

**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:** 38 (2014)

**Artikel:** Evidence of reworkings in Ars nova motets

**Autor:** Zayaruznaya, Anna

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-868856>

### **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:** 18.04.2026

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

## EVIDENCE OF REWORKINGS IN ARS NOVA MOTETS\*

by ANNA ZAYARUZNAYA

The hockets of Philippe de Vitry's motet *Cum statua/Hugo* are remarkably effective. Unusually located in only the last two of the piece's seven *taleae*, they illustrate Vitry's stupefaction at the nefarious deeds of his adversary, Hugo. As though with gasps of indignation, rests break up words into their component syllables, resulting in a memorable, nonsensical polytextuality marked by assonance and alliteration: „Stupeo et-et-e-qui-o-a-cum in-im-vi-pi-dus.“ Clearly, the syllabic texting required to make this work must have been carefully calculated (see ex. 1a).<sup>1</sup> And yet, this version of the hockets is preserved uniquely in the *Ivrea Codex*.<sup>2</sup> In the Cambrai source for the motet, the rhythms are different: in addition to semibreves and semibreve rests, they use minims and minim rests, providing two notes for each of Ivrea's in breves 110 and 113–14 (see ex. 1b).<sup>3</sup>

Ex. 1a: Vitry, *Cum statua/Hugo*, breves 106–115 in *Ivrea*, fols 14v–15.

The image shows a musical score for three staves. Each staff begins with a C-clef and a 'C' time signature. The lyrics are written below the staves. The first staff has the lyrics 'et qui - a im - pi - a li' with notes and rests above. The second staff has 'stu-pe - o, et e - o cum in - vi - dus' with notes and rests above. The third staff has a single note with a rest below it. Above the staves, the numbers 106, 109, 112, and 115 are placed, indicating specific breves. A small '8' is written below the first staff.

\* I am grateful to Pedro Memelsdorff for inviting me to present at the symposium at the Schola Cantorium, Basel, where these ideas were first aired, and for his choice of the theme „Re-workings“ for this event, which served as the direct impetus for this line of argumentation. Thanks also to Wulf Arlt and Margaret Bent for comments on the draft.

<sup>1</sup> For more on the function of these hockets within *Cum statua/Hugo* and of hockets more generally within Vitry's oeuvre see Anna Zayaruznaya, *The Monstrous New Art. Divided Forms in the Late Medieval Motet*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015 (Music in Context), 128–141 (discussion); 243–249 (edition).

<sup>2</sup> Ivrea, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS CXV(115), fols 14v–15.

<sup>3</sup> Cambrai, Bibliothèque municipale, B 1328 (olim 1176), fol. 3v (on the Digital Image Archive of Medieval Music, [www.diamm.ac.uk](http://www.diamm.ac.uk)) or fol. 11v following the foliation in Irmgard Lerch, *Fragmente aus Cambrai. Ein Beitrag zur Rekonstruktion einer Handschrift mit spätmittelalterlicher Polyphonie*, Kassel u. a.: Bärenreiter, 1987 (Göttinger musikwissenschaftliche Arbeiten 11), two vols; see also Lerch's edition in *ibid.*, II, 129–133. These same rhythms recur in Cambrai during the second hocket.

Ex. 1b: Vitry, *Cum statua/Hugo*, breves 106–115 in Cambrai, fol. 11v.

106 109 112 115

et qui - a im - pi - a lin -  
 stu-pe - o, et e - o cum in - vi - dus

It is relatively clear that the Ivrea version represents Vitry's original, since the text lines become shorter to enable syllabic texting in the hockets (hocketed text is in bold, rests are marked by vertical strokes):<sup>4</sup>

Triplum, ll. 12–end:  
 ypocrisis, antifrasis quibus  
 dat „mendici“ nomen sophisticæ.  
 Hec concino Philippus publice,  
**|et |qui-|a**  
**|im-|pi-|a|**  
 lingua ledor unius Tersite,  
**|pro| ve-|ro|**  
**re-|fe-|ro:|**  
 „A prophetis falsis attendite!“

Motetus, ll. 7–end:  
 Qua me culpas igitur rabie,  
 assignata mihi nulla die?  
 Inconsultus causamque nescius  
**|stupeo,|**  
**et e-|o|**  
**cum in-|vi-|dus|** sic sis, palam pius,  
**|perpere,|**  
**dice-|re|**  
**ypo-|cri-|tam|** te possum verius.

If the Cambrai version were the original, there would be no need for the trisyllabic „et quia“, „impia“, „stupeo“, and „et eo“. Moreover, minims and minim rests are a later notational development, and it is hard to imagine a motet being retrofitted. So even though Ivrea is probably the later of the two sources, there is a strong case to be made that it represents an earlier instantiation of *Cum statua/Hugo*.

The revision of hockets in the Cambrai version of *Cum statua/Hugo* was probably an act of sonic updating stemming from a slowing down of the breve tactus early in the century.<sup>5</sup> At a slow enough speed, alternating semibreves no longer sound like hockets at all, so the passages were reworked using a newly available notational technology – the minim rest – in accordance with changing tastes. Since the shape of the texts confirms that Ivrea represents the original version, there is no real problem here for the editor or analyst.

<sup>4</sup> Edition by Zoltán Rihmer in: Zayaruznaya, *The Monstrous New Art* (see n. 1), 243–244.

<sup>5</sup> See Heinrich Bessler, „Studien zur Musik des Mittelalters II. Die Motette von Franko von Köln bis Philipp von Vitry“, *AfMw* 8/2 (1927), 137–258, 150, 159; and Edward H. Roesner, François Avril and Nancy Freeman Regalado (eds), *Le Roman de Fauvel in the Edition of Me sire Chaillou de Pesstain. A Reproduction in Facsimile of the Complete Manuscript*, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, fonds français 146, New York: Broude Brothers, 1990, 35.

