

Guillaume Faugues and the Anonymous Masses "Au chant de l'alouete" and "Vinnus vina"

Author(s): Rob C. Wegman

Source: *Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis*, Deel 41, No. 1 (1991), pp. 27-64

Published by: Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis (KVNMM)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/939021>

Accessed: 13-03-2017 09:02 UTC

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

http://www.jstor.org/stable/939021?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>



Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis (KVNMM) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis*

GUILLAUME FAUGUES AND THE ANONYMOUS MASSES
AU CHANT DE L'ALOUETE AND VINNUS VINA

Guillaume Faugues is mainly known today as one of the key figures in the early development of parody.¹ He has long remained a shadowy figure, until Paula Higgins recently identified him in documents from the Ste.-Chapelle at Bourges, dating 1462 and 1471.² Faugues' only surviving compositions are Masses: *Le serviteur*, *La basse danse*, *L'Homme armé* (two versions) and *Je suis en la mer*.³ Another Mass by Faugues, *Vinus*, was mentioned by Tinctoris in his *Proportionale* and *Liber de arte contrapuncti* and by Gaffurius in his *Tractatus practicabilium proportionum*.⁴ It has been assumed that this was the anonymous Mass *Vinnus vina* which survives uniquely in VatS 51. That assumption has however been questioned on stylistic grounds by George C. Schuetze in his monograph on the composer.⁵

Faugues was a highly individualistic composer, who was consistent in his individuality.⁶ Several unusual stylistic features recur in all his Masses, and together delineate a distinctive, personal musical profile. That profile makes Faugues rather easier to pinpoint than composers whose styles are more conventional or more heterogeneous. Yet the advantages of this have largely yet to be worked out. These advantages lie mainly in two areas.

First, there is the question of the composer's historical position and later influence – a question that has become all the more important now that parody procedures very similar to those of Faugues have been discovered in the Masses of Johannes Martini.⁷ Was Faugues an influential master or an isolated *Kleinmeister*? Documentary evidence, discovered by Paula Higgins, suggests that at least one composer is likely to have been under his influence: Philippe Basiron was a choirboy at the Ste.-Chapelle of Bourges in 1458–66 and sang under Faugues in 1462 when the latter was choirmaster there.⁸ Cross-influences may moreover have existed with Johannes Ockeghem: the latter visited the Ste.-Chapelle in 1462, and it seems likely that the two composers met on that occasion.⁹

Second, Faugues' clearly defined musical profile provides a good basis for discussions of authorship and authenticity. If Masses by Faugues were to have survived anonymously, one would expect them to betray his authorship clearly in their structure and style. This is of importance for the case of the Mass *Vinnus vina*. Schuetze has questioned Faugues' authorship, but he admitted that his verdict was based only on the 'portion' of the Mass he had transcribed.¹⁰ A stylistic analysis of the *Vinnus vina* cycle, and a comparison with Faugues' four Masses, seems in order.

So there is ample justification for a renewed study of Faugues. The present study reexamines the composer's four Masses and analyzes two anonymous cycles from the 1460s or early 1470s, *Au chant de l'alouete* and *Vinnus vina*. Both cycles are relevant to the study of Faugues, the former for internal (i.e. musical) reasons, the latter for

external ones (the various references to Faugues' Mass *Vinus*). But they are also interesting as musical creations in their own right, and fully merit closer study.

I

Two of Faugues' Masses use monophonic tunes as their cantus firmi: *L'Homme armé* and *La basse danse*. The other two, *Le serviteur* and *Je suis en la mer*, are based on French polyphonic songs. The models of the Masses *La basse danse* and *Je suis en la mer* have not been identified. Faugues' cantus firmus treatment is generally of the elaboration (or paraphrase) type. This technique allows in principle almost unlimited freedom of cantus firmus ornamentation, but vertical alignments of Faugues' tenor statements¹¹ show that he uses this freedom with restraint. Although the composer regularly allows himself to augment or insert notes and rests, he tends to preserve the melodic and rhythmic characteristics of his cantus firmi fairly exactly. Thus his treatment of the cantus firmus is characterized by a paradoxical combination of flexibility on the one hand and literalism on the other. An important advantage of Faugues' 'flexible literalism' is that it allows us to reconstruct the lost models of his Masses *La basse danse* and *Je suis en la mer* with reasonable certainty. In his monograph on the composer, Schuetze has offered such reconstructions.¹²

'Flexible literalism' is an extremely rare procedure in the fifteenth-century Mass repertory. Since not only the melodic shapes but also the rhythms of the cantus firmi are retained, this type of treatment presupposes models written in mensural notation, i.e. mostly secular songs and dances. It may be significant that 'flexible literalism' was also applied by Johannes Martini, though with a greater stress on flexibility than is generally the case in Faugues.¹³

The *Missa Le serviteur* is probably the earliest surviving Mass by Faugues; it was copied in TrentC 88 around 1462.¹⁴ Two of its features have often been cited as early instances of parody: (a) points of imitation in the chanson are consistently brought in and expanded in the Mass,¹⁵ and (b) the top voice of the Mass quotes frequently from the top voice of the chanson, usually at the corresponding places of the cantus firmus. Both points require qualification.

First, the incorporation and expansion of points of imitation from the chanson springs from Faugues' attitude to imitation in general, and therefore involves parody only in a superficial sense. Like his contemporary Busnoys,¹⁶ Faugues had a penchant for imitation involving three or four voices. In his Mass *La basse danse*, for instance, the contrapuntal voices frequently start three-part points of imitation around the slow-moving tenor. Three-part points of imitation that do not involve the tenor are also found in the Masses *Le serviteur* and *Je suis en la mer*. The *L'Homme armé* Mass, which is built on a strict canon between tenor and contratenor altus, provides fewer opportunities for imitations in more than two voices, but occasionally the top voice and bass do imitate motives from the canonic duo. Considering this general attitude it is not surprising to find that Faugues regularly introduced four-part points of imitation in his

Le serviteur Mass, for the tenor of the model provided him with several ready-made motives. Similarly, in the Mass *Je suis en la mer* we find both three- and four-voice points of imitation. It would seem likely that here, too, the four-voice imitations (i.e. the ones that include the tenor) are expansions of points of imitation from the lost song *Je suis en la mer*.

Although the points of imitation in the Mass *Le serviteur* cannot be called parody in the strict sense, they do constitute a significant feature of Faugues' style. In the 1450s and 1460s Mass composers were rarely given to expanding motives suggested by the preexistent tenor (and then usually only when they were triadic).¹⁷ One of the very few contemporary Masses to follow Faugues' practice is the anonymous *Missa D'Ung aultre amer*, which survives in VatSP B80, VatS 51 and VerBC 755.¹⁸ Here, the imitation between tenor and top voice which occurs at the beginning of the second section of the model is retained in the *Qui tollis*, *Et resurrexit* and the first *Agnus*, expanded to three voices in the *Patrem*, and to four voices in the *Christe* and *Et in terra*. That the anonymous composer was aware of Faugues' precedent is apparent in the *Et in terra*, where the motive is modified so as to make it identical with a motive expanded in the *Missa Le serviteur* (see Example 1). Although the passage does not amount to a literal quotation, there is an unmistakable echo here of Faugues' Mass.¹⁹

The second point, the incorporation of material from the top voice of *Le serviteur* in the top voice of Faugues' Mass, is of considerable interest. Schuetze has vertically aligned the quoted material, and this alignment makes it apparent that the top voice of the chanson was continually in Faugues' mind when he composed the Mass.²⁰ It would probably be an overstatement to say that the Mass *Le serviteur* is structured on a two-voice framework, but the procedure followed here does clearly point the way to Johannes Martini's later procedures in Masses such as *Coda di Pavon* and *Ma bouche rit*.²¹ Faugues' *Missa Je suis en la mer* presumably employs the same type of parody treatment as *Le serviteur*. Although the model is lost, a reconstruction of at least the tenor-superius framework seems feasible.²²

One of Faugues' most curious and distinctive habits is what Schuetze called structural repetition: the repeat of whole sections (or the opening or closing parts of sections) in a Mass.²³ This procedure was not unique to Faugues. In Dufay's *L'Homme armé* Mass, for instance, the closing bars of the *Kyrie* are repeated in the third *Agnus*. In the same composer's *Missa Ave regina caelorum*, the last few bars of the *Gloria* recur at the end of the *Credo*. Repeats of this type are also found in Regis's *L'Homme armé* Mass.²⁴ But only Faugues employed the procedure consistently in every of his Masses (see Table 1).²⁵ Repeats of parts of sections, such as in the two Masses by Dufay, are found in the *Missa Le serviteur*. In his Mass *La basse danse* Faugues even repeats entire sections. The other two Masses, *L'Homme armé* and *Je suis en la mer*, show a combination of the two types of repeats.

Another important feature in Faugues' Masses, except *La basse danse*, is his tendency to incorporate material from the model in sections with reduced scoring. Of the ten instances listed in Table 2, two are of particular interest. First, at the beginning of the

(a)

(b)

Example 1

(a) An.: *Missa D'Ung aultre amer*, Et in terra mm. 44–9. The top staff gives the corresponding notes from the tenor of Ockeghem's song *D'Ung aultre amer*; these same notes are indicated by asterisks in the passage from the Mass.

(b) Guillaume Faugues: *Missa Le serviteur*, Patrem mm. 59–63. The top staff gives the corresponding notes from the tenor of Dufay's song *Le serviteur*; these same notes are indicated by asterisks in the passage from the Mass. The second example is taken from G.C. Schuetze, ed., *Collected Works of Faugues* (New York 1960).

Missa Le serviteur

Qui tollis mm. 162-99 = Et incarnatus mm. 153-90

Osanna mm. 1-10 = Agnus III mm. 1-10

Missa La basse danse

Kyrie II = Osanna

Cum sancto = Confiteor

Missa L'Homme armé

(version of VatS 14, VerBC 761, and PerBC 1013)

Kyrie II = Cum sancto = Confiteor = Osanna

Et in terra mm. 69-75 = Patrem mm. 89-95

Qui sedes mm. 79-103 = Crucifixus mm. 119-43

(ModE M.I.13 version)

Kyrie I = Confiteor = Sanctus

Christe = Osanna

Kyrie II = Cum sancto

Et in terra mm. 69-75 = Patrem mm. 89-95

Qui tollis mm. 79-103 = Crucifixus mm. 119-43

Missa Je suis en la mer

Kyrie I mm. 6-18 = Sanctus mm. 10-17

Kyrie II mm. 15-23 = Et in Spiritum mm. 37-45

Christe = Osanna

Table 1. Structural repetition in Masses by Guillaume Faugues.

