

20. POLYPHONY FROM AND FOR REFRAINS IN DANCE-SONG MOTETS*

Catherine A. Bradley

As Lawrence Earp observed in his fundamental study of the development of French dance lyrics from Adam de la Halle to Guillaume de Machaut: ‘in the thirteenth century, the refrain forms, associated with popular dancing at court, live a scattered and underground existence.’¹ Evidence of the kinds of rhythmicized refrain songs that may have been danced to in the thirteenth century is frustratingly incomplete or indirect. The early fourteenth-century manuscript **Douce 308** – a source never intended for musical notation – is the principal, and usually lone, witness to such lyrics.² **Douce 308** includes collections of overwhelmingly unique song texts designated estampies and ballettes, the latter in varied, often ballade- or virelai-like forms.³ **Douce 308** also contains rondeaux, of which there survive several earlier and notated collections, notably the monophonic rondeaux attributed to Guillaume d’Amiens in chansonnier **a** and the polyphonic rondeaux by Adam de la Halle in **Ha**.⁴ Vernacular motets, the best-represented polyphonic genre in surviving sources from the late thirteenth century, provide further poetic and musical traces of refrain songs.⁵ Motets present individual refrain texts and/or melodies as part of their motetus, triplum, or quadruplum voices, and they occasionally adopt refrains – or even complete refrain songs – as the foundational tenor voices that more often quote liturgical plainchant melodies.⁶ In the thirteenth century, then, the act of recording rhythmicized refrains songs with musical notation seems principally to have been prompted by special circumstances: the desire to preserve the corpus of a particular author, or the absorption of (parts of) these songs within a genre, such as the motet, with an established notated tradition.⁷ Typically, however, the formally hybrid songs that mix characteristics of rondeaux, virelais, and ballades seem to have been precisely the kind of texts and

* This research was funded by a European Research Council (ERC) Consolidator Grant under the European Union Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (Grant number 864174, in the context of the project *BENEDICAMUS: Musical and Poetic Creativity for a Unique Moment in the Western Christian Liturgy c. 1000–1500*). I thank Elizabeth Eva Leach and the editors of this volume for their valuable feedback.

1 • Earp 1991b, 102.

2 • On **Douce 308**, see Leach 2022.

3 • On estampies, see Leach 2020. On ballettes, see Doss-Quinby, Rosenberg, and Aubrey 2006.

4 • On chansonnier **a**, see Earp 1983, 234–40. As Earp demonstrates (pp. 237–40), rondeaux and motets are used sporadically throughout this source to fill in gaps at the end of sections. The only dedicated collection of rondeaux in chansonnier **a** opens with the rubric ‘Rondel Willamme d’Amiens Paignour’ (fol. 117^r) and contains ten monophonic songs. A pair of *grands chants* by Guillaume d’Amiens appears earlier in chansonnier **a**, opening (on fol. 85^r) with a miniature representing a painter, that may be a self-portrait. On polyphonic rondeaux and their manuscript sources, see Everist 1996 and Bradley 2019, 474–75.

5 • See the discussions of motets with refrain-song upper voices in Everist 1994, 90–108, and Everist 2018.

6 • On motets with vernacular song tenors, see Everist 2007.

7 • The exception is the collection of thirty-four polyphonic rondeaux in **PaB** (discussed in Everist 1996). **PaB** includes rondeaux elsewhere found in the author collections of Guillaume d’Amiens and Adam de la Halle, but it does not give composer attributions nor does it group rondeaux by the same composer. The rondeaux texts are complete but, although this source was laid out to accommodate staves in three-voice score format, these staves were never ruled and no music was entered. This could indicate a scarcity of musical exemplars for polyphonic rondeaux.

music that were not usually written down at all, and which had no conventional place within thirteenth-century collections of monophony or polyphony.⁸

This chapter compares and draws connections between three three-voice French motets in the Montpellier codex (hereafter **Mo**) that embody a profound fusion of aspects of motet and polyphonic song composition. The pieces are clearly shaped from the outset around a preexisting tenor quotation, probably the defining characteristic of the motet as a genre. At the same time, these motets have an overall refrain-song structure. This is never an entirely conventional rondeau, but key characteristics of the rondeau form (invariably a framing refrain) are mixed with those of the virelai (the introduction of internal musical material that alters that of the refrain).⁹ Shaped by repeated refrains, the upper-voices of these song-form motets exhibit a degree of textual and musical interdependence between voices and a tolerance for dissonance that is more characteristic of the surviving repertoire of three-voice polyphonic rondeaux than of motets. These compositions not only blur the genres of motet and refrain song, but they also stand to complicate understandings of what might constitute registrally ‘high’ or ‘low’ forms and styles. This productively opens up the question as to what might constitute compositional ‘sophistication’. Earp’s work has firmly established the musical intricacy of the polyphonic songs of Guillaume de Machaut,¹⁰ but the modest corpus of polyphonic rondeaux that survives from the thirteenth century has barely been analyzed at all.¹¹ And sophistication has also seemed a doubtful description for brief thirteenth-century song-form motets, with fairly generic poetic content and musical transmissions that are – as demonstrated below – unstable and/or containing dissonances ‘corrected’ in modern editions.

This study reconsiders the creative parameters at play in thirteenth-century refrain-song motets to reveal the underlying shared creative strategies by which multiple established melodies (songs, refrains, plainchant) were selected and manipulated to facilitate prolonged combination with each other and also with themselves. It demonstrates the considerable amount of pre-compositional planning at work in conceptualizing and designing – within the constraints of predetermined musical forms and quotations – an economical and thus highly memorable piece of three-part polyphony. Furthermore, such motets may offer rare examples of music and poetry, not typically recorded in writing or dependent on written records, that actually accompanied informal dancing. This is suggested by the survival of con-

8 • In Bradley 2022, 101–04, I argue that the monophonic refrain songs quoted as motet tenors in **Mo** (and which typically survive uniquely in this context) were well-known and largely unwritten popular melodies. The few concordances that exist for these songs are typically among the ballettes and pastourelles of **Douce 308**.

9 • Page 1998, 372, suggests that the forms of ballade and virelai were ‘intertwined in the late thirteenth century and that both duly emerged from a “ballade-virelai matrix” (which accounts for the profoundly mixed formal profile of the ballettes of **Douce 308**). The refrain-song motets analyzed here are also formal hybrids that might, analogously, be characterized as a part of a ‘rondeau-virelai matrix,’ in which the two forms are neither entirely distinct nor yet strictly defined.

10 • See especially Earp 1991a.

11 • The exceptions are Everist 1996, Maw 2006, Butterfield 2002, 273–90, and Everist 2018. Butterfield seeks, somewhat problematically, to elevate certain of Adam de la Halle’s rondeaux by suggesting that they are a response to his motets (p. 283). On this, see also Bradley 2019, 481–82.

cordances for their respective refrains among rondeaux and ballettes, and – in one instance – a refrain text that is an exhortation to come and dance. Refrain-song motets thereby present an unsuspected opportunity to recover ephemeral oral compositional and performative procedures involved in making polyphonic dance lyrics in the thirteenth century.

**Song against songs: working out quotational combinations
in *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant***

Uniquely preserved in **Mo**'s eighth and final added fascicle, the motet *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant* has long attracted attention for its polyphonic combination of the song tenor *He mi enfant* with the refrain '*Prenes i garde*,'¹² the latter also known from a rondeau attributed to Guillaume d'Amiens in chansonnier **a**.¹³ Mark Everist has offered a compelling analysis of this motet, demonstrating how its motetus and triplum voices depend on and complement their underlying tenor, all three voices sharing the same overall form and regular phrase-structure in a manner that is strongly reminiscent of a polyphonic song.¹⁴ Building on Everist's work, Matthew P. Thomson has also underlined the economy of melodic material in the upper voices of *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant*, both of which draw heavily and consistently on the melody and text of the '*Prenes i garde*' refrain.¹⁵ Although *He mi enfant* is known only from this **Mo** 8 motet, its position in the tenor voice is a strong indication of its independent existence as a song, here quoted as a polyphonic foundation. I argue here that the creator of *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant* selected the motet's two preexisting elements – song tenor and rondeau refrain – in conjunction, focusing (unlike Everist and Thomson) on how the melody of the original rondeau refrain was manipulated such that it could not only work in simultaneous polyphonic combination with itself, but also so that it could be fitted against its underlying tenor.

The refrain '*Prenes i garde*' had an unusually wide and stable notated transmission. The two phrases of this refrain (A and B) provide the entire musical content of a rondeau by Guillaume d'Amiens.¹⁶ Framed by the presentation of the complete refrain melody with its accompanying text, and featuring an internal reprise of the music and text of the refrain's A material, Guillaume's rondeau has the conventional overall eight-line form AB aA ab AB. The '*Prenes i garde*' refrain appears also within the context of the romance *Renart le nouvel*. Presented at the same pitch level and with only minimal variations in melodic decoration, the refrain is here a stand-alone musical and textual unit that, in the narrative, is sung as an expression of welcome.¹⁷ This refrain is memorably repetitive (see Example 20.1). Musically, and as

12 + Quotations of refrain texts are distinguished throughout by the use of both italics and inverted commas.

