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It is widely acknowledged that Claude Le Jeune was exalted among his contemporaries for his facility in modal composition – a reputation that he purposefully exploited through the publication of modally organized works. “According to his friend Artus Thomas and the organist Jehan Titelouze, Le Jeune excelled his predecessors in his understanding of the modes, as illustrated by... two airs performed during the wedding festivities of the Duke of Joyeuse in 1581.” Even in the present day, with the controversial discussion of the possible polemic between the theory and practice of mode during the Renaissance, scholars frequently point to Claude Le Jeune's *Octonaires* and *Dodecacorde* as exemplary of a purposeful theoretical-practical union. Both of these works were explicitly intended to represent contemporary conceptions of modality; in particular, the *Dodecacorde* espoused an affiliation with the modal theory presented by Zarlino in his 1573 edition of *Le Institutioni harmoniche.*

---


2 Claude Le Jeune, *Dodecacorde*, ed. Anne Harrinton Heider (Madison: A-R Editions, 1989), xvi. Heider explains that, while the name of the work, *Dodecacorde*, would imply an alliance with Glarean’s own theoretical *Dodecaorbe*, Le Jeune’s modal ordering is purposely Zarlinian, placing Ionian (C–C) as the first mode (Glarean’s expansion of the modal system retained the medieval numbering system, starting with Dorian as the first mode) (xiii). Heider asserts that in the *Dodecaorbe*, Le Jeune follows the rec-
Heider points to an excerpt from Le Jeune’s dedication of the *Dodecaoride*, which could normally be taken as a typical example of the mellifluously-toned dedications from this period: “I thought it appropriate, in a time when so many discords have been reconciled, to give the French something to unify [musical] tones like thoughts, and voices as well as hearts.” Instead, Heider perceives this comment as expressing Le Jeune’s desire to amalgamate aspects of earlier musical conceptions with those of the “moderns.” In particular, Heider points to the integration of the “ancient” practice of cantus firmi (the Genevan psalm tunes that form the basis of the twelve pieces) with the “modern” use of modality. The musical manifestation of this union has never been made explicit in the musicological literature. Rather, scholars tend to focus solely on Le Jeune’s application of purportedly modernist ideas – namely, the blatant use of Zarlino’s twelve-mode system.

Heider has also suggested that the implementation of this modal system had a socio-political connotation: since the *Dodecaoride* was a setting of twelve psalms chosen from the Genevan Psalter, it was an intentionally Calvinist work. Thus, the candid abandonment of the traditional Catholic eight-mode system could be perceived as a reflection of the Calvinist renunciation of restrictive, non-evangelical

Catholic customs. On a political level, Le Jeune dared to invite his companions:

> to honor our music of serious rationales, of serious notes and measures, in order to convince the most prudent of neighbouring nations that our flightiness and changes have run their course; that a firm harmony is established in our hearts; and that the peace that is supported on our constancies is a lasting tranquility, not a temporary calm.\(^5\)

This excerpt from the *Dodecacorde*’s preface refers not only to the current Protestant-Catholic conflicts in France, but also to the nation’s international political struggles. Thus, Le Jeune sought to unify the above “musical tones like thoughts” so as to represent a desired religious-political union within and without France.

Beyond the social contexts and ramifications of the *Dodecacorde*, its aforementioned role in exemplifying Zarlinian modality is frequently alluded to but never examined in the literature. The history of Renaissance musical theory tends to place Zarlino as emerging from the speculative-cum-practical tradition traceable back to Tinctoris, and following through Gaffurio and Glarean. However, while a “symbiotic relationship of musical theory and practice… is central to all of Zarlino’s activities,” his engagement with music print culture of the period positions Zarlino in a theoretical vein somewhat distinct from his predecessors.\(^6\) It is

---


apparent from Zarlino’s citations of exemplary works in his *Institutione* that his intentions with this work were largely self-serving: broadly, to advance his own career, and more specifically, to promote his publications. By projecting the work as an exposition of his teacher Adrian Willaert’s compositional conceits, Zarlino exploited the master’s established reputation. Zarlino’s inclusion of examples from Willaert’s *Musica Nova*, as well as from his own oeuvre, was politically motivated, for it positioned him in the Venetian artistic milieu as Willaert’s successor.

While Zarlino’s *Institutione* was certainly a tool for the advancement of his musical career, it also engaged with several levels of theory: the traditional modal theory (as mediated through dodecachordal theory) that informs the discourse on species and cadences; *musica practica*; and also a particular Venetian strand of music theory (expounded by Aaron, among others). This Venetian connection is relevant in the discussion of Le Jeune’s application of dodecacordial conceits, for the apparent influence of Zarlino’s conceptions of modality (as espoused in his 1573 *Institutione*) on Le Jeune’s *Dodecacorde* derives from Le Jeune’s engagement with contemporary Italian composition. In particular, Le Jeune is known for his affiliation with Adrian Willaert, thus bringing the theoretical

---

7 *Ibid.*, 197. There was some competition at the time from another student of Willaert’s, Vincentino, who was also attempting to publish a codification of Willaert’s compositional teachings.
relationship even closer, as Zarlin’s treatise was intended as a codification of Willaertian teaching.

