

**Zeitschrift:** Basler Jahrbuch für historische Musikpraxis : eine Veröffentlichung der Schola Cantorum Basiliensis, Lehr- und Forschungsinstitut für Alte Musik an der Musik-Akademie der Stadt Basel

**Herausgeber:** Schola Cantorum Basiliensis

**Band:** 16 (1992)

**Heft:** [1]

**Artikel:** Willaert motets and mode

**Autor:** Smith, Anne

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-869050>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 15.01.2026

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

## WILLAERT MOTETS AND MODE

by ANNE SMITH

### *I. Ordering Willaert Motets à la Mode*

My study of Willaert motets was instigated by years of playing sixteenth century polyphony and being constantly teased by the question of how these works functioned as entities. In particular, the constructive function of mode in compositions of this period remained obscure to me. It is in this connection that I chose to examine the motets of Willaert as his works were often cited by contemporary theorists (in particular Zarlino) as models of composition of his time.

The two books of Adrian Willaert's motets published by Scotto in 1539, *Liber primus* and *Libro 2*, are among the earliest motet collections devoted to a single composer.<sup>1</sup> In 1545 Gardano also published two books of Willaert motets, again with the titles *Liber primus* and *secundus*.<sup>2</sup> The motets found in both the Scotto prints of 1539 as well as those in the Gardano prints of 1545 appear in the first two volumes of the complete works of Willaert. The editor, Hermann Zenck – and in this he has been followed by later musicologists – noticed the many concordances between the two sets of prints and assumed that the Gardano prints were a re-edition of the motets found in the Scotto volumes.<sup>3</sup> A comparison of the two collections, however, gives reason to believe that they were assembled independently from one another, although the music was drawn from a common repertoire. There are differences in the Gardano prints which can only with difficulty be explained away as mere variants. For example, Gardano prints many ligatures where Scotto printed individual notes. If Gardano had made his prints from those of Scotto, it seems likely that it would have necessitated his deciding which notes should be notated in ligatures. The presence of these ligatures in the later prints could more easily be explained, however, if Gardano had taken the motets from some independent manuscript source with those ligatures. Secondly, there are many more accidentals in the Gardano prints than in those of Scotto. And finally, in the Gardano prints *Joannes Apostolus – Ecclesiam*

<sup>1</sup> *Famossimi Adriani Willaert, ... musica quatuor vocum (quae vulgo motecta nuncupatur)...Liber primus*. Venice: G. Scotto, 1539 [hereafter referred to as 1539a, in line with Zenck's nomenclature]; *Motetti d'Adriano Willaert, Libro 2 a 4 voci ...* Venice: B. & O. Scotto, 1539 [hereafter referred to as 1539b].

<sup>2</sup> *Adriani Willaert ...musica quatuor vocum/(motecta vulgo appellant) ...Liber primus*. Venice: A. Gardano, 1545 [hereafter referred to as 1545b, in line with Zenck's nomenclature]; *Adriani Willaert ... musica quatuor vocum/(motecta vulgo appellant) ... Liber secundus*. Venice: A. Gardano, 1545 [hereafter referred to as 1545c].

<sup>3</sup> *Adriani Willaert, Opera omnia*, ed. Hermann Zenck, *Corpus mensurabilis musicae* (CMM) 3, Vol. I, vii-xi.



*tuam* (1545b, Nr. 7) is a fifth higher and *Surgit Christus – Dic Maria* (1545c, Nr. 16) a fourth higher than in those of Scotto. All of this suggests that the Gardano prints were not made directly from those of Scotto.<sup>4</sup>

Whereas in the 1539 Scotto prints no perceptible ordering principle seems to have been followed, Zenck pointed out in the introduction to the complete works that the Gardano 1545b print only contains works in modes with major thirds and that 1545c, with two exceptions, only contains works in modes with minor thirds.<sup>5</sup> In this complete edition the motets appear in the order that they are found in the Gardano prints.<sup>6</sup> As I analyzed the motets from these prints, I began noticing some similarities between adjacent compositions. This led me to ask whether some further ordering principle – beyond the mere classification of the motets on the basis of the third of the mode – had been employed. Further examination led to the conclusion that each of the Gardano volumes was indeed ordered according to certain criteria associated with modes, but that in each case a different procedure was followed to establish the order. The order of the first book, 1545b, seems to have been based on the modal nature of the motets' beginnings, their *exordia*, while that of the second appears to be based on the works' cleffing and key signatures.

In the course of coming to recognize the procedures employed to order the motets in these two volumes, I became increasingly aware of the discrepancy between the aspirations of sixteenth century and modern theorists. A modern theorist, due to the tradition of analysis absorbed from 19th century, approaches a composition with the desire of delving into its depths, of understanding how a piece works in all its details. There is the (perhaps unfounded) expectation that with a sufficient knowledge of mode, one should be able to establish a structural framework for a vertical understanding of a piece, similar to the framework provided by the major-minor tonal systems for 18th and 19th century music.

The sixteenth century theorist, on the other hand, was facing different issues, different problems. These are reflected by the procedures used in ordering the two Gardano volumes. In classifying the pieces, criteria were used which placed works together which shared at least some of the following characteristics: the cleffing and key signatures; the finals; the melodic progression of the individual parts (in particular the use of the species of fourths and fifths); the repercussion tones; the cadential hierarchy; and, last but not least, the mode of the tenor in standard *a voce piena* distribution.)<sup>7</sup> Thus the

<sup>4</sup> I am indebted to Joshua Rifkin for many of the observations made in this paragraph.

<sup>5</sup> Op. cit., ix.

<sup>6</sup> They are preceded by those motets which are only in the Scotto prints but not in those of Gardano.

<sup>7</sup> In this distribution the tenor and soprano were perceived to be in the same mode, for example Dorian, and the alto and bass then being correspondingly in the complementary mode, Hypodorian. The mode of the entire piece was deemed to be that of the tenor.



aim here was to search out features held in common by several works rather than, as one is inclined to do today, to examine a specific work to find out what makes it tick.

Needless to say, both approaches can contribute to our understanding of the music of the period. The earlier approach, however, is still somewhat foreign to us. A closer examination of the music in the two Gardano prints of Willaert motets will give us insight as to how this approach was applied at the time, which in turn will enrich our present-day discussion of the function of mode in sixteenth century polyphony.

### The Order in *Liber primus*

Although the motets in 1545b are clearly grouped by mode (see Table 1), the modes are not arranged in numerical order, as they are in similar collections of works by Rore, Susato, Lasso, and Palestrina.<sup>8</sup> A few pieces in this Gardano print, however, fit only imperfectly into this modal grouping. Three of them, *Antoni pastor inclyte* (1545b, Nr. 2), *O Thoma, laus et gloria* (1545b, Nr. 5), and *O magnum mysterium–Ave Maria* (1545b, Nr. 9), are in *toni commixti* whereas *Magne martyr Adriane* (1545b, Nr. 10) is the only plagal piece in the group of Lydian pieces on F. Nevertheless, their placement in the print is explicable if one only looks at the *exordia* of these pieces. Let us examine these borderline pieces in greater detail as they reveal some of the differences between today's methods of modal classification and those of the sixteenth century.

*Antoni pastor inclyte* is modally ambiguous, vacillating between G Hypomixolydian and C Hypolydian in the octenary modal system. This is reflected by the fact that all of the cadences are on either G or C. Already the opening reveals the equivocal nature of the piece's modality (see Example 1). The tenor opens with progression of g-b-c'-g, which clearly outlines the fourth *ut-fa*, before continuing on to the the upper fifth d', touching on the e' and falling back to g at the cadence in m. 9. The soprano opens directly with the same fourth *ut-fa* an octave higher before rising to d" and falling back to g' in m. 9. Both of these melodies can be understood in three frameworks:

- (1) In Mixolydian they may be understood as tracing out the species of fifth (*ut-sol*) inherent to the mode, with an emphasis on the fourth as a stepping-stone to the fifth;
- (2) In Hypomixolydian they may be once again understood as tracing out the species of fifth (*ut-sol*) inherent to the mode, with a particular emphasis on C, the repercussion tone of the mode;

<sup>8</sup> See Harold S. Powers, „Tonal Types and Modal Categories in Renaissance Polyphony“, *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 34 (1981) 428-70.



- (3) In transposed Hypolydian they may be understood as tracing out the species of fourth (*ut-fa*) inherent to the mode, before going slightly above the final, only once again to fall to the lower limit of the mode.

The musical score is written for four voices: Soprano, Alto, Tenor, and Bass. It is in G Mixolydian mode, indicated by a single sharp (F#) on the treble clef. The time signature is common time (C). The lyrics are: "An - - - to - ni pa - - stor in - - - in - - - cly - te, in - - cly - te, Qui cru - ci -". The Soprano part has a melodic line that rises and then falls. The Alto part has a similar pattern. The Tenor part has a more active line. The Bass part has a more static line, often holding the fifth of the mode (C).

Ex. 1: *Antoni pastor inclyte*, mm. 1-10

Until the very end of its first phrase in mm. 9-10, the alto gives the impression of being in Hypomixolydian as its movement – d'-e'-d'-g' and the subsequent return to d' – remains within the range of the species of fourth (*re-sol*) inherent to that mode. The bass, however, with its reiteration of the fifth C-g in mm. 2-3, 4-5, and 6-7 seems to be in Lydian.

The strong cadence on G in m. 9 would seem to lend credence to the fact that this piece is either in the 7th or 8th mode. Judging from its position within the Gardano print, the editor obviously understood this opening phrase to be in G Mixolydian, giving priority to the interrelationships between the upper three parts. This would be perfectly reasonable in a normal *a voce piena* disposition, for the fifth *ut-sol* in the tenor and soprano would be seen as being complemented by the fourth *re-sol* in the alto.

When, however, one subjects the composition to a more differentiated procedure of analysis, one which not only takes sixteenth century theoretical criteria into account but also analytical techniques which have been developed since that time, a different modal classification results. First of all, its



disposition is not standard. The upper three parts have a larger than normal range; the middle ones extend from e-a', the top from e'-f". Thus their melodic structure does not allow for an incontrovertible determination of their mode. Then, although the beginning seems to be in G Mixolydian – with a strong emphasis on C – the tonal center of certain other sections of the piece seems to be C. The first of these shifts in tonal focus is introduced by the motivic play in mm. 29-30 between the tenor and alto which leads to the strong cadence on C in 32 (see Example 2).

29

et de - stru - is

et de - stru - is,

nas et de - stru - is,

nas et de - stru - is,

Ex. 2: *Antoni pastor inclyte*, mm. 29-32

In the subsequent phrase, the melodic structure of the upper voices, with their emphasis on g, c', e', and g', also implies C Hypolydian. Following this, there is a rapid alternation between C and G cadences until the piece once again turns toward C as a tonal center with the *cadenza fuggita* in m. 79. The strength of C as the local tonal focus is confirmed by the cadence on C in m. 85 and by the foregoing motivic interplay in mm. 82-84 which bears similarity to that found in m. 29 when the piece first turns toward C Hypolydian (see Example 3).

