CHAPTER 4

# Anonymous IV and the *Antiqui* *

Rob C. Wegman

## THE GARLANDIAN REVOLUTION

The early modal notation system is notorious for its pervasive ambiguity, which renders transcription difficult and sometimes impossible. Two problems in particular stand out as resistant to resolution. First, we cannot always tell the rhythmic mode of a given composition or voice-part, because the notation allows it to be performed in multiple modes, without telling us which is preferred. Second, we cannot always be sure that a composition is conceived in a rhythmic mode to begin with, because the notation allows it to be performed in both measured and unmeasured versions, once again without indicating which is the one to be adopted.

These problems arise principally in texted voice-parts that move in single notes with one syllable each – the so-called *cum littera* notation.[1] In the early modal system it was not possible to specify the rhythmic values of these syllable-carrying notes, for two reasons that are well known but which bear restating briefly. The first is that rhythmic values could only be securely notated by means of ligatures. But notes with syllabic underlay cannot be joined together into a ligature and stay texted at the same time, because ligatures can only carry one syllable. So either the notes merge into a ligature and gain notated rhythmic values at the expense of the syllables, or they stay separate and keep their syllables at the expense of rhythmic values. *Cum littera* notation represents the latter choice.

The second reason is that the free-standing notes of *cum littera* notation were not visually differentiated. Although some were meant to be performed long and others short, on parchment they all looked alike: nondescript square notes like the *puncta*

* This essay is dedicated to Christopher Page with deep appreciation, fondness and gratitude. I would like to thank Solomon Guhl-Miller for reading the first draft. Manuscript sigla are taken from Friedrich Ludwig, *Repertorium organorum recentioris et motetorum vetustissimi stili*, Luther Dittmer (ed.), 3 vols, Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen, Bd. 7, 17, 26 (New York and Henryville; Hildesheim, 1964–78).

[1] Literature on *cum littera* notation is extensive; for an excellent introduction to the problem, and a compellingly argued solution, see Christopher Page, *Latin Poetry and Conductus Rhythm in Medieval France*, Royal Musical Association Monographs 8 (London, 1997).

of chant notation. For musicians who had nothing to go on but the notation, the obvious problem was how to be sure which note was long and which was short. It is this problem, the problem of notes that are uniform in appearance but multi-valent in performance, to which a solution would be formulated some time around 1260. The solution, as first presented by Johannes de Garlandia in his treatise *De mensurabili musica*, was to use different symbols for long and short notes.[2] Henceforth they would have the shapes of the chant neumes *virga* and *punctum*, respectively.

Garlandia's solution was a victory for common sense. Never again would musicians have to be in doubt about the rhythms of syllabic polyphony. In the same treatise he also formulated major improvements to ligature notation, which had been problematic for the same reasons. Ligatures, too, had been uniform in appearance – the appearance they have in square chant notation – yet multi-valent in performance. A ligature of the same shape could mean one thing in textless *sine littera* notation, but quite another if it was made to occupy the place of a single note in *cum littera* notation. In the latter case its constituent notes had to be compressed all within the duration of that one syllable-carrying note, and the ligature lost all semblance of modal significance. The only solution to these problems was to expand the arsenal of available ligature shapes, so that each rhythmic possibility could have its own ligature, signifying it without the risk of confusion.

It is worth recalling briefly the two methods of ligature modification formulated by Garlandia, since they will play a key part later in this essay. The first was to create fragmentary ligatures by splitting off the final note and writing it separately. The torso that remained would be visibly incomplete – it was called a ligature without 'perfection' – yet the notes in it continued to behave as if the final note was still there. This was to have one's cake and eat it. The detached note was free to carry a syllable of its own, yet it still communicated a rhythmic value since it remained part of the ligature in a virtual sense. More importantly, the remaining fragment could be interpreted according to new rules, those that governed imperfection.

The second method was the modification of the first note. The proper way to notate a ligature was to write it exactly as in the square notation of contemporary plainchant manuscripts. A change, even of just the first note, would technically represent an 'improper' way of notating it, and thus result in a ligature without 'propriety'. That term had no negative resonance, for the goal was to generate enough ligature shapes to cover each and every rhythmic possibility. Propriety was a powerful tool to realise that goal. Perfection and propriety are frequently encountered as a

[2] Erich Reimer (ed.), *Johannes de Garlandia, De mensurabili musica: Kritische Edition mit Kommentar und Interpretation der Notationslehre*, 2 vols, Beihefte zum Archiv für Musikwissenschaft, Bd. 10–11 (Wiesbaden, 1972).

conceptual pair. In the writings of contemporary theorists they often stand for the Garlandian innovations as a whole.[3]

## THEORY AND VALUE

It would be difficult to overstate the sea change brought about by Garlandian notation. Judging from surviving musical sources it seems to have been adopted almost overnight, as though its universal implementation had been agreed upon by an international committee. In reality the new notation must have grown out of informal scribal practices that had already been applied on an irregular basis since the 1250s at the latest.[4] Garlandia's principal achievement may lie in the systematisation of those practices, rationalising them into a teachable doctrine with consistent rules and terminology. It may well have been the publication of his treatise that spurred its swift implementation by scribes everywhere.

And yet, if those solutions were welcomed so eagerly, and applied so swiftly, why had they not been developed much sooner? Measured polyphony with syllabic text underlay had been composed and performed as far back as the twelfth century. Scribes and musicians in those days could have benefited enormously from the graphic distinctions introduced by Garlandia. Why, then, did they not create such distinctions themselves? Surely it did not take an exceptional intellect to come up with the idea of using different shapes for different rhythmic values, which is simplicity itself. If that idea could occur to scribes in the decade before Garlandia, why would it not have occurred to their colleagues more than half a century previously? Did older scribes stoically accept the inconvenience of rhythmic ambiguity? Or did they not experience it as an inconvenience, even though it is to us?

The problem with these questions is that we can no longer hear the voice of pre-Garlandian musicians, at least not directly. None of their treatises on modal notation (if they wrote any) have survived. The earliest modal treatises that are still extant are those of Garlandia and his followers, written in the 1260s and beyond. These authors lived in a world where the new notation had already become the standard

[3] For an incisive study, see Fritz Reckow, 'Proprietas und perfectio: Zur Geschichte des Rhythmus, seiner Aufzeichnung und Terminologie im 13. Jahrhundert', *Acta Musicologica* 39 (1967), pp. 115–43.

[4] A systematic inquiry into the notation of propriety and perfection in the Notre-Dame sources is long overdue. For an excellent study, see Matthias Hutzel, 'Die Heidelberger Conductus-Fragmente (Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek, Hs. 2588): Untersuchungen zur Quelle, ihrer Notenschrift und zu den Überlieferungsproblem ihres Repertoires' (Ph.D. diss., Christian-Albrechts-Universität, Kiel, 1990).

for measured polyphony. Older repertory was still circulating in comprehensive anthologies like $W_1$, $W_2$ and F (the so-called Notre-Dame manuscripts), yet its notation now looked antiquated, and was not updated for the benefit of younger generations. In fact scribes would soon cease the production of such anthologies altogether. To the extent that theorists still reflected upon pre-Garlandian notation, their understanding of it was conditioned by the notation of their own time – that is, in terms of what it lacked.

That, needless to say, was not an unbiased perspective. It does not allow for the possibility, for example, that Garlandian notation had been of no particular interest to past musicians, not because it was too advanced, or too difficult to invent, but because there had been no need for change. Only the pre-Garlandian musicians themselves could have told us this; their successors would not have understood or been able to explain. Admittedly this is a speculative possibility, and it may look improbable at first sight. How could the *antiqui* have been content with the old notation, when it so manifestly lacked the advantages of the new? The answer is provided by the very observation that has brought us here: because they never did anything about it.

Let me explain the possibility with the help of a hypothetical example. Suppose that a future generation will one day overhaul English orthography in order to eliminate the ambiguities that characterise our current writing – for example, the fact that the ending *-ough* can be pronounced in at least five different ways (*thorough*, *through*, *rough*, *plough*, *lough*).[5] Once the new orthography has been declared the standard, and its advantages are becoming more evident by the day, it may be increasingly hard to understand why past ages like ours never developed a similar solution. What had been keeping us? Perhaps, some might suggest, we lacked the determination to do something about the problem. Or possibly, others might respond, we failed to recognise it as a problem, and put up with the inconvenience without realising that improvement was possible. Or if we did recognise the problem, yet others might venture, perhaps we lacked the resourcefulness, or more probably the intelligence, to arrive at solutions as effective as theirs.

If we were in a position to enlighten posterity – which pre-Garlandian musicians unfortunately are not – how would we respond? I can think of at least three points to make. First, those future observers with their conjectures are reasoning within the Platonic cave of their novel orthography, and cannot speak for us. Second, while

[5] See the final lines of the well-known poem *De Chaos* by Gerard Nolst Trenité: 'Finally: which rimes with "enough", | *Though*, *through*, *plough*, *cough*, *hough*, or *tough*? | *Hiccough* has the sound of 'cup' … | My advice is – give it up!' Charivarius [pseudonym of Trenité], *Ruize-Rijmen* (Haarlem, 1922), pp. 125–29, at p. 129.

there are indeed ambiguities in current English orthography, we experience most of these as quite unproblematic. In fact we scarcely even notice them, except perhaps as fodder for puns. Third, the important question is not what has kept us from solving the problem, but what caused the problem to be perceived by others when we do not. Somehow that future generation must have come to develop new expectations of English orthography, expectations it was not designed to meet. That change in expectations, and especially the historical causes behind it, are the real issue – not our disinclination to solve problems we do not have.

This final point is the important one for our enquiry. It brings up a question that we could ask with equal justification about the history of thirteenth-century polyphony. What if there had been a deeper shift, a shift in mentality and sensibility, of which the development of Garlandian notation was merely symptomatic? How might we be able to tell? What would the shift have amounted to? And what can we find out about the musical world before that shift, even from the witnesses who lived after it?

