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ABSTRACT

This study starts at the junction between the music of medieval France and the Italian Renaissance at the cusp of a new century. Although the repertoire from the period between 1390 and 1440 is often labeled as “transitional,” unprecedented access to manuscripts, archival documents, and high quality recordings demonstrates that there is an urgent need to reassess a prejudiced notion that early 15th-century Italian motets are peripheral to a so-called “French central tradition.” Indeed, it has now become more apparent than ever that the motets of the Veneto in the first decades of the quattrocento were part of a significant musical tradition with influence reaching well beyond Italian political borders and the study of this repertoire is crucial to understanding the musical culture of the early Renaissance. In particular, the music of Johannes Ciconia now stands out as one of the linchpins linking Italian localized traditions, elements of the Ars subtilior, and the innovative musical developments epitomized by Guillaume Du Fay and his contemporaries. Ciconia and Du Fay are significant in this study particularly because they were so notable in their own time both through the diversity of works they produced and the widespread distribution of their music.

I propose that there is connective tissue that links a distinctive Italian motet tradition with an early 15th-century body of works copied into significant Veneto manuscripts such as Q15 and Ox213, and connects still further into the earliest notable features of the Renaissance. Through study of Ciconia’s corpus of motets, an exhaustive analysis of the early 15th-century Italian motet repertory, and a stylistic comparison of works by Ciconia, Du Fay, and their
contemporaries, my dissertation contemplates several questions: What more can be understood of Ciconia’s life and career through the close examination of his musical style? How are Ciconia’s works perceived considering that most of his motets have been preserved in sources created long after his death? To what extent did he influence composers around him and following him? And perhaps most crucially, is there a definitive early 15th-century Italian motet style and what elements of that style carry forward into the music of subsequent generations of composers?

I am primarily interested in the analysis of this fascinating repertory. I focus on large-scale structures and textures as well as localized details of distinctive of rhythmic construction and characteristic melodic shapes and motions. To this end I focus on the in-depth study of manuscripts, which function as sort of first-hand accounts of the repertoire, musical culture, and performance practices. Modern transcriptions aid me by allowing a clear overview of the grammar and structure of the elaborate counterpoint of these works. I also engage on an aural level, both as a singer and a listener, allowing the musical experience to guide my understanding of these works on a very physical and personal level. Among my conclusions is the possibility that Ciconia’s motets are more significant than has ever been expressed before. As exemplars of the 14th-century Italian motet style, his works are the pinnacle of a distinctive musical tradition. As one of the most widely known composers in the early 15th century, he is the representative example of the Veneto motet style. Because of characteristic features that correspond between Ciconia’s motets and other works by Du Fay and the next several generations of composers, the influence of these compositions should not be underestimated.
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<td>Ciconia, <em>O Petre</em>, mm. 30–48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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3.11 Ciconia, *Doctorum principem*, mm. 1–10
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5.8 Ciconia, *Ut te per omnes*, mm. 74–83
5.9 Ciconia, *Ut te per omnes*, mm. 19–27
5.10 Ciconia, *Ut te per omnes*, mm. 46–54
5.11 Ciconia, *Ut te per omnes*, mm. 94–105
5.12 Du Fay, *Vasilissa*, mm. 51–68
5.13 Ciconia, *Ut te per omnes*, mm. 9–18
5.14 Ciconia, *Ut te per omnes*, mm. 19–27
5.15 Du Fay, *Vasilissa*, mm. 24–40
5.16 Ciconia, *Ut te per omnes*, mm. 28–37
5.17 Ciconia, *Ut te per omnes*, mm. 28–37
5.18 Du Fay, *Vasilissa*, mm. 60–68
5.19 Du Fay, *Vasilissa*, mm. 24–40

6.1A Hymbert de Salinis, *Iesu salvator – Quo vulneratis*, mm. 15–19
6.1B Hymbert de Salinis, *Iesu salvator – Quo vulneratis*, mm. 40–64
6.2 Rubeus, *Caro mea vere est*, mm. 22–32
6.3 Rubeus, *Caro mea vere est*, mm. 38–45
6.4 Romanus, *Aurea flamigeri*, mm. 60–71
6.5 Romanus, *Aurea flamigeri*, mm. 84–119
6.6 Romanus, *Aurea flamigeri*, mm. 203–224
6.7 Text of Rondel’s *Verbum tuum* with syllable count
6.8 Romanus, *Ducalis sedes inclita*, text and translation
6.9 Romanus, *Ducalis sedes*, mm. 21–35
6.10 Romanus, *Ducalis sedes*, mm. 14–28
6.11 Romanus, *Ducalis sedes*, mm. 77–89
6.12 Romanus, *Ducalis sedes*, mm. 55–76
6.13 Cristoforus de Monte, *Dominicus a dono*, mm. 25–39
6.14 Cristoforus de Monte, *Dominicus a dono*, mm. 36–41
6.15 Cristoforus de Monte, *Dominicus a dono*, mm. 14–24
6.16 Cristoforus de Monte, *Dominicus a dono*, mm. 73–83
6.17 Cristoforus de Monte, *Dominicus a dono*, mm. 48–53
6.18 *O Maria virgo davitica*, mm. 1–22
6.19 The Gradual *Haec dies* compared to the tenor of Grenon’s *Plasmatoris humani*
6.20 Antonius de Civitate, *O felix flos Florentia*, mm. 1–9
6.21 Antonius de Civitate, *O felix flos Florentia*, mm. 29–47
6.22 Antonius de Civitate, *O felix flos Florentia*, mm. 92–113
6.23 Canon of Grenon’s *Prophetarum fulti suffragio*
6.24 Du Fay, *Apostolo glorioso*, mm. 7–16
6.26 Cristoforus de Monte, *Plaude decus*, mm. 18–26
6.27 Cristoforus de Monte, *Plaude decus*, mm. 72–93
6.28 Cristoforus de Monte, *Plaude decus*, mm. 102–129
6.29A Cristoforus de Monte, *Plaude decus*, mm. 1–8
6.29B Cristoforus de Monte, *Plaude decus*, mm. 27–35
6.29C Cristoforus de Monte, *Plaude decus*, mm. 45–54
6.29D Cristoforus de Monte, *Plaude decus*, mm. 72–93
6.30 Cristoforus de Monte, *Plaude decus*, mm. 36–44
6.31 Cristoforus de Monte, *Plaude decus*, mm. 110–117
6.32 Cristoforus de Monte, *Plaude decus*, mm. 64–82
ABBREVIATIONS, SIGLA, AND TERMINOLOGY


Editions

CMM  Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae. 111 volumes. American Institute of Musicology, 1947–.

Volumes cited:
1. Heinrich Besseler and David Fallows, eds. Guillaume Du Fay: Opera omnia
8. Nino Pirrotta, ed. The Music of Fourteenth Century Italy
   4. 1954.
   2. Franchois Lebertoul, Guillaume Le Grant, Johannes Le Grant, Guillermi Malbecque, Johannes Reson, Gilet Velut, etc. 1959.

MB  Musica Britannica. 97 volumes. London: Stainer and Bell, 1951–.

Volumes cited:


Volumes cited:
1. Leo Schrade, ed. The Roman de Fauvel; The works of Philippe de Vitry; French cycles of the Ordinarium Missae. 1956.

**Manuscript Sigla**

Aosta, Seminario Maggiore, MS 15 (formerly: A 1º D 19) I-AOs15

Apt, Cathédrale Ste Anne, Trésor 16 bis F-APT Trésor 16 bis

Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek Lit. 115 (formerly: Ed.IV.6) D-BAs Lit. 115

Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preußischer Kulturbesitz, MS Mus. 40021 [olim: Preussische Staatsbibliothek, Z 21] D-B MS Mus. 40021

Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, MS 2216 I-Bu MS 2216 BU2216

Bologna, Museo Internazionale e Biblioteca della Musica di Bologna (formerly: Civico Museo Bibliografico Musicale; earlier: Biblioteca del Liceo Musicale), Q.15 I-Bc Q.15 Q15

Cambrai, Médiathèque Municipale (formerly Bibliothèque Municipale), MS D 6 F-CA MS D 6

Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Houghton Library, MS Typ 122 US-HAhl MS Typ 122

1 Arabic foliation is used throughout this study. Cross references to the Roman foliation and Mancini numbering can be found in Margaret Bent, ed., *Bologna Q15: The Making and Remaking of a Musical Manuscript*, 2 Vols. (Lucca: Libreria Musicale Italiana, 2008), 1:164–242.
Chantilly, Musée Condé, MS 564 (formerly 1047) F-CH MS 564 Chantilly
Dijon, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 2837 F-Dm MS 2837
Durham, Chapter Library, MS A.III.11 GR-DRc MS A.III.11
Escorial, Palacio Real, Monasterio de S Lorenzo, MS V.III.24 E-E MS V.III.24
Florence, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Archivio Capitolare di San Lorenzo, MS 22112 I-Fl 2211 SL2211
Florence, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Mediceo Palatino 87 I-Fl 87 Squarcialupi
Grottaferrata, Biblioteca del Monumento Nazionale, Kript. Lat. 224 (formerly: Collocazione provvisoria 197) I-GR Kript. Lat. 224
Ivrea, Biblioteca Capitolare d’Ivrea, MS CXV (115) I-IV MS CXV (115) Ivrea115
Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, MS L.T.K. 342A NL-Lu Fragment L.T.K. 342A
Modena, Biblioteca Estense, MS α.M.5.24 (formerly: lat. 568; IV.D.5) I-MOe MS α.M.5.24 ModA
Modena, Biblioteca Estense, α.X.1.11 (formerly: Lat. 471; VI.H.15) I-MOe MS α.X.1.11 ModB
Montefiore dell’Aso, Biblioteca-Archivio di Francesco Egidi, s.s. I-MFA s.s. Egidi
Montpellier, Bibliothèque Inter-Universitaire, Section Médecine, H 196 F-MO H 196
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 14274 (formerly: Mus. 3232a; Clm. 352c) D-Mbs Clm. 14274 St. Emmeram
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Mus. MS 3223 (earlier shelfmarks J.50 on verso; later Misc. lat. 183 on recto) D-Mbs Mus. MS 3223
New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS 978 US-NYpm MS 978
Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS, Arch. Selden B. 26 (formerly: MadanSC 3340) GB-Ob MS. Arch. Selden B. 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Inventory Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library</td>
<td>MS. Canon. Ital. 16</td>
<td>GB-Ob MS. Canon. Ital. 16</td>
<td>GB-Ob MS. Canon. Ital. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library</td>
<td>MS. Mus. e. 7</td>
<td>GB-Ob MS. Mus. e. 7</td>
<td>GB-Ob MS. Mus. e. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Corpus Christi College</td>
<td>MS 144</td>
<td>GB-Occ MS 144</td>
<td>GB-Occ MS 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padua, Biblioteca Universitaria</td>
<td>MS 675</td>
<td>I-Pu MS 675</td>
<td>I-Pu MS 675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padua, Biblioteca Universitaria</td>
<td>MS 1106 (Old inventory number 323)</td>
<td>I-Pu MS 1106</td>
<td>I-Pu MS 1106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padua, Biblioteca Universitaria</td>
<td>MS 1115</td>
<td>I-Pu MS 1115</td>
<td>I-Pu MS 1115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padua, Biblioteca Universitaria</td>
<td>MS 1225</td>
<td>I-Pu MS 1225</td>
<td>I-Pu MS 1225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padua, Biblioteca Universitaria</td>
<td>MS 1283</td>
<td>I-Pu MS 1283</td>
<td>I-Pu MS 1283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padua, Biblioteca Universitaria</td>
<td>MS 1475</td>
<td>I-Pu MS 1475</td>
<td>I-Pu MS 1475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France</td>
<td>MS fonds nouvelles acquisitions françaises 23190 (formerly: Angers, Château de Serrant, Duchesse de la Trémoïlle)</td>
<td>F-SERRANT Trémoïlle</td>
<td>Trémoïlle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque National de France</td>
<td>nouvelles acquisitions françaises 4379 (formerly: SevC 5-1-43)</td>
<td>F-PN nouvelles acquisitions françaises 4379</td>
<td>4379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale</td>
<td>nouvelles acquisitions françaises 13521</td>
<td>F-PN nouvelles acquisitions françaises 13521</td>
<td>13521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perugia, Biblioteca del Dottorato dell’Università</td>
<td>Incunabolo Inv. 15775 N. F. 15755</td>
<td>I-PEdu Incunabolo Inv. 15755 N. F.</td>
<td>Incunabolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense</td>
<td>MS 2151 (formerly: c. II. 3)</td>
<td>I-Re MS 2151</td>
<td>I-Re MS 2151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siena, Archivio di Stato</td>
<td>Fondo del Vicariato, Ravi 3</td>
<td>I-Sas 3</td>
<td>I-Sas 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siena, Biblioteca Comunale degl’Intronati</td>
<td>L.V.36.</td>
<td>I-Sc 36</td>
<td>I-Sc 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strasbourg, Bibliothèque Municipale (formerly: Bibliothèque de la Ville)</td>
<td>MS 222.C.22 (now destroyed)</td>
<td>F-Sm 222 Stras222</td>
<td>Stras222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria</td>
<td>T.III.2</td>
<td>I-Tn MS T.III.2</td>
<td>I-Tn MS T.III.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 A facsimile of Edmond de Coussemaker’s transcriptions of some works from this source are in Albert Vander Linden, ed., *Le manuscrit musical m 222 c 22 de la Bibliothèque de Strasbourg*, Thesaurus Musicus 2 (Brussels: Office internationale de librarie, 1979).
Trent, Museo Provinciale d’Arte, Castello del Buonconsiglio, MS 1374 (formerly: Trent 87) I-TRbc 1374 [87]

Trent, Museo Provinciale d’Arte, Castello del Buonconsiglio, MS 1375 (formerly: Trent 88) I-TRbc 1375 [88]

Trent, Museo Provinciale d’Arte, Castello del Buonconsiglio, MS 1379 (formerly: Trent 92) I-TRbc 1379 [92]

Warsaw, Biblioteka Narodowa, MS III.8054 (formerly: Krasiński 52) PL-Wn 52

Warsaw, Biblioteca Narodowa, MS lat.F.I.378 (photographic copy only Preserved in Poznan, Biblioteka Universytecka MS 695) PL-Wn MS lat.F.I.378


**Terminology, Titles, and Musical Examples**

I have used the Latin “longa” to prevent confusion with the adjective “long,” but “breve” and “minim” as opposed to *brevis* and *minima*, to avoid excessive italicization. I have also tried to refer to tempora/tempus for the length of the breve beat (usually equivalent to a single measure in the transcriptions of the works cited). In addition, Italian song-forms are made plural in their native fashion, i.e. caccia/caccie, ballata/ballate, etc. In general I have defaulted to the use of proper names as used in the New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians. This leads to some discrepancy in the use of Italian versus Latin versions of several names, but allows for simpler reference to a single leading English-language music dictionary. One notable exception is Antonio Zacara da Teramo. As the name “Zacara” is a sobriquet that possibly refers to this composer’s physical deformities, I prefer to use the name “Antonio da Teramo” in this study.

Foliation is indicated with “v” for verso and only the folio number for the recto. I use “cantus I” and “cantus II” rather than “superius” for the former and “motetus” or “duplum” for the latter in

---

cases where the equality of the upper voices is a key stylistic feature. Motets are cited in full for the first reference, but then by short incipits thereafter.

All transcriptions are my own although a great deal of debt must be credited to many editors who have published editions of many of these works before mine. I have reduced note-values consistently so that minim = quarter note. I have also tried to retain barring so that breve = measure. When mensural practice uses “cut” signatures (Ѡ and Ѳ), these values are doubled.

All images in this dissertation are either reproduced with permission, have copyright held by this author, are in the public domain (recently reaffirmed on most manuscript photographs for Berne Union nations by Bridgeman Art Library v. Corel Corp.), are small details printed under fair use, or more than one of these categories apply.
INTRODUCTION

In 1956 Leo Schrade prepared and published the first volume of a series dedicated to the entire corpus of polyphonic music of the fourteenth century.¹ Much of this repertoire had already been published, but the principal idea was the reworking of this repertoire single-handedly with a specific set of editorial considerations. Schrade began the series with the earliest polyphonic music of the 14th century—the Roman de Fauvel, the works of Philippe de Vitry, and several French Masses. The series included contributions from many editors from other areas of the polyphonic repertoire, ensuring geographic diversity from the farthest reaches of European music in the 14th century. The final volume (published in 1984) is the complete works of Johannes Ciconia, edited by Margaret Bent and Anne Hallmark.

Seeing as most of Ciconia’s works are thought to originate from after the turn of the 15th century, how does Ciconia’s corpus end up in a series of musical editions dedicated to polyphony of the 14th century? This question points to a problem of attempting to define stylistic divisions along chronological time lines. Is the use of an era limited to one-hundred years too restricted to accommodate Ciconia’s early 15th-century repertoire? Do Ciconia’s compositions have stronger links to the music that comes before him or to the music that comes after him? And if, as many music history texts arbitrarily propose, the end of the Middle Ages is marked by the turn of the 15th century, where does Ciconia’s repertoire fall? Does Ciconia belong in the Middle Ages or the Renaissance? Is he a “musicien de la transition” as he is monikered by Philippe de Vendrix and are his works merely an example of an evolutionary step between the two great Guillaumes—Guillaume de Machaut and Guillaume Du Fay?² This then leads to a further

¹ PMFC, vols. 1–24.
question: What do the terms “Middle Ages” and “Renaissance” really mean for music and what might be the defining dates of these two epochs?

The term “Renaissance” is attributed to Jules Michelet in his 1855 *Histoire de France*. Although the “rebirth” suggested in this neologism is applicable to a renewed interest in the proportions of the human body that were so celebrated in Greek and Roman statuary, the use of proportion in the visual arts, and a literary interest in classical writings about government and education, there is not really a parallel rekindling of interest in classical musical sources around 1400. Although the mathematical principles of the intervals were based upon ancient theories, these rules had already been proposed hundreds of years before the 15th-century artistic and literary counterpart. It is only in the late 16th century when there is a concerted attempt to return to the theories of musical composition mapped upon the practices of classical Greece.

The idea of an artistic “Renaissance” notwithstanding, the year 1400 has no specific watershed event marking it as a historical rupture between epochs. From the twenty-twenty perspective of the 21st century, there are a number of other events that might represent a more definitive end to the Middle Ages. For instance, both famine (especially the Great Famine of 1315–1317) and the plague, now known as the Black Death (peaked in 1346–1353), decimated the populations of Europe as far abroad as Russia, Italy, and Great Britain. The subsequent destabilization of authority and a number of popular uprisings may have contributed to a change in the way general populations thought about their society and governance, sometimes for the better and sometimes for the worse.

---

3 Michelet apparently abhorred the Middle Ages and it may because of this 19th-century historian that we understand there to be a drastic break between the two epochs. This idea was summarily reinforced by the Swiss scholar Jacob Burckhardt, who used the term Renaissance in 1860 in his influential work *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*. 
The removal of the papacy from Rome to Avignon in 1309 marks a significant moment in the history of the church, leading to distrust of the ultimate authority of the popes and an eventual schism in the Western church (the election of Pope Urban VI in 1378). It may be no wonder that many people turned to reformation (see especially the preaching of English theologian John Wycliffe and Czech priest Jan Hus). The end of the Papal Schism in 1417 at the Council of Constance pulled the Western church back from the brink of dissolution, but the seeds of dissent had already been laid for Martin Luther’s theological and liturgical revolution one-hundred years later.

The end of the Hundred Years’ War (1337–1453) between England and France and the Fall of Constantinople and the Byzantine Empire to the Ottoman Turks (1453) are not just the end of bellicose stances between kingdoms and empires. These two confrontations also mark a significant change in how wars are fought and won. More economical advances in technology replaced the extreme cost of outfitting knights and a heavy cavalry. This ultimately destabilized the medieval feudal system, which relied on the use of the nobility as the principle fighting force in these conflicts.

Another discordant note in defining 1400 as a turning point from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance is an artistic one. Although there are notable artistic movements that are associated with the 15th century, there is a significant flowering of arts in the 14th century. One cannot help but think of the progressive works of Giotto di Bondone (1266/7–1337), Dante Alighieri (1265–1321), Francesco Petrarca (1304–1374), Giovanni Boccaccio (1313–1375), and Geoffrey Chaucer (ca. 1343–1400) as representatives of just the sort of Renaissance that Michelet defined. The invention of moveable type and the first commercial use of the printing press the 1450s

---

4 This certainly was precipitated by the ignominious defeat of French nobles and horse-seated knights by King Henry Vʼs army supplemented by Welsh longbowmen at the Battle of Agincourt in 1415.
facilitated the spread of ideas with unprecedented speed and ease. In the events of musical nature, perhaps the most notable modernization of music in the 14th century are in the form of the treatises *Ars novae musicae* and *Ars nova* (ca. 1320 and 1322 respectively.) There may be room to consider the period between 1320 and Tinctoris’s pejorative 1430, as its own specific musical moment.⁵

These arguments about epochs are made even more complex when considering what historians and philosophers of the late 14th century thought about their own era. Petrarch is credited with the concept of the “Dark Ages,” which he demarcated as the period after the fall of the Roman civilization in the 4th or 5th centuries. In the 15th century, historians Leonardo Bruni (ca. 1370–1444) and Biondo Flavio (1392–1463) included themselves in a modern age, thus dividing known history into three epochs—antiquity, a middle period, and the modern era.⁶

At last I come to perhaps the most significant question: do we even need these dates for a proper musical assessment? We could call for a turning point in the development of musical thought somewhere around 1400, or we could deny any real break whatsoever and stress an essential continuity, but this conflict is ultimately irreconcilable. What I intend to do in the pages that follow is to extract the music of Johannes Ciconia and his contemporaries from the conceptual transitional gap between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance by focusing close analysis on their particular style of compositional planning of their motets. This subgenre of motet construction I have come to describe as the equal-cantus style.

---

⁵ Although it is helpful to have Tinctoris’s reasonably close perspective to use as a possible marker for when the concept of music changed in the 15th century, I cannot help but be put off by his assessment that anything written before 1430 is not worth hearing. But just because Tinctoris has an opinion of the worthiness of that repertoire does not mean that he is not noting something that has changed between music of his own time and that of the past.

Overview

Chapter 1 provides a new perspective on the motet in the first decades of the 15th century focusing on the Veneto and the composers working for ecclesiastical and noble patrons in northern Italy. An essential component of this research is a comprehensive comparison of the musical elements of the works that epitomize the Italian motet to other motet genres that coexist in Veneto manuscripts representing French and English traditions. This necessitates a reappraisal of the Italian motet as a peripheral or lateral repertory and instead establishes it as a unique and dynamic tradition. Here I am locating my study between Margaret Bent’s significant corpus of research on the 14th-century Italian motet and Julie Cumming’s book on the motet in the age of Du Fay. By doing so, I propose that there is connective tissue that links a distinctive Italian motet tradition with an early 15th-century body of works copied into significant Veneto manuscripts such as Q15 and Ox213, and connects still further into the earliest notable features of the Renaissance. In this chapter, I also engage in dialogue with the scholarship on musical style, particularly the work of Jan La Rue, Ian Bent, and Richard Crocker.

In Chapters 2 and 3 I address the motets of Johannes Ciconia. In Chapter 2, I use Ciconia’s motets to establish an exemplar of the equal-cantus style. I consider first Ciconia’s earliest known motet, *O virum omnimoda – O lux et decus – O beate Nicholae*. The date of composition for this work has been established as occurring in the mid-1390s and amongst the first of Ciconia’s works. Despite this early date, the motet is representative of tastes in the Veneto in the early 15th century, situating the composition of the motet instead within the years of Ciconia’s employment in Padua between 1401 and 1412. In this study I address some of the difficulties of establishing a chronology of Ciconia’s works by focusing musical style, form, construction, and texture of the motet and relating it to the works of composers associated with...
Ciconia’s tenure in Rome and Padua. In this chapter I explore and analyze Ciconia’s main corpus of motets, establishing them as exemplars of the equal-cantus motet style in the early 15th century.

Chapter 3 examines the Ciconia’s works that resist easy classification. For instance, the composer’s two-part setting *O Petre Christi discipule* is classed with several other pieces as “Latin songs” in Ciconia’s works list of Grove Dictionary, but the grouping of this piece with a canon and two contrafactum songs overshadows its stylistic features, especially those characteristics similar to Veneto motets. Although the work lacks a tenor and would not be typically classified as a motet, it has many of the distinctive features of a north-Italian motet. The reclassification of *O Petre* as well as two other contrafacta—*O beatum incendium* and *Regina gloriosa*—can serve as exemplars for how one might reevaluate the definition of the motet in general and the compositional uniqueness of the Italian motet in particular. Another work, *Doctorum principem – Melodia suavissima – Vir mitis* is remarkable in the use of a canon that instructs the tenor to sing his melody in three-fold repetition, each of which is in a different mensuration. This unusual format references the temporal manipulations of tenors in French isorhythmic motets through diminution of mensuration, but in this instance Ciconia invents a different mode of transformation. He changes the mensuration entirely moving from compound meter, to triple meter, to duple meter. A further example of Ciconia’s innovative compositional techniques is the motet *Petrum Marcello Venetum – O Petre antistes inclite* in which Ciconia
uses diminution to transform the tenor, but within an overarching form of the double-statement motet.

In Chapter 4, I shift my focus back into the late 14th-century seeking an alternative narrative of the development of motet style. Any description of the prevailing stylistic tendencies in a given period must accept a certain number of outliers. Still, not all outliers are created equal; some may diverge sufficiently from the norm so as to cause to ask whether a new, or at least revised, analytical frame would better account for the overall picture. It is in this context that I approach the anonymous motet *Rex Karole*. On the one hand, this piece has been represented as the pinnacle of *Ars nova* composition, popular and in use for a long time; on the other, it has much in common with the Italian motet of the early 15th century: in particular, its laudatory function, equality of upper voices in terms of ranges, rhythmic motion, and text setting, use of *tempus perfectum* with occasional temporal shifts into duple meter, a foundational three-voice texture, clearly delineated divisions between rhythmic sections, and no diminution. Using *Rex Karole* as a case study, I propose that the narrative of motet composition in the 14th century should be revised to include this second stylistic strand. This revised history can sharpen our picture of the development of the early 15th century motet; it can also inform our understanding of Italian compositional style. In this chapter I suggest that by the age of Ciconia, this style is a fully developed, independent, and significant school of composition. This alternate tradition is contemporaneous with the French *Ars nova*. I argue that *Rex Karole* is better understood as part of a two-pronged stylistic response on the part of mid to late 14th-century composers to the novel rhythmic practices and hierarchical organization of the early 14th-century motet.

In Chapter 5, I shift my attention to the generation after Ciconia and the possible influence of his works on other composers in the early 15th century. In his monograph on Du
Fay, David Fallows mentions in passing the influence of the works of Ciconia on the compositions of Du Fay’s formative years. In particular, Fallows notes the resemblance of the isorhythmic plan of Du Fay’s motet *Vasilissa ergo gaude – Concupivit rex decorem tuum* to Ciconia’s *Ut te per omnes celitum – Ingens alumnus Padue*. Fallows emphasizes the formal relationship of the two works, but they share more than just structural congruity. The common characteristics of the two works represent a larger tradition of motet composition that has precedents in the early-14th century and passed to composers working in the Veneto in the early decades of the 15th century. I compare Ciconia and Du Fay’s motets in a paradigmatic fashion that illuminates their connections and illustrates that Du Fay was using an Italian work as the exemplar for his earliest known composition.

In the final chapter I explore the works of the constellation of composers both from south and north of the Alps who found employment in Italy during and immediately following the Council of Constance. As a whole these composers demonstrate a vibrant musical community active in the Veneto in the first several decades of the 15th century, raising a number of questions regarding how the Italian style was transmitted from one composer to another. In this chapter I examine the connections between works that originate in one locus, but by composers with greatly divergent musical and cultural backgrounds. In particular I focus on the unique stylistic features that typify the Italian style and how those characteristics were utilized in whole or in part by composers in the creation of their motets. Through musical analysis, I demonstrate the links that connect the Italian style to composers not only indigenous to the region, but also from the north and working in the Venetian orbit in the first quarter of the 15th century.
CHAPTER ONE
THE EQUAL-CANTUS MOTET IN THE EARLY 15TH CENTURY

The focus of this study is on the equal-cantus style, which was first introduced in the 14th century and continues past the turn of the century until the dominance of a more florid style and nascent English influences after 1420. It is clear that equal-cantus motets in the first decades of the 15th century were part of a significant musical tradition with influences reaching across political and cultural boundaries. In particular, the music of Johannes Ciconia stands out as one of the linchpins linking localized Italian traditions, to elements of the *Ars subtilior* and the innovative musical developments epitomized by Guillaume Du Fay and his contemporaries. Ciconia and Du Fay, neither of whom, ironically, were native Italians, were initially the bookends to this study particularly because these two composers were notable in their own time both through the diversity of works they produced and the widespread distribution of their music. By widening the scope of my study to include 14th-century motets not only from Italy but also France, the equal-cantus style will be shown not to be restricted to particular regional tastes, but is instead a much longer musical tradition. Thus, the middle section of this dissertation includes a study of the motet *Rex Karole Johannes genite – Leticie pacis concordie*, written in the last quarter of the 14th century in honor of the French king, Charles V.

A New Narrative of the Late-Medieval Motet

Many music history textbooks tell one basic version of the evolution of the medieval motet.¹ It follows thus:

¹ See for instance the following general texts commonly used in the music history sequence: Joseph Kerman, Gary Tomlinson, with Vivian Kerman, *Listen*, 8th ed. (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2015); Douglass Seaton, *Ideas and Styles in the Western Musical Tradition*, 3rd ed.
In 13th-century France, the motet was primarily in three voices—two higher, fast-moving melodic lines and a slow moving pre-composed tenor. The tenor part was generally based upon a chant and typically organized in a series of rhythmic patterns in a technique that is now known as “isorhythmic” composition. The two upper voices each had their own texts, either in Latin, French, or both. The motet of the 13th century is exemplified by the repertoires found in the primary manuscript sources from Montpellier, Bamberg, and La Clayette.

A watershed moment that changed the manner of motet composition and how musical rhythm is notated occurred at the beginning of the 14th century. The treatises of the Ars nova group describe a new notational system in which the length of every sound and rhythm is precisely determined. The phrase “The Ars nova” is now used (as Grove’s dictionary

---


It appears that the poems of the upper voices had intertextual relationships with the original meaning of the chant text, regardless if the chant melody was only a fragment of its original tune.

expansively puts it) as a synonym for all 14th-century polyphony including that of Italy and England, but the original innovations are closely associated with the motets of Philippe de Vitry and the polyphonic interpolations in the Roman de Fauvel.⁶

In the mid-14th century, Egidius de Murino described how to compose a motet in his short treatise De motetti componendis.⁷ Egidius begins by telling the young composer to choose a chant melody to use as a tenor. The words of this tenor should be in some accord with the matter of the motet. Egidius then says to order the chant melody into color and talea. Egidius recommends that a beginning composer restrict himself to strictly successive construction, so next one is to order and color the contratenor. After this the composer is to order a triplum so that it concords with the tenor and contratenor. At last the motetus is written at the fifth in concord with the other parts. In this successive style of composition the motetus is dependent upon the triplum as the triplum is dependent upon the tenor.

As the century progressed, motet composition continued to evolve and expand. The fast moving upper voices quickened and stratified as triplum parts increased their relative tempi faster than motetus parts. Meanwhile the organized rhythmic patterns of the chant-based tenors became more complex. Many composers such as Guillaume de Machaut took advantage of the idea that organized rhythmic design did not need to be restricted to the tenor voice alone, but could also be expanded upwards to include isorhythmic organization of the upper voices.⁸ The

---


use of diminution, a reorganization of the tenor rhythm through the reduction of note values, appeared by the middle of the century. The use of diminution in the final section or sections of a motet potentially influenced the compositional structure of the upper voices. French motets expanded in texture with the addition of a fourth voice written in counterpoint with the tenor. Although these motets retained double texts for the upper voices, increasingly these were not in French, but instead entirely in Latin.

A few observations can be made at this point. The structure of a motet in this style is entirely hierarchical both vertically and horizontally. The tenor is the lowest and slowest part, mostly moving in longas and breves and shifting only into breves and semibreves for sections in diminution. The motetus is about a fifth above the tenor and moves at a moderate rhythmic pace. The triplum is in the highest range and moves at the fastest relative rhythmic speed. The triplum also bears more text than the motetus. The topic of the motet is usually sacred, many of which are in honor of the Virgin Mary. There are two different texts for the triplum and motetus. The tenor is based upon a *cantus firmus* borrowed from chant. The structure is isorhythmic, here meaning arranged by rhythm and melody.\(^9\)

As motet composition flourished and spread, different variations emerged basically along geopolitical lines although it is probable that they had some sort of 13th-century common ancestor.\(^{10}\) English motets developed many of their own characteristics over the course of the 14th century. Although there is ample evidence of French influence in isorhythmic motets copied

---


\(^{10}\) Kurt von Fischer has suggested that Philippe de Vitry’s *Quoniam secta latronum* may have been an important influence on Italian composition. See his “Philippe de Vitry in Italy and an Homage of Landini to Philippe,” *L’ars nova italiana del trecento* 4 (1978): 225–235.
in Bury St. Edmunds in Suffolk, England, Latin-texted motets on sacred texts were more common.\(^{11}\) English composers were known to create motet settings that featured equal melodic rhythm between voices and homophonic triadic sonorities, particularly in what could be understood as a \(\frac{6}{3}\) inversion in modern harmonic language. This kind of motet is called the “cantilena” style.\(^{12}\)

Like motets in England, Italian motets developed unique characteristics distinctive to regional tastes. Margaret Bent in her paper “The Fourteenth-Century Italian Motet” categorizes the essential elements of the Italian motet during the \textit{trecento}.\(^{13}\) She concludes that Italian motets did not always feature a pre-existent \textit{cantus firmus}, but they did retain two higher upper voices over a slower-moving tenor. Isorhythm, particularly pan-isorhythm was not used as often as it was in the north, but many motets are characterized by a repetition of the rhythms of all the voices by an exact replication for the second half of the work, such as the anonymous motet in honor of doge Francesco Dandolo (r. 1329–1339) \textit{Ave corpus sanctum gloriosi Stefani} –


Texts were laudatory for both sacred and secular public figures and most motets were likely intended for ceremonial use. The texts of these motets were almost entirely in Latin.\textsuperscript{15}

The typical narrative one learns in general music history courses is that the transition in musical style between the 14th and 15th centuries is abrupt and disjunct.\textsuperscript{16} In this telling, the

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Ave corpus} is edited in PMFC 12, 133–137. I have appropriated Julie Cumming’s term “double-statement” for a motet structured over a single repetition of the rhythm of the tenor dividing it into two parts. See Cumming, \textit{Motet in the Age of Du Fay}, 79.

\textsuperscript{15} There are only two known equal-cantus motets with Italian texts. These are the anonymous \textit{Cantano gl'angiol lieti – Sanctus} (PMFC 12, 140–146) and Du Fay’s \textit{Apostolo glorioso – Cum tua doctrina – Andreas Christi famulus} (CMM 1:1, 33–38), both of which were composed well after the turn of the 15th century.

\textsuperscript{16} Margot Fassler’s recent text \textit{Music in the Medieval West} (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2014) does a good job in the introduction and conclusions to avoid the description of medieval music as a reified strand with a linear evolution, but there are still so many challenges to overcome when textbooks still divide music of the Middle Ages from music of the Renaissance around 1400. The companion volume, Richard Freedman’s \textit{Music in the Renaissance} (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2013) includes a brief introduction to the Renaissance by discussing the craft of composition by Egidius de Murino and Ciconia’s motet \textit{Doctorum principem}. He also includes a brief introduction to the Italian humanists such as Flavio Biondo. Peter Burkholder does a fine job discussing the development of music in the 14th century and he continues to greatly improve this venerable text continues with each new edition, but the necessity of having to halt the narrative in order to explain the basic concepts of the Renaissance (about 21 pages of text) might lead the reader to conclude a major division between the middle ages and Renaissance with nothing but a murky transition between. See J. Peter Burkholder, Donald Jay Grout, and Claude V. Palisca, \textit{A History of Western Music}, 9th ed. (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2014), 143–164. Unfortunately, after this introduction to the Renaissance, Burkholder leaps directly from either the \textit{Ars subtilior} or the Italian \textit{trecento} (depending on perspective of the reader and if the \textit{trecento} is seen as a peripheral tradition) into the \textit{contenance angloise} and the emulation of Dunstable by composers by 1440. Only after another 14 pages of text, does he return to Du Fay’s early works and the first decades of the 15th century, and only in reference to the “new international style” in \textit{Resvellies vous} and the “archaic musical style” of \textit{Nuper rosarum flores} (pages 178 and 180 respectively. Richard Taruskin and Christopher H. Gibbs deal a little better with the seams in \textit{The Oxford History of Western Music (College Edition)} (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013). Both Ciconia’s \textit{Doctorum principem}, described as “a summation of \textit{Ars Nova} practices” and Du Fay’s \textit{Nuper rosarum flores}, described as “the direct generic and stylistic continuity that linked [Du Fay’s] creative output with that of his fourteenth-century precursors,” fall before the divide between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance (page 121). Taruskin and Gibb’s comments about the beginning of the Renaissance are limited to three pages and are couched in terms of the problems of periodization.
motets of Guillaume de Machaut are linked to the motets of Du Fay through provenance and thus reinforces a theory of a “French central tradition.”\textsuperscript{17} This theory assumes that, because Du Fay was born and raised in Cambrai, all of his music is in the French style. Du Fay’s works are often referenced as part of the “Burgundian School,” but this grouping is better associated with his mid-15th-century works alongside those of Binchois, Antoine Busnoys, and John Dunstaple, and does not apply to his earlier compositional period. This assumption completely ignores the overt Italianate features of his early motets. This notion also leads to a somewhat misguided idea that the most significant change in 15th-century musical style only occurred after Du Fay’s contact with the music of John Dunstaple and other English composers. One of the arguments for English influence is that Du Fay gravitates towards the use of triads. Many scholars have noted that both Italian and English composers share a predilection for triads. As mentioned above, English composers favored vertical triadic sonorities in the cantilena style. English composers also favored mensural shifts from triple to duple and vice versa.\textsuperscript{18} There are numerous examples of shifting mensural placement from triple to duple in the early motets of Du Fay.

I have come to conclude that many of the stylistic features of Du Fay’s early works that could be considered English—in the so-called “contenance angloise”—are actually Italianate characteristics. In his early works, Du Fay’s use of the double-statement structure and an equal-

\textsuperscript{17} Michael Scott Cuthbert describes this as the “arrow from Guillaume to Guillaume,” in his book \textit{Ars Mutandi: Italian Sacred Music in the Age of Plague and Schism} (Cambridge University Press, forthcoming), 2. I am extremely grateful to him for sharing his work with me before publication and subsequent correspondence. Even more problematic when the works of Machaut and Du Fay are linked via the \textit{Ars subtilior}, a style that does not seem to have much influence beyond the early years of the 15th century except perhaps for a particular interest in the treble-dominated florid texture of chansons. See Robert Nosow, “The Florid and Equal-Discantus Motet Styles of Fifteenth-Century Italy,” (PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1992) for more regarding the features of the florid-motet style.

\textsuperscript{18} See in particular the works of John Dunstaple. The first section his motet \textit{Quam pulcra es} is in \textcircled{O} and the final section is in \textcircled{C}, but there is almost no difference in notation or rhythmic motion in each mensuration. MB 8, 112–113.
cantus texture is more directly connected to the Italian style than the English style. I also show that Du Fay’s use of triadic sonorities and shifts of triple and duple are both derived from the Italian tradition. Composers working in Italy, such as Ciconia, gravitated towards melodic triads more reminiscent of trumpet fanfares than the vertical sonorities of the English cantilena. The custom of shifting the mensuration from tempus perfectum to tempus imperfectum is not in the style of Dunstaple’s large-scale sections marked by deliberate mensuration changes, but often minor rearrangements within the space of one tempus unit.

In a system where French features have been given primacy it is easy to relegate the motet traditions of 14th-century Italy and England to the periphery. These peripheral or lateral traditions have often been defined negatively by comparison to French and isorhythmic criteria and anything that falls outside the established parameters is considered anomalous.

19 See Chapter 5 for a section on Du Fay’s imitation of the fanfare-like structures in Ciconia’s motets.

20 The irony is that because of Martin Le Franc’s poem praising the contenance angloise, English music after 1400 gets a bit too much credit for it’s influence on the music of the early Renaissance. This problem is further complicated by an elusive definitive date of the start of the Renaissance in music. See Rob C. Wegman, “New Music for a World Grown Old: Martin Le Franc and the ‘Contenance Angloise’,” Acta Musicologica 75 (2003): 204–205. Martin’s poetically ill-defined “contenance angloise” has been the fodder of many studies of the early Renaissance and is much more than can be discussed in this study. But it is worth mentioning that Du Fay most likely did not encounter English polyphony until after his employment with the Malatesta family and the composition of his earliest works in the 1420s. Nuper rosarum flores, composed in 1436, is probably the first example of Du Fay’s works with demonstrable English influence, although where that influence originated is uncertain. For more on Martin’s poem, see David Fallows, “The Contenance Angloise: English Influence on Continental Composers of the Fifteenth Century,” Renaissance Studies 1 (1987): 189–208.

21 Bent, “Fourteenth-Century Italian Motet,” 85. See also Reinhard Strohm, The Rise and “Centre and Periphery: Mainstream and Provincial Music,” in Companion to Medieval and Renaissance Music, edited by Tess Knighton and David Fallows (New York: Schirmer Books, 1992): 55–59. According to Strohm, by 1410 “the ‘central tradition’ was extinct” and “there was now a network, not a new centre. Somehow the ‘peripheral’ nations in music had managed to turn the tables on the central tradition” (Centre, 59) and “these lateral traditions began to interact with each other,
be a tendency to disregard certain 14th-century stylistic trends as irrelevant because their origins are considered too distant from the key regions of polyphonic production. The unique stylistic features of these regions are excused as separate from a central tradition on the grounds that they are localized compositional practices. But this tendency only takes into consideration a work’s origins and not the stylistic features that could include motets of any provenance.

Two examples of how the focus on only provenance can distort one’s understanding of style can be seen through the analysis of the ceremonial motets, Petre Clemens – Lugenium siccentur, in honor of Pope Clement VI, and Rex Karole – Leticie pacis, a motet in honor of King Charles V of France. Neither of these works fit the traditional definition of a French isorhythmic motet. Petre Clemens is organized into six repetitions plus a fourteen-measure freely composed opening section (introitus) with canonic imitation between the two upper voices and an incomplete seventh iteration of the rhythmic section at the end. \(^2\) Although one of the defining elements of the structure of this motet is the repetition of the tenor’s rhythm, it does not feature repetition of the tenor melody nor does it utilize diminution. Similarly Rex Karole is organized in five rhythmic sections, plus a canonic opening duet, without repetition of tenor melody or diminution. Both of these motets are anomalous because they represent works that by provenance and ceremonial function might be considered part of the French central tradition, but

---

by-passing the centre” (*Rise*, 62). Michael Scott Cuthbert argues, “Why have the concept of a French center if France was not, in fact, the central tradition at the time when other traditions were flourishing?” Cuthbert describes the lines of influence not as a hub-and-spoke model from a central locus, but instead a “disordered, crisscrossing net like a black widow’s net.” See Cuthbert, “The Nuremberg and Melk Fragments and the International *Ars Nova,*” *Studi musicali nuova serie* 1 (2010): 23–24 and 23–24n43.

\(^2\) Michael Allsen argues that this incomplete iteration might be called a postlude. He also notes that the tenor part as notated in its single source (Ivrea115) is shorter than the two upper cantus voices by five breves. Jon Michael Allsen, “Style and Intertextuality in the Isorhythmic Motet, 1400–1440” (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 1992), 203 and 203–204n30.
their unique stylistic and textural characteristics do not fit into the stereotypical definition of a French isorhythmic motet.

As it is apparent that Ciconia spent his entire compositional career in Italy, it is rather odd to describe him as a Liègois musician. This separates his musical education, presumably in the French *Ars nova* style, from the actual practice and application of what he must have learned while in Italy. What is lost in this division by national boundaries is a sense of how composers respond to their local environments. Even if Ciconia’s early training in Liège consisted entirely of a diet of *Ars nova* techniques, Ciconia’s motets are more clearly in the equal-cantus style of the motet in Italy as Bent has defined. I suggest that a composer working in the equal-cantus style actually composes in an opposite manner from Egidius’s recommendations. It is clear that the freely composed tenor of the equal-cantus motet was created either simultaneously to the upper parts or even after their construction. Furthermore, it appears that equal-cantus motets were originally all in three voices. Any additional contratenors were likely later additions to these works. In an equal-cantus motet the interplay of voice crossings and echo imitation in the upper voices suggest that these were composed simultaneously and are interdependent.

By the time our music history student turns to the next section of her textbook titled “The Renaissance,” the narrative has firmly entrenched the idea of a central musical tradition that prioritizes and preferences stylistic features originating in France. But this narrative struggles to find a clear link between the 14th and 15th centuries. Thus an imaginary rift is created to

---

23 I provide a more complete biography of Ciconia in Chapter 2, but it should be noted that the commonly held hypothesis today is that Ciconia was born ca. 1370 in Liège. Suzanne Clercx, who wrote one of Ciconia’s first biographies, *Johannes Ciconia: un musicien liégeois et son temps (vers 1335–1411)*, 2 vols. (Bruxelles: Palais des Académies, 1960), may have conflated two different Liègois musicians with the same name and concluded that the composer Ciconia was born around 1335.

separate the stylistic features of the Middle Ages and of the Renaissance. In European history studies there once was a notion that the culture of Europe at end of the Middle Ages was one destined to implode in its own over-ripeness.\textsuperscript{25} Within the narrative of the French Central Tradition in which the appearance of the musical complexity of the \textit{Ars subtilior} replaces the \textit{Ars nova}, the general impression of music at the end of the 14th century is one of overwrought mannerism. From a 21st-century perspective, this overly complex repertoire is only redeemed by the humanistic designs of Du Fay and scrubbed clean by the perfect and pure counterpoint of Franco-Flemish polyphony as exemplified by the works of Josquin des Prez.

The besmirched perspective of the overripe fruit of musical culture at the turn of the 15th century can be removed by keeping the equal-cantus motet in the narrative. An examination of the repertoire at the beginning of the century reveals a continuation of both isorhythmic and equal-cantus compositional styles. These are combined with the more complex rhythmic elements of the \textit{Ars subtilior} and the development of the “florid-motet” style with composers drawing elements from the chanson repertoire.\textsuperscript{26} From this more richly woven tapestry it is much easier to explain the origin of many of the stylistic features of Du Fay’s early works. With a wider ranging view of compositional styles in the first decades of the 15th century, there is no

\textsuperscript{25} See for instance the references to overripe and decaying fruit in the preface to Johan Huizinga’s influential book \textit{The Waning of the Middle Ages} or the color of the language in the book’s first chapter, “The Violent Tenor of Life.” Johan Huizinga, \textit{The Waning of the Middle Ages} (the book is also known as \textit{The Autumn of the Middle Ages}, translated by Rodney J. Payton and Ulrich Mammitzsch [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997]). See also Barbara W. Tuchman’s \textit{A Distant Mirror}, subtitled \textit{The Calamitous 14th Century} (New York: Ballantine Books, 1978).

\textsuperscript{26} See Karl Kügel, “Glorious Sounds for a Holy Warrior: New Light on Codex Turin J.II.9,” \textit{Journal of the American Musicological Society} 65, (2012) for his conclusion that the \textit{Ars subtilior} repertoire of J.II.9 has origins in north Italy and not Cyprus as has been conjectured. Kügel’s discoveries removes the \textit{Ars subtilior} repertoire from the peripheries and “back into the fold” by locating its provenance in the Alps between France and Italy. See also Nosow, “Florid and Equal-Discantus,” 3 and his Chapters 3 and 6 on the use of the term “florid-motet” style.
longer the need to have a disjunct between 31 December 1400 and 1 January 1401. Instead a continuous connection between the two centuries can be explored. This is not to say that composers such as Ciconia whose career straddles the centuries ought to be defined as “transitional.” The idea that Ciconia is intentionally transitioning music from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance does his works as much disservice as considering them peripheral to a central tradition. Ciconia’s motets represent a flowering of the equal-cantus style. This is not just a modern perspective. The presence of Ciconia’s motets in Q15 and again in Ox213, both of which were created many years after his death, indicate the significance and importance (and thus stability) of his works to scribes long after the so-called transition between centuries. Indeed, it might be better to consider Du Fay’s works after 1435 as transitional and developmental in light of Martin Le Franc’s praise of the composer’s ability to create “bright consonance” having taken on the “English manner.”

Thus a new narrative is needed. The new narrative does not diminish the importance of the isorhythmic or proportional motet, but instead enriches the conversation by including other simultaneous strands of musical composition. The following diagrams help to clarify how this falls into place and is a start at helping to integrate works that had previously considered anomalies and peripheral.

---

27 See note 18 above.
The old perspective implies that the *Ars nova* and the works of Vitry have a direct connection to Machaut, which then connect to the French-style works in Q15. The connection to Vitry’s *Petre Clemens*, which because of its unusual isorhythmic arrangement and equal-range cantus voices has been somewhat of an outlier, is obviously linked directly to Vitry. But similar stylistic traits in the related motet, *Rex Karole* (equal-cantus parts, repetition of the tenor rhythm without repetition of the melody) indicate that *Petre Clemens*’ distinctive characteristics are not anomalous. Where then do these works lie in the narrative of the French central tradition?

There is certainly evidence that the early 14th-century notational developments associated with the constellation of *Ars nova* treatises were not restricted to French compositional practices. Marchetto da Padova was aware of the new developments in notation and mensural theory in the north and comments on the significant differences between French and Italian divisions of the
breve in his treatise *Pomerium*. But previous assumptions about the 14th century motet conclude that works in Italian notation and style are not considered strongly related to the early style of the *Ars nova*. In this diagram, the Italian motet is relegated to the farthest position from the strong and direct bands connecting Vitry and Machaut to the French works in Q15.

---

28 The notation that Marchetto da Padova develops in his treatise was primarily used for Italian secular music, particularly the madrigal and caccia genres. Because the Marchettan notation was not used for motets, many works were classified as French in origin and not Italian. See in particular Book II, Essay 3, Chapters 5–7 regarding the differences between the French and Italian manner of the division of imperfect time. Marchetto da Padova, *Lucidarium – Pomerium*, edited by Marco Della Sciucca, Tiziana Sucato, and Carla Vivarelli (Florence: Edizioni del Galluzzo per la Fondazione Ezio Franceschini, 2007): 390–400. I am not suggesting that Marchetto’s *Pomerium* was influenced by the French theoretical developments of the first decades of the 14th century, or even vice versa, but these passages by Marchetto indicate at the least knowledge of the other, despite Marchetto’s system evolving from the Petronian system, which allowed for the free division of the breve into varying groups of semibreves. Carla Vivarelli provides further evidence of the connection of Marchetto with French musical traditions and theoretical explorations. *Pomerium* is dedicated to Robert of Anjou, King of Naples. Despite Marchetto’s connections to the cathedral of Padua during the first decades of the 14th century and although Marchetto claims in the text of *Pomerium* that he wrote the treatise in the house of Rainaldo dei Cinzi in Cesena, Carla Vivarelli argues that Marchetto spent time at the court of Robert both in Naples (1318–1319) and in Avignon (1319–1323 or 1324). Furthermore, the presence of Petrus de Sancto Dionysio both at Robert’s court in the same era as Marchetto is significant. Although Petrus’s treatise *Tractatus de musica* was written after 1323, his thoughts about the French innovations in mensural notation may have been discussed and fermented alongside Marchetto’s theories. Lastly, none other than the French paradigm of the *Ars nova* style, Philip de Vitry, paid honor to Robert of Anjou in in his motet *O canenda – Rex quem metrorum – Rex regum* (PMFC 1, 106–109) with an acrostic in the motetus that spells out “Robertvs.” A further motet attributed to Vitry, *Flos ortus – Celsa cedrus*, (PMFC 5, 42–45) was dedicated to Robert’s brother Louis of Toulouse who was canonized in the early decades of the 14th century. See Carla Vivarelli, “‘Di una pretesa scuola napoletana’: Sowing the Seeds of the Ars nova at the Court of Robert of Anjou,” *Journal of Musicology* 24 (2007): 272–296.

A new perspective makes a much stronger connection between two different strands of motet composition. Both the equal-cantus motet and the isorhythmic motet are direct descendants of the notational developments at the beginning of the 14th century. This new perspective also anchors the two motets, Petre Clemens and Rex Karole, with the equal-cantus style instead of leaving them neither flesh nor fowl as “French motets with anomalous features.” This new perspective keeps the two strands of motet style connected directly to their antecedents in the Ars nova and their descendants in the early 15th century.