All of the issues surrounding the genesis of both Zarlini’s treatise and Le Jeune’s Dodecachord are valuable in our examination of the role that Le Jeune’s works had in the developments of Renaissance modal theory and practice. These contextual issues, however, do not address the actual manifestations of Zarlinian theory in the Dodecachord. By comparing the Dodecachord with the “modern” polyphonic examples by Willaert in Zarlini’s Institutioni harmonica, I intend to present a view of how Le Jeune chose to display the twelve Zarlinian modes, and to what degree he followed Zarlini’s dictates. This study will not only allow a perspective on the concreteness of Zarlin’s modal conceits, but it will also clarify the degree to which these regulations were practically (i.e. how or whether they could be applied to contemporary composition) or speculatively based.\footnote{Zarlino’s own musical examples, as brief, two-part, wordless settings, are too simplistic to warrant comparison with Le Jeune’s complex polyphonic settings.}

For sake of brevity it is only viable to analyze a sampling of these modal settings. In order to achieve the most thorough perspective, study is demanded of both authentic modes and their plagal corollaries, and both modes from the original eight-mode system, as

---

See also Isabelle His, “Italianism and Claude Le Jeune,” Early Music History 13 (1994): 149-170. Both Freedman and His explore Le Jeune’s purported Italianism. While the details of Le Jeune’s exposure to Italian traditions are basically conjectural, his imitations and re-workings of Willaert’s compositions evince his exposure to and familiarity with the contemporary Venetian tradition.
well as the modern modes of the twelve-mode system; hence, we will examine the Ionian, Hypoionian, Dorian, and Hypodorian modes (or the 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 3\textsuperscript{rd}, and 4\textsuperscript{th} modes in Zarlino’s 1573 system). The chosen Zarlinian examples will all be works by Willaert, in order to ensure a certain degree of stylistic continuity.\footnote{Besides the simplicity of comparing only two composers, Willaert has been chosen because of Le Jeune’s known compositional attachment to and influences from him. Willaert was also Zarlino’s intended “modern” exemplar of modality, which Zarlino makes explicit throughout his treatise. His Josquin citations (the other dominant composer in the treatise) were meant to represent “ancient” composition with the modes.}

The issues surrounding modality that are most emphasized by Zarlino in his \textit{Institutioni harmoniche} are logically those that will be examined in both Willaert’s and Le Jeune’s compositions: first, the means for distinguishing plagal and authentic modes, and the resultant textural structuring; second, the characteristics and roles of the mode-carrying voice in a polyphonic work; third, modal definition through finals and cadences; and last, the harmonic considerations of transposition and extra-modal chromaticism.

Although this paper does not intend to examine the broader relevance of the details of Le Jeune’s application of the twelve-mode system in his psalm-settings, it is meant to initiate the theoretical examination of modality in the \textit{Dodecacorde} in relation to Zarlino’s practical-speculative theory that will hopefully allow for more in-depth forays into this area in the future.
Plagal/Authentic Distinctions and Textural Structuring

Music theorists of the Renaissance constantly wrestled with how to graft monophonically-based modes onto polyphonic music. One of the perplexing issues was how to impose the theoretical conception of modal range onto works written for large numbers of voices, which would not be able to remain within these accepted ranges. The conventional solution was twofold: first, the mode would be carried by the tenor, which retained the proper range; second, the voices would form pairs of plagal-authentic ranges.

This still left the question of how composers should distinguish between the authentic and plagal modes within the overall texture of the piece. The typical answer was to score the authentic modes in higher clefs and the plagal modes in lower clefs, thus giving a timbral differentiation of brighter-sounding authentic modes versus more subdued-sounding plagal modes. ¹³

This is the route taken by both Willaert and Le Jeune in distinguishing authentic versus plagal modes in their Ionian pieces O salutaris hostia and Il faut que de tous mes esprits and their Hypoionian works Mittit ad Virginem and Deba contre mes debatenrs. In the Ionian O salutaris hostia, Willaert uses the high “chiavette” clefs: g², c², c³, and f³ (see Table 1). ¹⁴ In the Hypoionian Mittit ad

---


Willaert uses a variant of the “chiavi naturali” clefs: c\(^2\), c\(^3\), c\(^4\), and f\(^4\). Le Jeune distinguishes his authentic and plagal Ionian modes through a similar arrangement of clefs: for the Ionian *Il faut que de tous mes esprits*, the four basic voices are set to g\(^2\), c\(^2\), c\(^3\), and f\(^3\) clefs (the fifth voice, set in c\(^1\) is obviously viewed by Le Jeune as ancillary, as it is labelled “cinquiesme,” while the other voices are labeled characteristically “dessus,” “haute-contre,” etc.); for the Hypoionian *Deba contre mes debateurs*, Le Jeune uses g\(^2\), c\(^3\), c\(^4\), and f\(^4\) clefs (the fifth voice, “cinquiesme,” is set in c\(^4\), thus doubling the tenor’s (“taille”) range; an additional sixth voice, “second-dessus,” enters in the eleventh section of the work, and duplicates the dessus’ range, on g\(^3\)).

In their Dorian pieces, the same authentic/plagal distinction is made through cleffing: for their Dorian pieces, both Willaert and Le Jeune use the “chiavette” cleffing g\(^2\), c\(^1\), c\(^3\), and f\(^3\), while in their mode four pieces, Willaert sets his voices in the clefs c\(^1\), c\(^3\), c\(^3\), and f\(^4\), and Le Jeune uses the usual “naturali” cleffing c\(^1\), c\(^3\), c\(^4\), f\(^4\) (see Table 1).

though there are variant versions of the “chiavette” cleffing, the basic arrangement is g\(^2\), c\(^1\), c\(^3\), f\(^3\). Willaert’s composition simply doubles the two clefs of the middle voices.

15 *Ibid.* The typical “chiavi naturali” (or usual cleffing) is c\(^1\), c\(^3\), c\(^4\), f\(^4\).

16 In any case, since Zarlino’s treatise only explores the relationships between four voices (at most) in polyphony, our study of these works will evaluate only the fundamental voices: according to Zarlino, these are the soprano, alto, tenor, and bass.