Benedictus of the Mass *Je suis en la mer*, the first nineteen bars present the tenor of the chanson in inverted counterpoint with what was very probably the corresponding melody in the top voice. And second, two three-voice sections of the *L'Homme armé* Mass are built on straightforward statements of the cantus firmus, as though they were movements of a three-part tenor Mass rather than sections with reduced scoring.²⁶ Although these procedures are not unique to Faugues, he seems to have employed them more often than any of his contemporaries.

Faugues' cantus firmus layout is not essentially different from that of his contemporaries: his movements usually contain one or two complete presentations of the cantus firmus. In the *Le serviteur* and *La basse danse* Masses, the cantus firmus layout is invariably A/-/B, AB/-/AB or AB/AB (all with *-/ut supra* in the Sanctus, to accom-

Sections:	Passages where material from the model is incorporated:
<i>Missa Le serviteur</i>	
Christe	57-68
Pleni	53-8
Benedictus	55-60
Agnus II	1-20
<i>Missa L'Homme armé</i>	
Qui sedes/Qui tollis	cantus firmus, and free quotations in 22-31
Crucifixus	cantus firmus, frequently imitated in the other two voices
Pleni	1-2
Benedictus	-
Agnus II	1-9 (?)
<i>Missa Je suis en la mer</i>	
Pleni	-
Benedictus	1-21
Agnus II	1-17

Table 2. Quotations from the models in sections with reduced scoring of Masses by Guillaume Faugues. Bar numbers refer to G.C. Schuetze, ed., *Collected Works of Faugues* (New York 1960).

modate the Benedictus and second Osanna).²⁷ The *L'Homme armé* cycle is less regular: the Gloria, Credo and Sanctus have ABA' / - / ABA' (with / - / *ut supra* in Sanctus), but the Kyrie has the layout A/BA' / ABA'. The Agnus Dei is the only movement in this Mass that does not give the final repeat of the beginning of the tune (its layout is AB / - / *ut primum*, rather than, e.g., AB / - / A'). In the Mass *Je suis en la mer*, the tenor is divided into four phrases (A to D), which are presented in different groupings. The layout of the Kyrie and Credo is A/B/CD, whereas the Agnus Dei has A / - / BCD. The Gloria is anomalous in that it does not present phrase D; its layout is AB/C/A'. The Sanctus is likewise incomplete; it has A / - / B / - / B (where both Osannas [B] are identical to the Christe). In the latter case, structural repetition could have solved the problem, either by repeating the music of the second Kyrie [CD] in the second Osanna, or by using the music of the third Agnus Dei [BCD] in both Osannas.

With the exception of *Je suis en la mer*, all Faugues' Masses are conceived on a large scale, and vary in length between about 1800 and 2100 beats.²⁸ *Je suis en la mer* is with

1454 beats the shortest of the cycles. However, since the note-values in the latter Mass are generally much shorter than in the other cycles, its relative brevity on paper may have been counterbalanced by a slow tempo in practice.²⁹ In *L'Homme armé* and *La basse danse*, all sections in perfect time have a stroke through the circle, but it is doubtful whether this indicates a faster speed than in O proper. The relevant sections all have C in the tenor, a sign that usually called for augmentation when it was combined with other mensurations. Tinctoris condemned *prolatio major* augmentation and recommended that composers either provide a canon 'crescit in duplo' in the tenor, or apply diminution in the other voices.³⁰ Faugues apparently chose the latter option, and

Example 2

Disjunct melodic motion in top voices of Masses by Guillaume Faugues.

- (a) *Missa Le serviteur*, Kyrie I mm. 30-31;
- (b) *Id.*, Sanctus mm. 19-20;
- (c) *Missa L'Homme armé*, Christe mm. 57-60;
- (d) *Id.*, Patrem mm. 28-30;
- (e) *Id.*, Crucifixus mm.43-6
- (f) *Missa Je suis en la mer*, Patrem mm. 32-4;
- (g) *Id.*, Et incarnatus mm. 95-8.

(Examples taken from G.C. Schuetze, ed., *Collected Works of Faugues* [New York 1960]).

wrote Φ rather than O in the contrapuntal voices.³¹ In both Masses, the rhythmic movement under Φ does not seem to call for a faster speed than was usual in O .

Faugues' style seems most closely related to the Mass styles of Busnoys and Dufay. Like the former, he often organizes the counterpoint around the slow-moving tenor by means of imitation and, wherever possible, anticipates motives in the cantus firmus imitatively in the other three voices. Faugues' top voices continuously pendulate between melodic goals more than an octave apart. The extreme ends of the voice ranges tend to be sharply juxtaposed, particularly in the contratenor and bass. This frequently leads to unusually bold melodic writing (see Example 2).³²

In four-voice passages, the melodic interest and rhythmic activity are mainly concentrated in the top two voices; the lower voice-parts are characterized by slow harmonic and rhythmic movement. But often there is remarkably little rhythmic and melodic activity in all voices. This betrays a strong reliance on rich, chordal sound and a placid harmonic flow; these are also hallmarks of Dufay's later Masses, particularly *Ecce ancilla* and *L'Homme armé*. In sharp contrast with this four-voice style, there is extremely florid writing in the tenorless sections.³³ Noteworthy in the duos and trios of *L'Homme armé* are the long stretches of strict imitation; these recall similar imitations in Busnoys' Masses and motets.

The chronology of Faugues' Masses is difficult to establish. Manuscript dates indicate that *Le serviteur* existed by the early 1460s, *La basse danse* and *L'Homme armé* by the early 1470s, and *Je suis en la mer* by the late 1470s. If, as these dates suggest, Faugues' surviving Masses span a period of about ten to fifteen years, it is remarkable to find that they are so uniform with respect to structure and style. This may indicate that Faugues hardly developed from the position he had taken around 1460, and that he was relatively impervious to influences from his contemporaries. His own international influence, on the other hand, must have been considerable. All surviving copies of his Masses were written in Italy, and Tinctoris, in Naples, mentioned Faugues among the few composers whose works 'are to be imitated thoroughly'.³⁴

II

The choirbook VatSP B80, which was copied by the Vatican singer Nicholas Ausquier in 1475, opens on fols. 1v-9r with an anonymous *Missa Au chant de l'alouete*. This Mass belongs to the third layer of the manuscript, which unlike the retrospective layers 1 and 2 was filled with the most recent polyphonic repertory available to Ausquier.³⁵ In several of its features the cycle is closely related to Faugues' four Masses.

The Mass *Au chant de l'alouete* is a standard four-voice tenor Mass; its model has not been identified. Table 3 gives the structure, dimensions, mensural scheme and tenor layout of the cycle. The table shows one structural anomaly, which may be the result of incomplete transmission: the Gloria is unusually short (it is the shortest movement of the Mass) and unlike the other movements it has no final repeat of the beginning of

Sections:	Cantus firmus:	Mensurations:	Lengths:
Kyrie	A	O	54
Christe	BC	ϕ	38
Kyrie	DA	O	45
Et in terra	ABC	O	105
Cum sancto	D	ϕ	28
Patrem	AB	O	123
Et resurrexit	C	ϕ	71
Confiteor	DA	ϕ	53
Sanctus	ABC	O	69
Pleni	-	ϕ	48
Osanna	DA	O	45
Benedictus	-	ϕ	60
Osanna	<i>ut supra</i>		45
Agnus I	ABC	O	69
Agnus II	-	ϕ	54
Agnus III	DA	O	45

Table 3. Structure, tenor layout, mensural usage and dimensions of an.: *Missa Au chant de l'alouete* (VatSP B80, fols. 1v-9r). The lengths are counted in semibreves in O, in breves in ϕ, and do not include the final longas.

the cantus firmus. Moreover, the division Et in terra/Cum sancto is highly anomalous for a polyphonic Gloria; the usual divisions were Et in terra/Qui tollis, or Et in terra/Qui tollis/Cum sancto.³⁶ It would seem likely that part of the Gloria is missing, since the scribe, who was apparently determined to cram the entire Gloria text in the remaining two sections, had to break up the breves and semibreves to fit all syllables of the text. He did this not only in the top voice, but in the contratenor and bass as well.³⁷ The Mass is unusually brief as it stands, even if we allow for the anomalous Gloria: its total length on paper is 952 beats. This is confirmed by the number of only eight openings in the manuscript (the usual number for four-voice Masses was twelve or more).

Example 3 gives the vertical alignment of the tenor statements, and it can be seen that the anonymous composer's method of treatment was 'flexible literalism'. Although the song *Au chant de l'alouete* does not survive, the various presentations of the cantus firmus are in such considerable agreement that the original tune can be

A

5

Kyrie I

11

Et in terra

13

Patrem

6

Sanctus

7

Agnus dei

B

Christe

C

5

5

Et resurrexit

D

Kyrie II

Cum Sancto
14

Confiteor

Osanna = Kyrie II

Agnus III = Kyrie II

Example 3
 Vertical alignment of the tenor statements in an.: *Missa Au chant de l'alouete*, with a hypothetical reconstruction of the original chanson tenor (top staff).

reconstructed with reasonable confidence (just as was the case in Faugues' Masses *La basse danse* and *Je suis en la mer*). A hypothetical reconstruction of the chanson tenor is offered in the top staff of Example 3.

The layout of the tenor is related to that of Faugues' *Missa Je suis en la mer*. As in the latter Mass, the cantus firmus is divided into four phrases, which are presented in different groupings: A/BC/DA (Kyrie), ABC/D (Gloria), AB/C/DA (Credo) and ABC/-/DA (Sanctus and Agnus, with /-/*ut supra* in Sanctus). The original layout of the Gloria was possibly ABC/D/A.

A significant feature of the Mass *Au chant de l'alouete* is the frequent imitation of cantus firmus motives in the surrounding voices. This occurs particularly often with the opening motive of phrase C. Two-part imitations of that phrase are found in the Sanctus and Agnus Dei. The Christe expands the imitation to three voices, and the Et resurrexit to four (Example 4). But other motives from the cantus firmus are also regularly imitated in the contrapuntal voices. These imitations are reminiscent of similar points of imitation in the Masses by Faugues.

Another feature which reminds us of Faugues is the extensive use of structural repetition. The Kyrie II of the Mass is repeated in the Osanna and the Agnus III, and the beginning of the Cum sancto is repeated in the course of the Confiteor:³⁸

Kyrie II = Osanna = Agnus III
Cum sancto mm. 1-8 = Confiteor mm. 8-15

What makes these structural repetitions particularly interesting is the fact that the Cum sancto/Confiteor and Kyrie II/Osanna/Agnus III sections are reworkings of the same material: the five sections have three voices in common (top voice, tenor [phrase D] and bass), and differ only with respect to their mensurations (O and \mathcal{C}) and the music for the contratenor. The material shared by the five sections recurs elsewhere in the Mass, too. The Confiteor has an introductory duo which presents the top voice and tenor of the Cum sancto in inverted counterpoint, just before the first eight bars of the Cum sancto themselves are quoted. A similar presentation of preexistent two-voice material in inverted counterpoint occurs in Faugues' Mass *Je suis en la mer* (see above). In *Au chant de l'alouete* the top voice, tenor and bass of the Cum sancto are also quoted in the first four bars of the Pleni. And a slightly paraphrased version of the tenor is presented in the top voice of the Agnus Dei II (mm. 1-8; transposed up a fourth) and then literally repeated in the bass (mm. 13-21; transposed down an octave).³⁹ As has been observed above, similar quotations of cantus firmus material are often found in the tenorless sections of Faugues' Masses. There is in fact no tenorless section in the Mass *Au chant de l'alouete* where the model is not quoted, for the top voice of the Benedictus presents a paraphrased version of cantus firmus phrases A, B and the first half of C (mm. 1-16; transposed up a fifth), which version is immediately repeated in the bass (mm. 16-31; transposed down a fourth).