**A Matter of Style**

Musical stylistic analysis occurs on three levels. There is a concern for musical and “grammatical” patterns and structures within one single work or a group of related works, say by
a composer or in a single manuscript. One can also consider historical context, here meaning the life of the composer or the political and economic factors that drive artistic production. One also view historical music through the prismatic and often obscuring lens of one’s own contemporary perspectives, by examining an entire corpus of works as a whole, such as Italian motets in the early-15th century, or even an epoch such as the so-called *Ars nova*. In order to pull these three strands together into one strong braid, this study must by necessity first contend with the concept of “style.”

Over one hundred years ago, Guido Adler observed that the notion of style as the central concern of the historian.\(^3\) Adler’s main emphasis was on analysis as the primary investigative tool of musicology. In his methodology, the structure of a work is divided into several headings, these being rhythmic features, tonality, polyphonic construction, word setting, treatment of instruments, and performing practice. Adler rejected the idea of musical heroism that results from reliance upon associating works with individual composer. He instead urged the comparison of work with work, to specify what features the works have in common, and to embrace the organic development of musical style. Adler’s method of style analysis is useful for comparing works both within their own group (an “inductive method”) and for measuring works against a set criteria and establishing them in relation to that criteria (a “deductive method”). Jan LaRue also inclines to the principle of a high degree of conceptual autonomy.\(^3\) In his method one analyzes a work completely, starting with the “observation of every nook and cranny . . . at

---


various magnifications.” Thus one gradually zooms out to each level of connection from impression to phrase to section to work to composer to milieu.\(^{32}\)

I use both inductive and deductive methodologies in my style analysis, but I also include a third parameter. In a similar fashion to Knud Jeppesen’s work on dissonance in the music of Palestrina, I do not compare works, but searching for features in separate works independent from one another without any pre-established criteria, until I can build some sort of case for comparison (an “empiric-descriptive method”).\(^{33}\) Jeppesen’s methodology presents the interesting possibility of creating musical grammars that rely upon the music as it is rather than on cultural and historical contexts. Margaret Bent’s study on musical grammar in early music suggests that, despite many of the things that might obscure the “music itself” (i.e., inappropriate transcriptions, 19th-century harmonic pedagogy, modern listening tastes), there is a way to recover a work’s grammatical sense.\(^{34}\)

The implication here is that styles of music are autonomous in that their internal logic can be explored without reference to external matters.\(^{35}\) This is a compelling concept, but it ignores the social role of music. Culture and society can greatly shape not only how music is heard and read by 21st-century listeners and scholars, but also how music was created in its own era. This can make analysis phenomenally convoluted. As a consequence, it seems that early music

\(^{32}\) LaRue, *Guidelines*, 2.


\(^{34}\) Margaret Bent, “The Grammar of Early Music: Preconditions for Analysis,” in *Tonal Structures in Early Music*, edited by Cristle Collins Judd (New York: Garland, 1998), 16. Bent is responding to Philip Brett’s article “Facing the Music” (*Early Music* 10 [1982]: 348) in which he argues that close readings and analysis are needed to synthesize works on a whole. I was initially reluctant to use this phrase (*pace*, Richard Taruskin), but I am not implying any sort of anachronistic view of early-15th century music as “absolute music.”

scholars have a tendency to regard solely analytical studies with a great deal of suspicion. One cannot get inside the head of Ciconia or Du Fay and it is impossible to ascertain their motivations for creating their works in the fashion that they chose. Still, I argue what there is much to be gained from close readings of the music (much like one would do a close reading in English literature, which Philip Brett happily points out), while still acknowledging the work’s cultural and historical context.\(^{36}\)

Style analysis is further complicated by nationalistic essentialism, which tends to allow the classification of style to be ruled by national boundaries. This leads to a tendency to identify works as “Italian” or “Franco-Flemish” without considering that those geographic identities create false lines of demarcation. The reality is that those lines are blurry at best if any lines really exist at all.\(^{37}\) In this study I argue that composers who were originally from France, Flanders, and other regions north of the Alps, but who composed in a style more similar to early 15th-century Veneto composers indicate musical cross-fertilization. Their work also indicates that there was some sort of contact between musicians north and south either through travel and employment in Italian courts or through manuscript transmission. The features of multiple regional styles are absorbed and reissued in new and interesting ways that contribute to style as a whole. It also reflects some sort of intention on the part of the composer, either because of commission or because of the necessity of employment. We must not only account for cultural practice, but also the function a work serves.

In this dissertation in order to prevent anachronistic nationalist definitions I have tried to avoid terms such as “Italian” or “French” motet. Instead, I have relied upon descriptive words

---

\(^{36}\) Brett, “Facing the Music,” 348.

such as “equal-cantus,” “double-statement,” and “ceremonial” or “honorific” to define the primary differences in motet style in the 15th century. This reflects not the origin of the composer or source of the work, but instead the structure and functional purpose of the motet.

What is a Motet?

Alejandro Enrique Planchart has often said to me, “a motet is anything that the composer’s mother says it is.” This is an apt description because the concept of a motet as a genre is a continuously changing idea and subject to many different definitions. There is some evidence that 14th-century musicians and scribes considered a motet as something distinct from other musical genres, but what exactly characterizes a motet and distinguishes it from other musical genres is variable. For instance the Trémoïlle index from a lost source (ca. 1376) separates the motets from other genres under the rubric, “Motez ordenz et escriz ci aprés.” Here the idea of “motez” includes Mass movements and caccie in addition to what now might be considered a motet proper. Two 15th-century sources use the term “motet” in their indices: ModB (ca. 1448) and D-B MS Mus. 40021 (ca. 1485–1500). Records from the confraternity of The Illustrious Brotherhood of Our Blessed Lady (Illustre Lieve Vrouwe Broederschap) in ‘sHertogenbosch show that they received four works that may have been based upon a liber motetorum in St. Donatian’s in Bruges. It is apparent that even if scribes do not explicitly label

38 Nosow discusses the various early 15th-century uses of the term “motet” in both treatises and in manuscript sources in “Florid and Equal-Discantus,” 20–34.
40 Cumming, Motet in the Age of Du Fay, 48.
41 The records are printed in A. Smijers, “De Illustre Lieve Vrouwe Broederschap te ‘s-Hertogenbosch. II. Rekeningen van Sint Jan 1399 tot Sint Jan 1425,” Tijdschrift der Vereeniging
as motets works that today would be classified in this genre, there was a conceit of grouping like
genres together. For instance, Q15 groups Mass movements and motets separately, with secular
songs filling in empty spaces on a page.42

In the multitude of these examples, the idea of the motet seems to be a catchall for many
things. The motet is neither a sacred nor a secular genre. Motets can be both high art and popular
music. They can be simultaneously wildly complex and yet stupendously simple. Motets can
have one voice or many. They can be in any language or any combination of languages. Yet,
there is still somehow the concept of a “motet” that separates it from other genres of music.

Margaret Bent equates the term “motet” with genres such as symphony or sonata.43 These
are terms that categorize ever-changing musical phenomena. For instance, James Hepokoski and
Warren Darcy contend with a plethora of diverse approaches in the analysis of the sonata form,
claiming that too rigid an analysis leads to limitations in the understanding of the genre.44 In a
similar fashion, Bent considers both historical categorization and unifying forms or structures
such as isorhythm in the motet. Using Bent’s model, scholarship on the motet can be broad and
include works that are extremely unmotet-like or it can be completely circumscribed. For
instance, Bent has cautioned against defining any motet solely upon isorhythmic structure just as
I would warn against defining a motet only by historical provenance. Bent’s concern is that by

voor Noord-Nederlands Muziekgeschiedenis 12 (1926): 59. See also Reinhard Strohm, Music in

42 In all of these examples there is no division between motets that are isorhythmic and those that
are non-isorhythmic. This demonstrates that this was not a significant distinction known in the
14th century.


44 James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and
Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata (New York: Oxford University Press,
2006).
privileging the isorhythmic motet, other motet forms become implicitly inferior.\textsuperscript{45} Robert Nosow reiterates the consternation that Bent expresses. His apprehension is that the common division of motet types into isorhythmic and non-isorhythmic tends to set one variety negatively against the other.\textsuperscript{46} In this bicameral description of two types of motet the inclusion of “non” in front of the term isorhythm does not support an understanding of what the motet is, but only what it is not.

Julie Cumming’s book on the motet in the age of Du Fay begins with an exposition on the definition of the term “motet.” She adapts ideas from literary genre theory for her own use. Her first definition is thus: “The motet in the fifteenth century assimilated many of the kinds of Latin-texted polyphony. A genre so comprehensive can have but a weak unitary force. Indeed the motet largely ceased to function as a genre in the ordinary way.”\textsuperscript{47} Composers and scribes certainly used the term freely in the 14th and 15th centuries. Although subtle differences in function or texts of sacred works were not rigid definitions for genre boundaries, Cumming argues for two different meanings for the term “motet” as it is used in the 15th century. The first is that “motet” can simply mean “polyphony.” A second, more specific definition is “a genre without a prescribed liturgical function (such as the polyphonic Mass) that was used to adorn devotions.”\textsuperscript{48} To support this theory, Cumming quotes Tinctoris: a motet is at least “a composition of moderate length, to which words of any kind are set, but more often those of a sacred nature.”\textsuperscript{49} Cumming herself is quick to point out that this definition expands the genre to an enormous size. Therefore one must look to the various distinct subgenres of the motet that

\begin{itemize}
  \item[\textsuperscript{45}]Bent, “What is Isorhythm?” 132.
  \item[\textsuperscript{46}]Nosow, “Florid and Equal-Discontus,” 1.
  \item[\textsuperscript{47}]Cumming, Motet in the Age of Du Fay, 7.
  \item[\textsuperscript{48}]Cumming, \textit{Motet in the Age of Du Fay}, 60. Andrew Kirkman has more recently rejected the idea that the term motet was so specific in the 15th century. See Andrew Kirkman, “The Invention of the Cyclic Mass,” \textit{Journal of the American Musicological Society} 54 (2001): 10–12.
  \item[\textsuperscript{49}]Cumming, Motet in the Age of Du Fay, 7.
\end{itemize}
have their roots in earlier motet types and in other genres. The distinct method of her book is to critically engage with the multifarious subgenres of the motet in the first half of the 15th century.

Although Cumming answers many questions about the origins of the motet genre and the multiple definitions of the term both ancient and modern, I find that there are far too many subgenres in her compendium of genre types. These multifarious types—over 50 different kinds of motet—loose their efficacy. Overlapping terminology such as “motet-style motets” also troubles me. Many of Cumming’s subgenres are defined both by provenance and structure (Italian double statement structure, French isorhythmic, English isorhythmic). Some works are defined only by provenance (Italian, English), by form (Isorhythmic, Canon), or by other relevant features (Cut-circle, Cantilena, Song-motet, Retrospective double-discantus). By having so many subgenres, Cumming provides a specific and useful tool to categorize non-liturgical religious works from a broad selection of repertoire. But what is lost is a sense of continuity between different subgenres defined by structure, by provenance, or by mensural practice.

In this study I have chosen to use the term “equal-cantus” motet to shift away from focus on tenor structure (i.e. isorhythmic versus non-isorhythmic), but as a consequence I am left with no one appropriate term to describe motets outside of this structure. An equal-cantus Italian motet may or may not be isorhythmic. Many motets of French provenance in the late 14th and early 15th centuries are not wholly isorhythmic at all. The only responsible step is to use terminology that may be weak (equal-cantus versus proportional motets) and continue to contemplate other possibilities for better descriptors in the future.

50 See Cumming’s index of motets in *Motet in the Age of Du Fay*, 384–399.
51 Bent expresses an expectation of a future period of “experimental terminology” that would be more open to the variety of early 15th-century compositional techniques. See “What is Isorhythm?” 138.
In a dissertation on a musical genre of the early 15th century, it seems negligent to ignore other contemporaneous genres such as Mass movements or songs like madrigals and ballate, but necessity dictates that some sort of line must be drawn somewhere. Nevertheless, there is ample evidence that there was much cross-fertilization between varieties of genres. Particular imitative techniques for instance are found in both Mass movements and songs in addition to motets. Unfortunately, the expansion of this study to include other early 15th-century musical genres would be prohibitive, but will provide a rich and full portfolio for future research.

**The Equal-Cantus Motet**

Instead of focusing on a simple definition of motet, it may be more constructive to examine stylistic practices used by an associated groups of composers linked by their works’ provenance and date. Motets from northern Italy in the early decades of the 15th century are distinct from motets elsewhere in terms of function, texture, form, and other specific small-scale features. This is clearly a list of generalized characteristics, but as this study will demonstrate they are distinctive features typical of the equal-cantus style. These qualities appear in the earliest examples of the style and continue through around 1440 when exterior characteristics from English compositional style and from the chanson repertoire change the features of the motet. Although Bent has already defined many of the features of the equal-cantus motet, they are worth reiterating and clarifying.\(^{52}\) Her study of the 14th-century Italian motet includes works through Ciconia, but she has consistently reiterated that the style extended beyond the turn of the 15th century and through the next generation of composers and up through the early works of Du

\(^{52}\) For more on the equal-cantus repertoire from around 1300 to 1420, see Bent, “Fourteenth-Century Italian Motet.”
Fay.\textsuperscript{53} This can be seen specifically in the cosmopolitan motet repertoire of Q15 and Ox213, where one finds equal-cantus motets alongside motets in a modern florid style (as in Du Fay’s \textit{Flos florum}, Q15 ff. 267v–268) and in the English cantilena style (as in Dunstaple’s \textit{Quam pulchra es}, Q15 ff. 313v–314) as well as interesting blends of features combined in new and innovative ways.\textsuperscript{54} In this study I intentionally overlap with the end of Bent’s list of 14th-century Italian motets by including the entire motet opus of Ciconia. It is remarkable that Ciconia’s repertoire is so extensively copied in both Q15 and Ox213 some ten to twenty years after his death. Although this older repertory included texts for long-dead dignitaries, its inclusion indicates that Ciconia’s equal-cantus style was still viable and worthy of copy and updating with the addition of contratenors and by modernizing the notation so many years after the relevance of the motets’ topics.

For this study I have chosen to examine four basic categories of motet characteristics, function, texture, form, and small-scale features. In each category there are several qualities that differentiate the equal-cantus style from other motet subgenres as follows:

\textit{Texture}

An obvious primary defining element of the equal-cantus style is that the upper voices are equal in range, texture, here meaning melodic motion and relative speed of note values, length of

\textsuperscript{53} Margaret Bent, “Continuity and Transformation of Repertory and Transmission in Early 15\textsuperscript{th}-Century Italy: The Two Cultures,” in \textit{Kontinuität und Transformation in der italienischen Vokalmusik zwischen Due- und Quattrocento}, ed. Sandra Dieckmann, Oliver Huck, Signe Rotter-Broman, and Alba Scotti (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2007), 225.

melody, and length of text. This is true even if the motet has two different texts set by the upper voices. The composers of equal-cantus motets generally matched musical phrases with each line of text, changing the melodic and rhythmic motion to differentiate one stanza from another.

There is also perceptible attention to the meaning of the texts. Certain composers use texture to highlight key phrases or names through repetition, call-and response, block sonorities, or even create complex subtexts using contrapuntal interweaving and intertextuality. As a result of the equality their of upper voices over a lower tenor, equal-cantus motets have distinctive widely spaced cadences of an interval succession of $\frac{10}{6}$ resolving to $\frac{12}{8}$ instead of the typical narrower $\frac{6}{3}$ to $\frac{8}{5}$ cadence found in the hierarchical proportional motet.

Before the 15th century, the typical structure of the equal-cantus motet was in three voices—two equal upper voices and a lower tenor. Although there are examples of additional fourth voice contratenors, most of these appear to be later additions. Bent has shown that the contratenors of equal-cantus motets are inessential to the grammar of the work and some are so poorly constructed that they detract from the clarity and counterpoint of the music. This raises

---

55 In general, I have observed that this means that the upper ranges have the same clef, often C1. But I have also tried to bear in mind works in which the upper voices share a range within a step both on the highest and lowest end of the register regardless of the clef.

56 One of the distinctive elements in these cadences is that either cantus I or cantus II can resolve on the higher pitch.

57 Particularly compelling evidence of these contratenors as later additions can be found in the two different versions of Ciconia’s *Ut te per omnes*, which has a three-voice arrangement in Q15 and an additional contratenor voice that is added to the version in Ox213. Ciconia’s *O felix templum*, undergoes a similar transformation within Q15 itself. The scribe adds a four-voice contratenor in a stage II copy of the source (f. 341), but this was rejected in a stage III version of the motet (ff. 252v–253). There is another copy of the three-voice arrangement in Ox213. Bent, “Fourteenth-Century Italian Motet,” 100–102.

the question as to why the scribe of Q15 added the additional voice in the first place. There are no additional contratenors in Egidi, the Paduan fragments (I-Pu MS 1106 and I-Pu MS 1475) or in SL2211. The first known additions of contratenors to preexisting three-voice works is in Q15. Margaret Bent and Andrew Westerhaus both suggest that these additions may have been to update the Italian pieces to make them seem more French. Westerhaus further implies that the addition of a fourth voice by a later composer is either in homage to the original composer or an attempt to modernize the works of a favorite musical mentor.59

In general, the tenor of an equal-cantus motet is rhythmically faster relative to the tenor of a proportional motet. The tenors of Machaut’s motets, for instance, generally move in longas and breves, but most of Ciconia’s motet tenors move in breves and semibreves, and even accelerating rhythmically into passages of minims. Whether or not the tenor is composed or borrowed, the tenor of an equal-cantus motet is not merely the compositional foundation for the structure of the motet. The tenor is used as a melodic and rhythmic counterpoint to the upper voices. Newly composed tenors have a tendency to be melodically more angular than their counterparts that are based upon plainsong.60 The tenor is also allowed moments of full participation in the prevailing texture of the motet by moving in the same rhythmic motion of the upper voices, i.e. in semibreves and minims. At other times the tenor will initiate imitative passages that the upper voices echo in sequence. The underlaying of a text in the tenor voice in these examples supports the theory that the tenor part was created in response to the melodic shaping and text underlay of the cantus parts.61

60 See for instance a tenor as used in Antonius de Civitate’s O felix flos (EFCM 5, 25–28), which tends to function as vertical support for the sonorities of the upper voices.
61 An example of this kind of selective text setting is found in Antonius Romanus’s Ducalis sedes – Stirps Mocenico (EFCM 6, 166–171).
Most equal-cantus motets start in tempus perfectum and many never change mensuration.\textsuperscript{62} Although equal-cantus composers preferred the static single mensuration, there is a common proclivity to temporarily shift modus into a duple pulse. These temporary shifts of modus can occur in all voices for the duration of one tempora or may even appear as simultaneous divisions of the tempus causing the feeling of a syncopated two against three pulse.

*Function*

Most of the texts of equal-cantus motets likely refer to specific events or ceremonies.\textsuperscript{63} Even when a poem is overtly directed to a saint, it is likely that all of the texts were intended as honorific either through a connection of similar names or name saints, such as the multiple references to Peter in Ciconia’s *O Petre Christi discipule*, simultaneously pointing to St. Peter, Pietro Filargo da Candia (Pope Alexander V), and either Bishop Pietro Emiliani of Vicenza or Bishop Pietro Marcello of Padua.\textsuperscript{64} The inclusion of these motets in manuscripts often prepared long after the death of the honoree is intriguing. The question of why these motets were still significant to the scribe may give modern scholars clues about music transmission and performance in the early decades of the 15th century. Instead of being an ephemeral repertory, there was apparently some longevity in the value of these works.\textsuperscript{65} It will likely be impossible to

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{62} Bent shows that the prevailing mensuration of the 14th-century Italian motet is .p., which translates to the French equivalent ○. See Bent, “Fourteenth-century Italian Motet,” 103 and 107. One of the few French motets of the 14th century in ○ is the anonymous *Rex Karole*.
\item \textsuperscript{63} There are a few exceptions, but these generally address topics such as the Virgin Mary like the anonymous motet *O Maria virgo davitica* (Q15, ff. 262v–263, St. Emmeram, ff. 56v–57, and I-Pu MS 1106) or other sacred topics such as the Easter motet by Grenon *Plasmatoris humani generis – Verbigine mater ecclesia* (Q15, ff. 259v–260).
\item \textsuperscript{64} See Chapter 3 of this dissertation for more about *O Petre*.
\item \textsuperscript{65} For instance the motet *Comes Flandrie* has a specifically Flemish political text, but it is found in sources well outside the expected geographic reach of its influence. Michael Scott Cuthbert
\end{itemize}
ever fully understand the reasons why the scribe of Q15 included motets in honor of long-dead personages, but by the early 15th century there seems to be a long tradition of using works that are extremely remote from their origins. Especially notable are works that were copied around 1435–1440 (in the third stage of Q15 and in Ox213) for the deposed and disgraced Carrara family such as Ciconia’s *O felix templum*, which was likely intended for Bishop Stefano Carrara of Padua, who lead the diocese for three years between 1402 and 1405. There are no overt references to the bishop; thus one possible conclusion is that the motet had some continued use for the feast of St. Stephen. Or perhaps the scribe was demonstrating his preference for older three-voice equal-cantus motets. These hypotheses reflect ongoing speculation about the

---


“The example of the pilgrimage to the Sibyl of Montefortino invites us to keep an open mind to the idea that cultural contact between Northern Europe and Central Italy could occur without the mediation of either Rome or Northern Italy, and moreover as a result of individual behavior rather than through the usual channels of ecclesiastical and diplomatic connections.

“We may also find it surprising that a motet with such a specifically Flemish political text as *Comes Flandrie* could have appealed to an audience in Central Italy. The pervasive notion that medieval audiences valued text to the same extent as music, or even more, could lead us to overestimate the importance of this text to an Italian audience. It is, on the contrary, quite possible that the Italian audience of *Comes Flandrie* was mostly interested in the music and did not care more about the Latin text than a modern audience would. The late Middle Ages offer a number of examples of successful compositions that were appreciated for their musical qualities alone, even in cases where the text is wholly inappropriate. A case in point is the ballade *Par les bons Gedeon et Sanson* celebrating the Avignon pope Clement VII which is transmitted in the Boverio fragments (I-Tn MS T.III.2) with Clement designated as “anti-pape:” clearly a piece copied for its music rather than for its message.”

The fourth-voice contratenor was added in stage II of the compilation of Q15, but then summarily rejected in a recopy of the work in stage III. See Margaret Bent, *Bologna Q15: The Making and Remaking of a Musical Manuscript*, 2 Vols. (Lucca: Libreria Musicale Italiana, 2008), I:214.
reasons for the Q15 scribe’s interest in older equal-cantus works, particularly those by Ciconia.\textsuperscript{67} The scribe obviously made deliberate choices for the repertoire included in the manuscript that are revealed in the discarding, recopying, and rearranging of the collection over the space of fifteen to twenty years.

Form

Because the principle defining feature of the equal-cantus motet is based on the vertical arrangement of voices, there are significant differences in the structure of the various forms of these works. Because many equal-cantus motets are freely composed and there is no controlling tenor structure such as repetition of melody or rhythm, the inventiveness on the part of the composer is evident. He is challenged to create a sense of unity and functional coherence without relying on a preconceived structural foundation.

Some equal-cantus motets are isorhythmic according to the strictest definition of the term.\textsuperscript{68} In other words, these works are marked by a single rhythmic repetition of the tenor, whether a newly invented part or a borrowed chant melody. In these works there is no repetition of the melody (color) nor is there any diminution. These double-statement motets are distinguishable in terms of their construction from their hierarchical French isorhythmic cousins.

Whether these motets have a preexisting rhythmic form or not, both subgenres are marked by a structure articulated by shifts of texture. In a manner likely borrowed from the idioms of Italian song—particularly madrigals and caccie—many equal-cantus motets have extended untexted melismas at the beginnings and endings of sections, a characteristic that is


\textsuperscript{68} Bent, “What is Isorhythm?” 122–123 and 133.
also found in motets in Ivrea115.69 These melismatic passages have the effect of differentiating both musical and poetic structures. These melismatic sections can be further marked not only by the paucity of text, but also by a reduced texture from three or four voices to one or two. Duets or solos introducing extended passages of echo imitation of this kind are most commonly found in the two-voice introductory section or introitus of the work, often situated outside of the rhythmic frame of a double-statement motet. Melismatic cadences, on the other hand, are marked by expanding and contracting rhythmic and melodic modules that drive to major cadences, usually at the midpoint or the end of the work.70 Overall, the early 15th-century equal-cantus motet is typically composed with a rhythmic and melodic ebb-and-flow wave motion. Episodes of great rhythmic activity are balanced by moments of sonorous repose; large portions of text flow rapidly at one moment only to be countered by a single syllable stretched over many tempora; widely spaced four-voice sonorities are juxtaposed with solo phrases echoed from one voice to another.

Small-scale characteristics

At the most focused microscopic level, equal-cantus motets typically share a number of principal features that happen at the smallest scale. Several of these characteristics show up over and over through the entire repertoire of the early 15th century. One of these small-scale features is a tendency to shift from a prevailing triple-pulse perfect tempus into moments of duple rhythm. Another small-scale feature is the use of displacement syncopation where one voice

69 See for instance the introductory passage in Philippe de Vitry’s Petre clemens – Lugentium – Non est inventus, PMFC 1, 97–103.

70 See as an example Cristoforus de Monte’s Plaude decus. Transcribed by Bobby Wayne Cox, “The Motets of MS Bologna, Civico Museo Bibliografico Musicale, Q15” (PhD diss., North Texas State University, 1977), 2:208–222.
echoes an imitative passage of another, but displaced by a minim or a semibreve. Equal-cantus motets are typically arranged with careful attention to the interaction of rhythmic and melodic imitation (both exact echo imitation and sequential patterns). Vertical sonorities maintain adherence to the rules of 14th-century counterpoint in which consonances are based upon perfect fourths, fifths, and octaves, but there is also the preference for long pre-cadential sonorities arranged in thirds and sixths that “repose” for a tempus or two and then explode into a period of rhythmic activity instead of cadencing at a pause. Thirds also appear in passages that resemble trumpet fanfares, which follow the natural brass harmonic sequence. References to fanfares give the honorific nature of the motet texts an extra boost by including a ceremonial affect for the music.

**On the Sources**

Any study of 14th- and 15th-century music relies on musical sources as primary documents. Manuscripts assist the modern scholar by providing clues about historical events and key political and religious figures. This is true not only of the texts of the musical works as they are written in the sources, but also of the documents themselves. The creation and accumulation of manuscripts by scribes, archivists, and collectors gives insight into the musical world of the late middle ages. Occasional errors notwithstanding, these sources are often the only key to knowing who certain composers were and what their careers may have been like.

---

71 Although there may be some concern with the use of the term “syncopation,” which is a loaded word, especially as it is associated with the omission of the strong beat within a meter that causes a loss of balance and the lack of rhythmic security as heard in jazz and rock. Willi Apel instead describes the use of syncopation in the 14th century as “a temporary displacement, rather than omission, of the strong beat.” See Willi Apel, *The Notation of Polyphonic Music 900–1600* (Cambridge, MA: The Medieval Academy of America, 1953), 414.
Ciconia’s motets only occur in Q15, Ox213, BU2216, I-Sc 36, and possibly two in in I-Pu MS 1106. The most significant source for this present study is the manuscript, Q15. This massive manuscript, probably created by a single scribe over the course of fifteen or twenty years, contains a wide range of musical styles. The manuscript contains not only some of the most progressive works of the time, but also collects a number of older works from the earliest decades of the 15th century. This single source contains hundreds of works including complete Mass settings, individual Mass movements, over 100 motets, hymns, Magnificat settings, French secular songs, and laude. Many works are unica and the composers represent some of the most notable composers of the era. Best represented is Du Fay, joined by Johannes de Lymburgia, Ciconia, Arnold de Lantins, Salinis, Antonius Romanus, Brassart, Feragut, Franchois, Loqueville, Antonio da Teramo, Antonius de Civitate Austrie, Binchois, Dunstable, and many others. The wide range of the origins of these composers indicates the intentionality of the scribe who chose to bring together this international conglomeration of what he obviously thought was the most worthy of the repertoire available in northern Italy in the first half of the 15th century.

Despite the great value of the collection of works in Q15, exclusive referral to the motets in this single source could be misleading. Because Q15 was compiled by one person, it only reflects the taste of that single scribe and his selection and editing of the works are reflective of

---

72 As only one motet, Ciconia’s *O virum omnimoda*, is copied into I-Sc 36 it does not really feature in this study. For more on this source see Michael Scott Cuthbert, “Trecento Fragments and Polyphony Beyond the Codex” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2006), 28 and 385; Pedro Memelsdorff, “Siena 36 revisita: Paolo da Firenze, Johannes Ciconia, e l’interrelazione di polifonia e trattatistica in fonti del primo Quattrocento,” *Acta Musicologica* 76 (2004): 159–191; and also F. Alberto Gallo, “Alcune fonti poco note di musica teorica e pratica,” *L’ars nova italiana del trecento* 2 (1968): 73–76.

73 A single scribe theory is argued by Bent, *Q15*, 1:96–106.
both his preferences and his accessibility to sources and the limitations of geography.\textsuperscript{74} Thus, the examination of several other sources is a necessity for the completeness of this study.

Like Q15, the manuscript Ox213 has been thought to be the work of a single scribe.\textsuperscript{75} The parallels between these two manuscripts are numerable. David Fallows dates the compilation of Ox213 around 1428–1437 and thus basically within the dates of the creation of Q15. Ox213 is similar in size to Q15 in terms of content (Mass movements, motets, laude, and secular songs in both French and Italian), but most of these are shorter songs rather than longer Mass movements.\textsuperscript{76} What is notable is that the similar readings of the works shared between these manuscripts demonstrate that the two scribes were likely working within the same musical communities that used these sources and were drawing on shared repertory.\textsuperscript{77}

The third main manuscript of polyphony from the Veneto of the early 15th century is BU2216. Like Ox213, this source has been left basically intact from the time it was compiled. This is a large codex containing mostly sacred music most of which was written down by one person. There are only a few works in this source that are relevant to this study, but its concordances with Q15 and Ox213 places it with the two north Italian manuscripts in one group.\textsuperscript{78}

\textsuperscript{74} Bent, \textit{Q15}, 1:1. See also Bent, “Contemporary Perception,” 185, especially her comment that the scribe is a “native Italian who shows . . . a strongly francophile tendency.”


\textsuperscript{76} Ox213 contains 326 total compositions; Q15 has 329.

\textsuperscript{77} Bent, \textit{Q15}, 1:19.

\textsuperscript{78} There are three equal-cantus motets in BU2216: Ciconia’s \textit{O virum omnimoda – O lux et decus – O beate Nicholae} (ff. 36v–37), the anonymous motet \textit{O anima Christi} (ff. 37v–38), and Antonius Romanus’s \textit{Ducalis sedes inclita – Stirps . . . Veneti} (ff. 38v–39). Of all of the
The final source for Ciconia’s motets is the fragment I-Pu MS 1106. This source consists of theological writings with polyphony appearing in the flyleaves. There are six motets in this group some of which are fragmentary and incomplete. Two motets are possibly by Ciconia, *Padu . . . serenans* and *O proles Yspanie*, both of which exist as cantus I and tenor voice only. The motet *Laudibus dignus* is possibly by Jacopo da Bologna. This source also contains one of the few motets attributed to Francesco Landini, *Principem nobilissime*. Finally, there are two anonymous works, both of which transmit all known voice parts. *Hic est precursor* exists with only in two parts and may have been conceived as a rare two-voice motet. In addition to I-Pu MS 1106, the motet *O Maria virgo davitica* is also in Q15 and St. Emmeram, but not in this unique four-voice arrangement.

---

79 Cuthbert, “Trecento Fragments,” 95 and Dragan Plamenac, “Another Paduan Fragment of Trecento Music,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 8 (1955): 165–174. This source is often grouped with three other fragments (I-Pu MS 675, I-Pu MS 1225, and I-Pu MS 1283) all in the scribal hand of Rolandus de Casali and can be traced to the Abbey of S. Giustina in Padua. Of the four, I-Pu MS 1106 is the only part that contains motets.

80 Cuthbert, “Trecento Fragments,” 189–193. Cuthbert urges the use of the term “S. Giustina Project” for the ten fragments that he has identified as one enterprise by the abbey around 1405–1410. His argument is that by simply calling them the “Paduan Fragments,” any additional fragments could get grouped with this collection without careful scrutiny of their relationships to the existing sources. Cuthbert, “Trecento Fragments,” 218.

81 *Laudibus dignus* is attributed to Jacopo through the style of composition and the acrostic “Luchinus dux” in the text of cantus II (PMFC 13, 245–246). This tribute to Luchino Visconti links the motet to two other works in honor of Luchino that are by Jacopo, the motet *Lux purpurata* (PMFC 13, 194–196) and the madrigal *Lo lume vostro* (PMFC 6, 104–105).

82 The connection to Landini is only from he only surviving voice of this motet, which contains the text, “me Franciscum peregre canentem.”

83 I discuss this two-voice arrangement in Chapter 3.

84 Plamenac, “Another Paduan Fragment,” 168.
One further source is worth mentioning despite the fact that Ciconia’s works are not represented. The Florentine manuscript, in SL2211, is a parchment probably written by one scribe.\textsuperscript{85} The source was discovered by Frank A. D’Accone in 1982, although the palimpsest state of the manuscript makes it barely legible.\textsuperscript{86} SL2211 was written in Florenence around 1420 and is not associated with a university or a court, but it is related to Florentine pride in Italian polyphonic compositions much like its predecessor, the Squarcialupi Codex.\textsuperscript{87} The final gathering or gatherings contained mostly motets, with some of the newest works replicated in Q15 (Salinis’ \textit{Si nichil} and \textit{Jesu salvator}). This source also includes older works such as Jacopo’s \textit{Lux purpurata}, and the anonymous \textit{Leonarde pater, Flos ortus – Celsa cedrus, Apta caro plumis ingenii – Flos virginum decet et species – Alma redemptoris, Rex Karole, and Impudenter – Virtutibus} possibly by the venerable Vitry. It is not surprising to find these older motets in this source, as these are works that were known and copied and recopied in northern Italian manuscripts in the early decades of the 15th century.

In this study I am primarily interested in the analysis of the equal-cantus repertory. I focus on large-scale structures and textures as well as the extreme details of distinctive rhythmic constructions and characteristic melodic shapes and movements. To this end I focus on the in-depth study of manuscripts, which function as first-hand accounts of the repertoire, musical


\textsuperscript{87} See Nádas, “Transmission,” 486.
culture, and performance practices. Modern transcriptions of these works aid me by allowing a clear overview of the grammar and structure of the elaborate counterpoint of these works. I also engage on an aural level, both as a singer and a listener, allowing the musical experience to guide my understanding of these works on a physical and personal level. Among my conclusions is that Ciconia’s motets are more significant than has ever been expressed before. As exemplars of the 14th-century Italian motet style, his works are the pinnacle of a distinctive musical tradition. As one of the most widely known composers in the early 15th century, he is the representative example of the equal-cantus motet style. Because of characteristic features that correspond between Ciconia’s motets and other works by Du Fay and the intervening generation of composers, the influence of these compositions should not be underestimated.
CHAPTER TWO
JOHANNES CICONIA’S MOTETS AS EXEMPLARS OF THE EQUAL-CANTUS STYLE

D espite a relative dearth of documents that provide much evidence of Ciconia’s life and career, there still remains no doubt of his influence on other composers of the early 15th century and significance to our understanding of the early 15th-century motet style today. His embrace of compositional practices that he adopted while working in Italy is reflected in his surprisingly large corpus of works that survive today. The study of these works has been increasingly enabled by greater access, both digitally and in print, to replications of the sources that transmit these works. ¹ By examining the stylistic features of early 15th-century Italian motets and their precedents in the 14th-century, it is clear that there was influence from earlier precedents on Ciconia’s corpus. It is also clear from the compositional characteristics of Ciconia’s motets, that he subsequently had great influence on the works of other composers in the first decades of the new century.

In many ways Ciconia’s works can be considered the apex of the equal-cantus motet style. His creative use of features such as the double-statement rhythmic structure, melodic and rhythmic sequences, attention to text setting, and more, shows him to be not only attentive to a regional compositional practice when he arrived in Italy as a young member of a cardinal’s familia, but also a creative composer willing to take risks with structure, form, and tradition.

¹ See in particular the printed facsimile editions of Q15, (Margaret Bent, editor, Bologna Q15: The Making and Remaking of a Musical Manuscript, 2 Vols. (Lucca: Libreria Musicale Italiana, 2008), and Ox213 (David Fallows, ed., Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Canon. Misc. 213 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), and especially the remarkable work of Julia Craig-McFeely and DIAMM.
Before discussing Ciconia’s motets in more detail, it is prudent to take a closer look at his life and known associates. From this I will establish a basic compositional chronology of his motets and only then will discuss these works in some detail by describing their characteristics that fulfill the parameters for defining these motets exemplars of the equal-cantus style. In this chapter, I discuss the known equal-cantus motet by Ciconia including those that remain fragmentary. In Chapter 3, I will delve into the more innovative compositional techniques used by Ciconia that demonstrate his skill as a creative musician. Although some of these works are only doubtfully attributed to Ciconia, I have decided to include them all for discussion for completeness of study.

A Brief Biography of Ciconia

Johannes Ciconia is self-identified in two early 15th-century Paduan documents as the son of another Johannes Ciconia from the town of Liège. Suzanne Clercx in her seminal biography of Ciconia apparently conflated the lives of this father and son both with the baptismal name of Johan (the elder born in 1335). In the time since Clercx’s initial conclusions were drawn, closer examination of documents related to Ciconia point to a career begun no earlier than the 1390s. Thus the prevailing notion is that there were at least two different people with the

---

2 Much of the biographical information on Ciconia that follows comes from the notes to PMFC 24 by Margaret Bent and Anne Hallmark, the New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians including authors John Nádas, Giuliano di Bacco, Margaret Bent, and David Fallows (Giuliano Di Bacco, et al., “Ciconia, Johannes,” Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online (Oxford University Press), accessed 8 April 2015, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/40689), and numerous studies by the same authors. I am indebted greatly to them all for their advice and support of my research.
same name, probably a father and a son.\textsuperscript{3} Ciconia’s early musical training and life are less well documented than his career in Padua, but a Liégeois chronicle documents several illegitimate children of one Johan de Chiwogne, a canon of St. Johan.\textsuperscript{4} Considering a document later grants Ciconia dispensation for his illegitimate birth, it may be that the composer was one of these children of Meneer Chiwogne. Furthermore, a \textit{duodenum} by the name of Johannes is documented at the collegiate church of St. Jean l’Évangéliste in 1385. This young man is probably the composer of the works discussed in this study.

Much about Ciconia’s career from 1385 until the beginning of his Paduan years circa 1401 is speculative. There is a letter dated April 1391 that states that a \textit{clericus} by the name of Johannes Ciconia was in Rome. This same letter identified Ciconia as part of the retinue of Cardinal Philippe d’Alençon and granted him a prebend at the Church of the Holy Cross in Liège.\textsuperscript{5} Another document from later in 1391 states that Ciconia was a witness at the cardinal’s titular church, Santa Maria in Trastevere.\textsuperscript{6}

\textsuperscript{3} See Giuliano Di Bacco and John Nádas, “The Papal Chapels and Italian Sources of Polyphony During the Great Schism,” in \textit{Papal Music and Musicians in Late Medieval and Renaissance Rome}, edited by Richard Sherr (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 51–52, and David Fallows, “Ciconia padre e figlio,” \textit{Rivista italiana di musicologia} 11 (1976): 171–177. The matter of a father and son both named Johannes is still troublesome. The composer’s father, thought to be a canon in Liège, is attested as deceased by 1405. There is a canon named Johannes Ciconia (“Johannes de Schuwange”) in the Liège record who is still alive in 1405, so it is unclear which of any of these people may be related to the composer if at all. Many thanks to Anne Hallmark for sharing her list of records from Liège that include Ciconia’s name and her research on archival documents on Ciconia from Padua.

\textsuperscript{4} The genealogist Jacques de Hamricourt, while discussing the Heur family of Liège, states the following: “Jacques d’Heur, fils quatrième; épousa N., fille de Jean de Gembloux, Avocat à la Cour de Liège, dont il y a une fille qui se gouverne mal, & qui a plusieurs enfants naturels, du Seigneur Jean de Chiwogne, Chanoine de Saint-Jean.” Jacques de Hamricourt, \textit{Miroir des nobles de Hesbaye} (Liège: J. F. Bassompierre, 1791), 173.

\textsuperscript{5} This is the same document that granted the clerk Papal dispensation for his \textit{defectus natalicium}. 
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Much of Ciconia’s early career is related to Cardinal Alençon. Alençon was a noteworthy figure in religious politics at the end of the century. He was a member of the French royal family and designated to serve the church early in his life. By the last quarter of the 14th century, Alençon was serving in Rome as the Titular Patriarch of Jerusalem and was made a cardinal and Vicar General of the Papal States by Pope Urban at his election in 1378. Two days after his appointment, Alençon joined other French cardinals who elected a second pope, Clement VII as the first Avengian pope of the Western Schism. By 1380, Alençon had switched his obedience back to the Roman papacy of Urban VI. The cardinal’s duties as the Roman papal legate obliged him to travel extensively throughout the Urbanist allegiance and he visited many towns in northern Europe including Liège. Along the way, Alençon appears to have expanded his familia significantly and by the time of his return to Rome his retinue included not only the young Ciconia, but also a number of other musicians who later became singers in the papal chapel. Most significantly for Ciconia, his first contact with the Carraras, the ruling family of Padua, may have been through Alençon. His cardinal-patron was responsible for the governance of the Patriarchate of Aquileia and the monastery of Santa Giustina in Padua and from the mid-1380s resided there.

6 The full texts of these documents are in Giuliano Di Bacco and John Nádas’s “Verso uno ‘stile internationale’ della musica nelle cappelle papali,” Collectanea 1 (Rome: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1994): 13 and 25.

David Fallows has suggested that Ciconia’s secular works can be linked both to a Roman sojourn and a possible connection to the composer Antonio da Teramo. Fallows’ hypothesis helps locate a certain number of works that are otherwise unanchored songs in terms of provenance and date. Ciconia’s connection to Antonio da Teramo may also account for a number of Mass movements demonstrating a reciprocal influence of one composer on the other. At least one of Ciconia’s works, the motet *O virum omnimoda – O lux et decus – O beate Nicholae*, is posited to originate in Rome in the last decade of the century. The dating of this work is discussed in further detail below, but if it was written in 1393 or 1394, it is the earliest known motet in Ciconia’s opus.

After the death of Cardinal Alençon in 1397 it is possible that Ciconia found employment at the court of Gian Galeazzo Visconti. John Nádas and Agostino Ziino have concluded that Ciconia spent at least some amount of time in Milan and Pavia at the end of the 14th century due to the incorporation of specific Milanese heraldic devices in the texts of Ciconia’s songs and his use of Franco-Italian *Ars subtilior* compositional elements popular in the Visconti court in the late 14th century. The composer was at the least connected to the Visconti in 1399 when he

---

8 David Fallows, “Ciconia before 1400,” paper presented at the American Musicological Society Annual Meeting, New Orleans, 2012. I am extremely grateful to Fallows for sharing the unpublished version of this paper with me and for his generous comments on my own research.

9 All of Ciconia’s works I refer to in this chapter are edited in PMFC 24.

10 John Nádas and Agostino Ziino, *The Lucca Codex: Introductory Study and Facsimile Edition* (Lucca: Libreria Musicale Italiana, 1990), 42–45. Although my study is not concerned with Ciconia’s secular works, it should be remarked that these pieces demonstrate a connection to the *Ars subtilior*, especially the extreme complexity of *Sus une fontaine* and the canon *Le ray au solyen*. In addition Ciconia must have been quite familiar to Italian secular traditions like the madrigal. Ciconia’s madrigals contain specifically Italian features of notation and rhythm, specifically triplets within the beat and local syncopations. Several of these characteristics find their way into the compositional features of his motets.
composed the madrigal *Una panthera* for the visit of Lazzaro Guinigi of Lucca to Pavia.\(^{11}\) No motets are associated with this period, but it is likely that the bulk of Ciconia’s secular songs originated at this time. Particularly notable are the complex pieces *Sus une fontayne* and *Le ray au soleyl*.

The best-chronicled period of Ciconia’s life and career is from his time in Padua. Documents show that Ciconia was granted a benefice at San Biagio de Ronchalea and given a chaplaincy at Padua Cathedral in July 1401.\(^{12}\) These documents also mark Ciconia’s connection to the archpriest of Padua Cathedral, Francesco Zabarella, and noted humanist Pier Paolo Vergerio. By 1403 Ciconia was *cantor et custos* at Padua Cathedral, probably due to the support of Zabarella. Ciconia wrote two magnificent motets in honor of Zabarella, *Ut te per omnes celitus – Ingens alumnus Padue* and *Doctorum principem – Melodia suavissima – Vir mitis*. Other works from this period reference the mythical founder of Padua, King Antenoris, St. Anthony of Pauda, members of the Carrara family, and the city of Padua itself. In 1405 Padua fell to Venice after Francesco Novello da Carrara and his sons were strangled in a Venetian prison, and the Carrara family was removed from power.\(^{13}\) Ciconia’s motet texts between 1405 and 1412 reflect the new political situation, praising Venice and the Venetian doge. Ciconia’s final days came between 10 June 1412 (his last witnessed document) and 13 July when he was replaced by a new *cantor* at the cathedral “per mortem M. Johannes Ciconie.”\(^{14}\)

\(^{11}\) Nádas and Ziino, *Lucca Codex*, 42–43.


Sources of Ciconia’s Motets

A significant number of Ciconia’s unique works are extant. Fifteen motets can be associated with Ciconia, of which five are *opus dubium*, but connected to the composer based upon stylistic features, topics in the texts, and location in their sources. The motets are most represented in Q15 (ten of the fifteen), with a scattering in some of the other principal manuscripts of the era: two in Ox213 and one each in BU2216 and I-Sc 36. There are two incomplete and doubtful works in I-Pu MS 1106 as well as single, unattributed fragments in GB-Ob MS. Canon. Ital. 16, US-HAhl MS Typ 122, and I-Pu MS 1115. The remaining motet, *Regina gloriosa*, is unica in PL-Wn 52.\(^{15}\) Even excluding doubtful works, there are more extant motets by Ciconia in the greatest number of manuscripts than any other composer of the period. Unfortunately, no motets remain by the prolific and inventive Antonio da Teramo, Ciconia’s contemporary and likely colleague in Rome in the last decades of the 14th century. The only other composer to come close to this number of extant motets as Ciconia is Antonius de Civitate Austrie.\(^{16}\)

Ciconia’s Style

The stylistic conventions of Ciconia’s motets can be seen as an extension of an older Italian tradition. Presumably, Ciconia’s early musical education would have been steeped in *Ars nova* techniques as can be inferred by his understanding and use of diminution and tenor *cantus firmi*, but the core of his style is borrowed from the already existing equal-cantus practice. This

\(^{15}\) Although this work is unattributed and likely not by Ciconia, I have decided to briefly engage with *Regina gloriosa* in this study because it is included in Clercx’s *Johannes Ciconia*, and subsequently in PMFC 24. The work has sufficient stylistic variations from Ciconia’s basic compositional tendencies that I am reluctant to include this motet as one of his works. Further discussion of this work is included in Chapter 3.

\(^{16}\) Antonius de Civitate has six extant motets found only in Q15 and Ox213.
earlier style is principally seen in motets by composers associated with the ceremonial and sacred courts of northern Italy of the 14th century. Ciconia’s motets are clearly linked to their closest complete antecedents, Jacopo da Bologna’s *Lux purpurata – Diligite iusticiam* (for Luchino Visconti, 1339–1349) and the anonymous *Marce Marcum* (for Doge Marco Corner, 1365–1368). Like Ciconia’s motets, both of these works are honorific works, praising nobles from Milan and Venice respectively, have upper voices equal in texture and rhythmic activity, and have a freely composed and relatively fast moving tenor. *Marce Marcum* is set with a single text, another characteristic typical of the 14th-century equal-cantus motet, but not often found in the proportional and double-texted motets of the French *Ars nova*. Ciconia’s motets also reflect other typical characteristics of their 14th-century antecedents, particularly the correspondence of musical phrases to poetic lines, echo imitation, voice crossing, tenor solos, hocket, and extended melismas on the opening and penultimate syllables of the texts.

---


The texts of *Lux purpurata* do not reference Luchino Visconti directly, but the poem of cantus I contains an acrostic spelling out “Luchinus Vvcecomes,” a specific reference to the Lord of Milan. Nino Pirrotta postulates that the motet was written in honor either of the removal of the interdict against the Visconti in 1341 (and the elevation of Luchino as Papal Vicar) or the visit of a papal legate to Milan in 1343. See CMM 8:4, i. I am inclined more towards the later date, which falls after the election of Pope Clement VI, particularly as the text continually references a “clement prince” and a “clement and just lord.”

Although the composer of *Marce Marcum* is unknown, the motet has been associated at various times to Francesco Landini, Lorenzo da Firenze, and Jacopo da Bologna. See Ursula Günther, “Quelques remarques sur des feuillets récemment découverts à Grottaferrata,” *L'ars nova italiana del trecento* 2 (1970): 337.

18 *Lux purpurata* is bitextual with the text of cantus I almost double in length to the text of cantus II. Although this textual arrangement is more typical of *Ars nova* motets, the layered and sequential entrances of each voice in equal ranges are reflective of an interrelationship more commonly occurring in equal-cantus motets.

19 Echo imitation is found in *Marce Marcum*, mm. 1–11 and 27–30 (edition in PMFC 13, 197–201). Voice crossing is also in *Marce Marcum*, mm. 40–41. Tenor solos introduce pseudo imitation in cantus I followed by cantus II, mm. 61–64. See also the tenor solo at the beginnnning
The association between Ciconia and these earlier Italian works is not entirely spurious. Giuliano Di Bacco and John Nádas suggest that the sources for Marce Marcum had papal connections. Ciconia may have come into contact with these same sources while in Rome.\(^\text{20}\)

**The Motets**

The following list includes all of Ciconia’s motets in a loose chronological order. Many of these dates are speculative, but at least give a general ordering of the works. I will discuss the archetypical equal-cantus motets in Ciconia’s opus in more detail in the next section of this chapter, reserving the unusual or atypical works for Chapter 3. The conclusion of this chapter will be a discussion of the archetypical equal-cantus motets in Ciconia’s oeuvre.

---

of the “Amen” section. This solo establishes the new mensuration of *senaria perfecta* and also introduces a phrase of pseudo imitation with cantus I in m. 92. Hocket appears frequently such as in *Lux purpurata*, mm. 55–63 (edition in PMFC 13, 194–196), and *Marce Marcum*, mm. 51–52 and mm. 107–109. Jamie Greenberg Reuland has made a more complete analysis of *Marce Marcum* in her article “Voicing the Doge’s Sacred Image,” *Journal of Musicology* (forthcoming). I am grateful to her for sharing her study with me ahead of publication and for her provocative comments on my work.

\(^{20}\) Di Bacco and Nádas, “Papal Chapels,” 65.
Table 2.1: Ciconia’s works in possible chronological order of composition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Date or Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O virum omnimoda – O lux et decus – O beate Nicholae</td>
<td>1393–1394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ut te per omnes celsit – Ingens alumnus Padue</td>
<td>At least 1397–1412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . .]ptisari virgo Cristina (fragment)</td>
<td>Possibly written c. 1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O proles Hispanie (fragment)</td>
<td>Likely between 1401 and 1412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padu . . . serenans – Pastor bonus (fragment)</td>
<td>1402–1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O felix templum jubila</td>
<td>1402–1405 or 1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Padua sidus preclarum</td>
<td>Likely before 1405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venecie mundi splendor – Michael qui Stena domus</td>
<td>Perhaps 3 Jan 1406; 1400–1413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albane misse celsit – Albane doctor maxime</td>
<td>Perhaps 8 Mar 1406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorum principem – Melodia suavissima – Vir mitis</td>
<td>Perhaps after the Council of Pisa 1409; at least 1397–1412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrum Marcello Venetum – O Petre antistes inclite</td>
<td>Perhaps 16 Nov 1409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[. . .] de qua cordis psalteris – Trinitatem (fragment)</td>
<td>Possibly 1409–1415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Petre Christi discipule</td>
<td>1409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O beatum incendium</td>
<td>No date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina gloriosa</td>
<td>No date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions of Chronology

Margaret Bent has demonstrated that the 14th-century Italian motet was a vibrant tradition well established outside of the Ars nova practice. Ciconia’s motets sit in a place of prominence in this Italian tradition. Although mostly copied in manuscripts well after his death, Ciconia’s works epitomize a popular musical genre associated with the Veneto and the ceremonial and civic events of north-eastern Italy in the early-15th century. In the case of Ciconia’s motets, almost all are related with either Padua or Venice. But there is one major exception, the motet O virum omnimoda – O lux et decus – O beate Nicholae.