17 The role of the tenor is questionable in this piece, however. For reasons which will be addressed in the section “Mode-carrying voice,” it seems more likely that the “tenor” in this work
Thus, both Willaert and Le Jeune make this essential textural distinction between these pieces in principal and collateral modes. In the Ionian modes, these cleffing choices also result in Zarlino’s desired layout for vocal ranges:

Composers should be warned not to make the extreme notes of the bass more distant from the extreme notes of the tenor by a diatessaron or a diapente... or one more note... the extreme notes of the soprano will be as distant from those of the alto as the extreme notes of the tenor are from those of the bass.”

Indeed, Willaert’s *O salutaris hostia* sets the higher and lower extremes of the cantus and altus a fifth (diapente) and fourth (diatessaron) apart (c⁵–g⁵; c⁴–f⁴),

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willaert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>O salutaris hostia</em></td>
<td>g²</td>
<td>c²</td>
<td>c³</td>
<td>f³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mittit ad Virginem</em></td>
<td>c²</td>
<td>c³</td>
<td>c⁴</td>
<td>f⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Victimae paschali laudes</em></td>
<td>g²</td>
<td>c²</td>
<td>c³</td>
<td>f³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Praeter rerum seriem</em></td>
<td>c¹</td>
<td>c³</td>
<td>c³</td>
<td>f⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Jeune</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Il faut que de tous mes esprits</em></td>
<td>g²</td>
<td>c²</td>
<td>c³</td>
<td>f³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Deba contre mes debateurs</em></td>
<td>g²</td>
<td>c³</td>
<td>c⁴</td>
<td>f⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Propos esquis</em></td>
<td>g²</td>
<td>c²</td>
<td>c³</td>
<td>f³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mon Dieu me paist</em></td>
<td>c¹</td>
<td>c³</td>
<td>c⁴</td>
<td>f⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

is actually voice “V”; if this is the case, then the cleffing for the principal voices of this piece would fall into the more typical c¹, c³, c⁴, f⁴ setting.

while the bassus and tenor are oppositely set a fourth and fifth apart (c^4–f^5; b_b^2–f^3).

There is slightly more flexibility apparent in Le Jeune’s vocal ranges, as his voices tend to expand further beyond the octave range; nonetheless, Le Jeune remains within the confines of Zarlino’s dictates. The range of his discantus and haute-contre are a fourth and sixth apart (c^5–f^5; g^3–e^5), and his basse-contre and taille are similarly a fifth and sixth apart (d^4–a^4; a^2–f^3). While the expanse of a sixth is at the periphery of Zarlino’s prescriptions, Le Jeune’s range settings are still acceptable within the Zarlinian modal framework (see Table 2).

Because of the range placement in both O salutaris hostia and Il faut que de tous mes esprits, the voices are paired to meet Zarlino’s command that “the voices should be joined in such a way that if the tenor occupies the notes of an authentic mode, the bass ought to embrace the notes of the plagal, and vice versa.”19 Indeed, the tenor and cantus in both of these compositions encompass the range of the authentic Ionian mode, while the bassus and altus encircle that of the plagal Ionian mode. However, Le Jeune’s voices, in expanding beyond an octave, do not define the authentic and plagal modes as concretely as Willaert’s. While Zarlino accepts these dilated ranges,20 one would expect that a concerted attempt to

19 Ibid., 49.
20 Ibid., 44. For Zarlino, parts that circumscribe more than a nine- or ten-note range are considered to be in “superfluous” modes; those that encompass the entire twelve notes of both the authentic and the plagal modes are labeled as “common” modes.
compositionally illustrate these twelve modes would involve restricted, “perfect” ranges for the vocal parts – at the very least, for the tenor or mode-carrying voice.\textsuperscript{21}

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willaert</td>
<td>O salutaris hostia</td>
<td>f\textsuperscript{4}-g\textsuperscript{5}</td>
<td>c\textsuperscript{4}-c\textsuperscript{5}</td>
<td>f\textsuperscript{3}-f\textsuperscript{4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mittit ad Virginem</td>
<td>a\textsuperscript{3}-c\textsuperscript{3}</td>
<td>d\textsuperscript{3}-g\textsuperscript{4}</td>
<td>c\textsuperscript{3}-d\textsuperscript{4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victimae paschali laudes</td>
<td>d\textsuperscript{4}-f\textsuperscript{3}</td>
<td>g\textsuperscript{3}-c\textsuperscript{5}</td>
<td>g\textsuperscript{3}-g\textsuperscript{4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prater rerum seriem</td>
<td>g\textsuperscript{3}-c\textsuperscript{3}</td>
<td>f\textsuperscript{3}-g\textsuperscript{4}</td>
<td>f\textsuperscript{3}-d\textsuperscript{3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Jeune</td>
<td>Il faut que de tous mes esprits</td>
<td>e\textsuperscript{4}-f\textsuperscript{5}</td>
<td>e\textsuperscript{4}-f\textsuperscript{5}</td>
<td>f\textsuperscript{3}-f\textsuperscript{4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deba contre mes debateurs</td>
<td>b\textsuperscript{3}-d\textsuperscript{5}</td>
<td>f\textsuperscript{3}-a\textsuperscript{4}</td>
<td>c\textsuperscript{3}-f\textsuperscript{4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Propos esquis</td>
<td>d\textsuperscript{4}-g\textsuperscript{5}</td>
<td>g\textsuperscript{3}-c\textsuperscript{5}</td>
<td>d\textsuperscript{3}-a\textsuperscript{4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mon Dieu me paist</td>
<td>b\textsuperscript{3}-d\textsuperscript{5}</td>
<td>f\textsuperscript{3}-a\textsuperscript{4}</td>
<td>c\textsuperscript{3}-d\textsuperscript{4}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This expectation of “perfection” becomes skewed, however, upon study of Zarlino’s Hypoionian example, Mittit ad Virginem. This work breaks beyond the dictates of Zarlino’s vocal ranges: the extremes of the cantus and altus are a fourth and a seventh apart (c\textsuperscript{5}–g\textsuperscript{4}; c\textsuperscript{4}–d\textsuperscript{5}), and those of the bass and tenor are a (diminished) fifth and a fifth (a\textsuperscript{3}–e\textsuperscript{4}; f\textsuperscript{2}–c\textsuperscript{3}). While most