13 + *Prenes i garde* is the final rondeau in the collection attributed to Guillaume d'Amiens in chansonnier **a** and seems to have been added here as an afterthought. To be accommodated on fol. 119', *Prenes i garde* required the ad hoc addition of an extra staff and, unlike Guillaume's preceding nine compositions, it is absent from chansonnier **a**'s medieval table of contents. The rondeau refrain is no. 1531 in van den Boogaard 1969.

14 + Everist 2007, 391–98.

15 + Thomson 2016, 285–91.

16 + See the transcription and analysis of the complete rondeau in Stevens 1986, 188–89.

17 + The '*Prenes i garde*' refrains in the copies of *Renart* in **Ha** and in **Renart C** are closely related to each other and to

is typical of a refrain, *'Prendes i garde'* is comprised of a pair of phrases, and each phrase is here made up of two units of equal length. The two phrases open identically, with the same initial melodic unit (labeled i in Example 20.1), which is effectively a recitation on the pitch *a* that invites continuation or resolution by dipping down to *F*. This opening recitation establishes the primary tonal area and is, in both phrases, answered by a unit that introduces a secondary tonal area, the contrasting 'open' sonority, *G*. In the refrain's first phrase, this answering unit (ii in Example 20.1) descends to *D*, but then rises to cadence on its initial 'open' *G*. By contrast, the answering unit of the refrain's second phrase (iia) simply descends stepwise from *G* to a 'closed' cadence on *D*, which serves as the melody's home or final pitch.

Example 20.1: The *'Prendes i garde'* refrain in Guillaume d'Amiens's rondeau, chansonnier a, fol. 119^v

1. Pren - des i gar - de 2. s'on mi re - gar - de

3. s'on mi re - gar - de 4. di - tes le moi

Repetitions in the refrain text *'Prendes i garde | s'on mi regarde || s'on mi regarde | dites le moi'* ('Be on guard | if someone looks at me || if someone looks at me | tell me') cut across its two musical phrases, which are bridged by the internal reiteration of *'s'on mi regarde'*. The text is dominated by the '-arde' rhyme, as part of a word-play between *'i garde'* ('on guard') and *'regarde'* ('regard' or 'gaze'). This initial insistence on '-arde' clearly connects the repeated opening unit of each phrase (i) and indeed the first three tonally more open-ended units of the refrain (i and ii), which lead to the refrain's final, and closed cadence on *D* (iia) with its new '-oi' rhyme.

This same refrain, as it appears notated a fifth higher within the polyphonic context of the motet *S'on me regard/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant*, exhibits some notable variants from its monophonic transmissions (see Example 20.2). In fact, within the motet itself, two alternative forms of the refrain are presented simultaneously at the outset of its motetus and triplum voices. The motetus shares its four-unit structure with the monophonic version of the refrain and it replicates almost exactly the refrain's first unit of text and music. The continuation of the refrain, however, varies. The motetus text expunges the repetition of *'s'on me regarde'*, which is here replaced, in line 3, with a new text (*'trop sui gaillarde'*, 'I am

chansonnier a. A third source of the *Renart* romance, **Renart F**, whose refrains are poorly notated and often added later (see Haines 2010, 23), has an unrelated melody for this refrain text. See the comparative transcription of monophonic versions of the refrain in Thomson 2016, 291. See also *Refrain*, a website curated by Anne Ibos-Augé, Mark Everist, and Adam Field, <http://refrain.ac.uk/view/abstract_item/1531.html>.

too daring'), though which maintains the original '-arde' rhyme. Musically, only the endings of the motetus refrain's second, third, and fourth units (marked in Example 20.2) can be directly related to the monophonic version, and the motetus adjustments to their openings change the refrain's overall tonal and repetitive structure (variant opening pitches between rondeau and motet versions are circled in Example 20.2). The motetus refrain has a much stronger emphasis on the primary tonal area – here *e* and *a* – such that there is no longer a regular alternation between primary (*e* or *a*) sonorities, and the secondary, contrasting pitch *d*. Indeed, it is only the third unit of the motetus refrain that introduces a tonally 'open' contrast at its outset and, in so doing, this undermines the relationship between the third unit and the first, the two portions of the refrain that were musically identical in its rondeau and romance transmissions. It is not the third, but rather the second and fourth units that are tonally closer to the refrain opening in the motetus version: these phrases likewise begin on *e*, and although they do not stay on this pitch – but rather descend a fifth to the final *a* – they strongly inhabit the primary tonal area.

Example 20.2: Comparing rondeau and motet versions of the 'Prendes i garde' refrain

Mo 8 triplum opening

1. S'on__ me__ re- gar- de__ 2. s'on me re- gar- de 3. di - tes le moi

Mo 8 motetus opening

1. Pre - nes i gar - de__ 2. s'on__me__ re- gar- de 3. trop sui gail - lar - de__ 4. di - tes le moi

Rondeau refrain chansonnier a (up a 5th)

1. Pren - des i gar - de 2. s'on mi__ re - gar - de 3. s'on mi re - gar - de 4. di - tes le moi

The motetus alterations to the monophonic version of the 'Prendes i garde' refrain are highly effective: they invariably retain aspects of its melodic identity – and especially key aspects, such as the very opening and the final cadence – but they nonetheless allow the refrain to be successfully adapted to its new polyphonic context. By increasing tonal uniformity of the refrain's first, second, and fourth units (all of which now begin on *e* and contain only *a*, *c*, and *e* as rhythmically stressed pitches) these units become interchangeable and combinable, both in their horizontal melodic order and as stacked vertically in polyphony. The potential to interchange refrain units melodically and combine them polyphonically is immediately demonstrated by the triplum's opening and shorter (three-unit) version of the refrain, which sounds against that in the motetus. The triplum omits the opening 'Prenes i garde' exclamation, beginning rather by repeating the line 's'on me regarde', the repetition expunged in the motetus. Musically as well as textually, the triplum starts with the motetus refrain's second

unit, which it then follows with the motetus refrain's opening melodic unit. As such, that there is an immediate polyphonic voice exchange between the two parts (marked by arrows in Example 20.2). The triplum initially reverses the first two melodic components of the motetus, a swap made feasible by the now shared opening pitch (*e*) of these two initial refrain units and their emphasis on the primary tonal area. The triplum then omits the motetus refrain's most heavily altered third unit to cut straight to the ending of the refrain (marked by an arrow in Example 20.2). In terms of polyphonic combinations, therefore, the motetus refrain's first two units work against each other in simultaneous presentation, as does its third unit in combination with the fourth (though at the expense of a brief initial dissonant second, *d* against *e*, at the start of bar 3).

This polyphonic combination of a refrain melody against itself might seem sufficiently ingenious. But of course, there is an additional combination to be considered in the context of this three-voice motet, namely that with the quoted tenor melody. The complete motet is presented as Example 20.3, where each of the four individual units of the upper-voice refrain are numbered, and the melodic motives that are not directly refrain-derived are shown in small note-heads. The contour of the song tenor *He mi enfant* and the refrain '*Prendes i garde*' were evidently matched from the outset, the similarities of the two melodies surely inspiring, as well as making possible, their combination. In its overall form, *He mi enfant* has the six-part repetitive structure AB AA' AB (labeled in Example 20.3).¹⁸ On the one hand this could be categorized (as it is by Everist) as a kind of rondeau, which is missing its penultimate couplet.¹⁹ On the other, the internal alterations to the A material of the framing refrain – admittedly involving only their final cadences, but still technically against the rondeau convention of literal repetition – could suggest an AbbA virelai form (where the framing refrains are labeled A and the altered presentations of the refrain's modified first half are labeled b). Whether rondeau, virelai, or a hybrid of the two, *He mi enfant* is a refrain song in which the first half of the refrain melody (A) predominates. And it is this part of the song melody that is most similar to, and works best in combination with, '*Prendes i garde*'. Exactly as in '*Prendes i garde*', the A material of *He mi enfant* opens with an initial recitation on a single pitch (*a*, as in the monophonic version of the refrain), and closes with the step-wise descent of fifth.