---

21 Discussed later in this chapter.
22 Discussed in Chapter 5.
23 Discussed in Chapter 3.
24 One exception is the fragmentary motet, [. . .] de qua cordis psalteris – Trinitatem. If by Ciconia, the work was probably composed while he was working in Padua.
There is something of an anomaly in the chronology of Ciconia’s works. A cluster of his motets can be grouped together based upon compositional style and clues in the texts. These works were all composed in the Veneto (most likely in Padua) in the first decades of the 15th century and are all ceremonial works. This style of composition was favored by the Venetians of the period and are represented by a number of pieces in the manuscripts with origins in northern Italy such as Q15, two Canonici manuscripts in the Oxford, Bodleian Library, and BU2216, among others. The anomaly is that one additional motet is dated in the period of Ciconia’s employment outside of Padua. This work is the triple-texted motet *O virum omnimoda*.

*O virum omnimoda* is in honor of a rather obscure saint known as St. Nicholas of Trani (or St. Nicholas Peregrinus). Like the synonymous St. Nicholas of Bari (also known as St. Nicholas of Myra), St. Nicholas of Trani was especially revered in the Apulia region of eastern Italy. But unlike his famous saintly brother who was well known throughout Europe for many generations, St. Nicholas Peregrinus was not readily recognized outside of the immediate region of Trani, the place of his life and death. This immediately raises the questions of how Ciconia who had only recently arrived in Italy in the last decade or so of the 14th century learned about this little-known saint and for what purpose Ciconia wrote this motet. Two different solutions have been proffered, both of which conclude that the motet was composed sometime in the years 1393–1394.

Bent has proposed one hypothesis for how Ciconia may have come to write a motet for St. Nicholas Peregrinus. She notes that the 300th anniversary of the saint’s *dies natale* was

26 The two Oxford sources are Ox213 and GB-Ob MS. Canon. Ital. 16.

27 St. Nicholas’s feast day is typically given as 2 June in the Apulia, but there are also references to an observance that took place on 30 May elsewhere. This suggests that this saint was not only celebrated locally, but also north of the Alps. See PMFC 24, xiii.
celebrated in 1394. It is not a big leap to conclude that in the events surrounding the celebration there was a need for a ceremonial motet commemorating the saint. Ciconia’s motet suits this description ideally. A second theory was proposed by Giuliano Di Bacco and John Nádas. They surmise, based upon the style of the text, that Ciconia’s motet was written sometime in 1393–1394 in honor of the newly appointed bishop of Trani, Jacobus Cubellus. Regardless which is most likely, both solutions date the motet to the mid-1390s.

What I find so interesting about this dating is that there seems to be a disconnect between this single piece from Rome in the 1390s and all of Ciconia’s other motets from the Veneto dated after 1400. If one removes the historical record by somehow erasing the text and expunging the historical context from memory, this motet looks and sounds similar to the rest of the motets in Ciconia’s canon. This particular motet style is so strongly associated with the Veneto that it seems odd that there is one single motet by Ciconia composed in Rome and no others. The motet’s date also raises questions about how Ciconia learned the Italian style and by whom he was influenced (I am thinking specifically here of Antonio da Teramo, a singer in the papal chapel associated with both Roman and Pisan papacies). In addition, I would expect to notice some sort of stylistic difference between this early work and Ciconia’s later period or perhaps some sort of youthful inexperience or inexpertness in the composition.

*O virum omnimoda* does not stand out significantly from the rest of Ciconia’s motets from a stylistic standpoint. The distinctive elements that contribute to these motets are a unified

---

28 PMFC 24, xiii.
29 Di Bacco and Nádas, “Verso uno ‘stile internazionale,’” 7–74.
30 As an aside, there seem to be no existent examples of an “early” style in the works of Ciconia. Thus any discussion of a Roman or a Paduan style is merely speculative.
group. For instance, in all of these works the two upper voices are equal in range, texture, length, and in a great number of examples bear only a single text. Every motet was originally in three voices. If a fourth voice was added after the original composition, it is often problematic with a high level of dissonance and awkward octave doublings. Many of the tenors in these motets are freely composed and their ubiquitous fourth and fifth leaps that are manifest in an angular melodic topography bearing little resemblance to chant. The relative rhythmic speed of the tenors means that these voices participate fully in the texture of the motet and on occasion will also have solo melodic phrases.

I use these examples of a unified style to identify Ciconia’s works, but they are not unique to his output alone. Many other works associated with the Veneto in the early decades of the 15th century are constructed in this same fashion. In this respect Ciconia’s works are not exceptional. This is not to imply that Ciconia did not put his own stamp on the Italian-motet tradition. I have observed that there are specific stylistic features that stand out as particularly “Ciconian.” Drawing from O virum omnimoda as an exemplar, several key elements are immediately apparent. One of these characteristics is a fluidity of meter, especially shifts between triple and duple pulse within the prevailing tempus perfectum mensuration. Another is extended passages that are written with an offset displacement of one of the voices that moves in counterpoint to the other part’s rhythmically straight passages. Another element that is a particularly Ciconian characteristic is passages in echo imitation, many of which telescope into dramatic cadential figures.

An example of a shift from triple to duple pulse within the prevailing triple mensuration occurs in mm. 26–28 (Example 2.1.A). The mensuration of the motet is $\text{㈡}$ (implied in Q15 and I-

---

31 I have excluded Regina gloriosa in this count. See footnote 9 above.
Sc 36, and explicit in BU2216). Triple meter is firmly established in the opening salvo echoed between the two cantus parts. Cantus I shifts from motion in straight semi-breves to alternating semi-breves and minims for the duration of a tempus unit. In this instance, the shifting metric feel is particularly notable because it occurs in conjunction with a strong triple motion in the cantus II part. Within a few tempus units following, a similar shift occurs between cantus II and the tenor. Another temporary shift occurs (Example 2.1B), this time appearing in both cantus I and cantus II. This in and of itself may not seem terribly significant, but it is notable that Ciconia uses this same type of single tempus unit mensural shift in almost all of his motets.

Example 2.1A: Ciconia, *O virum omnimoda*, mm. 20–38. Numerals indicate the shift of mensural pulse occurring within the space of one tempus unit.
motion imitative

that the rhythmic motion melodic passage, note for note. The addition of a dot to a semibreve shifts the entire passage so that the rhythmic motion between cantus I and cantus II is displaced by a minim. Again, with only a few exceptions, these passages of displacement syncopation occur in almost every one of Ciconia’s motets.

Example 2.2: Ciconia, O virum omnimoda, mm. 39–48. Arrow indicates point of displacement syncopation in cantus II.

Echo imitation, especially the telescoping of cadential passages in echo imitation, is probably one of the most distinctive elements of Ciconia’s motets. In O virum omnimoda imitative passages are not necessarily in exact imitation, and often are constructed in contrary motion. The effect is the same: one voice will enter with a distinctive melodic and/or rhythmic profile, (Example 2.3), and another voice will respond with a repetition of the rhythm of the first
voice. An even more dramatic example is the telescoping passage from mm. 48–57 (Example 2.4) in which the rhythmic activity increases until the last measure of the pattern. The first cell is minim rest–minim–minim rest–minim–semibreve–semibreve–semibreve. This is followed by an alteration of the cell: minim rest–minim–minim–minim–semibreve and then minim rest followed by four minim rests. The last part of this section is a quick series of minim hockets that drive the rhythmic texture into the held pitches of the cadence. These kinds of echo passages are not exclusive to Ciconia’s cantus voices. The tenor introduces a rhythmic cell echoed by cantus I and then cantus II (Example 2.5). Echo imitation of this type is found in every known motet by Ciconia. These points of imitation are found especially in the long, untexted cadential passages in Ciconia’s works.

Example 2.3: Ciconia, *O virum omnimoda*, mm. 30–38. Imitative rhythmic cells.
Tra-nen-si-bus pa-tro-num pi-e con-ces-sit, cu-ius pre-ci-bus ad ju-vam-

sus-pi-ran-tes pro-te-ge, quo car-nis ex-ut-i er-gas-tu-lo ad sa-peros per-tra-

ha-mur.

e-ter-no tu-e-a-re presi-di-o

di-cen-tes: "Mi-se-re-re no-bis, Do-mi-ne."

et pe-ren-ni-ter gra-tu-le-mur tu-a fe-sta co-len-tes.

Example 2.4: Ciconia, *O virum omnimoda*, mm. 39–65. Repeated rhythmic cells transforming as they approach the cadence in m. 58.
learned it from another musician in Rome serving in the papal chapel in Ciconia's canon that is not associated with the works of one composer is unsurprising.

It is not impossible to imagine what there is ample evidence that many of these features are not unique to this composer. But what is interesting regarding *O virum omnimoda* is that there does not seem to be any sort of stylistic development across the fourteen motets of Ciconia’s canon. All of his motets seem absolutely stylistically unified with no difference between this single Roman motet and any of his Paduan motets. So what precisely does this indicate in regards to dating Ciconia’s works by style alone? It is not impossible to imagine that Ciconia could have written a motet in Rome for this lesser-known Apulian saint, but it is remarkable that it is the only motet in Ciconia’s canon that is not associated with the Veneto. If the young composer arrived in Rome around 1390, then he would have only learned about this particularly Italianate style of composition within the his first few years of residency there. Most likely, Ciconia could have learned it from another musician in Rome serving in the papal chapel. The most obvious
character that can fill just such a role is the aforementioned Antonio da Teramo. Unfortunately, if Antonio da Teramo composed any motets at all, they are unknown to us today.

As there are apparently no other Roman motets with which to compare Ciconia’s *O virum omnimoda*, one must look elsewhere for stylistic influences. The next obvious repertoire can be found amongst the Mass settings. One pair of Ciconia’s Mass movements is striking, *Gloria 1* and *Credo 2*.\(^{32}\) If one were to remove the Mass ordinary text from these two movements and a new motet text added, it would look and sound much like a north-Italian motet popular in the Veneto in the early-15th century. All of the same qualities that are present in Ciconia’s motets are found here as well. The two upper voices are almost equal in range and texture. The tenor is newly composed and although it has no solos, the relatively fast rhythmic motion of the part allows it to participate fully in the texture. There are shifts of triple and duple pulse in a prevailing mensuration of *tempus perfectum* (Example 2.6), displacement syncopation (Example 2.7), echo imitation (Example 2.8), and other Ciconian characteristics like a long, melismatic, cadential passage on the word “Amen.”\(^{33}\)

---

\(^{32}\) *Gloria 1* is in Q15, ff. 91v–93 and I-TRbc 1374 [87], ff. 52v–53v. *Credo 2* is Q15, ff. 93v–96 and I-TRbc 1374 [87], ff. 53v–55v. For the sake of consistency I am using the numbering system as established by Bent and Hallmark in their edition of Ciconia’s Mass movements in PMFC 24.

\(^{33}\) Ciconia’s Gloria-Credo pair (Gloria 1 and Credo 2) can be stylistically linked by the use of rhythmic imitation to a Gloria by the composer Egardus (ModA, ff. 21v–22; PL-Wn 52, ff. 204v–205; I-GR Kript. Lat. 224, f. 4; and I-Pu MS 1225, f. 1v. See Reinhard Strohm, *The Rise of European Music, 1380-1500* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 95–96. Although Egardus’s two Gloria settings and one motet appear in five manuscripts with strong conciliar or papal connections, there is no evidence of the composer’s presence in Italy during his career.
Example 2.6: Ciconia, *Credo* [2], mm. 18–33. Numerals indicate shifts of mensural pulse.

Example 2.7: Ciconia, *Credo* [2], mm. 84–91; arrow indicates point of displaced syncopation.

Example 2.8: Ciconia, *Credo* [2], mm. 1–9. The tenor voice participates in rhythmic echo imitation.

Perhaps a little less compelling from a stylistic standpoint, but more interesting when considering the possible influence of Antonio da Teramo on Ciconia, are *Gloria* 3 and *Credo* 4.

These two settings have fewer persuasive Italianate characteristics, but they have a close
relationship in form and tenor treatment to Antonio da Teramo’s Gloria *Mycinella* and Credo *Cursor*.\(^{34}\) Antonio da Teramo’s settings are paired by ranges, texture, mensural structure, and cadences which match not only each other, but resemble the same in Ciconia’s works. Likewise their repeating tenor and contratenor patterns are common elements of the equal-cantus motet style. In this case, it is apparent that Antonio da Teramo was the innovator and Ciconia was the follower when creating his own Mass pair.

There are great implications about a specific style that is associated so closely with Italian compositions in the early decades of the 15th century. Based upon stylistic features, *O virum omnimoda* can be clearly connected to a specific compositional language associated with other composers in the Veneto in the first decades of the 15th century. But could there be another possible point of origin for this distinctive style? What if we contemplate a musical tradition that shares characteristics of both northern polyphony and the north-Italian style? It would mean making a leap across great distances, but not unimaginable. Regions of the north were under the Urbanist allegiance during the early years of the Great Schism and this close association may explain the presence of so many northern musicians who, like Ciconia, traveled to Italy for work.\(^{35}\) It might also explain how Ciconia was so fluent in the so-called Italian style so early in his tenure in Rome. This style may not be exclusively Italian as previously presumed and really something that had origins north of the Alps. In Chapter 4, I contemplate a direct connection between north and south of the Alps and between the 14th and 15th centuries in more detail, but

\(^{34}\) *Gloria Micinella*, PMFC 13, 3–7. *Credo Cursor*, PMFC 13, 8–16.

this idea is intriguing. Is it made more bountiful by the inclusion of a wider variety of genres that have demonstrable links between Italy and the north. One such example of a connection between the music of Italy and the north is the presence of Italian laude in northern manuscript sources.

The problem is that by claiming a northern origin of, or at least the contribution of northern musical characteristics to, the motets of early 15th-century Italy also means that we would need further evidence of a northern musical tradition that contributed to the Italian style and vice versa. Reinhard Strohm implies just such a connection.\textsuperscript{36} I suggest in Chapter 1 that motet styles were much more fluid than previously imagined and the possibility that the equal-cantus style was a model used not only in northern Italy at the end of the 14th century is highly likely.

I am still troubled by what it means to have a chronological anomaly in the ordering of Ciconia’s works. Without any other supporting evidence to the contrary, the simplest conclusion is that the years 1393–1394 is a date of composition for \textit{O virum omnimoda}. Still, I might just throw in just one more thought about moving this one motet out of Ciconia’s Roman period. What links the motet to the years 1393–1394 is the specific text that makes references to particular events. If another early 15th-century ceremony or civic occasion in the Veneto were uncovered and the motet redated, I doubt that no one would question the date of composition falling in the years 1402–1412 based upon style. As it happens, there is another motet in the north-Italian manner with a text in honor of a specific Apulian saint that is dated sometime in the second decade of the 15th century based upon style and context. The motet \textit{Sanctus itaque patriarcha Leuncius} by Antonius de Civitate Austrie was written for the Cathedral in Trani and

mentions the transfer of the relics of St. Leucius to the city from Brindisi. In the motet are a number of elements that are similar to Ciconia’s works such sections in duple against the prevailing triple mensuration. The only thing really missing that is typically found in Ciconia’s motet but not in this work is extensive echo imitation. There is no question that Sanctus itaque is from the second decade of the 15th century, but we have no evidence of an event that links this motet or Antonius de Civitate to St. Leucis, Trani, the Apulia, or for that matter to any other political or cultural events. Perhaps Ciconia’s work is from this same unknown event or celebration.

Ironically, here I have almost glossed over another example of a motet intended for an audience outside the Veneto. Antonius de Civitate’s early career was in Venice and three Mass movements, six motets, and one virelai are in the primary Veneto sources, Q15, Ox213, and BU2216. Yet the second half of his career is associated with other locales. Antonius de Civitate’s motet Strenua quem duxit – Gaudeat et tanti was composed for the marriage of Giorgio Ordelaffi of Forlì to Lucrezia Alidosi of Imola in 1412. O felix flos Florencia – Gaude felix Dominice was written in honor of Florence and Leonardo di Piero Dati who was made Master General of the Dominican Order in 1414. Both of these works are clearly from the early 15th-century tradition not only because their provenance associated with discernable dates, but also their

37 EFCM 5, 33–35. St. Leucius was the first bishop of Brindisi and was especially venerated in the Apulia region. His relics were first transferred to Trani from Brindisi in the 8th century and then later moved to Benevento. His cult was widely known in southern Italy and even spread to Rome, where a monastery was dedicated to him. Paul Oldfield, Sanctity and Pilgrimage in Medieval Southern Italy, 1000–1200 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014): 32. The name of the saint is incorrectly written “Leuncius” by the scribe of Q15. In volume 5 of EFCM, xvi–xviii and xxv, Gilbert Reaney identifies a St. Leuncius, who is the patron saint of the city of Vicenza, but the text clearly indicates that this motet is for the Apulian saint and the transfer of his relics. More on the composer Antonius de Civitate Austria is in Chapter 4 of this dissertation.
38 EFCM 5, 36–39. Forlì and Imola are both in the Emilia-Romagna region of north-central Italy.
stylistic features that resemble the equal-cantus style of Ciconia. Is this evidence that the equal-cantus motet style was a genre not exclusive to the Veneto in the early 15th century? Here is a quandary: if I demonstrate that style is the more important qualification for dating, *O virum omnimoda* ought to be redated to a period after the turn of the century and moved to a period of Ciconia’s Paduan residency. If I show that there is no need to restrict the equal-cantus motet style to the Veneto, alternate dates of any of these works, including a date from the 1390s, are equally valid.\footnote{There are certainly inherent problems with using only style to date works in the late medieval period. Julie Cumming in a private conversation with me commented that scholars have a tendency to respond positively to a definitive occasion for the composition of early 15th-century works, sometimes too much so. She has remarked that there is a danger of looking too hard for a definitive chronology of these works especially when it supersedes other paths of study and research such as analysis or codicology.} Furthermore, there seems to be more and more evidence that the equal-cantus style is not exclusively Italian and may have greater representation in 14th- and early 15th-century works than has been previously assumed.

I have no compelling evidence that definitively redates Ciconia’s motet, but I hope that there will be continuing dialogue on and challenges to the dating of *O virum omnimoda* in spite of two compelling and convincing arguments to the contrary. My goal is not to dispute these conclusions, but instead to offer that the matter of dating Ciconia’s motets, already challenging as is it is, is an extremely complex a problem that continues to puzzle and intrigue us all.

**Ciconia’s Equal-Cantus Motets**

I have set up the problem of establishing a chronology of works for Ciconia in an effort to ascertain just how and when the composer may have arrived in Italy. By positioning the composer within the cultural milieu of Rome in the 1390s, it may be possible to recognize certain stylistic influences on his compositional characteristics. One of the features that may have
been influenced by his association with other musicians in Rome and subsequently in Padua is his use of the equal-cantus motet style. In the section that follows, I explore some of Ciconia’s works that fall easily into categorization as the equal-cantus motets.

O felix templum jubila is a freely composed motet in four voices.\(^4^1\) The pasted capitol on this folio showing a slightly different layout demonstrates that this motet was cut from a stage I copy of the manuscript and also indicates that the contratenor was not original to this work. The subsequent addition of the contratenor in stage II and then rejection in yet a further copy of the motet in stage III reinforces that the voice is inauthentic and inessential. The counterpoint with the contratenor is problematic with numerous redundant voice crossings and the part is best omitted in performance (Example 2.9).

Example 2.9: Ciconia, O felix templum, mm. 91–100. The voice exchange between the tenor and contratenor in mm. 91–94 creates a muddy, drone-like quality in the four-voice version of the motet. A similar passage occurs in mm. 115–126.

---

\(^{4^1}\) O felix templum is in two sources. One is Ox213, ff. 22v–23, attributed to “Magister Johannes Ciconia de Leodio,” cantus I and II and tenor only. Another is Q15, ff. 252v–253, attributed to “Jo ciconie,” cantus I and II and tenor only. A portion of the motet is also found on f. 341, a stage II leaf that replaced a stage I version of the motet by the addition of a contratenor, but which then was replaced yet another again in the third stage by a return to the existing three-voice version on ff. 252v–253. Ciconia’s name is also included in the text of the motet.
In general *O felix templum* resembles an archetypical equal-cantus motet. The two upper voices are set with the same text. The two cantus parts at the opening are in echo imitation (separated by ten tempus units) albeit accompanied by the tenor and contratenor in different counterpoint for each iteration. One of the key features of *O felix* is the use of significant tenor solo passages that are repeated by the cantus parts in echo imitation. In mm. 29–30 the tenor solo instigates a passage of exact imitation at the octave by cantus I two tempora later (Example 2.10). Inclusion of the text “Qui presul divi munera” set under the tenor part on f. 252v of Q15—the same text as is echoed in the cantus parts setting up the beginning of verse 2—further marks this solo passage (Figure 2.1). This short phrase features a shift of mensural pulse from triple to duple and back to the prevailing triple mensuration by a shift from straight semibreves to a semibreve–minim pattern. A similar tenor solo in mm. 86–87 instigates imitation in the upper voices, although echoed at the fifth (Example 2.11). The final cadence, which sets the word “Amen” (mm. 113–132 [end]), is fully imitative in the two cantus voices (Example 2.12). In this passage the melodic replication is constantly shifted so that the imitations continuously fall ever closer together, first in hockets of melodic cells, first separated by two semibreve rests, then in overlapping iterations, then driving to minim hockets, and then a final ascending phrase in cantus I echoed by cantus II leading to final sonorities of the motet.

Example 2.10: Ciconia, *O felix templum*, mm. 27–35.

The tenor is otherwise untexted.
Figure 2.1: Q15, f. 252v (detail); Ciconia, *O felix templum*, intermittent text underlay in the tenor voice.

Example 2.11: Ciconia, *O felix templum*, mm. 82–90.
Bent, as bishop of Padua in 1402. It may have been composed as early as 1400.


In *O felix templum*, Ciconia uses a number of devices to highlight specific names and phrases in the text. In mm. 48–52 he employs exact echo imitation in the cantus voices to highlight the name “Stephane” through repetition of both text and melody (Example 2.13). He also uses periods of reduced texture to highlight the starts and ends of verses. The tenor rests for 6 tempus units during the overlap at the join between Verses 2 and 3, bringing out the bridge between the texts of the two verses. The tenor drops out for 11 tempus units, exactly at the

---

43 Bent postulates that this work was composed for Stefano Carrara, perhaps for his installation as bishop of Padua in 1402. It may have been composed as early as 1400 for the dedication of an altar to St. Stephen in Padua, but no later than 1405 when the Carrara family fell from power. Bent, *Q15*, 1:214.
midpoint of the text (beginning of Verse 4, “Fano novo”). There is an additional three tempus unit rest in the tenor as the cantus voices begin the final verse.

Example 2.13: Ciconia, *O felix templum*, mm. 46–53. The echo imitation between cantus I and cantus II in mm. 48–53 highlights the name “Stephane” and the word “plaustriger,” which means something akin to “charioteer.” This is an emblem of the Carrara name and their heraldic device.

The large-scale structure can be seen as divided in two different ways (see Example 2.14 for the text and a translation). The first is as a bipartite division by metric organization that is highlighted by the withholding of the tenor part at the midpoint of the motet (Verses 1–3 : 4–6). The second is as a tripartite division according to the sense structure of the poetry (Verses 1–2 : 3–4 : 5–6). 44 Although one does not necessarily “hear” the dissonance between sound (metrical repetition) and meaning (poetic division) in these works, this sort of playfulness of formation is akin to the tension of *color* and *talea* in a proportional isorhythmic motet. Elements of the text stand out not because the listener has kept tabs on the formal structure of either the poem or the music, but because of the localized rhythmic and melodic elements.

---

44 Translation by M. J. Connolly in PMFC 24, 220.
Example 2.14: Text and translation of *O felix templum*.\(^{45}\)

The motet *O Padua sidus preclarum* is unique to Q15.\(^{46}\) The text is clearly dedicated to the city of Pauda and its mythical founder, Antenor.\(^{47}\) The fact that there is no mention of Venice indicates that the work predates the conquest of Padua by Venice and the removal of the Carrara family in 1405. This motet is in a typical Italian texture of two equal voices over a relatively fast-moving tenor setting a single text. Although the vocal texture is typical of the Italian motet, the

---

\(^{45}\) Translated by M. J. Connolly Connolly in PMFC 24, 220.

\(^{46}\) Q15, ff. 286v–287, attributed to “Jo ciconie.” Ciconia’s name is also included in the prayer at the end of the text.

imperfect tempus is not characteristic of the style. The tenor is freely composed with a rhythmic design that often increases in rhythmic speed as it shifts into homophonic counterpoint with the two cantus parts (Example 2.15). This work is remarkable as it relies little upon any sort of large-scale structure such as the tenor organization of a proportional motet, but is still carefully planned with regards to text setting and texture. There are untexted opening and closing melismas, but otherwise, the text is set throughout. The tenor is almost always involved in the counterpoint of the work, indicating that all voices were conceived simultaneously. Ciconia utilizes many of the key features of the equal-cantus style including hocket, repeated rhythmic cells, displacement syncopation, shifts of mensural pulse, and exact rhythmic and melodic echo imitation.

Example 2.15: Ciconia, O Padua sidus preclarum, mm. 40–53. Although the tenor generally moves in slower rhythmic values than the upper parts, in mm. 48–50, the lower voice increases in rhythmic activity to join them in a homophonic passage of displacement syncopation.

One of the key rhythmic figures in the motet is the repeated use of a minim – semibreve – minim cell. This rhythmic module moves in a syncopated fashion and is reminiscent of the shift between triple and duple pulse in Ciconia’s tempus perfectum works. This could even be described as a mini-moment of displacement syncopation within the space of one tempus unit. For example, note the rhythmic exchange in m. 5 introduced by cantus II and repeated by cantus

---

48 More often Italian motets of the 14th century are in tempus perfectum. See Bent, “Fourteenth-Century Italian Motet,” 103.
I over the steady movement of the tenor in semibreves (Example 2.16). This brief rhythmic shift is a precursor to the fully displaced syncopation that occurs between cantus I and cantus II in mm. 13–14 and again in mm. 22–24.

![Image of musical notation]

Example 2.16: Ciconia, *O Padua sidus preclarum*, mm. 1–27. The echoed rhythmic cells in mm. 5 and 6 are precursors to the full-scale displacement syncopation in mm. 13–14 and in mm. 22–24.

An example of Ciconia’s attentiveness to the relationship between text and music occurs in the first line of the motet. This phrase opens with a complex contrapuntal melisma on the interjection, “O.” In the next 16 bars, Ciconia utilizes hocket, displacement syncopation, and exact repetitions of melody and rhythm. This culminates in the vocative “Padua” with every voice arriving on the longa in an unstable minor-triad sonority. The instability of the triad in m. 8 leads into the continuation of the text and the verse proper. The dramatic phrasing of this passage brings the subject of the text—the city of Padua, its founders, its remarkable legal and artistic qualities—into high relief.
A further example of Ciconia's responsiveness to text is reflected in his frequent long cadences at the end of almost every line of each verse. He also reserves one specific compositional texture for each line of text. For instance the second line of text is set with displacement syncopation between cantus I and cantus II (see mm. 22–24 in Example 2.16 above). This is followed by a line of text set in strictly homophonic counterpoint (the beginning of which can be seen in m. 27 of the same example). Similarly the first line of verse four is set with strict echo imitation, which is then followed by line 2 set with repeated rhythmic cells (Example 2.17).

Example 2.17: Ciconia, *O Padua sidus preclaram*, mm. 38–10. The beginning of Verse 4, line 1 is set with exact echo imitation (mm. 84–87) and line 2 is set with repeated rhythmic cells (mm. 91–95).

Other than the explicit setting of each line with distinctive musical textures, this motet evades any sort of clearly organized large-scale structure. Each verse is set in a variety of phrase lengths and there is no clear musical foundation such as a repeating double-statement tenor. Because this work is not organized by isorhythmic structure, *O Padua* has a tendency to be neglected in previous studies of the late-medieval motet. But thanks to more inclusive analyses
of the motet since the last decades of the 20th century, freely composed works by Ciconia and others are being recognized for their progressive and compelling characteristics on par with the most ornate metrical features of the proportional motets of the late 14th and early 15th centuries.\(^{49}\)

*Venecie mundi splendor – Michael qui Stena domus – Italie mundicie* is a freely composed motet dedicated to Venice and the doge Michele Steno.\(^{50}\) The motet as it is copied in the manuscript reveals a number of corrections throughout. Significant amongst these is the alteration of notation from Italianate flagged minim triplets to French style void notation without flags. Italian composers commonly utilized flagged minims to indicate rapid triplet rhythms, mostly in the madrigal. Because this notational element did not exist in French-style notation, the copyist of Q15 had a significant challenge when he decided to use early 15th-century French notation over late 14th-century Italian notation in his manuscript. The scribe solves his problem by erasing the original flags and scraping out, and thus creating a void, “colored” note head. Thus he invoked an innovative form of “color” and shifted the duple division of the semibreve from duple into triple (Figure 2.2).\(^{51}\)

\(^{49}\) Allsen makes it clear that even in his dissertation on the early 15th-century isorhythmic motet, he is obliged to include Ciconia’s non-isorhythmic works because of this issue. I concur and reiterate his assessment that these works share many of the same features as Ciconia’s isorhythmic works and must be considered as one stylistic trend. See Jon Michael Allsen, “Style and Intertextuality in the Isorhythmic Motet, 1400–1440” (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 1992), 97–98, especially 97n26.

\(^{50}\) Q15, ff. 287v–288. The work is attributed to “Jo ciconia” and the composer is named in the text of cantus I. This work was composed no earlier than 1 Dec 1400 (the inauguration of Steno). Bent suggests 3 Jan 1406, the formal submission of the conquered commune of Padua to the doge and Venice. PMFC 24, 206.

\(^{51}\) The scribe uses a flagged stem on the minim to divide it into two semiminims.
One of the most remarkable aspects of this motet is that it contains three separate and newly invented texts for the two cantus parts and the freely-composed tenor voice. The tenor text is significantly shorter than those of the upper voices, and has an almost entirely separate sentiment. While the upper voices praise the earthly city and its ruler, the tenor is a prayer to the Virgin Mary for Padua and for Johannes Ciconia. Despite the different texts for each voice, Ciconia retains a clear sense of poetic division by highlighting the entrances of each verse in all voices.\(^{52}\) This gives the motet clear sense of form without the use of tenor organization. For instance, in mm. 18–19 (Example 2.18), Ciconia allows cantus II to rest for the entrance of verse 2 of cantus I. Then, in echo imitation, cantus II enters on the text of its own verse 2 as cantus I rests. The texture swaps for the beginning of verse 3 with cantus I waiting to echo the entrance of cantus II (Example 2.19).\(^{53}\) Both cantus texts begin simultaneously for the respective openings of each voice’s verse 4. New entrances of the tenor text are highlighted by high-tessitura solos that shift this typically lower part momentarily into the range of the two cantus voices (Examples 2.20\(A\) and \(B\)).

---


\(^{53}\) This passage also coincides with the end of the first phrase of the tenor text.
Example 2.18: Ciconia, *Venecie mundi splendor*, mm. 11–19. The text of verse 2 in cantus I begins in m. 18; the text of cantus II’s verse 2 begins in exact echo imitation one tempus unit following.

Example 2.19: Ciconia, *Venecie mundi splendor*, mm. 30–38. Although this passage is not in echo imitation, the texts of cantus I and the tenor conclude in m. 35 to make room for the entrance of verse 3 of cantus II, followed by the beginning of cantus I’s verse three a tempus unit following.

Example 2.20A: Ciconia, *Venecie mundi splendor*, mm. 39–48. In mm. 47–48 is a texted tenor solo.
begins with a rhythmic cell that is repeated a measure following in cantus II although the voices exchange overlapping patterns of both melody and rhythm. Example 2.20: Ciconia, *Venecie mundi splendor*, mm. 66–74. In mm. 73–74 is a texted tenor solo.

Melodic imitation and rhythmic echoes occur throughout. In mm. 10–19 the two cantus voices exchange overlapping patterns of both melody and rhythm (Example 2.21). Cantus I begins with a rhythmic cell that is repeated a measure following in cantus II although the melodic shape is inverted. Cantus I then presents a simple descending melodic phrase that is echoed in near repetition by cantus II, but at a different point in the tempus unit. Cantus I begins a new rhythmic cell on the second semibreve of the tempus unit in m. 14, which is echoed in cantus II on the first semibreve of the following tempus unit. The end of verse 1 in both voices (“mundicie” and “celibem” respectively) ends with a quick rhythmic cell on a repeated A pitch. As mentioned above, the next verse begins in m. 18 with exact melodic and rhythmic imitation in both voices.
A particularly notable moment of imitation occurs at the end of verse 2 in mm. 31–35, where cantus II introduces a point of imitation that moves in minim triplets (Example 2.22). Cantus I picks up this same melody and rhythm a measure later as cantus II rests.

The final section of the motet is marked by several typical features characteristic of Ciconia’s compositional style (Example 2.23). The upper voices have essentially completed their respective texts and are singing an extended melisma (cantus I is holding the final “–a” of the

54 This is the same passage of triplets that needed a notational “correction” from Italian-style flagged minim to French-style “colored” note heads that is mentioned above.
name “Ciconia” and cantus II is on the “A–” of “Amen”). As this work has an unusual autonomous tenor text, the last line of the tenor is highlighted by the melismas in the upper voices. This is especially notable because the text at this point is a prayer directed to the Virgin Mary by the composer, “Johannes Ciconia,” himself. The counterpoint of the upper voice is marked by hockets of rhythmic cells, first in exact imitation of rhythm and melody (mm. 90–93 and mm. 96–99) and then in rhythmic imitation only (mm. 99–100 and mm. 103–104). This passage also has a section of extended displacement syncopation (mm. 93–96) where the same melody is repeated by cantus II after cantus I, but displaced by minim. The rhythmic motion of the tenor is not faster in this section than the rest of the motet, but its melodic shape becomes increasingly angular, leaping in disjunct fifths (mm. 93–98) until a dramatic leap up an octave at the beginning of the composer’s name (m. 99) for a long stepwise descent to the cadence. This remarkable rhythmic and melodic activity drives the final section of the motet to its conclusion.
Albane misse celitus – Albane doctor maxime is a bitextual motet in honor of Albano Micheli, who replaced Stefano da Carrara as bishop of Padua. Bent proposes that the motet was likely written for Micheli’s installation on 8 Mar 1406. The work is anonymous in Q15, its only source, but Ciconia’s surname is included at the end of cantus II. This text implores the city and church of Padua along with Ciconia to raise hymns that “touch the vault of [the] temple.” The

55 Q15, ff. 300v–301. This motet is anonymous, but Ciconia is named in text of cantus II. “Jo ciconia” was added to the top of f. 300v in a more recent hand. Micheli was bishop of Padua from 1406 until his death in 1409. Diocese of Padova, Italy. http://www.gcatholic.org/dioceses/diocese/pado0.htm. Website accessed 6 Feb 2015.
56 8 Mar 1406. PMFC 24, 206.
fairly simple, freely composed tenor is a single melody divided into two halves in exact
repetition (in other words, this is a double-statement motet).

The scribe of Q15 has included a contratenor, but there are a number of problems with
the part that indicate that this voice was a later addition and best omitted in performance. In
general the addition of the contratenor diminishes the quality of the sonority of the counterpoint
because of a number of rather awkward complications with the part. These include a
preponderance of strong-beat dissonances between the upper voices and the contratenor, many
unnecessary doublings, especially at cadences, the muddying and obscuring of the counterpoint
because of unwieldy voice exchanges with the tenor, or the doubling of pitches in octave or
unison with the other voice parts. Particularly troubling are passages where the contratenor
obscures the displacement syncopation of the two cantus voices while the tenor is silent
(Example 2.24). In the three-voice arrangement, the two cantus parts exchange text and
counterpoint in alternating rhythms. The contratenor, moving in breves, does not contribute
significantly to the texture, and in my eyes prematurely introduces the sonority of the tenor part
that arrives only after the syncopation is completed.
Example 2.24: Ciconia, *Albane misse celitus*, mm. 39–65. In this example one can observe strong-beat dissonances (mm. 54, 62, and 65), unnecessary and overused parallel motion (mm. 41, 46–47, 54–55, and 59–60), voice exchange (mm. 55–56), unnecessary voice doublings (mm. 51 and 64–65), and occultation of the displaced counterpoint of the cantus parts in mm. 49–50.

*Albane misse celitus* is in *tempus imperfectum* and shares a common rhythmic cell with *O Padua* (minim – semibreve – minim) that functions as a mini-episode of displacement syncopation within the duple pulse of the work.

Although Ciconia uses two texts in this work, the relative length of each poem is the same, and the composer keeps each stanza in parallel with the corresponding verse of the other voice. As in *O Padua*, Ciconia often delineates line breaks in the poetry with a pause on a held sonority before the next entrance (for instance, mm. 13–14, m. 22–23, m. 30–31, etc.). As in other motets, Ciconia sets each line of text with a different feature, either displacement
syncopation or repeated rhythmic cells, although in this particular work, he avoids nearly all
exact melodic echo imitation. The most extensive passages of repeated rhythmic cells occur in
the melismas before the medial and final cadences (Examples 2.25A and B). The only occurrence
of melodic imitation occurs at the beginning of each melisma (mm. 68–71 and mm. 148–151),
but then shifts into a truncated version of the cell, hocketing back and forth to the cadential
sonorities.

Example 2.25A: Ciconia, *Albane missa celitus*, mm. 66–91. Melismatic passage
leading to the medial cadence in mm. 79–80.
Displacement syncopation between the two cantus parts occurs throughout the motet including the section of the opening duet mentioned above as well as passages in mm. 15–17 and a parallel passage in the second half of the motet (mm. 95–97) (Example 2.26). There are also examples of the tenor shifting into a rhythmically slower displacement syncopation in the melismas before the medial and final cadences (see mm. 73–76 and mm. 153–156 in Examples 2.25A and B above).
indicate fast triplets and the semibrevis caudata, a symbol used to indicate the perfect semibreve
in the Italian manner.

Bent’s reasons for attributing this motet to Ciconia are com-

Example 2.26: Ciconia, *Albane misse celitus*, mm. 12–24. Displacement syncopation between cantus I and cantus II in mm. 15–17.

**Fragments and Incomplete Motets**

The fragmentary motet [*…ptisari virgo Cristina* was written around 1400 in honor of Saint Christina of Bolsena. 57 Although there are a couple of events that occurred during the 14th and early 15th centuries that are associated with the saint, the style of music does not really suit these two occasions. Saint Cristina’s relics were transferred from San Marco di Ammiano to the Basilica of San Marco in Venice in 1340 (too early) and again to the church of St. Anthony in Torcello in 1430 (too late). The motet as it exists today is incomplete, but probably once was at least in three voices with a freely composed tenor. 58 Bent discusses this motet in some detail and asserts that the motet was associated with a Venetian monastic community that owned the relics of St. Christina and housed them at their monastery on the sinking island of Ammiano between 1252 and 1432. Bent’s reasons for attributing this motet to Ciconia are compelling, especially as it contains many of the same rhythmic and melodic elements as the other motets in Ciconia’s

---

57 GB-Ob MS. Canon. Ital. 16, f. 97v; fragment of a bifolium used to strengthen the final quire and flyleaf of the manuscript, both cut and erased. Transcribed in Bent, “Fourteenth-Century Italian Motet,” 120–121. N.B. this folio is in Italian notation with flagged minimis used to indicate fast triplets and the semibrevis caudata, a symbol used to indicate the perfect semibreve in the Italian manner.

58 Bent “Fourteenth-Century Italian Motet,” 110.
These elements include “imitation sequences, hocket with participation by the freely-composed tenor, held longas, and two-bar tenor interludes.” I add to her list displacement syncopation, duple within triple meter, and exact echo imitation.

*O proles Hispanie*, a motet in honor of St. Anthony of Padua is fragmentary its single source. If it was composed by Ciconia, the dedication to St. Anthony implies that the work would have had to be composed during his tenure in Padua, and thus between 1401 and 1412. No more specific date can be given.

Although the only extant voices of this single leaf are cantus II and the tenor, there are a number of notable features distinctive of Ciconia’s style that can be seen. Even though cantus I no longer exists, the recognition that the tenor incipit matches the text of cantus II (“O proles”) indicates that this was a single texted motet. The motet is in typical double-statement format with the second half exactly replicating the rhythm of the first half, with only the final sonority altering the replication. The first section was likely a duet between cantus I and cantus II (Example 2.27). After the opening sonority, the tenor drops out for eight tempus units with the upper voices likely moving in displacement syncopation, hockets, and either rhythmic or melodic imitative cells. These same features also probably reappeared throughout the motet. In addition there are specific moments that appear to be tenor solos where the tenor part is set with a text (Examples 2.28A and B).

---

59 Bent, “Fourteenth-Century Italian Motet,” 110. Bent compares this fragment to Ciconia’s motet *O felix templum*, which I discuss in more detail above.

60 Bent, “Fourteenth-Century Italian Motet,” 110.

61 I-Pu MS 1106, f. 4v (with a reverse image left on the inside rear cover of the manuscript).
Example 2.27: Ciconia, *O proles Hispanie*, mm. 1–12. The tenor rests indicate a likely moment of duet between cantus I and cantus II.

Example 2.28A: Ciconia, *O proles Hispanie*, mm. 13–23. The setting of the text in the tenor part, mm. 19–20, indicates that this may have been a solo passage.

Example 2.28B: Ciconia, *O proles Hispanie*, mm. 56–67. The setting of the text in the tenor part, mm. 60–61, indicates that this may have been a solo passage.

The single remaining leaf of *Padu... serenans – Pastor bonus* contains a cantus part and the tenor of a double-statement motet. Although the text this fragment is difficult to read, the motet is apparently in honor of Andrea Carrara, Abbot of Santa Giustina in Padua, 1398–1404.

This work is a typical equal-cantus motet and is distinctively Ciconian in style. Even without a second cantus voice, it is clear that there is melodic and rhythmic imitation, repeated rhythmic

---

62 I-Pu MS 1106, f. 1v.

cells in hocket, and a textless introductory duet that falls outside the repeated structure of the motet body proper. The tenor is identified by the text “Pastor bonus,” but thus far no *cantus prius factus* has been identified. The tenor is realized through the use of a canon: “Canon tenorum: Rubee dicantur de modo perfecto et tempore e converso; nigre vero e contra” (Red notes are in perfect mode, imperfect tempus; black notes are in imperfect mode, perfect tempus). The tenor is written out in a single melody divided by exact rhythmic repetition. The two sections of the cantus part are also in exact rhythmic repetition.

It is principally through the research of Margaret Bent that the fragmentary motet [...] *de qua cordis psalteriis – Trinitatem* has come to scholarly attention. This work is found as a pastedown flyleaf to a 15th-century missal for use in southern France. This motet is on the exposed side of a pasted bifolium and contains a cantus part and the tenor of the work. The bifolium is dated early 15th century and is contemporary with other fragmentary works from Santa Giustinia in Padua. The text contains a possible reference to the three-way papal schism and thus, she concludes a creation date of 1409–1415 (between the Councils of Pisa and Constance). This date is compatible with the compositional characteristics of the equal-cantus

---

64 PMFC 24, 208.


66 US-HAhl MS Typ 122, f. 1v. An image of this side of the bifolium can be found in Harvard College Library’s collection of digitized manuscripts, http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:FHCL.HOUGH:1124601.

67 See Michael Scott Cuthbert, “Trecento Fragments and Polyphony Beyond the Codex” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2006), 220, for a complete list of sources for these works.

motet of the era. These features include a freely composed tenor, the possible double-statement structure of the work, sequential repetition of rhythmic cells, and the use of hockets. Because of these elements, Bent groups this motet with the two other fragmentary works in I-Pu MS 1106, *O proles Hispanie* and *Padu . . . serenans* (discussed above) and are thus all possibly by a single composer if not Ciconia himself.69

On the other hand Cuthbert argues against this work as either by Ciconia or from an Italian scribal tradition at all.70 Cuthbert observes that neither the cantus part nor the tenor have the typical extensive rests found in Ciconia’s other motets nor are there passages where the texture is remarkably changed. There is no distinctive attention to the form and structure of the text, as the musical phrases are mismatched to poetic line. Along a similar vein, I am struck by the lack of rhythmic development of repeated rhythmic cells. Because only a restricted view of the work remains, (missing at least one additional voice and possibly the first half of the work) one can still observe that the composer remains quite conservative in this motet. For instance, the rhythmic cells remain static in the hocket passages as opposed to the elaborately expanding and contracting rhythmic cells found in many other examples of Ciconia’s works (Examples 2.29A and B). Because this conservative approach is not typical of Ciconia’s style, the authorship remains indeterminate.

---

Example 2.29A: Ciconia (?), [. . .] *de qua cordis psalteriis* – *Trinitatem*, mm. 11–30. Static hocketed cells in mm. 19–22 and mm. 28–30.

Example 2.29B: Ciconia (?), [. . .] *de qua cordis psalteriis* – *Trinitatem*, mm. 45–50. Static hocketed cells in mm. 46–47.

The appearance of a mensural signature (○) at the beginning of this fragment that changes to C midway through the work may indicates that this folio only contains the second half of a larger work.\(^71\) The first half of this motet, which would have opened in implied ○ that changed to C, is now apparently lost. The idea that this work is only fragmentary is further supported by the text, which points to an unknown subject that would have presence in the first half of the poem. These are compelling reasons to consider this source only part of a much larger and longer work.

---

\(^71\) Bent, “New Sacred Polyphonic Fragments,” 181–182.
CHAPTER THREE
JOHANNES CICONIA’S INNOVATIONS

In Chapter 2, I establish the motets of Johannes Ciconia as the epitome of the equal-cantus style. The nine works that I discuss in detail in that chapter feature typical equal-cantus characteristics such as upper voices equal in range, texture, text length, and activity, opening duets, a freely composed tenor that moves a relatively fast rhythmic motion, the use of hocket, displacement syncopation, and echo imitation, a double-statement structure, and the honorific and ceremonial intent of its text. Yet, there are a number of Ciconia’s works that, because of a variety of compositional inventions, evade convenient definition by these few parameters alone. For instance, the works O Petre Christi discipule, O beatum incendium, and Regina gloriosa have been classified as contrafacta of songs. By limiting the definition of these three works as simply reworkings of earlier songs, there is a tendency to avoid grouping them with Ciconia’s other motets. As I will elucidate below, we dismiss these works as abnormal or peripheral at our own peril. By bringing these works back into the discussion of the motet, a much greater understanding of the compositional world of the early 15th century is revealed, not only of the motet in general, but also of the equal-cantus motet in particular.

Redefining the Motet Genre: Motets Without a Tenor

When German musicologist Friedrich Ludwig first proposed using the concept of what is now known as isorhythm in the first decade of the twentieth century he invented an amazingly useful analytical tool. This device has helped music scholars identify works by their structural

---

1 This portion of this chapter is an expansion of a paper read at the Annual Conference of the American Musicological Society in New Orleans 2012. Many thanks to Margaret Bent, David Fallows, Lisa Colton, Michael Cuthbert, Rob Wegman, and Alejandro Planchart, all of whom have commented on various parts of this paper and have helped shaped many of the ideas herein.
organization, which in turn is useful for classification and discussion. A significant number of editions of 14th and early 15th century motets that have been subsequently published include the thorough analysis of each work’s isorhythmic structure. These editions divide the repertory into those that have formal melodic and rhythmic constructions and those that do not. But studies of motets that marginalize motets that do not fit neatly into the structural restraints of proportional manipulation demonstrate that the criteria of isorhythm are not all-inclusive. I am not the first to notice this and it is apparent that others agree that this hegemonic division is problematic. It is now over a century since Ludwig published his initial thoughts about proportional structures in motets and scholars are still negotiating the concept of isorhythm and its relevance to the analysis of 14th- and 15th-century motets. Thanks in particular to the contributions of Margaret Bent, Julie Cumming, and more recently Anna Zayaruznaya, the conversation about isorhythm continues to be a lively one. This dialogue has lead to the evaluation and reevaluation of a wide range of repertory that extends well beyond the earlier and more restrictive definition of the motet genre that originated in the early twentieth century.

An examination of early 15th-century motets from the Veneto in comparison to those from north of the Alps reveals two vastly different musical cultures. The texture of the equal-

---

cantus style of motet associated with Italy usually consists of two equal upper voices and a tenor in a lower range that often moves in slower note values, but which can also accelerate to join in an imitative counterpoint with the upper parts. Motets from the south also differ in construction from their northern analogues. Although some equal-cantus motets are strictly isorhythmic, a great many others are not. Italian composers experimented with compositional features that are associated with isorhythmic construction such as diminution or mensural manipulation, but in isolation from other isorhythmic principles. These composers were also more likely to avoid borrowing pre-composed chants as the basis for their motets and instead created newly invented tenors.

One challenge for scholars doing research on the motet in the early 15th century is overcoming the reliance on prioritizing isorhythmic features above all other stylistic construction. Because many Veneto motets are not classified as isorhythmic, they have often been relegated to a so-called “peripheral tradition.” By examining these works from a perspective free of isorhythmic identification alone, I present a richer view of the compositional world of this era that includes many motets that have been marginalized or neglected because of a lack of an overt formulaic or proportional structure. A revised definition of what a motet is

---

3 Bent shows that double-statement motets without diminution are actually more truly isorhythmic according to a strict definition than those with mensural or proportional manipulation. See Bent, “What is Isorhythm,” 122. See also Emily Zazulia’s dissertation, “Verbal Canons and Notational Complexity in Fifteenth-Century Music” (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2012). In Chapter 2 (83–132) she examines the role of isorhythmic techniques that are used well into the 15th century. She studies isorhythm not as a dying and residual technique as Thomas Brothers implies in his article “Vestiges of Isorhythmic Tradition in Mass and Motet, ca. 1450–1475,” Journal of the American Musicological Society 44:1 (1991): 1–56. Zazulia puts forward the argument that isorhythmic structuring is only one of many specific techniques of compositional method and that one should not rely upon the presence of isorhythm alone to define a motet and describe its structure.

4 Ciconia’s Doctorum principem is neither isorhythmic nor proportional, but is constructed by a threefold mensural transformation (C – O – C).
allows for the inclusion of a broader selection of works and gives a more complete picture of musical esthetics of the early 15th century.\textsuperscript{5} It follows that if the tenor part is not required to provide organization for the structure of the motet, then other features such as text, context, and melodic or rhythmic construction play a more important role in shaping the form and function of the work.

In this section, I focus on Johannes Ciconia’s \textit{O Petre, Christi discipule}, a song with two equal, low-cleffed voices, with a single text, and no tenor.\textsuperscript{6} Because this work lacks a tenor part, there has been a long-standing hypothesis that it is actually the contrafactum of a song and therefore it is not included with a number of other studies of the early 15th-century motet.\textsuperscript{7} Despite the possibility that the work may have originated as a secular song, I argue that a number of important characteristics reveal that the work also stands as an independent, two-voice, tenorless motet.

The concept of a motet without a tenor prompts reconsideration of the definition of the motet genre. By questioning the classification of genres, I am confronting the defining stylistic features that have been traditionally used to define a work as a motet. The reclassification of \textit{O Petre} from contrafactum to motet can serve as an exemplar for how one might reevaluate the

\textsuperscript{5} For instance, despite every intention of being inclusive in an otherwise comprehensive dissertation, Jon Michael Allsen excludes all of the non-isorhythmic works of Ciconia and as a consequence omits several significant motets including those for Padua and Venice. The reintroduction of these works to the regular canon of early 15th-century motets round out the understanding of Ciconia’s oeuvre. Jon Michael Allsen, “Style and Intertextuality in the Isorhythmic Motet, 1400–1440,” (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 1992).

\textsuperscript{6} The works by Ciconia referenced in this chapter are all edited in PMFC 24. \textit{O Petre} is in Q15, ff. 288v–289, attributed to “Jo ciconie.”

\textsuperscript{7} Bent states that \textit{O Petre} shows “none of the symptoms of contrafaction,” but she has also urged me to consider that there remain a number of factors, particularly form, that may demonstrate that the work was originally a secular work. See Margaret Bent, “Early Papal Motets,” in \textit{Papal Music and Musicians in Late Medieval and Renaissance Rome}, edited by Richard Sherr (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 26.
definition of the motet in general and the compositional uniqueness of the equal-cantus motet in particular. Furthermore, the reconsideration of how musicians viewed the role of the tenor allows for a new perspective on how stylistic features influenced the works of other composers who were working in Italy in the first quarter of the 15th century.

There exist a number of sacred works that exist in the repertory of the late 14th and early 15th century in only two voices, but it is apparent that these are incomplete pieces. For instance the anonymous motets *Hic est precursor* and *O Francisce funde* are both likely missing at least a third voice—a cantus II and possibly a contratenor—that would have been found on an adjacent leaf. Unlike these works, *O Petre* is a complete entity and not a fragment with missing parts. The motet occupies a complete opening in Q15, with cantus I on the verso and cantus II on the following recto (Figure 3.1). Considering customary scribal practice, it is not logical to conclude that there are missing leaves foliated between the two extant cantus parts on which would be contratenor or tenor part.

