

Musical Citations

There are three main kinds of musical citation, all of them adding important information for the *Catalogue*. First, and closest to the material of the preceding chapter, are the quodlibet songs that string together snippets from the openings of whatever song happens to fit the prevailing counterpoint. Second are the borrowings of a single voice, most often the tenor, whether in what is known as a chanson arrangement, in a motet, in a mass movement, or in a mass cycle; in this category belongs also the group of masses with the title *Carminum*, in which each section is based on a different song. Third, and of enormous interest, are the mass cycles that use all three voices of a polyphonic song, since their evidence can often provide an entirely new reading of the original song.

What the *Catalogue* does not list is the more indirect allusions that have been mentioned in some literature. But to have included them, and similar apparent allusions, in the *Catalogue* would have been a sure way to nervous breakdown. What looks plausible one day will seem insanity the next. For better or worse I have treated these as part of a world of higher exegesis that has no real place in the kind of listing offered in the *Catalogue*.

But they can be intriguing. In the Glogauer Liederbuch there are three quodlibets based on the discantus of Bedyngham's *O Rosa bella*. All are in similar style, with similar ranges and techniques. The discantus is copied only once in **Glog** and serves for all three quodlibets. On the face of it all three are by the same composer. In all three, the *O Rosa bella* discantus has below it a texted tenor made up of song quotations and an untexted low contratenor that seems free of quotations.¹ Some of the borrowed tunes in *O Rosa bella/ Hostu mir die lawte brocht* are known from polyphonic settings in **Schedel**, that is, from pieces composed apparently in the 1450s; of those in the next, *O Rosa bella/ In fewirsz hitcz*, there are eight (out of a total twenty-two) in the **Schedel** Appendix, that is to say, the pieces added to that manuscript in the mid-1460s and perhaps composed in the early 1460s; in the final quodlibet, *O Rosa bella/ Wer do sorget umb frawen*, only one of the eighteen quotations is known elsewhere, namely *Meyn libste zcart*, found in **Bux**. **Schedel** and **Glog** are two quite independent manuscripts: their readings for the works they share are in all cases substantially different. So the two entirely different portions of the **Schedel** repertory represented

¹ The editions in EDM4 (1936), 40–3, confusingly add the texts of the tenor snippets to the contratenor, thereby associating them with music for which they are irrelevant.

by those two **Glog** quodlibets can have nothing directly to do with **Schedel**; they simply reflect two different portions of the German repertory. Two conclusions are therefore possible from those quodlibets. The first is that the added repertory in the **Schedel** Appendix is indeed likely to be of the latest pieces, copied almost as soon as they became available. The second conclusion, which must be more tentative, is that the quodlibet from which almost nothing can be identified may well give clues to a further portion of the German song repertory, a portion that is otherwise lost through the absence of any German song source from between the 1460s and **Glog** of around 1480. That is why I have given careful note of the known sources for each song cited in all three quodlibets and added separate entries for those that do not survive in any more complete form. They could of course be monophonic songs, thus reflecting yet another portion of the repertory; but I am inclined to doubt it, partly because the whole structure is so close to that of the other two quodlibets. They could also just have been made up out of thin air by a composer who had run out of tags that would fit, but the skilled counterpoint of all three pieces argues against that too. After all, it is notable how easily the borrowed songs fit the discantus. The cento-line is a perfect tenor in the sense that it makes pure counterpoint with the *O Rosa bella* discantus except at one moment near the end of *O Rosa bella/ Wer do sorget*, where the tenor is momentarily a 4th below the discantus²—a moment that can easily be emended and may well be a simple copying error. The specific musical details of the quotations in these three quodlibets are probably of no account: some are very rough approximations. The text and the shape of the line are enough to identify the piece; it seems that the harmonic and contrapuntal thread are more important to the composer than literal accuracy. The main importance of these three pieces is in what they tell us about the repertory.³

Slightly different is the case of the *Au travail suis sans espoir* quodlibet credited to Compere. In its first stanza there are five clear citations from known polyphonic songs of the previous generation: *Au travail suis [que peu]* (Barbingant or Ockeghem); *Presque transi* (Ockeghem); *Par le regart* (Dufay); *De tous biens plaine* (Hayne); *D'ung aultre amer* (with music related to T opening of Ockeghem); and *Malheureulx cuer* (Dufay). The catch is in the last citation, which has no musical relation to anything in Dufay's famous virelai. Moreover, the poem continues with apparent citations of known song titles but again no musical allusion. Plainly the musical repetitions involved in a rondeau form had made it impossible to continue the scheme after the first stanza. It looks very much as though Compere (or whoever: it is ascribed to him only in RCas and I have some trouble believing this feeble piece to be his) simply took an existing poem and did his best at setting it to music.