To answer these questions it is logical to begin with the nearest we have to a chronicler of the ars antiqua, the English music theorist known as Anonymous IV. He had an exceptional interest in musical practices of the past, and generously shared his knowledge in a treatise he wrote some time after 1280, *Cognita modulatione melorum* (usually referred to as 'the treatise of Anonymous IV').[6] It is Anonymous IV who has given us his uniquely valuable testimony about Leonin and Perotin, the Cathedral of Notre-Dame at Paris, and the *Magnus liber organi*.

In the next section of this essay I will discuss an extended passage from his treatise (referred to hereafter as Excerpt 1) in which he recalls the distant musical past long before Garlandia. This is the age of the *antiqui*, who had to cope as yet without the notational innovations of his own time. The passage itself will be cited immediately after the next section, and my discussion of it will continue in the section thereafter, on Materialism. The clues obtained by then will direct the inquiry to the important question of Anonymous IV's historical vision. Critical to that vision will turn out to be the perception of his own age, that of the *moderni*. As Anonymous IV sees it, the *moderni* are a community of musicians, both living and dead, who are bound together by a shared tradition. It is the advent of that tradition, some time after 1200, which sets the *moderni* apart from the more distant age of the *antiqui*. The final sections of this essay will be devoted to the specific changes brought by the new notation.

[6] Fritz Reckow (ed.), *Der Musiktraktat des Anonymus 4*, Beihefte zum Archiv für Musikwissenschaft 2, 2 vols (Wiesbaden, 1967), pp. 49–50. Texts and translations from relevant passages in this treatise are provided in the Appendices, below.

## THE *ANTIQUI*

From the way Anonymous IV speaks about the ancient musicians in Excerpt 1, we can tell that he had never been one of them. This will become abundantly clear later on, yet it is apparent even on first reading. His use of the word *antiqui* already offers a hint. The adjective *antiquus* refers almost by definition to people who lived and died a long time ago, usually well before the lifetime of those who use the word.[7] The second give-away is the element of exaggeration in the account – like the claim, for example, that the ancients needed seven hours to figure out what moderns could learn from notation in one. The comparison makes for a memorable image, yet the time-spans are so wildly at variance that we might doubt that Anonymous IV was reporting from personal experience. Finally we can tell it from the way he speaks of the *antiqui* as 'they' – they used to have (*habebant*), they used to operate (*operabantur*), they used to labour (*laborabant*), and so on. These 'they' are strangers, a distant people, as far removed in time as they were behind in notational progress.

We may usefully compare this with another passage elsewhere in the treatise, in which Anonymous IV speaks about the composers of his own time, the *moderni* (Appendix I: 1). He remarks here upon a curious compositional device in which a dissonance is notated technically in the wrong place, and yet is strangely effective as music. The modern musicians who use that device are likewise referred to as 'they' – they notate (*ponunt*). However, Anonymous IV quickly turns out to be one of them, for he inadvertently slips from third-person 'they' to first-person 'we' as he concludes the same sentence: 'they notate (*ponunt*) … and we notate this (*ponimus*)' (Appendix I: 1).[8]

There is a professional bond implied in this revealing slip, one that extends also to past generations of *moderni*. We can tell this from two very famous passages in which Anonymous IV lists, in broadly chronological order, the masters and notators who had been active at Paris over the course of the preceding four-score years. The second of these passages will be quoted in its entirety in Excerpt 2 below, but the first is worth touching upon briefly here (Appendix D: 9–11). This is the well-known passage in which Anonymous IV speaks for the first time about Master Perotin the Great and his books of organum.[9] He recounts the path by which those books have been copied and

[7] See Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1879), s.v. *antiqui*: 'the ancients, esp. the ancient writers (i. e. those whose age has been long past)'.

[8] References to the Appendices include the text excerpt identifier (A–I) followed by sentence number in Arabic numerals. Reckow's editorial sentence divisions have been maintained.

[9] There is one previous mention of Perotin's name, in a passing reference to the time in which he lived; see Appendix B: 6.

recopied from the distant past into his own time. The particular course of that path is defined by a succession of masters going back several generations.

One critical issue in both this line of succession and the one in Excerpt 2 below is *change*. Within a tradition like the one sketched here, change is contentious. It puts at risk the thread of continuity which ties together multiple generations of masters. The case of Perotin illustrates this. On the one hand he is the key figure in the narrative, a master of unimpeachable authority. On the other hand he also took it upon himself to do something that no master after him would be advised to try. Prior tradition had handed down to him a large book of organum compiled by a previous master, the 'excellent *organista*' Leonin. However, instead of preserving the integrity of that book and its repertory, he began to revise it. Perotin was said to have 'shortened' Leonin's book while adding new music of his own. In doing so he drew attention to his own person (being as Anonymous IV said 'an excellent discantor') at the expense of the original compiler. After this revision we never hear of Leonin again, only of 'the book or books of Master Perotin'.

This is disruptive change – effecting a break in continuity. By editing and revising the Leonian tradition, Perotin effectively established a new one. This is the tradition with which Anonymous IV identifies. It connects his generation directly with Perotin, and unites all masters alive and dead in a collective 'we'. Further breaks of this kind are unwelcome, however. It may have been possible to build on the legacy of a foundational figure like Perotin, even expand it. But any sort of rupture may harm the tradition and the community, and is to be strongly discouraged.

As for the particular course of the path, Anonymous IV says that Perotin's books were in use until the time of a certain Master Robert de Sablon, and then from the latter's time to the present. Not content with naming just these two masters, he goes on to list four others who were active between Master Robert and his own time. What emerges from his brief narrative is a kind of genealogy of distinguished masters, an ancestral line rooted ultimately in the person of its originator, Perotin. Like the genealogy of any professional community, it invests the present generation with the accumulated authority of the past. That is no trifling thing. With professional authority at stake it is perhaps not surprising that Anonymous IV will present the same genealogy again, and then greatly expand on it (see below, in the section on Genealogy).

Since Perotin had died two or three generations before Anonymous IV was active, he was technically *antiquus* relative to him (Appendix D: 3). Yet he was not nearly as remote a figure as the *antiqui* in Excerpt 1 below. The memory of these musicians has taken on the crude features of anecdotal recollection, and lacks the glow of posthumous celebrity that surrounds Master Perotin. As Anonymous IV describes them, the *antiqui* were helplessly dependent on a primitive notation whose crippling deficiencies they were incapable of fixing. The surest sign that Anonymous IV has no intention of claiming them for his genealogy is that he does not trouble himself to

record their names. With the exception of Master Leonin, the *antiqui* feature in his story only as a nameless collective, standing for the whole nebulous prehistory that precedes the tradition of Master Perotin.

## EXCERPT 1 (LATIN TEXT IN APPENDIX F: 1–7)

> [1]In the beginning, the notes that [now make up the ligatures] called 'with propriety and without perfection' were confusing as to the name [to give those notes, whether longa or brevis]. [2]The notes were communicated in an ambiguous way – which of course is not the case today; for in the ancient books they had notes that were totally equivocal, because the single notes all looked alike. [3]So they worked purely by understanding, saying: 'I understand this to be a longa, I understand this to be a breve.' [4]And they worked for a long time before they gained proficiency in something that nowadays all those who work on this can easily learn with the help of the aforesaid [teachings], so much so that one could make more progress in one hour than was accomplished in seven before. [5]The *antiqui* spent most of their learning efforts on those notes without written signification, for they had knowledge of the full euphony of concords, like octave, fifth, and fourth …, and compared the higher to the lower part, and then they taught others, saying: 'Listen to us, and remember when you sing it.' [6]But the notation itself gave them virtually no information, so they said: 'this higher note concords in this way with the lower note', and that was quite enough for them. [7]And speaking thus they learned only a few things over a long span of time.

## MATERIALISM

One of the surprising things about Excerpt 1 is its undercurrent of *materialist* thinking. Anonymous IV seems to view the issue principally as one of efficiency and economy. It is telling, for example, that he speaks of rehearsal as a form of work, of labour. The ancients, he says, 'worked for a long time' (*laborabant*) because they lacked adequate notation. By contrast, the present-day musicians 'who are working on this' (*laborantes*) can do it very quickly. The Latin verb *laborare* need not imply that the activity was in itself laborious, and indeed cannot have that implication here. The point is that the job had become a lot easier for contemporary musicians, and yet they are also said to be 'labouring'. The principal meaning of the verb is far more neutral. To labour is to make a livelihood, to earn one's living. Labour, by definition, is work done for payment, out of necessity rather than, say, as leisure, or as an act of benevolence. Since the word implies remuneration, it follows that labour expended on useless tasks is a waste of money.

Money and labour are two commodities in an economic exchange, which in this case appears to be either between employer and employee, or between master and apprentice. Yet there is also a third commodity in the equation, and that is the one Anonymous IV is most concerned with – *time*. Although he does not say it in so many words, he takes it as understood that time is a thing worth saving, and that saving time is self-evidently a good thing. Indeed that is what he sees as the chief virtue of Garlandian notation. Unfortunately it is not clear from his words what he thought time-saving was good *for*, that is, what was the greater human good to which it contributed. Naturally it must depend on the activity, and what the activity is good for. There are plenty of activities in which it is not obvious at all that there is any benefit to time-saving: for example, physical therapy. Or caring for sick friends. Or playing a *Gymnopédie* on the piano. Any notion of saving time on these activities would imply the possibility of wasting it otherwise, which is to mistake their purpose. These are not things we do by the clock. When, on the other hand, workers are paid by the hour, saving time means saving money, and that presumably falls under the cardinal virtue of *industria*.

Economic exchange is what turns things into commodities, and gives them the material value without which they cannot be exchanged. That is what we are witnessing here – the commodification of time. Jacques Le Goff called it merchant's time, measurable and countable in arbitrarily defined units called hours.[10] The material value that time derives from the exchange, 'time is money', can be wasted, saved, or spent well. It also provides a measure of the usefulness of work that consumes time, and it allows one to distinguish between more and less effective ways of using one's time. On these terms, an unproductive activity would be one that does not justify the expense of time. That appears to be the premise of Anonymous IV. As he sees it, the ancients lost – indeed wasted – six out of every seven hours on a time-consuming but completely preventable chore.