---

8 *Hic est precursor*, PMFC 12, 151–152. *O Francisce funde* is in I-Tn MS T.III.2, f. 15v.
An indication that the scribe of Q15 considered a two-voice work such as *O Petre* as a motet is that he allotted this piece the principal space of the *mise-en-page* of the manuscript. This leaves no room at the bottom where the songs or laude of Q15 are generally inscribed as additions. Cantus I occupies the entire space on f. 288v although the scribe obviously tightened up the notation for the long “Amen” melisma (Figure 3.2). On the recto of the opening, the scribe leaves about three-quarters of the last stave of cantus II blank, but only a short canonico or isorhythmic tenor with obvious repetitions could possibly be squeezed into this small area (Figure 3.3).

---

9 There are a series of motets in this collection of folios (ff. 249v–294) with interspersed songs in available spaces at the bottoms of leaves. The contrafactum *O beatum indendium* is treated similarly, i.e. afforded principal space within the *mise-en-page* on the leaf, to *O Petre* a few openings earlier (ff. 285v–286).
Figure 3.2: Q15, f. 288v (detail); Ciconia, *O Petre*. The crowded notation of the “Amen” section shows that the scribe was probably conscious of the open space remaining on the leaf.

Figure 3.3: Q15, f. 289 (detail); Ciconia, *O Petre*. If this work has an original tenor, it would need to be fit into a limited space on this leaf.
A further consideration of the addition of a tenor, or lack thereof, comes from an examination of the source. Q15 was significantly revised after an initial stage. This included the removal and recopying of a number of motets to which the scribe added additional parts, such as the four-voice contratenor of Ciconia’s motet, *O felix templum*.\(^{10}\) If the scribe had been aware that a tenor part was missing in his inscription of *O Petre* in the first stage copying of the manuscript, he obviously had ample opportunity to remove and revise the work so that the tenor could be included. The fact that he did not either remove the work in total or revise and recopy indicates that the work was complete as it exists in the source today.

If *O Petre* is a contrafactum, one expects to find certain formal and structural markers indicating its original purpose. These markers such as the division of the song in the text setting, in musical structure, or by using graphic symbols can be found in other contracta. The structure of *O Petre* is suggestive. The musical form is divided into three sections (see Appendix 3.1 for a full score). The first section (mm. 1–52) is set with the first three strophes, the second section (mm. 53–76) is the fourth strophe, and the final section (mm. 77–100) is a long melisma on the word “Amen.” The poetic form of *O Petre*, on the other hand, is in four parts. The four stanzas are in rhyming quatrains (see Appendix 3.2 for a text and translation). The majority of the *formes fixes* are based upon two divisions of musical structure. The madrigal, the ballata, the virelai, and the rondeau all rely upon no more than two different musical sections. In the case of *O Petre* some part of the work by necessity would have to be “misshapen” and out of balance in order to accommodate three musical sections as well as four poetic stanzas.\(^{11}\)

\(^{10}\) The contratenor of *O felix templum* was first added, but then rejected in the stage III recopying of the work. See Bent, *Q15*, I:214.

\(^{11}\) Alejandro Planchart in a private conversation used the term “misshapen” in his rejection of the hypothesis that *O Petre* was could possibly have been a madrigal in its original form.
Considering the possibility that *O Petre* is a contrafactum leads to seeking the original song form. I will begin by considering that the original source was a madrigal. A madrigal text usually consists of three parts: two strophes (*terzetti*) and a concluding section (*ritornello*). According to the length of this poem, the *ritornello* ought to begin about three-quarters of the way through, on the text “O Christe” (line 13). The text is not well suited for a madrigal setting. It has three verses that would either need to be divided equally over the repetition of the *terzetta*, dividing the rhetoric of verse two in half (between lines 10 and 11), or that would require a repetition of the three verses of text for the return to the opening musical section. The first section of the music opens with an expressive “O” melisma (mm. 1–52), the second commences with held dramatic minor-thirds and then continues on the “O Christe” melisma (mm. 53–76; this is, as I have noted above, the hypothetical beginning of the textual *ritornello*), and finally moves into an “Amen” section (mm. 77–end).

If *O Petre* was originally a madrigal, the *terzetta* section would be from mm. 1–52. In a madrigal, the music of the *terzetta* is repeated for a second verse of text. In this case a second verse does not exist and, thus, a repeat is unnecessary. The *ritornello* then occurs immediately following a major cadence. In *O Petre* the *ritornello* would be far too long if it begins at m. 53 as this is nearly half the length of the work of one hundred measures. The work could be shortened at the end of the fourth verse by excluding the music for the “Amen,” but this makes no compositional sense. There is no clear cadence at the end of the text before the “Amen,” but instead a remarkable pause on a minor-third interval leap in cantus II (which in performance can be slightly lengthened for dramatic effect) that then resolves in a typically Ciconia-like fashion into the final long melisma.
Heinrich Besseler, followed by Suzanne Clercx and Bobby Wayne Cox, describes *O Petre* as a madrigal, but with the final “Amen” section (mm. 77–100) standing in for the *ritornello*. This works in a better formal sense in that the balance of the madrigal form is improved. There remains some problematic voice-leading at the cadential figure in m. 76. The unusual leap upwards of a minor third in cantus II, sounds odd as a return back to the opening of the work as would suit a proper madrigal.

When casting *O Petre* in the form of a madrigal, one must not only consider poetic or musical form, but also its mensural features. The lack of any change of mensuration in the work provides further evidence that the motet does not exhibit the normal conventions of a *forme fixe*. The claim that *O Petre* is a contrafactum of a madrigal would be strengthened if there were a major mensural change at the beginning of the *ritornello*. Even in Ciconia’s mensurally complex madrigals such as *Una panthera* the *terzetta* ends at a significant cadence indicated by a sign in the manuscript and then the *ritornello* begins in a new mensuration. *O Petre* is in only one mensuration throughout. The use of a single mensuration is a common feature of the equal-cantus motet.

Considering these elements—textual, formal, and mensural—the proposal that this work had originally existed as a madrigal seems less and less likely. Instead, the partitioning of *O Petre* into two nearly equal halves is more reminiscent of the equal-cantus motet. By

---


highlighting this half division with long melismas on the syllable “O,” Ciconia is referencing not the madrigal in three parts, but the motet instead.

Perhaps *O Petre* was not originally a madrigal, but a ballata (AbbaA). This is precisely what Robert Nosow asserts. He equates the four stanzas with a *ripresa* (mm. 1–21), two *piedi* (mm. 22–37 and mm. 38–52 respectively), and a *volta* (mm. 53–100). This configuration works with the format of the text, but the lack of exact musical repetition in the *piedi*. As Nosow indicates, musical repetition is not made by simply repeating the *piedi* but instead created through voice exchange. Nosow divides each *piede* into two phrases, an “a” and a “b” (Example 3.1). In the second *piede* the musical section is traded between cantus I and cantus II, but reversed with phrase “b” before phrase “a.” The repetition and reversal of these phrases is not exact, but the sonic quality is that there is at least a reference to the repeated *piedi* of a ballata.

---


15 Nosow does not indicate if he considers the final “Amen” section, mm. 77–100, original to the composition although he does mark this long melisma as ideal for setting an “Amen.” If one does not disregard this final passage, a ballata form seems a bit off balance as the *volta* becomes quite long.
nos tro pres u le. O princi pes apo sto li ce, tur be C e phas do mi ni ce, 

nos tro pres u le. O princi pes apo sto li ce, tur be C e phas do mi ni ce, 

pa sto rem no strum di ri ge, quem o mni malo pro te ge. Da 

pa sto rem no strum di ri ge, quem o mni malo pro te ge. Da 

sit in cun cis pro vi dus, cor po re et men te can di dus, o mni vir tu te 

sit in cun cis pro vi dus, cor po re et men te can di dus, o mni vir tu te 

splen di dus, in bo no sem per fer vi dus. O 

splen di dus, in bo no sem per fer vi dus. O 

Example 3.1: Ciconia, O Petre, mm. 20–57. Nosow identifies two piedi of a ballata form, the first beginning at verse 2, m. 22, and the second beginning at verse 3, m. 38. These piedi are divided into two musical phrases each: Piede 1, Phrase a, mm. 26–32; Piede 1, Phrase b, mm. 33–37; Piede 2, Phrase b, mm. 38–42; and Piede 2, Phrase a, mm. 43–49.

The return from the volta to the repetition of the represa with its significantly long, melismatic cadence argues against the original form of the work as a ballata. The long final section in Nosow’s words, “acts as a closing section,” but his meaning here is uncertain as a closing section of this kind is not found in any other ballate in the repertory.
I will discuss the final “Amen” section’s unique characteristics later in this chapter, but if it were entirely eliminated, the form could be rearranged to suit a virelai. The structure adheres to an AbbA format with section A corresponding to mm. 1–52 and section B corresponding to mm. 53–76. The final pitches of the second section enable a persuasive return to both the repeat of the A and B sections. In my opinion, this arrangement is the best solution to the question of whether O Petre is a contrafactum. Indeed, the idea that Ciconia would have added a melismatic cadence to an existing song to transform it into a motet also reinforces the hypothesis that the work is truly a motet in every sense of the definition in the mind of the composer.

The motet O beatum incendium, which is demonstrably the reworking of a preexisting virelai Aler m’en veus, is found a few openings before O Petre in Q15. In the manuscript the scribe has clearly delineated the underlying virelai structure of the motet. He has drawn a red line between the A and B sections of the work and includes a repeat sign for the ouvert and clos endings of the B section despite the fact that the single text in this case does not require the structural repeats as is needed for the original French text (Figure 3.4). In the case of O Petre

\[\text{\textsuperscript{16}}\] Margaret Bent first suggested the idea of examining O Petre as a virelai, but I must also give special thanks to Lisa Colton for discussing with me the practical possibility that the final “Amen” section was a later addition.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{17}}\] This major third leap may be the original clos ending of the virelai, although this odd solo leap before the repeat of B is redundant.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{18}}\] Q15, ff. 285v–286, attributed to “Jo ciconie.”

\[\text{\textsuperscript{19}}\] The original virelai is the song Aler m’en veus, f. Av of I-Pu MS 1115 (cantus I only; attributed to “Johes”). Faded double lines in the manuscript indicate the division of sections of the virelai. It is possible that the cantus II part was on an adjacent folio page. But Michael Cuthbert has demonstrated that the scribe’s preferred layout of this particular manuscript was to copy a piece on a single page rather than across an opening. For whatever reason, it appears that Cantus II was left out of this manuscript despite the fact that there seems to be enough room on the extant page to fit the second part. See Michael Scott Cuthbert, “Trecento Fragments and Polyphony Beyond the Codex,” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2006), 196–197. The cantus II voice has been reconstructed in Bent’s Ciconia edition using the second voice of O beatum incendium in Q15.
no such structural indicators are used (Figure 3.5).\textsuperscript{20} This lack of organizational markers, despite the demonstrable use of them elsewhere, raises more unanswered questions about the original form of \textit{O Petre}. If the scribe was aware that \textit{O beatum incendium} was originally a virelai with a secular text and left the original structural signs intact, why would he not do the same for \textit{O Petre}?

\textsuperscript{20} There is a hint of color on the two folios of \textit{O Petre}, but it seems to be entirely decorative. In addition to the decorated initials, there is a touch of red in the “O” of “O Christe” about half-way through the piece, and in cantus I, there is a spot of red in the “A” of “Amen.” \textit{O beatum incendium} has similarly decorative red touches in the “O”s of the text.
Figure 3.4: Q15, f. 285v; Ciconia, *O beatum incendium*, cantus I. Circles indicate the red line at the end of the A section and repeat signs for the *ouvert* and *clos* endings of the B section.

Example 3.5: Q15, f. 288v; Ciconia, *O Petre*, cantus I. Circles indicate missing structural indicators at the end of the hypothetical A and B sections of the original song.
Having examined several analytic and paleographic indicators that relate *O Petre* to some sort of possible progenitor, I now turn to the particularly motet-like features of the work. There are a number of key stylistic elements that place *O Petre* squarely within the equal cantus-motet genre. The first is that most of the motets of Venetian provenance were probably ceremonial and had honorific texts specifically mentioning the dedicatee. The only name overtly mentioned in the single text of the work is “Peter.” However, the honorific Peter in this work suits multiple identities. St. Peter is invoked and is asked to pray for his namesake who is both a bishop and a shepherd, but the evocation of Peter extends beyond this overt saintly reference. It is possible that a second Peter referenced in the text is Pietro Filargo da Candia who was elected as Pope Alexander V in Pisa in 1409. The text further invites the possibility that yet a third Peter is referenced. This Peter could possibly be Bishop Pietro Emiliani of Vicenza, who was the first appointment of Alexander V’s short reign, or Pietro Marcello, appointed as bishop of Padua in 1409 and confirmed by Alexander V in that same year.

---

21 Guiliano Di Bacco and John Nádas, Verso uno ‘stile internazionale’ della musica nelle cappelle papali,” *Collectanea* I (Rome: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1994), 33. In support of the theory that *O Petre* is for the Pisan antipope, Di Bacco and Nádas have hypothesized a pun on Filargo’s Cretan origins within the text. Candia was the Venetian name for the island of Crete and the line “corpore et mente candidus” (fair in body and mind) may have inspired a clever chuckle. In the 1960s Suzanne Clercx hinted at the possibility that the Petre of *O Petre* is Pope Benedict XIII (born Pedro de Luna) elected in Avignon in 1394. Clercx, Johannes Ciconia, I:61, 88, and 120. Numerous scholars including Fallows and Di Bacco and Nádas have shown that Ciconia’s Avignonese connections are less and less plausible.

22 Bent, “Early Papal Motets,” 25. Bent’s supposition that Emiliani is the honoree is based upon his known patronage of polyphonic music and his long-standing attachment to Filargo. The motet may have been intended for some sort of ceremonial event for the appointment of Emiliani or the confirmation of Marcello, but this is merely conjectural and there is no evidence that confirms these theories. Considering Ciconia’s connections to Padua, Marcello is a strong candidate for the third dedicatee, but Di Bacco and Nádas give compelling argument that it could be for either of the two bishops. It is possible that the motet was composed for the Council of Pisa, but the triple invocation would not have been appropriate for this occasion. More and more it is apparent that motets had much more usage than for one single event during this bustling era.
One key characteristic of the equal-cantus motet is the equality of the voices especially in function, rhythmic activity, and amount of text.\textsuperscript{23} For about three-quarters of \textit{O Petre} cantus I is in a higher range than cantus II, but the second cantus occasionally takes the upper part. Because the two cantus parts of \textit{O Petre} are equal in range I see them as analogous to the two equal upper voices of an equal-cantus motet, but even this does not lead to the conclusive elimination of this work from classification as a contrafactum. Fallows’ work on equal-range two-voice song settings urges me to refrain from leaping to too many conclusions on that score. He has shown that in the known song repertory, 50% are in two equal voices that occupy the same range with constantly intertwining lines in the same fashion as \textit{O Petre}’s.\textsuperscript{24} It is possible that Ciconia found that the equality of ranges of his equal-voiced virelai \textit{Aler m’en veus}, which has a contrafactum setting \textit{O beatum incendium} in Q15, and of the hypothetical original song upon which \textit{O Petre} is based, made them suitable for reworking as motets.\textsuperscript{25}

The rhythmic and melodic shape of \textit{O Petre} exhibits many of the features characteristic of other early 15th century motets originating in the Veneto. There is extensive use of hocket of early 15th-century Italian politics. This may suggest that any or all of these significant religious personages would have enjoyed the performance of this work at some juncture.

\textsuperscript{23} Bent, “Fourteenth-Century Italian Motet,” 102.


\textsuperscript{25} The only discrepancy here is that these works have significantly lower clefs than is usual for a motet. The normal clefs for the two upper voices of an equal-cantus motet are generally C-1 or C-2. In the case of \textit{O beatum incendium} (contrafactum of \textit{Aler m’en veus}) and \textit{O Petre} the voices are extremely low: C-4 clefs for \textit{O beatum incendium} and hybrid F-2/C-4 clefs on a six-line stave for \textit{O Petre}. To me, the idea of adding a tenor to these two-voice works to turn them into “legitimate” three-voice motets seems to be inconceivable. A tenor part with a range a fourth to an octave lower than the upper voices would be unusually low for the era although not entirely unknown. See Solage’s \textit{Fumeux fume} (Chantilly, f. 59) and Antonio da Teramo’s \textit{Deduto sey} (BU2216, ff. 49v–50, and F-PN nouvelles acquisitions françaises 4917, ff. 25v–26v), both of which use gamma clefs for the lowest parts. I have great doubts that there is any connection between these works and \textit{O Petre} on a compositional, intellectual, or conceptual level.
using both pitch and text. This is especially notable with the repeated names “Petre” and “Christi” that emphasizes the importance of the relationship of Christ and the various Peters being invoked (Example 3.2). In the first line of the motet, each cantus starts an octave apart, and then immediately crossing ranges in a dramatic fashion. This first utterance (a vocative “O”), cadences on the name “Petre” with both parts landing homophonically in unison. Then cantus I sings the name “Christi” and is immediately echoed by cantus II with the same melodic fragment, both in pitch and rhythm, emphasizing the relationship between Christ and, in this instance, his principal disciple, St. Peter.

Example 3.2: Ciconia, *O Petre*, mm. 1–9. Emphasis with unison homophony on the name “Petre” occurs in m. 5 and emphasis on “Christi” through repetition in m. 6.

Melodic imitation occurs throughout, the most extreme example of which is the swapping of melodies between cantus I and cantus II (Example 3.3). In this instance, Ciconia principally uses echo imitation in which cantus I introduces a melodic cell that is then imitated either by pitch, rhythm, or both in cantus II. But Ciconia also uses a more elaborate form of imitation by swapping an entire melodic passage through voice crossing between cantus I and cantus II. This serves to emphasize the equality of ranges between these two voice parts.
of one or the other of the voices. Either another unison or octave or inserting a fifth or third between the two existing parts. This every cadence is either in unison or in perfect octaves. If a third voice is added, it would require strong beats suggesting the need for a third voice completing the sonority a fifth lower. Al Petre distinctive characteristics of the motet.

\[\text{Example 3.3: Ciconia, O Petre, mm. 30–48. Melodic imitation between cantus I and cantus II in mm. 30–31, mm. 33, and mm. 47–48; this example also includes a long section of voice crossing between cantus I and cantus II, swapping mm. 33–37 with mm. 38–42.}\]

Finally, in the extended “Amen” section, Ciconia uses all of the Italianate characteristics in his toolbox: extensive repetition, hocket, syncopation, and sequence, all of which are distinctive characteristics of the motet.

How Ciconia come to compose this kind of work in the first place? Does this genre of work require a tenor for it to be a proper motet? I propose that the contrapuntal structure of O Petre functions perfectly well without a tenor. Furthermore, it is nearly impossible to imagine how a lower voice would fit below these two. Most notably, there are no perfect fourths on strong beats suggesting the need for a third voice completing the sonority a fifth lower. Almost every cadence is either in unison or in perfect octaves. If a third voice is added, it would require either another unison or octave or inserting a fifth or third between the two existing parts. This voicing is hard to conceive. Furthermore, the two existing voices exchange roles so easily within the body of the structure that the addition of a tenor would only duplicate the foundational nature of one or the other of the voices.
The tenor-like qualities of cantus II are particularly notable in the cadential “Amen” passage. During this final section of the work, cantus II has a change of quality that indicates that it has shifted its role. In the first section of the motet, it played an equal counterpoint to cantus I, sharing range, texture, and rhythmic activity. In the “Amen” section, cantus II behaves more like a tenor like the freely composed tenor voices found in Ciconia’s other motets (Example 3.4). The range of cantus II stays below the upper voice and although the rhythmic passages are still in counterpoint, and the melodic profile becomes more angular in support of repeated melodic cells in cantus I. Additionally there is also one short solo passage analogous to the tempora-long tenor solos found in other Ciconian motets. If the hypothesis is put forth that this “Amen” section was added to a preexisting virelai structure, the change of the function of cantus II may prove that Ciconia was intentionally remaking a secular song in order to function better as a motet. He does this not only through the retexting of the work as an honorific homage to Peter, but also by recasting the texture of the final section to better match the typical cadential passages of the his equal-cantus motets.
especially when cantus II moves into a range higher than cantus I (Example 3.4: Ciconia, *O Petre*, mm. 76–100. Cantus II shifts into a tenor-like function in the final section of the motet, staying in a lower range than cantus I and moving only in counterpoint to the upper voice. The only exception is m. 86 in which cantus II has a short solo section, but this is also a characteristic of tenors in other equal-cantus works.

In order to evaluate the structural integrity of *O Petre* as a two-voice motet, it is fruitful to compare it with other complete two-voice works in the genre. Another two-voice motet from Q15, Johannes Reson’s motet *Ave verum corpus*, may be of interest in this discussion. Reson’s work is not as musically creative as *O Petre*, but it provides further evidence that contribute to our understanding of motets without tenors in the early 15th century. There is little imitation in this work and Reson does not exploit contrapuntal syncopation as is found in Ciconia’s works. Regardless, Reson follows a similar model to *O Petre* by taking advantage of creating musical interest by utilizing equivalence of ranges through voice crossing. Both voices swap function especially when cantus II moves into a range higher than cantus I (Example 3.5). This is not

---

Reson’s most successful work (in my opinion, his three-voice setting of the same text demonstrates higher technical skill), but it is an example of a composer moving away from the essential presence of a tenor voice and utilizing the contrapuntal possibilities of only two voices to create a complete motet texture and sonority.

Example 3.5: Reson, *Ave verum corpus*, mm. 1–13. In this passage, cantus I and cantus II freely swap ranges, rhythmic activity, and function.

Another work relevant to this discussion is Johannes de Lymburgia’s motet *Recordare virgo mater.* In this work the composer utilizes a *si placet* tenor that appears and disappears at various points in the texture, but which does not follow any structural or formal pattern such as isorhythmic manipulation or other forms of repetition. *Recordare* is dependent on the *si placet* voice where it is essential for completing the sonorities of the work, but then is absent where the two upper voices create self-sustaining counterpoint. The addition of the tenor is especially notable at cadences and in particular in the final section of the motet where Lymburgia sets coronae over the homophonic text, “suscipe pia,” which is part of a longer polyphonic section asking the Virgin Mary to receive the prayers of the pious (Example 3.8). Here Lymburgia opts for a fuller sonority through the addition of the third voice emphasizing the pleading nature of the petition in this section of the work.

---


There are characteristics of *Recordare*’s tenor that are quite unexpected. The basic rhythmic motion of the tenor is entirely equivalent to the upper voices, moving by breve, semibreve, and minim. The melodic shape is awkward with large consecutive leaps downwards or upwards. At one point the tenor leaps up first a fourth, followed by an upward fifth, down an octave down from the top pitch, and then back up again by a fifth (Example 3.9). This unusual melodic contour indicates that the tenor part was created only in simultaneous consideration of this voice’s counterpoint with the two upper voices, which are exchanging passages of echo imitation.

Example 3.9: Lymburgia, *Recordare*, mm. 36–44. The tenor in this example makes a number of awkward consecutive leaps, especially in mm. 37–39.

The non-existent tenor of *O Petre* and the creation of newly composed contrapuntal lower voices for other equal-cantus motets all indicate the basic idea that the presence of a borrowed chant melody need not be the defining and essential element of a motet. A freely composed tenor part in works in the equal-cantus style support the other voices by filling in
sonorities as found in the extreme leaps of the tenors in Ciconia’s three-voice motets, in the si placet tenor of Lymburgia’s Recordare, and in the final “Amen” section of O Petre. By inventing tenors with faster rhythmic values, a composer creates an equal participant in the complete texture of a work, sometimes taking solo melodic passages. Even in a proportionally organized tenor, composers freely set the tenor in a fashion different from the traditional isorhythmic norms—as contrapuntal support, but not as formulaic structural features. Thus the tenor in an equal-cantus motet is an equal participant in the work as a whole, but not the exclusive structural component of the motet. This even leaves the possibility that no tenor is needed at all.

Without the constraints of tenor organization, how then does one define exactly what a motet is? On some level, the discussion of the motet is constrained by the concept that a motet is whatever a composer (or a scribe) deems to be a motet. This gives rise to multifarious definitions of the genre that transcend century and national identity. I would argue that a handful of features mark a composition incontrovertibly as a motet. In the case of the equal-cantus motet in the first decades of the 15th century, one of the primary characteristics is the text. The texts of equal-cantus motets are almost exclusively paraliturgical, ceremonial, honorific, and highly symbolic. It is possible that the early 15th-century honorific motet had a predecessor in the ceremonial madrigals of Italy in the 14th century and that honorific motets simply substituted one for the other. Yet there are subtle, stylistically marked elements in each generic classification. A motet is a genre with big textual gestures. By invoking St. Peter for instance, Ciconia moves away from the detailed and sometimes obscure heraldic emblems in the ceremonial madrigals Una panthera and Per quella strada. These two madrigals were intended for an intimate audience with specialized knowledge of the specific people and symbols that are referenced. Simultaneously
there is a kind of formal simplicity to motets especially as they eschew the intricate mensural changes of madrigals. The texture is clearer, with a single text performed by two equal voices in imitation and echo, which leaves open the opportunity for emphasis and reemphasis on particular phrases or words or names. Even as the number of voices increases, such as in the more complex works of Du Fay in the second quarter of the 15th century, this clarity of texture as found in the motet is distinctive from the secular works that are likewise evolving around it.

In the case of *O Petre* I see all of the typical characteristics of the equal-cantus motet especially as the work functions as a motet within its particular stylistic language. There is no need to justify it as a motet that is missing a tenor or a motet created out of a pre-existing song form. What is more, the creation of a tenorless motet shows us that Ciconia, if not all of the composers in the Italian Q15 circle were not anxious about being obliged to use the form and structure of the tenor to control and shape their compositional processes. This freedom of structure is part of a longer continuum of the evolution of style—a style that had already existed in Italy for nearly one hundred years that was then adopted and adapted by composers working south of the Alps, such as Du Fay, and which flows readily into the motet style of the second quarter of the 15th century.

This is not to say that Du Fay woke up one morning, suddenly freed from the shackles of isorhythmic and proportional constraint, to write perfect, imitative Renaissance polyphony. To suggest this is ludicrous, considering especially that in his early works Du Fay was merely adopting the characteristics of the Veneto motet and not creating a whole new mode of composition. Likely Du Fay was inspired by the creative possibilities of writing vocal parts that

---

can be produced in simultaneous construction, in relation one to the other rather than being exclusively reliant upon a pre-existing tenor framework. This innovative compositional freedom is clearly seen by examining his early Italian motets. One example of Du Fay’s compositional creativity is the motet *Apostolo glorioso da dio electo – Cum tua doctrina convertisti a Christo – Andreas Cristi famulus.*29 In this work Du Fay retains an upper-level duet between two equal-voice cantus parts and a lower-voiced, contrapuntal, *cantus firmus* tenor, but he also includes two contratenor parts that share length, function, rhythmic activity, and amount of text with each other.

Du Fay takes the remarkable construction of *Apostolo glorioso* beyond his original five-voice arrangement. The freedom of compositional practice enables him to generate a second version of the motet by fashioning a three-voice work that utilizes a newly composed solus tenor. This newly invented tenor consists of a pastiche of various sections of the two contratenors and the *cantus firmus* tenor. In the first half of each section, the solus tenor borrows primarily from the tenor, but then incorporates various bits from the contratenor voices. This occurs particularly in the cadential sequences where in the five-voice version these three voices are moving in long hockets (Example 3.10). Transformation of the tenor from a preexisting *cantus firmus* to a newly composed part causes a dramatic shift from a smooth chant melody toward a more angular

Anna Zayaruznaya, Bonnie Blackburn, and Stanley Boorman (American Institute of Musicology, forthcoming 2015). See also Chapter 5.

texture. This alteration also increases the rhythmic motion of the solus tenor. In this way the solus tenor functions more like the freely composed tenors of the north-Italian motet in the manner of Ciconia. This new voice fills in various sonorities under an upper-voice duet while contributing to the rhythmic drive and shape of the motet. The variant three-voice motet not only retains some of the structural elements of the densely textured five-voice isorhythmic work, but also hearkens back to the texture of Ciconia’s motets from the first decade of the century.

Example 3.10: Du Fay, *Apostolo glorioso*, mm. 33–41. Circled pitches indicate those borrowed from the two contratenors and the *cantus firmus* tenor to create the new solus tenor (bottom line of the stave).

In the long run it may not matter if *O Petre* is definitively removed from from categorization as a contrafactum especially as we may never be able to definitively discover an original secular version of the work. Instead it may matter more that the composer, the scribe, and we also, are able to conceptualize a work such as *O Petre* as a motet in both form and function. The notion of formulating a work without the use of a precomposed tenor, without an isorhythmic structure controlling the construction of a work, or even without a tenor at all, was part of the compositional norm of the Veneto in the first quarter of the 15th century. The utilization of a two-voice tenorless formulation is not unique to *O Petre*. Several examples of this
technique can be found in the Veneto repertory in the first decades of the 15th century. There is ample evidence of two-voice construction in mass movements from the early 15th century (particularly those in Q15 marked as *unus* for two voices and *chorus* for multi-voiced textures). The common appearance of short, two-voice episodes in many three-or-more voice works in Veneto manuscripts also points to a flexibility of construction that is shifting towards a more adaptable contrapuntal interaction solely between the two upper voices. Many additional stylistic factors other than tenor construction are at play in the Veneto motet including rhythmic and melodic imitation, or voice parts with equal or nearly equal function and construction. Even the prevailing double-statement structure of the Veneto motet is not controlled exclusively by the tenor’s framework. Taking this one step further, *O Petre* proves the exception that proves the rule: in the absence of a tenor, *O Petre* wholly relies on the essential formal, contrapuntal, and stylistic features intrinsic to the equal-cantus motet.

**Mensural Transformation**

*Doctorum principem – Melodia suavissima – Vir mitis* is a motet found uniquely in Q15. The work is in honor of the prelate Francesco Zabarella (1360–1417), the archpriest of Padua Cathedral from 1397 and known patron of Ciconia. Zabarella was not only versed in canon law, but he was also immersed in civic matters and was acquainted with a number of notable humanists of the early 15th century. Zabarella is a significant figure in the life of

---

30 The numerous two-voice “duets” between the upper voices of Ciconia’s motet *Doctorum principem – Melodia suavissima – Vir mitis* are superb examples of this sort of formation. See the section on mensural transformation that follows in this chapter for more on this motet.

31 Q15, ff. 299v–300, attributed to “Io ciconia.”

Ciconia and Zabarella may have been present when Ciconia was granted a benefice at the Church of St. Biagio di Roncaleza in Padua and a chaplaincy at the cathedral in 1401.\textsuperscript{33} Also under the leadership of Zabarella, Ciconia was made \textit{cantor et custos} of Padua Cathedral in 1403.\textsuperscript{34} In 1406 after the deposition of the Carrara family from their rule of Padua, Zabarella and the cathedral swore allegiance to Venice. In 1410 Zabarella was appointed as bishop of Florence by the Pisan pope, John XXIII.\textsuperscript{35} Zabarella was an important councilor of canon law at the Council of Pisa in 1409 and again at Council of Constance 1414 and as such, was a major contributor to the reunification of the Western Church after the Great Schism. Zabarella never saw the end of the Schism, as he died a month and a half before the election of Martin V in 1417.\textsuperscript{36}

One of the most remarkable features of \textit{Doctorum principem} is the use of three statements of an unknown tenor melody in a transformation that is neither isorhythmic nor

---

\textsuperscript{33} Anne Hallmark, “Johannes Ciconia of Padua – Johannes Ciconia of Liège,” paper presented at the American Musicological Society Annual Meeting, New Orleans, 2012. Two entries of 1401 in the Padua State Archives note that the appointments were granted at the house of Francesco Zabarella. One of these was witnessed by Pierpaolo Vergerio, who was well-known in humanist circles as an orator and educator.

\textsuperscript{34} It is not clear if Ciconia was ever a priest or a canon of Padua Cathedral although he is called “magister” in OX213.


proportional.\textsuperscript{37} The three mensurations—\(\frac{3}{2}\), \(\frac{2}{2}\), and \(\frac{1}{2}\)—are explicitly indicated in the manuscript in every voice. The tenor and contratenor are each stated one time with repetition symbols (Figure 3.6). These provide the first part of the motet’s performance directions. There are further instructions in the verbal canon in the tenor, which reads: “Et dicitur primo imperfecto maioris, 2\(°\) perfecto minori semper ultima semibrevis alteratur, 3\(°\) imperfecto minoris.”\textsuperscript{38} In other words, in the second iteration of the tenor (\textit{tempus perfectum cum prolatio minor}) the singer must always alter the second semibreve in a string of two-note ligatures with an upward stem (ligatures \textit{cum opposita proprietate} or \textit{c.o.p.}). In French notation, this alteration would only occur if the pair of semibreves was followed by a breve. Here the canon overrides the rule. In the first iteration of the tenor, the \textit{c.o.p.} ligature can be transcribed as equal dotted-quarter notes (in this case, assuming reduction for the transcription where a breve equals a dotted-half note in \(\frac{3}{2}\)). In the second restatement of the tenor where the mensuration has been transformed to \(\frac{2}{2}\) the realization must accommodate the long strands of \textit{c.o.p.} ligatures in the tenor by alternating semibreves followed by altered semibreves (quarter note followed by half note).\textsuperscript{39} When the mensuration is transformed from the triple-meter \(\frac{3}{2}\) back into a duple meter, in this case \textit{tempus imperfectum cum prolatio minor} (\(\frac{1}{2}\)), the transcription returns to equal semibreves realized as quarter notes. This canonic directive may be Ciconia’s (or even the Q15 scribe’s) manner of

\textsuperscript{37} Although the tenor is identified by the incipit “Vir mitis” there is no known cantus firmus of this name or melodic structure. Regarding the structure of this tenor, Bent states: “there is no replication comparable to the others in this subgenre.” See Margaret Bent, ed., \textit{Bologna Q15: The Making and Remaking of a Musical Manuscript}, 2 vols. (Lucca: Libreria Musicale Italiana, 2008), II:228.

\textsuperscript{38} See Zazulia’s discussion about the greater significance of this canon as a thing to be read and to be used for instruction for performance in “Verbal Canons,” 56.

\textsuperscript{39} This rule is irrelevant in \(\frac{3}{2}\) and \(\frac{1}{2}\) as the regulations for alteration only pertain to \textit{tempus perfectum}. 
overriding the French rules of notation and might indicate that this work was once in Italian notation but then later transformed into a modernized French notational system in the 1420s.\footnote{Bent, \textit{Q15}, 1:228 and PMFC 24, 207.}

Figure 3.6: Q15, f. 299v (detail); Ciconia, tenor of \textit{Doctorum principem}. This figure shows the entire part, which is repeated three times in successive iterations as indicated by the three mensuration signs at the beginning, the repetition signs at the end, and the canonic instructions below.

The tenor is remarkable not only for its unusual canon, but also the distinctive melodic shape that outlines angular leaps of fifths, fourths, and octaves in a fashion unknown in chant repertoire. This clearly demonstrates that the tenor was written in a way that supports the counterpoint of the upper voices rather than prioritizing a horizontal melody as one expects of a pre-existing \textit{cantus firmus} tenor. In the first passage alone, the repeated dramatic leaps between F and C are quite striking (Example 3.11). In every iteration of the tenor, this unusual melodic topography is repeated and reemphasized.

Example 3.11: Ciconia, \textit{Doctorum principem}, mm. 1–10.

Throughout this work, Ciconia is extremely attentive to the meaning of the texts particularly through the inventive use of imitation and repetition to highlight the honoree’s name.
This becomes especially important at the beginning of Verse 2 (Example 3.12). Ciconia sets this phrase with both voices set in a melisma featuring repeated rhythmic cells. Every voice repeats their own cell three times beginning with the tenor semibreve – breve leap up of a fifth, followed by the cantus II tempus-unit long cell, then followed a semibreve later by a cantus I iteration of the same rhythmic cell that was introduced by cantus II, but in a new melodic configuration. At this juncture the dedicatee, Francesco Zabarella, is named by both cantus I and cantus II. After a small cadence, cantus I states the first line of Verse 2: “O Francisce Zabarelle, gloria,” immediately followed a measure later by cantus II’s text in exact melodic imitation: “O Francisce Zabarelle.” The reiteration of Zabarella’s name emphasizes the dedication of this motet to Ciconia’s patron. Ciconia also sets Zabarella’s name at the beginning of Verse 3 (Example 3.13) in an emphatic variant. Instead of setting the proper name in repeating echoed phrases, Ciconia sets “O Francisce Zabarelle” (in both voices) in homophonic counterpoint. This creates a different kind of amplification of the text. Instead of repetition there is a sort of concord between cantus I and cantus II.
In Ciconia’s typical compositional fashion, he plays with a variety of textures—echo imitation, homophonic counterpoint, and responsive passages of rhythmic cells—to bring out the large-scale structure of the motet. This variety of textures generally matches the text setting, with a different iteration of texture occurring at the entry of a new line of each verse.\textsuperscript{41} The opening, melismatic passage (mm.1–7) is nearly homophonic in the upper voices, with the tenor moving in basic longas and semibreves underneath (Example 3.14). Then as a solo, cantus I introduces

\textsuperscript{41}A larger three-verse texture is articulated by shifts of mensuration.
the first line of text (mm. 8–9; the poetic text is annotated with numerals related to verse and line, i.e. 1.1 corresponds to Verse 1, Line 1) followed immediately by the first line of cantus II in exact echo imitation. After a cadential figure, both cantus I and cantus II sing the second line of their respective texts simultaneously in homophonic counterpoint (mm. 15–17) again supported by the simple rhythmic texture of the tenor underneath. The third line of each text is notable for again using solo echo imitation (mm. 22–25), although in this iteration the echo technique is less exact. Similarly the fourth line is marked by a slightly shorter homophonic passage (mm. 30–31). On the last syllable of the last line of each verse, Ciconia sets another melisma, shifting into a texture of imitative cells passing back and forth between the two cantus parts (mm. 34–44). Three iterations of a single rhythmic pattern in cantus are echoed by cantus II. This is then followed by a long string of minims over two tempus units in cantus II exactly echoed each time by cantus I. Finally the last two tempus units of the section is a series of hockets between cantus I and cantus II landing on a cadence in the next mensuration. Ciconia then repeats the process over in the next two sections, continually varying the texture, but always carefully marking the poetic divisions of the text.
Example 3.14: Ciconia, *Doctorum principem*, mm. 1–50. This annotated passage shows the correspondence of textural variation to poetic structure.
By establishing a correlation between text and music, Ciconia is able to take advantage of the structure of the poem to provide structure for the motet beyond the larger-scale mensural canon that divides the work into three parts. The following Figure 3.7 is a graphic illustration of Doctorum principem that shows how Ciconia uses the mensural repetitions of the tenor to anchor specific textures of the upper parts. For instance, exact echo imitation between cantus I and cantus II almost always coincides with passages of tenor rest (mm. 8–11 and 22–25 and the corresponding moments in mm. 52–55 and 66–69, and again in mm. 98–100). The final melisma at the end of each verse also begins at the same point in each tenor repetition (m. 34, m. 78, and m. 104 respectively). Furthermore, Ciconia also correlates a change of musical texture to almost every line of text. The only exception is in the third verse where Ciconia separates contrapuntal settings of the first two lines of each text with held chords (mm. 89–97).
Figure 3.7: A graphic chart of the structure of Ciconia’s *Doctorum principem*. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mensuration</th>
<th>Verse Line</th>
<th>Texture</th>
<th>Tenor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>C-dot</td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>2nd rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-16</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-28</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-32</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-36</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-40</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-44</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-48</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>2nd rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-52</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-56</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-60</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-68</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-72</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73-76</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-80</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-84</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-88</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-92</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>2nd rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-96</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-100</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-104</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105-108</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109-112</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113-116</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117-120</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-124</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125-128</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129-132</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133-136</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>2nd rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137-140</td>
<td></td>
<td>melisma</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By establishing a correlation between text and music in *Doctorum*, Ciconia is able to take advantage of the structure of the poem to provide structure for the motet beyond the larger-scale mensural canon that divides the work into three parts. If one only focused on the tenor structure, as is often done in the analysis of isorhythmic motets, the recognition of a richer structural arrangement would be lacking.

**Use of Diminution in the Equal-Cantus Motet**

*Petrum Marcello Venetum – O Petre antiste inclite* is Ciconia’s only motet with diminution. The tenor as spelled out in its original form is freely composed, with each half set with a repeated rhythmic structure (double-statement motet). The diminution used in this work is controlled by a canon: “Canon tenores dicuntur sic: primo usque ad secundam taliam ut iacent; 2° diminuuntur resumendo et sic successive alie talie procedant.” This canon states that the first phrase of the tenor is immediately followed by a repetition of that same section in diminution. The same then follows for the second half of the melody. Thus, Ciconia creates a hybrid kind of motet structure: a tenor with French-style diminution that is also an Italian-style double-statement work. Other than this unusual use of diminution in a double-statement motet, *Petrum Marcello Venetum* utilizes many features typical of an equal-cantus motet. It uses many of the same motet features of Ciconia’s other equal-cantus works—displacement syncopation, repetition of rhythmic cells, hockets, shifts of mensural pulse from triple to duple meter, and the like.

---

42 Q15, ff. 277v–278, attributed to “Jo ciconie” and Ciconia named in the text of cantus II.
The motet is in honor of Pietro Marcello (1409–1428), the bishop of Padua after Alberto Micheli. Bent suggests that this motet was probably created for Marcello’s installation in November of 1409. Unlike other motets by Ciconia that emphasize the dedicatee’s name, such as the echoed “Stephane” of *O felix templum* (discussed in Chapter 2) and “Francisce Zabarelle” in *Doctorum principem* (considered earlier in this chapter), each text is essentially stated simultaneously and there are often moments of great intertextual complexity that are not entirely audible. Perhaps the most obvious textual events occur at the opening with the repetition of “Petrum” in cantus I and “O Petre” in cantus II (Example 3.15), and at the ending in cantus II with Ciconia’s name stated in the final melisma (Example 3.16).

Example 3.15: Ciconia, *Petrum Marcello Venetum*, mm. 1–9. Repetition of the names “Petrum” and “Petre” reinforce the subject of this motet, Pietro Marcello, bishop of Padua.

---


44 Bent, *Q15*, 1:222.
and rhythmic cues in the respelling of each part, but also the rethinking of how these parts function mensurally. The scribe also includes a second ad longum version of each part. He writes out the diminutions of each section in full including the shift from the perfect modus to imperfect as directed by the canon. Bent asserts that this second form of the tenor/contratenor pair was a compositional tool that Ciconia used to clarify the effects of diminution, a technique not commonly used in the equal-cantus motets of northern Italy in the 14th and early 15th centuries. These two versions of the tenor/contratenor pair indicate not only the respelling of each part, but also the rethinking of how these parts function mensurally.

Example 3.16: Ciconia, *Petrum Marcello Venetum*, mm. 104–113. Final cadence featuring Ciconia’s name as the only text.

This is Ciconia’s only work with a tenor and contratenor ad longum arrangement (Figures 3.8A and B). In this work, the scribe has included the original compact tenor and contratenor that are controlled by a written canon. The scribe also includes a second ad longum version of each part. He writes out the diminutions of each section in full including the shift from the perfect modus to imperfect as directed by the canon. Bent asserts that this second form of the tenor/contratenor pair was a compositional tool that Ciconia used to clarify the effects of diminution, a technique not commonly used in the equal-cantus motets of northern Italy in the 14th and early 15th centuries. These two versions of the tenor/contratenor pair indicate not only the respelling of each part, but also the rethinking of how these parts function mensurally.

---

45 PMFC 24, 207. See also a longer discussion of this ad longum arrangement and of other examples of ad longum usage in the early 15th century in J. Michael Allsen, “Tenores ad longum and rhythmic cues in the early fifteenth-century motet,” *Plainsong and Medieval Music* 12 (2003): 60–64.
Figure 3.8A: Q15, f. 277v (detail); Ciconia, *Petrum Marcello Venetum*. A compact version of the tenor is at the bottom of the image, followed by the canon text. The tenor *ad longum* is written out in full above.

Figure 3.8B: Q15, f. 278 (detail); Ciconia, *Petrum Marcello Venetum*. A compact version of the contratenor is at the bottom of the image. The contratenor *ad longum* is written out in full above.

The manuscript shows some signs of scraping to void the note heads and the addition of dots in the *ad longum* parts of *Petrum Marcello Venecium*. This demonstrates that this copy was
made from an earlier Italian exemplar that used red notation, such as I-Pu MS 1106.\textsuperscript{46} As with the canon of *Doctorum principem*, which accommodates an atypical notational problem (the alteration of the second semibreve in a string of *c.o.p* ligatures), this modification of notation likely indicates that Ciconia’s motets were written in an older Italian manner and then updated for inclusion in a manuscript with notation in the French style.\textsuperscript{47}

**An Additional Contrafactum**

I have decided to include the contrafactum *Regina gloriosa* in this study because it has long been associated with Ciconia despite more recent compelling evidence to the contrary.\textsuperscript{48} Suzanne Clercx initially attributed the work to Ciconia in her seminal study of the composer’s life and work.\textsuperscript{49} She associated the song with a *Gloria – Credo* pair by Ciconia located in the same Polish manuscript, WnIII.8054.\textsuperscript{50} It is clear that the opening lines of both *Regina gloriosa* and *Credo* 4 descend in a similar fashion, but none of the other parts correspond to each other. In fact, except for this single resemblance, neither the *Gloria* nor the *Credo* has any other point of correlation with *Regina gloriosa*. The attribution to Ciconia is placed into further doubt because the work was obviously added later into additional space left over after copying the Mass movements of ff. 202–203. The motet is copied over a page turn in an impractical arrangement

\textsuperscript{46} PMFC 24, 207.

\textsuperscript{47} Other altered noteheads in Q15 include the flagged minim triplets in *Venecie mundi splendor* and *O Padua sidus preclarum* that are converted to void unflagged note shapes. These alterations are also indicators of a shift from Italian to French notation. See the discussion of these two motets in Chapter 2 of this study.

\textsuperscript{48} PL-Wn 52, ff. 202 (cantus I), 202v (contratenor), and 203 (tenor).

\textsuperscript{49} Clercx, *Johannes Ciconia*, 1:61 and 122.

\textsuperscript{50} These two works are *Gloria* 3 and *Credo* 4 as transcribed in PMFC 24. *Gloria*, WnIII.8054, ff. 197v and 196; *Credo*, WnIII.8054, ff. 202–204.
for performance demonstrating that this work was included as filler at the bottom of the leaves. The music on the upper portions of these folios includes two Credo settings, one by Ciconia and the other by Polish composer Mikolaj Radomski.\textsuperscript{51} It is likely that Clercx, seeing the opening phrase of both the motet and the Credo by Ciconia, concluded that the placement of the contrafactum on these folios was not random and that the motet must have been by Ciconia.

It is clear from the strong midpoint cadence, marked with a line of division, and open and closed endings of the B section, Regina gloriosa is contrafactum of either a French virelai or an Italian ballata. Unlike Ciconia’s two other contrafacta, O Petre and Beatum incendium, this work is not in the equal-cantus style. The three parts are hierarchical and even the elimination of the contratenor, creating a two-voice construction in the style of O Petre, does not create the same equal-voice texture found in Ciconia’s two other works. Furthermore, the dedication of the text exclusively to the Virgin Mary does not match the honorific nature of the secular subjects of all of Ciconia’s other works.\textsuperscript{52} Although there is a fair amount of basic rhythmic and melodic imitation and several passages of displacement syncopation throughout the motet, the melodic flow and rhythmic inventiveness do not reflect the usual ease of compositional style found in Ciconia’s other works. The jury may still be out, but this work appears to be less by Ciconia and

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{51} The works of Radomski, also known as Nicolaus Radom, bear witness to the Italian style in the north in the early 15th century. The two Polish manuscripts which contain Radomski’s compositions (PL-Wn 52 and the lost manuscript PL-Wn MS lat.F.I.378) also feature works by Ciconia and Antonio da Teramo. In addition, Radomski’s Gloria – Credo pairs exhibit the same characteristics as the two Italian composers. The features include three-voice structures, the lack of any plainchant cantus firmi, and overt melodic and rhythmic imitation. See Mirosław Perz, ed., Sources of Polyphony up to c. 1500, Antiquitates musicæ in Polonia 13 (notes and editions) and 14 (facsimiles of sources) (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1973).

\textsuperscript{52} This alone is not compelling evidence as it is already firmly established that this is a contrafactum and the new text could have been included by any number of people if not the original composer of the work.
more by another composer attempting to imitate the Italian style in this source copied at the northeastern border of western musical traditions of the era.

In this chapter and in Chapter 2, I seek to form a standard repertoire exemplified by Johannes Ciconia working in Italy in the late 14th and early 15th centuries. The existence of so many extant works firmly attributed to one composer can firmly establish Ciconia as one of the most significant musical figures in the first quarter of the 15th century. Perhaps our perspective is skewed in some ways because so many of these works are uniquely in one single source compiled by one single scribe. One other way to establish the relevance of Ciconia’s motets is by comparing them to other works from the same era and from the following generations. In Chapters 5 and 6, I will visit some of these other works in the genre. But before I turn to these motets, it may be fruitful to investigate one of Ciconia’s possible exemplars, found not south of the Alps in an Italian source, but instead a late 14th-century work dedicated to the King of France, Rex Karole Johannes genite – Leticie pacis concordie.
Appendix 3.1: Ciconia, *O Petre Christi discipule*

O Petre Christi discipule

Johannes Ciconia
splendidus, in bono semper versus. O
spendidus, in bono semper versus. O

Chi-sti, O Chi-sti, dector omnium, perene
Chi-sti, O Chi-sti, dector omnium, perene

pre-stita gaudi-um; pa-sto-rem, ele-rum, populum sal-va per omne se-cu-
pre-stita gaudi-um; pa-sto-rem ele-rum, populum sal-va per omne se-cu-

bu-m. A
bu-m. [A

men. men.
Appendix 3.2: Text and Translation of *O Petre Christi discipule*\(^{53}\)

1. **O Petre, Christi discipule,**
   *prime pastor ecclesie,*
   *funde preces quotidie*
   *pro Petro nostro presule.*

   **Oh Peter, Christ’s disciple**
   *first shepherd of the Church,*
   *pour forth your prayers daily*
   *for our bishop Peter.*

5. **O princeps apostolice,**
   *turbe Cephas dominice,*
   *pastorem nostrum dirige,*
   *quem omni malo protege.*

   **Oh prince of the apostles,**
   *Cephas, rock for the Lord’s multitude,*
   *guide our shepherd*
   *and protect him from every evil.*

9. **Da sit in cunctis providus,**
   *corpore et mente candidus,*
   *omni virtute splendidus,*
   *in bono semper fervidus.*

   **Grant that he be foresighted in all things,**
   *fair in body and mind,*
   *resplendent in all virtue,*
   *ever eager in what is good.*

13. **O Christe, ductor omnium,**
    *perenne presta gaudium;*
    *pastorem, clerum, populum*
    *salva per omne seculum.*

   **Oh Christ, leader of all,**
   *grant eternal joy;*
   *your shepherd, clergy, and people,*
   *save for ever and ever.*

   Amen.  

---

Any description of the prevailing stylistic tendencies in a given period must accept a certain number of outliers. Still, not all outliers are created equal; some may diverge sufficiently from the norm so as to cause to ask whether a new, or at least revised, analytical frame would better account for the overall picture. With this caveat explicitly stated, in this chapter I consider the possibility that the 15th-century equal-cantus motet, found principally in the major Venetian sources of polyphony Q15 and Ox213, did not emerge solely from an existing 14th-century Italian tradition. Instead, I propose that the characteristics of the equal-cantus motet style were much more broadly known amongst composers north of the Alps and contemporaneous to what is known as the *Ars nova*-style motet. As I have shown in the first chapter of this study, scholarship on the 14th-century French motet has tended to describe a single—and venerable—compositional tradition centered on the motets of Philippe de Vitry and Guillaume de Machaut. As the narrative is told, these motets are notable for the use of the notational system developed in the treatises now known singly as *Ars nova*. This system established that the length of every sound and rhythm is precisely determined. The constellation of *Ars nova* treatises also systematically describes the division of note values across all rhythmic lengths down to the minim. It is now typical to see the term *Ars nova* used as a synonym for all of 14th-century polyphony. The common traits of the style are multiple texts (sometimes

---

1 This chapter originated as a paper read at the Medieval and Renaissance Music Conference at the Centro di Studii Ars Nova in Certaldo, Italy, 6 July 2013. I would especially like to thank Alejandro Planchart, David Fallows, Fabrice Fitch, David Maw, Jesse Rodin, and Rob Wegman who have all provided helpful suggestions for revisions.

macronic), chant based, hierarchical in terms both of ranges from low to high and in rhythmic motion from low to fast, and isorhythmic arrangements of both rhythm and melody. One further feature particularly in the second half of the century is the use of diminution in the final section of the motet. As a group they cohere relatively well.

