ADDITIONAL NOTES ON THE 15th- CENTURY CHANSONNIER
BOLOGNA Q16

SARAH FULLER

The report of Edward Pease on the codex Bologna Q16, published in Musica Disciplina XX (1966), is a welcome addition to the literature on 15th-century chansonniers. Mr. Pease recounts the history of the manuscript since its residence in the library of Padre Martini and surveys the rather sparse accounts of the manuscript hitherto available. For the first time, he provides a detailed physical description of the manuscript and an accurate inventory of its contents, giving both textual and musical incipits. He stresses in particular the Italian aspects of the codex and the importance of its substantial repertory of Italian pieces for an understanding of native music in 15th-century Italy. The following remarks are offered to supplement Mr. Pease’s introduction to the manuscript.

Even though (as Mr. Pease points out) no ascriptions beyond a cryptic J. P. are offered in Q16 itself, concordances supply attributions for thirty-six of the one hundred thirty pieces in the collection. Busnois stands out as a favored composer with eight chansons. Next in order of representation are Caron, Agricola, and Johannes Martini — the latter two colleagues of Compère and Josquin as cantori di capella at the court of Milan in the mid 1470s. The following list gives all the composers so far identified in Q16 with their works.

Title and Number in Q16

Agricola

* Joy bien et honore, 6
* Dictes le moy, 17
Sidedero sonnum, 117


2 The identity of J. P. has not been established. Jehan Pullois or Johannes Prioris, both of whom worked in Italy during the second half of the 15th century, are likely candidates.


4 Titles are given as in Q16. Consult Appendix I for the more usual title of those works marked with an asterisk.
Several other pieces have conflicting attributions that remain unsettled.

From the attributions, one can reasonably conclude that the repertory of Q16 is concentrated on works written from about 1460-1490. The composers represented are predominately of the post-Dufay generation, men active in the middle decades of the second half of the 15th century. The cut-off point of about 1490 seems appropriate not only because of the fixed terminus ad quem of the main collection (1497, the year in which the principal scribe, Domenicus Marsilius, completed his work), but also because only one piece, and it among the later additions, can be assigned to Josquin. The earlier boundary is suggested from the absence of works by either Dufay or Binchois, an unusual occurrence in view of the continuing circulation of works by Dufay through the last decades of the century. The one piece that was certainly written in the first half of the century is Bartolomeus Brulo’s Entrepris suis (no. 85). Its earliest source is the third fascicle of the Oxford chansonnier (Cannonici Misc. 213, in the Bodleian Library), a section that is usually dated about 1440.

Slightly over half (56) of the compositions in Marsilius’s original collection of one hundred seven pieces appear to be unica. The checklist of concordances in Appendix II indicates the distribution of this original repertory in several chansonniers of the 15th and early 16th centuries. The concentration of concordances in the Pixerecourt, Florence 59 (Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Magliab. XIX, 59), Dijon (Bibliothèque publique, Ms. 517) and Seville manuscripts is noteworthy since all but Dijon are of Italian provenance.

The group of added pieces (nos. 108-131) shows a quite different relationship to the late 15th-century secular repertory. It is not that the proportion of concordances in particular sources changes radically, but rather that the total density of concordances is much increased within this group. Only four pieces among these additions have not been located.

6 For reasons that are unclear to me, Ludwig Finscher cites Q16 as the basis for his attribution of Sa pame pere (no. 49) to Compère in Laiset Compère: (c. 1450-1530) Life and Works. American Institute of Musicology, Musicological Studies and Documents 12 (Rome: 1964), p.51.
The enlargement of the collection was apparently done not haphazardly, but with a particular view toward enriching the original repertory with some of the most popular pieces of the day. The fact that the additions form an organic extension of the main collection leads one to suspect that the manuscript remained in its original milieu — perhaps actually in use — after Marsilius completed the main corpus. Even though the slight inclination to four-voice arrangements (6 of 23 added pieces) reflects a taste more modern than that of Marsilius, it seems most likely from the nature of the repertory that the main additions were made within the decade after 1487, rather than after 1500 as Mr. Pease proposes.