There is something paradoxical about his way of thinking, however. We might like to think of music as more than a material commodity in an economic exchange. Who is counting hours when musicians are perfecting the performance of an organum duplum? What is the value of six hours freed up by the use of rhythmic notation? Six hours to do what instead? It all depends on the activity. But what kind of activity did the *antiqui* engage in, according to Anonymous IV? A musical one,

[10] In reflecting on these issues the following essay has proved most helpful: Jacques Le Goff, 'Merchant's Time and Church's Time in the Middle Ages', Chapter 2 of Jacques Le Goff, *Time, Work, & Culture in the Middle Ages*, Arthur Goldhammer, trans. (Chicago and London, 1980), pp. 29–52. Le Goff briefly mentions the concept of wasting time on pp. 50–1; the author he mentions, both here and on pp. 296 n. 49 and 370, was named Domenico Cavalca, not Domenico Calva.

for sure – one that required a trained ear for consonant sonority. The *antiqui*, he says, 'had knowledge of the full euphony of concords, like octave, fifth, and fourth'. If such knowledge is to be drawn upon for hours, then it must comprise rather more than the basic mathematics of consonance, which is the most elemental euphony as heard on the monochord. *Full* euphony (*melodia completa*) is a carefully crafted sensory experience appreciated musically. It requires the fine-tuning of a range of parameters, which may include voice production, size of ensemble, intonation, register, volume, acoustics, and, yes, tempo and rhythm. Maintaining that quality over the course of an extended composition is a musical challenge that may require multiple hours of practice. There is virtually no end to the imperfections of sonority that the discriminating ear will pick up. Anonymous IV underlines the centrality of musical judgement when he quotes the *antiqui* as saying 'this higher note concords *in this way* with the lower note' (Appendix F: 6), implying that there are multiple kinds of euphony.

All this is worlds away from the singers of his own time, who are reportedly content to spend one hour using the shortcut of Garlandian notation and then take the rest of the day off. It may be true, as Anonymous IV says, that they learned the correct rhythms far more quickly. But unlike the rehearsals of the ancients, theirs was not fundamentally a musical activity. After all, they could just as easily learn the correct rhythms of pure cacophony, and not even have the musicianship to understand what is wrong with it. The problem here is not just that Anonymous IV is comparing completely different activities, but that he admits only one criterion of comparison: how long it takes to work out the rhythms – seven hours or one. That is a crudely reductive, book-keeping perspective, concerned more with the convenience of musicians who are disinclined to work overtime than with the perfection of the final performance. We might wonder how an educated musician like Anonymous IV could bring himself to propagate it.

## GENEALOGY

Whatever the answer, Anonymous IV's evocation of the distant past sets the stage for the passage that comes immediately after the first excerpt, quoted below as Excerpt 2. Having just described the problems of musical interpretation among the *antiqui*, he moves on to what he sees as the historic turning point. Now it is as if the clouds part, the dark ages vanish, and the Era of Perotin begins. This is the theorist's own age, the age of the *moderni*. Its advent calls immediately for a second genealogy, which turns out to be an expanded version of the first.

The second genealogy is more than a dry listing of names, however. It offers an illuminating picture of a professional community active more than seven hundred years ago. I have argued elsewhere that this was probably a confraternity – a guild of

notators and masters of organum.[11] Corporations of scribes, illuminators and painters are documented at Paris and other European cities from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries onwards.[12] Given the large number of organised *métiers* in thirteenth-century Paris, it would be surprising if masters of organum and notators had not joined in similar corporations. Although there is no evidence to confirm or disprove this, large parts of Anonymous IV's treatise make the most convincing sense, I would argue, if one assumes that he was thinking within the framework of an organised professional community, one of which he himself had been a member.

Consider, for example, the materialist strain of thinking already mentioned. Concepts like exchange and commodification may seem strangely incongruous for an art as evanescent and intangible as music. Yet they may also reflect the perspective of someone who makes a living with music, a professional, for whom time-saving could be a way to increase earnings, if only by expanding the repertory that could be prepared at short notice. From a contemporary Christian perspective there was nothing wrong with materialism per se, not in the right context. Labour was an honest means of sustaining oneself. To acquire appropriate material goods was no more than to practise the Christian virtue of just love of self. To waste time on useless tasks, by contrast, was to commit the sin of prodigality. Professional guilds had a justifiable stake in making labour more efficient. A time-saving device was an asset that improved the lives of its members. There could only be a high premium on the invention of such devices.

Likewise typical of guild organisation is the preoccupation with past masters, and the determination to remember their names. When Jesus Ben Sirach famously said 'Let us now praise famous men', he was mindful especially of 'those who found out musical tunes and recited verses in writing' (Ecclesiasticus 44:5, 8–9). Some of those musicians, he said, 'have left a *name* behind them, that their praises might be *reported*'. But others 'have no memorial': they 'are perished, as though they had never been; and are become as though they had never been born; and their children after them'. Musicians who have slipped from human memory have slipped away from the living altogether. Guild brothers were acutely aware of the obligation to remember their professional ancestors. It was a responsibility not to be taken lightly. To be careless enough to let them pass into oblivion was to offend against the Fourth

[11] Wegman, 'The World According to Anonymous IV', p. 715 n. 59 and p. 718 n. 70. In reflecting on these passages over the years, I have drawn inspiration time and again from the brilliant discussion and historical contextualisation in Christopher Page, *The Owl and the Nightingale: Musical Life and Ideas in France 1100–1300* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1989), pp. 134–54.

[12] For text scribes at Paris in the final decade of the thirteenth century, see Kouky Fianu, 'Les Professionnels du livre à la fin du XIIIe siècle: L'Enseignement des registres fiscaux parisiens', *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes* 150 (1992), pp. 185–222, at pp. 220–1.

Commandment. To forsake them, to allow them become strangers while they were labouring in Purgatory, was to commit the grave sin of ingratitude. In losing one's ancestors, one lost one's own identity.

Guilds and confraternities formalised this obligation by commemorating deceased members in regular Requiem services. The salvation of each member's soul was their raison d'être – the perspective of eternal life must outweigh all others here on earth. For the intercessory prayers it was essential to maintain membership records: deceased members cannot be remembered in prayers when their names are forgotten. As a rule, therefore, confraternities kept lists of all members past and present – as the well-known necrology of the Confrérie des jongleurs at Arras illustrates (*F-Pn* fr. 8541). It may well be in the context of regular commemorative services that Anonymous IV, repeating the names of deceased members in collective prayers, had come to retain the names even of masters he had never known personally.

Yet it was not enough just to maintain membership lists. The ancestors represented values needed by the living: authority, legitimacy and communal identity. To have a valid claim to this patrimony there had to be succession, a tradition connecting the originator with his most recent descendants. For Anonymous IV the originator was Master Perotin. Perotin was remembered as The Great, and with good reason: this is how any tradition is bound to remember the source of its own claim to greatness. Every master who came after Perotin continued the tradition and faithfully passed it on. If Perotin himself was known as The Great, his successors are typically identified by their first names plus the masters who taught them. The lines of succession are always there – that is the difference between a genealogy and a membership list. Perpetual remembrance keeps those lines intact. A rupture in the chain of remembrance would not be a problem if it separated the distant *antiqui* from the modern age. Anonymous IV does not claim them for his tradition anyway. Yet a clean break anywhere between Perotin and his own time, an erasure in the record, would effectively orphan the living. Patrimony can be handed down only along a legitimate line of descent. It cannot confer authority or legitimacy on those who are not its lawful inheritors.

## THE PARISIAN MASTERS

All this may explain why Excerpt 2 is structured as a succession of named masters from Perotin to Franco. Both here and in the first genealogy, the intermediate figure is Master Robert de Sablon. Anonymous IV cannot say which masters came before Robert, but after him his memory is detailed. Thus we learn that Robert had a student named Pierre who faithfully carried on his teachings and even improved them. Continuity and fidelity are key themes in the genealogy; they are also the points to emphasise when the lineal connections are less clear or forgotten. For example, Anonymous IV remembers 'a certain Jean' but he does not (and probably cannot) tell

us who his teacher was. It does not matter, for he can still report the essential point, which is that Jean had continued the ways of *all* the masters before him.

The emphasis on continuity also provides an illuminating context for the master named Thomas de Saint-Julien the Elder. He was known for *not* having notated the way the others did. Within the context of a guild such a thing was not likely to be looked upon favourably. How is one to uphold the collective reputation for excellence when individual masters go off and start doing things their own way? Why must Master Thomas be the exception? Since individualism may undermine the professional cohesion of a guild, Anonymous IV hastens to assure the reader that there was no problem about Master Thomas. For the elders, the *antiquiores*, whose word held final authority in such matters, had given him their stamp of approval: 'He did not notate the way [the others] did, but he was good according to the elders'.

There had been a similar issue in the first genealogy, but involving a far more famous individual (Appendix D: 10–11). The issue comes up near the end of this passage, when Anonymous IV mentions the most recent generation, led by two masters named Franco. These masters, he says, had begun to notate 'in a different way in their books'. More than that, they had begun to teach 'different rules of their own, having made them their own [that is, appropriated them] for their books'. Note the choice of words: 'their own rules' (*regulas proprias*, *apropriatas*); 'their books', as opposed to everyone else's (*suis libris*); 'in a different way' (*aliter*, *alias*) – all this stated twice within the space of two sentences. Did they go it alone? Were the time-honoured rules somehow not good enough for them? Did the elders have anything to say about that? Were they consulted? Anonymous IV does not say. Yet he cannot have been unaware that no master since Perotin, not even Johannes de Garlandia, had done what they did: establish a new school. By inventing their own rules, the two Francos effectively presumed to be their own teachers, their own authorities, and their own arbiters when it came to the correct notation of their books. History was to vindicate them, of course. Franconian notation became universal, and Garlandia was quickly forgotten. But is easy to imagine that the initial response in Paris was one of condemnation.