It is in this context that we must approach the anonymous motet *Rex Karole Johannes genite – Leticie pacis concordie*. On the one hand, this piece has been represented as the pinnacle of *Ars nova* composition, popular and in use for a long time; on the other, it has much in common with the Italian motet of the early 15th century: in particular, its laudatory function, equality of upper voices in terms of ranges, rhythmic motion, and text setting, use of *tempus perfectum* with occasional temporal shifts into duple meter, a foundational three-voice texture, and clearly delineated divisions between rhythmic sections. Additional Italianate characteristics are a focus on melodic imitation and canon, displacement syncopation and extended mensural displacements, and large-scale rhythmic structures that are based upon rhythmic repetitions, but without diminution.

**The Motet Rex Karole Johannes genite – Leticie pacis concordie**

*Rex Karole* was composed in the last quarter of the 14th century and may be associated with events during a relative moment of peace in the Caroline phase of the Hundred Years’ War (1369–1389). Written in honor of King Charles V of France, this work praises the wise and victorious king while simultaneously praying to the Virgin Mary as the destroyer of the enemy and the bringer of peace. The reign of the King Charles V was extremely good for the French
and they had much to celebrate. In the period between 1364 and 1380, Charles’s army had turned the tide of the Hundred Years’ War with England, reconquering almost all the territories of southwestern France ceded to the English in the Treaty of Brétigny in 1360. Charles’s management of the kingdom allowed him to restore the previously reduced wealth of the royal treasure. Charles took advantage of a time of relative peace and wealth to begin grand building projects including the Bastille and the Château du Louvre. At his time, Charles also arranged for the collection and translation of books for his personal library including important works of philosophy, astronomy, medicine, and law.

One of the most spectacular and possibly most significant event of the 1370s was the visit to France by the Holy Roman Emperor, Charles IV, in December to January 1377–1378. At this time, Charles V’s reign had come to its zenith and this was an occasion for a grandiose public ceremony. Although the central concern of the emperor’s reign was the Kingdom of Bohemia, it appears that his visit to his royal nephew accompanied by his son Wenceslas, King of the Romans, had as much to do with the enhancement of the public perception of nobility as with kinship and mutual good will. This event not only enhanced the dignity of each man’s crown, but also tightened the ties of the kingdom to the empire through kinship. The emperor was already closely linked to the Valois family. His first marriage was to Blanche de Valois, a sister of King Philip VI, Charles V’s grandfather. The emperor’s sister Bonne (also known as Guta) married King John II, Charles V’s father. In addition to these familial ties, the emperor and the king were

---

both known for sharing a similar disposition. They both were thoughtful, careful, and rational rulers unlike their intemperate fathers.\textsuperscript{4}

In the chronicle of the reign of Charles V, there are no fewer than 26 double-columned folios, including 18 illuminations, detailing the emperor’s visit.\textsuperscript{5} The culmination of the emperor’s tour was the meeting between Charles IV and Charles V in Paris where there were many ceremonial events, meetings, banquets, conferences, visits to relics, and state dinners. Music was likely a part of every aspect of these celebrations. The chronicler specifically notes the use of “bas instruments” as part of the entertainment by minstrels after the main banquet on 6 January 1378. Together the emperor, the French king, King Wenceslas, and the archbishop of Reims sat at the high table and were served with the most lavish ceremony. The climax of the evening came when all 800 guests moved to the Hall of Parliament to see a spectacle representing the conquest of Jerusalem during the First Crusade. This event was a technological marvel featuring knights and ships and even a muezzin chanting from a tower (Figure 4.1).

\textsuperscript{4} Tuchman, \textit{Distant Mirror}, 64, 88, and 126, and Sumption, \textit{Hundred Years War}, 15–16.

\textsuperscript{5} \textit{Grandes Chroniques}, ff. 467–480.
Figure 4.1: *Les Grandes Chroniques*, f. 473v. A scene depicting the banquet of King Charles V with the Holy Roman Emperor Charles IV.
The visit of the emperor to King Charles was purely for propaganda value and to heighten the prestige of the Valois dynasty. In reality there was no practical effect, but these lavish celebrations, made at great expense, honored and enhanced the crown of France. It is within this context that the performance of a celebratory and honorific motet would be appropriate. Despite the absence of information about what was precisely performed on the night of 6 January 1378, I conclude that, based upon its honorific text and ceremonial function, the motet *Rex Karole Johannes genite – Leticie pacis concordie* would be an ideal work for presentation at this monumental event. The two rulers would appreciate the double meaning of the names, “Charles, son of John” in the first line of text in cantus I. The comparisons of the French king to the warrior-like prowess of Alexander the Great, the wisdom of Solomon, and the largess of Ahasuerus (or Xerxes) are echoed in the rhetoric of Christine de Pisan’s biography of Charles V written in 1404.

There are many musical links between Eastern Europe and Italy throughout the late 14th and early 15th centuries. Charles IV was sovereign over Hainault, Holland, Luxembourg,
Bohemia, Hungary, and Poland, had family connections to Bavarian, Valois, and Hapsburg dynasties, and made long-standing attempts to assist Pope Urban V to return to Rome from Avignon. As a consequence, there is a likelihood that the emperor would have encountered ceremonial motets in the Italian style at some point in his reign. Even more enticing is the idea that Charles IV may have arranged for the composition of *Rex Karole* in honor of his royal nephew emphasizing their names and the name of his father, John of Bohemia, as well as his brother-in-law, John of France.

Ursula Günther in her critical notes to the edition of the Chantilly Codex posits that *Rex Karole* was possibly first heard at the peace negotiations between France and England establishing the Truce of Bruges.\(^9\) Historic accounts describe a parley between French and English envoys which convened in December 1475 “in the presence of dukes, cardinals . . . and other grand personages” and included “displays, jousts, fetes and banquets . . .”\(^10\) As with the visit of the emperor and the king in 1377–1378, these peace negotiations would be an ideal time for the presentation of a grand motet, although the chronicler does not make any mention of musical performances. A previous parley took place in June 1375 at great expense and magnificence between the Duke of Burgundy, Philip II (the Bold) and the 1st Duke of Lancaster, John of Gaunt. Although the king was not present at either the parley or the peace negotiations, both events could be suitable moments for an important motet to be offered, with the December event being more likely with the available time needed to prepare an appropriately complex and artistic work. Günther also suggests that the work may have originated in Paris at the royal court in the intervening months.

\(^9\) CMM 39, xxix–xxx.
\(^10\) Tuchman, *Distant Mirror*, 281.
Rex Karole is significant to several generations of composers, scribes, and scholars for several reasons. Because Charles V of France was a beloved king, his achievements during his reign were lauded long after his death in 1380 (see the text and translation in Appendix 4.2). Rex Karole is one of only a handful of laudatory motets from 14th-century France. The piece enjoyed a popularity well beyond its original ceremonial purpose. It was frequently copied and survives in manuscripts from up to fifty years after its date of composition. Rex Karole is also marked by the geographic dispersal of sources: it appears in manuscripts not only from France, but also Italy, Germany, Burgundy, and possibly England. Still another marker of its fame during its own generation and the next is that the piece was cited in musical treatises for almost a century after its creation.

There are six musical sources for Rex Karole. The primary source is one of the notable Ars subtilior manuscripts (now in the Musée Condé in Chantilly), which is most likely an early 15th-century Florentine or northern Italian copy of a southwestern French source from the last quarter of the 14th century.\textsuperscript{11} Four other sources—14th-century Italian fragments in Perugia, late 14th-century flyleaves bound with an English law manuscript, folios that originated in northwestern France in the late 14th century, and a palimpsest manuscript from early 15th-century Florence—are fragmentary or nearly illegible.\textsuperscript{12} The remaining concordance was housed in Strasbourg until it was destroyed in a fire in 1870; this manuscript probably originated in southwest Germany in the early 15th century.\textsuperscript{13} There is an additional reference to the motet

\textsuperscript{11} Chantilly, ff. 65v–66, cantus I, cantus II, contratenor, and solus tenor.

\textsuperscript{12} I-P-Edu Incunabolo Inv. 15755 N.F., Strip I Ar and Strip IX Ar, same contratenor/solus tenor pair as Chantilly; US-Wc M2.1.C6a.14 Case No. 5 and No. 8, fragment of cantus II only; GB-Lpro E 163/22/1/24, f. 1, same cantus II and contratenor of Chantilly with an additional unknown contratenor; and SL.2211, No. 73, palimpsest of cantus I only.

\textsuperscript{13} Stras222, f. 7v. Although this source was destroyed during the Franco-Prussian War, Edmond de Coussemaker copied the motet in 1866. It is published by Albert Vander Linden, ed., \textit{Le
being copied from a late 14th-century motet book in the town of ‘s-Hertogenbosch in 1423 or 1424.\textsuperscript{14} This great variety of sources indicates not only that the piece was widely disseminated, but also that it probably continued to be performed many years after its original date of composition.

At least three 14th- and 15th-century music treatises mention \textit{Rex Karole}: the anonymous \textit{Ars cantus mensurabilis} (mid to late 14th century), a 15th-century Venetian copy of Johannes Boen’s \textit{Ars (musica)}, and a 15th-century copy of the \textit{Tractatus figurarum}.\textsuperscript{15} The author of the \textit{Ars cantus mensurabilis} uses the motet to illustrate red or hollow notation for changes from perfection to imperfection and vice versa.\textsuperscript{16} When Johannes Boen’s mid-14th-century treatise

\textit{manuscrit musical m 222 c 22 de la Bibliothèque de Strasbourg}. Thesaurus Musicus 2 (Brussels: Office internationale de librarie, 1979). This copy includes cantus I, a labeled “contratenor” based on the final phrase of the chant \textit{Alma redemptori mater} and different from the Chantilly contratenor, and a labeled “tenor” which is the same as the solus tenor of Chantilly. The motet is attributed to Philippus Royllart in Stras222, but attributions in this source are notoriously unreliable. See Gilbert Reaney, “Royllart, Philippus,” \textit{The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians}, 29 vols., ed. Stanley Sadie (London: Macmillan Publishers, 2001) 21:825.


\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Ars cantus mensurabilis mensurata per modos iuris}: Florence, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Plut. 29.48, ff. 73–82v; Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 734, ff. 109v-122; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, fonds lat. 7369, ff. 10–25v; \textit{Ars (musica)}: Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. VIII 24 (= 3434), 15th century; \textit{Tractatus figurarum}: Faenza, Biblioteca Communale, MS 117, 1473–1474.

\textsuperscript{16} Only the Chantilly codex uses coloration to change the tenor and contratenor parts from triple to duple pulse. The Perugia fragments the London folio, and the Strasbourg manuscript “tenor” change the mensuration from \textcircled{O} to \textcircled{C} and back in their corresponding passages. Also in the Strasbourg source, but only in the contratenor, Coussemaker indicates that theses passages have both coloration and mensuration changes. In order for this arrangement to work, either there needs to be colorization or there needs to be a mensural change, so this transcription is either a
was reworked in northern Italy in the 15th century, the copyist replaced Philippe de Vitry’s motet
Tuba sacre fidei – In arboris empiro – Libera me with Rex Karole as an example of the playful
and good variation of modus from perfection to imperfection. It is in a late copy of the treatise
Tracatus figurarum (a source from Faenza, circa 1474) in which Rex Karole is identified along
with Vitry’s Quoniam secta latronum – Tribum que non abhorruit – Hec patimur as an example
of an older motet style, which the theorist calls “grosso modo.” This older tradition is juxtaposed
against a new and subtler style—the “ars magis subtiliter.”

Rethinking the 14th-century French Motet

Building on its clear laudatory function, the scholarly discourse situates Rex Karole
squarely in the mid 14th-century French isorhythmic motet tradition. This is especially true as
the motet has been associated with the Ars magis subtiliter because of the aforementioned
proximity to the motet Apta caro in the Tractatus figurarum. In recent scholarship it has been
implied that the author made an error when describing Rex Karole as representative of the older
style, but instead that it should be part of the modernized and more refined “more subtle art.”

But what if the copyist did get it right? Can we consider Rex Karole as a continuation of a
tradition established in the early decades of the 14th century by composers such as Vitry, but that
is divergent from another strain of the motet genre? Using Rex Karole as a case study, I propose

\[ \text{scribal error or Coussemaker made an error. The first mensural change is also incorrect, as it}
\[ \text{ought to be } \text{C} \text{ and not } \text{C}. \]

In particular I am responding to several statements in Jon Michael Allsen’s dissertation, “Style
and Intertextuality in the Isorhythmic Motet, 1400–1440” (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin,
1992): “One of the variants [of the Tractatus figurarum] cites Rex Karole with Tribum que non
abhorruit as an example of the older style. This makes little sense.” (28n6); Rex Karole “features
more fully-developed features of the same style [the “more subtle art”]” (32); Rex Karole and
Apta caro “could [. . .] be seen as successive refinements of the Ars magis subtiliter cited in the
Tractatus figurarum (37).
that the narrative of motet composition in the 14th century should be revised to include a second stylistic strand. This revised history can sharpen our picture of the development of the early 15th century motet; it can also inform our understanding of Italian compositional style. Margaret Bent has complicated this picture somewhat by identifying a distinct, late 14th-century Italian tradition, and I suggest that by the age of Johannes Ciconia, this style is a fully developed, independent, and significant school of composition. This alternate tradition is contemporaneous with the French *Ars nova*, and can be shown to have had great influence on composers working in Italy in the first quarter of the 15th century, Guillaume Du Fay chief among them. Intriguingly, a closer look at *Rex Karole* reveals stylistic traits that align it more convincingly with contemporaneous works from Italian sources such as Jacopo da Bologna’s *Lux purpurata – Diligite iusticiam* and the anonymous motet *Marce Marcum*.19

In what follows, I argue that *Rex Karole* is better understood as part of a two-pronged stylistic response on the part of mid to late 14th-century composers to the novel rhythmic practices and hierarchical organization of the early 14th-century motet. The one strand of the 14th-century motet is one that is isorhythmically structured, with *taleae* and *colores*. The second strand is one in which the upper voices are equal in range and texture, moving in rhythmic interdependence over freely composed tenors.

For all that *Rex Karole* has been associated with France, it readily adheres to Bent’s definition of the Italian motet.20 The laudatory dedication to Charles in the opening line is abundantly clear. The upper voices share a C2 clef, utilize the same rhythmic values, employ

19 See Chapter 2 for further consideration of these two works and of the 14th-century Italian motet style in general.
20 Bent, “Fourteenth-Century Italian Motet.”
voice crossings, and echo exact melodic phrases in canon. This interdependent relationship between the upper voices contrasts sharply with early Ars nova motets. In Ars nova motets voices are hierarchically organized, and mid-century and later isorhythmic motets continue to differentiate the rhythmic stratification of the voices. In the Italian equal-cantus motet, by contrast, the upper parts are set with equal rhythmic and melodic textures. Motets from 14th-century France tend to gravitate to mensurations other than $\textcircled{C}$. For instance, a quick survey of Machaut’s motets indicates that he preferred $\textcircled{C}$. This is similar to the motets of the Chantilly manuscript, of which only Rex Karole is in tempus perfectum.\(^{21}\) Rex Karole does not utilize diminution, another characteristic similar to the 14th-century Italian motet. Hocket effects in many equal-cantus motets are created not through the interplay of sound and rest, but rather articulations of short rhythmic cells rapidly dispersed across different voices of the texture, including the tenor. For example, in mm. 41–46 of Rex Karole, a four-semibreve rhythmic unit first introduced by a minim rest in cantus II is repeated in an altered form in cantus I, then in the solus tenor (Example 4.1).\(^{22}\) Thus, the hocket unit is made up of overlapping iterations of a cell consisting of several rhythmic durations, rather than a repeated single rhythmic punctuation such as one hears in the motets of Guillaume de Machaut.\(^{23}\)

\(^{21}\) I shall return in a moment to the treatment of talea and the rather remarkable use of simultaneous mensurations in Rex Karole.

\(^{22}\) The layout of voices CMM 39 by Ursula Günther is: cantus I, cantus II, the contratenor from Chantilly, the “contratenor” from Strasbourg (which is a cantus prius factus and therefore may have been a mislabeled tenor), and an explicitly labeled solus tenor. There is no tenor part in the manuscripts with a labeled solus tenor. I will address the layout of these five parts later in the paper. Some scholars have suggested that the five voices represent the earliest known five-voice motet writing. I have sincere reservations with this hypothesis especially as there is notably problematic duplication of both the rhythm and pitches of the contratenor and the solus tenor in the Chantilly source.

\(^{23}\) See for example the different treatment of hocket passages in Machaut’s Tous corps – De souspirant cuer – Suspiro (PMFC 2, 112–114) or the anonymous motet Li enseignement – De touz les biens – Ecce tu pulchra es (PMFC 3, 34–36).
Example 4.1: *Rex Karole*, mm. 35–52 (Cantus I, Cantus II, Contratenor Chantilly, Contratenor Stras222, and Solus tenor Chantilly/Tenor Stras222). A rhythmic cell is introduced in cantus II in measure 41, repeated in an altered form in cantus I, and then reiterated in the solus tenor as well as the contratenor of Chantilly. This pattern is repeated over the course of the cadential passage culminating in the cadence in m. 47.

While virtually all 14th-century composers used syncopation to some degree, more nuanced approaches to syncopation are characteristic of equal-cantus works. In mm. 37–40, cantus I is displaced by a minim from cantus II, generating an extended syncopated passage (Example 4.2). The equal-cantus style is notable not only for this kind of bold syncopation at the level of the minim, but also for extended length over which the syncopation is sustained.
The equal-cantus style is also notable for its rather blasé treatment of pulse. Rather than follow a particular perfect or imperfect division of tempus in the cantus voice, motets in this style often feature a rapid alternation between perfect and imperfect tempus units. In m. 21 of *Rex Karole*, for example, cantus II displays an imperfect division of the breve (instead of three semibreves in cantus II, the tempus unit is divided by a dotted-semibreve followed by three minimis and in the following measure the division of semibreve – minim – semibreve – minim), even though in the preceding breve and throughout the piece so up until this point is clearly divided into three semibreves (Example 4.3). In a similar vein, imperfection in cantus II in m. 29 creates temporal dissonance against cantus I (Example 4.4). In this measure, cantus II divides the breve imperfectly (minim – semibreve – minim – semibreve) under cantus I’s perfection (imperfected breve – semibreve). By the early 15th century, such passages become even more pervasive, but in 14th-century French isorhythmic motets, such rapid metrical shifts are rare. Indeed, it may be the nature of composing with two equal upper voices that allows for greater interaction between the upper parts and variation of tempus pulse. This flexibility between perfect and imperfect tempus both within and across cantus voices is an important textural and rhythmic feature of the equal-cantus style.
Example 4.3: *Rex Karole*, mm. 19–25, cantus I and II only. Shift to duple and back to triple pulse in cantus II.

Example 4.4: *Rex Karole*, mm. 26–34, cantus I and II only. Shift in cantus II from duple to triple while cantus I remains in triple pulse.

The composer of *Rex Karole* seems to relish the dissonance of mensural pulse created either through coloration (Chantilly codex) or the use of simultaneous \( \text{O} \) and \( \text{C} \) mensurations (Strasbourg manuscript, the London folios, and the Perugia fragments; see Example 4.5).\(^{24}\) In mm. 37–40, as the upper voices move in elaborate offset rhythm, the lower voices shift into a section of duple pulse. The explicit mensural shift is then further complicated as the solus tenor temporarily shifts by a semibreve, obscuring the newly established duple mensural pulse with a slower value syncopation.

---

\(^{24}\) The scribe of Strasbourg uses both coloration and an explicit change of mensuration in these passages. This is probably a scribal error as coloration within *tempus imperfectum* would create a triplet motion. One or the other method of imperfecting the prevailing triple prolation—either coloration or changing the mensuration—is the appropriate choice for the lower voices in these sections.
its cadence and the beginning of the next section. The repeated rhythmic cell consisting of four-semibreves continuously evades the prevailing *tempus perfectum* and drives this last portion of the *talea* to its cadence and the beginning of the next section.

Example 4.5: *Rex Karole*, mm. 35–42. Measures 37–42 feature two simultaneous mensural pulses as the two upper voices continue in triple meter while the lower voices shift to duple, either through coloration (Chantilly) or through a change of mensuration from $\frac{3}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ (Strasbourg, London, and Perugia). The semibreve in m. 37 (bottom stave) shifts the solus tenor into a passage of displacement syncopation with the two variant contratenor voices. (I have transcribed this example using Chantilly as an exemplar. A transcription of the sources that utilize a change of mensuration from $\frac{3}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ would require simultaneous time signatures, $\frac{3}{4}$ in the upper parts and $\frac{1}{2}$ from mm. 37–40 in the lower.)

The composer takes the displacement of pulse even further in mm. 41–46, which feature both the hocketing of rhythmic cells (see Example 4.1 above) and extended mensural displacement (Example 4.6). The repeated rhythmic cell consisting of four-semibreves continuously evades the prevailing *tempus perfectum* and drives this last portion of the *talea* to its cadence and the beginning of the next section.
Example 4.6: Rex Karole, mm. 35–52. The prevailing triple pulse of the motet is obscured by a four-semibreve rhythmic cell repeated over six tempora.

This unusual rhythmic pattern, which pushes against the prevailing triple meter tempus perfectum, is quite remarkable in that it is not unique to Rex Karole. The cell, which is repeated at the end of every talea, is the exact pattern that is directly quoted in a work attributed to Ciconia, Padu . . . serenans – Pastor bonus, as well as two works by Du Fay, Vasilissa ergo
gaude – Concupivit rex decorem tuum and Elizabet Zacharie. It is chronologically appropriate to suggest these practices had their roots in pieces such as Rex Karole.

In these examples by Ciconia and Du Fay, one can observe the same shift of mensural pulse caused by overlaying a duple rhythmic cell over a triple mensuration that exists in Rex Karole. The pattern is notable as it occurs in every voice in sequence. As in Rex Karole this unique pattern reserved for the cadential phrases leading to the end of a rhythmic section. In Padu . . . serenans (Example 4.7) and in Vasilissa (Example 4.8), the pattern is found at the end of each statement of the double-statement formation. In Elizabet Zacharie the rhythmic pattern occurs three times in the final section of the motet, each one at the midpoint of each talea repetition (Example 4.9). These exact imitations of this distinctive pattern indicate that Rex Karole was probably well known among composers working in Italy in the early 15th century.

Example 4.7: Ciconia (?), Padu . . . serenans, mm. 47–55.

\[\text{Example 4.7: Ciconia (?), Padu . . . serenans, mm. 47–55.}\]

\[\text{Example 4.8: Vasilissa, Elizabet Zacharie (Example 4.9), the pattern is found at the end of each statement of the double-statement formation.}\]

---


26 Although Padu . . . serenans is incomplete, the separation of each statement of the cell by a semibreve would easily accommodate another cantus part and a fourth-voice contratenor as well.

27 In Elizabet Zacharie the rhythmic pattern is also used as part of the isorhythmic structure. Thus, the passage in question (mm. 99–104) is actually the diminution of a semibreve-rest – semibreve – breve – breve – breve pattern heard in the first half of the motet. If the composer were intentionally referring to the same pattern in Rex Karole, this use of the rhythmic cell in the isorhythmic pattern may be an indication of the composer intentionally working backwards from it to create the overall rhythmic structure of the motet.
Example 4.8: Du Fay, Vasilissa, mm. 51–68.
Example 4.9: Du Fay (?), Elizabet Zacharie, mm. 94–107.

For all that the foregoing analysis highlights equal-cantus features of Rex Karole, there are nonetheless several prominent features that point in a different direction. First, the four-voice texture of the motet presents an obvious challenge to Bent’s criteria for three-voice textures in the Italian motet. That having been said, this work is also one of the earliest examples of a solus tenor, in which the two lower voices may be combined and swapped out for a newly composed tenor, creating a three-voice texture with the remaining two cantus voices.²⁸ The solus tenor in

²⁸ Heinrich Besseler, Bourdon und Fauxbourdon: Studien zum Ursprung der niederländischen Musik (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1974), 87, and Shelley Davis, “The Solus Tenor in the 14th and 15th Centuries,” Acta Musicologica 39 (1967): 44. Although a four- or five-voice performance of Rex Karole is suggested by at least one available edition of the motet, extensive duplication of pitches between the solus tenor and the other voices in mm. 46–51 make such an arrangement improbable. See in particular PMFC 5, 198. Allsen asserts that this motet “appears to be one of the earliest examples of five-voice writing,” an idea which I respectfully reject. See Allsen, “Style and Intertextuality,” 34n13.
the 14th century generally serves as a synthesis of important features of the two lower voices (albeit in this circumstance in combination with an unknown tenor). This demonstrates that *Rex Karole* can be conceived as a three-voice motet in which the solus tenor supports and joins the interplay of the two equal cantus voices. Thus, this motet begins to resemble more an equal-cantus work than the more hierarchically arranged proportional motets created in France in the late 14th century.

*Rex Karole* is in an atypical isorhythmic arrangement. Italian equal-cantus motets are typically in a double-statement structure, that is, two sections of repeated rhythmic material. While no case can be made for such a structure in this motet, neither do its *taleae* conform to the stereotypical structural treatment of French isorhythmic motets. The *talea*, 28 breves in duration, repeats four times and never undergoes diminution. The isorhythmic structure is also notable in that the beginnings of *taleae* are punctuated in all voices by a held longa (e.g., mm. 19–20, 47–48, 75–76, etc.) and are marked with a corona. There can be no doubt as to where the *talea* structure repeats, unlike the French style in which the seams of the isorhythmic structure are generally obscured and elided by textural features in the upper voices. Indeed, the composer draws on the equal-cantus style in which the structure is clearly articulated by an acceleration of rhythm in all voices including the tenor before the cadences of every section. This occurs as the lower voices shift from motion mainly in breves to a mixture of breves and semibreves, and then to semibreves and minims (Example 4.10).
leads to the possibility that the shared origins of these traditions has conflated the distinct characteristics of an equal-cantus rather than a proportional or hierarchical style. This conclusion leads to the possibility that the shared origins of these traditions has conflated the distinct northern and southern strains of motet composition. Yet in teasing out these lineages, we find profound implications for a new narrative of the 14th-century motet that includes a separate

Example 4.10: Rex Karole, mm. 35–52. The rhythmic motion of the lower voices increases until the cadence in m. 47 where the rhythmic motion returns to mainly breves for the next repetition of the tenor rhythm.

A New Narrative

From the analysis above, I suggest that Rex Karole exhibits more prominently characteristics of an equal-cantus rather than a proportional or hierarchical style. This conclusion leads to the possibility that the shared origins of these traditions has conflated the distinct northern and southern strains of motet composition. Yet in teasing out these lineages, we find profound implications for a new narrative of the 14th-century motet that includes a separate
contemporary and significant musical family that was anything but ancillary to the isorhythmic motet.

Identifying Italianate features in *Rex Karole* has considerable chronological and stylistic implications. Using the notational developments of the *Ars nova* treatise around 1320 on one end and the compilation of Q15 beginning around 1420, one would expect within the space of about 100 years a notable divergence between a French style, on the one hand, and another more closely associated with the south and the works of Italian composers. And yet, a work such as *Rex Karole* seems to be an exception to this conclusion because it is simultaneously “French” and “Italian.” Consequently, I suggest not geographic or nationalistic descriptions, but instead some alternate term like “Ars nova,” “proportional,” or “isorhythmic” for the former and “equal-cantus” or “laudatory” for the latter. As the second style struggles with a lack of common nomenclature amongst scholars, I propose “equal-cantus style” as a stylistically appropriate and geographically neutral alternative to “Italian.” This of course also begs the question of describing works as isorhythmic at all. Bent has already urged more careful consideration of this term and its origins in the early 20th century. I am not convinced that equal-cantus and isorhythmic are necessarily contrary and comparable descriptions of the motets of the 14th and early 15th centuries.

29 Michael Cuthbert recently has advocated for the term “*Ars mutandi.*” This phrase reflects the ever-changing stylistic features of the motet throughout the 14th century. Michael Scott Cuthbert, *Ars mutandi: Italian Sacred Music in the Age of Plague and Schism* (Cambridge University Press, forthcoming). I would like to thank Prof. Cuthbert for sharing his manuscript with me ahead of publication and for our subsequent discussions. See also Cuthbert, “Identifying Quotations and Concordances in *Ars nova* Music with Computational Methods,” paper presented at the annual Medieval and Renaissance Music Conference, Certaldo, Italy, July 2013.

Another element to consider about Rex Karole is its chronological and referential connections to the so-called Ars subtilior. Because this motet is mentioned in the Tractatus figurarum in one breath beside a known older work, Vitry’s Tribum que non abhorruit and a known contemporary work, Apta caro, it is difficult to differentiate what is the old style and what is the new. The theorists who wrote out the concepts behind the Ars nova treatise and the Tractatus figurarum were interested in the problems of notation and figures. What other musical elements they understood—performance, interpretation, compositional methodologies—are not as explicitly stated. For instance, the fact that the author of the Tractatus figurarum differentiates between the old (what we now call, without any hint of irony, the Ars nova) and the new (an “artem magis subtiliter”) by saying merely that the newer is “more subtle” is frustratingly problematic. His term, “subtilitates,” is subtle enough to generate a great deal of scholarly debate today about what exactly constitutes subtleness. But at the least, this single word demonstrates that there was an acknowledged evolution of the genre in its own time. Perhaps this is the moment to embrace a “multidimensional scenery,” as Karl Kügel puts it, “with the adjacent repertories of the English and the Italian motet visible in the distance.”31 This idea certainly urges one to modify the perception of a monolithic French central tradition. A more flexible view allows for a musical landscape full of diversity and which takes into account not only isorhythmically organized musical traditions, but also other stylistic variances both inside and outside France from 1320 onwards.

The concept of a second coexisting tradition challenges the assumption that works such as Rex Karole are outside of mainstream conventions. Bent has already marked 27 motets as part

of a well-established 14th-century Italian tradition. By expanding this list to include works outside of an Italian provenance, a much more vibrant second practice emerges. To Bent’s list, I would add not only Rex Karole, but also a number of another equal-cantus work from mid-14th-century France. To this end, I considered looking for some of the key features of the equal-cantus style—two equal upper voices determined by range, rhythmic motion, and text setting, ceremonial or honorific texts, a focus on melodic imitation and canon, displacement syncopation and extended mensural displacements, and large-scale rhythmic structures that are based upon rhythmic repetitions, but without diminution. Because ceremonial texts are more rare in the French isorhythmic repertory than in the Italian 14th-century motet, it is reasonably easy to compare across a variety of sources to compare stylistic features.

I also considered the sources of these works and attempted to take into account the wide-ranging access to musical exemplars that had previously that once had been considered insular.

The Chantilly codex is in many ways a kind of exemplar of the very question of the transmission of musical style. It is an Italian manuscript, copied in Florence or even further north, such as Cividale del Friuli (once Civitas Austria), or possibly in Pavia, a center of Francofile musical culture under the auspices of the Visconti. The copy in a semi-Gothic Italian

---

33 I focused primarily on sources, Ivrea115 and Chantilly, as well as the Trémoïlle index.
hand seems to be the work of an Italian scribe.\textsuperscript{36} Although both music and texts of a significant number of works were intended mainly for the Francophile courts of the Aragon princes, in particular count Gaston III/X of Foix-Béarn (also known as Gaston Fébus), and John I, king of Aragon, the source is filled with French, Catalan, Netherlands, and English works with many different purposes. Ursula Günther notes that although many of the compositions originated in southwestern France, it was eventually brought to Italy and copied there.\textsuperscript{37} Even the marginal decorations are considered to be by an Italian “from northern Italy or Venice.”\textsuperscript{38} What one can conclude is that this source was not a southern French original, but instead evidence of the diffusion of musical style throughout Europe.

The other principal manuscript of the era with a large number of concordances with Chantilly is Ivrea 115. The provenance of this codex is disputed. It was thought to have been compiled in Avignon, the seat of the French Papacy around 1370.\textsuperscript{39} However, the musically important court of Gaston Fébus has also been suggested because so much of the repertoire is dedicated to him and these works are in significant positions within the manuscript.\textsuperscript{40} Most recently, however, Karl Kügle has asserted that the source was made in Ivrea itself, by musicians


\textsuperscript{38} This was reported by François Avril, conservateur en chef of the manuscript department of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, to Günther. Günther, “Unusual Phenomena,” 98.


\textsuperscript{40} Many of these works are concordant with the Chantilly source. Ursula Günther, “Problems of Dating in \textit{ars nova} and \textit{ars subtilior},” \textit{L'ars nova italiana del trecento} 4 (1978): 292–293.
connected to the Savoyard court in the 1380s or 1390s.\textsuperscript{41} None of these three interpretations has become universally accepted although the Savoy connection is appealing principally because the political and ecclesiastic ties between north and south were so manifest in this Alpine county.

There are several works that stand out as possible examples of the equal-cantus tradition originating amongst French works in arranged in a hierarchical or proportional manner. \textit{Petre clemens} – \textit{Lugentium siccentur} was written in honor of Pope Clement VI (originally named Pierre Roger) at his court in Avignon, quite possibly between 24 December 1342 and 5 January 1343.\textsuperscript{42} As such it is one of the latest of the surviving motets attributed to Vitry. What is notable about \textit{Petre clemens} is not only a distinctive voice arrangement (two equal upper voices over a relatively fast moving tenor part), but also the repetition of seven complete rhythmic sections without diminution. This construction, with the seven sections possibly being a symbolic representation of the seventh Pope Clement of that name, is on an extremely large scale.\textsuperscript{43} Like many 14th-century Italian motets, the repetition of the tenor rhythm is not paralleled by a repetition of its melody. The melody is sung through as a single tenor \textit{color}. Furthermore, the tenor voice includes note values smaller than a breve, including semibreves and minim rests, another feature of the equal-cantus style.


\textsuperscript{43} The repetition of the tenor rhythm occurs in six complete iterations plus an additional partial repetition a seventh time. Thus the layout is 13 measures of introductory material, 33 measures of six rhythmic repetitions in near pan-isorhythm, 30 measures of a seventh iteration of the rhythm, and then 6 to 9 measures of concluding material. The tenor is missing 3 tempus units at the end and thus does not cadence simultaneously with the upper voices. In his edition of the motet, Leo Schrade lengthens the antepenultimate note to accommodate this difference. PMFC 1, 97–103.
Another connection to 14th-century Italian art is that this honorific motet reflects a nascent connection to early humanism. Pierre Roger before being elected pope was a leading orator and political spokesperson for the French crown. As such, it is apparent that great attention was paid to the poetic structure of the work and the complex references in the text. Andrew Wathey has noted that the texts of this motet among a number of others, has been copied within a literary tradition associated with Petrarch and the humanist tradition. This scholarly institution has several significant points of connection between Vitry’s works written in mid 14th-century Avignon and later motet traditions in Italy. It is known that principally German scholars collected literary collections of motet texts (including the text of Petre clemens), sermons, letters, and the like. Both scholars and copies of these texts eventually migrated south over the Alps. In Italy these collections were read and studied by students at the Italian universities in Bologna and Padua. These collections eventually found their way into the humanist circles of Francesco Zabarella and Pierpaolo Vergerio, two figures who feature in the life and career of Ciconia.

Like the text of Rex Karole, the poetry of Petre clemens celebrates the rule of nobility. This is done through numerous acclamatory references to Pope Clement and exhortatory references to both political conflict and Classical tragedy. The rule of Clement is juxtaposed to the political turmoil of the French crown and instead the pope is associated both with St. Peter

---


45 It has been noted that Vitry had a direct connection to Petrarch. Petrarch even hails the composer as the “only true poet among the French.” Wathey, “Motets of Philippe de Vitry,” 122, and Andrew Wathey, “Words and Music in the Motets of Philippe de Vitry,” *Revista de Musicología* 16 (1993): 1548 and 1551.

and the prophet Daniel. The allusions in this motet to Atreus, Thyestes, and the Seven against Thebes are all allegorical references to the conflict surrounding King Edward III of England and King Philip VI of France, both of whom claimed the crown of France due to their familial relationship to King Philip III. This text is clearly addressing a well-educated audience who would be familiar with current political events, Biblical stories, and Classical history. The recopying of these works not only as musical compositions, but as examples of significant literary specimens makes one pause before restricting our perceptions of the use of late 14th- and early 15th-century honorific motets to one specific state occasion such as a coronation or an appointment. Indeed, the opposite may be true that these works were designed to have multiple purposes, to be flexible in use, and thus were copied and recopied in a number of different contexts. These texts for long-dead political figures continued to be copied and collected many years after their point of origin. This custom is reflected in the same way that honorific motets such as Rex Karole had a longevity beyond their initial purpose.

Another work from France, but with distinctive equal-cantus motet features is Portio nature precellentis geniture – Ida capillorum matris domini dominorum – Ante tronum. This motet is honorific and was written in honor of cardinal Guy of Boulogne. Guy was a descendant of St. Ida, Countess of Boulogne, who is mentioned in the text of the motet as the mother of the first two rulers of the Kingdom of Jerusalem after the First Crusade.

---

47 Kügel, Manuscript Ivrea, 141.
49 PMFC 5, 24–25. Ivrea115, ff. 6v–7; Chantilly, ff. 61v–62; Stras222, ff. 74v–75; NL-Lu Fragment L.T.K. 342A, f. 2v (part of Cl only); Trémoîlle, 3 (index citation only). At the top of cantus II of Stras222, this work is attributed to two men: the composer, Egidius de Pusiex, an Avignon priest who died in 1348, and one Magister Heinricus, the poet. Heinricus also included his name in the text of cantus II as the author of the song.
Each statement of the tenor of the motet undergoes both mensural alteration and diminution. The complex canon of the tenor states, “It is to be sung in perfect [modus], second in imperfect [modus], third, cut by half of the first, the fourth [cut by half] of the second.” Similarly, the contratenor bears the inscription, “It is to be sung in the manner of the tenor.” Thus this canon indicates the realization of a proportion of 6:4:3:2. The tenor is only written out once, therefore, each repetition looks the same, but sounds different.

How is this motet like an equal-cantus motet? The upper voices are equal in range, although cantus I “Portio nature” has about twice as much text as cantus II “Ida capillorum.” The upper voices of this motet feature “supertaleae” that align with the four main sections of the motet. Anna Zayaruznaya has problematized the issue of “upper-voice periodization” to great effect. Her general observation is that there are patterns of construction in the upper voices of a number of motets that may or may not correspond to the underlying tenor taleae, but that can be analyzed in a way that can link complex structures with ideas expressed in the text. In the case of Portio nature, the upper-voice periods ultimately preserve the proportions and effect of the tenor’s diminution.

All of the sources of Portio nature transmit four voices, but the contratenor may have been added later. Scribe A of the Ivrea source provided the initial three-voice version and then scribe B added the contratenor and some other details. Either the four-voice version was not available when originally copied or scribe B told scribe A to wait and he changed his mind after the fact. No three-voice version survives, but other musical variants confirm that the motet was

---

50 The canon is in the tenor part of Ivrea 115 only.
52 Zayaruznaya, “Form and Idea,” 121.
53 See Kügel, Manuscript Ivrea, 147, and 148–149, regarding the additional contratenor.
reworked and modernized. Günther noted in her edition of the Chantilly source that the motet’s notation had been modernized to include dotted minims to create a momentary sesquialtera proportion.\(^{55}\)

Like Rex Karole and Petre clemens, Ida capillorum obviously had a longer life than a single ceremonial event. The addition of the contratenor and the other reworkings provides evidence that this was in use for a considerable amount of time. Honorific and ceremonial motets were important enough to update and modernize somewhat continuously demonstrating that they had a cultural value beyond their original purpose.

Alpha vibrans monumentum – Cetus venit heroycus – Amicum querit\(^{56}\) is nominally in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the Franciscans. It is possible that this work was intended for an individual honoree, but any more specific reference is merely conjectural despite the reference to Biblical heroes such as Elisha. This work was apparently originally in four voices and on the surface seems to be in the French proportional style. The most compelling evidence is the extreme manipulation of the tenor. The tenor is in two taleae, each divided into two parts with rests between. A canon gives instructions for singing the red notes in modus perfectus and the black notes in modus imperfectus. This is nothing so unusual. But the second set of instructions are more complex. The canon indicates that after singing the first section of the melody, one is to sing both in retrograde and with diminution by one half. Then one is to sing in normal order also with diminution by one half. Only after this pattern does one observe the rests and go on to the next section.

\(^{54}\) CMM 39, lix.
\(^{55}\) CMM 39, lviii.
\(^{56}\) PMFC 5, 136–140. Chantilly, f. 64v–65.
It might be easy to get lost in the complexity of the canon of Alpha vibrans, but after a brief analysis, it is relatively clear that the hallmarks of the equal-cantus style are present. There are a number of cognates with Rex Karole and the other motets discussed above. There is displacement syncopation at both the faster (minim) level between cantus I and II and also between the lower parts, although in slower rhythmic values, displaced by a semibreve (Example 4.11). The tenor also moves with a sense of displacement syncopation to the basic mensural pulse in even slower values, with duple-modus longas displaced by a breve (Example 4.12). Alpha vibrans features a number of examples of basic echo imitation that tend to mutate into melismatic hocketed cells, such as the passages that occur in conjunction with the tenor pattern at the end of every section (third part of the canon: sing the tenor in normal order with diminution by one half). These sections also correspond with a long melisma on the last syllable of every eighth line of text. Because the tenor is divided into two iterations of its rhythm, there are two different series of repeated rhythmic cells. The first cadential pattern begins in cantus II (two semibreves separated by a semibreve rest in m. 31–32) immediately rhythmically imitated by cantus I as the contratenor moves into an alternating breve – semibreve-rest pattern (Example 4.13). Cantus II’s rhythmic cell then mutates into three minims separated by a minim rest interjected occasionally with simple minim hockets. Each hocket passage transitions immediately without cadence or pause into the next tenor section. The second cadence is a little simpler with a minim-rest – minim – semibreve cell supplanted by a semibreve-rest – semibreve – semibreve pattern echoed between cantus I and cantus II (Example 4.14). The contratenor accompanies these hocketed cells with a series of semibreve notes and rests in irregular hocket patterns. This passage then shifts from hockets into two tempus units of displacement syncopation that then transitions immediately into the next tenor section.
Example 4.11: *Alpha vibrans*, mm. 21–32. Cantus I and II move in displacement syncopation to each other in a series of irregular patterns starting at m. 25, each displaced by a minim. Also beginning in m. 25, the contratenor and tenor move in displacement syncopation against the prevailing mensural pulse, but displaced by a semibreve.

Rabee dicuntur modo perfecto: Nigre imperfecto: Et in qualibet talia antequam pausetur retroeatur per semi modo ab ultima ad primum que ipsius talie nota. Et iterum eodem modo diminuendo a prima ad notam. Ultimam eiusdem talicie radiatur.

Example 4.12: *Alpha vibrans*, mm. 1–20. Tenor longas are in displacement syncopation to the prevailing duple modus, dispaced by a breve.
Example 4.13: Alpha vibrans, mm. 21–44. A rhythmically hocketed passage begins in m. 30 with a semibreve rest in the contratenor in conjunction with a series of echoed rhythmic cells in cantus I and II. These cells continue to mutate through the final section of the tenor’s canon until the next section begins in m. 41.
The idea that divergent late 14th-century French and Italian motet characteristics might share a common heritage in the motets of early 14th-century composers, one that later divides into two equally influential strands, challenges not just notions of *Ars nova* hegemony, but also the presumption that there is one central motet tradition. The wide and chronologically disparate dissemination of *Rex Karole* suggests that this motet may have been an important link between two styles of motet composition, one typically associated with northern traditions and the proportional manipulation of rhythm and melody, and the other usually identified as an Italian.
practice. The continuity of sources provides a paper trail to indicate that the characteristics shared by Rex Karole and Italian motets of the early 15th century were not a localized anomalies limited to the Veneto, but rather accessible to composers far north of the Alps and while also being associated with musicians in the Italian orbit. This, in turn, could suggest that composers such as Du Fay engaged with the equal-cantus style in their own works. Many of Du Fay’s earliest motets utilize the main characteristics of the equal-cantus style including Vasilissa ergo gaude – Concupivit rex decorem tuum, Apostolo glorioso – Cum tua doctrina convertisti a Christo – Andreas Christi famulus, Rite maiorem – Artibus summis, and O gemma lux – Sacer pastor Barensium.⁵⁷ Taken together, Rex Karole gives reason to believe that this second strand of motet composition is by no means subordinate to a “central” or “mainstream” style. This conclusion stands to reshape not only our understanding of the 14th-century motet, but also the way we approach the music of the early Renaissance.

---

⁵⁷ These four motets are also all included in the repertoire of Q15. See Chapters 5 and 6 for more about Du Fay’s utilization of the equal-cantus style.
Appendix 4.1: Rex Karole – Leticie pacis concordie – [Virgo prius]
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Appendix 4.2: Text and Translation of *Rex Karole – Leticie pacis concordie – [Virgo prius]*\(^{59}\)

**Cantus I**

1. Rex Karole, Johannis genitie, quondam regis Francorum strenui, mortalibus pre cunctis inclite, claritate generis ardui, facultate donandi comite, Alexandri more perspicui, qui Darium cum multo millite Porrum quoque subdidit nutui, sic hostili sub ducto stipite, pestifero gregis innocui vocativo fauce satellite inimica regni melliflui, pestis huius mordaci formite invidia consumptiva sui. Pastor cui jam quasi perdite suffragaris solercia cui, dolet Argus Yo perterrite cum simili sono gemitui, custos in hers gaudes sollicite, Nam gladio gentis ancipite per te pulso, remote domui tue pac est, nunc pacem reddite; Dat gaudium securo tramite, paci dando plebem restitui; quare potes vocis emerite Salomonis nomine perfrui. Miro regni paterno limite succedentem te principatui, litterarum diari divite coniugio pollet et instrui. Novi falli votis incongnite aut in verbi posset ambitui. Vive felix in aula celite, comprehensor regni perpetui.

1. King Charles, son of John (once vigorous king of the French) you are renowned before all mortals for the fame of your lofty family and for the accompanying faculty of generosity. After the fashion of the great Alexander— who subdued Darius with his great army, and Porus also, under his dominon— thus you removed with the enemy weapon, pestiferous to an innocent flock and also the devouring jaws of its accomplice, hostile to this sweet kingdom, by means of the biting fire of this plague: Envy, which consumes itself. Shepherd, whose [flock] was almost lost, you succor us with your ingenuity— Argus mourns for frightened Io with a similar sound of moaning— an inactive watchman you rejoice, carefully assuming the care of your excellent flock. For the double sword of your people has been routed by you; from afar to a home of peace your peace has now returned. And thus, to our hearing you give joy, with a safe path, by giving the people restored peace, whence you can deservedly enjoy the name of Solomon. I admire the extent of your father’s realm to which you have succeeded. You can be enriched and instructed by the union of letters with riches. Do not be deceived by empty promises and by ambiguous words. Live happily in the hall of heaven, possessor of a perpetual reign.

---

Cantus II

1 Leticie, pacis, concordie,
ac salutis humano generi
reparatrix, solem justicie
claustris tui baiulans uteri,
5 effugatrix Eve tristique,
testamento quam signat veteri
dulcis Hester, inventrix gratie,
Assueri cedatrix asperi,
revo catrix eius sentencie
plebi Dei dictate fieri,
5 ineffugatrix Eve tristique,
dispeller of Eve’s sorrow,
in the Old Testament you were signified by
sweet Esther, the inventor of grace,
tamer of fierce Ahasuerus
and revoker of his sentence.
10 testamento quam signat veteri
in the Old Testament you were signified by
10 plebi Dei dictate fieri,
That you [Esther] became the leader of the people of God,
elietie. plebs Israhel datur leticie.
lestress of Israel rejoices.
15 Sic genitrix te regis superi
Mother of a great king, thus to you
rogo supplex, ut regno Francie
I pray, suppliant: that to our Kingdom of France
nostro, per quod devote liberi
throughout which free people devotedly
magis tibi serviunt hodie
serve you today, more,
quam faciunt, ut puto, ceteri,
I think, than do others—
pacem dones, hostesque conteri,
you will give peace, and that the enemy be destroyed,

quod serviant tibi liberius.
so that they may serve you more freely.

De fauce nos eripe Cerberi,
Deliver us from the jaws of Cerberus,

De fauce nos eripe Cerberi,
virgin before and after.
CHAPTER FIVE
CICONIA, DU FAY, AND THE MUSICAL AESTHETICS OF THE EQUAL-CANTUS MOTET

In his monograph on Guillaume Du Fay, David Fallows mentions in passing the influence of the works of Johannes Ciconia on the compositions of Du Fay’s formative years.1 In particular, Fallows notes the resemblance of the isorhythmic plan of Du Fay’s motet Vasilissa ergo gaude – Concupivit rex decorem tuum to that of Ciconia’s Ut te per omnes celtum – Ingens alumnus Padue.2 If one disregards the introductory section of Vasilissa, Fallows argues, the two motets have nearly the same structure: both can be divided into two rhythmically identical parts. Based upon this structural similarity, Fallows concluded that Du Fay used his predecessor’s motet as the model for his work.

The primary goal of this chapter is to expand upon Fallows’ assertion and establish Du Fay’s Vasilissa as a motet in the tradition of works such as Ciconia’s Ut te per omnes. I compare the two works paradigmatically in order to examine their features in high relief and search beyond traditional means of stylistic comparison, such as isorhythm. This will demonstrate that Du Fay as a young composer adopted and absorbed the features of a distinctly Italian motet tradition as exemplified by the works of Ciconia. This study demonstrates that Du Fay was not composing exclusively in a proportional Ars nova idiom with only minimal references to Italian stylistic influences. Instead, Du Fay’s early works can be categorized as part of a much larger tradition that includes Ciconia as well as a number of other composers active in Italy in the first quarter of the 15th century.

2 Ut te per omnes is in Q15, ff. 289v–290, and Ox213, ff. 119v–120; Vasilissa is in Q15, ff. 276v–277, Ox213, ff. 132v–133, and I-TRbc 1374 [87], ff. 57v–58.
Fallows emphasized the formal relationship between *Ut te per omnes* and *Vasilissa*, but they share more than just structural congruity. Each motet is in honor of specific political figures, and may have served some ceremonial function. The upper two voices of both motets are equal in range and texture; the tenors are written in relatively short values and are rhythmically varied; and the double-statement structure of each is accentuated by rhythmically complex cadential figures. This list of common characteristics, which is catalogued and defined in Margaret Bent’s study of the 14th-century Italian motet, is part of a larger style of composition that has precedents nearly one hundred years before Du Fay arrived in Italy.\(^3\) The evidence that there is a significant proportion of equal-cantus motets, a technique largely identified with an Italian compositional tradition, that were copied into Q15 demonstrates that this older style was popular in the Veneto at the turn of the century and through the next three decades.\(^4\)

My examination of early 15th-century motets from the Veneto in comparison to those from France, particularly the region dominated by the musical culture of the papal court in Avignon, reveals two vastly different musical aesthetics. In general the texture of Italian motets consists of two equal upper voices with a tenor in a lower range that often moves in slightly slower note values, but which can also accelerate to join in an imitative texture alongside other voices. French proportional motets are generally much more hierarchical, with the triplum moving in faster rhythmic values than the motetus, and both of these voices moving in significantly faster values than the tenor.

---


Motets from the south also differ in construction from their northern analogues. Although a few equal-cantus motets are strictly isorhythmic, a great many others are not. Instead, these works rely on other structural features to provide shape and form. These composers associated with the noble courts of northern Italy were also likely to avoid borrowing pre-composed chants as the basis for their motets, instead creating newly composed tenors. Invented tenors are in general equal conceptually and compositionally with the upper voices. The counterpoint of the tenor moves in direct relationship to the upper voices and leads to the possibility that the tenor was composed either simultaneously or even after the fact. In an Ars nova motet, the counterpoint of the upper voices relies on the structure of the tenor. The tenor part must have been constructed first by organizing a pre-existing melody into various repetitions of rhythm. This organization gives an Ars nova motet its basic structure and form.