82

Chri - sti

Chri - sti,

mis - si - o - ni - bus Chri - sti

bus Chri - sti

Ex. 3: *Antoni pastor inclyte*, mm. 82-85



The conclusion of the motet, however, once again leaves the tonal center of the whole composition in the air. Although the entire last section is apparently in C, the last full cadence is a *cadenza fuggita* on C (with a in the bass) in m. 93 which leads to the final „half cadence“ on G in the following measure (see Example 4). I hear this piece as being in mixture of Hypomixolydian and Hypolydian.

Ex. 4: *Antoni pastor inclyte*, mm. 89-94

The modal confusion here arises from the importance of the fourth *ut-fa* (G-C) in transposed Hypolydian and Hypomixolydian, something which already caused theorists difficulties in the sixteenth century. Ellen Beebe pointed out that Hermann Finck assigned *Misit me vivens pater* by Clemens non Papa to the 8th mode, based on his melodic analysis of the piece, although she herself would consider it to be in Hypolydian.<sup>9</sup> In this connection she writes

Motets that begin with the rising fourth g-c' may be confusing. Motets in Mode VI on C usually rise above the fourth a major third, as in the melodic type described above. In Mode VIII, on the other hand, the fourth *ut-fa* is part of the modal fifth, and further melodic activity may occur below *ut* (the final), in the fourth re-sol characteristic of the Mixolydian modes.<sup>10</sup>

When the range of the voices extends in both directions, however, it is at times difficult to decide which mode has priority. This is exactly the situation we have with *Antoni pastor inclyte*, where the melodic structure of the individual parts includes elements of the both modes, making a definitive determination of the mode of the entire piece difficult.

The refrain motet *O Thoma, laus et gloria* raises similar questions. As with *Antoni pastor inclyte* its disposition is not the standard one, but rather *ad*

<sup>9</sup> Ellen Beebe, *Mode, Structure, and Text Expression in the Motets of Jacobus Clemens non Papa: A Study of Style in Sacred Music*, dissertation, Yale University, 1976, 148-49.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 208.



*aequales*. In spite of this, the *exordium* gives all appearances of being modally clear. The tenor opens with the triad c'-e'-g' and is answered in the bass by g-a-c', thus clearly establishing a transposed Hypolydian modality (see Example 5).

The musical score is presented in three systems, each with four staves. The first system (mm. 1-4) shows the vocal staves with lyrics 'O Thomas, laus' and the piano accompaniment. The second system (mm. 5-8) continues the vocal lines with 'Thoma, laus et' and the piano accompaniment. The third system (mm. 9-14) concludes the phrase with 'laus et gloria, Prae-dica-to'. The piano accompaniment features a steady eighth-note pattern in the right hand and a more active bass line in the left hand.

Ex. 5: *O Thomas, laus et gloria*, mm. 1-14



This impression is maintained with the entrance of the other voices and confirmed by the *cadenza fuggita* on C in m. 10 (the bass has a) and the cadence on C in 14 which brings the *exordium* to a close. It is obviously for this reason that the composition has been placed in the group of motets in C Hypolydian. At this point of the piece, however, there is a shift towards Mixolydian. This is made abundantly clear not only by the two cadences on G in m. 18 and 23, but also by the cadence pattern of the refrain where cadences on d (mm. 23, 40, and 42 or mm. 52, 60, and 62 respectively) and G (mm. 35 and 43 or mm. 55 and 63 respectively) prevail. Thus, unlike *Antoni pastor inclyte* where the two modes seem to be irrevocably intertwined, in *O Thoma, laus et gloria* there seems to be a real shift from Hypolydian to Mixolydian, although this is somewhat masked by the irregular disposition which makes modal distinction more difficult.

A similar shift in modality, this time from F Lydian to C Hypomixolydian, takes place in the refrain responsory *O magnum mysterium – Ave Maria*. The first phrase of the bass in this motet clearly delineates the third species of fifth (see Example 6).

The musical score is presented in four systems, each with four staves. The top staff is a vocal line (likely Soprano or Alto) in treble clef with a key signature of one flat (B-flat). The second staff is a vocal line (likely Tenor) in treble clef with a key signature of one flat. The third staff is a vocal line (likely Bass) in treble clef with a key signature of one flat. The fourth staff is a bass line in bass clef with a key signature of one flat. The lyrics are written below the staves, with some words split across lines. The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and bar lines. The first system shows the beginning of the piece with the lyrics "O ma - gnum my - ste -". The second system continues with "ri - um," and "my - ste - ri - um,". The third system includes "et ad - mi - ra - bi - le sa - cra - men -". The fourth system concludes with "et ad - mi - ra - bi - le sa - cra - men - tum, et".

O ma - gnum my - ste -  
ri - um,  
my - ste - ri - um,  
et ad - mi - ra - bi - le sa - cra - men -  
et ad - mi - ra - bi - le sa - cra - men - tum, et



Ex. 6: *O magnum mysterium*, mm.1-14

It opens with f-a-c' and then falls back to f. The second phrase reaches down to c, returns to f, rises up to the Hypolydian repercussion tone a, and finally comes to rest at a cadence on f in m. 9. The alto enters half a bar after the bass. It presents a slightly ornamented version at the upper fifth of the first few notes of the bass, c'-e'-(f')-g', and then continues up to b-flat' before falling back to f'. The tenor, on the other hand, answers the bass within the third species of fourth, the fourth associated with Lydian, with c'-d'-f', and then falls back to c'. The e-flat in m. 5 should be understood as a reflection of the text as Willaert frequently uses a *fa* foreign to the mode to illustrate the word „mysterium“ in his motets. The tenor melody is repeated in the soprano at the upper octave in mm. 9-13. The *exordium* of this motet thus clearly appears to be in Lydian, with the bass and alto moving through the Hypolydian C octave, while the tenor and soprano outline the third species of fourth. F receives additional stress as a tonal center by means of the cadence in m. 9. These factors surely led to the placement of this work with the other motets in Lydian in the Gardano print.

Up through m. 35 the piece remains in this tonal area with cadences primarily on F and C. With the text „jacentem in praeseptio“, however, there is a momentary turn towards G Dorian. It is within this context that the opening phrase of the refrain „Beata Virgo, cuius viscera“ is introduced in m. 42. The refrain itself remains in C Hypomixolydian.

Like the first part, the second opens in F. After just a few measures, however, it too turns momentarily to G Dorian in m. 83, leading to the entrance of the refrain in m. 91. Because very little material appears before the appearance of the refrain in the second part, the primary tonal weight here is C Hypomixolydian.

Thus the tonal framework of both sections is the same: both open in F Lydian and pass through G Dorian on the way to the concluding C



Hypomixolydian refrain. Once again we have a mixture of modes similar to that of *O Thoma, laus et gloria*, in which there is an actual shift of mode within each section of the piece.

The situation is different with the motet *Magne martyr Adriane*. Looking at it today, one would clearly assign it to F Hypolydian. Why then was it placed by the editor in a group of motets in the complementary authentic mode?

The piece opens with a duet between the soprano and alto in which the opening subject in the soprano, f'-d'-c'-f', is answered exactly at the lower fifth in the alto, b-flat-a-f-b-flat (see Example 7).

The musical score is presented in three systems, each with four staves (Soprano, Alto, Tenor, Bass). The key signature is one flat (B-flat), and the time signature is common time (C). The lyrics are written below the staves, with hyphens indicating syllables that span multiple notes.

**System 1 (Measures 1-5):**

- Soprano: Ma - - gne - mar - - - tyr A - - -
- Alto: Ma - - gne - mar - - - - - - - - -
- Tenor: - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- Bass: - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

**System 2 (Measures 6-10):**

- Soprano: dri - - - a - - - - - - - - -
- Alto: - - tyr - A - dri - a - - - - - ne, ma - gne mar -
- Tenor: - - - - - Ma - - gne - mar -
- Bass: - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

**System 3 (Measures 11-15):**

- Soprano: ne, A - - dri - a - - - - - ne, ma - gne mar -
- Alto: - - - tyr A - dri - a - ne, ma - gne mar - - - -
- Tenor: - - - - - tyr - A - dri - a - - - - ne,
- Bass: mar - - - - tyr - A - - - - dri - - - a - - -



16

tyr, ma - gne mar -

tyr A - dri - a - ne,

8 ma - gne mar - tyr -

ne, ma - gne mar - tyr A -

Ex. 7: *Magnus martyr Adriane*, mm. 1-20

Although this response at the lower fifth initially obscures the tonal center of the piece, the ranges of the voices and the further progression of the two upper parts seems unmistakably to establish F Hypolydian as the mode. In mm. 8-11, however, the tenor outlines the third species of fifth with  $c'-a-f-c'$  and is answered by the bass with  $f-d-c-f$ . The tenor remains within the range of  $f-d'$  in its first phrase and the note  $c'$  receives particular emphasis. It is the tenor's opening tone and recurs frequently. It thus may easily have been understood as the repercussion tone of the Lydian mode. At the same time the tenor is paired with a bass which is obviously in Hypolydian; it first outlines the fourth,  $f-c$ , and then progresses through  $f$  to  $a$  and further to  $b$ -flat before it returns to  $f$ . Normally the entrance of such a tenor-bass voice pair at the beginning of a work in standard *a voce piena* disposition would imply that the entire work was in Lydian. This indeed must surely be the reason that the editor chose to put it in the group of F Lydian pieces.

Once again with this piece, however, an examination of the entire work results in a different modal classification, as the second entry of the tenor extends down into the lower fourth of the Hypolydian mode. Indeed, the bass and tenor both coexist in more or less the same range ( $c-c'$  and  $c-d'$  respectively), an octave below that of the soprano, making it obvious that this piece is in Hypolydian. We have thus once again seen how the two approaches, that of the sixteenth century music editor and that of the twentieth century musicologist, lead to differing classifications.

Usually, however, these two approaches did lead to the same classification in this print. This is due to the fact that in an average motet, the tonal center of the piece as a whole usually corresponds with the mode which is delineated by the *exordium*. When, however, the composer was playing with just this compositional element, the varying procedures of classification at times do produce differing results. Thus although *Antoni pastor inclyte* was placed among the motets in G Mixolydian, for us today it is modally ambiguous, in that it combines features of two modes, thus making a definitive determina-



tion of its mode impossible. Similar difficulties arise with *O Thoma, laus et gloria* and *O magnum mysterium–Ave Maria*. Whereas their placement in their respective groups on the basis of their *exordia* is relatively straightforward, the shift in mode within these motets makes an unequivocal determination of their modes – in the sense of a functioning single tonal center – impossible. And in *Magne martyr Adriane* the melodic interaction between the parts at the beginning suggests a modal classification which is later nullified by the further progression of the piece. The editor's procedure of classification in this volume served to group pieces with similar beginnings together, as seen in the melodic progression of the individual voices and the corresponding use of the species of fourths and fifths.