18 • **Mo** gives only the text incipit for this tenor, and so it is impossible to verify whether the refrain text accompanied any of the repetitions of its music. Although repeated pitches at the opening of the tenor were carefully preserved to fit the syllables of text, the scribe of the **Mo** tenor dispensed with this detail for all subsequent statements of the A material. Rather than breaking down a perfect long into its constitute long-breve parts in the second half of each of the A material's opening two bars (and as in bars 1–2), the scribe simply notated a perfect long (in bars 9–10, 13–14, and 17–18). There was no harmonic or contrapuntal reason, in the context of the polyphonic motet, to adjust the final cadence of the internal A material (hence A') of the *He mi enfant* tenor. On both occasions (at the end of bars 12 and 16) the tenor cadence is accompanied by the kind of free-composed 'filler' material in motetus and triplum that was not refrain derived, and could easily have been tailored to the tenor's original A material, had this been desired.

19 • Everist 2007, 392.

Example 20.3: *S'on me regarde/ Prenés i garde/ He mi enfant, Mo 8, fols 375-376*

1. S'on me re - gar - de 2. s'on me re - gar - de 3. di - tes le moi 4. trop sui gail - lar - de.

1. Pre - nes i gar - de 2. s'on me re - gar - de 3. trop sui gail - lar - de 4. di - tes le moi

HE MI EN - FANT

5. bien fa - per - choi 6. ne puis lais - sier que mon sés - par - de.

5. pour dieu vous proi 6. car tes mès - gar - de 7. dont mout me tar - de 8. qu'il n'ait o soi.

A B

15. feu d'en - fer l'ar - de. 16. ja - lous de moi 17. mais pour li d'a - mer. ne re - croi.

15 pour nient. mès - gar - de 16. bien pert sa gar - de 17. ja - rai re - choi 18. et de mon a - mi.

A.

Detailed description: This musical score is for section A, measures 15-18. It consists of two staves. The first staff contains measures 15, 16, and 17, with lyrics: "15. feu d'en - fer l'ar - de. 16. ja - lous de moi 17. mais pour li d'a - mer. ne re - croi." The second staff contains measures 15, 16, 17, and 18, with lyrics: "15 pour nient. mès - gar - de 16. bien pert sa gar - de 17. ja - rai re - choi 18. et de mon a - mi." There are four first endings marked with a box containing the number 1. There are four second endings marked with a box containing the number 2. There are four third endings marked with a box containing the number 3. There are four fourth endings marked with a box containing the number 4. The music is in 8/8 time and features various rhythmic patterns, including triplets and sixteenth notes.

18. car par. ma foi | le dos - noi | le fai - re le doi. 19. fai - re le doi. 20. ne se - rai plus cou - ar - de de

19. pour nient. mès - gar - de 20. bien pert sa gar - de 21. ja - rai re - choi

B.

Detailed description: This musical score is for section B, measures 19-21. It consists of two staves. The first staff contains measures 19, 20, and 21, with lyrics: "18. car par. ma foi | le dos - noi | le fai - re le doi. 19. fai - re le doi. 20. ne se - rai plus cou - ar - de de". The second staff contains measures 19, 20, and 21, with lyrics: "19. pour nient. mès - gar - de 20. bien pert sa gar - de 21. ja - rai re - choi". There are four first endings marked with a box containing the number 1. There are four second endings marked with a box containing the number 2. There are four third endings marked with a box containing the number 3. There are four fourth endings marked with a box containing the number 4. The music is in 8/8 time and features various rhythmic patterns, including triplets and sixteenth notes.

Similarities between 'Prendes i garde' and the A material of *He mi enfant* notwithstanding, certain compromises were necessary to combine the two melodies, and these compromises were apparently made principally in the refrain rather than the tenor. For a start, the 'Prendes i garde' refrain was sung up a fifth (now falling from *e* to *a*) to sound above, rather than sharing, the *a*-*D* ambitus of *He mi enfant*. It seems too that the 'open' G sonority at the start of bar 3 of *He mi enfant* motivated the most significant alteration to the motetus refrain in its third unit. The combination of 'Prendes i garde' with the B material of *He mi enfant* proved trickier: since this section of *He mi enfant* opened on *D*, it was not possible to state initially the 'Prendes i garde' refrain, with its insistence on *e*. However, by introducing a delay of one bar, a statement of the three-unit triplum version of the refrain was possible against the end of the tenor's B material. In selecting the *He mi enfant* tenor it is probable that the motet creator recognized that the opening three bars of its A material and the final three bars of its B material were largely interchangeable as a harmonic support. The tenor's A material opens with an extended repetition of the pitch *a* that eventually descends a step to G. Within the same unit of musical time, the final three bars of the B material outline, a fourth lower, the same melodic contour (essentially a prolongation of *E* – though here including an internal descent to *C* – that falls a step to *D*), thereby offering a broadly equivalent foundation for their upper-voices. It is the initial order of melodic units established in the triplum's opening version of the refrain (bars 1–2) that works best in combination with the tenor's B material and is exploited (in the motetus bars 6–7 and in the triplum bars 22–23) on both of its appearances. By immediately descending to *a*, rather than remaining fixed on *e*, the statement of the refrain produces a fifth (in the motetus bar 6 and the triplum bar 22) against the tenor *D*. This avoids the dissonant ninth (*D/e*) that would have been sounded had the order of the first two refrain units been reversed (as in the opening motetus version).

The conception of the entire motet *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant* apparently lay in the considered manipulation of the melodic building blocks of the 'Prendes i garde' refrain such that they could work against each other and against parts of both the A and the B material of the *He mi enfant* tenor. As noted above, the refrain's first unit can sound polyphonically against both its second unit (as in bars 1, 2 and 17) and its fourth (as in bar 18), and the refrain's third and fourth units can also sound simultaneously (as in bars 3 and 19, tolerating a brief initial *d/e* clash). Melodically too, the refrain's various elements are open to multiple sequential arrangements. As well as the two melodic possibilities presented simultaneously at the outset of the motetus (units 1–4) and triplum (units 2, 1, 4), two further successive linear presentations of the refrain elements are exploited: units 2, 1, 3 (as in the motetus, bars 6–8) and units 1, 4, 3 (as in the motetus, bars 13–15). Even in creating the non-refrain derived 'filler' through which to delay by one bar the presentation of the refrain melody over the tenor's B material (in bars 5 and 21), the motet composer crafted a short phrase (marked by dashed boxes) that was also reusable against the start of the tenor's A material (as in bar 9). The carefully planned interoperability of short motives in *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant* made possible the motet's fundamental and economical compositional strategy: that of voice exchange between motetus and triplum.

The motetus and triplum of *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant* employ a voice-exchange or *rondellus* technique throughout, and are largely derived from a single melody and text that is passed between them. As demonstrated above, the refrain 'Prendes i garde' is used at the outset of the motet to generate both upper voices, which here presented it simultaneously. Subsequently, however, three substantial sections of the music and text of the motetus are later repeated in the triplum (all marked by boxes in Example 20.3).²⁰ In the first instance, it is the first three units of the refrain – with a new text – that are sung first by the motetus (bars 6–8, over the end of the tenor's B material) and then by the triplum (bars 9–12, over the start of the tenor's A material). This overlaps with the beginning of the second and more extensive section of music and text to be exchanged between the upper-voices, first presented in bars 10–16 of the motetus and repeated in bars 14–20 of the triplum. Overlapping with itself and predominantly freely-composed rather than strictly refrain-derived (although taking up the refrain's insistence on repeated *e breves*), this phrase appears in conjunction only with the tenor's A material with whose repetition it is correlated, such that the two statements of the same upper-voice material occur over exactly the same tenor foundations. Refrain material within this exchanged phrase occurs – as at the motet's opening – over the start of the tenor's A material (bars 13–15 of the motetus, and bars 17–19 of the triplum). This location of the refrain enables a dove-tailing with the final exchange of refrain material between the upper voices, which begins in the motetus (bars 17–19) at the start of the tenor's final A section, and takes advantage of the same possibility for polyphonic presentation of the 'Prendes i garde' refrain melody as was exploited at the motet's outset. The repetition of this melodic refrain material in the triplum (bars 22–24) is not immediate or overlapping on this occasion: it is postponed, not only to occur at the close of the motet, but also (and as before) to fit against the end of the tenor's B material.²¹ As a consequence of this sequence of exchanges between motetus and triplum, the overall melodic and harmonic content of the initial and closing presentations of the complete tenor refrain (AB) is largely identical. As Everist also emphasized, the roles of the upper voices are, however, swapped, such that what was first presented in the motetus is finally sung in the triplum and vice versa.²²

This compositional matrix was intricately mapped, and – as with all *rondellus*-type compositions – the result was an economical, and satisfyingly 'simple', polyphonic creation.²³ In

20 • See the analysis of two *Mo* fascicle 5 motets that also employ this technique in Bradley 2014, 413–19.