But the differences between the Ivrea and Cambrai versions entail several problems for the music historian. The possibility of revisions does not sit well with the reputation *ars nova* motets have long had for being deliberately constructed in every aspect, irrespective of multiple sources and occasional scribal error. In 1973, Ernest Sanders described each of Vitry's motets as „an integral entity possessing a specific structural and poetic individuality, which it retains, no matter how large a number of manuscripts might preserve it.“<sup>6</sup> And as recently as 2005 Anna Maria Busse Berger suggested that „isorhythmic motets are compositions in the modern sense of the word in that the composer fixes most details of pitch and rhythm in writing“; for her, even the „many motets with scribal errors in the manuscript or for which various versions exist [...] need not contradict the hypothesis that the composer wished to create a piece where every pitch and note value mattered.“<sup>7</sup> Thus, perhaps paradoxically, motets are not essentially subject to revision, despite the demonstrable existence of multiple versions.

The purported compositional stability of motets has been especially important for the construction of chronologies. Given a source situation in which almost nothing can be dated with certainty between the interpolated *Fauvel* MS (F-Pn 146, c. 1320) and the Machaut manuscripts, scholars have reasonably suggested that motets using later notational forms (the minim rest) or devices (imperfection by remote parts, tenor diminution) were likely to be composed later than those that lack those forms and practices. Thus Margaret Bent argues that „on any spectrum of style-based chronology [Vitry's *Flos/Celsa*] would fall rather late“ because it „requires the use of minim stems for its non-standard groupings and rests and for its nearly isorhythmic hockets

<sup>6</sup> Ernest H. Sanders, „The Medieval Motet“, in: Leo Schrade, Wulf Arlt and Higinì Anglès (eds), *Gattungen der Musik in Einzeldarstellungen. Gedenkschrift Leo Schrade*, Bern and Munich: Francke, 1973, 497–573, 556.

<sup>7</sup> Anna Maria Busse Berger, *Medieval Music and the Art of Memory*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2005, 211. This purported stability is genre-specific. That *formes fixes* songs were subject to revision can be seen especially clearly in the case of Machaut, whose multiple complete works manuscripts allow glimpses of works in different states. For an account of rhythmic and contrapuntal revision of the ballade *Donnez, signeurs*, see Wulf Arlt, „Donnez Signeurs – Zum Brückenschlag zwischen Ästhetik und Analyse bei Guillaume de Machaut“, in: Christoph Ballmer and Thomas Gartmann (eds), *Tradition und Innovation in der Musik. Festschrift für Ernst Lichtenhahn zum 60. Geburtstag*, Winterthur: Amadeus, 1993, 39–64. On the monophonic and polyphonic versions of the virelai *Mors sui*, see Sarah Fuller, „Machaut and the Definition of Musical Space“, *Sonus* 12 (1991), 1–15. Additional voices were composed by later composers for eight of Machaut's songs; for sources and bibliography see Lawrence Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut: A Guide to Research*, London: Garland, 1995 (Garland Composer Resource Manuals 36), 295–6 (on *Biauté qui*), 309–10 (on *De Fortune*), 310–11 (on *De petit po*), 311–12 (on *De toutes flours*), 351–52 (on *On ne porroit*), 369–70 (on *Rose, lis*), 378–79 (on *Se vous n'estes*), and 385–86 (on *Une vipere*).

in the second section where the tenor appears in 2:1 diminution.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, Karl Kügle noted that because in *Je comence/Et ie seray* „the notation of all three voices makes widespread use of semibreves and minims, including imperfection of the breve by a single minim, and minim-minim groups,“ the motet „cannot be transcribed into earlier notation, eliminating the possibility that [it] could have originated before the system of the *quatre prolacions* was firmly in place.“<sup>9</sup> Such lines of argument make sense: it is undoubtedly the case that the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> century saw a greatly expanded notational and formal palette as compared to the beginning, and the changes had to happen at some point.

But there are two underlying assumptions here that deserve further scrutiny. The first is that a composer would never chose to write a notationally conservative piece.<sup>10</sup> To test this claim stands outside the scope of this article, though Lawrence Earp's recent observation that Machaut's late motets (Motets 21–3) are notationally conservative compared to his earlier ones is worth keeping in mind.<sup>11</sup> The second, more basic assumption here is that the motets have reached us in something close to their original forms – that the pieces as they „originated“ used the same notational symbols, or at least the same rhythms, as their surviving versions. In relation to this assumption, the variants in *Cum statua/Hugo* invite a thought experiment: what if the only surviving version of the motet were the one in Cambrai? We would assign it to a later stage of Vitry's output than we do now. And we would probably never have wondered whether its hockets had been updated.

<sup>8</sup> Margaret Bent, „Early Papal Motets“, in: Richard Sherr (ed.), *Papal Music and Musicians in Late Mediaeval and Renaissance Rome*, Oxford and Washington: Clarendon Press, 1997, 10. For *Flos/Celsa*, see Frank Llewellyn Harrison (ed.), *Motets of French Provenance*, Monaco: Éditions de l'Oiseau-lyre, 1968 (PMFC 5), 42–45.

<sup>9</sup> Karl Kügle, *The Manuscript Ivrea, Biblioteca capitolare 115. Studies in the Transmission and composition of Ars Nova Polyphony*, Ottawa: Institute of Mediaeval Music, 1997 (Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen 69), 168 [Ph.D. diss., University of New York, 1993]. For *Je comence/Et ie seray* see Gordon K. Greene (ed.), *French Secular Music*, Monaco: Éditions de l'Oiseau-lyre, 1987 (PMFC 21), 73–81.

<sup>10</sup> As Bent put it, „composers including Philippe de Vitry were clearly reaching out for every possible technical means of enrichment for their enterprise. Once tasted, it would have been inconceivable for them to retreat from the powerful rhythmic variety“ offered by notational innovations, „Early Papal Motets“ (see n. 8), 12.

<sup>11</sup> Lawrence Earp, „Tradition and Innovation in Ars nova Motet Notation“, Paper presented at the 81<sup>st</sup> Annual Meeting of the American Musicological Society, Louisville (November 2015). Bent also points out in a private correspondence (December 18, 2015) that the narrative in note 10 does not preclude „cases of essays in deliberately archaic writing“ such as Machaut's David hocket. I thank Wulf Arlt for the observation that framing the stylistic and notational aspects of medieval musical and notational processes as a „simultaneity of the non-simultaneous“ (in Ernst Bloch's sense) shows unwritten practices in a new light and may lead to fruitful scrutiny of established periodizations.