The frequent repetitions of an entire three-voice block (containing cantus firmus

Musical score system 1, measures 1-4. It features a treble and bass clef with a common time signature. The treble staff contains a melodic line with eighth and sixteenth notes, while the bass staff provides a harmonic accompaniment with quarter and eighth notes.

Musical score system 2, measures 5-8. The notation continues with similar melodic and harmonic patterns. A measure rest is present in the first measure of this system. A measure number '21' is written above the final measure of this system.

Musical score system 3, measures 9-12. This system shows more complex rhythmic patterns, including sixteenth-note runs in the treble staff and sustained notes in the bass staff.

Example 4

An.: *Missa Au chant de l'alouete*, *Christe* mm. 5-9, and *Et resurrexit* mm. 1-26.

phrase D), suggest that parody may have been applied: in fact, every statement of cantus firmus phrase D is accompanied by the same material in the top voice and bass, the only differences occurring in the fourth voice, the contratenor. If this indicates parody treatment (which is likely but cannot be proved, since the model is lost), the type of treatment would have no precedent in Faugues' Masses.⁴⁰ Faugues, as we have seen, quoted and embellished the top voice of the model in the top voice of the Mass, mostly at the corresponding places of the cantus firmus: he did this in his Mass *Le serviteur* and very probably also in *Je suis en la mer*. But are there any indications that the latter type of treatment was employed in the *Au chant de l'alouete* cycle as well?

The answer to that question must be yes, for the top voices of the five movements show striking similarities at corresponding places of the cantus firmus. On the basis of these similarities it is possible to reconstruct the hypothetical model of the Mass (see Example 5; in the reconstruction it has been assumed that the three-voice framework of the *Cum sancto* represents the second section of the model). The model seems to have consisted of two sections, the first in O and the second probably in C . This may indicate that it was a virelai.⁴¹ Additional support for that possibility comes from the fact that like virelais (and unlike rondeaus) the two sections of the reconstruction end on the same final, G.⁴² On the other hand, the second section of the reconstruction seems too short to accommodate the at least four corresponding lines of the virelai text. Reinhard Strohm has suggested that the *Au chant de l'alouete* melody was more likely a *chanson rustique*, and that the composer of the Mass used a polyphonic setting of the tune.⁴³ Precedent for this possibility can be found in Johannes Martini's Mass *Orsus orsus*, which is based on an anonymous three-voice setting of a monophonic tune.⁴⁴ Several stylistic features of the reconstructed *Au chant de l'alouete* tenor strengthen the likelihood that it originated as a monophonic song. The tune has a distinct non-courtly ring: it is characterised by brief and simple phrases, frequent cadences, melodic repetitions, and typical figuration (bars 5-7, 10-11, and 24-5).⁴⁵ The main argument against the *chanson rustique* hypothesis seems to be the mensural difference in the proposed reconstruction. It is possible that this feature is a relic of the Mass's mensural structure, from which the reconstruction has been distilled. But so long as the model has not been found it is difficult to draw firm conclusions either way – *chanson rustique* or virelai.

The comparison of the *Au chant de l'alouete* cycle with Faugues' four Masses leads inevitably to the question of authorship. The features discussed here point almost unanimously to Faugues as the most likely composer of the Mass. However, these features are mainly of a structural nature; the stylistic evidence is ambiguous. *Au chant de l'alouete* is less than half as long as Faugues' Masses *Le serviteur*, *La basse danse* and *L'Homme armé*, and the writing is correspondingly more dense and compact. It is difficult to recognize Faugues' hand here: only in the Credo do we find the rich, chordal sound and the placid harmonic flow that characterize his Masses. In view of the extraordinary brevity of the Mass, the possibility that it was composed by a pupil, or by somebody who, following Tinctoris's recommendation, imitated Faugues' Masses

First system of a musical score in 3/4 time. It consists of three staves: a single treble clef staff at the top, and a grand staff (treble and bass clefs) below. The music begins with a whole rest in the treble staff and a half note in the bass staff. The treble staff contains a melodic line with eighth and quarter notes, including a measure with a fingering '5' above a note. The grand staff provides harmonic accompaniment with quarter and half notes.

Second system of the musical score, continuing from the first. It features the same three-staff layout. The treble staff continues its melodic line, with a measure marked with a fingering '10'. The grand staff accompaniment includes a steady eighth-note bass line and quarter-note chords in the treble.

Third system of the musical score. The treble staff shows a more active melodic line with eighth notes and a measure marked with a fingering '15'. The grand staff accompaniment continues with a consistent eighth-note bass line and quarter-note chords.

Fourth system of the musical score, starting with a measure marked with a fingering '20'. This system includes a key signature change to one sharp (F#) and a time signature change to 4/4. The treble staff has a melodic line with quarter and eighth notes. The grand staff accompaniment features a bass line with eighth notes and quarter-note chords.

Example 5

Hypothetical reconstruction of the model of an.: *Missa Au chant de l'alouete*. In bars 6–14, the reconstruction of the bass is very tentative.

‘thoroughly’, seems more likely.⁴⁶ Hence it would seem wise to leave the matter of authorship open, at least for the time being.

However this may be, the authorship issue is subsidiary to the fact that we have here a Mass which fully conforms to Faugues’ typical compositional procedures. Its prominent place at the beginning of VatSP B80 (ousting Dufay’s famous *Missa Ave regina caelorum* to the second place) suggests that the esteem for these procedures – whether applied by Faugues or by emulators – was high. Even though the identity of the composer remains uncertain, the Mass provides further testimony of Faugues’ importance for the history of the polyphonic Mass in the 1460s and 1470s.

III

There are three references to a *Missa Vinus* by Faugues in treatises from the 1470s and early 1480s. In Tinctoris’s *Proportionale* (1472–3) the Mass is mentioned, along with Domarto’s *Missa Spiritus almus*, as an example of vertical juxtaposition of \mathcal{C} and C – a practice which the theorist deems ‘tolerable’.⁴⁷

Alii vero pro signo duplae signum temporis imperfecti minorisque prolationis cum tractulo traducto [C] accelerationem mensurae ut praemissum est, denotante quo cantus vulgariter ad medium dicitur tantummodo ponunt [...] Quod, ut De Domarto et Faugues, in *Missa Spiritus almus* et *Vinus* ita signantibus placeam, tolerabile censeo [...]

Five years later Tinctoris mentions the *Missa Vinus* again, in his *Liber de arte contrapuncti*. This time the theorist praises the Mass – and five other compositions by Dufay, Regis, Busnoys, Ockeghem, and Caron – for their compositional variety, and is of the opinion that they are to be ‘extolled with the highest praises and imitated thoroughly’.⁴⁸

Finally, Franchinus Gaffurius mentions Faugues’ Mass in his early treatise *Tractatus practicabilium proportionum*, of 1481–83. He criticizes the work for its incorrect use of major prolation. Theoretically, the major prolation mensurations C and O are equivalent to the minor prolation mensurations c and o on the level of the minim (i.e., C/O ↓ = c/o ↓). But in Faugues’ *Missa Vinus*, as well as a number of other compositions, the relationship between these mensurations is, according to Gaffurius: C/O ↓ ↓ ↓ = c/o ↓ ↓ (i.e., 3:2, or sesquialtera proportion) – ‘quod intollerabile est’.⁴⁹ Interestingly, Gaffurius mentions the cycle under what appears to be a fuller title, *Vinus nanum*:

Multi item, ut Joannes de Quadris in motetto *Gaudeat ecclesia*, et Bartholomeus de Brolys, et Faugus in *Missa Vinus nanum*, et Joannes Fede in motetto *O lumen ecclesie* pro S. Dominico, sexquialteram signant proportionem signo ipso quo maior prolatio consideratur, videlicet signo temporis perfecti vel imperfecti cum puncto, hoc modo: O [vel] C.

This opens the question what the strange and puzzling incipit *vinus* might mean. As the word *vinus* occurs in no Latin dictionary, scholars have often suspected that it was a corruption. They were not the first to raise such doubts: the scribe of one major Tinctoris source ‘corrected’ the incipit consistently into *unius*.⁵⁰ In our century, the alternative reading *vivus* has been proposed.⁵¹ The word *nanum* in the treatise by Gaffurius would on the face of it seem to be the accusative of the Latin noun *nanus* = dwarf. If that is the case, the word offers little help in explaining the incipit *vinus*.

The key to the solution is offered by a jocular verse of Hugo Primas of Orléans, discovered by Reinhard Strohm in a manuscript that was once in the possession of a canon Jacques Vidale of Arras:⁵²

Datur in convivio vinus-vina-vinum.
 Masculinum deficit, atque femininum,
 Sed in neutro genere, vinum fit divinum.

This grammatical witticism can be translated as follows: ‘At the banquet is served *vinus-vina-vinum*. The masculine is not good enough, nor is the feminine [since neither

vinus nor *vina* means anything in Latin].⁵³ But in the neuter [*vinum*], wine becomes divine'. With the help of Strohm's discovery it is now possible to read Gaffurius's *vinus nanum* as the abbreviation *vinus -na -num*.⁵⁴ Once this is recognized, the somewhat ambiguous dashes in the treatise can be explained as abbreviative interpunction: the scribe clearly writes 'vinus-na-num' (see Figure 1). The full title of Faugues' Mass, then, was *Vinus vina vinum*. This title was most probably derived from Hugo Primas's verse.

M
 uli item Joannes de quadrus i Motetto Gaudens ecclesia
 & Bartholomeus de brolus & Faugus in Massa Vinus
 nanum. & Joannes felle i motetto O Lumen ecclesie pro
 s. dominico Sexalteram signat propor^o signo ipso quo
 maior prelatio Confidenciam s^o signo ipso q^o
 vel imperfecti cum punto hoc mo^o & c. nullas tractat^o
 deay Inter prelatore & proportionem quod intolerabile
 est: in sexaltera proportio tres nimis auxibus
 Cequat: prelatio vit maior no s^o tres

Figure 1

Franchinus Gaffurius, *Tractatus practicabilium proportionum* (1481-3): Bologna, Civico Museo Bibliografico Musicale, MS A 69, fol. 19r.