Because all the voices of an equal-cantus motet are usually feely composed, attention can be shifted from exclusive analysis of the tenor to the structural interaction of all voices, as well as other gestural features. These features can be identified and catalogued, allowing for a ready comparison not only between works such as Ut te per omnes and Vasilissa, but also many other

---

5 Recently, Bent has emphasized that double-statement motets without diminution such as those associated with the Veneto are actually more truly “isorhythmic” according to a strict definition of the term than those with mensural or proportional manipulation. See Margaret Bent, “What is Isorhythm?” in Quomodo cantabimus canticum? Studies in Honor of Edward Roesner, ed. David Butler Cannata, with Gabriela Ilńitchi, Rena Charnin Mueller, and John Nádas (Middleton, WI: American Musicological Society, 2008), 122. While not opposed to Bent’s critique of the use of the term isorhythm, Emily Zazulia examines the isorhythmic techniques that are used well into the 15th century. See Zazulia, “Verbal Canons and Notational Complexity in Fifteenth-Century Music” (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2012), 83–132. Zazulia proposes that isorhythm was not a dying and atrophic practice, as Thomas Brothers had implied in his article “Vestiges of Isorhythmic Tradition in Mass and Motet, ca. 1450–1475,” Journal of the American Musicological Society 44 (1991), 1–56; instead she supports the argument that isorhythmic structuring is only one of many specific techniques of compositional method and that one should not rely upon the presence of isorhythm alone to define a motet and describe its structure.
motets. I have divided this catalog of features into three general categories: texture, construction, and characteristic gestures.

**Texture**

Most proportional motets at the turn of the century were structured in a hierarchical fashion. In this differentiated structure the superius is in the highest register and the most active. The superius is thus set apart from the other voices of the motet in terms of number of notes, rhythmic complexity, and amount of text. Ciconia’s motets are all have equivalence of upper voices in terms of range, melodic shaping, rhythmic activity, and text setting. The similarity of range allows for imitative passages and melodic sequences to emerge as part of characteristic textures. In *Ut te per omnes*, with the comparable rhythmic structure of the two cantus voices, there are many possibilities for imitative melodic passages, particularly canons and sequences. Both parts also correspond in the nearly syllabic declamation of their texts. The texts are equal in length, sharing the same number of lines and nearly the same number of syllables per line. The syllabic text settings are bookended by extended melismas at the opening and conclusion of each half of each motet.

Following in the style of *Ut te per omnes*, Du Fay wrote the two upper voices of his *Vasilissa* in equivalent ranges. Although Du Fay sets *Vasilissa* for four voices, the basic grammatical structure of the work is two equal upper voices over a fast-moving tenor. As Fallows noted, *Vasilissa* shares a similar double-statement rhythmic structure with *Ut te per omnes*.

---


7 Nosow includes Du Fay’s *Vasilissa* amongst his list of equal-discantus motets. Nosow, “Florid and Equal-Discantus,” 43, and 101–106. I will discuss the function of the contratenor as the fourth voice of *Vasilissa* later in this chapter.
omnes. Du Fay sets a single text nearly syllabically in the two upper voices with some longer melismas adding punctuation at the ends of several of the poetic lines.

Ciconia does not use a pre-composed tenor for *Ut te per omnes*. Instead, he creates an entirely new melody, often moving in breves or semibreves. The rhythmic motion, despite being somewhat slower than that of the upper voices, moves much faster than the *cantus firmus* tenors of *Ars nova* motets. The newly created tenor moves rapidly and angularly to accommodate the counterpoint of its partners. In mm. 42–44 of *Ut te per omnes* the voices all move in counterpoint with each other, each moving in its fastest rhythmic values—semibreves for the tenor, and minims or minim rests for the cantus parts (see Appendix 5.1 for an edition of the motet).

Although Du Fay bases *Vasilissa* on a chant, suggesting an *Ars nova* influence, he sets the *cantus firmus* in a fashion that resembles less the slow-moving proportional tradition and more the rhythmically active equal-cantus style. It is likely that Du Fay chose or was given the tenor chant because the text is suitable for a nuptial theme; and yet the leaps of the melody that feature prominently in the first part of each half of the chant may have provided a compositional intrigue akin to that of the more angular motion of Ciconia’s newly composed tenor for *Ut te per omnes*.

Because of the spacing of the voices—two equally high cantus parts over a lower tenor—the primary cadential pattern in an equal-cantus motet is \( \frac{6}{10} \) that cadences to \( \frac{8}{12} \), contrasting with

---

8 Alejandro Planchart has identified the particular chant melody of *Concupivit rex* as one used specifically in the Veneto. Du Fay would have found this version only in the local chant books in Rimini. Alejandro Enrique Planchart, “The Early Career of Guillaume Du Fay,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 46 (1993), 361–362.

9 The first pitches of each half of the *Concupivit rex* melody—the leap up a fifth from \( d \) to \( a \)—are followed by upward motion. In mm. 24–31, the leap is followed by another leap up a minor third to \( c' \). In mm. 63–69, the tenor leap is followed by another step up to \( b \).
the French practice of cadencing \( \frac{6-8}{3-5} \). A typical Italian cadence is heard in mm. 11–12 of *Ut te per omnes* (Example 5.1). The motion creates parallel fifths between the two cantus parts, but retains acceptable contrapuntal motion between each cantus part and the tenor by resolving imperfect intervals 10 and 6 to perfect 12 and 8 respectively.\(^\text{11}\)

---

Example 5.1: Ciconia, *Ut te per omnes*, mm. 9–18. The cadence from mm. 11–12 is in a typical widely spaced Italian fashion, with cantus I moving from a 10th to a 12th above the tenor, and cantus II moving from a 6th to an 8ve.

Ciconia also utilizes what I describe as partial cadences by cadencing on a perfect sonority of \( \frac{12}{8} \), but without every voice contributing to the pre-cadential sonority. This occurs in m. 23 where cantus II rests while the tenor, on \( e \), and cantus I, on \( c'(\#) \), form a 6th interval (Example 5.2).\(^\text{12}\) Cantus II then rejoins to resolve to the fully cadential \( d-d'-a' \), a \( \frac{12}{8} \) cadence.\(^\text{13}\) In

---


12 I have implied the use of raised pre-cadential pitches as they likely would have been altered by a singer in the 15th century. The addition of musica ficta strengthens the directed resolution to the perfect sonority of the cadences. Prosdocimus, writing in early 15th-century Italy, discusses musica ficta at length in his treatise on counterpoint and especially notes the altering of pitches in imperfect consonance moving to perfect consonances to make the harmony “sweeter.” Prosdocimo de’ Beldomandi, *Contrapunctus (Counterpoint)*, ed. and trans. Jan Herlinger (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1984), 81–85.
mm. 69–70 Ciconia creates a partial cadence from the upward gesture of the tenor alone
(Example 5.3). As the two upper parts rest, the tenor moves up in a stepwise sequence from g to
c’, thus sounding the g that is normally heard in the cantus I cadential figure, and then resolving
to d’. Immediately following this sequence, the two upper voices rejoin on a closely voiced
cadence with cantus II in unison with the tenor and cantus I in a fifth, with $\frac{5}{1}$ replacing $\frac{12}{8}$.

Example 5.2: Ciconia, *Ut te per omnes*, mm. 19–27. In m. 23 cantus I and the
tenor form a partial cadence of two voices leading into a full sonority with three
voices in m. 24.

Example 5.3: Ciconia, *Ut te per omnes*, mm. 64–73. In m. 69, the tenor has a
brief, rhythmically active solo passage creating a partial cadence into m. 70.

One of Ciconia’s most striking cadential figures is heard in mm. 30–32 (Example 5.4).

Here the composer sets up a dissonant $\frac{10}{5}$ sonority, which is held for the duration of a longa
before rapidly cadencing on $\frac{12}{8}$. This resolution is only temporary. The $\frac{12}{8}$ sonority is heard only
for the duration of a semibreve and then moves immediately into an episode of high rhythmic

---

13 This same cadential pattern occurs again almost immediately in mm. 25–26 with the opposite
configuration for the two cantus voices.
activity.\textsuperscript{14} In \textit{Ut te per omnes} these cadences are particularly dramatic when the resolution immediately leaps into action after the held, pre-cadential sonority moving directly into a frenetic energy of interlocking counterpoint in the upper voices.

Although the upper voices of \textit{Vasilissa} are also equal in range, Du Fay does not typically cadence with an Italianate $\frac{10}{6} - \frac{12}{8}$. Instead, he strategically deploys this widely spaced figure at the medial and final cadences of the motet (see Appendix 5.3 for an edition of the motet). Almost all of the internal cadences are $\frac{6}{3} - \frac{8}{5}$, a cadential spacing more commonly found in \textit{Ars nova} motets. A shared feature of the internal cadences in \textit{Vasilissa} is that the contratenor crosses from

\begin{example}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{example.png}
\caption{Ciconia, \textit{Ut te per omnes}, mm. 28–37. The cadence in mm. 30–32 is striking in two ways. The held longa in mm. 30–31 is not the actual cadence (despite spelling out an anachronistic G-major triad). It is instead a dissonant sonority that cadences on an open 5th in m. 32. This cadence is surprisingly short, lasting only the duration of a semibreve.}
\end{example}

\textsuperscript{14} To a modern listener the arrival on the $\frac{10}{5}$ sonority in m. 30 can sound like the cadence, and thus disorientatingly and anachronistically harmonic. But this kind of tonal hearing can be mitigated if performed in Pythagorean tuning with a “large” major third. Thus the tension of the dissonant 10th resolves upwards to the perfect 12th and the cadential resolution on $\frac{12}{8}$ sounds correct despite the brevity of the cadential sonority. Ramon Pelinski calls the held sonorities before the excitement of the rhythmic passages, such as mm. 30–31 in \textit{Ut te per omnes}, “moments of repose” [\textit{Ruhelänge}], but I find this a misleading term. See Ramon Pelinski, “Zusammenklang und Aufbau in den Motetten Machauts,” \textit{Die Musikforschung} 28 (1975), 62–71, and Fuller’s response in “On Sonority,” 55. These sonorities should not be imparted with structural significance. If anything, they are moments of high tension relieved only by the explosion of activity that immediately follows.
a third below the tenor to come to unison at the cadence, creating parallel octaves with one or the other of the upper voices.\footnote{ Fuller and more recently Jennifer Bain have discussed cadential figures and “directed progressions,” most notably in the music of Guillaume de Machaut. See Fuller, “On Sonority,” 50–54, and Jennifer Bain, “Theorizing the Cadence in the Music of Machaut,” \textit{Journal of Music Theory} 47 (2003), 330–333.}

Honorific and ceremonial texts are typical of the equal-cantus motet, and equal voicing in the upper parts enables additional text-setting conventions that are unique to these works. In the case of Ciconia’s \textit{Ut te per omnes} (see the text and a translation below), a symbolic equivalence between its honoree, Francesco Zabarella, and St. Francis of Assisi is texturally reinforced by the call-and-response in the cantus parts (Example 5.5).\footnote{ Call-and-response is a technique that is most productively utilized when the vocal parts have an equal range and texture. It is therefore a compositional practice nearly unimaginable in works based upon hierarchies of range and rhythm as in motets of the \textit{Ars nova}.} The rhythmic and melodic imitation of this passage in \textit{Ut te per omnes} is further emphasized by being coupled with the alliteration of the names beginning with “fran-ci-” occurring in both texts.\footnote{ See Jane Alden’s study, “Text/Music Design in Ciconia’s Ceremonial Motets,” in \textit{Johannes Ciconia: Musicien de la Transition}, edited by Philippe Vendrix (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 55–56, for a more detailed discussion on the significance of alternating texts in Ciconia’s motets.}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{example5.5.png}
\end{center}

\textit{Example 5.5}: Ciconia, \textit{Ut te per omnes}, mm. 19–27. In mm. 20–25 echo imitation between cantus I and cantus II reinforces the repetition of the name “Francesco/Francis” in various iterations.
The text setting for the upper voices of *Vasilissa* can illuminate some of Du Fay’s compositional decisions. The poem that Du Fay set is in rhymed couplets, and each phrase of text coincides with a phrase of music (see the text and translation below). Although individual phrases are carefully arranged, the large-scale musical division of the motet is significantly different from its poetic form. The poem is made up of three six-line strophes honoring the marriage of an Italian noblewoman, Cleofa Malatesta, and her groom, Theodore Palaiológos. Verse one is in honor of Cleofa, verse two Theodore, and verse three is again for Cleofa. In the motet the first two lines of the first verse are set to the introductory canon. After this, there follows an equal division of the remainder of the poetry, cutting the verse for Theodore into unequal parts and leaving the last two lines of his verse for the beginning of the second half of the motet. Unlike his seemingly random division of the honorific text in the upper voices, Du Fay carefully uses the parallel melodic and poetic division of the psalm form for his setting of the *cantus firmus*. The first half of the psalm verse corresponds with the first iteration of the tenor rhythm and similarly the second half of the verse with the repetition of the *talea*.

---

18 The poem that Du Fay sets for *Vasilissa* is not finest example of literary or lyrical construction and is unusually prosaic for such a notable imperial topic. It is in no discernable meter, in rhyming couplets of irregular length. Leofranc Holford-Strevens does not attribute the poor quality of the poetry to youthful inexperience, but instead to the poet’s “incurable inadequacies of innate inability.” Leofranc Holford-Strevens, “Du Fay the Poet? Problems in the Texts of His Motets,” *Early Music History* 16 (1997): 107. In light of Planchart’s discovery of the recognition given to the young Du Fay for his literary skills while a scholar in Cambrai and the great divide between poetic text structure and musical structure of the motet, Holford-Strevens concludes in the same article that it is improbable that Du Fay was the author of this particular text. See also Planchart, “Early Career,” 351–352.


20 In the manuscript, the scribe emphasizes this structure by copying the entire text of the psalm under the tenor part. The second half of the psalm verse is placed directly under the repetition of the tenor rhythm.
In avoiding the poetic structure of the main text of *Vasilissa*, Du Fay must have intentionally chosen to separate three verses into two rhythmically identical parts. By rejecting the poetic structure, he composed a double-statement motet, directly imitating equal-cantus motets such as Ciconia’s *Ut te per omnes* that were known in the sacred and secular courts of northern Italy in the early decades of the 15th century.

Du Fay pays special attention in the text setting of *Vasilissa* to bringing out words of particular significance to the listeners. Because this is a setting of a single text, certain words and phrases carry emphatic weight either through call-and-response, in which one of the two upper voices imitates both the melody and the text of the other, or in homophonic passages in a technique Fallows describes as “increased directness of communication.”\(^{21}\) In a manner similar to the way in which Ciconia highlights the names Franciscus and Francise in *Ut te per omnes*, Du Fay uses both melodic imitation and homophony as tools to emphasize specific words. Particularly notable are the words “Vasilissa” and “Ytalica,” in imitation, and “Cleofe,” “Romeorum,” and the phrase “a tuis de Maletestis,” in homophony.\(^{22}\) In most cases, Du Fay gives the tenor rests during the homophonic passages of the upper voices. By doing this he clears the texture, giving extra emphasis to the words of the cantus parts. The preponderance of proper names in these musically and textually significant episodes signals Du Fay’s desire to highlight the honorees of the motet through both words and music.

*Ut te per omnes* is copied in two Veneto manuscripts, Q15 and Ox213. The Ox213 version the motet differs from that of Q15 in that it includes an additional contratenor part.\(^{23}\) This

\(^{21}\) Fallows, *Dufay*, 108. See also Nosow, “Florid and Equal-Discantus,” 103.

\(^{22}\) Nosow, “Florid and Equal-Discantus,” 104.

\(^{23}\) Heinrich Besseler declared the contratenor of *Ut te per omnes* “inauthentic” and in PMFC 24 it is labeled “optional.” Heinrich Besseler, *Bourdon und Fauxbourdon: Studien zum Ursprung der niederländischen Musik* (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1974), 76; PMFC 24, 103.
contratenor, added by either the scribe, the composer, or even a different composer, is problematic both from a contrapuntal and a compositional aspect. In the case of Ciconia’s motets, Bent concludes that none of the countertenors are authentic, for they were likely added in the creation of Q15 and Ox213, and thus postdate the composer’s death. Not only can many be ignored without changing the essential contrapuntal grammar of the motet, but some also alter the sonority of the work and are “best omitted.” It is possible that composers and scribes familiar with proportional motets in four voices may have introduced a novel four-part texture to works to replace the old-fashioned three-voice motet of 14th-century Italy. By adding a fourth voice to motets such as Ut te per omnes, the scribe of Ox213 seems to have made an attempt to modernize an older work for performance in contemporary settings.

Although there is doubt that the contratenor was part of the original concept of Ut te per omnes, this particular example is reasonably well crafted. It enters in an imitative relationship with the tenor (Example 5.6) and adds to the rhythmic complexity of the texture of the motet by moving in displaced syncopation with the tenor (Example 5.7). Yet the motet is contrapuntally complete with only three voices, for the contratenor does not contribute to the “essential

---

24 Bent has concluded that through the 14th century fourth-voice contratenors are problematic either because of copious doublings or excessive dissonance. It is prudent to consider many of these same issues with regard to added contratenors in early 15th-century sources. Bent, “Fourteenth-Century Italian Motet,” 101. See also Bent’s discussion of “problematic” contratenor parts in the motets of Ciconia and others in the introduction to PMFC 24, in particular pages xiii and xvii, and the critical commentary to specific works in the same volume.


28 I will address the concept of displacement syncopation later in this chapter.
grammar” of the work. This is especially notable with the completeness of cadential gestures discussed above. Conspicuously, the contratenor at moments of cadence merely doubles the formula already found in the three-voice texture.

Despite intentional and integrated compositional features, the contratenor voice of *Ut te per omnes* obscures and distorts some of the most salient musical qualities of the motet.

---

Particularly prominent is an echo passage between the two upper voices where cantus II introduces a melodic figure as the contratenor doubles the entire passage an octave lower (Example 5.8). Another passage of upper-voice echo imitation is muddied by a series of parallel fifths between the contratenor and cantus II (Example 5.9). The medial cadence is marred by extended stretches of parallel octaves (Example 5.10). In addition to these inessential additions and contrapuntal incongruities, the basic sonority of the work becomes generically homogenized, either when the contratenor continues while the tenor rests, or when the contratenor crosses into a range below the tenor. Particularly problematic is the final section of the motet, where the text ends on a long melisma and rhythmic intensity is at its peak (Example 5.11). Here the contratenor part simply alternates pitches with the tenor. Instead of propelling the passage towards the final cadence, this voice-exchange bogs down the motet on a static fifth drone that does not reflect the complex rhythmic and contrapuntal interplay present in the rest of the motet.  

Example 5.8: Ciconia, *Ut te per omnes*, mm. 74–83. In mm. 76–77 the contratenor simply doubles cantus II an octave lower.

---

30 Because counterpoint until the late 15th century was considered to be a dyadic process, one needs to consider first the relationship of the tenor to all other voices. See Bent, “Grammar of Early Music.” This does not mean that the contratenor is in any way essential to the grammar and sonority of *Ut te per omnes*, nor does it mean that the contratenor is any more authentic, but it does justify some of the excessive doublings and dissonances between the contratenor and the upper voices throughout the motet.
Example 5.9: Ciconia, *Ut te per omnes*, mm. 19–27. In mm. 20–21 the contratenor moves in parallel 5ths to cantus II.

Example 5.10: Ciconia, *Ut te per omnes*, mm. 46–54. In mm. 51–54 the contratenor doubles cantus II at the octave, but in a simpler rhythm that obscures some of the rhythmic complexity of this passage.
Example 5.11: Ciconia, *Ut te per omnes*, mm. 94–105. In mm. 101–106 the contratenor moves in exact voice exchange with the tenor. Because the tenor is moving in leaps of perfect 5ths, the resulting counterpoint sounds like an open-fifth drone, obscuring the contrapuntal interplay of this passage.

Unlike the contratenor of *Ut te per omnes*, the contratenor of *Vasilissa* appears to be authentic and original.\textsuperscript{31} The structural interplay between Du Fay’s tenor and contratenor indicates that each part was composed with the other in mind.\textsuperscript{32} Although the contratenor is acknowledged to be authentic, it does not mean that the voice is essential to the grammar of the motet. Despite the fact that it takes on a contrapuntal role with the tenor, and is integrated into the motet, it adds nothing crucial to the resolution of the counterpoint.\textsuperscript{33} This counterenor is well

\textsuperscript{31} The same contratenor is present in all three sources for the motet.

\textsuperscript{32} Nosow describes this relationship as “mosaic-like” in “Florid and Equal-Discantus,” 104.

\textsuperscript{33} Margaret Bent, ed., *Bologna Q15: The Making and Remaking of a Musical Manuscript*, 2 Vols. (Lucca: Libreria Musicale Italiana, 2008), 1:222. Nosow takes the opposite view,
crafted, contributing to the rhythmic layering of the semibreve – minim figures at the medial and final cadences (mm. 57–62 and 96–101). With the inclusion of the contratenor, these episodes are maximally rhythmically abundant, as there is new pitch falling on every semibreve of each tempus. The constant rhythmic activity in these two groups of measures drives the texture through these episodes to their respective cadences.

**Construction**

A key element in the construction of a Veneto motet is the foregrounding of small-scale musical features that combine into large-scale rhythmic repetitions. Rhythmic repetitions in all voices result in a double iteration of structure that divides the work into two parts. On the surface this double-statement structure might appear to be a fairly simple form, but the contrapuntal structure is instead quite sophisticated. Large-scale rhythmic repetition is notable because of small-scale features that are foregrounded and reemphasized in each half of the work.

In the equal-cantus style, a newly composed tenor permits Ciconia a certain amount of compositional freedom. He is not restricted to the structure of isorhythm, with its slow-moving rhythmic values and prescribed melodic contours. By creating and controlling the interaction between the cantus parts without having to accommodate a pre-composed tenor structure, Ciconia can allow the newly invented voice to participate in the counterpoint, or hold back in sections where the upper voices form more complex relationships with each other. Several times he supports the intricacy of rhythmic motion in the cantus voices by settling the tenor on a single extended pitch (see mm. 32–35). By contrast, in m. 13 Ciconia gives the tenor its own solo melodic and rhythmic module, while the upper voices rest. Although the tenor generally moves describing the contratenor as “harmonically essential.” See Nosow, “Florid and Equal-Discantus,” 106.
in breves and semibreves, Ciconia here activates the tenor line with semibreves and minims to fit in with the rhythmic contour of the other voices. In this instance, the tenor is actually the instigator of the imitative figure echoed three measures later in the cantus parts.

_Ut te per omnes_ remains in a single mensuration and tempus throughout the work. In motets composed in the north using isorhythmic procedures, the common practice was to use diminution or other kinds of mensural manipulation for the last section typically for the setting of the last _talea_ or two, to create a structural “acceleration” to the end of the motet. 34 In most equal-cantus motets, however, we see not a proportional diminution for the final section of the work, but instead an increase of the speed of individual note values in the tenor, bringing them into an equal rhythmic texture with the upper voices. This can be seen in mm. 93–103 of _Ut te per omnes_, where the tenor’s basic motion accelerates from primarily breves to semibreves. Furthermore, this increase of speed is not produced exclusively in the final section of the motet, but also in internal cadences, such as the midpoint between the repeated rhythmic halves of _Ut te per omnes_ (mm. 42–47). The increase in relative speed of the tenor results in the three voices weaving together in hocket and echo imitation. These cadential passages are distinctive of Ciconia’s works, particularly in his double-statement motets where rhythmic sequences lead to the medial and final cadences and thus highlight the formal structures of these works. This type of cadential sequence is also found in his through-composed motets, imbuing them with a formal structure regardless of the lack of isorhythmic constraints.

---

34 Although _Ut te per omnes_ has no mensuration sign in Q15, the notation implies that the motet is in _tempus perfectum_. This is confirmed by the mensural indication ○ in Ox213. Two motets by Ciconia have mensural changes, but neither represents the northern practice of diminution. Instead, these changes are utilized as “special experimental device[s].” Bent, “Fourteenth-Century Italian Motet,” 98.
The division between the two rhythmic sections of *Ut te per omnes* is emphasized by an extended, untexted cadential passage leading into the medial cadence at m. 57. Ciconia articulates these cadential passages by expanding and contracting melodic and rhythmic modules that drive to the cadence. This passage is first marked by increased motion in the tenor, changing from movement mostly in breves to semibreves for the duration of three tempora (mm. 42–44). Simultaneously a rhythmic module in the two cantus parts (minim rest–minim–minim–minim) is passed in imitation from one voice to the other, repeating four times. This resembles a hocket not of single alternating notes, but of rhythmic cells. This cell is expanded twice in cantus I in mm. 45–50, with repetitions immediately following in cantus II—this time preserving the exact melodic as well as rhythmic profile of cantus I. The modular material then contracts in m. 51, resulting in a single-note hocket passage. At the same time, beginning in m. 45, the tenor shifts into repeated leaps of fourths and fifths supporting the dynamic rhythmic interplay of the upper parts. At last the culmination of the melisma marks the end of the echo imitation and the first section of the motet resolves in m. 57 with a simultaneous a sonority that acts as both cadence and opening of the second half of the work. This distinctive repeated rhythmic episode is also a key feature at the end of the motet (beginning in m. 98) on an extended “Amen” melisma. These passages highlight the double-statement form of the motet, making the beginning and ending of each section clearly audible to the listener.

Du Fay’s *Vasilissa* is essentially in two parts with the second half a rhythmic replication of the first. Its sections are articulated by small-scale structures similar to those in Ciconia’s motet, and repeated in both halves of the motet. Both Ciconia and Du Fay set one line of

---

35 Two elements stand outside of this structure. The first is the canonic introductory section. The second is the final two pitches that complete the melody of the borrowed *cantus firmus* tenor at the end of the work.
poetry to one phrase of music, with shorter melismatic passages functioning as punctuation. In *Vasilissa* each rhythmic half of the motet opens with a homophonic statement set with each voice’s longest note values. A short melisma separates the fourth and fifth line of text (mm. 32–35). Another melisma in cantus I punctuates the eighth and ninth lines before the homophonic statement of “Romeorum” (m. 55). This phrase introduces the increased rhythmic activity of all voices that leads into the medial cadence. Unlike Ciconia’s melismatic cadential episode, the cadential sequences in both halves of *Vasilissa* are set with further text. Both Ciconia and Du Fay utilize imitative sequences and increased rhythmic activity to highlight the large-scale formal structures of their works, although there are slight differences in the method of setting up their individual small-scale structures.

One way in which Du Fay distances the setting of the *cantus firmus* in *Vasilissa* from its isorhythmic cousins is by not utilizing a repetition of the *color*. Instead, there is a single, through-composed setting of the chant. The *talea* similarly plays a muted structural role, being repeated only once. Another feature that distinguishes Du Fay’s tenor from a typical *Ars nova* tenor is that, as in other early 15th-century equal-cantus motets, there is no diminution. Instead Du Fay’s work is similar to motets such as *Ut te per omnes* in the rhythmic pacing of the tenor. Although the first several pitches are in relatively slower rhythmic values, the general motion is in breves and semibreves. After a canonic introduction, the tenor enters with a held pitch at m. 24, which is followed by movement primarily in breves and semibreves with longa rests between. This slow texture ratchets up incrementally and gradually begins to resemble less the slow-moving tenors of *Ars nova* motets and more the newly composed voices found in Ciconia’s works.
Like Ciconia, Du Fay emphasizes the overall structure of the motet by increasing the complexity of the rhythms approaching the medial and final cadences. This is done by accelerating the general speed of both the contratenor and tenor parts (Example 5.12). Until this point the two lower parts generally have moved in breves and semibreves. But starting in m. 57 cantus I introduces a rhythmic figure that is then imitated by all four voices in sequence. This increases the rhythmic motion of the contratenor and tenor, bringing them into textural equivalence with the cantus parts. This rhythmic module echoes through each voice and builds tension through to the cadence in m. 63.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{36} Du Fay also uses this same technique in his other motets of 1420s such as \textit{O gemma lux et speculum} – \textit{Sacer paster barenium} – \textit{Beatus Nicolaus adhuc} (Q15, ff. 292v–293 and Ox213, ff. 130v–131) and \textit{Apostolo glorioso} – \textit{Cum tua doctrina} – \textit{Andreas Christi famulus} (Q15, ff. 270v–271). I will discuss the melodic shape of this episode in the section on fanfares below.
the motet genre. Thus the following section is by necessity only a selection of five characteristic gestures that in combination give this kind of motet its particular and distinctive profile within used to define the equal scale features that are relatively easy to identify and describe, they are elements that are readily

Characteristic Gestures

Texture and form are only two of many features that define style. Because they are large-scale features that are relatively easy to identify and describe, they are elements that are readily used to define the equal-cantus style. But there are also a multitude of smaller-scale features and gestures that in combination give this kind of motet its particular and distinctive profile within the motet genre. Thus the following section is by necessity only a selection of five characteristic traits that generally characterize the equal-cantus style and are found in both Ciconia’s *Ut te per omnes* and Du Fay’s *Vasilissa*. These distinctive features are temporal flexibility, minimally
displaced melodies, the interaction of rhythmic and melodic imitation, trumpet-like fanfares, and melodic flow.

_Temporal flexibility_

Although _Ut te per omnes_ is written in one overarching mensuration, there is temporal flexibility throughout. Instead of changing time signature, Ciconia plays with a rhythmic plasticity that shifts between triple and duple modus. This is a characteristic equal-cantus trait and common to almost all of Ciconia’s motets and mass movements. Nearly all of these features include either shifts in the division of the breve from two to three semibreves and vice versa, or simultaneous duple and triple prolation in different voice parts. These rhythmic shifts could be transcribed in modern notation by a shift between $\frac{3}{4}$ and $\frac{6}{8}$ but in Ciconia’s works the effect is achieved not through a literal mensuration change, but simply through shifts in notation. These rapidly shifting rhythmic passages emphasize the equivalence of smaller rhythmic values and a fluid concept of mensuration that is not bound to a strict duple or triple division of the breve typical of the equal-cantus style.

In Ciconia’s works, the shift between triple and duple is fluid, passing easily from one measure to another and from one voice to another. An example of Ciconia’s use of duple within a triple tempus in _Ut te per omnes_ is in m. 16 (Example 5.13). The cantus parts move in parallel fourths in a duple figure over the tenor’s continuing triple motion. An additional illustration of a mensural shift can be heard in mm. 20–24, where a set of three semibreves is followed with semibreve – minim – semibreve – minim patterns in both cantus voices (Example 5.14). The

---

37 Bent, “Fourteenth-Century Italian Motet,” 103.
shift between triple and duple occurs in echo imitation with the two voices trading a solo passage first heard in cantus II.¹³

Example 5.13: Ciconia, *Ut te per omnes*, mm. 9–18. The mensural pulse shifts between triple and duple.

Example 5.14: Ciconia, *Ut te per omnes*, mm. 19–27. Cantus I and II trade imitative phrases that shift between triple and duple over a dominant triple mensuration.

Du Fay’s shifts of prolation within the tempus in *Vasilissa* are not as adventurous as Ciconia’s, yet he still employs this distinctly equal-cantus procedure. Ciconia relishes rapid shifts, changing the prolation in the space of a single breve. Du Fay is more confident in establishing a long passage of duple prolation within the implied *tempus perfectum* of the motet. This kind of mensural shift realized within one voice against duple elsewhere in the texture is exemplified by the episode (Example 5.15). In m. 31 the contratenor first introduces a duple pulse while the three other voices continue in triple. Two measures later cantus I shifts from an

³⁸ Shifts between duple and triple pulse within a single mensuration can be found in Guillaume de Machaut’s works from the mid-14th century, but this metric flexibility is restricted to musical genres such as ballades and rondeux and not found in any of his motets.
alternating breve – semibreve motion to a semibreve – minim pattern, transforming the sequence from triple to duple meter just as the contratenor returns to a triple pattern. The pulse remains indefinite until m. 41, at which point all four voices return to motion exclusively in breves and semibreves and tempus perfectum is restored in all parts.\footnote{Du Fay uses this procedure again in mm. 45–49, 70–75, and 84–88, suggesting a more conservative, yet nonetheless palpable, adaptation of the Italian technique.}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{example5_15.png}
\caption{Example 5.15: Du Fay, Vasilissa, mm. 24–40. Shifts in mensural pulse from triple to duple in various parts leaves the mensuration uncertain around m. 38.}
\end{figure}

\textbf{Minimally displaced melodies}

Another form of rhythmic interplay distinctive to the equal-cantus style is that of extended passages in which cantus I and cantus II move in equal semibreves, but one voice is displaced by a minim.\footnote{There are only a few examples of displaced rhythmic patterns in 14th-century works, such as in Machaut’s motet \textit{Qui es promises de Fortune – Ha, Fortune! trop suis mis loing – Et non est}} This creates a series of local syncopations. In \textit{Ut te per omnes} in m. 32,
cantus I replicates the same melodic contour of cantus II over a stretch of four tempora, but
shifted by a minim (Example 5.16). Ciconia further accentuates the procedure by placing it
over a held tenor note that functions as a kind of drone, highlighting the complex texture above
it. 41

Example 5.16: Ciconia, Ut te per omnes, mm. 28–37. Beginning in m. 32 cantus I
replicates the same melodic phrase as is sung in cantus II, but it is displaced by a
minim creating syncopation between the two voices.

Like Ciconia, Du Fay uses displaced melodies to create rhythmic diversity in the small-
scale form of each section of Vasilissa. One such example is in mm. 33–34. However, there are
several notable differences between Ciconia’s use of syncopation and Du Fay’s. Unlike the case
from Ut te per omnes above, in which the displacement passage echoes both rhythm and melody,
this passage from Vasilissa utilizes only rhythmic repetition. Again unlike the example from Ut
te per omnes, which lasts the duration of four tempora, the episode in Vasilissa lasts only half as
long. Ciconia creates his passage of syncopation by taking a simple semibreve melody and
shifting it by a minim. Du Fay instead allows for greater rhythmic diversification by shifting an
entire rhythmic cell (consisting of semibreve – minim groups) by a minim. This puts the rhythm

qui adjuvet (PMFC 2, 134–136). The text of this motet is concerned with treachery, deceit, and
unanchoredness, and shifting mensural pulses may be prompted by the poetry.

41 Rhythmic syncopations are common to most of Ciconia’s works. See for instance extended
passages of syncopation in O Petre Christi discipule, Albane missus celitus – Albande doctor
maxime, and Petrum Marcello Venetum – O Petre antistes inclite, amongst others. These works
are discussed in more detail in Chapters 2 and 3.
of each melody in opposition to each other. The two melodies wind about each other in voice exchange, with cantus I descending to an octave below cantus II in m. 35.42

Interaction of rhythmic and melodic imitation

Controlled rhythmic structure, specifically the repetition of rhythmic modules, rhythmic sequences and canon, and episodes of melodic imitation, is a hallmark of the equal-cantus style. In the absence of isorhythmic tenor construction, imitation provides these motets much of their structural form. Ciconia’s works are especially notable in this regard, for they exhibit extremes of the development of rhythmic structures and melodic imitation in cadential passages, particularly the diversity of rhythmic variation from stasis to extreme flurries of activity such as appears in Ut te per omnes, mm. 31–32. One extreme example of rhythmic and melodic development is heard in the medial and final cadential episodes of the motet. I have discussed expanding and contracting patterns at some length above, but these episodes are significant because of the relative amount of time during which the listener is engaged with Ciconia’s highest level of rhythmic interplay and melodic imitation. The two episodes leading to both the medial and final cadences constitute over a quarter of the musical material of the motet.

Unlike Ciconia’s use of highly varied rhythmic sequences, Du Fay forms the melodic shape of Vasilissa by utilizing relatively simple rhythmic structures. In general, the overall rhythmic motion of all voices of the motet is in semibreves with occasional breve – semibreve motion. When Du Fay writes extended minim passages, he always sets the melody in stepwise motion, creating a flowing character.

42 Du Fay uses displacement syncopation in a number of other motets, but in none of those instances is a melody echoed exactly, as it is in Ut te per omnes. The passages of syncopation in Du Fay’s motet O gemma lux are particularly sophisticated.
As in *Ut te per omnes*, *Vasilissa* features sequences of imitative rhythmic and melodic passages, but in general these are less explicit than Ciconia’s. Melodic imitative modules occur in only a few distinct moments in each part of *Vasilissa*, but even the non-imitative passages are unified by rhythmic contour. *Vasilissa* is in three sections of differing types of imitation. The introductory portion, to m. 23, is in strict canon. The second section, beginning at m. 24, is marked by loose imitation between the parts or imitation at an interval; for instance see mm. 36–37. In the third section (beginning at m. 63), Du Fay uses imitation at the unison reminiscent of the opening canon, particularly in mm. 75–76 and in m. 85. This unifies the work by bringing elements of the introduction into the last section of the motet.

Leading up to the major cadences of *Vasilissa* there is an exchange of a distinctive rhythmic module (minim rest – minim – semibreve – semibreve – semibreve) back and forth between the two cantus parts (see Example 5.12 above). Unlike Ciconia’s additive and subtractive cadential sequences, Du Fay maintains a single rhythmic pattern through to the cadence. Also unlike *Ut te per omnes*, the dramatic rhythmic imitation during the cadential sequences of *Vasilissa* is not melodically imitative. Indeed, it seems as if Du Fay deliberately evades melodic sequence in these two sections by avoiding repetition in the four-note module by either direction or interval. By doing this, Du Fay dissolves any notion of melodic superiority in any of the four voices, let alone either of the two upper voices, and instead creates a sonorous drive in which all the voices in combination move to the cadence. Du Fay decreases the general length of the tenor and contratenor notes, and, without deviating from the borrowed chant melody, sets them with the same rhythmic sequence as the upper voices, exclusively in

---

43 In the critical notes of the facsimile edition of Q15, Bent describes the rhythmic imitations at the end of each half of *Vasilissa* as “Ciconia-like,” but does not specify what this quality exactly entails. See Bent, *Q15*, 1:222.
semibreves and minims, with every voice participating in the rhythmic imitation. The four voices enter separated by one semibreve each, so that the four-semibreve pattern and the four-semibreve cycle of entries push against the triple meter. This emphasizes a different mensural locus for the module within each tempus, setting the four voices off in a series of displaced syncopations not in triple meter, but also not entirely in a duple division of the breve, resulting in a remarkable series of interlocking rhythmic cells driving to each cadence.

**Fanfares**

One characteristic feature heard in many of Ciconia’s works is a melodic passage that sounds like an echoing trumpet fanfare. In *Ut te per omnes*, the pitches of the two cantus voices in mm. 32–35 outline a melodic profile that resembles the second and third triadic register of a natural brass instrument (Example 5.17). After almost exclusively conjunct motion in the upper

---


45 Evocations of fanfares in 15th-century Italian works, particularly those of Ciconia, are legion. In particular, see Bent’s discussion of references to explicit descriptions of trompetta parts in 15th-century motets and mass movements in “Trompetta and Concordans Parts in the Early Fifteenth Century,” in *Music as Social Cultural Practice: Essays in Honor of Reinhard Strohm*, ed. Melanis Bucchiarelli and Berta Joncus (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2007), 38–73.

46 In Ciconia’s arrangement, this harmonic sequence is transposed up a fifth from the common range of the natural trumpet. The second register of the trumpet concludes on $g$, a perfect fourth below middle $e'$. The third register then extends from $c'$ up a major third to $e'$, a minor third to $g'$, and then up a perfect fourth to the octave $c''$. The out-of-tune seventh harmonic on $b^\flat$’ is not generally usable. See Raymond Monelle, *The Musical Topic: Hunt, Military and Pastoral* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2006), 44.
voices, both parts shift into a series of triadic leaps that suggest the pitches available through the harmonic series available on a heraldic trumpet. The syncopation of this melody at the minim, described above, further heightens the mimetic effect as the passage resembles trumpet calls echoing off the walls of a piazza during a procession or within the stone walls of a grand basilica. A fanfare of this complexity is more than merely a signal, but instead a heraldic announcement noting and proclaiming the presence of nobility. The passage evokes a notion of chivalrous, warrior-like figures, such as the motet’s dedicatee Francesco Zabarella, who was recognized as a noble amongst prelates and a fundamental figure in the battle to repair the rift of the Papal Schism.  

Example 5.17: Ciconia, *Ut te per omnes*, mm. 28–37. The circled pitches sound out a fanfare-like texture in this passage. 

As in Ciconia’s works, fanfare-like sequences can also be heard in a number motets and mass movements in Du Fay’s oeuvre. In the case of *Vasilissa*, the trumpet-like qualities are not

---

47 The notion that melodic episodes in Italian motets of the early 15th century might mimic horn calls is not outlandish. After all, a precedent is established in the Italian caccia repertory. Horn calls are particularly notable in Gherardello da Firenze’s *Tosto che l’alba* (PMFC 7, 109–116) and Jacopo da Bologna’s *Oselleto salvaz* (PMFC 6, 128–131). I find that the hunting calls referenced in the caccia are in general relatively simple, marking either a single pitch or outlining a leap of the fourth, and therefore distinct from the more elaborate fanfares in the 15th-century motets discussed in this study.

48 Bent, “Trompetta and Concordans,” 62. A particularly notable trompetta reference is the solus tenor of the motet *Rite maiorem Jacobum canamus – Artibus summis miseri reclusi – Ora pro
overt; even so a fanfare can be found. Du Fay subtly weaves a melodic pattern shared between all four voices during the episodes of increasing rhythmic intensity of the repeated rhythmic cells at the two primary cadences of the motet discussed above (mm. 57–62 and 96–104; Example 5.18). The basic melodic outline of the emphasized pitches is reminiscent of the registral pitches of the natural trumpet, particularly in leaps upwards and downwards of fourth and fifth in the medial sequence. As in Ciconia’s motet, the fanfare-like texture becomes an audible part of the episode at the end of the first rhythmic section of the motet and highlights the form of the work as it moves into the second half of the motet.
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Example 5.18: Du Fay, *Vasilissa*, mm. 60–68. The circled pitches represent the fanfare-like texture within the cadential passage of this motet.

**Melodic flow**

A further similarity between *Ut te per omnes* and *Vasilissa* is the rhythmic build-up that begins simply and then gradually increases in rhythmic activity at the end of each section. These long phrases, which correspond to the rhythmic division of the structure of each motet, are *nobis dominum* (CMM 1:1, 38–45). In most circumstances, elements from the original tenor and contratenor parts are combined to create a solus tenor. The product is a composite lower voice that moves in counterpoint to the two upper parts by using the grammatically essential elements of the tenor and contratenor. In the case of *Rite maiorem*, Du Fay adds a fanfare flourish at the beginning of each rhythmic section of the solus tenor that deviates from the basic borrowing of melodic elements from the contratenor and tenor. This flourish is trumpet-like in both rhythmic shape and in prevalence of leaps of fourths and fifths.
punctuated by occasional rhythmic flourishes. After the introductory material (*Ut te per omnes* to m. 8, and *Vasilissa* to m. 23), both motets move mainly in slower rhythms. The two cantus parts move in breves and semibreves (compare *Ut te per omnes*, mm. 9–12 with *Vasilissa*, mm. 24–27). As melodic modules are introduced and echoed, the texture accelerates to semibreves and minims, only occasionally punctuated by relaxations back to breve – semibreve motion (mm. 30–31 in *Ut te per omnes* and mm. 41–44 in *Vasilissa*). The rhythmic halves of each motet conclude in a flurry of motion in all voices, which then concludes in obvious cadences (compare *Ut te per omnes*, mm. 45–57, and *Vasilissa*, mm. 57–63). This wave-like hyper-texture is far removed from the differentiated and layered texture of the proportional *Ars nova* motet where the triplum is the most active voice and the tenor always plays a foundational role, with minimal moments of interaction between the motetus and triplum.

At the smallest scale of characteristic features, Ciconia utilizes distinctive rhythmic textures that highlight the juxtaposition of phrases and provide structural signposts. This fashions a configuration that shifts between motion and stasis throughout his works. Each phrase is distinct, picking up a new melodic or rhythmic element. A phrase in echo imitation is followed by a phrase that features syncopation, which in turn is followed by a phrase of rhythmic modulations between duple and triple meter. This is all rounded out by the cadential episode with rhythmic and melodic cells shifting through expansion and contraction, which places rhythmic emphasis on a different place in each tempus unit of the phrase. This seemingly simple

---

49 Allsen compares several of the internal rhythmic modules of *Vasilissa* to what he describes as “ostinato” passages in Ciconia’s *Doctorum principem*. The passages he highlights in *Doctorum principem* (mm. 3–4 and 15–16 as well as subsequent repetitions in the following mensural repetitions of these patterns) are unique to this single motet in Ciconia’s oeuvre. The corresponding measures that Allsen notes in *Vasilissa* are mm. 33–35. I do not agree with his description of these phrases in Ciconia as ostinatos, nor do I find a compelling similarity of phrases between the two works. See Allsen, “Style and Intertextuality,” 101.
construction is articulated in Ciconia’s works by the distinctive textures described above, that correlate to usher in each new phrase of textural acceleration.

In contrast, Du Fay is successful in creating a flowing texture that distinguishes *Vasilissa* from *Ut te per omnes*. He uses contrapuntal cells to create stable passages of sound passing from one phrase to another. For example, in mm. 32–35, Du Fay saturates the counterpoint at a minim level (Example 5.19). This sequence is launched by rhythmic motion in the contratenor and spans the next three measures with a pitch occurring on every minim in cantus I, cantus II, and the contratenor while the tenor rests. In the most rhythmically complex passages at the cadences, Du Fay places the entries at a consistent rhythmic interval that creates motion on every minim of the sequence, with the passage flowing evenly into the cadential sonority at the medial and the final cadences (beginning at m. 63 and m. 102 respectively).

Example 5.19: Du Fay, *Vasilissa*, mm. 24–40. Between mm. 32 and 35, Du Fay saturates the counterpoint with a note articulating on every minim.
A close study and analysis of Ciconia’s *Ut te per omnes* and Du Fay’s *Vasilissa* demonstrates that Du Fay was heavily influenced by some kind of Italian exemplar, if not specifically Ciconia’s motet. The first indicator is the texture, which in both motets is basically two equal upper voices over a fast-moving tenor. If there is a contratenor, it is grammatically inessential and, in the case of *Ut te per omnes*, is better left out in performance. Delving into the structure of *Vasilissa*, one can find a compositional arrangement comparable with equal-cantus practices rather than the typical *Ars nova* isorhythmic principles that require a foundational tenor and strictly rhythmically differentiate triplum and motetus. Finally, the rhythmic texture and melodic phrasing and rephrasing in echo imitation are complementary to similar textures found in equal-cantus works and especially the motets of Ciconia. A thorough reading of *Vasilissa* in comparison to Ciconia’s *Ut te per omnes* clearly demonstrates that Du Fay was working in an equal-cantus idiom.\(^{50}\)

Ciconia’s works are identifiable as part of one stylistic subgenre of the motet popular in the Veneto in the early 15th century. By contrast, the prevailing perception of a number of scholars is that Du Fay’s *Vasilissa* represents a new compositional style—a fusion of French and Italian traits, or even an isorhythmic motet that “deliberately imitates the Italian style.”\(^{51}\) But instead of viewing *Vasilissa* in terms of a new compositional style, I argue that Du Fay is working strictly within the existing equal-cantus style of Ciconia. A parallel analysis of *Ut te per omnes* and *Vasilissa* reveals that the relationship between them is much stronger than merely the resemblance of their respective formal structures. I conclude that both Ciconia and Du Fay were

---

\(^{50}\) This chapter’s argument that Du Fay was influenced by the Veneto motet style echoes Bent’s conclusion that Du Fay’s “motet *Vasilissa ergo gaude* of 1420 is in every way a pure Italian motet with respect to tonality, cadences, general rhythmic style and contrapuntal facture.” Bent, “Continuity and Transformation,” 225.

composing in a style that was distinctive of works composed for the Veneto in the early 15th century and that is linked to the older 14th-century Italian tradition. The overwhelming preponderance of equal-cantus characteristics in *Vasilissa* mitigates any apparently isorhythmic or proportional features influencing the young Du Fay’s musical style in the 1420s.

In 1984, Bent concluded that works from northern Italy in the *trecento* and the early decades of the 15th century represent a tradition that can be clearly identified by its traits and constraints. This has allowed later scholars to make further conclusions about the repertoire of the early 15th century in Italy. Identifying distinctive equal-cantus characteristics reveals lines of connection between various composers and traditions, lines that might not be so obvious if Du Fay is merely considered a transplanted Frenchman or the great pioneer of the “International Style” of the mid-15th century. There is no question that Du Fay’s motets exhibit the features of both French and Italian traditions, combining them and evolving into a new and innovative style by the middle of the 15th century. Yet, Du Fay had to start somewhere. In *Vasilissa* I do not see an equivalence of French and Italian features. Instead musical evidence in the motet points to an equal-cantus exemplar. While there is no conclusive evidence that Ciconia’s *Ut te per omnes* was specifically Du Fay’s Italian-motet paradigm, Fallows has it right in spirit. Du Fay was imbuing his works with equal-cantus characteristics, and his motets from the earliest decades of the 15th century are better considered equal-cantus motets rather than belonging to some other hybrid style.

An examination of the works in Veneto manuscripts within the broader context of the motet style south of the Alps in the early 15th century reveals that composers in the Veneto shaped an earlier Italian compositional practice into a distinctive motet style. The recognition of

these distinct characteristics changes our understanding of the motet in this era by shifting emphasis away from the assumption of the importance and influence of a so-called “French Central Tradition” of isorhythmic *Ars nova* motets and towards the concept of parallel stylistic pluralism, one of varied regional stylistic differences.\(^{53}\) It also corrects the assumption that the stylistic characteristics apparent in some of the earlier works of Du Fay originated only with his encounter with 15th-century English repertoire.\(^{54}\)

The question that must now be considered is why Du Fay chose to use equal-cantus works as his exemplars. The equal-cantus motets found in Q15 are primarily settings of texts for important political personages and ceremonial events. What is significant is that motets of this style were intended for a specific audience, patrons, or influential figures who may have desired to hear works composed in a particular fashion. I propose that Du Fay’s *Vasilissa* was simply a composition for a commission. In 1420 Du Fay was a young and eager composer who had been given his first prominent position with the Malatesta and instructed to write something appropriate for the occasion. He most likely turned to other works, such as the honorific motets of Q15, as exemplars for his own take on the ceremonial motet.\(^{55}\) The result is a work that is

---


\(^{54}\) Planchart in personal correspondence has noted that that Du Fay did not start incorporating English stylistic influences in his repertoire until the mid to late-1430s at the earliest. This echoes Fallows’ assertion that many of the stylistic characteristics that have been identified as “English”—vertical homophonic sonorities, triadic construction, and unprepared dissonances—can also be found in Italian music from the early 15th century. See David Fallows, “The Contenance Angloise: English Influence on Continental Composers of the Fifteenth Century,” *Renaissance Studies* 1 (1987): 194.

\(^{55}\) Bent, “A Contemporary Perception of Early Fifteenth-Century Style: Bologna Q15 as a Document of Scribal Editorial Initiative,” *Musica Disciplina* 41 (1987): 196. If it could be speculated that there was some sort of relationship between Du Fay and the Q15 scribe, it might
modern and innovative, and yet incorporates elements of an Italian style that he hoped would impress his new patrons. These works were simultaneously retrospective and innovative, reflecting Du Fay’s unique melding and manipulation of the Italian-motet style with his own compositional language.

be better possible to argue that Du Fay was familiar with the versions of Ciconia’s motets in Q15.
Appendix 5.1: Ciconia, *Ut te per omnes*

*Ut te per omnes celitus - Ingens alumnus Padue*

Johannes Ciconia  
Ed. Bent and Hallmark, 1985 (adapted by Buff, 2013)
Christus quod sum pse rat
vulnus recep tum per tu um no bis be ni-

Audi li bens dignus pre ces
doce ris im men si sa cer

gne por ri ge
ut de te ca nens glo ri am
sic il la fel ix regu-

Fran ci sce quo le ges bo nas
Ante no ris st arps ac ei pit.
Sil vas per
Appendix 5.2: Text and translation of *Ut te per omnes*\(^{56}\)

**Cantus I**

Ut te per omnes celitus
Plagas sequamur maxime
Cultu lavandos lumina,
Francisce, nostros spiritus.

Tu qui perennis glorie
Sedes tuere omnipatris,
Qui cuncta nutu concutit,
Perverse nobis erue.

Christi letus quod sumpserat
Vulnus receptum per tuum
Nobis benigne porrige
Ut de te canens gloriam
Sic illa felix regula,
Fratrum minorum nomine,
Cujus fuisti conditor
Duret per evum longius.

Amen.

---

Enlighten our unclean spirits, [Saint] Francis,
that we may follow you with full reverence
through all trials that come from on high.

You that watch over the seats of eternal glory
of the Father, who shakes all things with a
single nod, protect us from evil.

Through the wound of Christ, which he freely
accepted and which you did also receive,

Kindly grant us that the fortunate order of
Friars Minor, which you did found and that
sings your praises, may last forever.

Amen.

**Cantus II**

Ingens alumnus Padue,
Quem Zabarellam nominant,
Franciscus almi supplicat
Francisci adorans numina.

Sis tutor excelsis favens
Servo precanti te tuo,
Quem totus orbis predicat
Insignibus, preconiis.

Audi libens dignas preces
Doctoris immensi, sacer
Franciscus, quo leges bonas
Antenoris stirps accipit.

Silvas per altas alitus,
In mole clausus corporis,
Ducens viam celestiam,
Rector veni fidelium.