How many *ars nova* motets might have been reworked in some analogous way? This article brings together the evidence for notational and formal reworkings within the *ars nova* repertory. Some of the revisions are demonstrable, while others are more speculative, and can only be inferred through analysis. Furthermore, it is impossible to say at this stage whether the examples below are exceptions to the rule or the tip of the iceberg. In either case they necessitate a re-evaluation of the received chronologies of works and style in the 14<sup>th</sup> century.

### *Hocketing with the Times*

*O canenda/Rex* is a motet with a relatively secure attribution to Vitry transmitted stably in four sources, of which one is incomplete.<sup>12</sup> Formally, it consists of two parts: in the first the tenor is organized as two *colores* and eight *taleae* (four per *color*); the second part contains one further *color* in *diminution*, divided into four *taleae*:

color 1:	talea 1	talea 2	talea 3	talea 4
color 2:	talea 5	talea 6	talea 7	talea 8
color 3:	talea 9	talea 10	talea 11	talea 12

All the motet's text is set in the *integer valor* section, so that in the third *color* the upper voices have no words, but sing untexted hockets. Example 2 gives *taleae* 8–12.

<sup>12</sup> Leo Schrade (ed.), *The Roman de Fauvel; The Works of Philippe de Vitry; French Cycles of the Ordinarium Missae*, Monaco: Editions de l'Oiseau-Lyre, 1956 (PMFC 1), 106–109. Sources include Ivrea, fol. 55r; F-Pn nouvelles acquisitions latines 2444 (F-Pn 2444), fol. 48v; Durham, Cathedral Library, MS C.I.20, fol. 337v (GB-DRc 20; motetus and tenor only); and Fribourg, Bibliothèque Cantonale et Universitaire, Z 260 (CH-Fc 260), fol. 86v. The motet is also listed in the index to F-Pn nouv. acq. frç., 23190.

Ex. 2: *O canenda/Rex, breves 85–end (taleae 8–12).*

Triplum

Motetus

Contratenor

Tenor

*talea 8*

90

-lit. Ihe - ru - sa - lem do - mi - num pro - pri - um

-ti scri - be - re non pos - sem. Pos - sint

92

Ihe - sum sper - nens ha - bes in so - ci - um!

95

100

su - per e - the - ra scri - bi.

*talea 9*  
*color 3*

102

105

110

*talea 10* *talea 11*

111

115

120

*talea 12*

Robert of Anjou, the dedicatee of *O canenda/Rex*, ruled Naples from 1309 to 1343, and accordingly a wide range of dates has been proposed for the motet's composition: from c. 1320 or earlier to the mid-1330s. These datings are all to some extent based on readings of the texts and historical details about Robert and his reign, but the earlier ones have been used to argue for an early date for certain *ars nova* developments,<sup>13</sup> while the later ones have conversely drawn attention to the advanced state of the notation as evidence of the work's lateness.<sup>14</sup> But it has never been noted that the motet presents a neat division between these two elements: texts and notational innovations. The text is set to the opening two *colores*, which contain no diminution and no minim rests, though they do exhibit some upper-voice isorhythm in the first five breves of *taleae* 2–8, and superimpose duple and triple modus in the lower voices. The notational fireworks and more precise rhythmic recurrences are restricted to the untexted third *color*, as is the conflict between perfect and imperfect tempus in the contratenor and other voices, respectively. I suggest that the advanced second section with its hockets and diminution was added at a stage subsequent to the motet's initial composition, and that the version preserved in all of the surviving sources is a reworking.

This is not to deny that the difference in texture and notation between the second and third *color* can be explained by generic conventions: hockets always go faster than the material around them, and thus in a context where faster notes (and especially faster rests) are part of newer developments, hockets will always look newer. But what is telling in this case is that the motet is formally irregular. The other twenty-three bipartite French and Latin *ars nova* motets feature the same number of *colores* in each of their two parts (see table 1).<sup>15</sup> Most frequently (in seventeen of twenty-three cases), the tenor's chant is sung once through in each part. In six motets, two cycles of the *color* elapse during each half. But in all twenty-three works there is the same number of tenor notes in each section, and the work of making the second section shorter is entirely carried out by the tenor's smaller note-values. According to this scheme, *O canenda/Rex* should have another *color*, for a total of 16 *taleae*, the last 8 in diminution. Instead, it is unusually lopsided, with two *colores* in its first part and only one in its second. I suggest not that the motet looks or sounds wrong, but that in the context of generic conventions its hocket section has the ad-hoc appearance of a later addition. It is therefore

<sup>13</sup> Daniel Leech-Wilkinson, „Emergence of *ars nova*“, *JM* 13/3 (1995), 285–317, 315; see also below.

<sup>14</sup> Bent, who places the motet in the mid-1330s, notes its „full isorhythm, diminution, and minim hockets“, („Early Papal Motets“ [see n. 8], 14). Kügler, who suggests 1319 or 1323, uses notational details to place *O canenda/Rex* late within a group of 11 motets in Ivrea he considers to have been written between c. 1315 and 1320, of which it has „by far the most sophisticated level of isorhythm, phrase design, and hocketing“ (Kügler, *The Manuscript Ivrea* [see n. 9], 104, 110).

<sup>15</sup> The most succinct summary of *ars nova* motet forms remains Besseler, „Studien zur Musik des Mittelalters II“ (see n. 5), 222–224. The rightmost column in table 1 gives only the most easily accessible edition of each listed motet.

plausible that *O canenda/Rex* resulted from a two-stage compositional process. At some point it was written with two *colores* and eight *taleae* – a common enough shape for a motet. Then at some other, later point Vitry – or someone else – added an extra *color* in diminution accompanied by untexted hockets such that the new material left the upper-voice texts untouched.