### The Order in *Liber secundus*

A different method of classification was used by the editor of the *Liber secundus* of 1545. As mentioned before, the motets in this print, with two exceptions, are in modes with minor thirds. Further grouping has been made on the basis of the cleffing (which is much more uniform within a single group than in the first book) and key signature. As modes were conventionally notated in a specific set of clefs and with a specific key signature, a grouping made on the basis of these criteria also had a tendency to bring a certain grouping by mode with it.<sup>11</sup> This is exemplified by the grouping in 1545c:

- (1) the first five pieces are in G Hypodorian – here the cleffing is low and, with one exception, is also uniform; there is a b-flat in the key signature;
- (2) the majority of the next six pieces are in a plagal A mode – the cleffing is low and uniform; there is no flat in the key signature;
- (3) three of the pieces are in G Dorian, two in D Hypodorian – the cleffing is high and the bass is in various clefs; there is a b-flat in the key signature;
- (4) the next two pieces are in two different modes, A Aeolian and D Hypodorian, but are both in high clefs and without a flat in the key signature;
- (5) the last three pieces are in three different modes (two of them with a major third); they are in low clefs with a flat in the key signature.

As one can see (Table 2), the modal grouping in this print is by no means as clear as in the first book. This is actually to be expected as classification on the basis of cleffing and key signature does not lead to clearly defined modal categories.

<sup>11</sup> Anne Smith, „Über Modus und Transposition um 1600“, *Basler Jahrbuch für historische Musikpraxis* 6(1982), 9-43. The tables in this article show that – even when there was a general theoretical consensus that a mode was usually notated in lower or higher clefs – there was quite a bit of variety among the clefs specifically mentioned for each mode. This variety is reflected in 1545c where the bass in pieces in high clefs is notated in C4, F3 and in F4 clefs. For two of the pieces, *Congratulamini–Beatam* (1545c, Nr. 2) and *Amorum fortissime – Te igitur* (1545c, Nr. 19) particularly low clefs were used (C2C4F3F4).



The first group is, nevertheless, very uniform as far as the mode is concerned. Given the fact that essentially all of the motets in 1545c are in modes with a minor third, those notated in low clefs and with a flat in the key signature can almost only be in G Hypodorian. In this specific case then, the cleffing and key signature is sufficient for modal identification.

The situation with the second group is much more complex. On the one hand, the combination of low clefs and no flat in the key signature allows for several different modal attributions: D Dorian, A Hypoaeolian, and E Phrygian are possible, and perhaps even E Hypophrygian (although there one would expect still lower clefs). And indeed it is these modes that we find represented in this group, with a general predominance of plagal A modes. In this case therefore the combination of the cleffing and key signature is insufficient for unambiguous modal determination and we have to look at other compositional elements to understand the constructive role of mode in these motets.

Even when we expand our horizons, modal determination in this group is not easy. This should not surprise us, as even theorists of the time had difficulties with A modes. This is due in part to the fact that there is no clear-cut way of classifying a piece in an A mode in the eightfold modal system. As a result, theorists at times attributed them to *protus* and *deuterus* modes, reflecting the fact that A modes traditionally exhibit a dual modal affinity, towards D and towards E. Pietro Aaron, for example, writes the following in his chapter on the first and second modes on D:

Alcuni altri tenori finiranno in A la mi re. bisogna considerare et esaminare se el processo suo e conveniente et rationale a tal terminatione, perche essendo fini irregularmente terminata al primo & secondo tuono & non procedendo colla sua forma propria potrebbe facilmente non essere di quel tuono, dato che sia fine irregolare et termine del suo seculorum overo differenza, questo e, che el terzo et quarto tuono ha simil luogo quanto alla differenza come seguitando intenderei.

Certain other tenors end on A *la mi re*; here you will need to consider and examine whether their procedure is suited and rational to such an ending, for if a tenor end irregularly in the first or second tone, not proceeding with its proper form, it may easily not belong to it, even though this step is one of its irregular finals and an ending of its Saeculorum or difference. As you will understand from what follows, this is because the third and fourth tones also use this step as a difference.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Pietro Aaron, *Trattato della natura et cognitione di tutti gli tuoni di canto figurato non da altrui piu scritti* (Venice, 1525). Facsimile, Bologna, n. d., ch. 4. The translation is from Oliver Strunk, *Source Readings in Music History: The Renaissance*, New York, 1965, 23.



and the following in his chapter on the third and fourth tones on E:

Alcuni altri anchora in A la mi re del terzo troverai, negli quali essendo in essi el processo conforme saranno giudicati di esso terzo tuono.

You will also find certain other compositions ending on *A la mi re*; when these observe the appropriate procedure they will be assigned to the third tone.<sup>13</sup>

This solution of forcing pieces in A modes into one of the pre-existing eight categories, however, was not completely satisfactory, as it did not really come to terms with the tonal structure of the music. It was in part to compensate for this lack that the twelvefold system was introduced. Even then, however, the ambiguity of the A modes was commented upon. Zarlino, for example, writes the following about the tenth mode, Hypoaeolian (according to his earlier numeration):

Potremo dire, che la natura di questo Modo sia non molto lontana da quella del Secondo, & del Quarto, se tal giudicio si può fare dall'harmonia, che nasce da esso: imperoche si serve della Diapente, che è commune del Secondo; & della Diatessaron, che serve anche il Quarto.

We could say that the nature of this mode is not very far from that of the second and of the fourth, if one can make this judgment from the *harmonia* which arises from it: because it uses the [species of] fifth which is usual for the second [mode] and the [species of] fourth which is also used the fourth [mode].<sup>14</sup>

So Zarlino, although he established space for A modes in his modal system, still recognizes their affinities to other modes. The complex nature of the structure of A modes makes it difficult to determine the mode of those pieces within this second group unequivocally.

I wish to examine the pieces within this group in greater detail as many of them illustrate how other formal elements can play an at least equally important structural role as mode in music of this period. They must therefore be taken into consideration if one wants to understand the progress of a composition, seen as a complete entity.

The difficulty in ascertaining the mode of *Ave regina coelorum* (1545c, Nr. 6) is not only related to the complex structure of the A modes, but also lies in its underlying contrapuntal structure, the canon at the fifth in the two upper parts. A canon of this sort necessarily undermines a sense of modal order because it disturbs the modal relationship between the voices. For

<sup>13</sup> Pietro Aaron, *Trattato della natura et cognitione di tutti gli tuoni di canto figurato non da altrui piu scritti* (Venice, 1525). Facsimile, Bologna, n. d., ch. 5. The translation is from Oliver Strunk, *Source Readings in Music History: The Renaissance*, New York, 1965, 25.

<sup>14</sup> Gioseffo Zarlino, *Le institutioni harmonice* (Venice, 1558). Facsimile, New York, 1965. *Quarta parte*, Cap. 227, 332.



example, here instead of having the mode of the soprano, A Hypoaeolian, to use Zarlino's nomenclature, complemented by its counterpart in the alto, the whole structure of the melody has simply been moved down a fifth, thus creating a sense of instability regarding the tonal center of the whole. Nevertheless, the counterpoint at the beginning of these two parts establishes clarity. The initial movement in the soprano in mm. 5-7 outlines the modal fourth, e'-g'-a' (see Example 8); the arrival on the final of the mode is supported by the entry of the canonic voice on a.

Canon duorum temporum fuga in subdiapente

A - ve Re - gi - na coe -

gi - na coe - lo - rum, Ma - ter re - gis

A - ve Re - gi - na coe - lo - rum,

lo - rum, Ma - ter re - gis an - ge -

lo - rum, Ma - ter re - gis

Ex. 8: *Ave Regina coelorum*, mm. 1-12

The end of the soprano's first melodic phrase in mm. 9-10 on *fa-mi* is accompanied by a so-called „plagal“ cadence on A in the other parts. The end of this same phrase in the alto exhibits a movement from the sixth b-g' to the octave a-a' between the two upper parts, thus clearly establishing the tonal center of the composition. This clarity, however, is masked by the first few measures. There the tenor and bass anticipate the entry of the canonic voices. They enter, however, a fourth lower, on b and e. This leaves the listener wondering whether E or A is of primary importance modally. The melodic structure of the soprano, however, coupled with the prevalence of cadences on A in the opening section („plagal“ cadences in mm. 10, 25, and 30; and a *cadenza fuggita* in m. 32) reveal the predominance of A. Within mm. 34-59



there is a movement towards D Dorian. In m. 63., however, the soprano once again brings the opening phrase, thereby clearly re-establishing A as the tonal center.<sup>15</sup>

This piece thus displays the dual affinity so typical of A modes, bending at the beginning towards E and in the middle section towards D. This, in conjunction with the canon in the upper two parts, makes the determination of the mode more difficult.

The melodic and cadence structure of *Spiritus meus – Libera me* (1545c, Nr. 7), particularly in the first section, is quite clear in comparison to the other works in A Hypoaeolian in this group. Although there are repeated turns toward G Hypomixolydian in the second section, the A tonal center remains predominant.

*Veni sancte Spiritus – Sine tuo* (1545c, Nr. 8) is the sole representative of D Dorian in this group. Modal determination is made simple here due to the presence of the *cantus firmus* in D Dorian.

The picture presented by *Domine Jesu Christe – Et concede* (1545c, Nr. 9) is once again more complex. At first glance the opening measures would seem to suggest E Phrygian (see Example 9).

Do - mi - ne Je - su Chri - ste, Je -

ste, Je - su Chri - ste, me - men -

ne Je - su Chri - ste, me - men -

<sup>15</sup> For a detailed analysis of this piece, see pp 148-152.



11

to quod tu di-xi - - sti: vi - vo e -

8 to quod tu di-xi - - sti: vi - vo

8 to quod tu di-xi - - sti: vi - vo e - - -

to quod tu di-xi - - sti: vi - vo e - - - go,

16

go, et no-lo mor - tem pec - ca - to - - ris.

8 go, et no-lo mor - - - tem pec - ca - to - ris.

8 go, et no-lo mor - - - tem pec - ca - to - ris.

et no-lo mor - tem pec - ca - to - - - - ris.