In fact we know of another theorist, Master Lambert, who was publicly rebuked for propagating novel teachings not long before Franco of Cologne. In 1279 he became the target of a lengthy critique written by the so-called Anonymous of St Emmeram.[13] Significantly, the author of this critique invoked the very values of tradition and authority that Anonymous IV had only hinted at. We find him speaking of 'our ancestors, the inventors of measurable music', and of the more recent masters 'in whose footsteps I have followed'. Among these recent masters he also reckons the author of 'that venerable prose', the theorist we know as Garlandia, extolled here as 'a

[13] Jeremy Yudkin, ed. and trans., *De musica mensurata: The Anonymous of St. Emmeram* (Bloomington, 1990).

wise man'.[14] Against this unified tradition, he says, there has now stood up a foolish and misguided master who has made up rules of his own, rules that are an affront to the memory of Garlandia.[15] This is the 'crazed Lambert' who has spurned, rejected, corrupted and debased the teachings of the older master. The anonymous critic notes with dismay that some people had even praised Lambert's treatise not long ago, a sure sign of its corrupting influence on musical judgement. Reassuringly, however, a number of distinguished persons had given the matter a hard look, and they (or so the anonymous author claims) had rejected the work as trivial and shallow. If that was the majority view among the master notators of Paris, then perhaps it is not surprising that Anonymous IV never mentions Lambert in either of his two genealogies.

Franco was well aware that a master like him could risk censure and condemnation by overhauling the established body of teachings. Yet he did it anyway. In his treatise *Ars cantus mensurabilis* he presented a completely new notation system, not just diverging from Garlandia's teachings but incompatible with them. (Ironically, most of the new system was borrowed from Lambert.) The Prologue to his treatise shows the reactions Franco anticipated. 'Let no one say', he wrote, 'that I undertook this work out of arrogance, or perhaps out of self-interest alone'.[16] It had not been his intention, he added, to exalt himself or to place himself above his fellow-masters. On the contrary, he had meant to be of service to the professional community at large, by humbly offering what he described as 'the most perfect instruction for all notators of measurable music'.

Anonymous IV may not have agreed. Within the context of his genealogy the two Francos appear as separatists. There is not a word on whether the elders had approved, nor any mention of notators who followed their school. In the remainder of his treatise Anonymous IV ignores both Lambert and the two Francos, and makes no reference to their ideas. It is as if they did not exist, and never had.

As he approaches the end of Excerpt 2, Anonymous IV probes the furthest recesses of his memory to recall more ancestral musicians. Even when the names escape him he is determined to rescue them for posterity, by providing at least some identifying

[14] The inventors of the art: '*antecessores* nostri, musicae mensurabilis *inventores*'; Garlandia and his treatise: 'factum *sapientis* commendabile nec non in fornace studii totiens expurgatum vulgariter et expertum … prosae *venerabilis*'; the Anonymous St Emmeram himself: 'utens consilio magistrorum *quorum vestigia sum secutus*, practicam partim et theoricam … propono metrice compilare' (Yudkin, *De musica mensurata*, p. 64; my italics).

[15] For this and what follows, see Yudkin, *De musica mensurata*, pp. 64–74.

[16] Gilbert Reaney and André Gilles (eds), *Franconis de Colonia, Ars cantus mensurabilis*, Corpus Scriptorum de Musica 18 (Rome, 1974), p. 24: 'Nec dicat aliquis nos hoc opus propter arrogantiam, vel forte propter propriam tantum commoditatem incepisse, sed vere propter evidentem necessitatem et auditorum facillimam apprehensionem necnon et omnium notatorum ipsius mensurabilis musicae perfectissimam instructionem'.

information. And so they survive as nameless shadows: 'someone else, an Englishman', 'a certain master from Burgundy', 'another good singer'. He has little to say about any of them, and the comment about the Englishman seems positively tautological: 'he had the English way of notating and also to some extent of teaching', as indeed one might expect an Englishman to have. Yet in a specifically Parisian context this information is still meaningful. The point is surely that his was not the officially approved Parisian way of notating, and that this could potentially be a problem. Lack of the appropriate competence could well have barred him from the right to exercise his trade. One of the many functions of trade guilds was to protect and regulate the local 'market', lest foreign masters would come in and rob the Parisians masters of their business. But this man's English ways were evidently not held against him. To judge from Anonymous IV's words, this fellow Englishman was accepted as a member of the Parisian community, just as he himself had been. If, that is, there ever was a confraternity of notators at Paris …

## EXCERPT 2 (LATIN TEXT IN APPENDIX F: 8–19)

[8]But from the time of Perotin the Great, and just a little bit before, there was a shortening made by means of written signs, and they took less time to teach, and still less from the time of Master Robert de Sablon, even though he was a slow teacher. [9]But he brought out [musical] sounds most deliciously in singing. [10]Therefore he was greatly praised in Paris, just as the Orléanais Master Pierre Trothun was with respect to plainchant. [11]But people said that he had virtually no understanding of tempus units. [12]Master Robert knew them very well, however, and he taught them faithfully. [13]After him, and out of his schooling, came Master Pierre, the excellent notator, and he notated his books most faithfully according to the use and custom of his master, and even better. [14]And at that time there was someone called Thomas de Saint-Julien-de-Paris the Elder. [15]He did not notate the way they did, but he was good according to the elders. [16]There was also someone else, an Englishman, and he had the English way of notating and also to some extent of teaching. [17]After these, and in his time, there was a certain Jean, mentioned earlier, and he continued the ways of all [the masters] I have mentioned above, until the time of Master Franco, along with certain other masters, like Master Thibaut le Galois and Master Simon de Sacalie, along with a certain master from Burgundy, and also a *preud'homme* from Picardy whose name was Master Jean le Fauconer. [18]There were good singers in England, and they sang most deliciously, like Master John Fitzdieu, like Makebliss near Winchester, and Blacksmith at the court of the last King Henry. [19]There was another good singer in multiple kinds of song and organum, along with certain others of whom we shall make mention elsewhere.

## MATERIAL SIGNIFICATION

Excerpt 2 is of exceptional interest, showing as it does a medieval profession writing its own history. Yet what is the broader point to which it contributes? What is its connection to the text which precedes it in the treatise, the one about the *antiqui* (Excerpt 1)? More particularly, how does it continue the train of thought in that text: about the time it took to learn new music, about the use of consonance to determine the correct rhythms, and about the teaching of rhythmic interpretations by singing them before students?

I have already hinted at one likely connection. By recounting the problems of the *antiqui* in the first excerpt, Anonymous IV has prepared the stage for Perotin's arrival in the second. It clearly matters a great deal to him that the significance of that moment should not be lost on the reader. On the other hand, if the arrival of Perotin and his contemporaries truly marked a historic turning point, then it must have brought palpable change, a substantial improvement of some kind, otherwise polyphonic notation would have remained as problematic as it had been before. What was that change?

It is here that our inquiry runs into a major problem – a collision between two conflicting historical narratives. Let us briefly recall the historical picture with which we started this essay. To the best of our knowledge there was to be no definitive solution to the problem of notational ambiguity until the treatise of Johannes de Garlandia around 1260. Anonymous IV modelled his own text directly on that treatise. When he speaks of historic improvements, it is usually in connection with the conceptual pair of propriety and perfection. Garlandia was the first to name and define these two devices, and to formulate rules for their application. Our assumption throughout this essay has been that Perotin cannot be credited with those later teachings, since he lived a good while before Garlandia. Indeed that very assumption provided the starting point for our inquiry: why had those teachings not been developed much sooner, perhaps already during the lifetime of Perotin, in the early decades of the century?

The problem is that Anonymous IV directly contradicts this assumption. He insists that the rules of propriety and perfection had been in use well before Garlandia, and in fact were already current during the days of Perotin. That is an astonishing claim, not because it is in any way problematic within the context of his own treatise, but because it does not match the evidence we possess. This is best illustrated by the earliest complete Notre-Dame source, $W_1$, which has been dated to the 1230s. $W_1$ contains all the known works by Perotin, but it is only on the rarest of occasions that we find anything resembling a modification of propriety or perfection. Even when we do find such modifications, it is far from clear that there is rhythmic significance to them, let alone that Garlandian meanings must apply. That is the problem: the earliest Notre-Dame sources are Perotinian, yet they show no sign of the historic turning point remembered by Anonymous IV.

The collision between the two narratives is more violent even than this. Anonymous IV maintains not only that the principles of Garlandian notation were known during Perotin's time, but that they constituted the defining contribution of his generation. We can see this in the first sentence of Excerpt 2. The turning point is described here as an *abbreviatio*, a 'shortening'. Whatever that may mean, the theorist does not see it as a one-time event so much as the beginning of an ongoing process, a progressive shortening from Perotin's time all the way to his own. It is Perotin, not Garlandia, who had initiated the notational revolution. The ongoing process after that was effected, says Anonymous IV, by means of *signa materialia* – literally, material signs, but translated here as written signs. It is these that define the historic turning point. But what does he mean by 'material signs', and wherein lies the key to their revolutionary impact?

*Signa materialia* and *puncta materialia* are among the favourite expressions of Anonymous IV. Although they sound like technical terms, and have a vaguely Aristotelian ring to them, they are at base no more than a circumstantial way of stating the obvious. Signs are material by definition. They are written with ink on parchment, and visible to the eye. They do not need the adjective *materialis* to spell that out. To be sure, there is a certain flexibility in Anonymous IV's use of the adjective. He applies it also to something else that is not an object but a process – the process of signification. Anonymous IV speaks of *material signification* to indicate the process whereby material signs convey meaning. However, even in this case the adjective is redundant. Since there are no signs other than material ones, there can also be no signification other than material.