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 92. Zarlino articulates his opinion on vocal ranges: “It would be good if each part did not exceed eight notes and remained confined within the notes of its diapason. But parts do exceed eight notes… and thus we shall ascribe this practice to a certain license.”
of these are acceptable distances, the seventh between the lower ranges of the cantus and altus extends past Zarlino’s final concession to the distance of a sixth. This disparity results from a more general issue of modal identification: the range of each voice. As noted above, Zarlino’s ideal vocal range encompasses only an octave (which is basically set in Willaert’s Ionian example). In *Mittit ad Virginem* most of the voices stretch well past an octave; most importantly, the tenor reaches to a third above the final. Thus, while Willaert’s *O salutaris hostia* stands as a conservative declamation of the ideal modal ranges, *Mittit ad Virginem*’s enlargement of these ranges asserts the possibility that such an ideal conception of modal ranges was never expected by Zarlino.

Comparison of both Willaert’s and Le Jeune’s Hypodorian pieces underlines this flexibility. In their Dorian pieces, both Willaert and Le Jeune maintain the proper proximity between the extremes of their bass-alto, tenor-soprano pairings; however, in Hypodorian, both composers place the extremes of the bass and tenor out of the accepted compass. In *Praeter rerum seriem* Willaert has the lower limits of his bass and tenor an octave apart (f₂–f₃); in *Mon Dieu me paist* Le Jeune places these extremes a seventh apart.

---

22 Interestingly, it seems more likely that the cantus in this piece was intended to act as the modal carrier. However, articulating the mode through the cantus voice rather than the tenor would contradict Zarlino’s assertion regarding the modal voice (see the section on “Mode-carrying Voice”). In reality, perhaps Zarlino’s selection of this work as an example of mode 2 is actually pointing to a greater flexibility in which voice acted to assert the mode of the piece.
However, as we examine the mode-carrying voices in the following section, it will become apparent that Willaert’s “tenor” in the former piece does not actually function as a tenor in the Zarlinian sense.23

Interestingly, though, the expanse of each individual voice in these pieces is not greatly compromised; for the most part, every voice retains their required authentic or plagal range (they occasionally stretch beyond the definitive modal octave or ninth). The only issue arises from the questionable tenor in Willaert’s Praeter rerum seriem, and from its plagal-defining partner, the cantus. This tenor will be dealt with in the following section; the range of the cantus, however, suggests a Zarlinian acceptance of vocal range worth examining. This cantus voice, in encompassing g3–c5, is unfitting as a projection of the G Hypodorian mode for two reasons: while it does not reach the full plagal octave of d4–d5, it does extend between the expected extremes of a “common” C Ionian mode. Zarlino’s use of this piece as exemplary of the Hypodorian mode, like his choices for the Hypoionian representative, alludes to a toleration of a vague definition of mode through vocal range.

Some of Zarlino’s contentions about the distinction between authentic and plagal modes are not as clearly evident in Willaert’s or Le Jeune’s Ionian or Dorian examples. For one, his assertion, “if we attribute upward motion to the principal mode and downward motion to its collateral, everything will be done with

23 Ibid., 92. Tenor in the sense of the mode-carrying, “sinew” for the piece.
reason,”24 is not evinced in any of these works. Generally, none of the authentic-plagal pairs of pieces can be distinguished for an overall tendency of the melodic motion to move upwards or downwards. Le Jeune’s cantus firmi, however, do show a distinction between authentic, upward-leaning melodies, and plagal, downward-moving tunes. These choices will be examined in the following section on the “mode-carrying voice.”

Zarlino also contends: “We shall accommodate everything to its proper place by using slow movements in the collateral modes and fast movements in the principal modes.”25 It is not possible to show a consistent differentiation in approaches to rhythmic motion. While there are localized examples, these distinctions are not prominent enough to justify a polemical slow/fast analysis. Hence, these specific suggestions of modal distinction appear to be idealized views of the depiction of modality, aligned more with the traditional speculative modal theory than with modern practical applications.26

Mode-carrying Voice

The typical expectation in Renaissance theory was that the mode would be articulated in the tenor voice of the composition. Zarlino follows this convention, explicitly informing us: “The mode in which a

24 Ibid., 49.
25 Ibid.
26 Even Zarlino’s own polyphonic examples of mode do not illustrate this slow-fast distinction for authentic-plagal.
composition is written is established in the tenor… [The composer] should take care that the tenor proceeds regularly through the notes of the mode.”

Zarlino’s example O salutaris hostia undoubtedly articulates the Ionian mode in the tenor, both in terms of its range and its melodic-intervallic emphases: the tenor encompasses \( f^3 \rightarrow f^4 \), accentuates the mode’s fundamental diapente and diatessaron (F–C; C–F), and, more generally, highlights the principal notes of the mode (F, A, and C). There is obvious prominence given to the mode’s final in the tenor’s line: nine of its phrases are initiated by F. Secondary emphasis is given to the mode’s diapasonic division: one of the tenor’s phrases begins on C. Intervallic emphasis on F, A, and C is evident from the inceptive articulation, as the tenor outlines this exact triad (See Example 1). These primary notes continue to be emphasized, as the tenor frequently outlines these pitches melodically (see Example 2).