It should be noted that not just one but two scribes were important for the additions. After Marsilius ended his collection with a firm "finis" at the bottom of f. 127, a second scribe, B, contributed nos. 109-122 and the superius and tenor of no. 123. B's work was apparently interrupted in midstream, for yet another scribe, C, completed no. 123 with the contra, added nos. 124-127 and no. 129, and inserted no. 108 on the single blank folio between the additions of B and the main collection. Characteristic of his hand are diamond-shaped notes slightly larger than those of B and a central dot in the C of this foliation: C. He includes the first letter of the incipit in the superius voice while B typically omits it, anticipating an elaborate calligraphic initial as is provided in nos. 111 and 117. The stylized lettering of the Latin treatise, f. 150'-152, forestalls critical comparison of that hand with the more cursive style of the text incipits, but it was probably written by C along with Recordare domine (no. 130) which follows the treatise in the manner of an example. The remaining addi-

8 All four of these might well have some narrowly local association with Q16. Recordare domine (no.130) is a brief "truly piece" connected with the Latin treatise on f. 150'-152. The other three — La rocca deforme (no.122), Alia cassa (no.124) and Con gran disdigno (no.128) — all have Italian text incipits.
9 MD XX, p. 60.
10 Recordare domine was entered by C in the original index, but the Roman foliation figures of the page on which the treatise stands differ from his usual style and seem to have been supplied later, perhaps by hand E.

11 A four-voiced version of this piece is printed in Harmonices Musices Odhecaton A, edited by Helen Hewitt (Cambridge, Mass.: 1942), p. 280.
12 The attribution is recorded in the Schedelsche Liederbuch (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 351a [Ms. ms. 3232]). Other concordances are listed by Edward Kostick, "The Chansonnier Cordiforme", Journal of the American Musicological Society XX (1967), p. 92, number 4 in the inventory.
13 The unica are Quien es poeta (no.66), Asenando de mi au[se]do (no.70), Amadores sospirar (no.81), and Hayne muy nobles (no.99). The single concordance of these songs seems due to passing interpolators who can be designated as hand D (no.128), hand E (no.131), and hand F (who added no.64 within the first section of the manuscript on the staves left blank under the tenor of La bassa ostingula). The intermixture of hands is summarized in the following diagram.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Marsilius (Hand A)</th>
<th>Hand F</th>
<th>Hand G</th>
<th>Hand B</th>
<th>Hand C</th>
<th>Hand D</th>
<th>Hand C</th>
<th>Hand E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65-107</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>109-123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>129-130</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two compositions inscribed in the original index do not appear in the manuscript as it now stands. Cordes moy (Acordes moy of Busnois?) is indicated by hand C for folio Cxxvii, but at present Cochilie (no.131) stands on that opening. This chanson is the contribution of hand E and is not indexed. Gentil madonna (the Bedingham setting?) is recorded under G in the index, but is followed by no folio number. It is probable that scribe C intended to continue the collection with these pieces but was unable to do so.

The principal additions (of B and C) include three songs that appear also in the great contemporary Spanish collections, the Cancionero Musical de Palacio and the Colombina Cancionero. One of these songs is Urrede's widely circulated Nunquam tu pena major (no.116), but the other two Aay que non se remediar meno (no.121) and De vos en mi chisme (no.125) are known only from Spanish sources and Q16. This Spanish coloring is not, however, peculiar to the added section of Q16. Spanish incipits distinguish at least five songs from the main corpus, all but one of them, Noi espante mi partida (no.87), known only from Q16.
The Spanish ties of the codex are thus more central than Mr. Pease seems willing to acknowledge, even though their exact nature is still unclear.\(^{14}\) Probably Q16 was compiled in an Italian milieu under pronounced Spanish influence. The Papal court, dominated by the circle of Rodrigo Borgia (the future Alexander VI), and the Aragonese court at Naples stand out as the most likely possibilities. Either of these conjectures fits well with the unusual inclusion of a mass a 3 on L’homme armé (no. 91) in Q16. Masses on this tenor appear to have been particularly cultivated both at the Papal court and at Naples.\(^{15}\)