21 • The first statement of the tenor's B material appeared in conjunction with melodic units 2, 1, and 3 in the motetus (bars 6–8). In this final statement, the tenor's B material is combined with units 2, 1, and 4 of the refrain in the triplum (bars 22–24), such that the motet as a whole closes with the refrain's final cadence. This produces the brief initial dissonance of a ninth (*D/e*) between tenor and triplum voices in bar 24. This dissonance is 'corrected' in Tischler 1978, 3: 200 (a solution accepted in Everist 2007, 394 and Thomson 2016, 290) through an alternative rhythmic realization of the tenor. However, *Mo* clearly records the same ending as the song's opening presentation of the B material (save the addition of a plica). Similar dissonance for the sake of the refrain presentation is also tolerated elsewhere in the motet: *d/e* seconds between the upper-voices (at the start of bar 3) or an *E/d* seventh between tenor and motetus (at the end of bar 7).

22 • See Everist 2007, 392.

23 • Everist 2007, 396, considered that the 'close affinities of much of the musical and poetic material' in *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant* might count against the intricacy of its composition.

S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant, various permutations of a short refrain sung above the statement of a song melody generated the music of almost an entire three-voice motet. Poetically too, the texts of the two upper-voices are highly dependent on the refrain and on each other. In addition to the verbatim exchange of texts that accompanies their direct musical exchanges, the triplum (in line 4) also takes up the motetus's addition to the conventional refrain text ('trop sui gaillarde'). Conversely, the triplum text for the 'filler' material at the start of the tenor's first B section (line 5, 'bien l'aperchoi') is later adopted by the motetus (in line 9) when it reuses the same 'filler' to open the tenor's following A section. Both voices confine themselves exclusively to the rhyme sounds of their opening refrain ('-arde' and '-oi'), and typically also in conjunction with the same line-lengths as in the refrain (five and four syllables, respectively).²⁴ In addition, presentations of the refrain melody are usually accompanied by permutations of the word 'garde' (highlighted in bold: in the motetus line 6, repeated in the triplum line 8; in the motetus lines 15 and 16, repeated in the triplum lines 19 and 20).

Not only does *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant* usefully complicate the simple binaries of song (monophonic and polyphonic) versus motet, or low versus high styles, but it also invites reflection on compositional processes themselves and their attendant value. I described the creation of *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant* as intricate and indeed sophisticated. I would also argue that this motet was likely the outcome, not of some kind of concrete sketch or plan of the kind that is – in a view of music shaped by nineteenth-century aesthetics – often the guarantee of compositional worth, but of a process that was fundamentally informal and performative. The potential to combine *He mi enfant* and '*Prenes i garde*' was surely first recognized because of an intimate familiarity with these songs in practice. Furthermore, it seems probable that the adjustments to the quoted refrain and the various ways in which it could be combined with the preexisting song *He mi enfant* were tested and worked out in performance. Singers tried the refrain against a performance of *He mi enfant*, figured out how '*Prenes i garde*' needed to be tweaked to work with its underlying song tenor and against itself, tested orally various combinations and placements of the refrain, and then responded to and imitated each other, exchanging both musical and textual material. The economy of music and text in this three-voice motet, as well as its profound dependence on already well-known song and refrain melodies, strongly suggest that neither its creation nor its subsequent performance(s) would have required any recourse to written records. Arguably, it was a recognition of the ingenuity and value of the solution to a performative and practice-based polyphonic puzzle achieved in *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant* that caused it to be notated and preserved in the context of **Mo** fascicle 8. To return to a question left open by Everist and to paraphrase Earp's evaluation of Machaut's rondeau *Cinc, un, trespas*: *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant* 'is the studied product of a refined and subtle ordering of elements, doubtless requiring many calculations and ad-

24 • The exception is in lines 6–8 of the triplum where the typical line lengths and rhymes are disrupted, presumably to further the 'garde' word-play through the introduction of the noun 'regard'.

justments before the finished product was perfected.²⁵ *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant* is also – and unlike *Cinc, un, trese*, but like Machaut's virelai *Dame, a vous* – a “tune”.

A polyphonized refrain in a song-form motet: *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes*

As Everist noted, *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant* is exceptional in the degree to which it mixes characteristics of song and motet, and also more generally within the context of **Mo** 8 and the motet repertoire at large.²⁶ Yet it bears close comparison with another song-form motet framed by a motetus refrain that is combined with and stated against itself in the triplum at the outset. *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes* is uniquely preserved in the fifth fascicle of **Mo**'s earlier 'old corpus'.²⁷ Although this motet adopts as its tenor the plainchant melisma *Omnes*, its overall form – determined here by the motetus voice – is that of a refrain song (see Example 20.4). The *Omnes* tenor is stated four times, to align with the four phrases of the motetus's Abb'A form. This form, categorized by scholars as both a rondeau and a virelai, consists of a framing refrain that encloses two new and related internal phrases.²⁸ The framing motetus refrain comprises two complementary and tonally equivalent phrases (compare bars 1–2 and 3–4 of Example 20.4). Each half of the refrain shares the same opening motive (*c-b*) which is mirrored in its closing cadence (*b-c*). But while the refrain's first phrase goes from *c*, up to *f*, and back down to *c*, its second phrase goes from *c* down to *F* and back up to *c*. As in *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant*, *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes* opens with a simultaneous polyphonic presentation of two parts of a motetus refrain text and melody in its upper voices. The tonal consistency and contrary motion of the 'Haro' refrain's two halves allow the triplum simply to present the refrain's second phrase (with accompanying text) transposed up a fourth (beginning on *f* rather than *c*, boxed and marked by an arrow in Example 20.4), at the same time as the motetus sings the refrain's first phrase.²⁹ The triplum and motetus then immediately exchange their refrain texts, but the textual exchange lacks an accompanying musical dimension in bars 3–4 of the triplum. Here there is no attempt to match the triplum's 'Haro' text with a version of the motetus's accompanying opening music, presumably because the presentation of this phrase up a fourth would – although harmonically and contrapuntally successful – have pushed the triplum uncomfortably high (up to *b'*) in range. Instead, increasingly varied reiterations of the triplum's opening transposed version of the second half of the refrain go on to serve as the basis of this and almost every subsequent triplum phrase in the motet (marked by open brackets in Example 20.4).

25 • See Everist 2007, 396 and Earp 1991a, 135.

26 • Everist 2007, 398 and 391, respectively.

27 • On the dating of **Mo**'s various layers, see Bradley 2022, 4–5.

28 • See the summary and critique of the various formal taxonomizations of this piece (which also include its identification as a *motet enté*) in Everist 1994, 106–7.

29 • An opening at-pitch presentation of the refrain's second half in the triplum would also have been successful, but presumably the creator of the motet wished to avoid too much unison movement between the upper voices, opting instead to distinguish their registral profiles.

Example 20.4: *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes*, Mo 5, fols 212^v–213^r

The musical score consists of four systems, each with a vocal line and an accompaniment line. The key signature is one flat (B-flat) and the time signature is 8/8.

System 1 (A): The vocal line begins with a treble clef and a key signature of one flat. The lyrics are: "1. Ci m'i tient li maus d'a-mer, 2. ha-ro je n'i puis du-rer!". The accompaniment line starts with a bass clef and a key signature of one flat. There are asterisks above the first two measures of the vocal line.

System 2 (b): The vocal line continues with: "1. Ha-ro je n'i puis du-rer, 2. ci m'i tient li maus d'a-mer!". The accompaniment line is labeled "OMNES".

System 3 (b'): The vocal line continues with: "3. Dou-ce ka-mu-se-te 4. li cuers, qui san-loit es-tre mien 5. est". The accompaniment line is labeled "II".

System 4 (A): The vocal line continues with: "vos-tre sans-pra-me-tre. 6. Pra-me-tre sans do-ner n'est rien 7. a pris une a-mo-re-te, 6. qui ne mi-lait re-po-ser". The accompaniment line is labeled "III".

System 5 (A): The vocal line continues with: "13. loi-au-ment a-mer me tie[n]g 8. se trop vos aim, ce me plaist bien." The accompaniment line is labeled "IV".

Beyond the context of *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes*, the refrain 'Haro, je n'i puis durer, ci m'i tient li maus d'amer!' is known only from *Amors me font languir*, a ballette whose text is uniquely recorded in *Douce* 308 and which returns to this refrain at the end of each of its

three stanzas.³⁰ Since no external sources of the refrain melody survive, it is impossible to assess to what extent that melody might have been manipulated in *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes* to work against the *Omnes* tenor and against a transposed version of itself in the triplum. The very successful harmonic and durational correspondence between the statement of the refrain and that of the complete tenor melody may indicate that adjustments were made to the 'Haro' refrain. Yet it is worth noting that – unlike in *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant*, where both the melody and the rhythm of the song tenor were predetermined – the composer of *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes* was constrained only by the sequence of pitches in the *Omnes* melisma, free to group and rhythmicize them as required.³¹ And the *Omnes* melody itself was, like *He mi enfant*, a good choice as an amenable polyphonic foundation, thanks to its insistence principally on a single pitch (here the final, *F*) and the alteration of this repeated principal pitch with a counter-sonority a step apart (here *G*, a step above). It is feasible, then, that the 'Haro' refrain was indeed a relatively or an entirely literal melodic and textual quotation in *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes*, and that the possibility for the (transposed) second half of this refrain to sound against the first, and simultaneously in successful combination with the *Omnes* tenor, provided the compositional impetus for a three-voice motet.

Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes has further aspects of the same 'two voices from one' procedure as the motetus and triplum of *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant*. As emphasized above, the construction of the triplum is highly economical, since it insistently sings throughout a version of its opening transposed refrain quotation. After their initial presentation of exchanged refrain texts, the first-person triplum and motetus share and together declaim an additional line of text (the endearment 'Douce kamuseté', line 3, marked in bold in Example 20.4), though they thereafter address their love-object with different words. Yet the opening of *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes*, and indeed this motet in general, has a higher tolerance for parallel motion and dissonance than *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant*. The combined refrain presentation in bars 1–2 of *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes* produces (as discussed further below) an uncharacteristic opening for a motet: motetus and triplum move in parallel fourths at the beginning and end of this phrase, and additionally encompass two rhythmically stressed clashes of a second (*c* against *d*, in the second half of bar 1 and at the start of bar 2, marked by asterisks above the triplum in Example 20.4). Parallel motion between the upper voices continues in the second half of the refrain phrase, with triplum and motetus in fourths throughout bar 3, and in fifths at the start of bar 4.

The initial polyphonization of the 'Haro' refrain resulted in a motet opening that was rather less contrapuntally and harmonically conventional than that of *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant*. More generally, however, the creator of *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes* may have had a taste for dissonance. In the motet's internal *b* sections, seconds between triplum

30 • The refrain (no. 543 in van den Boogaard 1969) appears at the end of each stanza of the **Douce 308** ballette (on fol. 232^v) in the slightly variant form 'Dieus, je n'i pux durer, ceu me font li mals d'ameir!'. See the edition and translation of *Amours me font languir* in Doss-Quinby, Rosenberg, and Aubrey 2006, 426–27.

31 • In fact, the precise number of internal repetitions of *F* in the *Omnes* tenor itself was also flexible across polyphonic elaborations. On different established melodic versions of this polyphonic tenor, see Bradley 2019, 452–55.

and motets are, it seems, actively cultivated: the triplum twice sounds a second against the beginning and ending of a motetus phrase (marked by arrows in bars 8 and 10) with the effect of undermining the motet's typical *F/c* cadence. These two cadential dissonances were removed from the published edition of *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes* by Hans Tischler, who presumed that the triplum should sound in unison with the *c* in the motetus.³² Yet they are not entirely out of keeping with the motet's broader harmonic palette and they may be part of an attempt to thwart the cadential expectations of the listener in the motet's internal (b) phrases.³³ Here too, the motetus seems deliberately to tease the listener's formal expectations, twice giving the false impression (at the end of b, in bars 8–9, and in the middle of b', in bar 11, marked by dashed boxes in Example 20.4) that the refrain melody is about to return, before the phrase moves instead in a different direction.

That the upper voices of a three-voice motet should begin in parallel motion is very unusual in the broader thirteenth-century context: only six further motets out of a total of the one-hundred-and-four compositions in the fifth fascicle of **Mo** open with parallel intervals between motetus and triplum (that is, less than seven percent).³⁴ Upper-voice parallel movement – and especially that at the interval of a fourth – is, by contrast, common in three-voice polyphonic rondeaux, of which Adam de la Halle's corpus of sixteen rondeaux in **Ha** is the principal notated witness. Four of Adam's rondeaux (that is, twenty-five percent) begin with parallel fourths at the top of the texture.³⁵ Indeed, in his *Hareu li maus d'amer m'ochist* the two upper voices simply shadow each other at the interval of a fourth throughout, here with the (notated) middle voice sounding above the triplum (see Example 20.5).³⁶ The refrain '*Hareu li maus d'amer m'ochist*' is strikingly similar in its overall effect to the polyphonic presentation of the refrain '*Haro, je n'i puis durer, ci m'i tient li maus d'amer!*' in *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes*. Musically, in addition to their downward upper-voice movement in parallel fourths, both refrains open with a stressed *F/c/f* sonority. And poetically, the rondeau and motet refrains have related and basically equivalent texts: they start with the exclamation '*Hareu/Haro*' and describe the 'pains of love' ('*maus d'amer*'), which kill the first-person narrator ('*m'ochist*') in Adam's shorter version of refrain, but merely 'grasp' ('*m'i tient*') the *je* of *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes*.

32 • Tischler 1978, 2: 181–82.

33 • In addition to the seconds in bars 1 and 2, discussed above, the triplum also sounds an unstressed seventh against the motetus at the end of bar 15.

34 • Four of these motets open with parallel fourths (**Mo** nos. 99, 127, 130, and 169) and two with parallel fifths (nos. 95 and 108). There are also two **Mo** 5 motets whose upper voices begin with movement in unison (nos. 128 and 132).

35 • These are *Hareu li maus d'amer* (**Ha**, no. 3, discussed in detail below); *Dame, or sui* (no. 7) *A jointes mains* (no. 10); and *Tant con je vivrai* (no. 15). Apart from a brief moment of contrary motion on the second syllable, the upper voices of *Fi, mari* (no. 6) also basically move in parallel fourths throughout. Similarly, for the A material cadence and all of the B material, the upper voices of *Bonne amourette* (no. 14) shadow one another a fourth apart. See the editions in Wilkins 1967.

36 • This rondeau is also preserved in **CaB** (a single surviving leaf from what seems to have been another compilation of Adam's polyphonic rondeaux, in the same order as in **Ha**). Its transmission is basically identical here, save the final triplum note of bar 1, which is *b* rather than *G*, thus introducing a brief moment of independence and dissonance between the upper two voices.

Example 20.5: Adam de la Halle, refrain of polyphonic rondeau *Hareu li maus d'amer m'ochist*, Ha, fol. 32^v

Ha - reu li maus d'a - mer m'o - chist

In Adam's polyphonic rondeaux, it seems that two outer-voices were typically added and shaped around a refrain melody, presented in the middle voice.³⁷ All three voices of the rondeau declaimed a single text, supplied underneath the lowest voice in the original score notation (as in Example 20.5). *Hareu li maus d'amer m'ochist* is the most pronounced example of a case where added outer voices were entirely dependent on a middle-voice refrain melody throughout. The top voice simply copied it down a fourth, while the lowest voice provided an underlying scalar descent (from *F* to *D*) that shadowed the refrain's basic melodic contour, replicating every rhythmically stressed pitch of the refrain down an octave. The survival of *Hareu li maus d'amer m'ochist* may be indicative of an established and straightforward practical procedure – singing a refrain up or down a fourth and down an octave – by which three-voice polyphony was produced instantly and ad hoc from a single refrain. The polyphonization of refrains, by transposing and/or combining the different phrases of their melodies against themselves, as seen in the motets *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes* and *S'on me regard/Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant*, seems to be a related technique. In these motets, it is once again a middle-voice refrain itself that – here by combination rather than transposed replication – generates the music and text of its accompanying triplum. Elizabeth Eva Leach has drawn attention to the function of refrains, especially as depicted within the *Tournoi de Chauvency*, as acts of communal and social singing.³⁸ Presumably, these short and often quoted musical and textual phrases were not only declaimed in unison but could also (as in Adam's rondeau *Hareu li maus d'amer m'ochist*) be clothed in an 'instant' three-voice parallel polyphony that framed a fifth within an octave. Moreover, in the context of repeated performance of and familiarity with refrain melodies, it is tempting to imagine that the voice-exchange potential of their typically paired phrases might have revealed itself, and that *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes* and *S'on me regard/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant* testify to an additional and parallel oral practice in which parts of refrains and their corresponding texts were combined (at pitch and/or in transposition) to sound in polytextual polyphony.

37 • On the (compositional) relationship between voices in polyphonic rondeaux, see Everist 1996, 90–93. See also Bradley 2019, 474–75.

38 • See Leach forthcoming.