While this piece once again presents an ideal of Zarlino’s theory, the other Willaert pieces exemplify Zarlino’s more liberal conceptions of the modal tenor. Willaert’s Dorian Victimae Paschali laudes, for one, presents the fundamental characteristics of the tenor’s role of modal definition: the tenor ranges approximately within the modal octave (\( g^3 \rightarrow g^4 \), and very occasionally to down to \( f^3 \)), and terminates each of the two sections of the piece on the required final, G.

\[ ^{27} \text{Ibid.,} \]
\[ ^{28} \text{Ibid., 55. The notes I have identified as “primary” are those that Zarlino identifies both as the “true and natural initial tones,” and the notes on which a composer makes a “regular” cadence.} \]
Example 1: mm. 1-6

Example 2: mm. 28-34

The opening phrase in the tenor also emphasizes the primary pitches (G, B♭, and D) melodically and intervallically: it begins with a leap between G and D, followed by a scalar run back up to d, leaping back
down to B₃ and up to G in measure 18, down to D in measure 19, and eventually finishing on D in measure 21. After this inceptive phrase, however, the tenor freely explores other intervallic accents, following the sectional peregrinations through different pitch emphases. For example, leading up to an internal quasi-cadence on F, the tenor voice both leaps between the intervals F–F and F–C, and also energetically follows a melodic rise upward to F (clearly audible within a calmer texture in the rest of the voices) (see Example 3). Interestingly, the tenor’s emphasis on these extra-modal fifths and fourths goes directly against Zarlin’s dictates:

The composer in his modes should frequently sound the members of the diapason in which the mode is composed, namely, the diapente and diatessaron. I emphasize that these should be the mode’s own diapente and diatessaron and not those of another mode.”

29 A more perplexing example of divergence from Zarlin’s principals of the tenor’s role of modal definition occurs in Willaert’s Praeter rerum seriem. As noted above, this tenor exudes characteristics atypical for Willaert’s modal compositional practice. This tenor reaches a range of f₃–d⁴, and more frequently, hovers between f₃–c⁴. 30 Not only does this narrow

29 Ibid., 49. While this applies generally to all of the voices, Zarlin stressed the import of all elements of modal distinction (melodic, intervallic, etc.) being made particularly in the tenor, which defines the mode, after all.

30 Normally, in the pieces under examination, Willaert’s tenors define the entire modal octave (and occasionally an extra tone upward or downward).
pitch-scope mean that Willaert’s tenor does not “proceed regularly through the notes of the mode,” but it also prominently emphasizes intervals other than the fourth and the fifth (F–G; G–D) of the mode.\footnote{Ibid., 49.}

\textbf{Example 3: mm. 36-40}

Interestingly, the voice “V” in this work actually engages with most of the Zarlinian expectations for tenor roles: its range (c\textsuperscript{3}–d\textsuperscript{4}) encapsulates the modal octave, and it melodically accentuates the principal pitches of the mode. However, this voice frequently emphasizes fifths and fourths “of another mode” (see Example 4).

Zarlino’s inclusion of these two Willaert pieces with tenor roles divergent from his prescriptions offers the possibility that both principal intervalllic emphases and
mode-carrying placement in the tenor were flexibly applied in Zarlinian practice.

This theoretical pliancy is evident in Le Jeune’s *Dodecacorde*, which is also less secure and traditional in its application of the modal tenor-role than Willaert’s *O salutaris hostia*. Throughout the *Dodecacorde*, the tenor

Example 4: mm. 30-34

voice fairly consistently outlines the basic modal octave; however, the tenor also tends to reach a tenth, or even a twelfth. The most consistent modal determiner is actually the Genevan cantus firmus. The psalm tunes that Le Jeune selected for this work all reliably articulate the required modal octave and also emphasize the expected primary notes of the mode. Hence, it would seem more likely that Le Jeune was generally treating whichever voice he had set the

32 Each piece in the *Dodecacorde* is built around a psalm (in the appropriate mode) from the Genevan psalter of 1562.
cantus firmus in as the “tenor.” This is also more fitting with Zarlino’s idea that the tenor is the basis, or “sinew,” around which the work is composed; since Le Jeune based each of his sections around an articulation of the psalm verse, the “tenor” of each section, by Zarlino’s definition, would logically be whichever voice this psalm tune had been placed in for this segment of the piece.

Example 5: mm. 23-24

Le Jeune’s Dorian Propos exquis is a typical example of this floating psalm tune tenor. The original psalm tune employed for this piece spans the G–G transposed Dorian octave (plus an extra tone up to A – an addition that is completely acceptable in Zarlino’s definition of a “perfect” modal voice), and clearly highlights the primary notes (G, B♭, and D) of the mode. The initial notes of the phrases alternate between these primary notes (mostly beginning on G) and frequently emphasize the mode’s diapente and diatessaron (see Example 5). With very few
divergences, prominence is consistently given to these pitches throughout the tune (see Example 6\(^{33}\)); indeed, Le Jeune sets psalm tunes throughout the *Dodecandre* that tend to articulate their modal fifths and fourths both intervally and melodically.