Ex. 9 *Domine Jesu Christe - Et concede*, mm. 1-21

The opening motif, which is almost the same in all the three upper parts, circles around *b* before reaching up to *d* and falling to *g*. The bass enters on *e* and leads to a *cadenza fuggita* on this same note (*c'* appears in the tenor) in m. 7. All of this makes one think of E Phrygian. This impression, however, is negated by the following cadences (G4-3 in m. 11 and C in mm. 15, 16, and 19) before the *exordium* comes to a close in A in m. 21. This last cadence is given additional weight by the following two cadences on A in mm. 25 and 28. At this point there is a shift to G Hypomixolydian, as may be seen by the melodic structure of the voices (the prominence of the repercussion tone in the tenor in mm. 32-38, for example, cannot be overlooked) as well as in the cadential structure (a cadence on C in m. 36, cadences on G in mm. 41 and 44). There is a short return to the A tonal area with the *cadenza fuggita* in m. 53. The piece then returns to the G Hypomixolydian realm, only returning to the A tonal center just before the end of the first section. The second part opens with a major triad on A and basically remains centered around A throughout the entire section, although there are references to Hypomixolydian with the cadence on C in m. 91 and the avoided cadence on G in m. 93. The entire piece ends on a so-called „plagal“ cadence on E.



The piece as a whole is thus in A Hypoaeolian with, however, a clear shift to G Hypomixolydian in the first section. Indeed, the opening motif in the upper three parts might almost suggest G Hypomixolydian, outlining as it does the fifth g-d; this is undermined by the bass, though, with its entry on E and its suggestion of Phrygian, something we have seen is typical for Hypoaeolian. The obvious cadence on A at the end of the *exordium*, however, makes the mode clear. The shift to G Hypomixolydian, prepared by the opening motif, may be understood as an illustration of the text, for it occurs at the point in which Jesus is requested to turn merciful eyes towards a sinner, towards an aberrant, as he did to Peter, Mary Magdalena and the thief. The second section, in which these three are seen to turn towards Christ as the Savior, remains in A Hypoaeolian. The use of mode here serves to underline the message imparted by the text.

*Quem terra – Beata coeli* (1545c, Nr. 10) is obviously in a plagal A mode. Unlike the other motets in A in the second group, it is based on a chant melody in the „old-fashioned“ mode A Hypodorian. This would be a categorization similar to those carried out by Pietro Aaron. The cadence structure of the motet is otherwise quite similar to that of the previous two motets; it is, however, clearly centered around A.

*Dulces exuviae* (1545c, Nr. 11) is in many ways an exceptional composition in this collection. It has no liturgical function and its text – Dido's words as she approaches death – is taken from Virgil's *Aeneid*, IV, 651-658. Its setting is unlike any of the others in the volume (see Example 10). The phrases are obviously set off from one another by clear cadences and often by rests. There is little of the overlapping between phrases found in the other works. The declamation is astonishingly homophonic for Willaert; imitation remains suggestive. The harmonic movement seems at times quite modern, primarily because of the chromaticism in the upper parts coupled with the appropriate movement by a fourth or a fifth in the bass.

Dul - ces ex - u - - vi - ae, dum fa - ta De -

Dul - ces ex - - - u - vi - ae, dum fa - ta De -

Dul - ces ex - u - - vi - ae, dum fa - ta De -

Dul - ces ex - u - - vi - ae, dum fa - ta De -



6  
us-que si - ne - bat Ac - ci - pi -

11  
te hanc a - ni - mam, ac - ci - pi - te hanc a - ni -  
Ac - ci - pi - te hanc a - ni - mam, ac - ci - pi - te hanc a -  
te hanc a - ni - mam, ac - ci - pi - te hanc a -  
te hanc a - ni - mam, ac - ci - pi - te hanc a -

16  
mam me - que his ex - ol - vi - te cu - ris.  
- ni - mam me - que his ex - ol - vi - te cu - ris.  
- ni - mam me - que his ex - ol - vi - te cu - ris.  
- ni - mam me - que his ex - ol - vi - te cu - ris.

Ex. 10: *Dulces exuviae*, mm. 1-21

In conjunction with the distinct phrasing, these strong cadences make it difficult to determine the mode of this piece, as they seem to wrench the music from one tonal area to another. This is no doubt intended as a reflection of the desperation of Dido's words. Taken alone, however, the melody of the soprano – which is clearly the predominant voice here – may be easily



understood to be in E Phrygian. The majority of the cadences are on E, D, A, and G, the tones which comprise the *clausulae principales* and *minus principales* for the third mode. Seen vertically however – analyzing the work using later criteria – the beginning seems to be clearly in A, starting as it does with an A minor triad and already coming to the first caesura in m. 4 with a „plagal“ cadence on an A major triad. In fact the piece remains tonally centered around A until the „plagal“ cadence in m. 32. There are no further cadences on A; in m. 70 as well as in m. 86, a cadence formula leading towards A is broken off midstream. It is not until the end, in m. 93, that Willaert brings the only full cadence on E; this is strengthened by the concluding „plagal“ cadence two measures later. Due to the sparsity of cadences, E does not seem to have the stability required of a tonal center by the modern day listener.

This piece leaves many questions concerning its modality open. Taken in conjunction with the final chord, is the melodic structure of the top voice sufficient to determine the mode? Is there an actual shift in tonality within the piece from A to E, or did the trained listener of the time also hear the beginning as being in E? How is the intermediate material with its cadences on D, C, and G to be interpreted?

Thus we have seen that a modal classification of the motets in the second group which goes beyond the mere mechanical recognition of the cleffing and key signature raises many questions, as each piece has its own constructive framework, each piece makes its own use of mode. In *Ave Regina coelorum* the foremost structural element is the canon at the lower fifth which in turn creates some ambiguity at the modal level. *Domine Jesu Christe – Et concede* uses a mixture of modes to illustrate the text. And *Dulces exuviae*, too, with its „modern“ style, is difficult to classify modally. Indeed, modal classification was relatively simple only in three cases: *Spiritus meus – Libera me*, *Veni sancte Spiritus – Sine tuo*, and *Quem terra – Beata coeli*. In two of these the mode is given by the *cantus firmus*; in *Spiritus meus – Libera me* it is expressed in the melodic progression of the individual voices and the cadential structure without any additional formal device. This group thus clearly illustrates the compositional complexities generally associated with E and A modes.

The third group consists of motets in high clefs with a flat in the key signature. As one would expect the pieces are in G Hypodorian and D Hypoaeolian. From a modal point of view, the two motets in D, *Flete oculi* (1545c, Nr. 12) and *Beatus Joannes – Ipse est* (1545c, Nr. 14) are perhaps most interesting. In *Le institutioni harmoniche* Zarlino listed *Flete oculi* as an example of a composition in the tenth mode (according to his earlier numeration), here transposed down a fifth to D.<sup>16</sup> Pietro Aaron, a proponent of the

<sup>16</sup> Gioseffo Zarlino, *Le institutioni harmoniche* (Venice, 1558). Facsimile, New York, 1965. Quarta parte, Cap. 27, 332.



eight-mode system, would have probably said that it was in D Hypodorian, as he wrote the following about pieces in D with a b-flat in the key signature:

Et similmente alcuni altri col segno di B molle, Dico che questi non muteranno natura, perche non si remove altro che el suo diatessaron formato da A la mi re ad D la sol re, non si movendo adunque el suo primo et natural diapente, sara chiamato anchor del primo tuono ...

The same is also true of certain other compositions with a flat signature; the nature of these remains unchanged, in my opinion, for only the diatessaron, formed by the interval A la mi re to D la sol re, is altered. Seeing then that the diapente primary and natural to the tone is left intact, such compositions are also to be assigned to the first tone.<sup>17</sup>

There was no other way for Aaron to classify a mode with this structure in the eight-mode system. Nicola Vicentino, while not embracing the twelvefold system, saw it as being outside the eightfold one, describing it as a mixed mode, one which joined the first species of fifth from the first mode with the second species of fourth from the third mode.<sup>18</sup> Thus we are faced here with difficulties similar to the ones we observed with the A modes. The question of whether Willaert, Zarlino's teacher, perceived this motet to be in Hypoaeolian (as a modernist) or in a modified version of Dorian (as a traditionalist) cannot be answered. The general melodic and cadential structure of both *Flete oculi* and *Beatus Joannes* corroborates that these pieces are in what Zarlino would have called D Hypoaeolian.

The fourth group has high clefs and no flat in the key signature. The two motets in this group represent the two modes one would expect to find with this combination, D Hypodorian and A Aeolian.

The fifth group appears to be a miscellany. It contains the only two motets in the print in modes with major thirds as well as a piece in G Hypodorian, which logically should have been placed in the first group.

This print thus clearly demonstrates the limitations of the procedure of ordering the motets on the basis of their cleffing and key signature, at least as a method of modal determination. To begin with, even if we confine ourselves to the modes with minor thirds, there is no exclusive mapping of a specific set of clefs and key signature to a single mode. As we have seen in the second, third, and fourth groups two, even three modes can be represented by the same cleffing and key signature. Secondly, this method does not even attempt to answer questions concerning modal structure within the compositions

<sup>17</sup> Pietro Aaron, *Trattato della natura et cognitione di tutti gli tuoni di canto figurato non da altrui piu scritti* (Venice, 1525). Facsimile, Bologna, n.d., ch. 4. The translation is from Oliver Strunk, *Source Readings in Music History: The Renaissance*, New York, 1965, 22.

<sup>18</sup> Nicola Vicentino, *L'antica musica ridotta alla moderna prattica* (Rome, 1555). Facsimile, ed. Edward Lowinsky, Cassel, 1959, fol. 51.



themselves, but is merely a reflection of the fact that certain cleffings and key signatures were conventionally associated with specific modes. On the other hand, analysis of these works as entities, particularly those in A and E modes, shows that one often has to look beyond mode to other structural features to gain understanding of the progress of the music.

### *Summary*

The two Gardano prints exemplify two separate sixteenth century conventions for ordering compositions, both of which are quite different from a modern analytical approach. The intent of the first two is to group works together which share certain common features; the intent of the latter is to attain an understanding of how a piece works. The discrepancy between these intentions may in part be explained by the difference in the physical access the editors had to the music in contrast to that possessed by modern musicologists. In general, the editors could only examine the individual parts, whereas we may view the pieces in score, that is in their totality. It is therefore not surprising that the demands that we place on a method of ordering are so different from those of a sixteenth century editor.

Why, however, did the editor(s) not use the same classification procedure in both volumes? Is it not possible that the first method of classification was abandoned because it was too difficult to put into use in the second volume? We have seen how difficult it is to determine the mode of some of these pieces, in particular those in E and A modes, even when we have a full score of the compositions at our disposal. Just think how much more difficult a task this would be if we only had the individual parts in front of us. Perhaps the editor of the second book, upon realizing that he could not establish the mode of the pieces by looking at the opening measures of the individual parts, then decided to fall back on two incontrovertible features which are often associated with mode, the cleffing and key signature.