Marrying motet and (polyphonic) rondeau in *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem*

A further example brings into focus these aspects of thirteenth-century polyphonic refrain songs, written and unwritten. This is another three-voice French motet recorded uniquely in fascicle 5 of *Mo*, *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem*, but which survives also in a version with Latin contrafactum texts uniquely preserved in *Mo* fascicle 4. The French version of the motet has been much discussed because of its use of several Occitanisms in its texts and indeed its motetus refrain, which also makes explicit reference to dancing: ‘*Tuit cil qui sunt enamourant | vieignent dançar, li autre non*’ (‘All who are in love | may come and dance, the others not’).³⁹ And an identical external concordance survives for the refrain’s music and text in the narrative poem *La Court de paradis*, where it is a summons to dance at a ball in paradise.⁴⁰ This refrain melody (see Example 20.6) opens both of its phrases (labeled A and B) with the same *c-b-c-d* motion (marked by boxes). This shared melodic material is, however, prefaced by different anacrusis, and whereas the A phrase makes an upward melodic trajectory to *f*, the B phrase goes down to *G* and then back up to cadence on *c*. There are two versions of the B material’s cadence: the first – as initially stated in the motetus – simply leaps from *G* to *c*, while the second (provided above the staff in Example 20.6, which closes the motetus and is the version of the refrain recorded in *La Court de paradis*) fills in this fourth leap with scalar motion. In spite of their shared openings and overall contrary motion, the two halves of ‘*Tuit cil*’ are not – and here unlike the ‘*Haro*’ refrain – so compatible in harmonic combination. In bar 2 of the A material, the arrival on *f*, eventually falling to *d*, does not work well against the corresponding arrival on *G*, which rises to *c*, in bar 4 of the B material (marked by asterisks in Example 20.6).

Example 20.6: The ‘*Tuit cil qui sunt enamourant*’ refrain in *Li jalous/ Tuit cil/ Veritatem*, *Mo* 5, fols 218^v–219^r

As Elizabeth Aubrey established in her persuasive analysis of *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem*, this motet clearly quotes the music and text of the preexisting ‘*Tuit cil*’ refrain, which generates the overall form and content of the motetus voice (see Example 20.7).⁴¹ Poetically, the motetus is a conventional AB aA ab AB eight-line rondeau, framed by a refrain text and with an internal recapitulation (in line 4) of the first half of this refrain text. Musically however, the rondeau form is complicated by the fact that the refrain’s melody is slightly modified in lines 3 and 4. Moreover, it is actually a modified version of the refrain’s B material that is presented here (although in conjunction with the A material text in line 4, see bars

39 • See I. Frank 1954 and the discussion in Aubrey 1997, 15–16. The refrain is no. 1822 in van den Boogaard 1969.

40 • See the transcription of this refrain and its concordances at <http://refrain.ac.uk/view/abstract_item/1822.html>. See the discussion of *La Court de paradis* in Aubrey 1997, 10–11.

41 • Aubrey 1997, 13–15.

5–8) such that the overall form of the motetus is rather AB b'B' ab AB.⁴² The modification to the B material is very slight but nonetheless significant: both lines 3 and 4 adopt, not its *e-d* up-beat, but rather the up-beat *c* associated with the A material (here expected according to rondeau convention, and present poetically in line 4), and with the effect – and as Aubrey has emphasized – of fusing the refrain's two elements.⁴³

Example 20.7: *Li jalous/ Tuit cil/ Veritatem*, Mo 5, fols 218^r–219^r (with bars 5–8 of the contrafactum *Poſt partum/ Ave regina/ Veritatem*, Mo 4, fols 102^r–103^r)

The musical score is presented in three systems, each with three staves (vocal line, tenor line, and bass line). The music is in 8/8 time and features a complex rhythmic pattern with many eighth and sixteenth notes. The lyrics are written below the vocal line, with some words in bold. The score includes various musical markings such as asterisks, brackets, and box letters (A, B, a, b) indicating specific musical phrases or structures. The first system covers bars 1-8, the second system covers bars 9-12, and the third system covers bars 13-16. The word 'VERITATEM' is written in the bass line of the first system. The score concludes with a double bar line.

1. **Li** ja - lous par tout sunt fus - tat 2. et por - tent coine en mi le front.
 1. Tuit cil qui sunt en a - mou - rat 2. vie - gnent dan - car li au - tre non.
 VERITATEM
 3. que fi - li - um pe - pe - ris - ti 4. cui - lus fi - li - a fu - is - ti
 3. Par tout doi - vent es - tre hu - at. 4. La re - gi - ne le com - men - dat.
 3. La re - gi - ne le com - men - dat. 4. Tuit cil qui sunt en a - mor - at.
 9
 5. Que d'un bas - ton soi - ent fra - pat. 6. Et cha - cie hors com - me lar - ron
 5. Que li ja - lous soi - ent fus - tat 6. fors de la dan - ce d'un bas - ton.
 II
 13
 7. si en dan - ca - de viel - lent en - trat 8. fier le du pie com - me gar - con.
 7. Tuit cil qui sunt en a - mou - rat 8. vie - gnent a - vant li au - tre non.

42 • On the motetus's classification as a rondeau, see Everist 1994, 106. The motetus has also been considered to be in virelai form (see, most recently, Peraino 2012, 258).

43 • Aubrey 1997, 11–13. Aubrey (following I. Frank 1954) does not take full account of the basic similarity (save their anacrusis) between the opening of the A and B phrases of the motetus refrain, such that she overstates the prevalence of the refrain's A music in bars 5–8.

The motetus's refrain-song form is achieved in conjunction with two statements of the plainchant tenor *Veritatem*. *Veritatem* is a serviceable polyphonic foundation, strikingly similar to that provided by the *Omnes* tenor in *Ci m'i tient/Haro*. Like *Omnes*, *Veritatem* is dominated by its final pitch (also *F*) and occupies the narrow range of a fifth (*D–a*). As in *Omnes*, *Veritatem* opens with the progression *F–G–F*, and here too *G* is the principal counter-tone to the *F* final throughout. The only significant difference between the two melismas is the number of pitches they contain: *Veritatem* is twice as long as *Omnes*. In *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes* each statement of the four-bar motetus refrain was accompanied by a single (ten-note) tenor statement. In *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem*, by contrast, each four-bar motetus refrain or rondeau couplet is structurally aligned with half of the twenty-note tenor melisma. Thus, as in *S'on me regarde/Prenes i garde/He mi enfant* (where motetus refrains had to be fitted against both the A and the B material of the tenor song), the creator of *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem* had to make the motetus refrain material work against two alternative tenor units: the sequence of pitches in both the first and the second half of the *Veritatem* melisma.

Unlike in *S'on me regarde/Prenes i garde/He mi enfant*, the combination of plainchant and rondeau melodies in *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem* was aided by the fact that the rhythmicization of the plainchant tenor was at the motet creator's discretion, and furthermore that no strict rhythmic pattern was enforced here (as it was in *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes*). Nonetheless, and as Aubrey also argued, certain compromises were required to marry the quoted melodies in *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem*, and it was evidently the predetermined sequence of tenor pitches that demanded the unconventional appearance of the refrain's (modified) B material in bars 5–8 of the motetus, the rondeau's second couplet.⁴⁴ The refrain's B cadence allowed motetus and tenor to sound a unison *G* in bars 6 and 8, avoiding the dissonant seventh (*G/f*) that would have been produced by the A material here. At the equivalent juncture in the tenor's second statement, however, a different accommodation was made. The final presentation of the motetus refrain's A material was here prioritized and the rhythmicization of the tenor in bars 13–14 was adjusted (*vis-à-vis* bars 5–6: compare these sections of the tenor in dashed boxes in Example 20.7) to accommodate it. A breve rest was inserted at the end of bar 13 and the tenor pitch that it replaced, *F*, was delayed to sound an octave beneath the motetus on the downbeat of bar 14, displacing what would have been a dissonant tenor *G* to the subsequent unstressed breve.

One wonders why this tenor rhythmicization in bars 13–14 was not also adopted at the same juncture in the first statement of the *Veritatem* melisma. This could conceivably have supported, in bars 5–6, the motetus's unaltered A material, thereby facilitating the presentation of a conventional rondeau melody. Perhaps the motet creator wished to create variety in the rondeau form; to introduce alternative musical material in bars 5–8 that played on the similarity of the refrain's two phrases and thus with the listener's expectations.⁴⁵ Decisions

44 • Aubrey 1997, 14.

45 • Variety is additionally cultivated the motetus's b'B' phrases in *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem* through the degree of their decoration (compare the second half of bar 5 with the second half of bar 7) and in the successive use of both conjunct and disjunct versions of the B cadence (compare bars 6 and 8).

at this juncture in the two tenor statements may also have been motivated by the triplum, and with a view more generally to the motet's overall balance between the competing priorities of formal repetition and consonance. Unlike in *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant* or *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes*, the motetus's refrain material in *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem* was not exchanged with the triplum. Instead, the triplum provided an initial polyphonic accompaniment to the opening refrain that simply returned alongside its A and B material throughout the motet.