Tab. 1: Number of *color* statements per section in bipartite motets

Triplum/Motetus	Part I	Part II	Edition
.../Fors perversa	1	1	Lerch, <i>Fragmente</i> , no. 20
A vous/Ad te	2	2	Harrison, PMFC 5, no. 13
Almifonis/Rosa	1	1	Harrison, PMFC 5, no. 8
Altissionis/Hin	1	1	Harrison, PMFC 5, no. 2
Aucune/Qui	1	1	Schrade, PMFC 2–3, no. 5
Bone pastor/Bone pastor	2	2	Schrade, PMFC 2–3, no. 18
Christe/Veni	1	1	Schrade, PMFC 2–3, no. 21
Colla/Bona	1	1	Schrade, PMFC 1, Vitry no. 9
De bon espoir/Puisque	2	2	Schrade, PMFC 2–3, no. 4
Douce/Garison	1	1	Schrade, PMFC 1, Vitry no. 6
Felix/Inviolata	1	1	Schrade, PMFC 2–3, no. 23
Firmissime/Adesto	1	1	Schrade, PMFC 1, no. 30
Flos/Celsa	2	2	Harrison, PMFC 5, no. 7
Hareu/Hélas	1	1	Schrade, PMFC 2–3, no. 10
He! Mors/Fine	1	1	Schrade, PMFC 2–3, no. 3
Impudenter/Virtutibus	1	1	Schrade, PMFC 1, Vitry no. 11
J'ay tant/Lasse	2	2	Schrade, PMFC 2–3, no. 7
<i>O canenda/Rex</i>	2	1	Schrade, PMFC 1, Vitry no. 14
Quant/Amour	1	1	Schrade, PMFC 2–3, no. 1
Rachel/Ha fratres	1	1	Harrison, PMFC 5, no. 11
Se paour/Diex tant	2	2	Harrison, PMFC 5, no. 16
Tous corps/De souspirant	1	1	Schrade, PMFC 2–3, no. 2
Tuba/In arboris	1	1	Schrade, PMFC 1, Vitry no. 10
Vos/Gratissima	1	1	Schrade, PMFC 1, Vitry no. 7

Once the rift in this composition is rendered visible, it is hard to ignore. The rhythmic vocabulary of the first section is conservative compared to the second, largely restricting itself to *Fauvel*-era patterns. All motion is trochaic, and the overwhelming majority of the rhythms could have been notated with undifferentiated semibreves.<sup>16</sup> Moreover, there is a sonic seam. Immediately before the hockets begin, all voices cadence (m. 95 in ex. 2), and the motet could easily have ended here, in the manner suggested by example 3. The only advisable change might be the conversion of breves in triplum and tenor to final longs – though indeed even this is not required, since the motet's ending as transmitted has the tenor end on a semibreve, and the contratenor on a breve (ex. 2, m. 120).<sup>17</sup>

Ex. 3: Hypothetical ending for an earlier version of *O canenda/Rex*, breves 90–95.

It is telling that the other motet associated with Vitry which ends in an untexted hocket section looks very different. As indicated in table 1, *Impudenter/Virtutibus* has the same amount of tenor material in each of its sections – one *color*, divided into five *taleae*:<sup>18</sup>

color 1:	talea 1	talea 2	talea 3	talea 4	talea 5
color 2:	tal. 6	tal. 7	tal. 8	tal. 9	tal. 10

The bridge between these two sections is given in example 4. Significantly, the cadence is elided with the beginning of the second *color*, resolving into the start of the hockets rather than before them as in *O canenda/Rex*. Also

<sup>16</sup> Triplum breve 47 is rendered in the three sources that transmit it as  $\blacklozenge\blacklozenge\blacklozenge$  whereas four undifferentiated semibreves in *ars antiqua* notation would translate into  $\blacklozenge\blacklozenge\blacklozenge\blacklozenge$ . Triplum breve 4, the only other exception, hints at the interchangeability of these two patterns, since it appears as  $\blacklozenge\blacklozenge\blacklozenge$  in F-Pn 2444 but  $\blacklozenge\blacklozenge\blacklozenge$  in Ivrea and CH-Fc 260.

<sup>17</sup> The motetus already has a longa here in three of the sources, while F-Pn 2444 gives two *G* breves instead.

<sup>18</sup> This diagram maps only the tenor, and thus excludes the first 12 breves, in which a texted triplum sings alone.

noteworthy is the superimposition of iambic and trochaic rhythms in the motet's first section (appearing throughout the motet and in bb. 99 and 101 of ex. 4). Thus there is, in both the texted first section and the untexted second section of *Impudenter/Virtutibus*, a preponderance of rhythms which could not have been notated with tools available in the opening decades of the century, tools which, even when they could be notated, were slow to catch on.

Ex. 4: *Impudenter/Virtutibus*, breves 99–113.

Triplum  
Motetus  
Contratenor  
Tenor

(talea 5, contd.)

talea 6  
color 2

105

110

talea 7

One question raised by these observations is whether there is a logical order for *O canenda/Rex* and *Impudenter/Virtutibus* based on the idea of a two-stage genesis for *O canenda/Rex*. I suggest that *O canenda/Rex* received its hockets before *Impudenter/Virtutibus* was planned, and that indeed the expansion of the former might have given Vitry the idea for the latter's form. Large untexted hocket sections are relatively unusual in the repertory – there are only one or two more examples, discussed below. But the addition of such a section would have been a logical way to expand a 'finished' motet without affecting its texts. The integrity of texts is especially important in *O canenda/Rex*, where the eight-line motetus preserves the acrostic ROBERTVS. It is perhaps not unreasonable to posit that what might

have begun as a creative solution to the problem of expanding *O canenda/Rex* could have entered the composer's toolbox and become a premeditated part of *Impudenter/Virtutibus*.

One more motet merits investigation as a possible example of hockets added later, though it is an even more speculative case. The upper voices of *Beatius/Cum humanum* have recently been reconstructed from three fragmentary sources in Paris, Vienna and Würzburg.<sup>19</sup> The lower voice or voices do not survive at all, and certain aspects of the form are therefore irrecoverable. But the motet's large-scale structure is striking. After a 12-breve motetus opening, it consists of two 66-breve sections of texted material which are separated by an 80-breve untexted hocket section:

12 ■ instr.	66 ■ texted	80 ■ untexted hockets	66 ■ texted
----------------	----------------	--------------------------	----------------

In *O Canenda/Rex*, I argued that the hockets were added later; in *Impudenter/Virtutibus*, that they were part of the original plan. To which category does *Beatius/Cum humanum* belong? Well, as it happens, *Beatius/Cum humanum* is the only tripartite motet of the *ars nova*. It is also the third-longest, at 226 breves. During its texted sections it uses a mode-1 rhythmic vocabulary that would be at home in *Fauvel*, though with minim stems. However, its middle is from a different universe – it demonstrates methodically what hocketing can do, moving from longer phrases exchanged by the two upper voices to progressively shorter ones which make effective use of minim rests and to execute playful, striking sequences of a kind not present in *Fauvel*-era motets.<sup>20</sup> There are also clean breaks on either side of the hockets, rendering each of the three sections closed from the harmonic and textural standpoints (see ex. 5 and ex. 6).