What these two different conventions of ordering compositions do tell us, is that these various features were considered to be important as discriminating factors in compositional structure, particularly in relation to mode. And it is in that sense that we can also see these ordering principles as valuable sources of information for us about what we can expect to learn about modal distinction from sixteenth century theorists. At the same time it becomes evident that the conventions cannot, in and of themselves, fulfill our desire of understanding how a piece functions as a whole. Indeed, analysis of the pieces in E and A modes has clearly demonstrated that we not only have to look beyond these criteria but also beyond modal considerations to gain some insight into the functioning of these motets.



Table 1:

Mode and Cleffing in *Liber primus* (1545)

Motet	Cleffing	Mode
1. <i>Congratulamini-Recedentibus</i>	g2C2C3F3	G Auth.
2. <i>Antoni pastor inclyte</i>	g2C3C3F3	G-C
3. <i>Omnipotens sempiterne Deus</i>	C1C2C3F3	G Auth.
4. <i>O gemma clarissima</i>	C1C3C3F3	C Plagal
5. <i>O Thoma, laus et gloria</i>	C1C2C3C4	C-G
6. <i>Angelus Domini descendit</i>	C1C3C3F3	C Plagal
7. <i>Joannes Apostolus-Ecclesiam tuam</i>	g2C2C3C4	C Plagal
8. <i>Natale sanctae Euphemiae-Tu Domine</i>	C1C3C3C4	C Plagal
9. <i>O magnum mysterium-Ave Maria</i>	g2C2C3F4 b	F-C
10. <i>Magne martyr Adriane</i>	C1C3C4F4 b	F Plagal
11. <i>In tua patientia</i>	g2C2C3F3 b	F Auth.
12. <i>Homo quidam-Christus vere</i>	g2C2C3F3 b	F Auth.
13. <i>Nazaraeus vocabitur</i>	C1C3C3F3 b	F Auth.
14. <i>Videns Dominus</i>	C1C3C4F4	G Plagal
15. <i>Quasi unus-Deus, qui beatum Marcum</i>	C1C3C4F4	G Plagal
16. <i>Benedicta es-Per illud ave</i>	C1C3C4F4	G Plagal
17. <i>Salve, crux sancta-Causa etiam</i>	C1C3C4F4	G Plagal
18. <i>Mirabile mysterium</i>	C1C3C4F4	G Plagal
19. <i>Sancte Paule Apostole</i>	C1C3C4F4 b	F Plagal
20. <i>Ave Regina coelorum-Gaude gloriosa</i>	C2C4F3F4 b	F Plagal
21. <i>Inviolata-Nostra ut pura</i>	C2C4F3F4 b	F Plagal
22. <i>Dominus regit me-Parasti</i>	C2C4F3F4 b	F Plagal
23. <i>Saluto te-Rogo te</i>	C1C3C4F4 b	F Plagal
24. <i>Patefactae sunt-Mortem enim</i>	C1C3C4F4 b	F Plagal



Table 2:

Mode and Cleffing in *Liber secundus* (1545)

Motet	Cleffing	Mode	
1. <i>Pater noster-Ave Maria</i>	C1C3C4F4 b	g	Plagal
2. <i>Congratulamini-Beatam</i>	C2C4F3F4 b	g	Plagal
3. <i>Parens tonantis maximi</i>	C1C3C4F4 b	g	Plagal
4. <i>Usquequo Domine-Illumina</i>	C1C3C4F4 b	g	Plagal
5. <i>Magnum haereditatis mysterium</i>	C1C3C4F4 b	g	Plagal
6. <i>Ave Regina coelorum</i>	C1C3C4F4	a	Plagal
7. <i>Spiritus meus-Libera me</i>	C1C3C4F4	a	Plagal
8. <i>Veni sancte Spiritus-Sine tuo</i>	C1C3C4F4	d	Auth.
9. <i>Domine Jesu Christe-Et concede</i>	C1C3C4F4	a	Plagal
10. <i>Quem terra-Beata coeli</i>	C1C3C4F4	a	Plagal
11. <i>Dulces exuviae</i>	C1C3C4F4	e?	Auth.
12. <i>Flete oculi</i>	g2C2C3F4 b	d	Plagal
13. <i>Beatus Stephanus-Et videntes</i>	g2C2C3C4 b	g	Auth.
14. <i>Beatus Joannes-Ipse est</i>	g2C2C3C4 b	d	Plagal
15. <i>Victimae paschali-Dic nobis</i>	g2C2C3F3 b	g	Auth.
16. <i>Surgit Christus-Dic Maria</i>	g2C2C3F3 b	g	Auth.
17. <i>Intercessio quaesumus</i>	g2C2C3F4	a	Auth.
18. <i>Qui habitat in adjutorio</i>	g2C2C3C4	d	Plagal
19. <i>Amorum fortissime-Te igitur</i>	C2C4F3F4 b	C	Auth.
20. <i>Regina coeli laetare</i>	C1C3C4F4 b	F	Plagal
21. <i>In illo tempore stabant</i>	C1C3C4F4 b	g	Plagal



## II. Willaert's Use of Mode in „*Mirabile mysterium*“ and „*Ave Regina coelorum*“

Adrian Willaert is a rather anomalous figure in that his music was highly prized by his contemporaries but is hardly known today. Born around 1490, he went to Italy as a young man (documentary evidence shows that he was in the service of Cardinal Ippolito I d'Este by July 1515 at the latest). In 1527 he was chosen to be *maestro di cappella* at S. Marco in Venice, a position which he maintained until his death in 1562. In his century he was accorded the highest accolades as a composer. Zarlino wrote that his principal purpose in his writings was to describe and formulate the fundamental rules of polyphony as represented by contemporary composers and „especially according to the way and manner used by Adrian Willaert, that most excellent practitioner of great judgment and of most green and felicitous memory“.<sup>19</sup> Giulio Cesare Monteverdi, in his defense of his brother Claudio in 1607, wrote that the *prima prattica* was „finally perfected by Messer Adriano with actual composition and by the most excellent Zarlino with most judicious rules“.<sup>20</sup> Today, however, his works are rarely performed, and even more rarely recorded (there are only a handful of motets listed under his name in the standard catalogues of recordings). This is due, in part, to the density of his style as well as to the intellectual demands he places on those who perform and even on those who merely listen to his music. He seems – and in this he bears some similarity to C.P.E. Bach – to have taken pleasure in playing with his listeners' expectations, leading them on the basis of some convention to expect a specific musical event and then surprising them by bringing something else, often in a somewhat veiled manner. Thus to understand his music, one has to be very aware of the compositional practices of the time in order to derive pleasure from Willaert's manipulation of them. His skill in these manipulations is quite evident on both the modal as well as on the contrapuntal level in the two works which are to be examined here.

*Mirabile mysterium* and *Ave Regina coelorum* both appear in the 1545 Gardano editions of four-part Willaert motets. These two prints, which include many works that were published by Scotto in 1539, are ordered by mode. To be sure, they are not ordered in the neat numeric fashion exhibited by the edition of Rore's first book of madrigals published in Venice in 1542. Tables I and II show the distribution of modes within the two prints (see pp. 138-139). A first and obvious difference between the two volumes is that *Liber primus* only contains works in modes with major thirds, whereas *Liber secundus*, with two exceptions, contains works in modes with minor thirds.

<sup>19</sup> Gioseffo Zarlino, *Sopplimenti musicali*, quoted from Lewis Lockwood, „Adrian Willaert“, *The New Groves Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, Vol.20, 423.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.



Closer examination, however, reveals that varying methods of modal classification were used for the two volumes. In *Liber primus* the tonal character of the *exordia* seems to have been crucial in determining the classification of the individual pieces; in *Liber secundus*, however, the motets seem to have been ordered by what Harold Powers calls „tonal types“, the individual groups marked by a uniformity of cleffing.<sup>21</sup> The motets in these prints were thus classified in some way as representing certain modes.

I have chosen *Mirabile mysterium* and *Ave Regina coelorum* because their tonal structure does not correspond with the modal conventions of the later sixteenth century, although their position in the 1545 prints leaves no doubt as to the editor's assignation of their „mode“, the eighth and the tenth respectively. By looking at such exceptional works, ones that go beyond the realm of normal conventions, one gains insight into mode's role in composition.

\*

One of the ideas that fascinated me most when I first read Bernhard Meier's classic, *Die Tonarten der klassischen Vokalpolyphonie*,<sup>22</sup> was that a trained late sixteenth-century musician, upon *hearing* a normal piece in standard *a voce piena* distribution for the first time, would have been able to identify its mode on the basis of the motivic and cadential structure of its *exordium*. On the one hand, it made me realize the extent of the difference with which I listened to sixteenth century music and that of later epochs where certain tonal conventions are taken for granted (whether expressed in the language of thorough bass or functionality) and, on the other hand, it made me curious about the degree to which I would be able to cultivate the ability to distinguish the mode of a sixteenth-century piece simply by hearing it or, more specifically, its opening. I soon discovered that although there clearly were conventions concerning the modal progress of a piece of music, they were by no means infrangible. Indeed, other features seem to have played an equally important role in determining the structure of polyphonic works.

By mid-century, however, convention did begin to dictate that the mode of a piece be presented in the *exordium*, through the melodic and cadential structure of the individual parts. Gallus Dreßler in his *Praecepta Musicae Poeticae* of 1563-4, for example, writes that

Sumantur autem exordia ex praecipuis  
fontibus tonorum videlicet ex specie-  
bus diatessaron et diapente vel ex  
repercussionibus et prinicpalibus

The *exordia* are taken from the prin-  
cipal sources of the tones, namely  
from the species of the fourth and  
fifth or from the repercussion tones

<sup>21</sup> Harold S. Powers, „Tonal Types and Modal Categories in Renaissance Polyphony“, *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 34 (1981), 428-70.

<sup>22</sup> Bernhard Meier, *Die Tonarten der klassischen Vokalpolyphonie*, Utrecht, 1974.



clausulis. Non enim pueros exordiis peregrina vel minus usitata immiscere velim, sed adducant tonis convenientia ut sine mora aures de certo aliquo tono iudicium statuant. Quo facto harmonia gratior sit et aures magis demulceat...

and the principal cadences. I prefer [my] students not to mix a *peregrina* or less used [cadence] into the *exordia* but rather they should lead to the tones by means of a convergence, so that the ears may immediately form a judgment about any specific tone. This done, the harmony should be more pleasing and caress the ears more...<sup>23</sup>

Although this comment was clearly directed towards pupils, perhaps implying that the experienced master did not necessarily limit himself to the principal cadence points in an *exordium*, it does tell us that for Dreßler the mode of a piece conventionally evinced itself in the work's opening measures. Is this true, however, for Willaert's *Mirabile mysterium*?