² EDM4 (1936), 43, at bar 43.

³ The same is the case with several of the later quodlibet chansons, of which perhaps the most famous is the anonymous *A l'aventure, tous mes amys*, printed in Attaignant's *Second livre contenant XXV chansons* (Paris, 1536), and reprinted in *Anthologie de la chanson parisienne au XVIe siècle*, ed. F. Lesure et al. (Monaco, 1953), no. 7 (p. 19), with analysis by Isabelle Cazeaux (at p. VI).

Isaac's Quodlibet

The examples in Col have been edited and fully analysed by Dragan Plamenac;⁴ and the three in Glog are well discussed in EDM4 (1936). But Isaac's quodlibet below the discantus of *De tous biens plaine* merits brief description, though it may well date from the 1490s (Ex. 18.1 and Table 18.1).⁵

Ex. 18.1. Isaac, *De tous biens plaine*/ *Et qui la dira*^a

De tous bien play - ne

1. Et qui luy di - ra di - ra 2. Se jo - ly moys du may 3. Com - mant

pueult a - voir joy - e 4. Mays que se fuyt se - cre - - - te -

ment 5. J'ay bien no - ry sept ans ung pa - pe - gay mon

pa - pe - gay s'en vo - - le 6. Le ser - vi - tuer

7. Je n'ay deul 8. Ma bou - che rijt 9. A - dieu

⁴ D. Plamenac, 'The Two-Part Quodlibets in the Seville Chansonnier', in *The Commonwealth of Music: In Honor of Curt Sachs*, ed. G. Reese and R. Brandel (New York, 1965), 163–81. The pieces are nos. 26–29 in the MS, fos. E1^v–E5.

⁵ There is as yet no published edition, though it is transcribed in N. K. Baker, 'An Unnumbered Manuscript of Polyphony' (Ph.D. diss., U. of Maryland, 1978), 978, with a list of some of the material cited; for a transcription of half of it, see L. F. Bernstein, 'French Duos in the First Half of the Sixteenth Century', in AlbrechtF (1980), 43–87, at 52–3.

Ex. 18.1. Continued

mes a - mours 10. Ung franc ar - chier 11. Et je boy d'au -
 tant 12. A que mon enfant 13. J'ay prijs a - mours a ma de -
 vi - - - se 14. Et vous y - rés o vin 15. Je
 suis de al - le - man - ge et je par - le fran - - choys

^aFrom Segovia, fo. 176^v. Emendations: 19ii7: F for E; 20ii1: G for F; 28i2: dotted crotchet in MS.

Table 18.1. Songs quoted in Isaac's *De tous biens plaine/Et qui la dira*

- 1 *Et qui luy* [i.e. la] *dira dira*. Melody matches monophonic version in P9346, no. 86; polyphonic settings by Agricola, Busnoys or Japart, and by Isaac himself.
- 2 *Se* [i.e. Ce] *joly moys du may*. Not identified, though the melody is fairly close to P9346, no. 72, *Ce mois de may par ung douls asserant*.
- 3 *Commant puel t avoir joye*, a melody found in various settings of the years around 1500, including the mass by Isaac normally known as *Wohlauf gut gsell von hinnen*. The citation here differs from all other known versions of the song in having a minor third (for major) and rather different rhythms.
- 4 *Mays que se fuyt secretament*. The tune roughly follows the T opening of Pietrequin's *Mais que ce fust secretement*. There is no particular reason to think of this as a cantus prius factus.
- 5 *J'ay bien nory sept ans ung papegay, mon papegay s'en vole*. The first and last lines of a poem that has different music in P12744, no. 26. The melody appears as the T of a setting (by Japart or Josquin or Johannes Joye) in F229, no. 46; see commentary in BrownF (1983) for further settings.

Table 18.1. Continued

6	<i>Le servituer</i> . This almost follows the T opening of Dufay's <i>Le serviteur hault guerdonné</i> (see <i>Catalogue</i>), used for many other arrangements in the later fifteenth century.
7	<i>Je n'ay deuil</i> . This follows the distinctive B opening of Ockeghem's song <i>Je n'ay dueil que je ne suis morte</i> (Ex. 3.7 above), later used as the opening motif in Agricola's <i>Je n'ay dueil que de vous ne viengne</i> (see <i>Catalogue</i>).
8	<i>Ma bouch rijt</i> . Opening of T (and D) of Ockeghem's <i>Ma bouche rit</i> , but put down a tone.
9	<i>Adieu mes amours</i> . Opening of T of Josquin's <i>Adieu mes amours</i> (see <i>Catalogue</i>), presumably itself built on the monophonic song in P9346, no. 83.
10	<i>Ung franc archier</i> . Opening of T of Compere's setting, 4vv, almost certainly a cantus prius factus, since the melody appears again in an anonymous setting in Cantic.
11	<i>Et je boy d'autant</i> . Given a necessary emendation to the fourth and fifth notes, this precisely matches the T opening (a 5th higher) of Isaac's own setting with this title.
12	<i>A que mon enfant</i> . This is a puzzle, not least because there are only four notes for the five syllables. I cannot suggest any possible identification.
13	<i>J'ay prijs amours a ma devise</i> . Follows D opening (a 9th lower) of the widely copied anonymous rondeau (Ex. 5.8 above).
14	<i>Et vous yrés o vin</i> . Matches T opening of setting, 4vv, in P16664 (see <i>Catalogue</i>).
15	<i>Je suis de allemange et je parle franchoyoys</i> . Found in various settings (see <i>Catalogue</i> and BrownM (1963), no. 219).