Why then does he use that superfluous adjective? Anonymous IV needs it to distinguish regular signs – for that is what *signa materialia* are – from another type of sign which does not signify in the conventional way. In fact we would not even call it a sign. What he has in mind is signs with *significatio intellectualis*, with intellective signification. He already gave an example of this in Excerpt 1. When somebody points to a spot of ink that has no visible rhythmic significance and says 'I understand this to be a longa', then the signification is not material but intellective. We might say that there is no signification at all because his understanding does not come from the ink shape but from something else. To illustrate this let us take a word like 'row'. As printed on this page, that is, materially, it cannot signify unambiguously, for the word has several different meanings and pronunciations – it can refer to a quarrel, items arranged in a line, and propulsion by oars. But when I encounter the word in a sentence, I understand immediately what it means. Then I can point to the ink trace and say 'I understand this to mean "quarrel"'. And I can credibly state that this is what the ink trace signifies, even if it does so intellectively rather than materially.

Yet what is the point of all this sophistry? What does it have to do with music? If Anonymous IV's reasoning strikes the reader as hopelessly abstruse, the good news is that he thinks so, too. *Significatio intellectualis* is his roundabout way of defining what

was wrong with the notation of the *antiqui*. The problem was that their notes signified rhythms intellectively, whereas it would have been far more expedient to signify them materially. What they needed was material signs, *signa materialia*, to convey rhythmic information unambiguously. Translated into plain English: they had no rhythmic notation, and they were desperately in need of it.

This is precisely what they got at that historic turning point. And it is the increasing use of *signa materialia* that drove the progressive *abbreviatio* after it. Although sources such as $W_1$ do not confirm that this happened during the lifetime of Perotin, Anonymous IV is positive that it did. Here is how we know:

- In Appendix D: 1–2, Anonymous IV quotes two rules verbatim from Garlandia, the second of which defines the values of ligatures *without propriety*. He goes on to say that the two rules were already applied in books during the age of Perotin, well before Garlandia. The only difference is that notators in those days were unable to 'narrate' them: that is, they did not formulate them in rules like Garlandia did, and did not pass them on verbally (Appendix D: 1–3).
- In Appendix F: 1 (Excerpt I), Anonymous IV speaks of ligatures *without perfection*, and remarks that the notes in these ligatures were 'at first' confusing as to name. What he means, presumably, is that musicians were unsure what names to give the notes, whether longa or brevis, because the ligature looked the same no matter what names the notes were supposed to have. Since Excerpt 1 is all about the period of the *antiqui*, we must infer that imperfection already existed that early (at least according to Anonymous IV). It was not possible to see it, but it was there intellectively. Perotin and his contemporaries made it visible *per signa materialia*.

There is one sense in which all this may be helpful. We began this essay with the question: why were the Garlandian innovations not developed much sooner? Anonymous IV answers that question by saying that, actually, they *were* developed much sooner, already during Perotin's lifetime. His answer solves one problem, but it creates another, since we cannot reconcile it with the musical evidence we have. What we do with that problem is another matter. But in a situation like this, where a historical witness does not say what we expect him to say, the best way to proceed is retrace our steps, and think of ways in which he might be right – for the simple reason that he *must* be right. Here are some things to consider. The only pre-Garlandian sources we have are the Notre-Dame manuscripts $W_1$, F and $W_2$, and numerous fragments of the same type of source. Are these likely to represent all the musical sources current at this time? The answer must surely be no, because everything we know about the Notre-Dame manuscripts tells us that they were not copied for practical performance. If we then posit the existence of practical sources, now lost, are these likely to have been

notationally identical to the surviving sources? This is a much harder question to answer, because it must depend in part on the musical genre. As far as organum purum is concerned, stemmatic research suggests that the Notre-Dame manuscripts present edited versions, compiled *ad hoc* from a variety of pre-existing practical sources.[17] In other genres, too, there may be peculiarities of transmission that could point to more complicated copying processes than we are used to in other periods. A good example might be the phenomenon of modal transmutation in conducti.[18]

One thing is clear in all this, however. We are not going to get meaningful answers from Anonymous IV if we insist on a historical picture that is at variance with his. We will have to go along with his view, and accept, if only for the sake of argument, that Perotin and his contemporaries really did effect the major turning point of which he speaks. Since Anonymous IV describes that turning point as an *abbreviatio*, it is the meaning of that term which we must now explore.

## ABBREVIATION

What does Anonymous IV mean by 'shortening'? There has been much discussion about both this word and its cognate *abbreviare,* which he uses in another passage. Since the latter passage is about Leonin and the *Magnus liber organi*, and about the way Perotin was said to have 'abbreviated' that book, it matters a great deal to the historiography of the ars antiqua what Anonymous IV meant by it (Appendix D: 5). Unfortunately the word is perversely elusive and ambiguous precisely in this passage.[19] On the other hand, there is nothing especially difficult about its interpretation in Excerpt 2. All we need to do is join its first sentence to the final sentence of Excerpt 1, which precedes it in the treatise. In direct succession they read (Appendix F: 7–8):

[17] I will present the results of my research on the transmission of organum purum in another context.

[18] Vincent Corrigan, 'Modal Transmutation in the 13th Century', in David Halperin (ed.), *Essays in Honor of Hans Tischler*, Orbis Musicae 12 (1998), pp. 83–106.

[19] The conventional interpretation is that the 'shortening' refers to the practice of replacing organal sections in organum duplum by so-called substitute clausulas. This appears to have been an ongoing and mostly cumulative process taking place during the thirteenth century, and leading eventually to organum settings that were in discant throughout; see William G. Waite, 'The Abbreviation of the "Magnus Liber"', *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 14 (1961), pp. 147–58. The currently accepted interpretation of the verb *abbreviare* is 'to make an edition'; see Edward H. Roesner, 'The Problem of Chronology in the Transmission of Organum Duplum', in Iain Fenlon (ed.), *Music in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Patronage, Sources and Texts* (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 365–99, at pp. 377–8.

> And speaking thus they learned only a few things over a long span of time (*longo tempore*). But from the time of Perotin the Great, and just a little bit before, there was a shortening (*abbreviatio*) made by means of written signs …

*Longo tempore* – *abbreviatio*: the juxtaposition of 'long' and 'short' could hardly be more direct. In the Latin original there are only three words separating the two expressions. With such direct proximity it may not be a stretch to suggest that the two words bear directly on one another, and as a pair define the turning point by polar opposition. Basically that would give us a narrative saying that what was long before became progressively shorter after. It is also not hard to determine what 'long' must mean in this context. Excerpt 1 was all about the long time it took the *antiqui* to determine rhythmic values and to teach rhythmic interpretations. A shortening of this *longum tempus* would make it possible to have shorter lessons or rehearsals or study sessions – or, more likely, all three in a single type of shorter meeting. And as a matter of fact this is exactly what Anonymous IV says, again in the first sentence of Excerpt 2: 'from the time of Perotin the Great … they taught more briefly, and then still more briefly from the time of Master Robert de Sablon' (Appendix F: 8).

What this comes down to is the same point we encountered earlier, in the section on Materialism. It is the same line of thinking which holds that time-saving – shorter lessons for no particular stated or implied benefit – represent major historic progress. Anonymous IV makes so much of this that he celebrates the beginning of that process as a historic event of the first order. Whether it was or not, it still confronts us with the baffling point noted earlier – that there is nothing inherently musical about any of these changes. Shorter lessons may be good for something, yet they cannot guarantee more musically accomplished performances. In fact the opposite is more likely. For although reading the correct rhythms in one hour may be expedient, it jettisons the ear as the arbiter of consonance and sonority. For that reason alone, it cannot make up for the activity of fine-tuning a piece, sonority by sonority, until it is correct.

Then again, perhaps there was more to the change than we have as yet inferred from Anonymous IV's account. When it comes to propriety and perfection, there is one fundamental precondition that must be met if they are to be notatable at all, and without which it is not possible even to conceive them. This is *square notation* – and square notation of a particular kind. For propriety and perfection it does not suffice that notes and ligatures are only approximately square or rectangular. There is a clearly circumscribed and precise set of notational conventions that must be observed with such consistency that any deviation will be immediately noticeable as one, and that can be relied upon to signify rhythmic meaning without ambiguity. The first rule is never to modify propriety and perfection when the rhythm does not call for it. The second is to render all notes so perfectly and uniformly rectilinear that modifications of any kind will immediately stand out. Square notation of this type appears to have emerged in northern France within a fairly narrow chronological window, about

1200–25 at the earliest.[20] Its currency could still not be taken for granted around the middle of the century, nor even late in the century. To give the example of Garlandia's treatise, he does not even discuss the rhythmic interpretation of ligatures before he has finished a chapter on how they are to be written and what names to give the various ways of writing them. The same is true of Anonymous IV. (Significantly, he explains the shapes of ligatures not before his Chapter 1, where shape is of no consequence, but before Chapter 2, where it is.)

Within the sphere of Notre-Dame polyphony, a good example of pre-square notation is the so-called Vatican Organum Treatise.[21] This is a very early source, essentially a small parchment gathering that survived because it was bound in a compilation of fascicle manuscripts. The treatise provides rules and examples for the singing and composition of organum purum. It has an appendix which presents a number of otherwise unknown organa dupla in the style of the Notre-Dame school. What is unusual about these organa, compared to later Notre-Dame sources, is that they are not written in square notation but use a more informal kind of notational script. That script is not suitable for the indication of rhythm: the notes and ligatures have an air of casual irregularity that leaves the impression of randomness. Modifications are occasionally encountered that would later assume rhythmic significance, but within the broad range of notational variation they do not attract particular notice.