With this new information we can now take a fresh look at the anonymous *Missa Vinnus vina* which survives on fols. 68v-81r of VatS 51. The external evidence supporting this piece's identity with Faugues' *Missa Vinus vina vinum* is very strong. First, there is the virtual identity of the titles. The Sistine Chapel manuscript admittedly gives a slightly different spelling (*vinnus* rather than *vinus*), but this could easily have been the result of scribal corruption or misreading. It is possible, for instance, that the dot on *i* in *vinus* was accidentally shaped like a dash in the exemplar for VatS 51 (*vinus* = *vinnus*), and that this confused the Vatican scribe. Since the full title of the Mass makes no grammatical sense, it would have been impossible for the scribe to deduce the intended spelling from the context. Nor would knowledge of Latin have been of any help: neither *vinnus* nor *vinus* exists in Latin.⁵⁵ But, whatever the possible cause for the different spelling, the reading in the Vatican manuscript does not seem to carry much weight. The title *Vinnus vina* occurs there only once (on fol. 68v), and is not confirmed by later entries. Considering the close resemblance of the

two highly unusual incipits, the difference in spelling would seem to be of minor significance.

Second, there are strong grounds for believing that Tinctoris was familiar with the anonymous *Missa Vinnus vina*. Of the twelve Mass cycles mentioned by him in his *Proportionale*, no fewer than seven are found in VatS 14.⁵⁶ This source – and its twin manuscript VatS 51 – was copied presumably in Naples around the time Tinctoris wrote his treatise.⁵⁷ The survival of the anonymous *Missa Vinnus vina* in this very manuscript pair, and the reference to Faugues' *Missa Vinus* in a treatise which refers extensively to the VatS 14/51 repertory, adds to the probability that the two Masses are, in fact, identical. In this context it is worth adding that Gaffurius mentions – besides Faugues' *Missa Vinus vina vinum* – three Masses from the VatS 14/51 complex in his *Tractatus practicabilium proportionum*.⁵⁸

Finally, the transmission of the *Missa Vinnus vina* may support its possible authorship by Faugues. Adalbert Roth has shown that the VatS 14/51 scribe was concerned to arrange the repertory of manuscript 14 in a logical fashion.⁵⁹ This choirbook was apparently intended as an anthology of Marian Masses (fols. 6r-101r) and *L'Homme armé* cycles (fols. 101v-149r) – even though a number of later additions break the pattern. Roth found no evidence that the twin manuscript 51 was likewise systematically arranged.⁶⁰ However, recent stylistic analysis of the anonymous cycles in VatS 51 points increasingly to the conclusion that this may have been the case: the scribe seems to have aimed to group together Masses by the same composer. Two Masses attributed to Johannes Martini are found next to one another on fols. 145v-165r. Antoine Busnoys' *Missa O crux lignum* (fols. 104v-113r) is preceded, on fols. 90v-104r, by an anonymous *Missa L'Ardant desir* which is almost certainly by the same composer.⁶¹ The anonymous *Missa D'Ung aultre amer* (fols. 113v-122r) is probably attributable to Philippe Basiron,⁶² whose *Missa Regina celi* immediately follows on fols. 113v-122r of the manuscript. In view of this it may be significant that the *Missa Vinnus vina* immediately follows Faugues' *Missa La basse danse* (fols. 55v-68r).⁶³

In spite of this wealth of external evidence, the attribution to Faugues is not without difficulties. The style of the *Missa Vinnus vina* is fully consistent with that of Faugues, but, puzzlingly, the cycle does not seem to match the descriptions by Tinctoris and Gaffurius. A closer look at the piece is in order.

Example 6 gives the tenor statements of the Mass *Vinnus vina* in vertical alignment. Apart from a melodic variant in some presentations of phrase B, and the addition of free material in the third Agnus Dei, the statements differ only with respect to their rhythmicizations. However, they have enough in common to allow a tentative reconstruction of the original melody; this reconstruction is given in Example 6a. In addition to the tenor, the other voices also quote the *Vinnus vina* tune in the course of the Mass (see Table 4).⁶⁴ With few exceptions, these quotations are all identical with the reconstruction that was made on the basis of the tenor statements. Thus there can be little doubt that the melody as given in Example 6a is identical to the one used by the composer.

The image displays a musical score for a Kyrie and Agnus dei, with tenor statements aligned vertically across multiple staves. The staves are labeled as follows:

- Kyrie I:** Statements 8 A and 7 B.
- Kyrie II:** Statements 8 and 3.
- Et in terra:** Statements 32, 11, and 12.
- Qui tollis:** Statements 73, 15, and 17.
- Patrem:** Statements 26, 10, and 7.
- Et in spiritum:** Statements 3, 6, and 35.
- Sanctus:** Statements 13, 4, and 13.
- Osanna:** Statements 5 and 2.
- Agnus dei I:** Statements 26, 2, and 16.
- Agnus dei III:** Statement 1.

Below the main score, two additional staves are provided for comparison:

- (a):** A hypothetical reconstruction of the original tune, showing a sequence of notes with diamond-shaped markers.
- (b):** A comparison with the *L'Homme armé* melody, showing a sequence of notes with diamond-shaped markers.

Example 6

Vertical alignment of the tenor statements in an.: *Missa Vinnus vina*, with a hypothetical reconstruction of the original tune (a), and a comparison with the *L'Homme armé* melody (b).

Sections:	Voice parts:	Passages:	Phrases:	Types:
Christe	bass	mm. 78-83	B	1
Kyrie II	bass	mm. 145-8	B	2
Qui tollis	bass	mm. 148-52	B	2
	top voice	mm. 218-23	B	1/2
	top voice	mm. 227-32	B	1/2
Patrem	top voice	mm. 1-8	AB	1
	top voice	mm. 62-6	B	3
	bass	mm. 68-71	B	3
Pleni	contratenor	mm. 55-9	B	1
	top voice	mm. 64-8	B	1
Osanna	bass	mm. 77-85	AB	2
	bass	mm. 95-8	B	2
Agnus Dei III	bass	mm. 140-144	B	2
	bass	mm. 148-152	B	2

Table 4. Quotations of cantus firmus phrases in the Mass *Vinnus vina* in voices other than the tenor. Bar numbers refer to Laurence Feininger's edition of the Mass (*Monumenta Polyphoniae Liturgicae Sanctae Ecclesiae Romanae*, Ser. I, Vol. 4 [Rome 1952]). Types of quotation: (1) isolated quotations, (2) pre- or post-imitations of the tenor in one voice, and (3) pervading imitation.

One of the interesting features of the *Vinnus vina* melody is its resemblance to the *L'Homme armé* tune (compare Examples 6a and 6b). Phrase A is an inversion of the initial phrase 'L'Homme, l'homme, l'homme armé', and phrase B corresponds with 'd'ung haubregon de fer'. Musically speaking the *Vinnus vina* tune is obviously inferior: it has the character of a simple popular cry, whereas *L'Homme armé* shows a balanced large-scale design, betraying a conscious creative act.⁶⁵ Yet one feature suggests that *Vinnus vina* was known to the composer of the Mass as a written rather than orally transmitted melody: this is its F Lydian modality. By faithfully observing that modality, the composer was forced to use two flats in the three voices surrounding the tenor.⁶⁶ If one considers that the concept of a fixed, standard pitch did not yet exist at the time, and that the composer could have got rid of the flats by transposing the Mass up one step (to G), there seems to be no apparent reason to use this cumbersome notation – unless the notational form of the cantus firmus had forced the composer to do so. The rhythmic character of the *Vinnus vina* tune, and its relationship with the *L'Homme armé* melody, suggest that it was originally written in *prolatio major* notation (C). However, since the tune has not survived, that speculation is unprovable.

Table 5 gives the cantus firmus layout, mensural scheme and dimensions of the

Sections:	Cantus firmus:	Mensurations:	Lengths:
Kyrie	ABB	O	93
Christe	-	☿	89
Kyrie	ABB	O	87
Et in terra	ABB	O	225
Qui tollis	ABB	☿	168
Patrem	ABB	O	225
Crucifixus	-	☿	95
Et in Spiritum	ABB	☿	108
Sanctus	ABB	O	105
Pleni	-	O	117
Osanna	ABB	O	111
Benedictus	-	☿	134
Osanna	<i>ut supra</i>		111
Agnus I	ABB	O	66
Agnus II	-	☿	80
Agnus III	ABB	C3	148

Table 5. Structure, tenor layout, mensural usage and dimensions of an.: *Missa Vinnus vina* (VatS 51, fols. 68v-81r). The lengths are counted in semibreves in O, in breves in ☿, and do not include the final longas. C3 is assumed to be equivalent to C on the level of the breve, as the sesquialtera diminution was carried out on the level of the semibreve. Hence, a perfect breve in C3 is counted as the equivalent of a breve in C (or an imperfect breve in O), namely 2.

Vinnus vina cycle. There are no structural repetitions; it was mainly for this reason that Schuetze doubted Faugues' authorship.⁶⁷ As regards mensural usage, the only information Tinctoris provides about Faugues' Mass is that it employs C and ☿ simultaneously. This happens nowhere in the *Vinnus vina* cycle, at least not as it has come down to us.⁶⁸ The mensural peculiarity mentioned by Gaffurius - 3:2 proportion between major and minor prolation – does not occur in *Vinnus vina* either. There are no major prolation signs in the Mass at all; nor, indeed, is there any sesquialtera passage that implies triple division of the semibreve.⁶⁹ It would appear, then, that Tinctoris and Gaffurius were talking about a different Mass. Without careful evaluation of their remarks, however, that conclusion would be premature; this matter will be dealt with in more detail below. First we must proceed with the stylistic analysis of the *Vinnus vina* Mass.

The total length of the cycle on paper is 1962 beats, more than twice the length of the Mass *Au chant de l'alouete*. Since the cantus firmus consists of only 17 notes (against 109 or possibly more in *Au chant de l'alouete*), it is not surprising to find it stated in very long note-values: mostly breves and semibreves in O, and maxims and longs in C. This in turn affected the contrapuntal writing. In the Patrem, for instance, the tenor starts with two longs and one maxim on B flat, together equalling twenty-four semibreve beats in O (i.e., eight bars); the surrounding counterpoint is written entirely in terms of triads on B flat and E flat. Needless to say, if the cantus firmus is stretched out to such lengths, it cannot be perceived as a musical entity: each melodic turn in the tenor becomes an isolated musical event in itself.