The point of this list of the songs cited—apart from drawing attention to an unaccountably neglected quodlibet—is to show a rather different approach to musical assembly that demands in turn a different kind of analysis. Here the majority of the quotations are *chansons rustiques*, simple tunes. That most of them turn up in polyphonic settings (some by Isaac himself) is interesting to the story of how music was selected for inclusion in combinative songs and quodlibets, that is, to the story of the growing contacts between monophonic and polyphonic repertoires in the last quarter of the century. But it takes us a little aside from the task of understanding the polyphonic art song. The only ones that are not from simple tunes are from four of the most famous art songs of the second half of the century: *Le serviteur*, *Je n'ay deuil*, *Ma*

bouche rit, and *J'ay pris amours*—all of them so well known and so often reused that the melodic material cited from them would be recognized as quickly as that of any monophonic song. (The same goes for the polyphonic song used in the discantus, Hayne's *De tous biens plaine*.) Apart from the two unlocated quotations, there are just two difficult cases. One is *Mais que ce fut* (no. 4): its use here is of no help in determining whether or not Pietrequin's work is based on a pre-existing tune, though the fact that its text is a pure rondeau suggests otherwise. The other is *Et vous irés au vin*, a four-voice drinking song with highly irregular text: the nature of the setting would seem to imply that it is based on borrowed monophonic material.

Single Voice Borrowing

Occasionally, though, a composer will see exact quotation as the main musical challenge. There is a four-voice *Salve regina* setting in M3154 that performs the feat of putting the usual chant in the tenor while the discantus is built entirely out of the discantus lines of six songs, all identified by their opening words.⁶ Certainly the two French songs are quoted exactly. *Le serviteur* is put up a step and has an inserted rest at the beginning; but once it starts it follows every detail of Dufay's line; the same is the case with *J'ay pris amours*, though at its original pitch. *Wunsliche schone* is given in a form that may reflect the model from which the Buxheim version was arranged; that the discantus is used here from a song that was probably conceived as a *Tenorlied* gives another hint of the strictness with which the composer—named only as 'Ar. fer.'—treated his bizarre contrapuntal task. The last song quoted, *Wes ich mich leid*, luckily gives us the title of one of the textless songs in the Glogauer Liederbuch, again in a version so close as to suggest that precision was part of the game. For the other two, *Zu jagen* and *Glick walt da rayß*, there is no other musical source, though in both cases the context and nature of the line make it quite certain that we have parts from two more lost polyphonic songs. That *Salve regina* seems to have been copied into M3154 in about 1476.⁷

⁶ Edited by Thomas Noblitt in EDM81 (1993), 50.

⁷ R. Strohm, 'Meßzyklen über deutsche Lieder in den Trienter Codices', in *Liedstudien: Wolfgang Osthoff zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. M. Just and R. Wiesend (Tutzing, 1989), 77–106, esp. n39, suggests that the composer could be identified as Arnold Fleron, documented as a singer in the chapel of the Emperor Friedrich III in 1467–8.

Carminum Masses

It is here, however, that the fuller quotations gather a major significance. A composer who borrows an entire voice from a song to form the basis of a quodlibet, a version with new surrounding voices, or a larger liturgical work, essentially has three courses. The first is to adjust or embellish it freely, as happens, for example in Bedyngham's mass *Dueil angoisseux* or Le Rouge's mass *So ys emprentid*—and many other cases, all of which are fairly easily identified as such. Another approach is to establish a rough basis, as happens in several *L'homme armé* masses where the precise form of the tune can vary from movement to movement: these too are fairly easily identified and tend to show that the borrowed melody was a monophonic tune without anything approaching a definitive version. But the third possibility, which became increasingly popular as the century progressed, is that the composer takes a single form of his borrowed material and treats it with fastidious respect. As examples of the information these can give, here are two cases from the masses of Obrecht, a particularly helpful composer because he seems to have regarded borrowed material as a positive challenge and tended to treat it with corresponding respect.