The mode of *Mirabile mysterium* is given by its *cantus firmus*, the chant melody in G Hypomixolydian on the same text; it is to be assumed that the educated church musician of the time would have known this melody and its assignation to the eighth mode in the chant repertory. And indeed, the editor of the 1545 Gardano *Liber primus* print included this motet in the Hypomixolydian group. The phrases of the chant melody are divided up and appear in various parts, primarily in the soprano and tenor. In a standard *a voce piena* distribution one would expect the soprano and tenor to be in Hypomixolydian, and that the alto and bass would be in the corresponding authentic mode. The principal cadence points of Hypomixolydian are G and D, as well as C, the repercussion tone of the eighth mode, although Pontio also allows cadences on F and A *per transito*.<sup>24</sup>

The first few measures of the *exordium* of *Mirabile mysterium* are fraught with surprises. The bass opens with the first few notes of the chant melody (see examples 11 and 12 on pp.153-158). This is imitated a half bar later at the upper fifth by the alto. Taken alone, these voices would be a perfectly normal opening in Hypomixolydian. The tenor, however, is rather jarring, to say the least, in the context of G Hypomixolydian. With the b-flat in measure 2, the whole modal context is placed in question, as a minor third has been substituted for the major third so characteristic for that mode. The feeling of instability is then augmented by the fifth e - b in m. 4 between the bass and alto. Just at this point the soprano enters with the *cantus firmus*, repeating the notes from the bass in mm. 4-7. This time both the tenor and alto enter half a bar later than the chant melody. Both repeat the motifs they had at the

<sup>23</sup> Gallus Dreßler, *Praecepta musicae poeticae*, Ms., 1563/64, ed. B. Engelke, *Geschichts-Blätter für Stadt und Land Magdeburg*, 49/50 (1914/15), cap. 12., 244.

<sup>24</sup> Pietro Pontio, *Ragionamento di Musica*, Parma, 1588. Facs. ed. Suzanne Clercx (Documenta musicologica I/16), Kassel, Basel, etc. 1959, 117.



opening with very small variants. The alto has taken on the opening minor third of the tenor; the tenor, instead of moving in thirds with the chant melody, now moves in thirds with the alto. (Such minor alterations are very characteristic for Willaert. It is as if he is showing off his mastery by intentionally varying that which is expected.) Thus, following the fifth e - b in m. 4, we have the fifth b-flat - f' in m. 5, the fifth a - e in m. 6, and, as part of a sixth chord, the fourth b - e' in m. 7. I must confess, that for a short moment I rashly contemplated flattening the e in the bass in m. 4 by *ficta*, but quickly rejected the notion once I realized the far-reaching consequences. In m. 8 the soprano continues with the *cantus firmus* melody, bringing the first phrase to a close on F in m. 11. The movement of a third at „mysterium“ is reminiscent of the tenor's opening third at „mirabile“; perhaps this is one source for the tenor's motif. The bass brings the opening four notes of the alto an octave lower in mm. 8-10. The first phrase thus is an intricate, complex unit, one which I suspect would have left all but the most elite, even in the sixteenth century, modally baffled on a first hearing.

The second phrase of the chant melody is brought twice, first in the soprano from m. 11 to m. 17, then in the tenor from m. 18 to 23. Here, too, we have a dense imitative network based on the diatonic ascent of a third at the beginning of „declaratur“ and of „hodie“. What is startling here is the rapid succession of cadences. The first, on E, is between the alto and bass in mm. 12-13. Then one is led to believe that there will be a cadence on C at the beginning of m. 14. At that point the tenor comes to the close of its imitation of the soprano melody from m. 8-12 at the lower fifth, thus suggesting there will be a cadence on C. This is supported by the alto and bass which seem as if they will respectively bring the tenor and bass clausulae. Instead the alto resolves too quickly, and the bass moves to f, and the cadence is neatly avoided. In m. 15 the alto and bass seem to be leading to a cadence on E; the bass, however, rests just when it should bring its final tone. In the meantime the tenor moves up to C, thereby altering the tonal outcome. In m. 17 we once again have a *cadenza fuggita*; just at the moment when the soprano and tenor come to a proper cadence on A, the bass moves up to F. In the following measure the alto and bass cadence on D. The setting of „declaratur hodie“ is brought to a close with a cadence on A in m. 23. Of these cadences, only the one on D in m. 18 is on a true cadence point of Hypomixolydian. The ones on A, to be sure, would be accepted by Pontio *per transito*; coming as they do at the end of the *exordium*, however, they require some explication.

Bernhard Meier has pointed out that the cadence plans of classical polyphonic works based on a *cantus firmus* are often significantly at variance with those without a *cantus prius factus*.<sup>25</sup> This is due to the fact that the cadential structure of the chant melodies influences that of the work upon which it is based. As opposed to polyphonic works, the cadential structure of

<sup>25</sup> Op. cit, p. 98.



Gregorian chant is melodic. In chant, caesuras are thus frequently related to the tension between the fundamental note of the mode and the notes immediately adjacent to it. For this reason, many chant melodies in Hypomixolydian display cadences on F and A, as does *Mirabile mysterium* in its first phrase. This may perhaps be an explanation for the cadences on F in m. 11 and A in mm. 17 and 23 – although if Willaert had really desired it, he could have probably found another solution which would have enabled him to stay within the polyphonic realm of G Hypomixolydian – but it does not explain the minor third at the beginning, with the resultant cross relations, nor does it explain the subsequent rapid succession of cadences, some of which are rather foreign to the mode. For an interpretation of these one has to look in a different direction.

Sixteenth-century theorists were in agreement that music should serve the text, should reflect the affects expressed by the specific words of a composition. And it is here that we can find an explication for the musical events discussed above. Let us therefore examine the text more closely. The work is an antiphon in the Lauds service for the circumcision of the Lord:

Mirabile mysterium	A miraculous mystery
declaratur hodie:	is proclaimed today:
innovantur naturae:	the natures [of God and man] are renewed:
Deus homo factus est:	God has become man:
id quod fuit permansit,	that which He was He has remained,
et quod non erat assumpsit:	and that which He was not He has assumed:
non commixtionem passus,	He has not suffered commixture
non divisionem.	nor division [of the natures].

The subject of the text is the double nature of Christ, who became man while remaining God.

The first words, „Mirabile mysterium declaratur hodie“, emphasize the mystery of Christ's birth. Willaert illustrates this by undermining the sense of a tonal center in the *exordium*. It is here that we find the explanation for the *fa* which does not belong to the mode in the second measure of the tenor. On the one hand, he seems to have associated the use of such modally „foreign“ *fa*'s with the word „mysterium“, for it is also found in other works, for example at the beginning of *O magnum mysterium – Ave Maria* (see example 13 on p. 158). On the other hand, by locating it as he did in conjunction with the other voices, he reveals his intention of shocking the listener's sense of tonality by bringing the minor third in such an important, exposed moment of the piece. The subsequent cross relations contribute to the instability. This is by no means a unique use of this technique on the part of Willaert. In the opening bars of *Beatus Joannes – Ipse est* he also uses a *fa* that is foreign to the mode for the setting of the word „beatus“ (see example



14 on page 159). Here, too, it leads to cross relations, but of a less extravagant nature.

The following rapid series of cadences in *Mirabile mysterium* add to the tonal instability, depicting in a still more extended way the mystery surrounding Christ's birth. Indeed, it is not until m. 29 at the conclusion of the first statement of „innovantur naturae“, „the natures are renewed“ that we have the first full cadence on G. Just at the point in the text when we have a renewal of God's and man's basic natures, we also have a renewal of the tonal basis of the motet, namely G with the major third proper to the mode. This is confirmed by the next two cadences, the first in m. 32 where a cadence on G is avoided by the movement in the tenor and alto to c' and e' respectively and the cadence on C in m. 36, a principal cadence point in Hypomixolydian. Willaert uses yet another compositional technique to illustrate the renewal of the natures. Not only does he cadence on tones proper for the mode, he also presents the last statement of „innovantur naturae“ in *faux-bourdon* style in mm. 33-36. Bernhard Meier has already pointed out that passages in *faux-bourdon* style were often employed for text-illustrative purposes in sixteenth-century polyphonic works.<sup>26</sup> One of its functions was to depict age. Its use can therefore be understood in a figurative sense here, referring to the basic, time-worn natures of God and man which underwent renewal through the birth of Christ.

There is thus a direct relationship between the text and the fact that the tonal center of *Mirabile mysterium* is only clearly established polyphonically after the *exordium* has been brought to a close. Willaert thus went far beyond mere „madrigalistic“ illustration of the individual words of the text, making use of a wide variety of compositional techniques in his efforts to express the text's meaning. This may also be seen in the further progress of the motet.

If one views the rest of the text in light of his treatment of the first three lines, one notices some further tonal and textual relationships. The fourth line, „Deus homo factus est“, „God has become man“, again deals with the paradox surrounding Christ's birth. The tonal center of this phrase is F, established by the cadences on F in mm. 39, 40, 43 and 48 (the first of which, to be sure, is a *cadenza fuggita*) and the single cadence on C in m. 45. This evokes a connection to the first cadence in the work in m. 11 on F, and thus between the „*Mirabile mysterium*“ and its manifestation, „*Deus homo factus est*“.

In the next line „id quod fuit permansit“, „that which He was He has remained“, the tonal center once again immediately returns to the realm of Hypomixolydian. Willaert avoids an immediate cadence on G in m. 50 only to

<sup>26</sup> Op. cit., 231-2.



land more solidly on it in m. 52, followed by an avoided cadence on D in m. 56, and cadences on C and D in mm. 59 and 61 respectively. Thus we have a situation here parallel to the one at „innovantur naturae“ where the renewal of the natures of God and man is conveyed by the clear establishment of a tonal center. Here, the permanence of God's nature is expressed by the reaffirmation of the mode after the short turn towards F at „Deus homo factus est“. The concept of constancy is given further weight by the suspensions with their associated dissonances which appear with each entrance of the *soggetto* on „id quod fuit“. It is as if the voices wanted to demonstrate how steadfast they were by always lingering too long on their first note.

It comes as no surprise then that he once again turns away from the principal cadences of Hypomixolydian for the following line „et quod non erat assumpsit“, „and that which He was not He has assumed“, with a *cadenza fuggita* in m. 66 on A and in m. 70 on E, and full cadences on A in mm. 69 and 71. The final lines of the motet, „non commixtionem passus, non divisionem“, „He has not suffered commixture nor division [of the natures]“, which once again affirm God's permanence also confirm G as the tonal center of the work.

Willaert has thus skillfully used shifts in tonal center to help mirror the paradox which is the subject of the text. The tonal instability of the *exordium* evokes the mystery of Christ's birth, and stands in contrast to the tonal security presented immediately thereafter at „innovantur naturae“. Following this the permanent, enduring nature of God is always underlined by principal cadence points of the mode, the miraculous newness by steps away from this center. One must admit, to be sure, that the cadence points do reflect those of the chant melody, and thus the tension between its fundamental tone and the adjacent notes. That Willaert retained these cadence points in his polyphonic setting, however, was a matter of choice on his part, not necessity, as is evident from other of his works, for example his four-part *Pater noster*, where the composition is in G Hypodorian although the chant melody is in F.