Amen.

---

Francesco, the famous offspring of Padua,
Zabarella by name, worshipping the power of
kindly [Saint] Francis beseeches him:

Be a well-disposed protector for your servant
that prays to you, whom the whole world
acclaims with outstanding honors and with
songs.

Holy Francis, freely hear the worthy prayer of
this great teacher, from whom Antenor’s line
receives good laws.

Come leader of the faithful, raised in the deep
forests (?), enclosed in a mighty body, and
guiding the way of the heavenly.

Amen.

---

\(^{56}\) Translation by M. J. Connolly (slightly adapted) in PMFC 24, 224–225.
Appendix 5.3: Du Fay, *Vasilissa ergo gaude – Concipuit rex decorem tuum*

**Vasilissa ergo gaude - Concipuit rex decorem tuum**

Guillaume Du Fay  
Ed. Besseler, 1966 (adapted by Buff, 2013)
Quoniam ipse est dominus tuus
Appendix 5.4: Text and translation of *Vasilissa ergo gaude*\(^{57}\)

Vasilissa, ergo gaude,  
Quia es digna omni laude,  
Cleophe, clara gestis  
A tuis de Malatestis,  
In Italia principibus  
Magnis et nobilibus,  

Empress, therefore rejoice, for you are worthy  
of all praise, Cleofa, glorious from the deeds of  
your Malatesta kin, leading men in Italy, great  
and noble.

Ex tuo viro clarior,  
Quia cunctis est nobilior:  
Romeorum est despotus,  
Quem colit mundus totus;  
In porphyro est genitus,  
A deo missus celitus.  

More glorious from your husband, for his  
nobler than all; he is despot of the Rhômaioi, he  
whom all the world reveres; he was born in the  
purple, sent by God from heaven.

Juvenili etate polles  
Et formositate  
[Ingenio] multum fecunda  
Et utraque lingua facunda  
Ac clarior es virtutibus  
Pre alis hominibus.  

In youthful bloom you abound in beauty, very  
fertile [in your wits] and eloquent in both  
tongues, and you are more glorious for your  
virtues above other human beings.

Tenor  
Concupivit rex decorum tuum  
Quoniam ipse est dominus tuus.  

The king will desire your beauty  
Since he is your lord.

\(^{57}\) Translation of cantus text by Holford-Strevens in “Du Fay the Poet?” 102–103. Translation of  
and Bruce M. Metzger (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), 690.
CHAPTER SIX
THE EQUAL-CANTUS MOTET IN THE FIRST QUARTER OF THE 15TH
CENTURY

A familiarity with musical traditions in the Veneto in the first quarter of the 15th century gives me the opportunity to examine a large repertory reflective of early-Renaissance culture. This in turn contextualizes the works of both Ciconia and Du Fay. Their works are several of the key players in the principal sources that originated in the Veneto in the early 15th century, Q15 and OX213. The purpose of this chapter is to present works from these sources in what I consider motets in the equal-cantus style. This also presents an opportunity to advocate for a connection between Johannes Ciconia, who died in 1412, and Guillaume Du Fay who only appeared in Italy in his early career sometime around 1420.

By focusing in the previous five chapters on the significance and influence of Ciconia, I have almost entirely neglected the rich and varied musical contributions of his contemporaries. This chapter will remedy this situation somewhat. The previous chapter concludes with the theory that Ciconia’s works could have influenced Du Fay as he was setting off on his own compositional career in Italy around 1420. In Chapter 4, I have shown that there is demonstrable evidence that a distinctive and unique motet tradition separate from a proportional and isorhythmic French Ars nova style existed in the 14th century through at least the first quarter of the 15th century. This chapter will contend with representative of the equal-cantus motet style found in the major manuscripts from the Veneto dated between 1420 and 1450. All of these sources are from the first half of the 15th century and postdate the death of Ciconia.

The primary aim of this entire study has been to make a connection between the late-medieval Italian motet and the earliest works of what is known as the Renaissance. By elevating the status of the 14th-century Italian motet and shifting my focus away from nationalistic
definitions, I have concluded that the equal-cantus motet is the connective tissue between stylistic epochs. Thus the narrative I propose in Chapter 1, in which the equal-cantus motet flows out from the innovations of the *Ars nova*, through ceremonial motets in the 14th century both in Italy and in France, directly to the great collection of motets by Veneto scribes in the first decades of the 15th century is fulfilled. I have found not just single, occasional, and peculiar works standing on the periphery of history, but a rich tradition enjoyed at the courts of the most notable princes and prelates of the age. Wide dispersal both over geographic regions and over time demonstrates that this style had a profound influence on the compositional models of the early 15th century, not reflective of an overripe era doomed to a rotting end, but instead a lively musical period honoring both tradition and innovation that provides the foundation for the earliest Renaissance polyphony.

There is abundant evidence that Ciconia’s stylistic influence was widespread in the early decades of the 15th century. David Fallows has observed that the number of individual works by Ciconia is greater than any other composer of the period except for Antonio da Teramo.\(^1\) Furthermore, Ciconia’s works are comprehensively represented in a great number of manuscripts, most of which originate many years after his death. One of the most important of these sources, Q15, is significant in that it represents one scribe’s specific intention to collect and copy as much of Ciconia’s complete works as possible.\(^2\) Of his fifteen motets, half are solely in this manuscript.

---


Without Q15, what is known about Ciconia’s works and life would be sadly diminished. Yet, the presence of his works in a single manuscript is not enough to demonstrate the influence of his motets on other composers. What is evident is that there is a definitive stylistic practice that emulates the equal-cantus features of 14th-century Italian works and the stylistic innovations of composers such as Ciconia in the first decades of the 15th century. In Chapter 5, I show that Du Fay had a complete understanding of the equal-cantus style in his early works. Even if Ciconia’s motets are not the demonstrable exemplars for Du Fay’s motets of the 1420s, the formal structures and melodic and rhythmic shapes of early 15th-century motets show that there are links between them and the older 14th-century Italian style.

One way to understand the stylistic influence of the 14th-century Italian motet is to examine broader picture of the musical culture in Italy in the early years of the new century. One point of contact between different motet styles is in the various sources of motet repertoire that bridge the end of the 14th and the beginning of the 15th centuries. This includes the examination of evidentiary material such as pay records and letters of commission as well as the primary musical sources such as manuscripts Q15 and Ox213.

There is no evidence for any known association between Du Fay and the scribe of Q15, but from the works in the manuscript it is clear that the compiler had access to Du Fay’s most recent works from 1420 onward. Bent has shown that the relative order of compilation matches known dates of composition.3 This indicates some degree of close contact of the scribe with the composer.4 Obviously the scribe was working within an environment in which he was interacting

4 This of course is not evidential, but only supposition. There is no real need for a scribe to be in direct contact with a composer for that scribe to demonstrate knowledge of a composer’s works. For instance, the scribe of Q15 was also responsible for the collection of many of Ciconia’s unica motets, but Ciconia was dead nearly ten years before the start of work on the manuscript.
with composers, musicians, and collectors who provided him with the exemplars from which he was compiling the manuscript.

As I suggest at the end of Chapter 5, the equal-cantus style was fashionable in the courts of northern Italy at the beginning of the 15th century. It certainly seems apparent that at least through the first layer of Q15 (ca. 1420–1424), the equal-cantus motet was a major influence on the musical taste of the era. One of the key drivers for the relevance of the equal-cantus motet is not really the discrimination of the composer, but actually the taste of the person who pays him. When Du Fay began his compositional career in Italy, he would have been expected to compose in the equal-cantus style, especially for ceremonial and honorific works prepared for his patrons. Although there is no existing documentary evidence that Du Fay was working for the Malatesta family (in particular Malatesta dei Sonetti) in Pesaro around 1420, his music provides much information about his relationship with the noble family. Du Fay wrote the motet *Vasilissa ergo gaude – Concupivit rex* for the departure of Malatesta’s daughter Cleofa for her marriage to Theodore Palaiológos from Fano (near Pesaro) to Mystra on 20 August 1420.\(^5\) Du Fay’s ballade *Resveilliés vous* was composed for the 1423 wedding of Malatesta’s son Carlo to Vittoria Colonna, niece of Pope Martin V.\(^6\) The florid and ornate polyphony of this song reflects the sumptuousness of the event given by Malatesta’s uncle, Carlo Malatesta of Rimini. *Apostolo glorioso – Cum tua doctrina – Andreas Cristi famulus*, with a text possibly written by the poetically inclined patriarch, was likely composed in 1424 for the appointment of Malatesta’s son, Pandolfo, as the bishop of Patras.\(^7\) A supplication by Malatesta dei Sonetti for his *familiares*

---

\(^6\) Fallows, *Dufay*, 22.
\(^7\) This commission may have included Du Fay traveling to Greece to work with Pandolfo at the cathedral of St. Andrew. Alejandro Enrique Planchart, “Four Motets of Guillaume Du Fay in
suggests that Liégeois composers Hugo and Arnold de Lantins (along with at least two others mentioned in Du Fay’s song *Hé compagons*) were in service in Pesaro in 1423. Both of the Lantins brothers composed equal-cantus motets and could be the source of Du Fay’s first association with that compositional style.

An opportune moment for a composer’s exposure to the equal-cantus motet style would have been at the Council of Constance (1414–1418). Not only would musicians meet possible patrons and employers in Constance, but they also would have crossed paths with each other. One can easily imagine the informal sharing of manuscripts and music amongst these illustrious musicians between formal ceremonies and festivities. As evidenced in illustrations of the council, music played a large role in the ceremonial events and many notable prelates included entire *cappelle* in their retinues (Figures 6.1A and B).

---

8 Interestingly, Du Fay is not mentioned on this list indicating that he may have been in the paid service of Carlo Malatesta de Rimini instead of Malatesta dei Sonetti. Alejandro Enrique Planchart, “The Early Career of Guillaume Du Fay,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 46 (1993): 344.

9 For instance see the manuscript illustrated by Ulrich of Richental, which is richly decorated with illustrations from what is probably the most significant international event of the early 15th century. Konstanz, Rosgarten Museum, Hs. 1. Folio 36v features singers around a choirbook, f. 74v trumpet players, f. 75r shawms and trumpets playing together, 75v bagpipes, and f. 103r more singers around a choirbook.
Figure 6.1A: Konstanz, Rosgarten Museum, Hs. 1, f. 103. Pope Martin V crowned by King Sigismund and two cardinals.

Figure 6.1B: Konstanz, Rosgarten Museum, Hs. 1, f. 36v. Singers around a choirbook.
Imitation and adoption of the equal-cantus style by both local and foreign composers is reflective of a much larger musical and cultural circle in which musicians are working within a closely linked group of personal chapels and cathedral communities. Whether musicians met each other at Constance or not, by the 1420s, both northern and southern composers were working in the equal-cantus style. Certainly, Guillaume Du Fay was familiar enough with the style that he created works with distinctly equal-cantus characteristics such as *Vasilissa*, *Apostolo glorioso*, *Rite maiorem Jacobum canamus* – *Artibus summis miseri reclusi* – *Ora pro nobis dominum*, and *O gemma lux et speculum* – *Sacer pastor baresium* – *Beatus Nicolaus adhuc*, all of which are included in Q15. The presence of these works in a manuscript that was being created as these works were being composed raises many interesting questions. It suggests that that during the 1420s Du Fay may have met the scribe of Q15. Another alternative is that a whole group of musicians who were working in the Veneto shared his motets with each other. Eventually this shared repertoire would have found its way into common knowledge and finally a unified source such as Q15.

There are several key features that identify a motet in the equal-cantus style. The first of these is that all are structured with two equal upper voices in terms of range, amount of text, and rhythmic phrasing. In most cases these upper voices are accompanied by a relatively fast-moving tenor. This is true whether the tenor is based on a borrowed *cantus firmus* or freely composed. It is also true if the motet has a repeating rhythmic structure or is through composed. Generally, if a

---

10 The scribe of Q15 could also have been associated with the chapel of Bishop Pietro Emiliani of Vicenza, who in the 1420s was living in Padua and kept his library there. Margaret Bent, “Bologna Q 15: an Anthologist’s View of Old and New Music,” paper read at the American Musicological Society Annual Meeting, Austin, Texas, 1989, as reported in Robert Nosow, “The Florid and Equal-Discantus Motet Styles of Fifteenth-Century Italy” (PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1992), 5n6.
fourth voice is present in addition to the basic three-part construction it does not contribute grammatically to the counterpoint of the work. An equal upper-voice construction is notable enough to differentiate what is known as a French, isorhythmic, *Ars nova* motet from the equal-cantus works of the same era. In addition to a dominant texture of two equal upper voices many equal-cantus motets feature introductory duets, sequential imitative cells, repetition of distinctive rhythmic devices, and characteristic cadential sequences featuring expanding and contracting melodic and rhythmic cells. Based on these distinctive characteristics, I have compiled a list of works from a variety of sources that I consider an extension of the 14th-century equal-cantus style that continues at least through the first quarter of the 15th century (Appendix 6.1).

As with any other study based on style and analysis, problems can arise when specific stylistic features occur in an unexpected genre or when a combination of stylistic features from various subgenres blend together. In past studies of the early 15th century motet, some have opted to limit the field by relying upon one specific feature, such as the presence of isorhythm.\(^\text{11}\) It can also lead to an overabundance of subgenres, each with its own distinctive characteristics, but which also obscure the broader view of musical culture and style.\(^\text{12}\) Instead of endeavoring to isolate the motets of the era into one stylistic tradition or another, I have chosen to examine specific features that indicate the composer’s cross-cultural knowledge of various motet composition techniques. For instance, a pan-isorhythmic motet arranged according to the theoretical standards of the late *Ars nova* in the late 14th-century (*cantus firmus* borrowed from chant, proportional reiteration of both *color* and *talea*, diminution for the final section of the work, hierarchical rhythmic layering from the slowest pace in the lowest voice to the fastest in


\(^{12}\) Julie Cumming, *The Motet in the Age of Du Fay* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). See also Chapter 1 of this dissertation.
the upper, hierarchy of ranges from low to high in each voice), can also include a canonic introductory duet outside of the formal structure of the work, and thus incorporates an Italianate characteristic with French *Ars nova* techniques. One might be tempted to excuse this as a hybridization of styles, but it is significant to note which essential characteristics are coopted from one tradition or another in order to draw connections and reveal innovations.

Appendix 6.1 is a comprehensive list of motets that share the key characteristic of having two equal upper voices. I have also included the name of the composer, when known, and the source(s) of the work. Several works only fulfill one single characteristic, but many others combine other elements in interesting ways. In the pages that follow I will examine a number of characteristics distinctive of the equal-cantus style and use specific examples from this repertoire to illustrate how the composers used these features in their motets.

*Two Equal Upper Voices*

The significance of two equal upper voices in a motet cannot be underestimated. As shown by Bent the use of equal cantus parts is a key characteristic of the 14th-century Italian motet. This equality is reflected in tessitura, activity of both parts, and the distribution of text setting. The equal range of the voices allows the composer to play with distinctive echo elements in the melody, rhythmic cells, and text. Melodic echo can either be a literal repetition of pitches or can be a melodic sequence that imitates another, but altered by an interval. Rhythmic cells likewise can directly imitate each other or can reference a previous cell that then can expand or contract. Text repetitions can be particularly effective either on the same pitches or in some sort of rhythmic pattern that references a previous iteration of the name or phrase. This kind of

---

imitation is especially notable in the repetition of names in Johannes Ciconia’s *O felix templum jubila* or Du Fay’s *Vasilissa*, as I show in Chapters 2 and 5. Text repetitions might be expected in motets with a single text shared between the two upper voices. Even more striking is when text repetition or combined phrases occur in motets with two different texts. Alden has discussed the possibility that some of these combined texts can provide a new subtext to the motet when two different texts are heard either simultaneously or in close proximity.¹⁴

There is a greater burden of proof to include works on my list of equal-cantus motets in which the upper voices, despite being in the same range, do not demonstrate the several key imitative features such as echoed passages of melody and rhythm or the repetition of texts. Although I freely use the term “equal-cantus style” to describe works of one kind, a number of other important factors must be considered in this discussion. In the following series of analyses, I have attempted to highlight individual characteristics of the motets that demonstrate a whole stylistic type, but that does not mean that every motet will have the same set of criteria that will define it. Indeed, I am inclined to argue that it is the brilliant manipulation of the whole series of characteristics that makes each of these works worthy of closer examination.

When two upper voices of a motet are in the same range over lower-voice tenor parts they are necessarily widely spaced at cadences. The typical equal-cantus cadence is $\begin{array}{c} 10 \\ 6 \end{array}$ to $\begin{array}{c} 12 \\ 8 \end{array}$ with parallel fifths in the top parts. Either voice, cantus I or cantus II, can cadence on the higher pitch of the cadence. This contrasts from motets that have differentiated ranges for the two upper voices that cadence in a tighter $\begin{array}{c} 6 \\ 3 \end{array}$ to $\begin{array}{c} 8 \\ 5 \end{array}$ configuration in which the triplum always cadences on the highest pitch. This closer-voiced cadential spacing are typical of French *Ars nova* motets.

The equal ranges of the equal-cantus motet enables the tendency to set phrases in direct imitation by voice exchange or imitative rhythmic sequences that are easily identifiable. For example, a quick glance at the two cantus parts of Hymbert de Salinis’s motet *Iesu salvator – Quo vulneratus* reveals two longer melismatic passages that move in the same semibreve–minim sequence in nearly identical ranges (Examples 6.1A and B). These episodes are interlocking passages of displaced syncopation with a surprising amount of dissonance as each voice overlaps the other in identical ranges.

Example 6.1A: Hymbert de Salinis, *Iesu salvator – Quo vulneratis*, mm. 15–39. In mm. 21–30 is a long chain of interlocking and sometimes dissonant imitative rhythmic patterns. Cantus I and cantus II share nearly the same range, mostly trading pitches through voice exchange.

---

Example 6.1B: Hymbert de Salinis, *Iesu salvator – Quo vulneratis*, mm. 40–64. In mm. 44–54 is another long chain of interlocking and sometimes dissonant imitative rhythmic patterns. In this passage cantus II is nearly always higher in range than cantus I.

In Petrus Rubeus’s *Caro mea vere est* an echoed falling figure on the word “sanguinem” clearly highlights the text setting which is taken from the Gospel of John 6:55–56 (Example 6.2). In this passage, Jesus claims that the flesh and blood of Christ will give believers the food and drink of eternal life. The flowing phrases in the motet evoke the wine turned blood of the holy sacrament of communion. Both cantus I and cantus II have the same figuration in this sequence with the passage descending from the top to the bottom lines of the staves.

---

reception to reference the echo one might here inside a large edifice like a grand church or a nobleman’s reception chamber or within the walls of a courtyard or grand piazza.

Example 6.2: Rubeus, *Caro mea vere est*, mm. 22–32. The effect of the echoed phrases in mm. 28–32 seems to evoke the flowing wine turned to blood of the holy sacrament.

At the end of *Caro mea vere est*, Rubeus sets both cantus voices in echo imitation over a held tenor pitch, driving into the final cadence. Here he adds an extra flourish for the final melisma (Example 6.3). These final echoed phrases, common to many motets in this style seem to reference the echo one might here inside a large edifice like a grand church or a nobleman’s reception chamber or within the walls of a courtyard or grand piazza.

Example 6.3: Rubeus, *Caro mea vere est*, mm. 38–45. Final cadence in echo imitation.
Equal distribution of texts in the upper voices is another characteristic of the equal-cantus style. In other words, the basic rhythmic motion and text placement will be similar in each voice. This is relatively simple to achieve when the two cantus parts are settings of the same text. The composer might opt to echo phrases or single words between the equal ranges of the voices or emphasize specific passages in homophony. In mm. 66–71 of Antonius Romanus’s *Aurea flamigeri* the composer highlights the proper name “Johannes Francisco” in honor of Gianfrancesco Gonzaga by making this text a point of imitation between the two

Both voices enter in the higher part of their ranges emphasizing the name, “Johannes! Johannes!”

This is followed in m. 69 with the first syllable of “Francisco” landing simultaneously on the beginning of the tempus (Example 6.4).

![Example 6.4: Romanus, Aurea flamigeri, mm. 60–71. Emphasis through echo imitation on the name “Johannes” in mm. 66–68 and through a homophonic entrance on the name “Francisco” in m. 69.](image)

Later in *Aurea flamigeri*, the single text is split into a call-and-response between the cantus parts (Example 6.5). This is especially remarkable as both cantus I and cantus II have the same text. By arranging each line so that it does not occur simultaneously, but in a kind of appeal from the first voice echoed and reiterated by the second. In m. 89, cantus II begins with the

---

17 EFCM 6, 177–183. Q15, ff. 255v–256.
phrase, “O felix Mantua . . .” Then cantus I enters, overlapping the end of the text of cantus II with, “que tanto nites lumine . . .” This overlapping exchange continues through seven lines of the poem with the texts reuniting only on the last syllable in m. 115.  

An exact musical repetition of this passage occurs in mm. 147–173, with the melodies of cantus I and cantus II in a call-and-response arrangement.
Example 6.5: Romanus, *Aurea flamigeri*, mm. 84–119. In this passage the single text of the motet is split between cantus I and cantus II.

A similar echoed passage occurs in mm. 205–221 of *Aurea flamigeri*. In this section the two cantus parts do not trade phrases. Instead single words exchange in hocket-like melodic cells, passing the text back and forth between the two voices. These call-and-response episodes emphasize the laudatory nature of the text. Gianfrancesco Gonzaga and the city of Mantua are
praised with an ever-increasing excitement that the overlapping texts evoke (Example 6.6). Although neither melody nor rhythm is echoed in each instance of these call-and-response episodes, the reactive setting of the text unifies the work in honor of the nobility of Gianfrancesco, the illustriousness of the Gonzaga family, and the brightness of their domain.


One of the most remarkable equal-cantus motets features two upper voices that are exactly canonic at the unison. Cantus II of Johannes Carmen’s *Pontifici decori speculi* is simply derived according to the canon: “Fuga trium temporum.” This motet is a true representative of the equal-cantus style in every sense of the idea.

In an equal-cantus motet the basic rhythmic motion and placement of the text will be similar in each voice even if the basic poetic structure is significantly different between the two
texts.¹⁹ For instance, Jo Rondelly in his motet *Verbum tuum – In cruce te providens* sets two texts with widely divergent poetic structures; the text of cantus I is eight verses of three lines in eight syllables for a total of 191 syllables and the text of cantus II is four verses of four lines in twelve to fourteen syllables for a total of 204 syllables (Example 6.7). The closeness of the number of syllables allows for the texts to end almost simultaneously with equal distribution of the text and similar rhythmic motion in semibreves and minims.

¹⁹ Several French motets of the 14th century do have upper parts with equal pitch ranges, but none of them is equal in texting, overall tessitura, or rhythmical activity. These are discussed in more detail in Chapter 4 of this dissertation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cantus I</th>
<th>Cantus II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbum tuum, verbum sane,</td>
<td>In cruce te providens ay my, ay my clamo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonum quod eructat mane</td>
<td>Dulcis Ihesum querulous quod te minus amo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortuum ante secula.</td>
<td>Stringi tam cupiens discipline clamo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repice pater cruentum,</td>
<td>Sicut prome captus es karitas hamo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laudum et turbulentum</td>
<td>Quasi hamum karitas tibi presentavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per atra mortis pocula;</td>
<td>Mori cum pro homine te folicitur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et placare nobis quia</td>
<td>Sed esta placida hamum occultavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non est hostia tam pia</td>
<td>Cum latiari amans te pro hoc monstravit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que ista sit suavior.</td>
<td>Te quidem aculeas ha my non latebat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nam mors Cristi in statera</td>
<td>Sed ilius punito te non deterebat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nostris peccatis venera</td>
<td>Ymo hunc appetere tibi conplacebat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparet multo gravior;</td>
<td>Quia desiderium ex te de trahebat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amor summa yungens in iste</td>
<td>Ergo prme misero quia tu dilexisti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totum fundens to riuuso</td>
<td>Mortis in aculeo sciens impeglisti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ihesu dulcissime,</td>
<td>Cum te patri victimam sanctam obulisti,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclinans ut ostuleris</td>
<td>Et in tuo sanguine sordidum lavisti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex ponsus ut amplexeris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O frater amantissime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corde nudas amorosus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nidum prebens sariosum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad pausandum feliciter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da nos te semper timere,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te semper adhunare,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O inseparabiliter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.7: Text of Rondelly’s *Verbum tuum – In cruce te providens* with syllable count.

In his motet *Ducalis sedes inclita – Stirps Mocenico Veneti*, Romanus uses the parsing of the two poems in an interesting way. Both poems consist of four stanzas of four lines each. Most lines are in eight syllables with an occasional stray nine- or seven-syllable phrase (Example 6.8). The text of cantus I is a set of a four rhyming quatrains (AAAA). In contrast, the four verses of cantus II sets rhyming couplets (AABB). With a few exceptions, Romanus generally sets the analogous line of each poem within one tempora of the other. For instance the 5th

---

through 7th lines of both texts do not correspond with the entry of the other voice. Instead each part enters after rests as if they were responding to the text of the other (Example 6.9). Subsequently, line 8 of both parts enters simultaneously in the same rhythm. When Romanus’s setting deviates from this formula, for example where line 3 of cantus I and line 4 of cantus II are within one tempora, he brings them back into alignment by setting a long melisma on the final syllable of the line for cantus II as cantus I completes the statement of its verse (Example 6.10). This alignment of text is particularly effective when both poems arrive on the doge’s proper name “Thome / Thomam” at the beginning of line 15 (Example 6.11). Romanus brings in each part in succession, first cantus I, then cantus II, thus underscoring the name by repeating it for the listeners.
Cantus I:
1. Ducalis sedes inclita
es Venetorum predita
Toma duce, quo supera
locaris inter sydera.
   Doge Thomas, you are endowed
   with the famous seat of Venice,
   which is placed among the stars
   above.
5. Hoc duce tuta permanes,
   hostes hoc duce perymes,
hoc duce ad alta venies,
tibi cuncta subicies.
   This doge keeps us safe, this doge
   slays the enemy, this doge comes
   from on high; to him are all subject.
9. Voto precamur sedulo
diu consistat solio,
longo vivat inperio,
excelso Jove previo.
   We pray earnestly for him to keep
   the throne for a long time, long live
   his rule, lead by Jove on high.
13. Letare, festa, jubila,
    senatus et plebs veneta;
    Tome sub alis condita,
nunquam videbis nubila.
   Rejoice, feast, shout, you the
   Venetian senate and people; Under
   the wings of this foundation may
   Thomas never be clouded.

Cantus II:
1. Stirps Mocenico, Veneti
tibi tenemur debiti
quod noster dux et genitus
de te, princeps magnificus.
   Branch of Mocenigo, the Venetians
   are bound in debt to you,
   magnificent prince, as the leader of
   our nation.
5. O Christe, grates agimus
tibique vota solvimus,
qui nos dotasti pro duce
tanto rectore consule.
   O Christ, we give thanks and our
   vows to you for our doge, who is
   the guide of our consulate.
9. Hunc nobis serva incolumen,
ducatus nostri column,
quo stante tuti stabimus
et nil adversi dabimus.
   Keep us safe and sound with the
   support of our doge, who by
   standing safely will let nothing
   harm us.
13. O sancte Marce, presidem
    ad usque terre limitem
    Thomam prefer dominio,
nunquam mereat prelio.
   O Saint Mark, let Thomas govern
   the entire territory of our land, may
   he never encounter battle.

Example 6.8: Romanus, Ducalis sedes inclita, text and translation

Example 6.9: Romanus, Ducalis sedes, mm. 21–35. Rests separate each entry of a new line of text in the upper voices as if each voice were responding to the other. The subsequent entry of line 8 in each part (“Tibi cuncta” and “Tanto recto”) occur simultaneously in the same rhythm.

Example 6.10: Romanus, Ducalis sedes, mm. 14–28. Line 3 of cantus I (“Toma duce”) and line 4 of cantus II (“de te, princeps magnificus”) enter within one tempora of each, but Romanus makes up the difference by adding a long melisma to the end of cantus II. Thus the entry of line 5 in each part is nearly simultaneous in mm. 23 and 24.
Example 6.11: Romanus, *Ducalis sedes*, 77–89. In mm. 78–79 both cantus parts begin line 15 of each text with the repeated name “Thome / Thomam.” The reiteration of the name is followed by the repetition of the word “nunquam” in all three parts.

There are occasional moments when Romanus sets a particular line and phrase apart by separating their entrances significantly. This further emphasizes the rhetoric of the celebratory text in honor of Doge Tommaso Mocenigo. The opening of the motet includes what may have been intended as a formal *introitus* based upon the large capital “I” in the margin of f. 275v of Q15. After this fanfare flourish announces the beginning of the motet and attracts in the listener’s attention, cantus I rests and the first text is heard in cantus II: “Stirps Mocenico.” After the statement of the Doge’s family name, the text of cantus I enters with the text, “Ducalis sedes inclita,” reinforcing the association of Tommaso’s name with his title. The separation of the entries of these texts pulls the listeners into the complexity of the dual poems and alerts them to continue to attend to both sets of words throughout the work.

A similar interesting interplay of text occurs in the last two lines of each poem beginning with the repetition of “Thome / Thomam,” which is then followed by the repetition of the word...
“nunquam (never)” twice in succession (three times if the text fragments in the tenor are included) (see Example 6.11 above). Again this text in cantus II is emphasized by its juxtaposition against rests in cantus I. Upon the completion of the phrase, cantus I enters with its own “nunquam” text. The rhetorical repetition of nunquam—“never (encounter battle) – never [in the tenor] – never (be clouded)”—continues to ring in the ears through the final melisma sending out a prayerful invocation to the listeners and especially to the doge himself.

The most dramatic of textual separations in Dualis sedes occurs at the beginning of the last verse, line 13 in each (Example 6.12). Both cantus voices rest after a major cadence followed by a solo phrase in the tenor that starts a new section and new melodic idea. In this passage tenor is set with text shared with cantus II, “O sancte Marce, presidem.” Cantus II enters in echo imitation in a plea for the patron saint of Venice to guard the city and the doge, in a musical phrase that echoes the similar entry in the highest range of this part at the opening of the motet. Romanus ends this text in cantus II with three longa rests as cantus I enters, again emphasizing another entry of a new text. This text, “Letare, festa, jubila,” instructs both the listeners and the singers to rejoice and celebrate. Cantus II then reenters and both voices then move into an extended imitative and sequential melisma that could be described as a 15th-century version of an Easter Alleluia jubilus.22

22 The doge was elected on 7 January 1414, but the Venetians held a celebration of this event on the feast of St. Mark (25 April) that year, and thus only a few weeks after the great feast of Easter in 1414. A great deal of planning went into this multi-day celebration such as the organization of significant tournament on the 28th of April. As such, the composition of a motet like Ducalis sedes would be appropriate for this occasion. For more on the election of Tommaso Mocenigo, see William Carew Hazlitt, The Venetian Republic: Its Rise, Its Growth, and Its Fall 421–1797, 2 Vols. (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1900), 1:786.
Three- or Four-Voice Texture

Unlike the late 14th-century French motet, Italian motets of the 14th century are typically in three voices, two upper and one lower. Contratenors in the same range as the tenor were only added after the beginning of the 15th century. The oddity of the new parts is that the inclusion of fourth-voice contratenors to three-voice motets contribute nothing grammatically essential to the work. Bent has argued that the contratenors of these 15th-century works are contrapuntally inessential and often problematic. The contrapuntal problems include unresolvable dissonances, unnecessary doublings, and a tendency to create drone-like passages when simply generated.

Example 6.12: Romanus, Ducalis sedes, mm. 51–76.
through voice exchange with the tenor. This differs significantly with the contratenors of the French tradition.²³

The contratenor of Cristoforus de Monte’s *Dominicus a dono* is a representative example of a problematic added contratenor.²⁴ The work functions well without the fourth voice and is contrapuntally complete in three voices. The two upper voices are in equal ranges accompanied by a lower tenor that moves mostly in breves, semibreves, and occasional minims. Major cadences are widely spaced \( \frac{10}{6} \) to \( \frac{12}{8} \). The upper voices frequently echo each other and there are a few examples of the tenor participating in the imitative texture. The addition of the contratenor as a fourth voice obscures this balanced structure. This first problem is the large proportion of dissonances with the tenor. Some of these are passing discordances, but there are so frequent that they are hard to justify. This is notable particularly in moments of extended dissonance such as m. 27 (Example 6.13). Here the tenor holds \( c' \) as the contratenor moves from \( e' \) to a dissonant \( d' \), to a unison \( c' \), back up to the \( d' \), and then dipping down to the dissonant \( b\flat \), before resolving on a perfect-fifth, \( f \) and \( c' \) sonority. Equally problematic is the voice crossing in m. 40 (Example 6.14). In this example the contratenor not only creates a redundant sonority in the lower two voices as if the tenor and contratenor were holding a minor-third sonority, \( e' \) to \( g' \) for a tempus unit, but then marred by dissonances on the third and sixth minim.


Example 6.13: Cristoforus de Monte, *Dominicus a dono*, mm. 25–29. A problematic passage in the contratenor is circled in this example.

Example 6.14: Cristoforus de Monte, *Dominicus a dono*, mm. 36–41. A problematic passage in the contratenor is circled in this example.

While the amount of contrapuntal dissonance between voices is notable, excessive doubling between the contratenor and other voices is also problematic in *Dominicus a dono*. The main issue is that when the contratenor couples the tenor at the octave or in unison, the sonority is smeared rather like a hand brushing along the painted surface of a still-wet canvas. The result is that the spread pigments mix into a brownish-grey blob of mud without any definition. In these circumstances, the contratenor adds little of substance to the counterpoint or sonority of the work. In mm. 19–20, the contratenor sings a c’ at the beginning of the tempora, which is then immediately iterated in the same range, but in a more distinctive rhythm—a minim – semibreve pattern—in the tenor (Example 6.15). The contratenor on the last minim dips down to e in
octaves with cantus II, but then returns to a held unison $c'$ with the tenor in m. 20 that obscures the next movement of the tenor up to $e'$. In effect, the held $c'$ in the contratenor becomes like a grey smear in the motet and masks what is interesting about the motion of the tenor.

Example 6.15: Cristoforus de Monte, *Dominicus a dono*, mm. 14–24. The contratenor creates excessive doubling, especially in mm. 19–20.

Doublings between the contratenor and the upper voices may be difficult to avoid at cadential resolutions, but the contratenor often follows a much longer couplings that could otherwise be avoided. Excessive doubling marks the arrangement of voices in the final cadence of *Dominicus a dono* where the contratenor moves in parallel motion with cantus II (Example 6.16). In yet another episode, the contratenor initially obscures the cadential motion of cantus I moving onto a dissonance at the second semibreve of m. 37, a minor 7th between $e'$ and $d''$, but then moves in parallel motion for the resolution on octaves $c$ and $d$ (see Example 6.14 above).
Example 6.16: Cristoforus de Monte, *Dominicus a dono*, mm. 73–83. Excessive doubling in the final cadence between cantus II and the contratenor, mm. 81–83.

Because echo imitation is such a significant element of the equal-cantus style, when the contratenor interferes with the clarity of declamation, it may be better to omit it from performance and as a consequence, in terms of analysis it is prudent to consider the work as both a four- and three-voice motet. In m. 48 of *Dominicus a dono*, cantus II sings a phrase, which without the contratenor would be a solo (Example 6.17). A measure later the tenor sings a similar echoed melody to cantus II. This also would be a solo without the addition of a contratenor. In m. 50, cantus I sings the phrase a third time, again a solo without the additional fourth voice. The contratenor neither participates in the imitation nor does it have its own repeating melodic cell that could enhance the imitation of the other voices. Although it is not dissonant with the tenor, there are three points of unison within one tempora both with cantus II and the tenor that add nothing to what otherwise is an interesting moment of imitation. Similar imitative passages in mm. 59–60 and 74–76 also reveal the contratenor detracting from the imitative counterpoint of the other voices and diminishing the structural integrity of the work as a whole.
Example 6.17: Cristoforus de Monte, *Dominicus a dono*, mm. 48–53. The contratenor obscures several echoed melodic passages that would otherwise be solos in cantus II, the tenor, and then cantus I in mm. 48–50.

Unlike compositions where the contratenor is presumably added as a fourth voice to enrich the texture of a preexisting three-part work, the presence of a solus tenor indicates that a four-voice texture has been reduced to a three-part work. As is the case with all motets that include a solus tenor, the contratenor of the anonymous motet *O Maria virgo davitica – O Maria maris stella* is essential to the work.\(^{25}\) Of the three sources only the version in the fragmentary manuscript I-Pu MS 1106 has both the four-voice version for cantus I and II, contratenor, and tenor, as well as the solus tenor.\(^{26}\) Q15 and St. Emmeram both have thee-voice versions with the single solus tenor. In St. Emmeram, the solus tenor is identified as “tenor” only. In the Q15 manuscript the arrangement is interesting as it is labeled “solus tenor” even though the alternate contratenor and tenor parts are not available. In *O Maria virgo davitica* the solus tenor is made up of a composite selection of pitches taken from both the tenor and the contratenor parts with no

---


\(^{26}\) PMFC 12, 147–150. Q15, ff. 262v–623; St Emmeram, ff. 56v–57; and I-Pu MS 1106, f. 1.
unique additions (Example 6.18). All cadences use the same elements to create proper contrapuntal grammar between the parts.

Example 6.18: *O Maria virgo davitica*, mm. 1–22. The circled notes indicate the pitches used to create the solus tenor (bottom stave).

**Tenor Construction: Melodic Shape**

Many equal-cantus motets, like Ciconia’s *O virum omnimoda*, have a freely composed tenor—in other words, a tenor composed without basis on a *cantus prius factus*. In a motet with two equal upper parts, the tenor voice was likely created either after, or at the least, in
simultaneity with the upper voices. In both of these cases, the tenors of equal-cantus motets are conceived as counterpoint to the higher parts. The upper voices carry melodic phrases that are primarily in conjunct motion and set mostly in breves, semibreves, and minims. Most phrases and rhythmic cells of the upper parts are in imitation. The tenor moves in basically the same rhythmic motion and speed as the upper voices. It can on occasion join in the imitation with the upper parts, even moving in minims if an echo phrase warrants it. Because the relative rhythmic motion of the tenor is similar to the upper parts and the tenor must follow contrapuntal rules, it by very nature must move in a disjunct manner. This is demonstrated in the preponderance of equal-cantus motets with tenor parts that leap in fourths and fifths. This motion is distinct from the tenors based upon chant. Because the pre-conceived tune of the cantus firmus has an independent melodic shape, intervallic leaps, particularly conjunct leaps, are infrequent. In order to avoid leaps in the upper voices necessitated by the rules of counterpoint, the upper voices are much more florid and the relative rhythmic relationship of the cantus firmus to the upper parts is much slower.

The equal-cantus motet is distinctive because the tenor, whether newly composed or a preexisting chant melody, moves in leaps of fourths and fifths and in relatively fast rhythms, mostly breves and semibreves. This distinguishes the equal-cantus motet from the slow-moving cantus firmus tenor of an Ars nova motet. This difference is readily apparent in two motets that appear on subsequent folios, Richard Loqueville’s O flos in divo – Sacris pignoribus and Ciconia’s O virum omnimoda veneracione – O lux et decus tranensium – O beate Nicholae (Figures 6.2A and B). The tenors of these works are notably different. Loqueville’s isorhythmic tenor is an unidentified cantus firmus that moves in stepwise motion according to a canon. It

---

repeats two statements of color, the second in retrograde. There are four statements of talea, the first two in C, the second two in O. The tenor is notated primarily in breves with a couple of longas and a handful of semibreves. On the other hand, Ciconia’s wide-leaping tenor is newly composed. The rhythmic motion is primarily breves and semibreves and thus moves at a relatively faster pace than the tenor of O flos in divo. Ciconia’s tenor occasionally participates in imitation with the two upper voices. In these passages the tenor motion increases even more by shifting in to passages with movement in minims.

Figure 6.2A: Q15, f. 283v (detail), Richard Loqueville, O flos in divo, tenor. The tenor moves mostly in conjunct motion with few angular leaps.

Figure 6.2B: Q15, f. 284v (detail), Johannes Ciconia, O virum omnimoda, tenor. Extreme leaps of the melody reflect the freely-composed contrapuntal function of this tenor melody.
Tenor Construction: Cantus prius factus

Although it is common to see equal-cantus motets with newly invented tenors, it is not to the exclusion of equal-cantus motets with a cantus prius factus. Bent uses the phrase “tenor-based Italian motet,” to describe works such as Du Fay’s Vasilissa that employs a preexisting tenor melody. Nicolas Grenon’s Plasmatoris humani – Verbigine mater ecclesia is another example of a motet with a preexisting tenor. Like Vasilissa, it features the characteristic profile of a fast-paced and angular tenor distinctive of the equal-cantus style. Although the cantus firmus of the work is yet unidentified, it follows the general shape of the Easter Sunday Gradual, Haec dies quam fecit dominus (Example 6.19). This is especially notable in the last section of the motet where the tenor reiterates the insistently repeated c’ and the ostinato-like melody dips down from c’ down to a or up to d’ and returning, which are motives taken from the original chant. In his setting of the cantus firmus, Grenon deploys the longa note value sparingly. From the first phrase, instead of establishing a long sonority on the opening pitches, Grenon launches immediately into quick note values in the tenor (breve – two minims – semibreve – and three colored semibreves) before the first arrival on a longa and subsequent rest. The tenor is nearly isorhythmic with two repetitions of a rhythmic pattern that is then repeated twice in diminution in a 3:1 ratio. With the combination of repeated minor-third interval leaps and frequent rests between short rhythmic cells, the diminution sections resemble Ciconia’s cadential episodes, which feature rhythmic acceleration in every voice into major cadences. The specific way in which the fast rhythmic values, mostly minims and semibreves, form a mosaic of interlocking

28 Bent, Q15, 1:222. A more thorough discussion of Du Fay’s Vasilissa is in Chapter 5.
30 EFCM 7, xvi.
rhythmic cells is particularly reminiscent of cadences found in many other works in the equal-cantus idiom.

Example 6.19: The Gradual *Haec dies* compared to the tenor of Grenon’s *Plasmatoris humani.*
**Tenor Construction: Repetition**

One of the more interesting developments of the equal-cantus style is the avoidance of reliance solely on tenor structure as the controlling feature of the work. Since the invention of the term “isorhythm” at the beginning of the 20th century, the relative status of motets has been subject to delineation between those with tenor structure and those without. This modern perception has shaded the scholar’s view of the value of works that fall outside the strict constraints of melodic and rhythmic repetitions. Also encumbered by subjective scrutiny is the use of freely composed tenors and the avoidance of using borrowed chant melodies for the lowest voice of the motet. But these two elements, especially in combination, demonstrate the compositional inventiveness of musicians at the turn of the 15th century. For instance, the freely composed tenor of Antonius de Civitate Austrie’s *O felix flos Florentia – Gaude felix Dominice* moves in a distinctive fashion. The majority of pitches are in semibreves (sb=102) with only few longas (l=9) and a nearly equal distribution of breves (b=29) and minimis (m=21) for the remainder of note values. Tenor minimis are concentrated in several specific passages where there is rhythmic interaction between the tenor and the two cantus voices. The first of these is in the opening portion of the motet (Example 6.20). The first voice that enters is the tenor only. This introduces the melodic cell that is then echoed a fifth higher in cantus I and again by cantus II in separate entries three tempora apart. This example of the solo tenor introducing the motet is unique to this work. It is significant that Antonius chooses to highlight the free invention of the tenor part as well as linking the three voices in imitative dependence upon each other’s parts. This remarkable tenor introduction is marked by being set with the text of cantus I.

---

The second passage with a higher proportion of minims in the tenor voice occurs in mm. 38–46 (Example 6.21). Each voice participates in nearly exact repetitions of individual rhythmic cells in what can be described as a large-scale hockets. Cantus I enters first after two minim rests in a two-tempus figure. The tenor enters after two minim rests on a slightly slower paced two-tempus figure. Cantus II then follows in a similar two-tempus rhythmic pattern. This rhythmic figure, always introduced by two minim rests, continues to be passed between the voices for the next six measures. Although the melody of each voice continues to evolve, the rhythmic pattern provides this entire episode a sense of increase of rhythmic activity into the cadence at m. 47. As in the cadential figure of Grenon’s *Plasmatoris humani* discussed above, this increase of rhythmic activity is reminiscent of similar passages in Ciconia’s motets.
Cantus II

minims

hocket with each voice resting between iterations. The tenor rhythm slows in reverses, such as the second iteration of cantus II in m. 98, the two cantus I. By giving the tenor the text at this specific point, Antonius de Civitate highlights the participation of this voice in this episode. Although the rhythmic pattern occasionally reverses, such as the second iteration of cantus II in m. 98, the two-tempus cells continue to hocket with each voice resting between iterations. The tenor rhythm slows into the “Amen” text with three longas, as the two upper voices echo a smaller rhythmic cell (minim-rest – two minims – semibreve) for three tempora, finally cadencing on the final sonority of the motet.

Again this increase in rhythmic activity and imitation is similar to the cadential episodes in Ciconia’s works particularly in sequences leading to the final cadences of his motets.

Example 6.21: Antonius de Civitate, *O felix flos Florentia*, mm. 29–47. Melodic evolution of a rhythmic cell into the cadence in m. 47.

The third appearance of minims in the tenor occurs in the last section of the motet, mm. 95–113 (Example 6.22). Cantus II begins the sequence with a lilting semibreve – minim pattern.

This is echoed by cantus I and followed again by the tenor, which here is carries the text of cantus I. By giving the tenor the text at this specific point, Antonius de Civitate highlights the integral participation of this voice in this episode. Although the rhythmic pattern occasionally reverses, such as the second iteration of cantus II in m. 98, the two-tempus cells continue to hocket with each voice resting between iterations. The tenor rhythm slows into the “Amen” text with three longas, as the two upper voices echo a smaller rhythmic cell (minim-rest – two minims – semibreve) for three tempora, finally cadencing on the final sonority of the motet.

Again this increase in rhythmic activity and imitation is similar to the cadential episodes in Ciconia’s works particularly in sequences leading to the final cadences of his motets.
Beginning in m. 95, cantus II introduces a rhythmic figure which is then echoed by cantus I and cantus II.

**Structures**

Equal-cantus motets range from through composed, to truly isorhythmic with the simple repetition of a rhythmic scheme, to complex manipulations of mensuration and proportion. Some of the techniques used by Italian composers demonstrate a need for complete rhythmic and melodic mapping before the composition could be completed. Other works, such as the through-
composed motets, show an ability to compose every part simultaneously with no single voice part functioning as the controlling structural factor. On the other hand, French isorhythmic motets tend to follow one kind of formulaic system that utilizes an organizational proportional scheme and that requires a significant amount of prior planning. The isorhythmic construction of the tenor has a tendency to dominate the form and arrangement of the upper voices as the repetitions of color and talea control the melodic shape and contrapuntal structure of the work as a whole.

In general, most equal-cantus motets do not feature the repetition of both color and talea, especially that which features manipulations through the process of diminution, as is heard in the proportional motets of France. Instead, composers of equal-cantus motets in the early 15th century use other manipulations of repetition and mensural alteration to generate noteworthy structural foundations for their works. For example, Grenon in his motet Prophetarum fulti suffragio – Ave virtus – Infelix propera uses an interesting canonic reinterpretation of the tenor in successive mensurations.\(^{32}\) The tenor melody is repeated six times, once in \(\text{酡}^1\), once in \(\text{酡}^2\), twice in \(\text{酡}^3\), and twice in \(\text{酡}^4\) with a proportion of 8:6:2:2:1:1. The structure of the tenor is based upon a four-line sequence poem that gives the canon of the motet (Example 6.23). The actual text of the tenor is repeated three times over the course of the motet. Each line of the tenor text divides the melody into rhythmically related A and B halves, thereby creating proportional structure of its own: line 1–melody A; line 2–melody B; line 3–melody A; line 4–melody B.

\(^{32}\) EFCM 7, 10–17. Ox213, ff. 120v–121; attributed to “Nicolaus grenon.”
Crescit in octuplo semel hic tenor incipiendo; As it begins, this tenor first grows in octuple proportion.
fac in sextuplo; crescat semel inde candendo. Then sing it in sextuple proportion; let it grow at the same time it is diminished.
Postea bis canitur in duplo cum bene crescit, Afterwards it is sung twice, although it grows at duple proportion
sed bis concinitur tandem velut hic requiescit. But finally it is sung twice the way it is written here.

Example 6.23: Canon of Grenon’s *Prophetarum fulti suffragio*\(^{33}\)

Over this complex rhythmic design, the upper voices respond with repeated isorhythmic sequences. These rhythmic patterns do not follow either the rhythmic pattern of the tenor nor the repetition of the text, but a large-scale single repetition of each phrase. In the first mensuration, the first rhythmic repetition of upper voices correspond to the first half of the tenor melody (mm. 1–18) and the second to the second half (mm. 19–36). The second rhythmic pattern is structurally similar, starting on the next repetition of the tenor in \(\text{\textcircled{c}}\). The next upper-part rhythmic sequence begins on the tenor iteration in \(\text{\textcircled{c}}\), but this rhythmic passage covers the entire tenor phrase as the rhythmic values for the tenor get shorter. The repetition of the upper voice rhythm begins on the next repeat of the tenor in \(\text{\textcircled{c}}\). The same is true for the iteration of the tenor in \(\text{\textcircled{2}}\).

Thus another substructure appears:

- first tenor *talea* in \(\text{\textcircled{c}}\) ......................... two repetitions of upper-voice *talea 1*
- second tenor *talea* in \(\text{\textcircled{c}}\) ......................... two repetitions of upper-voice *talea 2*
- third and fourth tenor *taleae* in \(\text{\textcircled{c}}\).......... two repetitions of upper-voice *talea 3*
- fifth and sixth tenor *taleae* in \(\text{\textcircled{2}}\)......... two repetitions of upper-voice *talea 4*

This elaborate rhythmic scheme is further complicated by the relationship of musical phrase to text (Table 6.2). The two iterations of the first upper voice isorhythm is set to five lines of the text of cantus I each, the next also to five lines, the third to four lines, and the last to two lines.

lines each. The text of cantus II is even more elaborate. The two iterations of the first upper voice isorhythm is set to eight lines of text each, the next to five lines, the third to four lines, and the last to three lines each. This setting matches the diminishing rhythmic setting of the tenor, and giving the entire motet a feeling of rhythmic acceleration to the end especially as the ratio of minims to breves increases throughout.
### Table 6.1: The structure of Grenon’s *Prophetarum fulti suffragio*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenor talea</th>
<th>Tenor text</th>
<th>Upper-voice talea</th>
<th>Cantus I text</th>
<th>Cantus II text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C 1</td>
<td>1. Infelix, propera, crede vel vetera;</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>1. <em>Prophetarum fulti suffragio</em> collaudemus ingenti gaudio matrem Christi carentem vitio, nunc jacentem in puerperio.</td>
<td>1. Ave, virtus virtutum, caritas qua nos summa dilexit trinitas, penas culpe repellens debitas et restaurans coronas perditas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Dulcis cantus, dulcis est lectio,</td>
<td>5. Enixa est virgo puerpera regem regum quem tellus, ethera contremescunt et stupent cetera descendendem a patris dextera.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cur dampnaberis, gens misera?</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>dulce totum ubi fit mentio scripturarum de testimonio quo Maria ventris hospitio</td>
<td>8. Sine mater qui celis genitus, sine patre terris est editus; viam currit ut gigas celitus. sicut servus jacet humanitus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2</td>
<td>2. Quem docet littera, natum considera, ipsumque genuit puerpera.</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>stupert mundus tanto misterio: parit virgo sine dispendio;</td>
<td>17. Portam clausam pandit Ezechiel cum de Sion venit Hemanel, cum dubium solvit Ezachiel, cum populus salvator Israel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17. Jam non latet lumen sub modio sed refugiet in templi medio, jam primeva recedit unctio, jam aerea surgit religio.</td>
<td>25. Exultemus in voce uberi, quod terrenis junguntur superi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 3</td>
<td>3. Infelix, propera, crede vel vetera; cur dampnaberis, gens misera?</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>24. Cum de celo, teste Virgilio nova venti hec generatio, jams coruscat sanctorum satio, jam potenti tueretur brachio,</td>
<td>29. Gens hebrea, natum considera quod dormitas nobiscum propera;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>quod gaudentes respirant miseri, quod dolentes predantus inferi.</td>
<td>33. Aaron virga fructum dat hodie, prodit pater de claustro filio;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33. Aaron virga fructum dat hodie, prodit pater de claustro filio;</td>
<td>33. Aaron virga fructum dat hodie, prodit pater de claustro filio;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>17. Infelix, propera, crede vel vetera; cur dampnaberis, gens misera?</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>29. quem congoscens bos in presepio, quem adorans magorum concio</td>
<td>ac in nostra valle miserie contemplemur solem justitie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37. Eya, mater virgo cristifera,</td>
<td>37. Eya, mater virgo cristifera,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>27. Quem docet littera, natum considera, ipsumque genuit puerpera.</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>est Judee gentis confusio nos canentes juvet presidio.</td>
<td>te laudantes ita remunera, ut peccati spernentes onera te concernant in vite vespera.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some equal-cantus motets with isorhythmic construction include both the repetition of melody and rhythm of the tenor, but most are characterized by only two iterations of the tenor.
rhythm with one single statement of the tenor melody. These I have described as double-
statement motets to distinguish them from proportional French-style isorhythmic motets. A great
number of equal-cantus motets that cannot be identified as isorhythmic can instead be found to
feature manipulations of form through the repetition of a tenor melody in successive
mensurations, such as in Carmen’s *Salve pater creator omnium – Felix et beata Deo fecundata*.34
This motet is one of the most formally complex works of the early 15th century.35 The tenor is
written out once in a single color of two taleae, the first in \( \textcircled{1} \) and the second in \( \textcircled{2} \). Presumably, in
order to have the tenor cover the entire length of the two cantus parts, the tenor would have to be
repeated two additional times, but it is not this form that makes the work so complex. Instead, the
upper voices have a series of mensural changes throughout the work—\( \textcircled{1} \ \textcircled{2} \ \textcircled{3} \ \textcircled{4} \ \textcircled{1} \ \textcircled{2} \ \textcircled{3} \ \textcircled{4} \). The tenor is
instructed in a canon, “Tenor dicitur ter quari de prolatione sui moteti” (The tenor is sung three
times by the prolationes of the motet), thus changing both its modus and mensuration to match the
cantus voices. The contratenor also has a canon instructing the singer to imitate the instructionis
for the tenor.