What we may conclude from this is the following. If Perotin and his contemporaries applied Garlandian rules of propriety and perfection, as Anonymous IV maintains, then they must have used the square notation that allowed those rules to be conceived in the first place. If we interpret the terms *abbreviatio per signa materialia* as a process that included the re-notation of existing repertory into square notation, then the turning point could have been far more memorable than we initially suspected – if only in the superficial sense that manuscripts had acquired a completely different visual aspect. A re-notation of this scope could not have occurred overnight. Square notation is a script of extraordinary elegance and refinement – especially when the notes are as minute as they are in the Notre-Dame manuscripts. Any scribe who was used to a different notational dialect must have spent a long time honing his art in order to reach a professional level of competence. Anonymous IV himself confirms the responsibility of notators to be fastidious about visual precision: 'if the single notes are well depicted or notated there shall be no ambiguity' (Appendix E: 1). It must

[20] Kate Helsen, 'The Evolution of Neumes into Square Notation in Chant Manuscripts', *Journal of the Alamire Foundation* 5 (2013), pp. 143–74.

[21] *V–CVbav* 3025. The musical notation in this manuscript has been studied most extensively by Frieder Zaminer, *Der vatikanische Organum-Traktat (Ottob. Lat. 3025): Organum-Praxis der frühen Notre Dame-Schule und ihrer Vorstufen*, Müncher Veröffentlichungen zur Musikgeschichte 2 (Tutzing, 1959), pp. 33–41.

have been a highly advanced skill, possessed perhaps by few specialists – conceivably the masters of a professional guild. And it is something that must have been passed on from master to student – the very process Anonymous IV describes in his genealogies.

A wholesale *abbreviatio* of polyphonic music from the time of Perotin onward, beginning with the *Magnus liber organi* of Leonin and continuing with his own books, would have been an undertaking of considerable scope. It might not have been easy to accomplish in musical centres other than Paris. Once again this is something that Anonymous IV confirms. At the time of writing, the Spaniards and Navarrese, and to some extent also the English, still used the kind of notation that had been current among the *antiqui*, and they still went on understanding it intellectively (Appendix G: 1–3). 'But', he adds, 'the French at Paris had all those rhythmic modes mentioned earlier, as is more fully evident from the different books of different notators'.

There is an important corollary to all this, which can perhaps serve as a more satisfying answer to the question that prompted this enquiry. When we ask why the Garlandian innovations were not introduced a great deal sooner, we may now answer that they could not be introduced so long as there was no square notation. If *abbreviatio* means the re-notation of existing music into square notation, then by definition this represents the earliest possible point for perfection and propriety to become modifiable. It remains unclear why we find virtually no examples of such modification in the early Notre-Dame manuscripts, despite Anonymous IV's assurance that the practice had been already current in Perotinian days.

## GENRE

Yet Anonymous IV is a complicated witness.[22] His treatise is at times chaotic. He is often forgetful. Occasionally he loses himself in tangential trains of thought. In some parts of the treatise he does not seem to have sufficient grasp of the material to explain it intelligibly. And then there is the complicating factor of what appears to be a hidden agenda. It is obvious that Anonymous IV has a story to tell. He has told it elaborately in Excerpts 1 and 2, and he frequently repeats and alludes to it elsewhere (see the Appendices, below). Yet is it the whole story? There are other things about which the theorist is far less forthcoming. In some cases he is conspicuously silent. The reasons for this are not always readily evident.

There is, most importantly, the question of musical genre. Although one might not quickly infer it from the treatise, and although I have not emphasised the point so far, there was no single, universal type of notation before the very end of the thirteenth century. Before that, there were several different types of notation, each of

[22] For what follows, see Wegman, 'The World According to Anonymous IV'.

which was tied directly to a genre whose problems it solved. Different musical genres posed different notational problems and required different solutions. A satisfactory solution to the problem of one genre was of no help in resolving that of another. The ties between musical genres and their corresponding notations were exclusive. No genre could be written in any notation other than the one that was special to it. And no notation could be used for any other genre than the one with which it was associated. Because these ties were so close, the various types of notation were also quite adequate to their purpose. So long as the genre underwent no major changes, there was neither scope nor need for change. And as long as the notations were adequate to their purpose, there was no need to invent a single type of notation that would serve all genres equally.

But why did there then emerge a single, universal notation by the end of the century? The reason is that all genres other than the motet disappeared. And their particular notations disappeared along with them. Motet notation thus became universal by default. Contemporary treatises reflect this situation. Although they give the impression of being about a general thing called 'modal notation', they are actually about the motet. Some of them still pay lip service to other genres in short discussions tucked away at the back. Yet it is doubtful that even these theorists knew a great deal about those genres. Anonymous IV devotes more than half his treatise to motet notation – Chapters 1 and 2. Since the genre was so important in his time, he assumes it had that same importance back in the days of Perotin. That is how he can perceive an epochal change in the history of its notation. Perotin is seen to have improved rhythmic notation across the board, whereas his contribution was actually limited to the genre of the motet. The full historical picture is quite different. The rhythmic notation of polyphony in Perotin's time can be broken down into the following types:

1. Organum purum was written in unmodified chant notation. Its rhythm was flexible and irregular, did not follow a rhythmic mode, and was not measured in fixed time-units. Singers deduced the correct rhythm by the method that Anonymous IV associated with the *antiqui*. It operated according to the consonance rule: consonant notes in the organal part are long, and dissonant notes are short. Although he says repeatedly that organum purum notation cannot convey rhythmic values, it does actually allow one to identify consonances and dissonances, and thus implicitly their rhythmic values. The consonance rule cannot be applied to any other genre. Only organum purum offers the freedom to lengthen and shorten organal notes according to the singer's judgement and taste. It is impossible to modify the score of a conductus or motet according to the consonance rule. Nor can the notation of other genres convey the irregular rhythms of organum purum.

2. Rhythmic modes in textless polyphony are notated with unmodified ligatures arranged in chains. This notation is applied in clausulas, great tripla, and quadrupla, and must be quite old: only Garlandia and Anonymous IV discuss it. The ligatures signify the mode not by their shape, but by the number of constituent notes and their position in the chain. This notation cannot be used in texted music. It might be used in the textless caudas of conducti, provided the music moves unvaryingly in one or another rhythmic mode.
3. The textless caudas of conducti are not typically pressed into the rhythmic straitjackets of ligature chains. They use a flexible ligature notation, unmodified by propriety or perfection, whose basic principles are described by Anonymous IV as Leonian (see Appendix D: 3): two-note ligatures have the values BL, and three-note ligatures the values LBL. There are additional rules that govern the notation of more complex rhythms. This ligature notation cannot be applied to texted music.
4. The texted *cum littera* sections of conducti are written in undifferentiated single notes whose square shapes have no rhythmic significance. Rhythmic performance involves the application of one of the six rhythmic modes. The choice of mode is left to the performer. *Cum littera* notation cannot be usefully applied to other genres except the motet (see below, no. 5). But it is the only way to notate syllabically texted voice-parts.
5. Motets combine two of the previous types of notation: no. 2 in the tenor, and no. 4 in the other parts. These two types are incompatible in the sense that neither can substitute for the other in the same music. They are also incompatible in the sense that notes and ligature shapes have different meanings in the tenor and the other parts. Garlandian notation was designed to unify the notation of motets, allowing all parts to be read according to the same rules. This involved the differentiation of longa and brevis and the modification of propriety and perfection, innovations that Anonymous IV credited to Perotin and his contemporaries.

Anonymous IV does not go out of his way to volunteer this information. It may be complete coincidence, but it so happens that some of the information undermines his narrative. A good example is the comparison between the seven hours needed by the *antiqui* and the one hour needed in his own time. The comparison leaves the impression that the music of the *antiqui* could be renotated according to Garlandian principles and then found to take six hours less to learn. If that was correct, then certainly the achievement was an impressive one.

Yet it is not correct. Anonymous IV is not speaking of the same musical genre, and certainly not the same musical repertoire. The *antiqui* worked with the consonance rule, and this rule was associated specifically with organum purum: that is the genre

that took them seven hours to learn, comparatively speaking (see above list, no. 1). Yet the *moderni* were benefiting from the improvements of Garlandian notation, and these were associated specifically with the motet: that is the genre that took them only one hour (above, no. 5).

So actually we are dealing here with a case of the proverbial apples and oranges – the fallacy of false analogy. Anonymous IV's statement comes down effectively to this: the *antiqui* used to spend seven hours on organum purum, but nowadays we can sing motets in one hour. One might as well say: it used to take me seven hours to drive to New Hampshire, but now I can get dinner ready in one hour. All we learn from Anonymous IV's statement is that the *antiqui* sang organum purum and the *moderni* motets, and that these genres require different amounts of time to learn. There is nothing impressive about that comparison. It is not actually even a comparison, since there are no common terms. Neither genre was good or bad on the terms of the other, for the two types of music were worlds apart. The following comment by the Anonymous St Emmeram gives an idea of the terms of *organum*, and may explain why even seven hours might not have been enough.[23]

> For if [organum] is performed with clarity, creating praiseworthy concord with a sweet voice (as this kind [of music] requires), it surpasses and banishes all other kinds of music with the delicate sweetness of its euphony. That is why it allures the minds of the listeners, yea, it surpasses and defeats mimes and other practitioners, who produce tunes [relying merely] on their craft. For without the contemplation [that organum purum requires] they could not voice such sweetness of sound, or play it, because it is firstly and principally contemplated in the mind rather than performed on the spot.

This would not be an adequate description of the motet, which is a wordy and talkative genre by definition, with voices competing in different rhythmic modes, narrating different things, neither hearing what the other says, and all this tightly measured and timed, taking less than two minutes to finish. It is the very image of urban life. The vast difference between the two genres sums up the mentality shift that we have been hoping to find in this inquiry.

To try to impress with a comparison that is actually a fallacy may be to let slip the covert presence of an agenda. There are other passages that confirm this impression.

[23] 'Nam si in suo genere prout decet lucide proferatur dulci voce et laudabiliter concordante, omnia cantuum genera superat et excludit delicata dulcedine melodiae. Hinc est quare pellicit animos auditorum, mimos et alios artifices per suum artificium modulos exercentes superat et devincit, quia sine consideratione ipsius non possent tantam sonorum dulcedinem exercere, vel promere resonando, eo quod primo et principaliter consideratur in mente quam proferatur in actu'. (Yudkin, *De musica mensurata*, p. 282.)