The first is Obrecht's mass *Plurimorum carminum* II, identified and described by Martin Staehelin.⁸ Each movement takes the discantus line of a three-voice song and transposes it down to become the bassus of the new four-part texture. The songs it uses are listed in Table 18.2.

Table 18.2. Songs quoted in Obrecht's mass *Plurimorum carminum* II

Kyrie	<i>Scon lief</i> (Barbireau), down a 12th Sources: RCas Ber40021 BaselF.X.22
Gloria	<i>Entre Peronne et Saint Quentin</i> (Rubinet), down an 11th Earliest sources: Dij (App) Wolf Glog
Credo	<i>La martinella</i> (Martini), down an 8ve Sources of this version: RCas Glog Tr91 PL-WRu Mf.2016 (This seems to have been the most widely accepted version of the secular piece, used also in the masses by Isaac and Martini.)
Sanctus	<i>A qui dirai je</i> (Compere), down an 8ve Earliest sources: RCas BQ16
Agnus	<i>Le renvoy</i> (Compere), down an 8ve Earliest sources: RCas F229 FR2794

⁸ M. Staehelin, 'Obrechtiana', *TVNM* 25 (1975), 1–37, at 25–7; the mass is edited by Thomas Noblitt in *NOE10* (1991).

Staehelin tentatively suggested that there was a significance in the appearance of four of these songs in RCas and that the mass may therefore date from Obrecht's visit to Ferrara in 1487–8. The one that does not appear in RCas (*Entre Peronne et Saint Quentin*) is, like most of the others, a widely distributed work (six sources).

But the strongest support for his theory surely comes from the version of *A qui dirai je* used here: Obrecht's version has an extra beat near the beginning, found in RCas but not in any other source of the song. On the one hand, it appears to represent a distinct version of the song, since all three voices have that extra beat; and its inclusion means that the song has an exact number of *brevis* units, whereas the 'non-Obrecht' version is more irregular and may therefore reflect considered second thoughts. On the other hand, however, that beat makes little sense in RCas, since it stands over an unsupported open fourth: it can hardly be correct as it stands.

Ex. 18.2a. Compere, *A qui dirai je*, opening from RCas, the extra beat marked 'x'

Ex. 18.2b. Compere, *A qui dirai je*, opening from CantiB

But it gets more complicated. First, RCas may be the earliest surviving source of *A qui dirai je*: BQ16 is its only other fifteenth-century manuscript. Second, comparison of the main sources (see the beginning in Ex. 18.2) indicates that the song went through various stages of revision: CantiB, for example, has a heavily rewritten contratenor (only one bar in Ex. 18.2b, but quite substantially in bars 13–15 and 17–19). If that is correct, the version Obrecht used might suggest that he wrote the mass before 1487, the date entered in the index of BQ16, the earliest source of the 'revised' version.

The case of the other Compere song here is rather more conclusive. Ex. 18.3 gives all the variants for the first half of the song—remarkably few, considering that it survives in ten sources alongside the Obrecht mass. Obrecht in fact uses it twice through, with several readings only in the first statement. The only variant shared with RCas (and Verona757) is in bars 5–6; and in the second half (not in Ex. 18.3) there is a variant shared only with Verona757. But none of the song sources has the falling triad in the last bar of Ex. 18.3. Once again it urges caution about views that the mass arose out of Obrecht's experience of RCas during his few months in Ferrara in 1487–8. Reinhard Strohm once pointed out that 'It is time to stop overloading Obrecht's ten-month stay in Ferrara 1487–88 with compositions, forgetting how many years he labored in little-studied Northern cathedrals'.⁹

Ex. 18.3. Discantus line of the first half of Compere's *Le renvoy*

RCas Ver Obrecht

Obrecht 1

Obrecht 1

Obrecht 1

Obrecht 1&2

Of Barbireau's *Scon lief*, the other sources are German and generally unreliable.

Of *La martinella*, Obrecht simply has the most common version, which happens to appear in RCas.

Obrecht's other citation mass, *Plurimorum carminum* I,¹⁰ is not easy to analyse, partly because there are several citations that cannot be identified. I list them in Table 18.3 simply because they are not directly retrievable from the *Catalogue* or anywhere else.

⁹ In a review of NOE7 in *Notes* 47 (1990), 552–4.

¹⁰ Also published in NOE10 (1991).