The composer compensated for this lack of melodic clarity in the cantus firmus by presenting literal quotations of the *Vinnus vina* tune in voices other than the tenor. The quotations are of three types (see Table 4): (1) isolated quotations, (2) pre- or post-imitations of the tenor in one voice, and (3) 'pervading' imitation. I will discuss each of these in turn. Some of the isolated quotations figure so prominently that they immediately attract the ear. At the beginning of the Credo, for instance, the entire tenor melody is stated literally in the top voice – thus assuming the role of the head motive. In the Pleni, phrase B is stated in the contratenor, accompanied only by the bass; a few bars later, the phrase is literally repeated in the top voice. Such quotations of cantus firmus material are a typical feature of the tenorless sections of Faugues' Masses.

Pre- and post-imitations of the tenor (common features in fifteenth-century Masses)⁷⁰ are found several times in the course of *Vinnus vina*, and provide further reminders of the preexistent tune. The long pre-imitation at the beginning of the Osanna, for instance, can hardly have escaped the attentive ear. The use of pre- and post-imitations is intensified towards the ends of the Qui tollis and Patrem, no doubt in order to achieve climactic concentrations of cantus firmus material. Indeed, the *Vinnus vina* melody becomes all-pervading in the last twenty bars of the Patrem: it is stated successively in the tenor, top voice, bass, and tenor (see Example 7). We should perhaps exercise caution in relating this procedure to Faugues. The procedure cannot be compared to the points of imitation in the Masses *Le serviteur* and *Je suis en la mer*, since *Vinnus vina* was in all likelihood a monophonic tune. And nothing similar seems to happen in Faugues' two Masses on monophonic cantus firmi, *La basse danse* and *L'Homme armé*.

A context for the procedure is provided by Ockeghem's *Missa L'Homme armé*. Examples 8a and 8b show two imitations of the *L'Homme armé* tune that are very similar to the imitations in *Vinnus vina*.⁷¹ The first of these in particular recalls the *Vinnus vina* Mass, since the imitated phrase is musically identical with the one in Example 7. Yet it is also clear that Ockeghem handles the procedure much more skilfully than does the *Vinnus vina* composer. In the *L'Homme armé* Mass, the imitative entries tend to follow one another very closely, and consequently they provide a greater sense of momentum. Moreover, Ockeghem reinforces the effect of his imitations by having them combined with other procedures, in particular changes of

Musical score system 1, measures 58-61. The system consists of four staves: two treble clefs (upper and lower) and two bass clefs (left and right). The key signature is two flats (B-flat and E-flat). Measure 58 starts with a circled 'O' above the first treble staff. Measure 60 is marked with the number '60' above the first treble staff. The music features a mix of quarter, eighth, and half notes, with some rests and ties.

Musical score system 2, measures 62-65. The system consists of four staves: two treble clefs (upper and lower) and two bass clefs (left and right). The key signature is two flats (B-flat and E-flat). Measure 65 is marked with the number '65' above the first treble staff. The music continues with various rhythmic patterns and rests.

Musical score system 3, measures 66-70. The system consists of four staves: two treble clefs (upper and lower) and two bass clefs (left and right). The key signature is two flats (B-flat and E-flat). Measure 70 is marked with the number '70' above the first treble staff. The music includes a sequence of eighth notes in the first treble staff and various rests and notes in the other staves.

Example 7

An.: *Missa Vinnus vina*, Patrem mm. 56–76.

Bar numbers refer to L. Feininger, ed., *Monumenta Polyphoniae Liturgicae Sanctae Ecclesiae Romanae*, Ser. I, Vol. 4 (Rome 1952).

scoring, tone colour, and rhythmic activity. Finally, Ockeghem's imitations tend to be functionally integrated in larger musical developments. Example 8b illustrates these features. The initial imitation between bass and top voice (bars 117–20) is placed directly after an extended duo; it marks the expansion to three-part texture, the move to higher regions in the voice-ranges, and a decrease in rhythmic activity. The imitative entry in the tenor, in bar 121, brings a further expansion of the texture, and is dramatized by a sudden downward shift in scoring: in bars 118–23, the three upper voices move down almost an octave. For a Mass written in the mid-1460s,⁷² this is an extraordinary passage. The *Vinnus vina* composer did not aim at such striking effects. In the passage quoted in Example 7, each voice politely waits its turn to state the final phrase of the cantus firmus; the free counterpoint that surrounds the imitations moves forward steadily, and appears to be heading for no particular direction.

The anonymous composer of the *Vinnus vina* cycle shares, on the whole, Faugues' attitude to imitation. Imitations involving two or three voices occur frequently in the course of the work; some of these are quite extended.⁷³ Together with the patterned lines and the sequential repetitions,⁷⁴ these imitations are among the Mass's more progressive features. Forward-looking features are found particularly in the tenorless passages and sections; these also contain some extremely florid writing.⁷⁵ The four-voice passages, on the other hand, are in a completely different style, and are characterized by slow harmonic rhythm and a majestic chordal sound. Here, the note-values are much longer than in the tenorless sections, and dissonance is regularly on the breve (in both Φ and O). The latter style could be seen as archaic for a Mass copied in the early 1470s, but the tenorless sections show that the composer was well aware of contemporary stylistic developments. The melodic style of *Vinnus vina* also

recalls the Masses of Faugues. The contratenor and bass frequently make very wide leaps, and often present several rising or falling leaps in succession (cf. note 32 above). In the top voice we find several instances of bold melodic writing, and again we are reminded of Faugues rather than his contemporaries (compare Examples 2 and 9).

To summarize, many features in the *Missa Vinnus vina* support Faugues' authorship: the 'flexible literalism' of the cantus firmus treatment, the use of cantus firmus phrases in tenorless sections, the florid style of these latter sections, the style of the full sections, the sometimes somewhat inelegant melodic writing, and the general attitude to imitation. Together with the external evidence outlined above, this would amount to almost conclusive proof of the Mass's identity with Faugues' *Missa Vinus vina vinum*, were it not that Tinctoris and Gaffurius seem to provide firm evidence to the contrary.

However, that evidence may not be as firm as it would seem at first sight. To begin with, several of the compositions mentioned by Tinctoris in his *Proportionale* do not appear to have the mensural peculiarities he describes. Ockeghem's song *L'Autre d'antan*, for instance, is described as using the mensuration O3, but this sign occurs in no practical source for the piece.⁷⁶ Similarly, Tinctoris quotes a brief passage from a

The image displays two systems of musical notation. The first system is labeled '(a)' and includes a vocal line for Tenor (transposed) and a Bassus part, along with a piano accompaniment. The piano part consists of three staves: two for the right hand and one for the left hand. The vocal line for the Tenor (transposed) is on a single staff. The Bassus part is on a single staff. The piano accompaniment is on three staves. The second system continues the piano accompaniment with three staves. The notation includes various rhythmic values, accidentals, and dynamic markings. A measure number '50' is indicated above the first staff of the first system.

(b) C

[Bassus]

[Tenor (transposed)]

Example 8

Johannes Ockeghem: *Missa L'Homme armé*

(a) Credo mm. 47-53;

(b) Credo mm. 117-124.

Bar numbers refer to D. Plamenac, ed., *Johannes Ockeghem. Collected Works*, Vol. 1, second corrected edition (American Musicological Society, 1959).

Credo by Binchois, but the notational picture is different in all the surviving sources.⁷⁷ Regis is alleged to have used the sign $\text{O}2$ in his Mass *L'Homme armé*, but neither this sign nor its equivalent, C in perfect minor modus, occurs in the unique source for the piece, VatS 14.⁷⁸ Finally, Tinctoris quotes a passage from the Credo of Dufay's Mass for St. Anthony of Padua, which appears in half the note-values in its unique source, TrentC 90.⁷⁹ All this is not necessarily to question Tinctoris's reliability. But it would seem likely that either his sources or ours were affected by scribal revision – a circumstance to be kept in mind in the case of *Vinnus vina*.

It would not be surprising if the *Missa Vinnus vina* had been revised in the course of



Example 9

Disjunct melodic motion in the top voice of an.: *Missa Vinnus vina*.

- (a) Qui tollis mm. 171-3;
- (b) Et in Spiritum mm. 183-5;
- (c) Osanna mm. 102-5.

Bar numbers refer to the edition in L. Feininger, ed., *Monumenta Polyphoniae Liturgicae Sanctae Ecclesiae Romanae*, Ser. I, Vol. 4 (Rome 1952).

its transmission. If one compares the various tenor statements for phrase B in Example 6, it is immediately apparent that two sections, the *Qui tollis* and *Et in Spiritum*, stand apart: the tenors of these sections are written in note-values that are about two to four times as large as those in the other sections. As it happens, the *Qui tollis* and *Et in Spiritum* are also the only four-voice sections of the Mass that are written in \mathcal{C} . So if *Vinnus vina* was the Mass that Tinctoris referred to, the C - \mathcal{C} juxtaposition should have occurred in these sections, if anywhere. It is not inconceivable that the tenors of these sections were originally written in half the note-values under the signature C (against \mathcal{C} in the other voices), to be renotated in \mathcal{C} in the present source. This is admittedly speculation, but there would be precedent for the scribal renotation in VatS 51. As I have argued elsewhere,⁸⁰ the tenors of the *Et resurrexit* and *Osanna I* of the *Missa L' Ardant desir* (VatS 51, fols. 90v-104r) were originally almost certainly written in C ; the surrounding voices are in O_2 , which is an alternative sign for \mathcal{C} in perfect minor modus. In the manuscript, however, all voices of the two sections are now written in O_2 : the tenors have been renotated in doubled note-values – the very adaptation that we have postulated for the *Qui tollis* and *Et in Spiritum* of *Vinnus vina*. In view of these considerations, the absence of the C - \mathcal{C} juxtaposition in VatS 51 would not seem to present an insurmountable obstacle to Faugues' authorship.

The same goes for the absence of the mensural peculiarity described by Gaffurius. Gaffurius's treatise on proportions, written shortly after his brief stay at Naples in 1478-80, is strongly influenced by the views of Tinctoris.⁸¹ Several remarks in the *Tractatus* are clearly derived from the *Proportionale*, even though Gaffurius rarely acknowledges the source of his information. For instance, Tinctoris had rebuked

Busnoys for his pleonastic habit of indicating triplets by coloration as well as the cipher '3'; Gaffurius reiterated these comments almost verbatim.⁸² Similarly, several comments on Domarto's *Missa Spiritus almus*, the *Missa L'Homme armé* by Busnoys, and Dufay's *Missa de Sancti Antonii*⁸³ clearly have their source in Tinctoris's treatise.