Ex. 5: *Beatius/Cum humanum*, breves 75–83 (lowest voice editorial).

<sup>19</sup> Anna Zayaruznaya, „Quotation, Perfection, and the Eloquence of Form. Introducing *Beatius/Cum humanum*“, *PMM* 24/2 (2015), 129–166.

<sup>20</sup> See the edition in Zayaruznaya, „Quotation, Perfection, and the Eloquence of Form“ (see n. 19), 157–165, and especially measures 127–159.

Ex. 6: *Beatius/Cum humanum*, breves 155–63 (lowest voice editorial).

These circumstances suggest that *Beatius/Cum humanum* might have started life as a bipartite motet, and that its central hocket section is a later addition. On the other hand, there is a textual reason for this motet to place formal emphasis on the number 3: it is closely related to, and in dialogue with, the Trinitarian *Fauvel* motet *Firmissime/Adesto*. Indeed, breves 199–210 of *Beatius/Cum humanum* quote the text and music of a triplum passage from *Firmissime/Adesto* which features a striking, fanfare-like rendition of the phrase „nunc igitur sanctam Trinitatem veneremur, atque Unitatem“ (let us therefore venerate the holy Trinity, and also the Unity). This quotation – unusually prominent for an *ars nova* motet – lends the whole work a focus on trinity and unity that could certainly serve to legitimize its tripartite form. (Indeed, it legitimizes that form whether it was in the work’s original version or inherent to its reworking.) Thus it is ultimately difficult to glean whether a significant reworking was or was not involved in this case.

A final piece of evidence for the insertion of hockets – whether into these motets or others – comes from book VII of the *Speculum musicae*. In the course of his famous polemic *Jacobus* repeatedly complains that modern musicians do not cultivate enough genres. In Chapter 46 he praises the ancients for singing various kinds of organum, delightful conductus, and a variety of hockets; in contrast, he reports, the *moderni* limit themselves to songs and motets. The only exception to this is the hocket: „Do not the moderns use motets and chansons almost exclusively, except for inserting hockets in their motets?“ (nisi quod in motetis suis hoketos *interserunt*).<sup>21</sup> And this is in fact the second reference to the practice, since already in Chapter 9 he had lamented that his day’s *musici*, singers, and *discantores* reject organum, conductus, certain kinds of motets, and the wide range of available hocket textures (double, contradouble,

<sup>21</sup> „Moderni nonne quasi solis utuntur motetis et cantilenis nisi quod in motetis suis hoketos interserunt? Sed cantus alios multos dimiserunt quibus in propria forma non utuntur, sicut fecerunt antiqui, cantus organicos mensuratos vel non ubique mensuratos ut est organum purum vel duplum de quo forsitan pauci sciunt modernorum; item conductos, cantus ita pulchros, in quibus tanta delectatio est, qui sunt ita artificiales et delectabiles, duplices, triplices et quadruplices: item hoketos similiter duplices, contraduplices, triplices et quadruplices. In his antiqui cantores alternatim cantibus vacabant, in his se fundabant, in his exercebantur, in his delectabantur, non in solis motetis aut in cantilenis“, *Jacobi Leodiensis Speculum musicae*, ed. by Roger Bragard, [Rom]: American Institute of Musicology, 1973 (Corpus scriptorum de musica 3/7), 89.

and triple), except when they interpose these in their motets (nisi quod aliquos illorum *inserunt* in motetis).<sup>22</sup> In a previous publication, I suggested that these references were to short hockets like the ones in *Cum statua/Hugo*, reading „interserunt“ and „inserunt“ as „they include“.<sup>23</sup> But both verbs imply a grafting or interposition, and it now seems at least as likely that Jacobus was referring to the *insertion* of hockets into motets which did not previously have them.

### Reworked Beginnings

It is possible to glean at least one other kind of reworking in the *ars nova* motet repertory. Frank Harrison and Mildred Johnson, the editors of *O Philippe/O bone dux*, which opens the Ivrea codex, both mentioned in their notes the existence of a long untexted introductory section to the motet. Neither included this section in their edition, Harrison explaining that „the Introitus is very rubbed“.<sup>24</sup> Close examination of the source renders the notation largely legible, and it appears that not one but two openings survive for the motet.<sup>25</sup> The opening material preceding the motetus consists in two voices notated successively, separated by a vertical divider clearly visible in the manuscript though not in its reproductions (see diplomatic facsimile in fig. 1). These two voices make good counterpoint with the material notated in the tenor, also set off by a vertical bar (see fig. 2). The three-voice section amounts to 39 breves of material and ends with a cadence (see ex. 7). However, it does not have anything to do with the opening notated in the triplum. There, the scribe wrote 55 breves of music before giving up for some reason. What survives is an attractive and heavily sequential monophonic opening (see ex. 8). Around breve 35 the voice becomes less contoured, and maybe a now-lost motetus or several voices once joined in at this point.



Fig. 1: *O philippe/O bone dux*, diplomatic facsimile of motetus opening, Ivrea fol. 2r.

<sup>22</sup> „Musici cantores et discantatores [...] a se repellunt cantus antiquos organicos, conductos, motellos, hoketos duplices, contraduplices et triplices, nisi quod aliquos illorum *inserunt* in motetis, vel motellis suis“, *Jacobi Leodiensis Speculum musicae* (see n. 21), 22.

<sup>23</sup> Anna Zayaruznaya, „Hockets as Compositional and Scribal Practice in the *ars nova* Motet. A Letter from Lady Music“, *JM* 30 (2013), 490.

<sup>24</sup> Harrison, *Motets of French Provenance* (see n. 8), 193. Mildred Jane Johnson, *The Motets of the Codex Ivrea*, Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1955, two vols, II, 1–8. The existence of this section is also mentioned by Bent and Wathey in their New Grove article on Vitry, to whom *O philippe/O bone dux* is sometimes attributed on stylistic grounds; Margaret Bent and Andrew Wathey, „Vitry, Philippe de“, *NGroveD2*, XXVI, 808.