**Example 6: 1562 *Propos Exquis***

![Image](image_url)

The tunes that Le Jeune selects also reflect a Zarlinian contention that is not obviously applied elsewhere in the texture: the attribution of upward motion to the principal mode and downward motion to its collateral.\(^{34}\) This characteristic is evident when contrasting one of Le Jeune’s authentic selections and one of his plagal tune choices. If we compare the first two phrases of the Dorian psalm tune *Propos exquis* with those of the Hypodorian psalm tune *Mon dieu me paist*, the incipits of each phrase distinguish their inclination towards upward or downward melodic movement. For example, *Propos exquis* begins by climbing up a scalar run of a fourth, while *Mon dieu me paist* commences by leaping down a fourth. The

---


\(^{34}\) Zarlino, *Modes*, 49.
following phrases begin similarly, with *Propos exquis* leaping briefly down a third but then rising conjunctly upward a fifth, and *Mon Dieu me paist* descending slowly a sixth downward (see Example 7).\textsuperscript{35}

**Example 7: 1562 *Mon Dieu me paist***

This upward-downward distinction is also evident in Willaert’s tenors. His Ionian and Hypoionian tenors for *O salutaris hostia* and *Mittit ad Virginem* are clearly differentiated in their melodic shape. For example, in their initial phrases, the authentic-mode *O salutaris hostia* leaps upward through the principal pitches of the mode (F–A–C); *Mittit ad Virginem* hovers around the pitches A and F, and eventually descends downward to C.

Thus, since Zarlino’s claim to distinct upward-downward motion in authentic-plagal pairs is evinced in the tenors of both his examples, and Le Jeune’s exhortation of twelve-mode composition, it seems that this contention was intended in relation to the tenor or mode-carrying voice.

**Finals and Cadences**

Since it would be folly to apply Zarlino’s articulations about cadences anachronistically, one must examine how he interprets the term: “intermediate endings at the end of each clause, or sentence, and at the end of

\textsuperscript{35} Transcription based on Marot and Beze, *Psaumes*, 67-68.

\textsuperscript{36} The ranges of these psalm tunes as well as their pitch-orientation also explicitly define them as authentic vs. plagal.
each complete thought… are called cadences.”37 Thus, Zarlino perceives cadences as the musical punctuation marks in a piece. He tells us:

we should always take care to make the cadences principally in the tenor, inasmuch as this part is the principal leader of the mode in which the vocal composition is written, and it is from this part that the composer should derive the invention of the other parts. But these cadences are also made in the other parts of the composition when it is more convenient.38

In the more particular chapters that examine each individual mode, Zarlino declares that “regular” cadences are those made on the “true and natural initial tones of each mode,” and that “all the cadences that are made on all the other notes are called irregular.”39 Zarlino does not clarify, however, whether composers should strive to cadence on regular and irregular notes; further, if irregular cadences are acceptable, what are the typical irregular pitches, and how pervasively may they be used?

While Zarlino does not address this issue, it may be confronted by studying the cadential patterns in both Zarlino’s examples by Willaert and Le Jeune’s cadential choices. Such a matter cannot be addressed fully within this paper; nonetheless, we will analyze the broader category of cadences through examining the sectional cadences. Even within this generalized framework, the difficulty of dealing with the

---

37 Zarlino, Modes, 55.
38 Ibid., 58.
39 Ibid., 55.
application of cadential ideals to large polyphonic works results in the intangibility of certain issues of Zarlinian modal theory. Zarlino’s explanation of “cadences” implies a monophonic theoretical basis, in that he lays the duty of musical phrase-punctuation on a single voice – typically the tenor. In the pieces in his citations, however, important phrase-endings are articulated by the amalgam of the pitches in all of the voices. These chords, regardless of their structural function, are clearly intended by the composer; the texture of these pieces highlights these chords rather than simply emphasizing the final pitches of the tenor, or mode-carrying voice. That said, the overall chordal cadential structures of both the Willaert and Le Jeune pieces basically emphasize the pitches that Zarlino demands in the “cadences” of the tenor:

As examples of Zarlinian modal pieces, these works essentially articulate an emphasis on “regular” cadences. Since we are examining only the sectional cadences of these works, it is reasonable that the final of the mode (to the exclusion of the other primary tones) is continually reiterated as the cadential pitch. As a result of this emphasis on the modal final, the exiguous non-final cadential tones stand out like a sore thumb. Particularly notable are the cadences on B♭ in the Ionian and Hypoionian works: not only are they the only non-final tones, but they are also “irregular” pitches being used on important cadential points.
Zarlinian Modality in Claude Le Jeune's *Dodecachorde*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Chordal Cadences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>O salutaris hostia:</em></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>Mittit ad Virginem:</em></td>
<td>F; F; B₅; [F]; F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>Il faut que de tous me esprits</em></td>
<td>F; F; B₅; F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>Deba contre es debateurs</em></td>
<td>F; F; F; F; F; F; F; B₅; F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>Victimae Paschali Laudes</em></td>
<td>G; [G]; G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <em>Praeter rerum seriem</em></td>
<td>G; G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>Propos exquis</em></td>
<td>G; G; G; D (F#); G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G; G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <em>Mon dieu me paist</em></td>
<td>G; G; G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seems that, in his declarations about regular and irregular cadences, Zarlino's argument that the pitches of the regular cadences are the same as the "true and natural initial tones" of each mode is largely out of theoretical convenience.⁴⁰ For a treatise that supposedly unifies theory and practice, the rigidity of a systematized rule for determining the "regular" cadences is surprising. The only non-final pitches that are articulated chordally in these above cadences do not belong to the "true and natural initial tones" that are expected. One such irregularity occurs in Willaert's *Mittit ad Virginem* where the tenor voice is silent during

---

the chordal cadence on B♭ (in m. 226), thus eliminating the possibility of the characteristic tenor-based cadence. It could be expected that, in a situation where the tenor does not articulate a cadence, the natural alternative would be the soprano, as the two voices are meant to outline the same modal octave. Here, the soprano lands on a B♭, thus reinforcing the irregular pitch-orientation of this cadence.

