed by *Se je chant mains que ne suelh*. Pertinently, the extensive hockets of this *chace* are texted, but not with words: they carry the onomatopoeic cries of hunters calling to their dogs ("hau ha hau," "hou hou," etc).\(^{52}\) If we read *Musicalis/Sciencie* in conjunction with its neighbor in the rotulus, we could ask whether the author of the motet would argue that all hockets that split text convert their words—however meaningful—into inarticulate cries.

The heretofore unidentified tenor of *Musicalis/Sciencie* may constitute yet another in-joke. It is not labeled in its source, but Music’s beloved disciples would have recognized it as a mode 2 Alleluia of the type *Dies sanctificatus*. Due to the near-identity of the multiple chants in this family, we can never know which Alleluia it was.\(^{53}\) But perhaps the best semantic match is the *Alleluia ṭ Hic est discipulus*, which also received polyphonic settings in the thirteenth century. In that case the tenor *color* corresponds to the phrase "Alleluia, alleluia. Hic est discipulus ille"—"this is that disciple."\(^{54}\) It may well be that the tenor is pointing fingers as well, whether at a specific composer or at each of Music’s disciples in turn: *hic* est ille!

Regardless of whether its composer is pointing fingers at Machaut or someone else, *Musicalis/Sciencie* certainly has the potential to act as

\(^{51}\) I thank Margaret Bent for the observation that scribes almost never highlight isorhythm.


\(^{53}\) There are almost fifty Alleluias to choose from. Even if restricted to Alleluias used as tenors by Notre Dame composers, the list contains five candidates: *Dies sanctificatus, Video celos apertos, Hic est discipulus ille, Vidimus stellam*, and *Tu es petrus*.

\(^{54}\) The text of the Alleluia, which is proper to the feast of St. John the Evangelist (December 27) is taken from John 21:24: "Hic est discipulus ille, qui testimonium perhibet de his, et scripsit hæc: et scimus, quia verum est testimonium eius" (This is that disciple who giveth testimony of these things, and hath written these things; and we know that his testimony is true). The phrase is an aside affirming John’s authorship at the book’s conclusion. Reading it against the upper voices of *Musicalis/Sciencie* we might see the tenor as an affirmation of the poet-composer’s confidence in the truth of his claim. We cannot be sure, however, that this was indeed the tenor’s source, so such speculation stands on a rather weak foundation. On the relevance of the tenor’s liturgical and biblical context to the interpretation of upper-voice texts in *ars nova* motets, see, for example, Bent, “Words and Music,” and Anne Walters Robertson, *Guillaume De Machaut and Reims: Context and Meaning in His Musical Works* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002). Cf. Zayaruznaya, "‘She Has a Wheel That Turns…’: Crossed and Contradictory Voices in Machaut’s Motets,” *Early Music History* 28 (2009): 185–240 at 205–209.
a pointer to the potential importance of text and its absence in *ars nova* compositional design. In doing so it raises difficult questions about the roles and responsibilities of modern editors and performers. The men to whom Music’s letter is addressed would have been adept at making text-underlay decisions on the go; indeed, for those who continue to sing one-on-a-part from facsimiles of sources such as *Pic*, the power to place text at will remains a great pleasure. But setting a musical work down in graphic form on parchment, paper, or screen necessitates that decisions be made. In many cases there remain solutions more convincing than those proposed in the existing editions—editions that are in some cases more than fifty years old and hail from an entirely different academic climate. It is relatively clear that for the early editors of “Isorhythmic Motets” the meaning of the words—let alone their placement—was much less important than the rational, mathematical, symbolic structure of the music. But we have arrived at a different place on the shoulders of those giants, and it is time to give text placement in *ars nova* motets as critically acute a glance as the one customarily reserved for their pitches and rhythms.