In view of this, the possibility that Gaffurius's criticism of Faugues' Mass was based on the *Proportionale* rather than on first-hand knowledge of the piece seems more than theoretical. It is true that the two theorists made different statements about the *Missa Vinus*: according to Tinctoris it contained vertical juxtapositions of C and \mathcal{C} , while Gaffurius alleged that it combined major and minor prolation in a 3:2 relationship. This would seem to rule out the possibility that Gaffurius was citing the *Proportionale*. However, it so happens that the mensural practice which Gaffurius claims was applied in Faugues' Mass was discussed by Tinctoris in the very passage that contains his own reference to the piece:⁸⁴

Quod, ut De Domarto et Faugues, in *Missis Spiritus almus* et *Vinus* ita signantibus placeam, tolerabile censeo propter quandam aequipollentiam illius proportionis ac istius prolationis. Dum enim aliquid ad medium canitur, duae notae sicut per proportionem duplam uni commensurantur. *Ast quidam signo prolationis maioris et temporis perfecti vel imperfecti sesquialteram signant* [...] (my italics)

This opens the possibility that Gaffurius quoted Faugues' Mass as an example of 3:2 proportion between major and minor prolation because he believed to remember – incorrectly – that Tinctoris had criticized the Mass for that practice.

It is not inconceivable that Gaffurius made this error. In the early 1480s he was still an earnest student striving for recognition. Eager to demonstrate the breadth of his knowledge, he quoted extensively from contemporary writers in his own treatises.⁸⁵ He did this, as we have seen, in the *Tractatus*: several of the compositions he discusses here are mentioned in the *Proportionale*. It is doubtful that Gaffurius had carefully studied all these compositions himself: much of what he said must have been simply hearsay. This is particularly likely in the case of Faugues: at the time Gaffurius wrote his *Tractatus*, Faugues' music must already have been considered old-fashioned in comparison with the works of younger contemporaries such as Weerbeke, Martini, and Obrecht. Thus, if the theorist had incorrectly remembered Tinctoris's comments on the *Missa Vinus*, it is quite possible that he knew the work not well enough to correct his error.

To summarize, then: if Tinctoris was talking about the Mass that survives in VatS 51 but knew it in a different notational form, there would be four precedents for the notational discrepancy in his treatise. If the VatS 51 scribe, or that of his exemplar, was responsible for the discrepancy, there would be at least one precedent for the renotation in that manuscript. And if Gaffurius attributed the wrong mensural peculiarity to Faugues' *Missa Vinus vina vinum*, his strong dependence on Tinctoris's *Proportionale* would explain the error.

Of course, none of these speculations, however plausible they may seem, can be proved. However, what is crucial is not so much the possibility that the theorists are wrong, as the improbability that they are right. What compels us to question their testimony is the overwhelming evidence in favour of the identity of *Vinnus vina* and *Vinus vina vinum*. Somehow, we suspect, the disagreements between the theorists and the music must be due to errors, or vagaries of transmission. The existence of plausible explanations, even if they are unprovable, makes that suspicion well-founded.

The alternative is to take the theorists' statements at face value and to reject Faugues' authorship of the Mass *Vinnus vina*. This, to be sure, would force us to accept a series of coincidences for which no plausible explanation can be offered. We would have to assume that two different Masses with nearly identical, yet highly unusual titles happened to turn up in the very same musical centre at the very same time. The lost one was by Faugues, the surviving one written in a style closely resembling that of Faugues. The lost one was mentioned by a Naples theorist in 1472-3 and 1477, the surviving one was copied presumably in Naples in the mid-1470s, in a repertory to which this theorist must have had access. This unlikely course of events is supported only by the statements of Tinctoris and Gaffurius – if they are taken at face value. Given the considerations outlined above, there seems little justification for insisting that the theorists deserve absolute trust. On balance, their testimony carries not enough weight to overrule the evidence in favour of Faugues.

Compared to the case of *Au chant de l'alouete*, the *Vinnus vina* case is much easier to decide, as it involves many different types of evidence. In *Au chant de l'alouete* the evidence pointing to Faugues' authorship was only of a structural nature, and was not confirmed by stylistic or external evidence. With *Vinnus vina* there is a strong external as well as internal case; plausible explanations can moreover be offered for the contrary evidence. It therefore seems reasonable to conclude that the anonymous *Missa Vinnus vina* is most probably identical with Faugues' *Missa Vinus vina vinum*.



Like Schuetze's book on Guillaume Faugues, the present article can have only an introductory nature. Although the two anonymous Masses discussed here have told us more about the composer, little is still known about Faugues' position in the music history of the late fifteenth century. What were the origins of his style? Was he the 'inventor' of structural use of parody in the Mass? Did he influence later composers? Was there a special relationship between Faugues and Martini? Why are all his Masses found in Italian sources? Did he compose Masses only? If these questions must for the moment remain unanswered, the discussion of Faugues' Masses – and the two cycles that are related to them – has nevertheless made it clear that the composer fully merits closer study.

The writing of this article was made possible through a British Council Fellowship enabling me to pursue research at Manchester. I am indebted to David Fallows, Andrew Kirkman, Chris Maas, Christopher Reynolds, and Reinhard Strohm for reading earlier drafts and offering many valuable suggestions.

- 1 See the discussions in: G. Reese, *Music in the Renaissance* (New York 1954), pp. 111-3; E.H. Sparks, *Cantus Firmus in Mass and Motet, 1420-1520* (Berkeley-Los Angeles 1963), pp. 172-3 and 177-81; G.C. Schuetze, *An Introduction to Faugues* (New York 1960).
- 2 P. Higgins, *Antoine Busnois and Musical Culture in Late Fifteenth Century France and Burgundy* (Ph.D. diss., Princeton 1987), pp. 257-9; P. Higgins, 'Music and Musicians at the Sainte-Chapelle of the Bourges Palace, 1405-1515', paper read at the Sixteenth Annual Conference on Medieval and Renaissance Music, Edinburgh, 12-15 August 1988. Faugues is mentioned as a chaplain and master of the choirboys in 1462, and later turns up (as 'Faugues the priest') in a document of 1471.
- 3 These Masses were edited by George C. Schuetze, *Collected Works of Faugues* (New York 1960). Faugues' Mass *L'Homme armé* was also published in Laurence Feininger's *Monumenta Polyphoniae Liturgicae Sanctae Ecclesiae Romanae*, Ser. I, Tome 1, No. 4 (Rome 1948; version of VatS 14, VerBC 761, and PerBC 1013), and the *Missa Le serviteur* appears in O. Koller et al., eds., *Sieben Trienter Codices. Dritte Auswahl*, DTÖ 38 (Vienna 1912), pp. 95ff. The *Missa Le serviteur* survives uniquely in TrentC 88, fols. 411v-422v. The *Missa La basse danse* is found in VatS 51, fols. 55v-68r, and TrentC 91, fols. 13r-24v. The *Missa L'Homme armé* exists in two different versions: the presumably earlier one is in VerBC 761, fols. 112v-123r, PerBC 1013, fols. 93v-95r and 101r, and VatS 14, fols. 138v-149r; the later reworking appears in Mode M.1.13, fols. 176v-192r. The latter source also transmits the *Missa Je suis en la mer*, on fols. 192v-207r.
- 4 C.A. Miller, 'Early Gaffuriana: New Answers to Old Questions'. *MQ* 56 (1970), pp. 375-6. The Mass is mentioned in the unpublished *Tractatus practicabilium proportionum* of 1481-3 (Bologna, Civico Museo Bibliografico, MS A 69, fol. 19r). I am indebted to David Fallows for drawing my attention to the Gaffurius reference; Eddie Vetter kindly supplied me with a microfilm of the manuscript. For Tinctoris's references, see: A. Seay, ed., *Johannis Tinctoris Opera Theoretica*, CSM 22, vol. 2 (American Institute of Musicology 1975), pp. 155-6; vol. 2a (1978), p. 46. The anonymous *Missa Vinnus vina* was published in L. Feininger, ed., *Monumenta Polyphoniae Liturgicae Sanctae Ecclesiae Romanae*, Ser. I, Vol. 4 (Rome 1952).
- 5 Schuetze, *Introduction to Faugues*, unpaginated folder with corrigenda.
- 6 Edgar Sparks described Faugues as 'an outstandingly progressive composer who shows an interest in consistent procedures not commonly found at this time' (*Cantus Firmus*, p. 459, n. 104).
- 7 J.P. Burkholder, 'Johannes Martini and the Imitation Mass of the Late Fifteenth Century'. *JAMS* 38 (1985), pp. 470-523. Burkholder discusses the possibility of direct contact between Faugues and Martini on pp. 504-8.
- 8 Higgins, *Antoine Busnois*, pp. 257-9.
- 9 *Ibid.*
- 10 Schuetze, *Introduction to Faugues*, pp. 100-1.
- 11 Schuetze, *Introduction to Faugues*, pp. 18-22 and 24-8.

- 12 Schuetze, *Introduction to Faugues*, pp. 24–8. I would express some doubts concerning Schuetze’s hypothetical reconstruction of the melody of *La basse danse* (*ibid.*, pp. 24–5). In this reconstruction, the melody is consistently interpreted in a dance-like, iambic rhythm, even in passages where there is no basis for such an interpretation in the tenor statements. Moreover, Schuetze included no rests in his reconstruction, even though the five tenor statements show remarkable agreement with respect to the placement and duration of the rests. Most of the rests in the statements have a duration of two minims (in C). It could perhaps be argued that this is too long for a monophonic tune. On the other hand, there is no proof that Faugues’ model was monophonic in the first place. In view of that uncertainty, it might have been better to reconstruct the model with the rests given by Faugues, rather than to omit them on the basis of unproven assumptions concerning the model’s nature and identity.
- 13 See e.g. the vertical alignment of the tenor statements of Martini’s Mass *Io ne tengo quanto a te* in Burkholder, *op.cit.*, pp. 492–5.
- 14 For the date of the TrentC 88 layer containing Faugues’ *Missa Le serviteur*, see: S.E. Saunders, *The Dating of the Trent Codices from their Watermarks, with a Study of the Local Liturgy of Trent in the Fifteenth Century* (Ph.D. dissertation, King’s College, University of London, 1983), pp. 87–91. The anonymous *Missa Le serviteur* which was copied in Cambrai in 1462–3 was in all probability Faugues’ setting (see J. Houdoy, *Histoire artistique de la cathédrale de Cambrai, ancienne église métropolitaine Notre-Dame* (Paris 1880), p. 194). Two other possible candidates are the anonymous three-voice *Le serviteur* Masses in TrentC 89, fols. 153v–160r, and TrentC 88, fols. 267v–275v. However, the latter two cycles take up only seven and eight folios, respectively, while Faugues’ setting takes up eleven folios, which is closest to the ‘xvi focuillés’ of the Mass copied at Cambrai (I thank Reinhard Strohm for pointing out this to me).
- 15 See particularly the discussion in Sparks, *Cantus Firmus*, pp. 177–81. Schuetze discusses the points of imitation on pp. 33–7 of his *Introduction to Faugues*.
- 16 Sparks, *Cantus Firmus*, pp. 226–9.
- 17 See, for instance, the anonymous *Missa O rosa bella* III of c. 1460 (Gloria bars 26–31, Sanctus bars 8–12); edited in G. Adler and O. Koller, eds., *Sechs Trienter Codices. Zweite Auswahl* DTÖ 22 (Vienna 1904), pp. 28–69; and Dufay’s *Missa Se la face ay pale* (e.g. Gloria bars 192–4, Credo bars 192–3, Sanctus bars 122–3); edited in H. Besseler, ed., *Guglielmi Dufay Opera Omnia*. CMM 1, vol. 3 (Rome 1951), pp. 1–32.
- 18 I have analysed and discussed this outstanding composition in my essay ‘The Anonymous Mass *D’Ung aultre amer*: A Late Fifteenth–Century Experiment’. *MQ* 74 (1990), pp. 566–94. Although its survival in ‘layer 2’ of VatSP B80 suggests that the Mass *D’Ung aultre amer* existed by 1463, the style of the cycle points to a date probably not before c. 1470. In view of this, I have suggested the possibility that Nicholas Ausquier replaced one of the Masses of the ‘1463’ archetype by the presumably more recent *D’Ung aultre amer* cycle when he copied VatSP B80 in 1475 (cf. C. Reynolds, ‘The Origins of San Pietro B80 and the Development of a Roman Sacred Repertory’. *EMH* 1 (1981), pp. 257–304).
- 19 Laurence Feininger has attributed the *D’Ung aultre amer* Mass to Philippe Basiron, who, interestingly, sang as a choirboy under Faugues in 1462 (cf. J.M. Llorens, *Capellae Sixtinae Codices musicis notis instructi sive manu scripti sive praelo expressi*, Studi e testi 202 (Vatican City 1960), p. 104). On the possibility of Basiron’s authorship, see note 62 below.
- 20 Schuetze, *Introduction to Faugues*, pp. 38–46.