<sup>25</sup> For what follows, see Anna Zayaruznaya, „[I]ntroitus: Untexted Beginnings and Scribal Confusion in the Machaut and Ivrea Manuscripts“, in *Digital Philology* 5/1 (2016), 47–73.




Fig. 2: *O philippe/O bone dux*, diplomatic facsimile of tenor opening, Ivrea fol. 2r.

Ex. 7: *O philippe/O bone dux*, opening material notated at the head of the motetus and tenor realized as a three-voice introitus.

A musical score for a three-voice introitus. It consists of four systems of staves. The first system has three staves with measure numbers 1, 5, and 10. The second system has three staves with measure numbers 15, 20, and 25. The third system has three staves with measure numbers 25, 30, and 35. The fourth system has three staves with measure numbers 40 and 45. The lyrics are: "O Phi-lip - pe, Fran-ci qui ge - ne - ris rex" and "O bo - ne dux in - do-lis op-ti-". The score includes various musical notations such as clefs, time signatures, and accidentals.

Ex. 8: *O Philippe/O bone dux*, introductory material notated at the head of the triplum voice; sequences are boxed.

So it seems that two different opening sections were copied for the same motet. One or neither of these may have been part of the work's original conception. The introitus on the recto is perhaps the earlier of the two, whereas the heavy sequences of the material notated in the triplum voice are reminiscent of the beginning of Machaut's late motet 21, *Christe/Veni*, dateable to December 1359/January 1360.<sup>26</sup> Although small melodic sequences also appear in *Tuba/In arboris*, which is usually thought to be early (though, I would suggest, with little cause), it might reasonably be posited that such opening sequences belong to the middle third of the century if not its second half.

Despite their differences in texture, the introitus sections of *O philippe/O bone dux* and the hockets of *O canenda/Rex act* in analogous ways: they update and lengthen their motets without changing the original *color* or *talea*, and without interfering with the words. The fragmentary *O vos omnes/Locus iste*, edited by Peter Lefferts and more recently by Elina Hamilton, may also

<sup>26</sup> On this dating see discussion and bibliography in Lawrence Earp, *Guillaume de Machaut* (see n. 7), 39, 298–299; see also n. 43.

exemplify this tendency while providing a link between the two.<sup>27</sup> (In fact, it appears on the same opening as *O canenda/Rex* in its unique source.<sup>28</sup>) Though one upper voice is missing, the surviving tenor of *O vos omnes/Locus iste* divides the motet into three sections, the first labeled „Introitus“ and set as four *taleae*, the second on a longer *color* and divided into four new *taleae* (though of the same length, 18 breves) and the third a diminished version of the second, in four nine-breve *taleae*. Only the middle section carries text. This section and the last use the same *color*, a version of the chant *Locus iste*:

color A1:	talea A1	talea A2	talea A3	talea A4	← untexted, hocketed
color B1:	talea B1	talea B2	talea B3	talea B4	← texted, no hockets
color B2:	talea B5	talea B6	talea B7	talea B6	← untexted, hocketed

Without its opening section *O vos omnes/Locus iste* is formally and texturally similar to *Impudenter/Virtutibus*. With its opening, it resembles *O canenda/Rex*, and is irregular like that motet. Here what sticks out is not the diminution section, but the long *introitus*, which does not use the *color* common to the rest, but rather features an alternation of *F*s and *G*s derived from the first four notes of the *Locus iste* chant. This long opening section is both hocketed and textless, and results in a motet that is formally irregular within the repertory (its fourth *talea* is also two breves short in one voice – another, minor oddity<sup>29</sup>). The possibility that the piece resulted from reworkings in line with those observed above is tantalizing, though, as Hamilton notes, the motet's unique survival in an English source leaves its connections with Vitry and the French *ars nova* repertory unclear.

To sum up: the hockets of *Cum statua/Hugo* were refashioned at some point to use minims and minim rests, whereas initially they were comprised of semibreves and semibreve rests; the final section of *O canenda/Rex* seems to have been added to that motet at some point subsequent to its initial compo-

<sup>27</sup> Peter Martin Lefferts, *The Motet in England in the Fourteenth Century*, Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1983, 569–575; Elina Hamilton, „Philippe de Vitry in England. Three French Motets in the *Quatuor Principalia*“, paper presented at *Philippe de Vitry: An International Symposium*, Yale University, November 2015, and forthcoming in publication, Appendix B. I am grateful to Dr. Hamilton for sharing this work with me prior to publication.

<sup>28</sup> Its two voices survive in GB-DRc 20, fol. 337v.

<sup>29</sup> At the end of *talea* A4, the top voice as written is two breves shorter than the tenor, which ends with two breves of rest. Lefferts omits the rests and lengthens the final notes of both voices as maximas (see n. 27); Hamilton also omits the tenor's longa rest as having no corresponding rest in the top voice, but transcribes the final note in both voices as a longa.

sition; *Beatus/Cum humanum* is tripartite by virtue of a hocketed interlude that may have been inserted; *O philippe/O bone dux* has several surviving opening sections, one or neither of which may have been originally planned; and the hocketed introitus of *O vos omnes/Locus iste* might have been a later addition to that motet. Thus some *ars nova* motets seem to have been subject to certain kinds of reworking. This thesis should hardly be a surprise given the oft-acknowledged flexibility of medieval works. But it is worth stating in light of the rhetoric that surrounds *ars nova* motets. In addition to their reputation for compositional stability, noted above, they have at times been characterized as deeply mathematical or even architectural objects – orderly evocations of sounding number, the musical equivalents of Gothic cathedrals (a rhetorical move Christopher Page called „cathedralism“).<sup>30</sup> And while this rhetoric is perhaps most prominent in scholarship of the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, it is not confined to that era: as late 2005 Richard Taruskin still characterized „the fourteenth-century isorhythmic motet“, as „possibly the most hierarchically conceived and rigorously ordered genre in the history of European music.“<sup>31</sup> If so, we can hardly expect this edifice to be modular – for some of its pillars to be newer than others, for its buttresses to be later additions – even though, ironically, this is true of many cathedrals.