Thus we see that in this piece that Willaert did not so much use mode to establish a tonal center for the piece – this was given by the chant melody in any case – but as a technical means for structurally illustrating the text. This usage implies a knowledge of more conventional progressions and a conscious transgression of them in order to give greater emphasis to the text. The piece is, nevertheless, tonally clear due to the modal clarity of the *cantus firmus* on the one hand, and to Willaert's clever manipulation of the tonal areas on the other.

\*



This manner of dealing with mode was by no means unique in Willaert's works, as may be seen with *Ave Regina coelorum*, a motet with a completely different architecture. Much of its musical structure is determined by the canonic melody. It may be seen as a kind of *cantus prius factus* which gives the motet its fundamental structural framework, both modally and contrapuntally. For this reason let us first examine the canonic melody closely.

The canonic melody is, for the most part, grouped in pairs of phrases, the second of which, in each case, repeats at least some of the material of the first. This made clear in the following diagram in which I have written the individual pairs of phrases above one another (see example 15 on p. 160). The opening pair of phrases gives clear expression to a plagal mode on A, Hypoaeolian in the twelvefold system. The melody begins by delineating the second species of fourth, e-a', and then falling back to e; the end of the phrase is given a sense of closure by the *mi-fa-mi* movement in mm.8-10. The second phrase begins like the first, outlining the second species of fourth, and then moves up to c'', the repercussion tone of the tenth mode (according to Zarlino's first numeration) before falling back to a'. (In this manner A is made the tonal focus of the opening of the canonic melody. This is confirmed by the next pair of phrases. The third phrase starts on a', which is then reaffirmed by the movement from below, f'-g'-a', before once again falling to e'. The conclusion of this phrase is reminiscent of the end of the opening phrase with its *mi-fa-mi* movement. This third phrase is then repeated with a different text from mm. 25-30. At this point the melody leaps to c'', which brings m. 13 to mind, and comes to a cadence on a' in m. 32. The melodic unit from mm. 30-32 then appears in a very slightly varied form and transposed down a third in mm. 32-34; and finally once again in a simplified version and transposed down yet another third in mm. 34-36. This creates a sudden shift of the fourth-fifth melodic structure. Up until m. 32, A was clearly the tonal focus with the second species of fourth below it and an extension to the repercussion tone c'' above it, thus implying the second species of fifth which would complete the E octave. But in the four measures between 32 and 36 A is transformed from the arithmetic dividing point of the E octave into the harmonic dividing point of the D octave. This shift is confirmed by the subsequent phrases. The phrase, „O Maria, flos virginum“ outlines the first species of fourth, d''-a' and the following one, „Velut rosa vel lilium“, the first species of fifth, a'-d'. The next two phrases bring a repetition of this structure in triple time. These four phrases are paired at two levels. On the one hand, „Velut rosa vel lilium“ is a slightly varied version at the lower fifth of the the previous phrase „O Maria, flos virginum“. This pair, however, may also seen as a single entity because of the subsequent repetition in triple time. In m. 63 the opening phrase of the canonic melody is brought once again, implying a return to a fourth and fifth structure characteristic for the tenth mode. This is born out by the final phrase ending as it does on c-sharp', the raised third of the tenth mode. Modally speaking, the canonic melody would thus seem to be in a *commixtio*



*tonorum*, beginning in the tenth mode, shifting to the first between mm. 32-36, and then returning to the tenth at m. 63.)

The iterative structure of the melody reflects that of the text, a Marian antiphon.

Ave Regina coelorum,	Hail Queen of the heavens,
Mater regis angelorum,	Mother of the king of angels,
Ave stella matutina,	Hail morning star,
Dux suavis et benigna,	Sweet and benign leader,
O Maria, flos virginum,	O Mary, flower of virgins,
Velut rosa vel lilium,	Like a rose or lily,
Funde preces ad Filium	Pour out prayers to your Son,
Pro salute fidelium.	For the salvation of the faithful.

It consists, namely, of three invocations of the Virgin Mary: the first two, rhymed couplets, both open with the salutation „Ave“; the last, a rhymed quatrain, calls on the Virgin by name for the first time and ends with a supplication that she intervene for the faithful with her Son. The first two phrase pairs of the canonic melody correspond to the first two couplets of the text. The quatrain is set to the extended phrase pair: „O Maria, flos virginum, Velut rosa vel lilium“ is heard during the first descent through the D octave in mm. 39-48, and the supplication during the second descent in triple time. The melodic shift from an A to a D tonal focus thus dovetails with the structure of the text. The final line of text appears yet a second time with the opening phrase of the canonic melody, rounding off, as it were, the entire work.

Given this information about the canonic melody, let us now look at the cadential structure of the piece as a whole to see what it tells us about the tonal center of the polyphonic construct (see example 16 on pp 161-165). The first complete, non-evaded cadence in the piece is in m. 36 on D. Before that there are three on A of the sort we would now call „plagal cadences“ (mm. 10, 25, and 30), a *cadenza fuggita* on E in m. 8, on C in m. 18, and on A in m. 32, and also an incomplete cadence on D in m. 34. The cadential structure is thus in full agreement with modal structure of the canonic melody as it appears in the soprano in that up until m. 32 the only inflections are toward A, E, and C, the principal cadence points in the tenth mode; then, at the point where the melodic shift to the first mode takes place, there are two cadences in D.

The cadential structure of the middle section, from mm. 36-63, clearly is a reflection of that of the canonic melody. As mentioned above, the soprano moves down through the D octave twice in this section, first in duple time then in triple; each time a caesura is made on A (in mm. 43 and 54). After an initial cadence on A in m. 40, the cadential structure of each descent of an octave is parallel: the evaded cadence on A in m. 43 corresponds to a similar one in m. 54; the cadence on D in m. 45. corresponds with that in m. 56; the evaded cadence on D in m. 48 with that in m. 59; and finally the cadence on



G in m. 50 with the cadence in m. 61. The cadences on D and A are certainly those one would associate with the first mode; and Pietro Pontio would have accepted the cadences on G *per transito*.<sup>27</sup> The cadential structure of this section is thus also revealed to correspond to the modal structure of the canonic melody in the soprano.

The lower voices come to a cadence on C in m. 63, just at the point when the opening of the canonic melody returns. Although according to Pontio this cadence could be considered a transitory one in the first mode, it is also one of the principal cadence points in the tenth. As we have seen above, this phrase appears to have been associated with Hypoaeolian in the opening measures and thus perhaps this cadence on C serves as a bridge between the section in D and the final measures in A. This motet comes to a close with a *cadenza fuggita* on A in m. 70, followed by another so-called „plagal cadence“ on A at the end.

The cadential structure is thus related to the modal structure of the canonic melody, and the piece, like the melody, may be understood to be in a *commixtio tonorum*, beginning and ending in the tenth mode with a shift to the first in the middle. This, too, would be in agreement with the classification made by the editor of the 1545 Gardano print, as it appeared in the group of pieces with the „tonal type“ associated with a plagal A mode.

On paper this all seems very clear. This clarity, however, is belied by various features of the motet taken as a polyphonic entity:

- (1) The opening tenor-bass voice pair anticipates the canon in the upper voices. The voices, however, enter a fourth lower than the canonic parts. The tenor outlines the second species of fourth, b-e'. It is answered by the bass with e-a, which by implication could be expanded to the second species of fifth, e-b. Willaert therewith gives a very strong impression that the motet is in the fourth mode. This impression is given additional weight by the movement in the lower voices towards a cadence on E in mm. 6-7, which, however, the bass evades at the last minute, moving to c instead of to e. This initial tonal focus, which is extremely strong, is immediately placed in question, however, by the entry of the canonic parts with their implication of the tenth mode.
- (2) This opening modal ambiguity is then further accentuated by the lack of strong cadences until mm. 32-36. As mentioned above, the first non-evaded, complete cadence is on D in m. 36. Thereafter, in the middle section, there are a number of strong cadences associated with the first mode. The concluding section, however, also lacks a strong cadence on A.
- (3) There is, in addition, a certain amount of modal confusion due to the canon at the lower fifth. This confusion is typical for works with canons, because the canon, of necessity, disrupts the normal linking of the fourths and fifths between the individual parts of a polyphonic work.

<sup>27</sup> Op. cit., 100.



Taken together, these features tend to leave at least the modern listener in the air as far as the tonal center of the work is concerned. It is not so much that Willaert is transgressing modal conventions here – as we have seen the cadential pattern reflects the structure of the canonic melody – but that his primary interest lies with the canon and with demonstrating his contrapuntal finesse.

The emphasis on contrapuntal techniques can be seen throughout the motet and serves as a basis for the stylistic unity of the work. Evidence for this can already be found at the beginning of the composition. Shortly after the canon enters, ostensibly as an answer to the passage presented by the tenor and bass, the lower two voices come to a rest in mm. 8 and 10. The tenor makes a new entrance, seemingly a slight variant of the alto's first notes, a-a-c'-d'-c' instead of a-c'-c'-d'-d'-c'. Just a few measures later, however, it is revealed to be an anticipation of the second phrase of the canonic melody which, as we have noted above, opens with the first five notes of the canon, e'-g'-g'-a'-g', but then reaches upward to c" before coming back to rest on a'. The tenor thus presents an almost complete version of the second phrase of the canon as it later appears in the alto; the canonic melody in the soprano thus appears to be a response to the tenor rather than a law unto itself. Correspondingly in m. 13, the tenor then brings the second phrase of the canonic melody starting on e, an octave lower than the soprano, one measure after the canonic presentation of this phrase in the alto. This then suggests that the contrapuntal structure is given by a tenor-soprano voice pair answered with the same musical content by an alto-tenor voice pair. This parallel in structure is given further weight by the repetition of the fall from g to c in the bass in mm. 11-13 and mm. 14-16.

Thus, in addition to the repetition of melodic material, provided by the similar beginnings of the first and second canonic phrase, we also have a veiled short repetition of the complete contrapuntal fabric in these measures. This distracts the attention from the strictness of the canon and is evidence of Willaert's superb ability to manipulate contrapuntal details. Similar passages may be found throughout the work, giving it cohesion.

Seen in this way, the whole motet can be understood as a kind of mosaic of melodic elements which are intricately pieced together. Joshua Rifkin has recently pointed out the similarities of such motivic work in Josquin's motet *Huc me sydereo* to the patterns found in the poetry of the so-called „Rhétoriqueurs“ and in the mosaics in many buildings of the Renaissance.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>28</sup> Joshua Rifkin, „Motivik – Konstruktion – Humanismus: Zur Motette *Huc me sydereo* von Josquin des Prez“, unpublished, to appear in the Festschrift for Ludwig Finscher. He bases many of his ideas on the concepts presented by Jonathan Beck in „Formalism and Virtuosity: Franco-Burgundian Poetry, Music, and Visual Art, 1470-1520“, in *Critical Inquiry* 10, 1983/84, pp. 644-47.