- 21 Burkholder, *op.cit.*, pp. 486–7.
- 22 Schuetze has even attempted (with limited success, I believe) to reconstruct the hypothetical four-voice model for the Mass *Je suis en la mer* (*Introduction to Faugues*, pp. 48 and 52–4).
- 23 Schuetze, *Introduction to Faugues*, pp. 29–31.
- 24 See Sparks, *Cantus Firmus*, pp. 172–3. I am indebted to Elaine Moohan for pointing out to me that there is also structural repetition in Martini's *Missa Io ne tengo*: each movement ends with the same eleven bars of four-part writing, except the Sanctus, where the Osanna only quotes the beginning of this passage (private communication, 24 January 1990). Faugues and Martini seem to have several compositional habits in common (cf. notes 7 and 13 above); their relationship deserves further study.
- 25 Based on Schuetze, *Introduction to Faugues*, pp. 29–30.
- 26 It could be argued that since the *L'Homme armé* Mass uses canon throughout, it is essentially a three-part Mass (at least in notational terms). Hence, the three-voice sections in the Mass inevitably contain the tenor, and that voice states the *L'Homme armé* melody by definition. However, what is crucial is that Faugues decided to write the Qui sedes/Qui tollis and Crucifixus for three voices at all, for thus he forced himself to use the *L'Homme armé* tune. He could have avoided doing so by leaving out the tenor, as he did in the two-voice Pleni, Benedictus, and Agnus II of the Mass.
- 27 The layout of individual movements is indicated here with letter codes. In these codes, the various sections of the movements are divided by slashes ('/'). The sections either contain statements of cantus firmus phrases in the tenor (labelled A, B, C, etc.) or are in reduced scoring ('-').
- 28 I prefer 'beat' to the anachronistic concept of *tactus*, which was not introduced before the end of the fifteenth century, and which carries misleading connotations of tempo and tempo relationships. In the fifteenth century, the beat was on the semibreve in O, and on the breve in \mathcal{C} and $\mathcal{C}3$. The total lengths of Masses generally varied between 900 and 2100 beats. It should be noted that beats indicate the length of a Mass as it appears on paper; the actual duration of the work depended on the tempo of the beats. (Total Mass lengths given in this text always include the repeat of the Osanna.)
- 29 For the relationship between rhythmic density and tempo, see R.C. Wegman, 'Concerning Tempo in the English Polyphonic Mass'. *AcM* 61 (1989), pp. 40–65.
- 30 J. Tinctoris, *Proportions in Music*, transl. A. Seay (Colorado Springs, 1979), pp. 37–8; see also *Opera Theoretica*, vol. 2a, p. 50.
- 31 It is strange, therefore, that in the same passage, Tinctoris chides Faugues (among others) for his 'misuse' of the sign C (*ibid.*). Were the strokes through O in *L'Homme armé* and *La basse danse* later additions by scribes or singers? Or did Faugues commit the 'error Anglorum' in other Masses that are now lost?
- 32 This is particularly the case in Faugues' contratenors and basses, which frequently rise and fall with extraordinary steepness (a phenomenon also noted by Schuetze, *An Introduction to Faugues*, pp. 81–3). For Masses composed in the 1460s and 1470s this is quite unusual: the trend was towards more fluent writing in all voice-parts. In this respect, then, Faugues stands virtually alone among his Franco-Flemish contemporaries. Nevertheless, I have given only excerpts from the top voices of Faugues' Masses in Example 2, since it could be objected that the contratenor and bass were traditionally characterised by disjunct melodic motion.

- 33 The Pleni of the Mass *Je suis en la mer* is indeed so florid that Schuetze did not reduce it in his edition, as he did with all the other sections in O (*Collected Works of Faugues*, pp. 168-70).
- 34 *Opera Theoretica*, vol. 2, p. 156.
- 35 Reynolds, *op.cit.*.
- 36 I thank Professor Chris Maas for pointing out this to me.
- 37 Considering the habits of contemporary scribes, who often jotted down no more than a few text phrases in the top voices of Glorias and Credos and provided only incipits for the other voices, one wonders why it was apparently so important for Ausquier to have the full text in three of the four voices of the Gloria.
- 38 Two breves in \mathcal{C} are counted here as one bar.
- 39 This interesting procedure, which is also used in the Benedictus (see below), is exceedingly rare. I know of only two other instances in the fifteenth-century Mass repertory. The first occurs in the Pleni of the anonymous *Missa Se tu t'en marias*, which was copied in TrentC 88, fols. 77v-84r, between about 1456 and 1462. After ten tempora (in O) the contratenor states the entire cantus firmus in sesquialtera proportion. After it has finished, the bass immediately repeats the cantus firmus a fifth lower (but in a different rhythmicization). Significantly, the anonymous composer also quotes the entire cantus firmus in the top voice of another tenorless section, the Agnus Dei II (on the word 'miserere'), and in the bass of the Et in terra (after 49 tempora in O). The cantus firmus of the Mass was identified by Reinhard Strohm (*Music in Late Medieval Bruges* (Oxford 1985), p. 141). For the tenor, see: M. Picker, 'The Cantus Firmus in Binchois' *Files a marier*'. *JAMS* 18 (1965), pp. 235-6.
- The other instance occurs in the Pleni of the anonymous *Missa Rex dabit mercedem* (VerBC 755, fols. 54v-63r). This section is more closely related to the Benedictus and Agnus II of *Au chant de l'alouete* in that it is structured in two parts of equal length, the music for the top voice (first part) being literally repeated an octave lower in the bass (second part). However, the music that is repeated is freely composed, and does not seem to involve preexistent material.
- 40 Edgar Sparks mentions a few examples of 'block' parody on p. 153 of his *Cantus Firmus*. A context for this interesting procedure, which is also found in some German Masses from the 1460s, is provided by Reinhard Strohm in *Music in Late Medieval Bruges*, p. 128.
- 41 See D. Fallows, *Dufay* (London 1982), pp. 151-5.
- 42 My thanks to David Fallows for pointing out this to me.
- 43 Private communication, 22 March 1989.
- 44 Burkholder, *op.cit.*, pp. 482-4.
- 45 See, for an example of this type of figuration in a monophonic song, the chanson *My my* (T. Gérold, *Le manuscrit de Bayeux* (Minkoff Reprint, Geneva 1979), pp. 110-1, bars 36-9).
- 46 The most likely candidate after Faugues seems to me Johannes Martini. In footnotes 7, 13 and 24 above I have pointed to correspondences between Faugues' and Martini's compositional habits; several traits common to both men are found in the *Missa Au chant de l'alouete*. Although other features of the Mass seem quite untypical of Martini, it would be worth drawing the piece into discussions of the style and chronology of his Masses.
- 47 *Opera Theoretica*, vol. 2a, pp. 45-6.
- 48 *Opera Theoretica*, vol. 2, pp. 155-6. Seay's reading 'Et vinus' in the *Liber de arte contrapuncti* is probably erroneous. In the relevant passage in the treatise, Tinctoris mentions six compositions, which are grouped in three pairs (two Masses, two motets and two songs), each pair having the conjunction 'et'. The parallelism in the sentence clearly indicates that the title of

Faugues' Mass was *Vinus* rather than *Et vinus* (my italics):

tam in missis 'L'Homme armé' Guillaume Dufay et 'Vinus' G. Faugues

quam in motetis 'Clangat' Johannis Regis et 'Congaudebant' Anthoni Busnois (. . .)

quam in cantilenis 'Ma maistresse' Johannis Ockeghem et 'La tridaine a deux'
Firmini Caron.

Tinctoris proceeds, with becoming modesty: 'Quosquidem cantus pro conformatione huius nostrae regulae meis quidem praetermissis in exempla non ab re produxi. Enimvero et eos summis laudibus extollendos et penitus imitandus censeo, ne contra officium boni viri me solum probare, alios autem ubi recte fecerint contemnere videar' (*Opera Theoretica*, vol. 2, p. 156). For an interpretation of Tinctoris's remarks on compositional variety, see my essay 'The Anonymous *Missa D'Ung aultre amer*'.

49 Bologna MS A 69, fol. 19r. Johannes Tinctoris condemned this same practice in Guillaume le Rouge's *Missa Mon cuer pleure* (cf. *Opera Theoretica*, vol. 2a, pp. 46–7).

50 This was the scribe of Valencia, Biblioteca Universitaria, MS 835, a source dating c. 1490 (cf. *Opera Theoretica*, vol. 2, p. 155; vol. 2a, p. 46).

51 See: J. Tinctoris, *The Art of Counterpoint*, transl. A. Seay. MSD 5 (American Institute of Musicology 1961), p. 140.

52 See: Strohm, *Music in Late Medieval Bruges*, pp. 176–7. The verse appears on fol. 242v of Bruges, City Library, MS 493.