The disturbance to the motetus's rondeau form in its second (b'B') couplet was matched in the triplum by modified musical material in bars 5–6 (also combining the anacrusis of its own A material opening with a decorated version of its B cadence). In bars 7–8, however, with the return of the refrain's opening text in the motetus but an altered (B') version of its melody that was better suited to the tenor, the triplum nonetheless insisted on the reiteration of its original A material accompaniment. This was at the expense of two stressed ninths against the tenor (at the start of bar 7 and at the end of bar 8, marked by boxes in Example 20.7). Tellingly – and as Aubrey also observed – the triplum of the Latin contrafactum *Post partum/Ave regina/Veritatem* (presented above the staff in Example 20.7) offered a more consonant version of this phrase in bars 7–8 (substituted by Tischler in his edition of *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem*).⁴⁶ In *Post partum/Ave regina/Veritatem* the triplum simply repeated in bars 7–8 its new and more suitable accompaniment to the preceding b' statement in bars 5–6, thereby avoiding a cadential ninth against the tenor *F* in the second half of bar 8. Nevertheless, even the Latin motet triplum made the same initial nod to the structural importance of the motetus refrain text in bar 7: here, and in contrast to bar 5 (compare the dashed boxes), the *Post partum* triplum reiterated at the start of its B' accompaniment the *f-f-e* incipit associated with the refrain. As in *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem*, a ninth with the underlying tenor *E* – avoided in favor of an octave in bar 5 – was tolerated in bar 7, in apparent deference to the return of the opening text of the motetus's rondeau refrain.

This tolerance of triplum dissonance in the service of quotation is evident too in the final statement of the refrain in both French and Latin versions of the motet. Compared to its very first appearance, the literal reiteration of the triplum's opening phrase in bars 13–14 introduces – in its new tenor context – two new stressed ninths against the second half of the *Veritatem* melisma (marked by boxes in Example 20.7: indeed the same two stressed ninths as in the different tenor context of bars 7 and 8). But the triplum also introduces, unprovoked, two new seconds against the motetus (at the end of bars 14 and 15, marked by asterisks) absent from the opening statement of the refrain.⁴⁷ The substantial increase of

46 • Aubrey 1997, 11–15, Tischler 1978, 2: 188.

47 • The stressed *d/e* dissonances in the second half of bar 15 produced by decorative figures that sound seconds against one another in motetus and triplum are already present also in the statement of the refrain's A material in the second half of bar 11. The unstressed *e/f* second at the end of bar 14 is, however, present only in the refrain's final statement. While the dissonance in bar 14 is found also in *Post partum/Ave regina/Veritatem* (and is in both motets 'corrected' to *e* in Tischler 1978, 2: 56 and 188), the dissonant triplum decoration is absent from bar 15 of this Latin contrafactum (although it is present in bar 11).

dissonance in the rondeau's final couplet seems therefore to have been not just tolerated but (as argued above in the case of *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes*) cultivated, perhaps used here to draw attention to the final refrain quotation and/or to signal closure.⁴⁸

The conception of the triplum itself – which does not appear to be determined by quotation, imitation, or voice exchange – is, however, curious. If the creator of *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem* was at liberty to tailor the refrain's triplum accompaniment to the particular polyphonic context in question, then why not fashion a top voice that could be more straightforwardly accommodated to its various tenor contexts? The motetus's opening on *c* was compatible with both of its accompanying tenor pitches: *F* (as in bars 1 and 13) and *E* (as in bars 5, 7, and 9). Yet *f* as the starting pitch for the triplum – rather than *c* or *a/a'* – was a problematic choice given the tenor *Es* (as the substitution of a triplum *e* in bar 5 confirms). Similarly, the close of the triplum's A phrase on *g* works against the motetus (its initial dissonance on *f*, resolving satisfactorily to *d*) and against the tenor *Gs* (in the second half of bars 2 and 10), but it is less compatible with the tenor *F* in bar 14 than, for instance, *d* or even *c* would have been.

The characteristics of this triplum, therefore, seem indicative of fundamentally different contrapuntal and harmonic priorities than are typical in a motet. Indeed, the motetus and triplum of *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem* outline exactly the same (uncharacteristic) opening parallel fourths (*c/f-b/e-c/f*, over an *F* in the tenor) as in *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes* and their initial presentation of the refrain also features three brief, but relatively gratuitous, clashes of a second (marked by asterisks above the triplum in Example 20.7). While the upper voices of *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem* move in contrary motion in bar 2, the triplum largely shadows the direction of the motetus in the second half of the refrain (bars 3–4). In the penultimate and final statements of the B material of the motetus refrain, where the refrain's final leap of a fourth is filled in with a scalar ascent (bars 12 and 16), the motetus and triplum also close in parallel fourths.

Although the motetus refrain text is not directly or immediately exchanged with the triplum (as it is in *Ci m'i tient/Haro/Omnes* and *S'on me regarde/ Prenes i garde/ He mi enfant*), the upper-voices of *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem* share a significant amount of their poetic content (marked in bold in Example 20.7). This ranges from the complete and literal adoption of poetic lines (compare, respectively, triplum line 4 and motetus line 3), to paraphrased lines (lines 1 and 5), and shared vocabulary (both mention a 'baston' or 'stick' in lines 5 and 6, and the triplum takes up in line 7 the motetus reference to dancing in line 2). More generally, the triplum of *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem* shows a degree of dependence on its motetus that surpasses that in previous examples: it matches the motetus formally throughout, and these two voices not only share the same musical phrase structure, but both present

48 • Two of Adam's polyphonic rondeau feature pre-cadential clashes of a second between their upper-voices, comparable to those in *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem* and *Ci m'i tiens/Haro/Omnes*. In *Dame, or sui* (no. 7), the upper-voice *d-e* approach to an *f* cadence at the end of the A material sounds against *e-d* in the middle voice's approach to *c*. The *F/c* cadence of the B material is also prefaced by a brief *E/d* clash. In *A jointes mains* (no. 10), at the end of the B material, the final upper-voice *f-e-f* cadence sounds against *e-d-c* in the middle voice.

an entirely regular eight-syllable poetic text, sounding the same end rhymes at the same time ('-at' for the A sections of the rondeau poem, '-on' for the B sections).⁴⁹

This persistent homogeneity is at odds with the independence typical of triplum and motetus voices in a polytextual motet, and indeed even in other refrain-song motets. It recalls, rather, the musical and poetic dependence of voices in a polyphonic rondeau. In its use of an anacrusis (which is rare, though not – as Aubrey suggested – unique in the motet repertoire) and in its opening perfect fourths, *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem* is reminiscent of Adam's three-voice rondeau *Hareu li maus d'amer m'ochist* (compare Example 20.5 above).⁵⁰ Possibly, the two upper-voices of *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem* did not merely thematize the polyphonic rondeau idiom, but rather they actually existed already as a polyphonic entity (perhaps as the top voices of a three-voice rondeau) that predated their combination with the *Veritatem* tenor. That the motet creator attempted to accommodate not only a motetus rondeau but also its associated upper voice would account – both stylistically and in terms of the triplum's otherwise curious compositional choices – for the unusually high degree of dissonance in the three-voice motet, which was adjusted, tolerated, and/or cultivated to different degrees at different formal junctures within the motet itself as well as between the its two surviving French- and Latin-texted versions.

Aubrey draws attention to the ingenuity of the marriage between the motetus refrain and the preexisting tenor in *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem*, underlining – as I have done also for the motets discussed above – its 'intricate structural and thematic counterpoint of text and melody' and 'complicated compositional procedure'.⁵¹ If this compositional procedure involved fitting not only one but two upper-voices of a preexisting rondeau against the two halves of the *Veritatem* tenor the motet would be even more intricate still. I have demonstrated elsewhere that Adam de la Halle's motet *Aucun se sont loe/ A Dieu commant/ Super te* involved a polyphonic quotation of his three-voice rondeau refrain *A Dieu commant*, achieved by the substitution of the tenor melody *Super te* for the lowest-voice of his rondeau *A Dieu commant*.⁵² Like *Veritatem* and *Omnes*, the chant melisma *Super te* has an *F* final and is predominantly comprised of the pitches *F*, *G*, and *a*. Adam apparently recognized and exploited the similarity of this chant melody to the foundation of a polyphonic rondeau, taking advantage of the specific interchangeability of *Super te* with the lowest voice of *A Dieu commant*. It is plausible, therefore, that the *Veritatem* tenor could have been selected for similar reasons in *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem*. Either *Veritatem* replicated a particular preexisting rondeau foundation, or it simply offered the kind of underlying step-wise movement and alternation

49 • The single exception is line 7 of the triplum, where the expected '-at' rhyme is actually '-ar'.

50 • Aubrey 1997, 14. In *Mo* 5, motet no. 94 also opens with a ('*Harol*') refrain that begins on an anacrusis, as does the *W2* refrain-song motet *En ce chant/ Roissoles ai/ Domino* discussed below. In addition to *Hareu li maus d'amer* (no. 3), Adam's polyphonic rondeau *A jointes mains* (no. 10) also opens on an anacrusis and with parallel fourths between the upper voices. An anacrusis at the start of the B material is more common in Adam's polyphonic rondeaux. This occurs in both nos. 3 and 10, as well as in nos. 6 and 11. In no. 5 there is an internal anacrusis between the two phrases of the A material (and in nos. 5 and 6 the anacrusis are plicated – as in the '*Tuit cil*' refrain – in more than one voice).