If we have been hesitant to recognize the mutability of certain notational and even larger formal features in these motets it is probably because of a tacit assumption that something very like the work-concept applies to them – meaning here Lydia Goehr’s account of the musical work as „a product existing over and above its performance“.<sup>32</sup> To recall Busse Berger’s characterization, motets are „compositions in the modern sense of the word“. Goehr posited that the Work did not come into being until c. 1800, at which point it became pervasive and took on the role of a regulative concept which was then projected backwards across music history. Others have worked to shift the birth of the ‚work‘ earlier. Rob Wegman, for example, moved Goehr’s divider line but left her distinction essentially intact when he argued that music before c. 1500 was more of an event than a ‚composition‘.<sup>33</sup> Eloquent defenses of pre-1500 compositions as works or fixed objects have come from the pens of Reinhard Strohm, Leo Treitler, and Wulf Arlt, and Bent alludes to motets when she argues that „there are plenty of demonstrably complete and finished works by Machaut, Vitry and Du Fay, that are fixed in writing

<sup>30</sup> Christopher Page, *Discarding Images. Reflections on Music and Culture in Medieval France*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993, 1–42.

<sup>31</sup> Richard Taruskin, *The Oxford History of Western Music*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2005, five vols, I, 272.

<sup>32</sup> Lydia Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992, 118; see also the essays collected in Michael Talbot (ed.), *The Musical Work. Reality or Invention?*, Liverpool University Press, 2000; and Matthew Butterfield, „The Musical Object Revisited“, *Music Analysis* 21/3 (2002), 327–380.

<sup>33</sup> Rob Wegman, „From Maker to Composer. Improvisation and Musical Authorship in the Low Countries, 1450–1500“, *JAMS* 49/3 (1996), 409–479.

and artfully worked out to the last detail, meeting all criteria for an autonomous ‚work‘.<sup>34</sup>

Something like a ‚work concept‘ has to be called upon to support the kind of analysis to which *ars nova* motets are subject. A relative stability must be taken for granted when claims are made about numbers of notes, numbers of words, measures, midpoints, and sounding simultaneities. Furthermore, as noted above, a large degree of musico-poetic stability has been assumed in the construction of chronologies: when the words of a motet suggest a date, scholars use its music to construct ideas about notational usage and compositional innovation at that date. And then the picture built up from these data points is in turn used to date other works by their notational and formal aspects. The assumption here is that neither the words nor the music changed, and that they certainly did not change independently of each other. This lies behind Leech-Wilkinson's claim, in his account of the early *ars nova*, that it is „inherently unlikely [...] that the music of any [*ars nova* motet] was written long after its text“; ‚the music‘ implies a stability that does not leave space for robust revisions.<sup>35</sup>

Evidence of revisions therefore puts us in a Scyllaeo-Charybdean position. If *ars nova* motets are not stable then hermeneutic work done on them rests on a shoddy foundation. On the other hand, an assumption of too much stability occludes obvious signs of revision, potentially leading to problematic chronologies and editions. One way forward would be to employ a mediating ontology that casts late-medieval songs as neither ‚works‘ in the Beethovenian sense nor as sounding acts devoid of any „essentially textual or visual“ qualities.<sup>36</sup> In a recent monograph on *ars nova* motets I explored music-theoretical and other discourses that treat songs, and their components, as living creatures – from ligatures turning their heads to motets that end in tails. This led me to posit a ‚creature concept‘ of the musical object – to imagine the *ars nova* motet as more of a cat than a cathedral. Like ‚works‘, song-creatures are discrete in that they can be named and classified. Though they might not have pretended to universality, neither were they ephemeral or geo-culturally circumscribed: songs and motets traveled and accrued new meanings in the process, existing over and above their performances. Some aspects of their bodies and natures

<sup>34</sup> Margret Bent, „Reading, Memory, Listening, Improvisation. From Written Text to Lost Sound“, *Bj/bHM* 34 (2010), 13–28, 24. See also Reinhard Strohm, „Looking Back at Ourselves. The Problem with the Musical Work-Concept“, in Talbot, *The Musical Work* (see n. 32), 128–52; Leo Treitler, „Response to Patricia Carpenter, ‚the Musical Object‘“, *Current Musicology* 5 (1967), 89–90; and Arlt, „Donnez Signeurs“ (see n. 7).

<sup>35</sup> Leech-Wilkinson, „Emergence of *ars nova*“ (see n. 13), 316. A contrasting view and one closer to the present argument is voiced by Bent. Though she does not suggest that the music of motets was subject to revision, her observation that „most motets are dated or placed on the basis of their texts“ and that in the case of *Per grama* „the encouragement for an early dating comes entirely from the texts [...] [but] is doubtful on musical grounds“ suggests that there could in fact be distance between these two elements („Early Papal Motets“ [see n. 8], 10–11).

<sup>36</sup> Wegman, „From Maker to Composer“ (see n. 33), 453.

were stable (more on this fixity below). But song-creatures also had the capacity to change as they aged. Unlike ‚works‘, they were not created to be timeless or immortal. They could grow old and become irrelevant, their notational systems forgotten and their sources cut up to reinforce newer books. When faced with such obsolescence, song-creatures sometimes adapted.<sup>37</sup>

How might the ‚reworkings‘ described here be classified within this admittedly whimsical model? The updated hockets of *Cum statua/Hugo* are something of a face-lift, or a toupé – they keep that motet looking young by incorporating the most recent rhythmic developments, perhaps also responding to a slowing-down of the tactus between the motet’s initial composition and its eventual revision. At some point alternating semibreves stopped sounding like hockets, and *Cum statua/Hugo* underwent a non-invasive cosmetic procedure to stay hip. Why a motet about a hypocrite named Hugo who offended Philippe de Vitry needed to stay up-to-date is a separate question, but the piece seems to have had wide currency at mid-century on both sides of the channel.<sup>38</sup>

It is easier to see why *O canenda/Rex* and *O philippe/O bone dux* would have been updated. Both are dedicated to rulers whose reigns stretched across multiple decades. A motet for Robert of Anjou would have had ceremonial uses between 1309 when he ascended to the Neapolitan throne and his death in 1343 – though no-one has ever tried to date *O canenda/Rex* earlier than 1319, due to its musical features. As for *O philippe/O bone dux*, it is addressed jointly to Philip VI (1293–1350), and his son John (1319–1364), calling the latter „bone dux [...] Johannes“, and not yet a *rex*. It ends with a reference to a pledge or vow made by John,<sup>39</sup> whose career before his 1350 coronation provides plenty of opportunities for ceremony. The year 1332 saw him titled Count of Anjou, Count of Maine, and Duke of Normandy; in 1344 he was named Count of Poitiers; and in 1345, Duke of Aquitaine. Thus on at least three separate occasions over the course of twelve years – not to mention countless smaller diplomatic and laudatory opportunities – a motet exhorting John, a duke, to rule wisely and to „zealously strive to fulfill [his] vow“ would have been singularly appropriate. The ranges of currency for *O canenda/Rex* and *O philippe/O bone dux* may be graphed as in figure 3.