In the search for national idioms and for native roots of the Italian madrigal, scholars have tended to stress the significance of the compositions with Spanish and Italian texts in Q16.\(^{16}\) These are the songs most likely to have been written by non-French musicians and to reflect local practices and tastes. Study of them may open new vistas on musical influences between Spain and Italy and disclose 15th-century secular styles that were relatively independent of the ubiquitous French chanson.\(^{17}\) This Spanish-Italian group of compositions indeed promises considerable cultural and musical interest. Yet there is in Q16 another handful of compositions that stand out intrinsically as a special stylistic group, and that may be more significant for stylistic currents of the later 15th century. In the absence of distinctive external signs such as language or number of parts, it is difficult to categorize these compositions by any simple formula. As a group, they differ most basically from typical chansons of the 1480s in essentials of musical organization. Their shape is controlled by immediate repetitions of phrases or of short well-profiled motives. Formal outlines are defined through the succession of detail rather than depending on large sectional repetitions of poetic forms. These pieces tend to yield readily — almost too readily — to schematic diagrams of structure, framed without reference to poetic form.

An archetype for this stylistic group may be established in Loysot denisot (no. 7). This composition is generated through a series of phrases repeated alternately between tenor and superius (Ex. 1). Only at the two main cadences does the pattern break — and there with telling effect. Although the systematic alternation could become monotonous, musical interest is sustained by fanciful irregularities in the length and metric placement of the shortwinded phrases.\(^{18}\) In the second half, the superius pre-empts the lead from the tenor, and interchanged duets briefly replace alternation of two and three-voiced texture.

---

\(^{14}\) MD XX, p. 59. I agree with Mr. Pease in rejecting Angle’s hypothesis that Q16 was copied either in Spain or by a Spanish scribe working in Italy.\(^{15}\) See Helmuth Osthoff, Josquin Desprez I (Tutzing: 1982), p. 156, and Gustave Reese, Music in the Renaissance (New York: 1954), p. 149-150.\(^{16}\) The Italian side of the problem has been most succinctly expressed as "Il segreto del quattrocento" in the study of that title by Fausto Torrefranca (Milan: 1939).\(^{17}\) See the remarks of E. Pease, MD XX, p. 62-63 and of H. Angle, "El 'Chan­sonner français' de la Columbina de Sevilla", Estudios Universitarios Catalans XIV (1929), p. 253. Whether the Spanish and the Italian text pieces do in fact show special stylistic traits is a matter that has not yet been satisfactorily investigated.
The formulaic quality of Loysot denisot is intensified by a conspicuous economy of musical ideas. The syncopated rhythm first heard at the end of the first phrase subsequently pervades the texture. The ascending dotted-rhythm figure used as the cadence of the second distinct phrase becomes the principal motive of the second section (after the fermata). The contrapuntal style is simple and has a marked improvisatory quality. The voices are coupled rhythmically to an extreme degree; they proceed largely in parallel thirds and sixths relieved by easy suspensions and syncopations.

The beginning of Mon bien imparfait (no. 18) shows a constructivist bent similar to that in Loysot denisot. For the first twelve measures, duets systematically alternate with three-voiced writing. After the opening exchange, the superius exactly echoes the preceding tenor phrase at the fifth and then at the octave. Though this process is not sustained after the first three phrases (about one-third of the entire piece), such interchange of phrases is used to articulate the two main sectional divisions following, the last one a lively passage in triple rhythm.

The tendency toward reiterative patterns crops out on a different level in a predilection for sequential writing and closely packed imitation of short motives. Repetitive and sequential phrases take up the largest part of Aime la plus bella (no. 15), even though the piece opens with a broad imitative texture typical of a Busnois chanson. Motivic patterns are pursued even to the detriment of contrapuntal detail in this piece. The crowded imitation in m. 16-18 is pressed upwards despite the awkward clash between superius and contra every second and fourth semibreve (Ex. 2a). In the approach to the final cadence, parallel octaves are scarcely disguised by the motivic activity of the upper voice (Ex. 2b).