Table 18.3. Songs quoted in Obrecht's mass *Plurimorum carminum* I

Kyrie I	<i>Je ne vis oncques</i> (Dufay or Binchois) in T = T, bars 1–9 ¹¹ Earliest sources: Niv Lab 1 Schedel Wolf
Christe	<i>Bon temps</i> (not easily identified) in T
Christe (2nd half)	<i>Ou le trouveray</i> (not easily identified) in T ¹²
Kyrie II	<i>Ha cueur perdu</i> (anon.) in T = prima pars of T, up a 4th Only musical source: FR2794
Et in terra pax	unidentified in Ct
Glorificamus te	unidentified in T
Jesu Christe	<i>Vostre amour</i> (Busnoys) ¹³ in T = T up a 4th Earliest source: F229
Qui tollis	<i>Joye me fuit</i> (Busnoys) in T = T Earliest source: F229
Tu solus	<i>Mais que ce fut secretement</i> (Pietrequin or Compere) in T = T Earliest sources: RCG F229 BQ17
Patrem omnipotentem	<i>Petite camusette</i> (Ockeghem) in Ct = T Earliest sources: Niv Wolf
Et ex Patre	<i>Je ne pourroye plus celer</i> (anon.) in T = T up a 4th Sources: Col EscB Pav
Et resurrexit	<i>Adieu mes amours</i> (Josquin) in T = T Earliest sources: RCG RCas F229
Qui cum Patre	<i>Acordés moy ce que je pense</i> (Busnoys) in T = T Sources: RCas Pix F229
Confiteor	<i>Et trop penser</i> (Bosfrin) in T = T Sources: F121 F178 F229 RCas
Sanctus	<i>Scon lief</i> (Barbireau) in D = D down a 5th Sources: Ber40021 RCas
Sanctus (2nd half)	<i>Gracieuse plaisant muniere</i> (Busnoys version) ¹⁴ in T = T Sources: Dij F229 Odh SG461

(continued)

¹¹ The choice of these bars is by no means unique to Obrecht and is discussed in my article 'Nine Breves of Dufay or Binchois,' *Die Tonkunst* 5 (2011), 51–4. There I point out that the bizarre selection of only those nine *breves* recurs in a *Salve regina* by Pierre de La Rue, in Josquin's song *Lamye a tous*, in Brumel's song *Jamés que la*, and in Ghiselin's *Salve regina*; I argue that Ghiselin began the tradition and that the other composers allude to him.

¹² This is not musically related to Loyset Compere's *Et ou la trouveroye la femme au petit con*, found as the second part of two different songs, *Alons fere nos barbes* and *Mon pere m'a donné mari*, ed. CMM15/v (1972), 9 and 39.

¹³ *Une filleresse/ S'il y a compaignon/ Vostre amour.*

¹⁴ *Mon mignault musequin/ Gracieuse plaisant muniere.*

Table 18.3. Continued

Pleni sunt celi	<i>Ce n'est pas jeu</i> (Hayne) in Ct = T Earliest sources: Lab 3 RCG RCas
Osanna	<i>Quant je vous dy le secret de mon cuer</i> (not identified) in T
Benedictus	<i>Ma dame faytes moy savoir</i> (?Basin) in T = T Sources: BQ16 Cape Col F229 Pix RCas
In nomine	<i>J'ay mains de biens</i> (Busnoys) in Ct = secunda pars of T Earliest sources: Lab 2 Dij Cord

There are other masses *carminum*, but they add very little to our understanding of the polyphonic song tradition:¹⁵ Isaac's is entirely of known monophonic songs, though they often reach us through polyphonic settings;¹⁶ Bruhier's quotes only one known polyphonic song, the contratenor bassus (*brevis* values only) of Hayne's *Allez regretz* in the Agnus III.¹⁷ The mass credited variously to Andreas de Silva and Costanzo Festa has a scattered profile shown in Table 18.4.¹⁸

Table 18.4. Songs quoted in the mass *Carminum* of De Silva or Festa

Kyrie	<i>L'homme armé</i> in tenor (a twelve-note motif repeated six times in bassus)
Sanctus	<i>J'ay pris amours</i> (anon.): T up a 4th in Ct Earliest sources: Niv Wolf Lab1
Osanna	<i>Adieu mes amours</i> (Josquin): second phrase of T sung five times as T
Agnus I	<i>Adieu mes amours</i> (Josquin): first and second phrases of T sung twice as B
Agnus III	<i>De tous biens plaine</i> (Hayne): T up a 5th in T

¹⁵ Among them one that Joshua Rifkin believes must be by Obrecht, though without clear allusions to any polyphonic song, see his 'A Song Mass in Siena', *JM* 24 (2007), 447–76.

¹⁶ Published in *Das Chorwerk* 7, ed. R. Heyden; analyses are in H. J. Moser, *Missae Carminum* (Wolfenbüttel, 1962), and in StaehelinM (1977), iii. 60–1. J. Heidrich, 'Heinrich Isaacs (?) *Missa Carminum*: Überlieferung – Werkgestalt – Gattungskontext', in *Ständige Konferenz Mitteldeutsche Barockmusik . . . Jahrbuch 2001* (Schneverdingen, 2002), 123–39, argues persuasively that it cannot be by Isaac.