Le Jeune's Ionian chordal cadences on B♭, on the other hand, follow the Zarlinian cadential suggestions more clearly. While the overall chord is constructed of B♭–D–F, the pitches of both the tenor voice and the soprano cantus-firmus carrier (allowing leeway for the interpretation of the true “tenor” voice in this situation) are Fs.

It is still striking, however, that the B♭ orientation of this cadence was a purposeful decision on Le Jeune’s part, as the cantus firmus itself concludes on an F; in the most natural Zarlinian setting, Le Jeune would have followed this textural “sinew” and cadenced chordally on F as well.

Regardless of whether one follows a monophonically- or polyphonically-based conception of cadences, it is evident from these patterns in the above pieces that there is a definite intentional emphasis on the pitch B♭ and the interval F–B♭, a pre-eminence that seems inconsistent with Zarlino’s aforementioned strict pitch characterizations. Since this pitch and interval emphasis is present in both the Willaert and the Le Jeune Hypoisonian pieces, it seems that this tone
played a greater role in Ionian pieces than Zarlino acknowledged in his rigid classification system for cadential pitches.

Although he does assert that one needs to examine the “form” of a piece\textsuperscript{41} to establish its mode, the integral modal determinant for Zarlino remains the final: “Since… everything should be named according to its end, which is the most noble attribute, we should judge each mode by its final note.”\textsuperscript{42} Since this final cannot occur in all of the voices in a polyphonic composition, Zarlino logically turns to the tenor to articulate the final. This is one element that is extremely consistent within all of the compositions under examination; even in the aforementioned contexts of sectional cadences that terminate \textit{chordally} on “irregular” cadential pitches, the tenor and/or mode-carrying voice generally still terminates with the modal final.

\textbf{Transposition and Extra-modal Chromaticism}

Whereas most theorists from Zarlino’s generation tend to agree on many of the key components of modal determinance, the issue of modal treatment is more contentious. In one area of this subject, transposition, Zarlino clearly asserts, “there is no doubt that any mode… can be transposed up or down, as it pleases us, with the help of any note that

\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Ibid.}, 91. By “form,” Zarlino actually means the consistent articulation of the fourth and fifth of the mode: “The form of the mode is the diapason divided into its diapente and diatessaron, and the diapente and diatessaron… which are repeated many times in the proper modes.”

\textsuperscript{42} \textit{Ibid.}, 44.
changes one [species of] diapason into another.” In his actual application of the modes, however, he always refers to a specific transposition of the modes: upward by a fourth (for authentic modes) or downward by a fifth (for plagal modes), through the addition of a B♭.

Interestingly, all of the pieces under examination are transposed up a fourth or down a fifth by the use of a B♭. Zarlino’s selection of pieces in transposed settings of these modes served to illustrate the application of his codification of modal transposition. Le Jeune’s transpositions of the modes from their original positions may have been an attempt to demonstrate the compositional procedure for Zarlino’s transposition, but he was more likely honouring the original transposed settings of the Genevan tunes, as his pieces simply set the psalm tunes in the modal transposition in which they appeared in the 1562 psalter.

Although the usage of accidentals is not an issue specifically addressed or emphasized in Zarlino’s treatment of mode, chromatic alterations (a prevalent part of the Venetian modal language at this time) have a great impact on the clarity of the modal orientation of a piece. While there are many fascinating aspects of the chromatic language worth studying in all of the pieces under consideration, the larger part of this issue is not within the scope of this paper. In comparing Willaert’s and Le Jeune’s illustrations of modality in these works, however, it is necessary to distinguish

---

43 Ibid., 52.
between their choices of chromatic inflection. The most prominent divergence in their practices of accidental addition is functional use versus expressive use: many of Willaert’s accidentals in these pieces tend to carry the purpose of avoiding tritones; Le Jeune’s chromaticisms, although also frequently used for the evasion of tritones, are more strikingly employed for affective purposes.

An illustration of these differing approaches can be seen in Willaert’s and Le Jeune’s Hypoisonian settings. In Willaert’s *Mittit ad Virginem*, E₅ persistently appears within a chordal structure that moves from the amalgamated pitches C–E₅–G (or occasionally E₅–G–B₆) to B₅–D–F (or very rarely, G–B₅–D). The inflected pitch E₅ typically falls to the pitch D in the following chord. In this work, Willaert also uses B₅ in a similar manner to avoid discordance with a chord containing the pitch E₅. This altered B also routinely moves upward by step to C (see Example 8).

While Le Jeune does employ both of the inflected pitches E₅ and B₅ for similar purposes in his Hypoisonian piece, he also uses them with much greater flexibility. One example of the difference in the behaviour of Le Jeune’s E₅’s and B₅’s occurs in the tenth section of his *Deba contre mes debateurs*, wherein

---

44 In this manifestation, the tone E₅ could also be perceived as a melodic decoration, or a musica ficta application for the sake of the flow of the melody.
the chromatic inflections are not based on tritone avoidance (see Example 9). For one, there are E♭s (in the context of a C–E♭–G chord) that move, not to a chord containing a B♭, but to one with an accidental B♮ (e.g. m 17). Also, E♭s frequently leap away to other pitches,45 rather than resolving downward to Ds. Further, B♮s are not simply added to avoid a clash with E♭s, as certain B♮s are in as close of a proximity to E♭s as they are to E♮s (e.g. m 17).46

45 While these other notes are typically Cs, and therefore a continuation of the same chord (C–E♭–G), this disjunct motion emphasizes the E♭s as harmonically oriented, rather than the melodically conceived inflections of the Willaert E♭s.