In advocating for stronger editorial intervention in matters of text-underlay—even to the extent of emending the notes to fit the words in their new places—I stand to displease at least two kinds of reader. The first is one who continues to believe that the notes of motets are more of a Text than their poetic texts. And the second is a reader who holds that the kind of text-critical activity that stands behind the accompanying edition of *Petre/Lugentium* is epistemologically fraught. Analysis of perceived differences between four sources of *Flos/Celsa* has led to a version of *Petre/Lugentium* that belongs entirely to the twenty-first century, whereas the Ivrea codex at least represents something a medieval singer would have looked at. While this is beyond dispute, it is also the case that time has had a more distorting influence on our understanding of these works than any slight shifting around of syllables could achieve. Text underlay has a formal as well as an expressive function within the *ars nova*

---

55 I am grateful to the student facsimile group at Princeton University, led by Jamie Reuland, for their willingness to sing not only the notes, but the words too.
56 See Margaret Bent, “What Is Isorhythm?” in *Quomodo cantabimus*, 122–43.
aesthetic, and a full appreciation of this fact necessitates a certain amount of editorial play. *Musicalis/Sciencie*, with its injunctions against a state of affairs that seems at first glance to be ubiquitous, thus emerges as a powerful interpretive tool.

And yet, *Musicalis/Sciencie* is only prescriptive. While seeming to tell us something unambiguous about the “right” way to sing and compose, this motet also reminds us that not all *ars nova* composers—and not all *ars nova* scribes—thought similarly about these matters. Stalemate. If it cannot point to any truths, the motet can in any case lead us to reflect on our own *sciencia* (or *Wissenschaft*). The web of tiny scribal details into which it leads—whatever sense we are to make of it—serves as a timely reminder that many problems arising from such traditional activities as editing and source study remain current, interesting, and unsolved. It seems that we must remember the basics and offend neither Grammar nor Rhetoric if we hope to number among Music’s darlings.
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Appendix: Musicalis/Sciencie, texts and translations

1. Triplum

Musicalis sciencia
qua regitur melodia
universis rectoribus
arte suaque practicis,
specialiter dilectis,
subscriptis suis subjictis—

The science of Music,
by whom melody is ruled
to all the masters
and those practiced in her art,
especially her beloved
disciples listed below—

de Douacho dicto Thoma / cuius fama fuit Roma, / Johanni de Muris quoque, / de Viteri Phillipppoque / Normanno Dyonisio, / Burces et Egidio; / Gaudefrido de Baralis, / Valquero de Valenciens, / de Palacio Roberto / atque Louchart Ingelberto; / dicto de Soissons Garino, / Egidio de Morino, / Reginaldo de Tyremont, / G. d’Orbendas et Jo. du Pont; / Guisardo de Cameraco, / et de Bailleul Reginaldo, / atque de Machau Guillelmo; / Petro Blavot et Matheo / de Luceu, d’ Arras Jacobo—

salutem et observare
sua precepta mandare
vestrum cuilibet cupio,
ne sit erroris motio
in dominam rethoricam,
neque contra grammaticam
lingua secans incomplexa
sit in silentio nixa;
cuncta vicia cavit;
in melodia valete.

[sends] greetings,
to heed her your lessons,
lest there be a false move
against Lady Rhetoric,
and lest, contrary to grammar,
[your] tongue be tied in silence,
severing words;
entirely avoid all such vice.

In melody, farewell!

2. Motetus

Sciencie laudabili
musice venerabili
rethorica sciencia
cum omni reverencia
salutem, O dulcissima
subjiciisque gratissima,
tali conquerens nuncio
quod maxima corruptio
in nostris dictaminibus.

To the praiseworthy, venerable science
of Music, the science of Rhetoric with all
respect [sends] greetings. Oh sweetest
woman and most pleasing to her subjects!
Lamenting I deliver to you this message:
That the greatest corruption is
committed by many singers in our
writing, for they divide words by making
sighs. Whereby I politely request that you
attend to a remedy for these things.

nam dividunt simplicia,
faciendo suspiria.
Quare pietate rogito
remedium his audito.