¹⁷ Published in *Das Chorwerk* 127, ed. A. K. Laird and N. S. Josephson (Wolfenbüttel, 1979) and in R. Wexler, *Antoine Bruhier: Life and Works of a Renaissance Papal Composer* (Turnhout, 2014), 324–71, with a detailed analysis of its borrowings at 145–58.

¹⁸ Published in CMM25/i (1962) and CMM49/iii (2012), 1–35; the editor of the latter, Winfried Kirsch, p. XIII, proposed further melodic identifications, none of which I can share.

About the *Missa carminum Dionisii Prioris* in Brno, I simply report—pending a modern edition—that Dumitrescu identified *Mon pere m'a donné mari* in the Kyrie, *Lourdault lourdault* in the Gloria, *Tant que nostre argent dura* in the Sanctus, and *Adieu mes amours* in the Agnus;¹⁹ of the mass *Omnium carminum* by Pipelare in the two Kraków partbooks 40634, the loss of the tenor partbook makes analysis hard.²⁰

Musical Readings

There is often information of the very first value to be gleaned from later mass cycles or motets based on a particular song. Thus Obrecht's mass *Rose playsant* includes all three voices of the original song; when assembled they give a version that is different from any of the song sources, and in some ways appears to provide superior information.²¹ The same could be said—to take only one example out of many—of the mass *Di dadi*, credited to Josquin, which confirms what only careful analysis shows to be the likely best reading of the song on which it is based, Morton's *N'aray je jamais*.²² In cases like this, the evidence of a major composer is obviously a prime consideration for establishing a musical text for any song; yet this is the one body of information that is almost invariably excluded from critical commentaries. Seen from that perspective, it is odd that editors of the masses of Obrecht and Josquin, for example, have all presented the chanson models from some other source: the correct approach would surely be to present the song as derived from its treatment in the mass and then see how these readings compare with the ones in

¹⁹ T. Dumitrescu, 'Who was "Prioris"? A Royal Composer Recovered,' *JAMS* 65 (2012), 5–65, at 40n69.

²⁰ As noted in M. Staehelin, 'Eine wiedergefundene Messen-Handschrift des frühen 16. Jahrhunderts,' *Studien zur Musikgeschichte: Eine Festschrift für Ludwig Finscher*, ed. A. Laubenthal (Kassel, 1995), 133–44, at 142.

²¹ Effectively there are two branches to the stemma: the Florentine sources **Pix** and **F229** are all but identical in their readings, and **CantiC** has few enough differences (namely, two tie differences, two plain errors, and one very small musical variant in the contratenor) to belong with that group; **RCas** and **BQ16** belong on a different branch, to which Obrecht's mass belongs. (**Leipzig1494** has a substantial contratenor variant and is in any case too distanced geographically to be of much likely relevance.)

²² D. Fallows, 'Robert Morton's Songs' (Ph.D. diss., U. of California at Berkeley, 1978), chapter 2.

the songbooks. As an isolated but perplexing example, one could note that the tenor of Ockeghem's *Ma maistresse* appears in his own mass with readings quite different from those in the song sources.²³ This is another case in which it seems likely that Ockeghem recomposed his song (as I believe Binchois, for example, often did).

So if I have one major regret about the information given in my *Catalogue* of the repertory it is that later arrangements and mass cycles are often listed in summary fashion. That seemed the only practical approach; but it surely stands to reason that a serious critical edition of a song should give more credence to the views of Josquin or Obrecht than to those of an unnamed copyist, probably working at speed, in a chansonnier that contains dozens of songs. Of course the Josquin masses themselves come down to us through fallible scribes and printers; but the details are to some extent self-checking in a way that they rarely are in the song sources, partly because the tune can be presented several times, partly because augmented forms leave less room for doubt.

The masses on *Fortuna desperata* by Josquin and Obrecht further help to define the situation. Josquin incorporates all three voices of the original song: put them together, and you have a reading that seems in some respects more convincing than anything in the song sources. There is only one dubious detail: whether the discantus in bar 19 has a dotted figure (see Ex. 34.3). The two appearances of the line give it differently, and in both cases the counterpoint confirms that what is written is the only possible reading.²⁴

²³ See my fuller discussion in 'Fifteenth-Century Songs in Tongeren', in *Musicology and Archival Research*, ed. B. Haggh et al. (Brussels, 1994), 510–21, at 514–19; further discussion is in F. Fitch, *Johannes Ockeghem: Masses and Models* (Paris, 1997), 98–109.