46 Chromaticisms are generally much more prevalent throughout the Dodecacorde; C#s are particularly pervasive.
Thus, Le Jeune’s *Dodecacorde* pieces have more obviously adventurous (rather than functional) chromaticism than the Willaert examples in Zarlino’s *Institutiones*. While this means that Le Jeune was diverging from explicit adherence to the practices of the Zarlinitian musical citations, his harmonic experimentation in the *Dodecacorde* does not signify a departure from Zarlino’s conception of modality, since this chromaticism is neither prohibited in Zarlino’s conception of modality, nor does it interfere with Le Jeune’s other explicitly Zarlinitian modal features.

**Conclusion**

In the early decades of the sixteenth century, with the increased concern for the theoretical justification of modern approaches, music theory moved into a realm of practical theory that dealt with contemporary compositional issues; rather than addressing basic issues of performance (the typical “practical” theory of the middle ages), investigating musical theories of mathematical-philosophical arenas, or relaying the archaic conceits of the established speculative
tradition, treatises from this period of the Renaissance encroach into the territory of modern composers.47 While the study of these treatises can offer us some broad answers as to the compositional practices of the “modern” composers in the later sixteenth century, many details of the practice remain in question – particularly in terms of the accepted breaches of typical approaches. In the Institutione, Zarlino consistently offers up the possibility of disregarding his dictates when it is demanded by the musical circumstance.48 In the typical approach of his time (and of many early Baroque treatises), Zarlino leaves these decisions up to the composer and his “good taste.”49 Logically, Zarlino’s “practical” theory still contains remnants of a speculative basis – not only because of the weight of this tradition, but also out of an effort to construct a homogeneous theoretical framework (which would not allow for the heterogeneous divergences of actual compositional practice). An examination of a work purportedly intended to illustrate the modern Zarlinian twelve-mode system, in comparison with exemplary Zarlinian models allows a perspective on what theoretical tradition Zarlinio’s modal regulations belong to; it also offers a view of which dictates, however strictly

47 In fact, these treatises are frequently intended as codifications of particular composers’ theoretical approaches.
48 Frequently, this suggestion crops up with reference to text setting.
49 Ibid., 49. Zarlino frequently refuses to censure divergences from his theories, when the subject matter calls for it: “But in everything one should use judgment, without which little good can be done.”
asserted by Zarlino, are actually meant to be flexibly applied.

In the sphere of practically based assertions, our study of these above pieces has pointed to the likelihood that no perfection of vocal range is realistically required in order to compositionally exemplify a mode. The role of mode-carrying voice itself, although preferably given to the tenor, can also be filled by other voices – particularly if it assists in some area of compositional interest (for example, the floating cantus firmus in the Le Jeune pieces, which moves throughout the voices, and thus gives variety to the texture).

In relation to modal rules based in speculative traditions, the mode-carrying voice\(^{50}\) (when it is not a modally-based cantus firmus) may actually explore various diapentes and diatessarons as the music moves into areas of differing pitch-emphases (i.e. in modulations), rather than predominantly articulating the mode’s own diapente and diatessaron. One other regulatory field that likely derives from a speculative tradition is Zarlino’s “true and natural tones” that serve as initial notes and cadential tones. The clear prominence that is given to the pitch B\(_b\) (both intervallically and cadentially) in the Ionian modes of both Willaert’s and Le Jeune’s pieces suggests a broader selection of important pitches than Zarlino’s systematization allows.

\(^{50}\) The mode-carrying voice is always the “tenor” in Zarlino’s theory.
While there are individual divergences between Willaert’s pieces and those by Le Jeune (such as chromatic usage), these typically do not influence the vital elements of modal identification set out by Zarlino. Further examination of these compositional differences would be relevant for investigating the manifestation of Zarlino’s conceptions of modal affect; however, this is generally a much less tangible issue, and certainly not within the scope of this paper.

With further examination of Zarlino’s exemplary modal pieces and the purposeful manifestations of his modal theory, like Le Jeune’s Dodecachorde, these practical/speculative distinctions, and their degrees of flexibility could be elucidated more concretely. Nonetheless, the exploration of the above pieces has suggested a perspective on the divergences and realities of Zarlino’s examples of the modes, and the compositional interpretations of the modes from one of his respected mode-wary contemporaries.
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Abstract

Beyond the religious-political discourse of Le Jeune’s musical publications, current academics regard his work as a key to elements of sixteenth-century compositional practice in the twelve-mode system. Le Jeune was highly regarded among his contemporaries for his modal compositions – a reputation that he purposefully exploited through the publication of modally-organized works.

In the current discourse on the theory and practice of mode during the Renaissance, scholars frequently cite Le Jeune’s Dodecacerde as an example of the Zarlinian theoretical-practical mixture of modal theory. An explicit analysis of Le Jeune’s application of Zarlinian dodecacordial theory, however, has not yet appeared in the academic literature. A comparison of excerpts from the Dodecacerde with polyphonic examples from Zarlino’s Institutione will illustrate the specific ways that Le Jeune adapts these modal practices. In attempting such a study, this paper will not only present a perspective on the concreteness of Zarlino’s modal conceits, but it will also clarify the degree to which these regulations were practically (i.e., how or whether they could be applied to contemporary composition) or speculatively based.

While not examining the broader relevance of Le Jeune’s application of the Zarlinian system in his psalm-settings, this paper will initiate the theoretical study of modality in the Dodecacerde in relation to Zarlino’s practical-speculative theory. This will hopefully allow for more in-depth forays into this area in the future.