The text quoted in Appendix B is such a passage. Here Anonymous IV makes the mistake of saying that the *antiqui* had already been notating motets since olden times, and then equivocates to affirm the truth of both this claim and that of his general narrative, which says the opposite. It would take a separate essay to untangle this complex and contradictory passage.

And yet, there is still a way in which Anonymous IV's comparison might work, and might even inform a credible historical scenario. Organum purum and motet did after all coexist in one context: the organa dupla in the Notre-Dame manuscripts. As compositions these are typically cast as an alternation between discrete passages in either sustained-note organum or discant. As is well known, very many of the discant passages are actually motets without their words, settings that survive in texted versions elsewhere. In the organa they represent later additions: they replaced extended stretches of organum but still presented the same plainchant notes. The replacement of organum by discant was an ongoing and cumulative process, whereby organa that had originated as settings in sustained-note style could end up consisting wholly of discant. Because of this they were significantly shorter than the original organa.

Now we do have common terms. A comparison between organum purum and motet is valid when they can serve as alternatives for the same stretch of plainchant in the same work, and they must consequently be practised in the same rehearsal session. For in that case the session may indeed be longer or shorter according to the use made of the two styles. And a singer might credibly say: the *antiqui* used to spend seven hours practising their organa, but we sing those pieces in the new notation, having replaced the time-consuming organum sections by motets that can be read straight off the page. One hour and we're done!

There are very many implications to this and other scenarios, and the texts cited in the Appendix still have more to reveal. Yet this inquiry must come to an end. The answer to our initial questions is best summarised by the viral phrase: it's complicated. This is partly because Anonymous IV is a complicated human being. It is also because historical documents like his treatise are exceedingly difficult to interpret. And finally it is because history has a perverse habit of not following the rational scenarios by which we know it should behave. The readings offered in this essay are certain to be superseded by more skilful and more informed readings. That is inherent in the pursuit of history, and the limitations of the author. It could give me no greater pleasure if the always original, always arresting, always searching light of Christopher Page's vision were to illuminate this dark corner of music history as only he can.

# APPENDICES: TEXTS FROM ANONYMOUS IV, *COGNITA MODULATIONE MELORUM*; AFTER RECKOW, *DER MUSIKTRAKTAT DES ANONYMUS 4*

## A. Introductory sentence to the treatise

[22] [1]Cognita modulatione melorum secundum viam octo troporum et secundum usum et consuetudinem fidei catholicae nunc habendum est de mensuris eorundem secundum longitudinem et brevitatem, prout antiqui tractaverunt, ut magister Leo et alii plurimi plenius iuxta ordines et colores eorundem ordinaverunt …

[1]Having inquired into the singing of musical sounds according to the way of the eight modes, and according to the use and custom of the Catholic faith, we must now deal with their measures, of length and shortness, as treated by the ancients such as Master Leo and arranged more fully by many others according to the orders and colours of the same.

## B. The notation of mode 5 in motet tenors

[31] [1]Primus ordo quinti procedit [32] sic: longa, longa, longa cum pausatione trium temporum; longa, longa, longa cum pausatione trium temporum; iterato, iterato, iterato, quantum placuerit, ex eisdem sonis vel diversis. [2]Sed intellige, quod quaelibet longa continet tria tempora, et sic quaelibet longa aequipollet longae et brevi in primo modo vel brevi et longae in secundo modo vel ambobus, si bene armonice deducantur, quod difficile est apud talia scientes, nisi fuerint a longo tempore ad talia consueti. [3]Iterato fuerunt quidam antiqui, qui antiquitus solebant elongare illas tres longas coniunctim cum sua longa pausatione, quare ponebant iuxta materialem significationem tres ligatas pro tribus longis, quamvis sit ista ligatura contra ligatas tres in aliis modis antecedentibus et postpositis. [4]Sed nullus hoc poterit cognoscere nisi iuxta armonicam considerationem superius sibi attributam, ut in superiori fuerit longa brevis, longa brevis et longa brevis pro pausatione secundum primum modum, vel brevis longa,

[1]The first ordo of the fifth [mode] proceeds thus: L L L with a rest of three tempora; L L L with a rest of three tempora; and again, again, and again, as many times as you like, either with the same pitches or with different ones. [2]But you must understand that each L contains three tempora, and so each L is equivalent to LB in the first mode, or to BL in the second mode, or to both [modes] if they are harmonically well deduced, which is difficult among those who know about such things unless they have been used to them for a long time. [3]Also there were certain *antiqui* who were accustomed from olden days to lengthen these three longas in a ligature followed by a longa rest, wherefore they notated, in terms of written signs, a three-note ligature standing for three longas, even though that ligature is different from three-note ligatures in the other modes mentioned above and below. [4]But no one will be able to find out except by giving it the harmonic consideration attributed to it above; for example, the top voice in mode 1 had LB, LB,

brevis longa et brevis longa pro pausatione secundum secundum modum. [5]Sed secundum tertium longa duae breves, longa et duae breves pro pausatione, et quarto duae breves longa iuxta ordines supradictos. [6]Et iste modus trium supradictorum est modus notandi coniunctim in inferioribus et in primis sive tenoribus, sed disiunctim in superioribus omnibus, et hoc ab illo tempore, quo homines incipiebant talia cognoscere, ut in tempore Perotini Magni et a tempore antecessorum suorum. [7]Et in quantum distabat ante ipsos, minus erat cognitio talium, sed tantummodo operabantur iuxta relationem inferius ad superius, superius ad inferius, et hoc iuxta sex concordantias armonice sumptas. [8]Et satis sufficiebat tunc temporis eis, et non erat mirum, quia paucis modis utebantur iuxta diversitates ordinum supradictorum, de quibus in postpositis satis patebit.

and L with a breve rest, and in mode 2 had BL, BL and B with a long rest. [5]And in mode 3: LBB, LB with a breve rest, and in the fourth BBL according to the ordos mentioned above. [6]And that manner of three [longas] is the way of notating [motets, that is, with] ligatures in the lower or first parts, or tenors, and discrete notes in all upper parts, and this from the time that people began to find out about such things, as in the time of Perotin the Great and also from the time of his predecessors. [7]And the further back in time before these men, the less knowledge they had of those things, but they operated only according to the relation between lower and higher, and higher and lower, with the help of the six consonances understood harmonically. [8]And that was quite enough for them, nor was it surprising, for they used few modes with the kind of variety of the abovesaid ordos, as will become quite clear in what follows.

### C. Longas that lengthen or shorten the tempus units in organum purum

[44] [1]Sunt quaedam aliae longae et significant longitudinem temporum secundum maius et minus, prout in libris puri organi plenius inveniuntur.

[1]There are certain other longas, and they indicate the length of tempora according to greater and lesser, such as are found more fully in books of organum purum.

### D. Masters and books, from Leonin to the Francos

[45] [1]Ad praesens vero de ligatis sic habendum vel intelligendum est, et primo de hiis, quae cum sua proprietate et perfectione consistunt, sicut scriptum est sic: *omnis figura ligata cum proprietate et perfectione sic est intelligenda: paenultima eius brevis est, ultima vero longa; praecedens vel praecedentes, si fuerint, pro longa habentur vel habeantur*. [2]Iterato *omnis figura sine proprietate et perfectione opposito modo se*

[1]Notes in a ligature are to be treated and understood as follows; and firstly, the following is written [by Johannes de Garlandia] about those with propriety and perfection: *every ligated figure with propriety and perfection is to be understood thus: the penultimate is B and the last is L; if there are notes before this, whether one or more, then they have or should have* [the combined duration of] *an L*. [2]Also, in the opposite way, *every ligature without propriety*

*habet sicut paenultima longa, ultima vero brevis*. [46] [3]Istae regulae utuntur in pluribus libris antiquorum, et hoc a tempore et in suo tempore Perotini Magni, sed nesciebant narrare ipsas cum quibusdam aliis postpositis, et similiter a tempore Leonis pro parte, quoniam duae ligatae tunc temporis pro brevi longa ponebantur, et tres ligatae simili modo in pluribus locis pro longa brevi longa et cetera. [4]Et nota, quod magister Leoninus, secundum quod dicebatur, fuit optimus organista, qui fecit magnum librum organi de gradali et antifonario pro servitio divino multiplicando. [5]Et fuit in usu usque ad tempus Perotini Magni, qui abbreviavit eundem et fecit clausulas sive puncta plurima meliora, quoniam optimus discantor erat, et melior quam Leoninus erat. [6]Sed hoc non est dicendum de subtilitate organi et cetera. [7]Ipse vero magister Perotinus fecit quadrupla optima sicut *Viderunt*, *Sederunt* cum habundantia colorum armonicae artis; similiter et tripla plurima nobilissima sicut *Alleluia Posui adiutorium*, *Nativitas* et cetera. [8]Fecit etiam triplices conductus ut *Salvatoris hodie* et duplices conductus sicut *Dum sigillum summi patris* ac etiam simplices conductus cum pluribus aliis sicut *Beata viscera* et cetera. [9]Liber vel libri magistri Perotini erant in usu usque ad tempus magistri Roberti de Sabilone et in coro Beatae Virginis maioris ecclesiae Parisiensis et a suo tempore usque in hodiernum diem. [10]Simili modo et cetera, prout Petrus notator optimus et Iohannes dictus Primarius cum quibusdam aliis in maiori parte usque in tempus magistri Franconis primi et alterius magistri Franconis de Colonia, qui inceperant in suis libris aliter pro parte notare. [11]Qua de causa alias regulas proprias suis libris apropriatas

*but with perfection has a penultimate note L, and a final note B*. [3]Those rules are used in many of the books of the *antiqui*, and this from the time of Perotin the Great, and in his time, but they did not know how to articulate them, along with certain other things below, and likewise in part from the time of Leo, for in those days they notated two-note ligatures to indicate BL, and in the same way in many places three-note ligatures to indicate LBL, and so on. [4]And note that people said that Master Leonin was an excellent *organista*, who made a large book of organum from the Gradual and Antiphonal for the enrichment of the Divine Service. [5]And it was used until the time of Perotin the Great, who made it shorter, and made many clausulas and *puncta*, because he was a better *discantor*, and was better than Leonin. [6](But this is not to be said of the subtlety of organum.) [7]Now this same Master Perotin made excellent quadrupla like *Viderunt*, *Sederunt*, with an abundance of colours of the harmonic art; likewise also many tripla of greatest distinction, like *Alleluia Posui adiutorium*, *Nativitas*, and so on. [8]He also made three-part conducti like *Salvatoris hodie*, and two-part conducti like *Dum sigillum summi patris*, and also monophonic conducti along with many others, like *Beata viscera*, and so on. [9]The book, or books, of Master Perotin were in use until the time of Master Robert de Sablon, and in the choir of the church of Notre-Dame at Paris, and from his time to the present day. [10]In like manner as [did] Pierre the excellent notator and Jean *dit* Le premier, along with certain others for the most part, until into the time of Master Franco the First and the second Master Franco, of Cologne, who had begun in part to notate in a different way in their books. [11]This is why they passed on different rules of their own, having made

tradiderunt. [12]Iterato fuerunt quidam respicientes, quod regulae supradictae non erant sufficientes, et posuerunt signum proprietatis oppositae, ut supradictum est.

them their own for their books. [12]And there were some who considered that the above rules were not enough, and they notated a sign of opposite propriety, as said before.