²⁴ With Obrecht the situation is less clear. The figure in bar 12 of the tenor appears four times dotted and five times undotted; and several of both would be better if they had the other reading. A particularly intriguing case arises in the discantus at bar 17, where the unanimous reading of the Obrecht sources disagrees with the unanimous reading of the song sources, though the first of Obrecht's appearances makes musical nonsense as it stands and would be fine if emended to follow the song sources. Barton Hudson (in NOE4) points out that such an emendation would produce musical nonsense at its second appearance. I would be inclined to respond that the dissonance thereby produced at the second appearance is well within the tolerance of Obrecht's contrapuntal style, whereas the dissonance at the first appearance, if the source-reading is retained, is quite unacceptable within any style of the time.

Cela sans plus

To conclude this chapter, we can look at one of the most famously despised songs of the fifteenth century, *Cela sans plus* by Colinet de Lannoys. Otto Gombosi devoted almost four pages of his monograph on Obrecht to explaining why it was definitely the thinnest work he had ever encountered.²⁵ Nobody would deny the brilliance with which he demonstrated his case (a case of a kind that has all too rarely been made about any fifteenth-century music), but the song's very career suggests that it merits attention.²⁶ It was many times recopied and at least twice adapted by other composers; it formed the music for a Florentine lauda; it was quoted by both Molinet and Nicole de La Chesnaye; it was used for mass cycles by Martini and Obrecht; and its tenor generated three further compositions. Moreover, it was chosen to open the chansonnier F176—certainly a scruffy collection, but one that seems well informed on musical values.

What is important about the original song, in Ex. 18.4, though (apart from its probably obscene text), is the simplicity of the discantus and tenor. They run in canon at the 8ve through all four phrases, always with the discantus leading; in all but the third phrase the distance is of a *longa*; and in all but the third the discantus has a final flourish to bring in the cadence. The very simplicity of that pattern has led to the idea that this may be a setting of a borrowed and perhaps popular melody.²⁷ It may not be important or possible to decide exactly where the tenor originated. But it should be clear enough that this duet provides a distinctive body of melodic material, attractive and easily remembered. The canonic writing may not present much of a compositional challenge; but at the same time the phrase-structure has enough that is irregular to make the piece intriguing: the slight irregularity at the end of the first phrase (here transcribed

²⁵ O. Gombosi, *Jacob Obrecht: Eine stilkritische Studie* (Sammlung musikwissenschaftlicher Einzeldarstellungen, 4; Leipzig, 1925), 75–9, at 76: 'entschieden die dünnflüssigste Komposition, die mir jemals begegnet ist'.

²⁶ It is perhaps relevant that Gombosi (b. Oct., 1902) was not yet twenty-three years old when he published his doctorate and presumably finished the writing before he was twenty-one.

²⁷ This notion is supported by the way the last phrase echoes material from the first, as well as by the apparently unrelated setting of a version of the tenor in Cop1848, p. 140, ed. in ChristoffersenF (1994), iii. 75–6 (also canonic in most of its phrases, though often at the space of a single *semibrevis*), and by differences in the tenor as used in a five-voice setting ascribed to 'Rigamundus' in BQ19.

with a 2/4 bar) may be common enough in the songs of the era, but it works well because the duple pattern is almost naively accentuated up to that point; and the overlaps in the third phrase create an elegantly irregular pattern. The structure of 13, 10, 14, and 11 *breves* may be surprising, given the apparently enormous expansion of the canonic interval in the third phrase (from 2 to 6 *breves*). But the results are central to the style of the time.

One clue to the nature of the song lies in its text:²⁸

Cela sans plus et puis hola.	Only this much, and then enough.
Gente bergiere belle de bon renom,	Sweet shepherdess, reputed beauty,
Getés mon cor hors de vostre prison.	cast my heart out from your prison.
Cela sans plus et puis hola.	Only this much, and then enough.

This departs from the normal rondeau form in several respects. First, of course, the lines vary in length, with 8, 11, 10, and 8 syllables. Second, the first line repeats as the fourth, albeit with different music. Third, the finality of the statement: it is very hard to think how the poem could continue. So it is almost certainly not a rondeau at all, but a simple single-stanza song, which I suggest gives a slightly different slant to what Gombosi felt about the music.

The song itself survives in ten sources: just two have a flat signature in all three voices (**BQ16 RCas**), two have a flat signature in just the discantus (**RCG Wolffheim**), and six are unsigned (**BQ17 CantiB F176 F178 F229 PC**). As it happens, three published editions of the piece all use as their main source one without any signature, namely Helen Hewitt (from **CantiB**), Howard Mayer Brown (from **F229**), and Fabrice Fitch (from **F176**). All three used the various hints in the surviving sources to come up with a version that looks more or less like Ex. 18.4, which is taken from **BQ16**.²⁹ And I think it worth presenting in this way because the result is enormously less cluttered, namely with signatures to all three voices and therefore very few editorial accidentals. But everybody who has given any time to these sources knows that very often a piece will occur in one source without any signature and in others with signatures; and in almost all cases (in fact I cannot think of an exception) the source with the largest number of flats seems closest to the mark.