The canons in *Salve pater* produce a number of remarkable rhythmic reinterpretations for
the tenor and contratenor in a complexity that is not entirely evident in the simple layout of the
two parts.36 Fortunately, the scribe has also included a tenor “ad longum” either as a contrapuntal
or performance aid that enables the modern scholar to see a realization of how these mensural


35 This work is rivaled only by the even more complex motet by Billart, *Salve virgo virginum –
Continental Miscellany of the Fifteenth Century* (Plainsong and Mediaeval Music Society:

36 Charles Turner made a remarkable analysis of this tenor structure in his article, “Proportion
and Form,” 106. One should note that there are a number of errors in the transcription found in
EFCM 1, 48–54.
transformations actually work. This fifth part could actually be described as a pseudo-solus tenor as it basically consists of the lowest sounding notes from both the tenor and contratenor parts. Unlike the ad longum tenor of Ciconia’s *Petrum Marcellum*, which seems to only be a compositional aid, this part could potentially serve as a substitution for the tenor and contratenor in a three-voice arrangement of the work. The ad longum tenor is fully realized and includes each mensural change (Figure 6.3). This realization also reveals a changing modus in successive iterations of the tenor that are not immediately apparent in its original statement.

![Figure 6.3: Q15, f. 278v (detail). Carmen, *Salve pater*, Tenor and Tenor ad longum.](image)

Another example of mensural transformation is the creative utilization of diminution in Du Fay’s *Balsamus et munda cera – Isti sunt agni novelli*. As in Carmen’s *Salve pater*, this motet features multiple mensurations in the upper voices, although all of the changes are compressed into the second half of the motet—[\(\text{[C]} \varnothing \Phi \in \varnothing \Phi\)]. If one divided the motet into two sections based upon the tenor repetitions, the first half of the motet (mm. 1–78) would be entirely in \(\text{[C]}\) and the second half would be in two exact rhythmic repetitions in a sequence of three mensurations each, \(\in\), \(\varnothing\), and \(\Phi\) (mm. 79–97 and mm. 98–118).

---

Unlike the configuration of the lower voices in *Salve pater*, the tenor and contratenor of *Balsamus* do not change mensuration with the upper voices. The contratenor is in two *colore*, each in a different mensuration: [사업] then Ⓑ, each with two repetitions of *talea*. The tenor, which is written out twice because the motet occupies two openings, is controlled by two canons, one for each iteration of the melody. The first canon tells the tenor to sing first in perfect modus and imperfect tempus and then in retrograde. The retrograde rhythm of the tenor transforms it into a palindrome, so the retrograde of pitches becomes a repetition of rhythm. The second canon says that the tenor is now diminished by half and sung forwards followed by the same in retrograde, keeping the “black” notes to the end.\[38\]

The most common construction of equal-cantus motets is the double-statement structure, but there are many examples of isorhythmic equal-cantus works that feature repetition of both rhythm and melody as well as the use diminution. These features appear to be influenced by French *Ars nova* compositional techniques. These motets are actually hybrids and retain two cantus parts with equal ranges and rhythmic pattering and shapes of the equal-cantus style. Grenon’s *Ad honorem sancte trinitas – Celorum regnum sempiternum – Iste semper celestibus* is just one such example of a hybrid motet.\[39\] After the opening duet, the tenor starts on the first iteration of the *cantus firmus*. This rhythm is then repeated by all voices midway through the melody. In the last quarter of the motet, the tenor melody is repeated as the rhythmic repetition is reduced by a third accelerating the rhythmic values of the tenor. Because of the mensuration change from [사업] to Ⓑ, the notation (longas and breves) does not change from one section to the

\[38\] These “black” notes only appear in the second copy of the tenor on f. 208v and are actually in void notation.

other. Instead the rhythmic values are halved resulting in the same shortened breve – semibreve rhythmic tenor texture that is commonly found in the equal-cantus motet.

Ad honorem has equal-range upper voices, which open in canonic imitation fully written out in the manuscript. After the introductory duet and in the main body of the motet there is little imitation between the two voices, but they feature numerous incidences of voice crossing and move primarily in equivalent rhythmic values. The text setting is not quite equal—the text of cantus I has two more rhyming couplets than cantus II—but the gradual separation of lines occurs so subtly that it is difficult to notice a dissimilarity of text distribution.

**Introductory Duets**

Introductory duets are a characteristic common to the equal-cantus motet. By using Ciconia’s motets as an exemplar, one can see that many of his works utilize some sort of

---

40 As I suggest in Chapter 4, the use of an opening duet, especially if canonic or at least imitative, is distinctive of an equal-cantus style that appears to reach back into the 14th century in a much more prominent way that has been hitherto suggested in much of the literature on the motet. There are a few examples in the French repertory that have solo introductions or introitus sections. These include *O Philippe Franci qui generis – O bone dux indolis optime*, although it should be noted that this *introitus* was not transcribed by Mildred Johnson in her dissertation (“The Motets of the Codex Ivrea” 2 vols. [PhD diss., Indiana University, 1955], 1:1–8), nor, after her, by Frank Ll. Harrison in PMFC 5, 1–6 (as it is “very rubbed”), *Apta caro plumis ingenii – Flos virginum* (PMFC 5, 17–23), *Almifonis melos cum vocibus – Rosa sine culpe spina* (PMFC 5, 46–49; this work has a solo introduction, but not imitated by the other voices, which is reminiscent of Machaut’s *Martyrum gemma – Diligenter, PMFC 3, 8–10*). *Amer amours est a choison pourquoy – Durement au cuer me blece – Dolour meus* (PMFC 5, 100–103), *Alpha vibrans monumentum – Cetus venit heroycus – Amicum querit* (PMFC 5, 136–140), and *Rex Karole*, which I discuss in Chapter 4. In addition, several of the motets usually attributed to Vitry have an introitus without the tenor. These include *Tuba sacre – In arboris* (PMFC 1, 88–90) and *Virtutibus – Impudenter* (PMFC 1, 91–96). *Petre Clemens – Lugentium* (PMFC 1, 97–103) has an imitative but accompanied introduction, and a widely spaced, Italianate final cadence. In addition, it should be noted that Philippe de Vitry’s *Tribum que non abhoruit – Quoniam secta latronum – Merito hec patimur* (PMFC 1, 54–56) is an important predecessor to the equal-cantus motet. It has an *introitus*, a borrowed tenor in the middle voice, and a repeating *talea* without diminution. Occasionally introductory material was added to motets later. This occurs in the
introductory duet feature. Some of these duets are explicit, such as the imitative opening of Ciconia’s *O virum omnimoda – O lux et decus – O beate Nicholae*. In this motet the two cantus parts exactly imitate each other in a nine-breve texted melody that overlaps only on the final pitch. Each cantus voice is set with its own poem. The tenor accompanies these imitative phrases, but does not repeat itself by matching the imitative parts above, but instead continues in its own unique and through-composed counterpoint to the single upper voice sounding above. The opening of Matheus de Brixia’s *Jesus postquam monstraverit* is set in a similar fashion. Cantus I has an eight-tempora long opening phrase followed in exact imitation by cantus II as the tenor repeats the same accompanying melody. The only overlapping pitch is the last note of cantus II at the entry of the text in cantus I. This entire opening section in echo imitation is sung on the first syllable of the text. After these echoed phrases, as the text proper begins, cantus I has a two-tempora long solo phrase echoed at the 10th by a tenor solo. This is followed by cantus II’s echo of cantus I at the original pitch accompanied by the second half of the tenor’s phrase. There are no other examples of melodic repetition in the motet after these two imitative phrases.

An example of a motet with an unaccompanied and self-contained opening duet is Nicolao’s *Argi vice polyphemus – Tum Philemon*.\(^{41}\) The composer, identified only as Nicolao in the text of cantus II (alongside the poet, Guilhermus) has variously been associated with Nicolaus Zacarie, Nicolas Grenon, or as Nicolaus Frangens de Leodio, but as Bent proposes, the

---

attribution based upon this solitary forename is fragile at best.\textsuperscript{42} The motet was possibly composed either for the 1410 election of Antipope John XXIII in Pisa or for the opening of the Council of Constance in 1414. The introductory duet is a fully written out canon over the space of twenty-one tempora (\textit{in tempus perfectum}). This introductory section falls outside the repeated rhythmic sections of the rest of the motet. Although this is one of the longest unaccompanied introductions in the repertoire, the relative long length of \textit{introitus} (21 breves) balances the long length of the motet (161 breves). The composer has doubled the length of a typical double-statement motet, by repeating the rhythmic structure four times with thirty-five breves in each \textit{talea}. Although the composer does not coordinate the parsing of the verses with the structural repetitions of the music, he does set the first stanza of each text only in the introductory passage. This emphasizes not the sacred references in the two poems, but instead their the Classical and mythological elements. These texts in general are a mixture of Greek and Roman mythology, Old Testament heroic tales, and an exhortation for the militant church to take a stand to reunify not only the Western Schism (which by the time of John XXIII consisted of three differing allegiances), but the also the Great Schism between Rome and the Orthodox churches of Greece and Byzantium. The introductory text of cantus I promotes the idea that Argos is representative of the need for steadfast resiliency in the face of adversity (against the one-eyed Polyphemus). The first stanza of cantus II refers to the union of Philemon and Baucis both in marriage and after their deaths in their transformation into trees with intertwining branches. John XXIII is only mentioned by name well within the motet in the text of cantus I.

Other imitative introductions are identified by a signum or with canonic instructions such as in Benoit’s *Gaude tu baptista Christi*. The canon for the introductory section is derived from both a signum and the instruction “fuga sex temporum” written above the staff. The intentional and explicit rests in cantus II may clarify that cantus I is intended for some sort of choral performance and not exclusively one voice on a part. This differs from *Ave virgo* which has no rests in cantus II and it is unclear if the canonic repetition of cantus I is intending for the second voice or for a second singer on the first part. This texted duet falls within the rhythmic structure of the motet—this is a double-statement motet—and there is an internal, non-canonic duet for cantus I and cantus II at m. 33.

Several motets on the table above feature introductory duets specifically labeled “Introitus,” such as Du Fay’s *Apostolo glorioso*. This introductory section is self contained and demarcated with a corona and stands outside the formal structure of the motet. The opening fanfare features untexted, wide-spaced imitation between cantus I and cantus II (three tempora) and remains imitative until the entry of two contratenors in m. 7. This is followed by wide-spaced imitation between contratenor I and contratenor II (also three tempora). Unlike opening canons created through the use of signa, all imitation in the opening of *Apostolo glorioso* is written out for both the cantus parts and the contratenor parts. The tenor enters only on the final sonority of the introduction. The solus tenor for the most part borrows material from the two contratenors and like them enters in m. 7 after the two imitative statements of the cantus parts. The only portions of the solus tenor that are not borrowed from the contratenor parts seem to take advantage of the trompetta-like quality of the melody. The new tenor consists mainly of

---

44 I discuss the function of the solus tenor of *Apostolo glorioso* in Chapter 3.
leaps of 4ths and 5ths making the opening salvo even more like the flourish of a trumpet fanfare (Example 6.24).

Example 6.24: Du Fay, *Apostolo glorioso*, mm. 7–16. The solus tenor generally consists of borrowed portions of the two contratenor parts and the tenor.

The opening duet of Johannes de Lymburgia’s in *Recordare virgo mater* is notable because it is labeled “introitus,” but it is non-imitative and simply a duet that occurs before the entrance of the main body of the text. Like many other opening duets, is extented and demarcated for cantus I and II only, with the *si placet* tenor joining the texture after fourteen tempora.\(^{45}\) This *introitus* is separated from the main structure of the work by being in a different mensuration than the main body of the motet, ♩ instead of ♪.

Almost all of Du Fay’s equal-cantus works feature an opening duet of some sort.\(^{46}\) *O gemma lux* has a texted canonic introduction created with the use of a signum in cantus I. The rests written in cantus II at the top of the voice part indicates that probably cantus I would be

---

\(^{45}\) I discuss this motet in more detail in Chapter 3 in regards to its unusual use of a *si placet* tenor in what is otherwise a two-voice structure.

\(^{46}\) I discuss *Vasilissa* in Chapter 5 and *Apostolo* with its labeled “Introitus” above.
sung by multiple singers each of whom would take a part of the canon while the rest of the voices are tacet, although cantus II could potentially sing in the introduction. The motet *O sancte Sebastiane – O martir Sebastiane – O quam mirram* has an opening duet much like that of *O gemma lux*. It is a self-contained canonic duet, created by a signum in cantus I and with rests in cantus II. *Rite maiorem* has a non-canonic duet on the first syllable of each text of the cantus parts. In the four-voice version, the tenor and contratenor rest through this six-tempora introduction. In the three-voice version with the new solus tenor, the lowest voice accompanies this introductory material in trompetta-like equal rhythmic motion with the upper voices with breves, semibreves, and minims.\(^{47}\) This duet is repeated at the beginning of the next *talea*.\(^{48}\) At the start of the next *color*, a new duet is stated (accompanied by the solus tenor in the three-voice arrangement) which is also repeated at the next *talea*. The motet in honor of the city of Florence, *Mirandas parit haec urbs florentina puellas*, opens with a texted, short, two-breve imitative phrase for cantus I followed by cantus II. The tenor does not enter until the end of the cantus II phrase. *Ecclesiae militantis – Sanctorum arbitrio – Bella canunt gentes – Gabriel – Ecce nomen domini* has a four-breve, overlapping canonic opening phrase in cantus I and II followed by an extended self-contained, non-imitative duet. This extended 24-tempus introduction allows the two cantus voices to state one full verse of each part’s text and in a fashion inviting the contratenor, which unusually contains its own third text, to make its own petition to the church militant. The one exception amongst Du Fay’s equal-cantus works without an introductory duet is the motet *Balsamus et munda cera – Istri sunt agni novelli.*


\(^{48}\) The isorhythmic arrangement is two *color* statements that are mensurally transformed each consisting of two *taleae.*
Trompetta *Parts*

A number of equal-cantus works from the early 15th century have trumpet-like sections that either are identified specifically as “trompetta” or are written in a way that their melodic phrases imitate the natural harmonics of a straight trumpet of the late Middle Ages.⁴⁹ One of these motets with a trompetta part is Johannes Franchois de Gemblaco’s *Ave virgo lux Maria – Sancta Maria*. This work is unusual for several reasons. There are eight different parts in the source that can be arranged in two different versions.⁵⁰ The first is a five-voice arrangement with cantus I and cantus II, and the labeled contratenor “Sancta Maria,” the alius tenor, and tenor “Sancta Maria.” Alternately, the motet can be performed with the same cantus parts I and II, and the labeled contratenor “cum solo tenore” with the solus tenor. An eighth notated part is a uniquely labeled “trumpetta introitus” and has a trumpet-like melodic shape outlining numerous leaps of fifths and fourths and landing frequently on octave *d* and *a* (thus a step up from the natural harmonics of a brass trumpet). The *introitus* section is extremely long (forty-three breves). The two upper voices are in canon, created through the inclusion of a signum at the sixth tempora indicating exact echo imitation. It is unclear for whom the trompetta part is intended. The range is quite low, going down to the *A* an octave and a third below middle *c’*. Although the range is low enough to be sung by any of the tenor or contratenor voices (who are presumably tacet during the *introitus*), the fast motion of the part that stays within the same rhythmic values as the upper voices is distinctively different from any of the lower parts that follow in the main body of the motet.

---

⁴⁹ Bent also notes the use of the identifiers “concordans” and “tuba” as synonyms for “trompetta.” See Bent, “Trompetta and Concordans,” 43.

Melismatic Cadences

Antonius de Civitate’s *Pie pater Dominice – O Petre martir – Thoma lux ecclesie* is a triple-texted equal-cantus motet in honor of three Dominican saints: St. Dominic, St. Peter of Verona (also known as St. Peter Martyr), and St. Thomas Aquinas. This motet may have been very personal to Antonius as he was a Dominican monk.51 His six motets represent one of the largest groups of surviving music by a single Italian composer of the time. *Pie pater Dominice* features many of the key characteristics of other equal-cantus motets, but notable is his use of hocketed rhythmic cells in the final cadence in a similar fashion to Ciconia’s use of the same in his motets. The non-repeating tenor borrows from a sequence melody while the upper voices are freely-composed, so it is only at the final cadence that Antonius incorporates repeated rhythmic cells. In m. 100, cantus I and II begin the first of four interlocking repetitions (Example 6.2). In m. 104, cantus II shifts into a single tempora of displaced syncopation that cadences on the penultimate sonority in m. 105.

![Example 6.2: Antonius de Civitate, *Pie pater Dominice*, mm. 99–108. In this cadential passage, cantus I and cantus II are in a series of interlocking, rhythmically related rhythmic cells that generate energy to the final cadence.](image)

51 Another of Antonius’s motets, *O felix flos Florentia – Gaude felix Dominice*, is also in honor of the Dominicans. The work refers to friar and humanist Leonardo Dati, the Master general of the Dominican order in Florence from 1414–1425.
In the motet *Plaude decus mundi – Venetum clarisima*, the composer Cristoforus de Monte uses repeated and hocketed rhythmic cells freely. This may reflect a close relationship to Ciconia in Padua between 1402 and Ciconia’s death in 1412. *Plaude decus* bears several of the same characteristic hallmarks as Ciconia’s motets including a short imitative opening, frequent displacement syncopation, and shifts between triple and duple pulse. Many of these temporal shifts are notated within a single mensuration, such as m. 18, where both cantus II and the tenor are written in a duple semibreve – minim – semibreve – minim pattern as cantus I has a tempus-long syncopated cell (Example 6.26). Other sections of the motet use explicitly designated changes of mensuration from ○ to ‡. Measures 45/46 see the first shift into duple in all parts. In m. 73 all parts return to ○, although neither cantus I or cantus II really settle into this mensuration. In m. 92 every voice is back in ‡ for ten tempora, but then the mensuration returns one final time to tempus perfectum for the remainder of the work. What is interesting about these mensural changes is that they are not marked in any other way as sectional divisions in either the music or the text. The blended use of simple, non-mensural shifts between triple and duple and the mensural changes from ○ to ‡ is so subtle as to be almost unremarkable except that the whole texture of the work is so dependent on this characteristic shifting of pulse.

Example 6.26: Cristoforus de Monte, *Plaude decus*, mm. 18–26. In m. 18 cantus II and the tenor are in a duple pattern as cantus I is in displacement syncopation within the context of tempus perfectum. The tenor firmly reestablishes the triple meter in m. 19.
Where the shift between triple and duple is more noticeable is in the middle section of the motet. As noted above, in m. 73 all voices have returned to $\text{o}$ from $\text{c.}$ In m. 77, both cantus parts change their mensurations to $\text{c,}$ but the tenor and contratenor remain in $\text{o}$ (Example 6.27). This creates an interesting tension between the upper and lower voices, but facilitates a remarkable emphasis on the text of the cantus parts. By shifting the mensuration, Cristoforus de Monte places the entry of poetic lines on the strong part of each tempus. If left in a triple mensuration, this imitative text and music would be obscured. In duple, the three poetic lines, “dux pius equus,” “mille quadringentis,” and “domini currentibus,” are emphasized and reemphasized in echo imitation.

Example 6.27: Cristoforus de Monte, Plaude decus, mm. 72–93. Between mm. 77 and 90, both cantus I and cantus II are in tempus imperfectum over tempus perfectum in the tenor. The change of mensuration helps bring out the imitative and echoed phrases between the two cantus voices.

The final melismatic passage of Plaude decus is remarkable for its great sense of rhythmic adventurousness (Example 6.28). The final melisma begins in cantus II, m. 105 with a hint of displacement syncopation over the prevailing tempus perfectum, held steady in the tenor.
This syncopated snippet is imitated by cantus I a tempus following, which then transforms into a long string of syncopations for three tempora. Meanwhile, the other voices begin to push against the triple pulse. Both cantus II and the tenor shift momentarily into duple (m. 108) and as the tenor goes back into triple with three steady semibreves, cantus II makes a momentary tempus-long shift into displacement syncopation. In m. 110 cantus I introduces a repeating rhythmic cell (minim rest – three minims – semibreve) echoed by cantus II in its own rhythmic pattern (minim rest – two semibreves).\(^{52}\) This series of hocketed cells repeats until m. 115 where both cantus I and cantus II shift into a tempus of duple. In m. 116, both cantus I and cantus II begin a long string of echoed rhythmic hockets (minim rest followed by five minims) featuring a distinctive repetition of a pitch in each cell. This series ends in m. 123 where cantus II joins with the steady triple pulse of the tenor as cantus I moves in a duple pulse for three tempora. Cantus I only rejoins the triple motion in the antepenultimate measure for the final cadence.

\(^{52}\) Notably, this series of hocketed cells has been heard before in the motet, in melismatic passages in mm. 19–23 and mm. 41–44.
Example 6.28: Cristoforus de Monte, *Plaudre decus*, mm. 102–129. Final cadential melisma of the motet.

Consider for a moment the problematic and inessential contratenor of *Plaudre decus* (Examples 6.29A–D). In mm. 1–6, the contratenor obscures the introductory imitation between cantus I and cantus II while contributing nothing to the sonority, especially in mm. 5–6. It contributes unnecessary doubling at the octave with cantus II in mm. 32–33. It creates an
obstruction of the imitation in mm. 46–47 while the tenor rests. The part is so busy in mm. 77–89
during the *tempus imperfectum* phrasing of the two upper voices that it becomes distracting.

Example 6.29A: Cristoforus de Monte, *Plaude decus*, mm. 1–8. Contratenor
obscures the opening echo imitation of cantus I and II while adding nothing to the
counterpoint in mm. 1–6

Example 6.29B: Cristoforus de Monte, *Plaude decus*, mm. 27–35. Unnecessary
doubling between the contratenor and cantus II in mm. 32–33
Example 6.29C: Cristoforus de Monte, *Plaude decus*, mm. 45–54. Continuation of the contratenor in mm. 46–47 overlaps into an interesting duet between cantus I and II where the tenor rests.

Example 6.29D: Cristoforus de Monte, *Plaude decus*, mm. 72–93. The contratenor in mm. 77–89 completely distracts from the interactive counterpoint between the other three voices with excessive activity.
On the other hand, several interesting interactions between the contratenor and the other parts might compel an argument for the inclusion of this voice in analysis and performance. Particularly notable is the melismatic passages in mm. 41–44, where the contratenor participates in the sequence of rhythmic cells with entries on every beat of the tempus (Example 6.30). The same holds true in a similar set of rhythmic hockets in mm. 110–114 (Example 6.31). At last, there is a hint of an extra-long repeated cell (two-tempora long, starting in m. 66 in cantus I). This passage is primarily interaction between cantus I and II in hocketed rhythmic cells over a rapidly moving tenor in semibreves. In m. 70, the contratenor adopts the rhythmic cell one and a half times through to the mensuration change in m. 73 (Example 6.32).

Example 6.30: Cristoforus de Monte, *Plaude decus*, mm. 36–44. In mm. 41–44 the contratenor participates in a sequence of repeated rhythmic cells occurring on every beat of the tempus.
Example 6.31: Cristoforus de Monte, \textit{Plaude decus}, mm. 110–117. In mm. 110–114 the contratenor is part of a sequence of repeated rhythmic cells occurring on every beat of the tempus.

Example 6.32: Cristoforus de Monte, \textit{Plaude decus}, mm. 64–82. In mm. 66–72 is an interesting sequence featuring a two-tempora long rhythmic cell introduced by cantus I. This is echoed by cantus II in m. 67 and at last by the contratenor in m. 70.
Appendix 6.1: Equal-cantus motets, ca. 1400–1450

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>Clefs of cantus voices</th>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>No. of Voices</th>
<th>Tenor text</th>
<th>Rhythmic speed of tenor</th>
<th>Cantus firmus</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Introductory duet or introitus</th>
<th>Trumpet-like figures</th>
<th>Melismatic cadence(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Ad honorem sancte trinitatis – Celorum regnum supernum – Iste semper celestibus</em></td>
<td>Nicolas Grenon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 Ox213</td>
<td>C1, diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I and b / b and sb</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>isorhythmic w/ diminution</td>
<td>duet, w/o T or Ct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Albane misse celsius – Albane doctor maximus</em></td>
<td>Johannes Ciconia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1, diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>4, Ct problematic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anima mea liquefacta est</em></td>
<td>Guillaume Du Fay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 Ox213</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes, same as CI and CII</td>
<td>b and sb</td>
<td>all voices based on chant</td>
<td>canonic, but not strict imitation</td>
<td>canonie duet, w/o T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-TRbc 1374 [87]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Apostolo glorioso – Cum tua doctrina – Andreas Christi famulus</em></td>
<td>Guillaume Du Fay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1, diff. CI and CII, CtI and CtII have corresponding texts</td>
<td>6 (CI, CII, CtI, CtII, T, and ST)</td>
<td>T I and b / b and sb; ST I, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>mensural transformation C to O</td>
<td>“Introitus,” CtI, CtII, and ST enter after opening statements</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Argi vices Poliphemus – Tum Philemon</em></td>
<td>Nicolao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-AOs15</td>
<td>C1, diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I, b, and sb</td>
<td>yes, both T and Ct</td>
<td>4 statements of T rhythm</td>
<td>duet, w/o T or Ct</td>
<td>use of echo imitation, but texted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aurea flammigeri jam excesis</em></td>
<td>Antonius Romanus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1, single, at times split and shared between CI and CII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>mostly I and b</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td>yes, echo imitation accompanied by T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source(s)</td>
<td>Clefs of cantus voices</td>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>No. of Voices</td>
<td>Tenor text</td>
<td>Rhythmic speed of tenor</td>
<td>Cantus firmus</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Introductory duet or introitus</td>
<td>Trumpet-like figures</td>
<td>Melismatic cadence(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave gemma claritas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>4, Ct</td>
<td>I, b, and sb</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes, extended echo imitation w/ T and Ct</td>
<td>yes, “Amen”</td>
<td>Hugo de Lantins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Maria gracia plena – O Maria gracia plena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I, b, and sb</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4 statements of T rhythm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Johannes Brassart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-TRbc 1374 [87]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave sancta mundi salus – Agnus Dei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModA</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>same CI and CII, T diff.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>I and b / b and sb / sb and m</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 statements of T w/ diminution and double diminution; 4 statements of CI and CII w/ diminution</td>
<td>yes, final “Amen”</td>
<td>Matteo da Perugia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave verum corpus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Johannes Reson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave virgo lux Maria – Sancta Maria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>8 (CI, CII, Trumpetta, Ct, T, Alius T, Ct cum solo T, and ST)</td>
<td>I and b</td>
<td>yes, both Ct and T</td>
<td>2 statements of T rhythm, with mensural transformation in 2 statements; 2 statements of color</td>
<td>“Introitus,” canon w/ signa congruentiae, accompanied by “Trumpetta”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Johannes Franchois de Gemblaco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balsamus et munda cera – Iste sunt agni novella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I, b, and sb</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>canon with mensural transformation and retrograde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guillaume Du Fay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source(s)</td>
<td>Clefs of cantus voices</td>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>No. of Voices</td>
<td>Tenor text</td>
<td>Rhythmic speed of tenor</td>
<td>Cantus firmus</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Introductory duet or introitus</td>
<td>Trumpet-like figures</td>
<td>Melismatic cadence(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carminibus festos – O requies populi</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>4, Ct inessential and may have been added later</td>
<td>very active, l, b, sb and m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caro mea vere est</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>underlay for imitative solo (m. 23)</td>
<td>l, b, and sb</td>
<td></td>
<td>incomplete?</td>
<td>yes, canonic, accompanied by T</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Celsa sublimatur – Sabine presul</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox213</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>5 (CI, CII, Ct, T, ST)</td>
<td>b, sb and m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>double statement</td>
<td>canonic duet, w/o T, Ct or ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarus ortus – Gloriosa mater ecclesia – Justus non conturbatitur</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox213</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>5 (CI, CII, Ct, T ad longum)</td>
<td>l, b, and sb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 statements of T in C, 3 statements of T in D</td>
<td>canonic duet, w/o T or Ct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cuius fructus ventris – Te Maria rogitassem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>l, b, and sb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>canon</td>
<td>3 isorhythmic taleae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-AOs15 F-Dm MS 2837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[..] de qua cordis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-HAhl MS Typ 122</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>2 (fragment, CII and T only)</td>
<td>l, b, and sb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>double statement? (2nd half of motet?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Antonius Romanus

Petrus Rubeus

Hugo de Lantins

Anonymous

Anonymous (Johannes Ciconia?)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>Clefs of cantus voices</th>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>No. of Voices</th>
<th>Tenor text</th>
<th>Rhythmic speed of tenor</th>
<th>Cantus firmus</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Introductory duet or introitus</th>
<th>Trumpet-like figures</th>
<th>Melismatic cadence(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Descendi in ortum meum</strong></td>
<td>Anonymous (possibly Cristoforus de Monte?)</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>underlay for imitative solo (mm. 21, 27, and 56); also underlay for block sonorities under coronae</td>
<td>very active, l, b, sb and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td>begins canonically, w/Ct but not T</td>
<td>yes, echo imitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctorum principem – Melodia suavissima – Vir mitis</strong></td>
<td>Johannes Ciconia</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>4 (Ct inessential and problematic)</td>
<td>l, b, and sb</td>
<td>3 statements of T w/canon and mensural transformation: C – O – C</td>
<td>introductory melisma w/all voices then imitative passage between CI and CII</td>
<td>yes, echo imitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominicus a dono</strong></td>
<td>Cristoforus de Monte</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>4, Ct problematic and likely added later</td>
<td>l, b, sb and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td>canonic duet, w/o T or Ct</td>
<td>yes, minimal echo imitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source(s)</td>
<td>Clefs of cantus voices</td>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>No. of Voices</td>
<td>Tenor text</td>
<td>Rhythmic speed of tenor</td>
<td>Cantus firmus</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Introductory duet or introitus</td>
<td>Trumpet-like figures</td>
<td>Melismatic cadence(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducalis sedes inclita – Stirps Mocinico</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>4 (Ct in Q15 only)</td>
<td>underlay for imitative solo (mm. 57 and 82)</td>
<td>fairly active, l, b, sb and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td>“T” = Introitus(?) in C1; solo entries by CI and CII, non-imitative, accompanied by T and Ct</td>
<td>yes, internal</td>
<td>yes, echo imitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiae militantis – Sanctorum arbitrio – Bella canunt gentes – Gabriel – Ecce nomen domini</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>diff. CI, CII, and Ct</td>
<td>5 (CI, CII, Ct, TI, and TII)</td>
<td>extremely slow relative to upper voices, max, l, b, and sb</td>
<td>yes, for both TI and TII</td>
<td>6 statements of tenor in successive mensurally transformed pairs, each in diminution as thus: C – ¥ : C – ¥ : Ø – Ø</td>
<td>solo duet for CI and CII, begins canonically, ends before the entry of the other voices and outside the structure of the body of the motet</td>
<td>some internal references</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabet Zacharie</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I, b, and sb / b, sb, and m</td>
<td>“inspired” by cf but appears to be freely composed</td>
<td>3 statements of talea for color 1; 3 statements of talea in diminution for repetition of color</td>
<td>solo duet for CI and CII, begins canonically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source(s)</td>
<td>Clefs of cantus voices</td>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>No. of Voices</td>
<td>Tenor text</td>
<td>Rhythmic speed of tenor</td>
<td>Cantus firmus</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Introductory duet or introitus</td>
<td>Trumpet-like figures</td>
<td>Melismatic cadence(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gaude tu baptista Christi</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>opening is canonic w/ signa congruentiae, w/o T or Ct; complete before the entry of other voices; duet also at the beginning of the second statement</td>
<td>Ct trumpet-like</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>l, b, sb and m</td>
<td>double statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ihesu salvator seculi – Quo vulneratis scelere</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>canonic, accompanied by T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. Cl and CII</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>relatively active; l, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL2211</td>
<td>Ox213</td>
<td>Stras222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ihesus postquam monstraverat</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>canonic, accompanied by T and Ct</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>4 (Ct problemat ic)</td>
<td>underlay for imitative solos (mm. 19 and 48)</td>
<td>l, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Inclita persplendens</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>incomplete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox213</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 (incomplete)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>incomplete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source(s)</td>
<td>Clefs of cantus voices</td>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>No. of Voices</td>
<td>Tenor text</td>
<td>Rhythmic speed of tenor</td>
<td>Cantus firmus</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Introductory duet or introitus</td>
<td>Trumpet-like figures</td>
<td>Melismatic cadence(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laurea martirii – Conlaudanda est – Proba me Domine,</strong> Matteo da Perugia (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModA</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>5 (CI, CII, Ct, T, and ST)</td>
<td>likely</td>
<td>3 colors divided into 2 taleae w/ canon creating mensural transformation of each statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Letetur plebs fidelis – Pastor qui revelavit</strong></td>
<td>Nicolaus Zacharie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox213</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>none, although imitative melodic passages could be used for underlay (mm. 75 and 86)</td>
<td>relatively active; l, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td>canonic, w/ T and Ct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Magne Deus potentie – Genus regale esperie</strong></td>
<td>Johannes Brassart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I and b / b and sb</td>
<td>color in 3 talea statements, repeated in diminution</td>
<td>canonic duet w/o T or Ct</td>
<td>some internal references</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mirandas parit haec urbs florentina puellas</strong></td>
<td>Guillaume Du Fay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModB I-TRbc 1375 [88]</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>underlay for imitative passage (m. 27)</td>
<td>very active, l, b, sb and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td>duet in echo imitation</td>
<td>some internal references</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source(s)</td>
<td>Clefs of cantus voices</td>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>No. of Voices</td>
<td>Tenor text</td>
<td>Rhythmic speed of tenor</td>
<td>Cantus firmus</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Introductory duet or introitus</td>
<td>Trumpet-like figures</td>
<td>Melismatic cadence(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missus est Gabriel</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>single, at times split and shared between CI and CII</td>
<td>3 (N.B. unus and chorus instructio ns)</td>
<td>occasional underlay</td>
<td>l, b, and sb</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td>(canonic w/ T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova vobis gaudia</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>l and b</td>
<td>possibly</td>
<td>2 colors in 2 nearly identical taleae; upper voices in 4 taleae</td>
<td></td>
<td>(none, but distinctive “noel” refrain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O beatum incendium</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>contrafactum of a virelai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-Pu MS 1115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O felix flores Florencia – Gaude felix Dominice</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>underlay for imitative passages (mm. 1 and 97)</td>
<td>relatively active; l, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td>canonic in all 3 voices</td>
<td></td>
<td>use of echo imitation, but texted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O felix templum jubila</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>4 (Ct problematic and best omitted)</td>
<td>underlay for solo imitative passages (mm. 29 and 86)</td>
<td>relatively active; l, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td>canonic w/T</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes, echo imitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source(s)</td>
<td>Clefs of cantus voices</td>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>No. of Voices</td>
<td>Tenor text</td>
<td>Rhythmic speed of tenor</td>
<td>Cantus firmus</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Introductory duet or introitus</td>
<td>Trumpet-like figures</td>
<td>Melismatic cadence(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O gemma lux et speculum – Sacer pastor barenseium – Beatus Nicolaus adhuc</td>
<td>Guillaume Du Fay</td>
<td>Q15 Ox213</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>relatively slow, l, b, and sb</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 statements of followed by 1 in diminution; all voices isorhythmic</td>
<td>opening is canonic w/ signa congruentiae, w/o T or Ct and complete before the entry of other voices</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Maria virgo davitica – O Maria maris stella</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Q15 I-Pu MS 1106 St. Emmeram</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>5 (CI, CII, Ct, T, and ST)</td>
<td>l and b</td>
<td>possible but unknown</td>
<td>double statement with 3 tales for each of 2 statements of color; isorhythmic in all voices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Padua sidus preclarum</td>
<td>Johannes Ciconia</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>relatively active; l, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes, echo imitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Petre Christi discipule</td>
<td>Johannes Ciconia</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C4 F2</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>possibly a contrafactum of unknown form</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O pia virgo Fides – Sancta Fides persolvamus – Fides nomine</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>ModB</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>l and b</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
<td>double statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source(s)</td>
<td>Clefs of cantus voices</td>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>No. of Voices</td>
<td>Tenor text</td>
<td>Rhythmic speed of tenor</td>
<td>Cantus firmus</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Introductory duet or introitus</td>
<td>Trumpet-like figures</td>
<td>Melismatic cadence(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O proles Hispanie</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-Pu MS 1106</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>2 (incomplete, CII and T only)</td>
<td>underlay for possible solo imitative passages (mm. 19 and 60)</td>
<td>l, b, and sb</td>
<td>at minimum double statement</td>
<td>possible</td>
<td>yes, with possible echo imitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O sancte Sebastiane – O martir Sebastiane – O quam mirram</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 Ox213</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>diff. CI, CII, and Ct</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>b, sb, and m; becomes quite fast when in diminution</td>
<td>none identified</td>
<td>2 statements of color, each in 3 taleae; second statement in diminution</td>
<td>opening is canonic w/ signa congruentiae, w/o T or Ct; complete before the entry of other voices</td>
<td>yes, long “Amen” with echo imitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O virum omnimoda veneracione – O Lux et decus tranensium – O beate Nicholae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 BU2216 I-Sc 36</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. CI, CII, and T problematic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>textured throughout</td>
<td>l, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td>canonic w/T and Ct</td>
<td>yes, “Amen”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Padu . . . serenans – Pastor bonus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-Pu MS 1106</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>2 (incomplete, CII and T only)</td>
<td>relatively active; l, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>at minimum double statement</td>
<td>possible</td>
<td>possible use of echo imitation, but texted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source(s)</td>
<td>Clefs of cantus voices</td>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>No. of Voices</td>
<td>Tenor Text</td>
<td>Rhythmic speed of tenor</td>
<td>Cantus firmus</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Introductory duet or introitus</td>
<td>Trumpet-like figures</td>
<td>Melismatic cadence(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Petrum Marello venetum – O Petre antistes inclite</strong></td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>diff. CI, CII, and T</td>
<td>4 (Ct added later in a diff. hand)</td>
<td>1, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>double statement; 1st half of T color stated in integer and then in diminution, followed by the same for the 2nd half; canon</td>
<td>yes, at the end of each statement with echo imitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pie pater Dominice – O Petre martir inclite – O Thoma lux ecclesie</strong></td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>diff. CI, CII, and T</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td>yes, w/ Ct</td>
<td>yes, “Amen” w/ echo imitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plasmatoris humani generis – Verbigine mater ecclesia</strong></td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>diff. CI, CII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicolas Grenon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plaude decus mundi – Venetum clarissima</strong></td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>diff. CI, CII</td>
<td>4 (Ct inessential and problematic)</td>
<td>occasional underlay (mm. 45 and 61)</td>
<td>very active; l, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>mensural changes create an ABABA form</td>
<td>brief echo imitation w/o T or Ct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source(s)</td>
<td>Clefs of cantus voices</td>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>No. of Voices</td>
<td>Tenor text</td>
<td>Rhythmic speed of tenor</td>
<td>Cantus firmus</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Introductory duet or introitus</td>
<td>Trumpet-like figures</td>
<td>Melismatic cadence(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pontifici decori speculi</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox213</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>4, CII derived from C1 according to canon</td>
<td>b and sb</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td></td>
<td>entire work is canonic, opening phrase w/ T and Ct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevalet simplicitas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>b and sb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox213</td>
<td>CII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prophetarum – Ave virtus – Infelix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox213</td>
<td>CI, CII derived from CI and CII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>setting of chant text could be sung throughout</td>
<td>notated in sb and m</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>canon with mensural reinterpretation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psallat chorus in novo carmine – Eximie pater et regie</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>CI, CII derived from CI and CII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>l, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td>extended echo imitation w/ T and Ct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL2211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[. . .]ptisari virgo Cristina</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB-Ob MS. Canon. Ital. 16</td>
<td>CI, CII derived from CI and CII</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>l, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source(s)</td>
<td>Clefs of cantus voices</td>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>No. of Voices</td>
<td>Tenor text</td>
<td>Rhythmic speed of tenor</td>
<td>Cantus firmus</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Introductory duet or introitus</td>
<td>Trumpet-like figures</td>
<td>Melismatic cadence(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Puer natus in Bethlehem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>4 (N.B. unus instructio ns, although no reentry of chorus)</td>
<td>T texted throughou t; Ct occasional underlay (mm. 33 and 75)</td>
<td>relatively active; l, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td>yes, echo imitation w/ T and Ct</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recordare virgo mater</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>3 (CI, CII, and si placet T)</td>
<td>very active; l, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td>“Introitus” w/o si placet T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regina saeculi salvatrix sempiterna – Reparatrix Maria nobilis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox213</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII, CtI and CtII have corresponding texts</td>
<td>5 (CI, CII, CtI, CtII, and T)</td>
<td>“Amen” at the end of the motet</td>
<td>I, b, and sb</td>
<td>double statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rite maiorem Jacobum canamus – Artibus summis miser reclusi – Ora pro nobis dominum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>5 (CI, CII, Ct, T, and ST)</td>
<td>T: l, b, and sb; ST: creatively active with addition of m figures</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>2 statements of color, 1st in 2 statements of talea, 2nd in 2 statements of talea with mensural transformation</td>
<td>non-canonic duet w/ ST</td>
<td>intermittent references in ST</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source(s)</td>
<td>Clefs of cantus voices</td>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>No. of Voices</td>
<td>Tenor text</td>
<td>Rhythmic speed of tenor</td>
<td>Cantus firmus</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Introductory duet or introitus</td>
<td>Trumpet-like figures</td>
<td>Melismatic cadence(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salve pater creator omnium – Felix et beata Deo fecundate</td>
<td>Johannes Carmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. Cl and CII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>l, b, and sb</td>
<td>3 color statements in 2 taleae: canon with mensural reinterpretation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctus itaque patriarcha Lencius</td>
<td>Antonius de Civitate Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 I-Sas 3</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>4 (problematic Ct)</td>
<td>fairly active; l, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si nichil actuleris – In pretio pretium</td>
<td>Hymbert de Salinis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 SL2211</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>diff. Cl and CII</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>b, sb, and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strenua quem duxit – Gaudeat et tanti subiens</td>
<td>Antonius de Civitate Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox213</td>
<td>CI: C1; CII starts C2 but changes to C1</td>
<td>diff. Cl and CII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>relatively slow; l and b (Ct relatively active)</td>
<td>unidentifi ed</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td>overlapping echo imitation w/ Ct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summe summy tu patris unice – Summa summy tu matris filii</td>
<td>Gilet Velut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 I-TRbc 1374 [87]</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>diff. Cl and CII; Ct and T have corresponding texts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>texted throughout</td>
<td>relatively active; l, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td>echo imitation accompanied in repetition by T and Ct</td>
<td>yes, before final 6 tempora (w/ coronae)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summus secretarius</td>
<td>Johannes Brassart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 Ox213</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>max, l, b, and sb</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source(s)</td>
<td>Clefs of cantus voices</td>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>No. of Voices</td>
<td>Tenor text</td>
<td>Rhythmic speed of tenor</td>
<td>Cantus firmus</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Introductory duet or introitus</td>
<td>Trumpet-like figures</td>
<td>Melismatic cadence(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surge propera</td>
<td>Johannes de Lymburgia</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>textured for imitative passage (m. 41)</td>
<td>l, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td>yes, “Alleluia” in echo imitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tota pulchra es</td>
<td>Johannes de Lymburgia</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>textured on the repetition of the word “veni” (m. 64)</td>
<td>relatively active; l, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td>wide-spaced echo imitation w/ T and Ct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tota pulchra es</td>
<td>Arnold de Lantins</td>
<td>Q15 BU2216 St. Emmeram Ox213 F-PN n.a. fr. 4379 Stras222</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>4 (Ox213 and BU2216: Cl, Ct, T; Q15 and St. Emmeram: Cl, CII, Ct, and T)</td>
<td>l, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu nephanda prodigy – Si inimicus meus – Emitat celum fulgura</td>
<td>Johannes de Lymburgia</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>l, b, and sb</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td>yes, “Amen” in echo imitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ut te per omnes – Ingens alumnus Padue</td>
<td>Johannes Ciconia</td>
<td>Q15 Ox213</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>4 (Ct inessential, in Ox213 only)</td>
<td>l, b, and sb</td>
<td>double statement</td>
<td>short duet passage w/ Ct after initial sonority</td>
<td>yes, “Amen” in echo imitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source(s)</td>
<td>Clefs of cantus voices</td>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>No. of Voices</td>
<td>Tenor text</td>
<td>Rhythmic speed of tenor</td>
<td>Cantus firmus</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Introductory duet or introitus</td>
<td>Trumpet-like figures</td>
<td>Melismatic cadence(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vasilissa ergo gaude</strong></td>
<td>Guillaume Du Fay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 Ox213 I-TRbc 1374 [87]</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>b, sb, and m</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>double statement</td>
<td>canonic w/ signa congruentiae</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes, echo imitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Venecie mundi splendor – Michael qui Stena domus – Italie mundicie</strong></td>
<td>Johannes Ciconia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. CI, CII, and T</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>texted throughout, albeit sparsely</td>
<td>relatively active; l, b, sb, and m</td>
<td>through composed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes, echo imitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Venite adoremus dominum – Salve sancta eternal trinitas</strong></td>
<td>Johannes Carmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 Ox213</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>5 (CI, CII, Ct, T, and ST)</td>
<td>l and b</td>
<td>2 statements of T in 2 diff. rhythmicised color statements in 3 taleae w/ canon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbum tuum – In cruce te providens</strong></td>
<td>Jo Rondelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>diff. CI and CII</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>l, b, and sb</td>
<td>4 statements w/ mensural transformation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At an early stage in the process of writing, the title of this dissertation was, “Let us sing with sweetest melody.” This sentiment is borrowed from the text of cantus II of Johannes Ciconia’s motet *Doctorem principem – Melodia suavissima – Vir mitis*. It is not simply a conceit of the poet that in general one should sing sweetly, but in my mind it is an apt description of what the composer intended to instill in his creations. I have been captured by that phrase through this entire process and have hoped that through the analysis of these works and the careful consideration of what they can still communicate after 600 years I can recapture at least some of the sweetness of these glorious works.

The musical culture of the Veneto in the early decades of the 15th century was dynamic. The events in the region that celebrated nobles and prelates were lavish and filled with poetry, processions, speeches, robes, jewels, and musical events. Sadly, there are so few first person descriptions of the actual musical performances, but it takes little to imagine the trumpets, the drums, and the skilled singers presenting elaborate works both in the piazzas and in the basilicas of northern Italy. These events featured moments of brilliant musical invention in honor of one person or acclaiming a single event. Yet, lest we become too complacent in the assumption that a motet was performed once and then locked into a museum or a treasury, the transmission, recopying, and reediting of motets shows that they were a valuable commodity. The elaborate texts with double or even triple meanings gives the impression that these were works that were created for the enjoyment of the listeners. The complexity and virtuosity of the melodies shows that they were also works created for the pleasure of the singers.

The creation of the equal-cantus motet did not occur in a vacuum. Throughout this study I
have alluded frequently to the adjacent musical cultures both south and north of the Alps in Italy, France and even further abroad in England. There is no way to fully understand the repertoire of the early-15th century Veneto without having some perspective of both the shared and differing traditions of motet composition throughout Europe. Furthermore, I have intended to demonstrate that there are dangers in assuming that one tradition was dominant or central, relegating all other traditions to the periphery. Indeed, it is the richness of a variety of traditions that merge around 1430, which blossoms into a whole new vast repertory of musical gestures that has come to be known as Du Fay’s “international” style. French, English, and Italian characteristics all had a part to play in the musical environment of the first half of the 15th century. By setting the Italian motet apart, I have thrown its role into high relief and removed it from the edges of musical thought.

In the course of working on this repertoire, the phrase “international style” has often appeared as a description for the motets of the early 15th century. This concept is fraught. The implication of the word “international” is that regional styles—either French or Italian—needed to be supplanted. But the equal-cantus motet an example of a kind of truly international style that had roots in the motets of Vitry. It was then not only transmitted to northern Italy, but also connected to the ceremonial and honorific motets of France as well.

I do not intend to essentialize a nationalistic compositional tendency by focusing only on the stylistic features of what could be described as the Italian motet. In fact, one of the biggest challenges of this project has been to keep ever in my sights the variety of different stylistic tendencies not only within the corpus of known 15th-century motets in all of Europe, but also within one geographic border and within the corpus of one composer. A thorough understanding of the music of the mid-15th century cannot be understood without locating the stylistic
tendencies of the fourteenth century within regional boundaries. The regional differences offer a way of organizing genre and subgenre and help define the elements of the diverse catalogue of stylistic variation.

While simultaneously isolating distinctive elements that identify differences between regional style traditions and between individual composers, it has also been useful to examine connections between composers and works. In this study I have described examples of works that are linked by form, texture, text, and gesture. One of the theories that rises to the top is the connection between Ciconia and Du Fay. This is not a new proposition, but in-depth analysis removes any doubt that Du Fay was greatly influenced by the features of the Veneto motet and that the general characteristics of the Italian style remained part of his musical vocabulary through the first several decades of his career. But the notion of influence only goes so far. The biggest issue is that influence is not necessarily directional. The influence of a particular musical characteristic or stylistic feature can skip a generation or have multiple progenitors. These characteristics are also slippery as their differences are apparent only in small-scale mensural shifts or subtle alterations of range or text setting.

I have also been reluctant to place too much emphasis on the dependence of composers upon pre-existing musical forms and stylistic features because that sort of study in isolation has a tendency to reduce the significance of the individual’s invention. Ciconia’s works are exemplars of the Italian-style motet, but he is simultaneously the master and the inventor. It is because of the extremes of his innovation that there is a better understanding of the essential features of the style. I have also shown how Du Fay used these characteristics for his own developing style, but without doubt, Du Fay was a great innovator and was adventurous in continuing to pull in a multitude of features and gestures from a number of different sources and it is that combination
what mixes and matures into a profusion of differing characteristics that Du Fay leaves on his works like fingerprints on glass. This idea may go against an idea in the ether that Du Fay was a musical genius responsible for the invention of Renaissance music as if he sprang Athena-like from the skull of Zeus. Yet, a composer must start somewhere. Du Fay would not have been the composer he became without the instruction and example of the musicians who came before.

After all of this research, I must ask: what does it matter that to know there is a clear distinction between the 15th-century equal-cantus motet and other stylistic traditions? I can describe in detail texture, musical gestures, rhythmic syncopations, echo imitation, texts and text-setting, and historical context. I can understand from a theoretical and analytical perspective how the music works on the page, but for me I had already internalized the knowledge that there was something different about the Italian motet and anything else through performance. I have experienced these works as breathing, living things. The celebratory tone of a motet to a long-dead doge or cardinal still rings with the same fervor as it may have in a piazza in Padua 600 years ago. The written analysis and the sounding performance are not in conflict, but complement each other in a dialogue that has only just begun. I intend to continue questioning and seeking through the study and performance for many years to come.

Thus I come to the conclusion that there is so much more to be gained from the study of these works once considered peripheral or transitional. Their influence is more than it has been understood in the past. The age of technology is upon us, and today more than ever unprecedented access to manuscripts and documents keep revealing more about this remarkable style. Let us continue to seek and study, analyze and hear, and most of all, sing with sweetest melody the motets of the early-15th century.
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