51 • Aubrey 1997, 15.

52 • Bradley 2019, 466–73.

between two tonal poles (here *F* and *G*) that was characteristic of the lowest voices of polyphonic rondeaux in general, and thus well suited to accompany the upper-voice polyphony of the ‘*Tuit cil*’ refrain. Despite the survival of this refrain-song motet only within **Mo**, it was evidently popular enough to inspire (unlike any other of the motets discussed here) a Latin and Marian-themed contrafactum.⁵³ These two extant versions confirm that the motet had a fundamentally flexible musical as well as textual existence, with the potential for surface variety and different preferences regarding the priority of consonance and formal repetitions. Nevertheless, it may have been the basic combinatorial ingenuity of *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem* – the realization that the *Veritatem* plainchant could be sung against a quoted motetus refrain melody, the rondeau-like form it generated, and potentially also its associated triplum accompaniment – that ensured the commitment of this motet to written record.

Motets for dancing?

The fact that the text of the motetus refrain in *Li jalous/Tuit cil/Veritatem* is an actual invitation to come and dance, prefaced by an anticipatory anacrusis, invites speculation as to whether this rondeau-like motet could genuinely have functioned as a dance song. It is conceivable that once various refrain, song, or chant combinations had been puzzled out, known polyphonic solutions generated by familiar quotations could easily be realized spontaneously, and potentially as accompaniments to dancing. The incomplete and unique (mid thirteenth-century) survival in **W2** of another a refrain-song motet, *En ce chant/ Roissoles ai roissoles/ Do[mino]*, to which Christopher Page has also drawn attention, supports such speculation (Example 20.8).⁵⁴ This plainchant motet tenor *Domino* is melodically wider-ranging than *Omnes* or *Veritatem*, although it is principally confined to the harmonically interchangeable pitches *D*, *F* and *a/A*.⁵⁵ But the motetus *Roissoles ai roissoles* did not pose much of a problem in terms of its accompaniment, since it is almost throughout a simple and regular alternation of ‘recitation on *a*’, ‘open cadence on *G*’. The motetus refrain – prefaced by an anacrusis, as in ‘*Tuit cil qui sunt enamourant*’ – resembles a street cry, advertizing rissoles.⁵⁶ This refrain generates a musically repetitive song which, in length (eight lines), looks like a conventional rondeau, but seems otherwise to be a grafted or *enté* melody. The two phrases of the refrain (labeled *A* and *B* in Example 20.8) were split to open and close the motetus, whose six identical internal phrases simply repeated a modified version of the refrain’s opening (labeled *a*’, though which simultaneously anticipated the *B* material’s opening *F–a* leap of a third). Although the ‘*Roissoles ai roissoles*’ refrain is known only from this motet, the fact that the statement of its *B* material produces a contextually uncharacteristic seventh against the *Domino* tenor in the second half of bar 15 (marked by a box in Example 20.8) may confirm its status as a genuine

53 • As proposed in Aubrey 1997, 10, the creation of *Post partum/Ave regina/Veritatem* may have been inspired by the sacred context of the original vernacular refrain in *La Court de paradis* and its resonances with the motet’s Assumption tenor.

54 • Page 1993a, 53–56. See also the discussion of these motet texts in Wolinski 2008, 10.

55 • This was one of the most widespread thirteenth-century motet tenors, which quotes a *Benedicamus Domino* melody that itself borrows the Assumption responsory melisma *Flos filius eius*.

56 • On the street-cry quality of ‘*Roissoles ai*’, see Stimming 1906, 168 and Page 1993a, 56.

quotation.⁵⁷ The situation narrated in the motetus's refrain song could also be suggestive of its own context: it is 'puceles folés' ('crazy girls') singing (and probably also dancing) 'queroles' (that is, caroles or round-dances) who offer rissoles to the 'clers d'escole', clerks (perhaps teachers) in the (presumably ecclesiastical) schools.

Example 20.8: *En ce chant/ Roissoles ai/ Domino*, W2, fol. 197^r

1. En ce chant 2. qe je chant 3. faz a - cor - der 4. sanz des - cor - der

1. Rois - so - les ai, rois - so - les 2. de du - res et de mo - les

DO[MINO]

5. ce nou - vel des - chant 6. ain - si m'en vois 7. a - lons a la dan - ce 8. a - lons i car g'i - vois.

3. fai - tes sont a biaux mo - les 4. por ces biaux clers d'e - sco - le

9

5. qui di - ent les pa - ro - les 6. a ces pu - ce - les fo - les

II

13

7. qui chan - tant as que - ro - les 8. rois - so - les ai, rois - so - les!

57 • The only comparable dissonance between motetus and tenor is at the outset of bars 3 and 11, resulting from the single stressed tenor G at the start of a motetus phrase.

For a clerk well versed in plainchant it would not have taken much to realize that the repetitive eight-line song generated from the ‘*Roissoles ai roissoles*’ refrain (with its relentless *a*-*G* alternation and final descent from *a* to *D*) could easily be accommodated to two statements of the very well-known *Domino* melisma (with its melodic ascent from *D* to *a*, then down to *A*, and back to *D*). The triplum of *En ce chant/ Roissoles ai/ Domino* also underlines the potential for a danced and indeed ad hoc polyphonic performance. This triplum narrates its own creation: ‘In this song | that I sing | make accord | without discord | this new discant | thus I send out.’ The triplum’s song concludes with a refrain (again, outlining an *a* to *D* descent, and probably a refrain quotation given the atypical dissonance – marked by a box – with the motetus in bar 7) that is an invitation to dance: ‘let’s go to the dance | let’s go, because I’m going there.’⁵⁸ The state in which this triplum is preserved in its only extant source confirms its spontaneity. The voice simply breaks off after providing music and text for only the first half of the motetus song and the first statement of the *Domino* tenor. What happened in the second half of the motet? Perhaps the triplum melody, and indeed its text, was simply repeated, like its tenor and motetus foundation.⁵⁹ Alternatively, the polyphony could conceivably have continued in only two parts, maybe because the singer(s) of the triplum did indeed go off to dance, such that they ceased to sing or chose instead to join in with the simpler and more repetitive motetus.

In conclusion, the scenario depicted in this motet in particular, as well as the circumstances of its incomplete survival, lend credence to the hypothesis that it was not only songs in lower-register or popular genres that were used for dancing in the thirteenth century. This chapter has shown how stereotypical elements of ‘high’ and ‘low’ styles could be married and blended in motets that combined the convention of tenor quotations with a refrain-song upper voice or voices. The motetus and triplum voices of such refrain-song motets were still polytextual, but more textually and musically dependent on each other than was usual for a motet, and they employed voice-exchange techniques or harmonic and contrapuntal idioms reminiscent of *rondelli* and polyphonic *rondeaux*. Arguably, the absorption or evocation of lower-register or informal polyphonic forms, stylistic idioms, and indeed performative creative practices within the context of these motets did not, somehow, downgrade their status as a sophisticated genre. Rather, the integration of refrain-song forms and idioms was central to the compositional craft and sophistication of the motets in question, which are often defined by a simple polyphonic solution to a riddle of melodic combinations. The ‘simplicity’ of the polyphonic solution to fit together well-known melodies made the mo-

58 • The only comparable dissonance between triplum and motetus is created by the triplum *b* in second half of bar 3 (which Page 1993a, 55, tentatively suggests should be *c*). It is possible that the triplum *b* was made to concord with what should – according to the chant quotation – have been the tenor pitch *E*, but which is actually given as *F* in both statements of the *Domino* melisma. Alternatively, the triplum could have been making a joke by contrasting its text (‘faz accorder’) with the resulting lack of ‘accordance’ or consonance produced by its music. The triplum refrain (no. 103 in van den Boogaard 1969) has a (partial) text-only concordance (‘*Alons a la donnce*’) in the sacred *Livre d’amouretes*, which contains textual refrain insertions without any musical notation. See <http://refrain.ac.uk/view/abstract_item/103.html>.

59 • This is the solution offered in Tischler 1982, 1: 874–75.

tet not less, but more, ingenious, as well as more practical, memorable, and replicable. The hybrid polyphonic compositions analyzed here probably owe their survival to connections with the motet, a genre that – unlike refrain songs – had an established notated manuscript tradition. This chapter has uncovered various compositional techniques involved in putting together refrain-song motets, arguing that we might profitably extrapolate from these scarce and unusual extant examples the kinds of informal and now lost creative practices by which song forms and polyphonic accompaniments were once created from and for refrain melodies, perhaps in the service of dancing.