²⁸ Taken from Colinet de Lannoys, *Mass and Songs*, ed. F. Fitch (Paris, 1999), at xvii, published too late to be in the *Catalogue*; my one departure was suggested by Fabrice Fitch in a mail of August 2020.

²⁹ Another edition, Johannes Martini, *Secular Pieces*, ed. E. G. Evans (RRMAER, 1; Madison, 1975), is taken from **RCas**, with Martini's added voice, as is the edition in B. Wilson, 'Heinrich Isaac among the Florentines', *JM* 23 (2006), 97–152, at 131–3, with extensive discussion at 133–5.

Ex. 18.4. Colinet de Lannoys, *Cela sans plus*, following BQ16, with text added to discantus from F176 and to tenor since it seemed inevitable

D
Ce - la sans plus et puis ho -

T
Ce - la sans plus et puis

Ct

6
la. Gen - te ber - gie - re bel - le de bon re -

8
ho - la. Gen - te ber - gie - re de bon re -

12
nom, Ge - tés mon cœur hors de vos - tre pri

nom, Ge - tés mon

17
son. Ce - la sans

cœur hors de vos - tre pri - son.

21
plus et puis ho - - la.

Ce - la sans plus et puis ho - la.

Confirmation of this comes from the place one would least expect, namely Johannes Martini's mass on *Cela sans plus*, which treats the tenor throughout but runs it a fourth lower than in the song, namely starting on A rather than on D; and it does so without any signature, thereby retaining the interval sequence of Ex. 18.4. And just in case we could be confused by the situation Martini clarifies it by opening the Kyrie, Gloria, and Sanctus with the riff that he had used for his 'si placet' added voice for *Cela sans plus* in RCas, also down a fourth.³⁰ Ex. 18.5 gives the opening of Martini's Kyrie.

Ex. 18.5. Martini, mass *Cela sans plus*, opening of Kyrie



The tricky question this raises concerns the edition of Obrecht's mass *Cela sans plus* in the New Obrecht Edition. As usual, the edition presents the original song, but in a plain transcription, not an edition, therefore with no flats anywhere. Similarly, the mass itself appears, following its only known source, the 'Green' choirbook of the Biblioteca Viadrina, without signatures and with scarcely any editorial flats. That simply cannot be right.³¹

What Johannes Japart did to the music, in his four-voice setting with the text incipit 'Cela sans plus ne souffi pas', has gone unnoticed. That text opening appears in all three sources (with allowance for dialectal differences) and is plainly correct for the piece. Both Brown and Atlas edited this with the given first line, the second and third lines borrowed from Colinet's piece, and the last repeating the first.³² But that seems to me misguided. Japart's every structural detail marks his music as a *response* to Colinet. As Ex. 18.6 shows, he follows

³⁰ Johannes Martini, *Masses: Part 2*, ed. E. Moohan and M. Steib (RRMAER, 35; Madison, 1999), again published too late to be reported in the *Catalogue*.

³¹ NOE13 (2013), ed. Martin Staehelin. That puzzled me at first. Then I noticed a disclaimer at the end of his commentary on the work, in a separate paragraph (p. XVII): 'With respect to the placement of accidentals . . . the editor of the present volume has different opinions than those reflected in the music published here. In the interest of uniformity of the whole New Obrecht Edition he has agreed to let his edition be adapted to the views of the General Editor.'

³² BrownF (1983), no. 108; Jean Japart, *The Collected Works*, ed. A. Atlas (Masters and Monuments of the Renaissance, 6; New York, 2012), no. 1.

Ex. 18.6. Japart, *Cela sans plus non souffi pas* (D and T only)

The musical score is written for two voices, Discantus (D) and Tenor (T), in a 4/4 time signature and the key of B-flat major (two flats). The score is divided into four systems, each starting with a measure number: 1, 8, 14, and 19. The notation includes various rhythmic values (quarter, eighth, and sixteenth notes), rests, and accidentals (sharps, flats, and naturals). The piece concludes with a double bar line at the end of the fourth system.

Colinet in almost all details: I give here only the discantus and tenor of Japart's version, so that it is clear how the pieces share their precise canonic structure and their main cadence points, while using different melodic material and inverting the canon. After the first line Japart loses a *brevis*; and in the third phrase he offers a rather more intricate (and therefore at the end, looser) canon, which deflects the foursquare patterns of the rest of the piece; but he plainly uses Colinet as a template. He may well also have been using Martini, to judge from his four-voice texture and voice-ranges; but there is not enough parallel material to be certain. His main structural idea comes directly from Colinet.