<sup>37</sup> Zayaruznaya, *The Monstrous New Art* (see n. 1), 66–69.

<sup>38</sup> As attested by Jehan de le Mote’s request that Vitry not „make a *Hugo*“ of him (cf. Zayaruznaya, *The Monstrous New Art* [see n. 1], 106, 140–141) as well as the citation of *Cum statua/Hugo* in the English *Quatuor Principalia* of 1351; see Luminita Florea Aluas, „The *Quatuor principalia musicae*. A Critical Edition and Translation“, Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1996, 420.

<sup>39</sup> „Testamentum cura persolvere“, l. 23, ed. by A. G. Rigg in PMFC 5 (see n. 8), supplement, 2.




Fig. 3: Dates of currency for *O canenda/Rex* and *O Philippe/O bone dux*.

When such wide ranges of dates are permitted by motet texts, scholars have tended to favor the earlier possibilities, assuming initial coronations and promotions as the occasions for premières – a practice that Margaret Bent has reasonably criticized.<sup>40</sup> For *O canenda/Rex*, as mentioned, the proposed dates range from c. 1320 (Leech-Wilkinson) to the mid-1330s (Bent). Though Bent's case seems to me to be the stronger one, the history of revisions posited here puts less pressure on the notation: only the added part of the motet reflects the newest developments.

And yet, more is at stake here than the dating of any single motet. Minim rests in the hockets of *O canenda/Rex*, *Per grama*, and *Flos/Celsa* – all motets that have been placed early in the ranges allowed by their texts – led Leech-Wilkinson and Kügle to place most of the *ars nova* motet repertory between 1316 and c. 1325.<sup>41</sup> This yielded some strange results; chief among them that *Fauvel* is rendered notationally conservative, and that Vitry is largely inactive as a composer in the middle third of the century, with the exception of one motet. Leech-Wilkinson argued the case thus:

After the *Fauvel* motets no work associated with Vitry carries a date other than *Flos/Celsa* in 1317 and *Petre/Lugentium* in 1342, and there is no reason other than musicological tidy-mindedness to spread the other pieces out over the intervening years. Indeed, their stylistic similarity, and their marked dissimilarity from *Petre/Lugentium*, suggests exactly the opposite – that they are all quite early [...] Given

<sup>40</sup> Bent offers Wathey's re-dating of *Petre/Lugentium* several months into the reign of Clement VI as instance of a „new loosening of the – anyway weak – basis for assuming that motets are more likely to be inaugural than not“ („Early Papal Motets“ [see n. 8], 17).

<sup>41</sup> The story of *Per grama* is complicated by the mis-identification of that motet's dedicatee: while it has long been associated with John XXII, I suggest that it is in fact for Pierre Roger, the future Clement VI. Furthermore, a close reading of *Phi millies/O creator* allows that motet to be dated to 1356 or 1357, making it considerably later than *Petre/Lugentium* and rendering the latter less of an outlier than Leech-Wilkinson implies in the passage cited below. These findings were presented in March 2015 at All Souls College, Oxford as „The Late Works of Philippe de Vitry“, and are pursued further in a publication in progress.

the style achieved in the motets from around 1317, or in *Firmissime* and *Tribum* in 1315, there seems no reason why Vitry should not have completed all the motets we associate with him by the time he first appears in royal service in the 1320s.<sup>42</sup>

It is not tidy-mindedness, but rather the sort of musicological messiness which the possibility of revisions introduces, that ultimately belies this schema. If some motets were subject to ‚reworkings‘ then it would occasionally be the case that music would carry a later date than texts, and thus that certain formal and notational developments would seem to have been introduced earlier than was in fact the case. Admitting the possibility of reworkings thus opens out the space for a new chronology of both works and style in the *ars nova*.<sup>43</sup>

The down-side of these findings is that they can seem to leave us knowing even less now that we did before. If everything is subject to revision, then how can any claims be made about style or chronology? But it is not the case that everything was mutable. The kinds of changes we can observe – or reasonably posit – reveal some patterns. In *O canenda/Rex*, *O philippe/O bone dux*, and *O vos omnes/Locus iste*, the sections apparently affected by revisions are untexted elements at the beginning or end. And in *Cum statua/Hugo*, though the hockets are texted, they are the least texted part of the motet. It seems likely that pre-compositional planning for *ars nova* motets involved careful consideration of how texts would relate to repeating rhythmic structures in upper and lower voices, and these basic calculations seem to be unaffected by reworkings.<sup>44</sup> Hence my analogy with cosmetic alterations: the core of the motets remains untouched – they are still the same creatures. But it also seems that reworked motets could serve as inspiration for integrally conceived works that retain some aspects of ad-hoc structure – as least, that is a plausible genesis story for the form of *Vos/Gratissima*. So re-workings have an impact not only on the works transformed but also on those that followed. And when it comes to dating the repertory, they invite us to ask a new set of questions: not „When was this piece written?“ but „When would this piece have been current enough to warrant being composed or performed or revised?“; „When did it flourish?“ These messier questions will result in messier answers, but promise to place us on surer footing in the long run.

<sup>42</sup> Leech-Wilkinson, „Emergence of *ars nova*“ (see n. 13), 315.

<sup>43</sup> I pursue the chronology of Vitry's output and his relationship to *ars nova* theory in a book on the composer currently in progress.

<sup>44</sup> For analysis of a group of motets whose upper-voice texts and structures seem to have been planned out early in the compositional process, see Anna Zayaruznaya, *Upper-Voice Structures and Compositional Process in the Ars nova Motet*, Routledge, forthcoming 2018 (RMA Monographs). I argue there against using the term ‚color‘ to describe melodic repetitions in motet tenors, but this thinking is not reflected in the present study.