### E. No ambiguity if notes *cum littera* are written properly

[48] [1]Figurarum cum litera vel supra literam, prout simplices accipiuntur, si bene depinguntur vel notantur, nulla erit ambiguitas, prout organistae divinum officium multiplicantes in suis voluminibus plenarie percipiunt et secundum diversas partes orbis terrarum divinae potentiae dilectissime usibus suis accipiunt, prout tenentur iuxta sanctam scripturam, ubi dicit: *Laudate dominum in timpano et choro*, et cetera, cum suis adiunctis.

[1]With regard to figures with text or above text, if the single notes are well depicted or notated there shall be no ambiguity, as the *organistae* who enrich the Divine Office in their volumes know well, and accept most delightfully for their uses according to the various parts of the world of the divine power, as they along with their colleagues are held to do according to holy scripture, where it says: *Praise the lord with timbrel and dance*.

### F. Protracted labour reduced by Perotin and his successors (English translation in main text, Excerpts 1 and 2)

[49] [1]Ea que dicuntur cum proprietate et sine perfectione, erant primo confuse quoad nomen.* [2]Sed per modum equivocationis accipiebantur, quod quidem modo non est, quoniam in antiquis libris habebant puncta equivoca nimis, quia simplicia materialia fuerunt equalia. [3]Sed solo [50] intellectu operabantur dicendo: intelligo istam longam, intelligo istam brevem. [4]Et nimio tempore longo laborabant, antequam scirent bene aliquid, quod nunc ex levi ab omnibus laborantibus circa talia percipitur mediantibus predictorum ita, quod quilibet plus proficeret in una hora quam in septima ante quoad longum ire. [5]Maxima pars cognitionis antiquorum fuit in predictis sine materiali significatione, quod ipsi habebant notitiam concordantiarum melodie complete sicut de diapason, diapente et diatesseron … prout habebant respectum superioris ad cantum inferiorem, et docebant alios dicendo: audiatis nos et retineatis et hoc canendo. [6]Sed materialem significationem parvam habebant, et dicebant: punctus iste superior sic concordat cum puncto inferiori, et sufficiebat eis. [7]Et sic dicentes in longo tempore aliqua percipiebant.

[8]Sed abreviatio erat facta per signa materialia a tempore Perotini Magni et parum ante, et brevius docebant, et adhuc brevius a tempore magistri Roberti de Sabilone, quamvis spatiose docebat. [9]Sed nimis deliciose fecit melos canendo apparere. [10]Qua de causa fuit valde laudandus Parisius, sicut fuit magister Petrus Trothun Aurelianis in cantu plano. [11]Sed de consideratione temporum parum aut nichil sciebat, ut dicebatur. [12]Sed magister Robertus supradictus optime ea cognoscebat et fideliter docebat. [13]Post ipsum ex documento† suo fuit magister Petrus optimus notator, et nimis fideliter libros suos secundum usum et consuetudinem magistri

sui et melius notabat. [14]Et tempore illo fuit quidam, qui vocabatur Thomas de Sancto Iuliano Parisius antiquus. [15]Sed non notabat ad modum illorum, sed bonus fuit secundum antiquiores. [16]Quidam vero fuit alius Anglicus, et habebat modum Anglicanum notandi ac etiam in quadam parte docendi. [17]Post ipsos et in tempore suo fuit quidam Iohannes supradictus, et continuavit modos omnium supradictorum usque ad tempus magistri Franconis cum quibusdam aliis magistris sicut magister Theobaldus Gallicus et magister Symon de Sacalia cum quodam magistro de Burgundia ac etiam quodam probo‡ de Picardia, cuius nomen erat magister Iohannes le Fauconer. [18]Boni cantores erant in Anglia et valde deliciose canebant sicut magister Iohannes Filius Dei, sicut Makeblite apud Wyncestriam et Blakesmit in curia domini regis Henrici ultimi. [19]Fuit quidam alius bonus cantor in multiplici genere cantus et organi cum quibusdam aliis, de quibus aliis alias faciemus mentionem et cetera.

* *Ea* translated here as notes, since the only neuter noun in the surrounding paragraphs is *punctum*. I understand *nomen* to mean what a note is called (*dicitur*), whether longa or brevis, which name it may signify visually (see Reckow (ed.), *Musiktraktat*, p. 48: 27), but does not in this excerpt.

† For the reading of *documentum* as teaching or instruction, see Yudkin, *De musica mensurara*, p. 192, ll. 11, 20, 26, and 38.

‡ For the reading of *probus* as *preux* or *preud'homme*, see: Charles du Fresne Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis* (Niort, 1883–7), s.v. 'probus'; and Wegman, 'The World According to Anonymous IV', p. 719, n. 70.

## G. Modes first introduced at Paris

[51] [1]Sed in libris quorundam non erat materialis significatio talis significata. [2]Sed solo intellectu procedebant semper cum proprietate et perfectione operatoris* in eisdem ut in libris Hyspanorum et Pampilonensium et in libris Anglicorum, sed diversimode secundum maius et minus et cetera. [3]Gallici vero Parisius habebant omnes istos modos supradictorum, prout in libris diversis a diversis notatoribus plenius patet, ad cognitionem quorum sic procedimus.

[1]Yet in the books of some *antiqui* no such written signification was signified. [2]They proceeded only by understanding, as the figures in those books were always written with propriety and with perfection, just as in the books of the Spaniards and Pampilonians, and in the books of the English (though in a different way, according to greater and lesser). [3]However, the French at Paris had all those [rhythmic] modes mentioned earlier, as is more fully evident from the different books of different notators; we shall now proceed to learn about them like so.

* For the reading of *operator* as note or figure (either single or ligature), see Reckow (ed.), *Der Musiktraktat*, p. 41, l. 4. Anonymous IV uses the term *operator* also to denote instrumental performers as opposed to singers (ibid. p. 85, l. 29).

## H. Understanding of consonances reduces the need for Garlandian notation

[53] [1]Et secundum istam regulam ultimam mediantibus concordantiis maxima pars dubitationis librorum antiquorum solvitur, et hoc supra literam vel sine litera, si disturbantia contingat meli unisoni et cetera. [2]Et propter hoc non est necesse inter scientes talia, habere totaliter proprietatem et perfectionem semper et cetera prescise, sed prout melius et brevius competit et cetera, ut in posteris plenius patebit.

[1]And following that last rule, most of the uncertainty in the books of the ancients is resolved with the help of consonances, and this in both texted and untexted music, if there should happen to be a disturbance of the sound of the unison. [2]Therefore, those who know about such things have no need whatsoever of propriety and perfection all the time, but only when it suits them better and more briefly, as shall be more fully evident later on.

## I. A subtle trick with dissonances

[78] [1]Sunt quidam boni organistae et factores cantuum, qui non regulariter iuxta considerationem praedictam ponunt discordantias loco concordantiae vel concordantiarum, et hoc per quandam subtilitatem ponimus [79] punctorum sive notarum et sonorum sicut tonus ante perfectam concordantiam, sive fuerit paenultima vel aliter, quoniam regula est: omnis paenultima ante pausationem, quae dicitur finis punctorum, longa est. [2]Et si paenultima fuerit tonus in duplo supra tenorem ut in organo puro, optime erit concordans, quamvis tonus non sit concordantia. [3]Et iste modus valde utitur inter puros organistas et inter Lumbardos organizantes. [4]Sed differentia est, quod organistae in libris suis ponunt ultimam, quae est post paenultimam in eodem sono cum tenore vel in diapason, sed quidam Lumbardi quandoque ponunt ultimam, quandoque non, et recedunt sub intentione concordantiae ultimae in eodem sono. [5]Tamen concordantia philosopha non est.

[1]There are certain good *organistae* and makers of songs who do not notate dissonances in the regular way, according to the consideration mentioned earlier, but in the place of one or more consonances; and we notate this through a certain subtlety of points or notes or sounds, like a whole tone before a perfect consonance (whether it be the penultimate or otherwise), for the rule is: every penultimate before the rest which is called 'the end of points' is long. [2]And if the penultimate shall be a whole tone in the duplum above the tenor, as in organum purum, then it shall be most concordant, even though the whole tone is not a consonance. [3]And masters of organum purum, and those who sing organum among the Lombards, use this practice very much. [4]Yet the difference is that the *organistae* write a final note after the penultimate, either in unison with the tenor or at the octave above, whereas the Lombards write the final note only sometimes, but also sometimes not, and then they stay on the same sound as though it were a consonance. [5]Yet it is not a consonance in a philosophical sense.