53 Reinhard Strohm suggested that the poem refers to fasting in Lent: '*vina* or *vinna* is the "fin" of the fish which is served at the dinner-table; *vinnus* must mean something similar; the poet clearly preferred *vinum* – wine!' (*Music in Late Medieval Bruges*, p. 177). However, I do not think there is any need to search for possible meanings of the words *vinus* and *vina*, since the poet himself affirms that these words *deficiunt* – which can be translated as 'they fall short', 'they fail', or indeed 'they do not exist'. The Latin word for 'fin' is *pinna*.

54 My admiring thanks to Eddie Vetter, who spotted the relationship. As he informed me, abbreviations of this type are fairly common in Medieval treatises. For instance, in etymologies of words such as *tenor* and *tonus*, the Latin verbs *tenere* and *tonare* are often written as 'teneo nes' (= 'teneo/tenes') or 'tono nas' (= 'tono/tonas'). See, for example, Jacob of Liège, *Tractatus de Consonantiis Musicalibus [etc.]*, J. Smits van Waesberghe, E. Vetter and E. Visser, eds., DMA A.IXa (Buren 1988), p. 46.

55 The only possible reference to the word *vinnus* I know occurs in a treatise by Isodore of Seville: 'Vinnola [recte vinnula?] vox est mollis atque flexibilis. Et vinnola dicta vinno, hoc est cincinno molliter flexo'. ('The *vinnola vox* is soft and flexible. And *vinnola* comes from *vinnus* [or possibly *vinnum*?], which means gently crisped hair'.) The passage is quoted in B. Trowell, 'Faburden – New Sources, New Evidence: A Preliminary Survey', *Modern Musical Scholarship*, ed. E. Olleson (Stocksfield 1978), p. 59. The adjective *vinnula* is now explained in most dictionaries as deriving from 'Venus'.

56 This was noted by Albert Seay in *Opera Theoretica*, vol. 1 (American Institute of Musicology 1975), p. 25. It should be noted, however, that Tinctoris's reference to a *Missa L'Homme armé* by Regis using the sign O2 (*Opera Theoretica*, vol. 2a, p. 55), may not apply to Regis's Mass of that title in VatS 14, since the latter cycle does not use O2. It is possible that Tinctoris confused the Mass with Caron's *L'Homme armé* cycle, which follows Regis's Mass in VatS 14, and which does use O2. But see the discussion below.

57 A. Roth, *Studien zum frühen Repertoire der Päpstlichen Kapelle unter dem Pontifikat Sixtus' IV.*

- (1471-1484). *Die Chorbücher 14 und 51 des Fondo Cappella Sistina der Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana* (Inaug. Diss., University of Frankfurt-am-Main, 1982), pp. 185-240.
- 58 Bologna, MS A 69, fols. 5r and 12v (*Missa Spiritus almus* by Petrus de Domarto), fols. 12v and 22r (*Missa L'Homme armé* by Antoine Busnoys, whom Gaffurius calls 'famosissimus compositor'), and fol. 12v (*Missa O Venus bant* by Gaspar van Weerbecke). The latter Mass, which appears on fols. 132v-145r of VatS 51 (and in many other sources), was not mentioned by Tinctoris in his *Proportionale*.
- 59 Roth, *Studien zum frühen Repertoire*, pp. 124-41.
- 60 Roth, *Studien zum frühen Repertoire*, pp. 142-58.
- 61 See: R.C. Wegman, 'Another Mass by Busnoys?' *M&L* 71 (1990), pp. 1-19.
- 62 The possibility of Basiron's authorship is discussed cautiously in my essay 'The Anonymous *Missa D'Ung aultre amer*'. I have argued there that the *D'Ung aultre amer* Mass was most probably written in Central France, by a talented and imaginative composer who was under the influence of Ockeghem and Faugues (though certainly not identical with either of the two). This description fits Basiron, who sang as a choirboy under Faugues in Bourges in 1462 (see note 8 above). In his forthcoming edition of the collected works of Basiron, Jeffrey Dean will propose Basiron's authorship on the basis of close stylistic similarities with the latter's *Missa de Franza*.
- 63 It was for this reason that Adalbert Roth supported the attribution to Faugues; see: *Studien zum frühen Repertoire*, pp. 169-70.
- 64 All bar numbers in the text refer to Laurence Feininger's edition of the Mass *Vinnus vina* (see note 4 above). In Table 4, I have not included the imitative passage in Agnus Dei II, mm. 57-67. The motive in this passage does show a certain resemblance to phrase B, but that resemblance is probably coincidental rather than intentional.
- 65 For a descriptive analysis of the *L'Homme armé* tune, see: L. Lockwood, 'Aspects of the "L'Homme armé" Tradition'. *PRMA* 100 (1973-4), pp. 104-5. Reinhard Strohm has convincingly argued that the *L'Homme armé* tune is 'a composed, mensural song – a work of art' (*Music in Late Medieval Bruges*, p. 130).
- 66 The modal character of the Mass *Vinnus vina* is somewhat puzzling. Although F Lydian is apparently the mode of the piece, two movements (Kyrie and Patrem) open with a chord on E flat (*sic*), the three others opening on B flat. Moreover, most of the time the music behaves as though it is written in B flat Lydian. For instance, nearly half of all the cadential progressions in the Mass are on B flat, and many of the internal cadences on F are immediately followed by one on B flat. Also, the composer of the Mass moves several times from the final cadences on F to chords on B flat (Kyrie I, Et in terra, Patrem, and Sanctus; in the Agnus Dei I he moves from F to D). Nearly all tenorless sections end with a cadence on B flat (the only exception is the second Kyrie). It is usually only in compositions in the Phrygian mode that we find such a strong emphasis on the fourth degree. Masses in B flat Lydian are exceedingly rare; one early example is Petrus de Domarto's *Missa Quinti toni irregularis* in VatSP B80, fols. 143v-154r.
- 67 Schuetze, *Introduction to Faugues*, unpaginated folder with corrigenda: 'We have transcribed a portion of the *Missa Vinnus vina* and have not found any conclusive evidence, on stylistic grounds, that Faugues is its composer. Moreover, structural repetition, certainly Faugues's most obvious characteristic, is not featured anywhere in this Mass. Thus, any attribution of the *Missa Vinnus vina* to Faugues would seem doubtful at best.' I agree with Adalbert Roth

- that Schuetze's verdict was premature, on the grounds that structural repetition is 'eine Verfahrensweise, die eher Formal-strukturelles als Substantielles betrifft' (Roth, *Studien zum frühen Repertoire*, p. 169).
- 68 *Opera Theoretica*, vol. 2a, pp. 45-6. The editor of the treatise, Albert Seay, stated that the juxtaposition occurs in the Sanctus of the Mass *Vinnus vina*: 'the Superius here is written in Φ , the other three voices in O' (*ibid.*). This, however, does not appear to be the case. My photographic reproduction of the relevant folio of VatS 51 shows no trace of any stroke through the signature in the top voice, and the music of that voice is clearly to be read in O. Moreover, what Tinctoris meant was the vertical juxtaposition of C and Φ , not O and Φ (since he wrote 'ita signantibus', which refers to the signatures C and Φ in the musical example given by him to illustrate his point). In Domarto's *Missa Spiritus almus*, the signs C and Φ are vertically combined in the Christe and Benedictus; Seay's assumption that Tinctoris referred to the Qui tollis of Domarto's Mass (juxtaposition of O2 and O) is surely erroneous (*ibid.*).
- 69 There are several passages in the Mass where the composer prescribes sesquialtera proportion in C and Φ , either by the cipher '3' or by coloration. However, this invariably affects the division of the breve, not the semibreve.
- 70 Several instances can be found, for example, in the anonymous *Missa O rosa bella* III (see note 17 above) and Ockeghem's *Missa Ecce ancilla Domini*.
- 71 All references are to D. Plamenac, *Johannes Ockeghem. Collected Works*, second, corrected edition, Vol. 1 (American Musicological Society 1959), pp. 99-116. Other relevant examples of pre- and post-imitations of the cantus firmus in Ockeghem's *L'Homme armé* Mass are: Gloria bars 24-9, 110-6, 118-24, and Credo bars 87-91.
- 72 Ockeghem's *Missa L'Homme armé* was copied in Bruges in 1467-8 (Strohm, *Music in Late Medieval Bruges*, p. 30).
- 73 Imitations involving two voices: Kyrie mm. 33-47, 58-69, 74-8, 96-109, 113-21, 134-5; Gloria mm. 25-8, 40-1, 67-9, 100-4, 112-20, 133-7, 177-81; Credo mm. 11-13, 35-6, 51-4, 84-106, 115-20, 126-36, 141-7, 145-55, 154-62, 183-6, 201-5, 205-6, 234-8, 241-59; Sanctus mm. 49-53, 71-4, 102-4, 106-8, 160-70, 174-89, 208-10, 213-9; Agnus Dei mm. 25-52, 79-88, 90-106, 118-26. Imitations involving three voices: Gloria mm. 9-11, 16-20, 57-9; Credo mm. 19-23, 107-11, 224-34; Sanctus mm. 147-60, Agnus Dei mm. 52-6, 57-70, 161-6. (Imitations involving the tenor are not included here; see for these Table 4.)
- 74 See: Kyrie mm. 25-8, 52-5; Gloria mm. 30-2, 46-52, 85-8; Credo mm. 47-50; Sanctus mm. 7-10, 202-6; Agnus Dei mm. 144-52.
- 75 This stylistic dichotomy seems to be typical of central-French Masses and motets from the 1460s. Apart from Faugues, we find it in Ockeghem's *Missae L'Homme armé* and *De plus en plus*. It disappears in Ockeghem's later Masses. Busnoys' motet *In hydraulis*, written within two years after the composer's move from Tours to Burgundy in 1465, shows the same dichotomy; it is absent in Busnoys' later Masses and motets.
- 76 *Opera Theoretica*, vol. 2a, p. 14. Gaffurius refers to Tinctoris's remarks on fols. 5v-6r of his *Tractatus practicabilium proportionum*; he gives a musical example of Ockeghem's song in which the mensuration is Φ 3.
- 77 *Opera Theoretica*, vol. 2a, p. 45.
- 78 *Ibid.*, p. 55 (but see note 56 above).
- 79 *Ibid.*, pp. 14 and 57.

- 80 Wegman, 'Another Mass by Busnoys?', pp. 5-12.
- 81 See: Miller, 'Early Gaffuriana', pp. 375-9, and A.W. Atlas, *Music at the Aragonese Court of Naples* (Cambridge 1985), pp. 80-2.
- 82 Tinctoris, *Opera Theoretica*, vol. 2a, p. 52; Gaffurius, *Tractatus*, fol. 18r.
- 83 Gaffurius, *Tractatus*, fols. 3v, 5r, 12v, 19v; Tinctoris, *Opera Theoretica*, vol. 2a, pp. 14-5, 46-9, and 55-7.
- 84 Tinctoris, *Opera Theoretica*, vol. 2a, p. 46.
- 85 See: Miller, 'Early Gaffuriana', pp. 369-70.