According to him, musical structures of this sort can be seen as a reflection of the intellectual-artistic environment of the time. Evidence of the influence of this tradition is abundant in Willaert's works as is exemplified by *Ave Regina coelorum*.

Thus we have seen that the structure of this motet is a reflection of the iterative nature of the text achieved by means of repetitive elements in the canonic melody and in the contrapuntal fabric. The cadential patterns are in accordance with the *commixtio tonorum* exhibited by the canonic melody. They are, however, ambiguous on a polyphonic level due to the confusion in the fourth and fifth structure caused by the canon at the lower fifth. It is not so much that the conventions concerning mode were transgressed, but more that they were considered to be of secondary importance in the structure of the work, the melodic and contrapuntal elements playing a far greater role.

\*

Mode thus played a very different role in each of these motets. The modality of *Mirabile mysterium* was clearly established by the *cantus firmus*. Therefore Willaert was able to transgress modal conventions, deviating from them in order to mirror the paradox in the text in the musical structure. In *Ave Regina coelorum*, however, mode was simply relegated to a compositional level of lesser importance, with other factors playing a predominant role in determining the structure.

In either case this usage of mode does not correspond to ideas of tonality we have inherited from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In my opinion, however, it does show that certain tonal relationships often were associated with specific „modes“, to a degree greater than that implied by the minimal concept of „tonal types“ which was so vehemently discussed at the symposium. I also feel sure that this and other issues treated by the theorists were equally intensely discussed in the sixteenth century, as indeed we know from the few extant letters between Aaron and other theorists, or the famous dispute about *ficta* in Rome.<sup>29</sup> And issues of the magnitude of mode would certainly not have been ignored by composers, particularly in the major cultural centers. Thus composers of rank in the first part of the sixteenth century would have been aware of the discussions of mode at their time. What we do not know is how this affected their style of composition. We can only hope to find out more about this question by closely analyzing music of this period and investigating how it relates to modal theory expounded in the contemporary sources.

<sup>29</sup> Lewis Lockwood, „A Dispute on Accidentals in Sixteenth-Century Rome“, *Analecta Musicologica*, 2 (1965), 24-40.



Ex. 11:

# Mirabile Mystery

Mi - - - ra - - bi - le,

Mi - - - ra - - bi - le,

Mi - - - ra - - bi - le

4

Mi - - - ra - - bi - le my - - ste - -

mi - - - ra - - bi - le my - ste - ri -

mi - - - ra - - bi - le my - - ste -

my - ste - ri -

10

- - ri - um de - cla - ra - tur ho - - -

um de - cla - ra - tur ho - di - e, de - cla - ra - tur ho -

- - ri - um, my - ste - - - ri - um de - cla - ra - tur

um de - - - cla - ra - tur ho - di e,



16

di - e, de - cla - ra - tur ho - di - e, [ho - - - di - e, - - - ] de - cla - ra - tur ho - di - e: ho - di - e, de - cla - ra - tur ho - - - de - cla - ra tur ho - di - e, de - cla -

22

di - e, ho - - - di - e: - - - ] in - no - in - no - van - di - e: in - no - van - tur na - ra - tur ho - di - e: in - no - van - tur, in - no - van -

28

van - - tur na - tu - - rae: tur na - tu - - rae: in - no - van - tu - - rae, in - no - van - tur na - tu - - rae, in - no - van -



34

De - us ho - mo fa - - ctus est, De - us

- tur na - tu - - - rae: De - us ho - mo fa - ctus est,

- - tu - - - rae: De - us ho - - mo fa - ctus

tur — na - tu - - rae: De - us ho - mo fa - -

40

ho - mo fa - - ctus est, De - us ho - mo fa -

De - us ho - mo fa - - - ctus est, De - us ho - - - mo

est, — De - us ho - mo fa - ctus est, — fa - - - ctus est,

- ctus — est, De - us ho - - mo fa -

46

- - - ctus est: —

fa - ctus est: — fa - - - ctus est:

fa - - - ctus est: id quod fu - it per - man -

- - - ctus est: id quod fu - it per - man - -



52

id quod fu - it per - man - sit, id quod

id quod fu - it per - man - sit,

sit, id

sit, id quod fu - it per - man

58

fu - it per - man - sit, et quod non

id quod fu - it per - man - sit, et

quod fu - it per - man - sit, et quod non e - rat as -

sit, id quod fu - it per - man - sit, et quod non e - rat as -

sit, id quod fu - it per - man - sit, et quod non e - rat as -

64

e - rat as - sump - sit, et

quod non e - rat as - sump - sit, et quod non e -

sump - sit, et quod non e - rat as - sump -

sump - sit, et quod non e - rat, et quod non e - rat as - sump -

sump - sit, et quod non e - rat, et quod non e - rat as - sump -



69

quod non e - rat as - sump - - sit: non com - mix - ti - o - nem pas -

rat as - sump - - sit: non com - mix - ti - o -

sit, et quod non e - rat as - sump - sit: non com - mix - ti - o - nem pas -

sit, et quod non e - rat as - sump - sit: non com - mix - ti - o - nem

75

- - - - sus, non com - mix - ti -

nem pas - - - - sus, non com - mix - ti - o -

sus, ne - que di - vi - si - o - - - - nem,

pas - sus, ne - que di - vi - si - o - - - - nem,

81

o - nem pas - - - - sus, ne - que

nem pas - - - - sus, pas - - - - sus, ne - que

non com - mix - ti - o - nem pas - - - - sus, ne -

non com - mix - ti - o - nem pas - - - - sus, ne -



87

di-vi-si-o - - - nem, ne - que di-vi-si-o - - - - - nem.

di-vi-si-o - - - nem, ne - que di-vi-si-o - - - - - nem.

- que di-vi - si-o - - - nem, ne - que di-vi - si-o - - - - - nem.

- que di-vi - si-o - - - nem, ne - que di-vi-si-o - - - - - nem.

Ex. 12:

Ad Benedictus, Antiphona.

8. G

**M** I-rá-bi-le mysté-ri-um \* decla-rá-tur hó-di-e : in-

novántur na-túrae : De-us homo factus est : id quod fu-it

permánsit, et quod non e-rat assúmpsit : non commixti-ó-

nem passus, neque di-vi-si-ó-nem. E u o u a e.

Ex. 13:

O ma - - gnum my-ste - ri - um

O mag - num my-ste - ri - u , et

O mag-num my-ste - ri - um, et ad-mi-ra-bi-le sa-cra-men-  
[tum]



Ex. 14:

# Beatus Joannes – Ipse est

Be - a - tus Jo - an -

5

nes, A - po - - - - - sto -

Jo - an - nes, A - po - - - - -

Be - a - tus

9

lus et E - van - ge - li - sta

sto - lus et E - van - ge - li - sta,

Jo - an - nes, A - po - sto - lus

Be - a - tus Jo - an - es,



Ex. 15:

5  
A - ve re - gi - na coe - lo - - rum,  
10  
Ma - ter re - gis an - ge - lo - - - rum,

20  
A - ve stel - la ma - tu - ti - - - na,  
25  
Dux su - a - vis et be - ni - - - gna, et  
30  
ni - - - gna  
32  
et be - ni - gna,  
34

39  
O Ma - ri - a, flos vir - - - gi - num,  
44  
Vel - ut ro - sa — vel li - - li - um,  
50  
Fun - de pre - ces ad Fi - - - li - um  
55  
Pro sa - lu - te — fi - de - - li - um, pro sa - lu - te,  
63  
pro sa - lu - te fi - de - li - um, fi - de - - - li - um.



Ex. 16:

Canon duorum temporum fuga in subdiapente

Ad longum

A - - ve Re - gi - - na coe -

A - - ve Re -

5

A - - ve Re - - gi - - - - na coe - lo -

A - - - - ve Re - gi -

lo - - rum, coe - - - - lo - rum, Ma -

gi - - na coe - - lo - - - - - - - - rum,

10

rum, Ma - ter re - gis an - - ge - lo - - - rum,

na coe - lo - - rum, Ma - ter re - gis an -

ter re - gis an - ge - lo - rum, Ma - ter re -

Ma - ter re - gis - - an - ge - lo - rum, an -



15

rum,

- ge - lo - - - rum,

gis an - ge - lo - - - rum, A - ve stel - la

ge - lo - rum, A - ve stel - la ma - tu - ti -

20

A - - - ve stel - la ma - tu - ti - - - -

A - - - ve stel - la

ma - tu - ti - - - - na, Dux su - a - vis - - - -

- - - - na, ma - tu - ti - na,

25

na, Dux su - a - vis et be - ni - - - -

ma - tu - ti - - - - na, Dux su - a - vis - - - -

- - - et be - ni - gna, et be - ni - - - gna,

Dux su - a - vis et be - ni - - - -



30

gna, et be - ni - gna, et be -

et be - ni - gna, et be - ni -

[et be - ni - gna, ] et be -

gna, et be - ni - gna, et be -

35

- ni - gna. O Ma -

- gna, et be - ni - gna.

- ni - gna. O Ma - ri - a, flos vir - - gi -

ni - gna. O Ma - ri - a, flos vir - - gi -

40

ri - a, flos vir - - gi - num, Vel - ut

O Ma - ri - a, flos vir - - gi -

num, o Ma - ri - a, flos vir - - gi - num, Vel - ut ro - sa vel -

num, o Ma - ri - a, flos vir - gi -



45

ro - sa vel li - li - um:

num, Vel - ut ro - sa vel li -

li - li - um: Fun - de pre - ces

num, Vel - ut ro - sa vel li - li - um, li -

50 (♩ = ½)

Fun - de pre - ces ad Fi - li - um Pro sa -

um: Fun - de pre - ces ad Fi - li -

ad Fi - li - um Pro sa - lu -

um: Fun - de pre - ces, fun - de pre - ces ad Fi -

56

lu - te fi - de li - um, pro sa - lu - te,

um Pro sa - lu - te fi - de li - um, pro sa - lu -

te fi - de li - um, pro sa - lu - te fi - de li -

li - um Pro sa - lu - te fi - de li -



63 (♩ = 4)

pro sa - lu - te fi - de - li -

te, pro sa - lu -

um, pro sa - lu - te fi - de - li - um,

um, pro sa - lu - te fi - de - li - um,

68

um, fi - de - - - - - li - um.

te fi - - de - li - um.

fi - de - - - - - li - um, fi - - de - - - li - um.

pro sa - lu - te fi - - - - de - - - li - um.