La taurine (no. 19) is also characterized by extended sequences and close imitation of short motives. The partwriting is better than in Aime la plus bella. Though this rhythmic flexibility presents considerable difficulties for modern transcription. In my version of Loysot denisot (Ex. 1), I have tried to make the large phrases clear by full bar lines through the score. The basic units within these are shown by the Mensur-Strich which usually marks off groups of two, but sometimes three, semibreves (original value). The piece should be played at the beginning as though in modern ~. The triple section ending the piece should begin as a ¼.

20 This piece is an unicum, differing completely from the Mon bien imparfait in the Escorial B manuscript, f. 71v-72.
plus bella, but at the expense of a more angular contratenor that is less integrated motivically with the other two voices. For the most part, contratenors that very nearly equal the other voices in melodic and rhythmic interest are characteristic of this special group of pieces — a side effect, apparently, of the overall concern for formal clarity. Within the broad currents of 15th-century stylistic development, such contratenors are a progressive feature; they draw these pieces toward a thoroughly imitative style that by the turn of the century has become common property. The impression of rather old-fashioned style created by the angular contratenor of *La taurina* is further intensified by the under-third cadences which persist throughout the piece.

Both phrase repetition and sequential passages engaging the contratenor are combined in *Ce n’est pas* (*ansi*) (no. 74). This composition opens with a static interchange of phrases between superius and tenor (such as that in *Loysot denisot*), but eventually reaches an impressive climax in an energetic sequential dialogue between superius and contratenor 25.

Compositional procedures of the kind just described are by no means confined to pieces in Q16. The same preoccupation with closely imitative sequential writing and schematic devices is encountered in certain works of Isaac, in a portion of the *Odhecaton* repertory, and in many pieces by Josquin 22. His *Cela sans plus* and *La bernadina* offer particularly close parallels to this special group of Q16 compositions. Yet, judging from the composers identified in Q16, the anonymous pieces in this manuscript were probably written earlier than the similar works of Isaac and Josquin and may indeed be regarded as their forerunners. In addition to probable chronological succession, the geographical situation is worth noting — Q16 copied in Italy, Isaac and Josquin working in Italy during the last decades of the century, Petrucci an Italian publisher. Perhaps it is in compositions of this special stylistic idiom, as much as in those with Italian text, that an “Italian manner” of the 15th century may be discovered.

Even aside from such speculations, we are faced with the question of how to explain this idiom. What are its roots, and where might it lead stylistically? Precedents are scarcely to be found. One earlier composition that does exhibit similar techniques is, however, furnished by Q16 itself in *Entrepris suis* (no. 85). Although the superius and portions of the tenor are texted in Canonici Misc. 213, a good three-fifths of the piece is taken up in long untexted melismas that abound in sequential imitation of terse motives. The large formal outlines of the piece are clarified through the recurring repeated-note figure that begins every phrase, usually imitated between superius and tenor. Without text, *Entrepris suis* could easily be taken for a piece of “abstract” instrumental music. Like many vocal pieces, it was apparently used as such in the later 15th century 23.

21 *Ce n’est pas* is printed under its more usual title of *La sangetta* in Harmonice Musices Odhecaton A, ed. H. Hewitt, p. 325-326.

22 The compositions by Isaac are printed in the Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich, vol. 28. *Maudit soit* (p. 94-5); *Wolauff gut gesell von hinnen* (p. 110) and a piece “sine nomine” (p. 119) deserve particular attention. To my knowledge none of these are texted in any source. Helen Hewitt discusses the *Odhecaton* pieces of this type under the category of “instrumental tricinia” (p. 74-78).

23 Besides Q16 and Canonici Misc. 213, this piece survives in two German sources, in both probably intended for instrumental performance. The Buxheim Orgelbuch preserves a predominately two-voiced intabulation (printed in Das Erbe Deutscher Musik, vol. 38, no. 106); the Glogauer Liederbuch has an untexted version, *Der Entrepris* (no. 191, printed in the same series, vol. 4, p. 80), which is put by the modern editors into the category of spielenick. In addition, *Entrepris suis* appears with the Contrafactum text *Congratulamini michi omnes* in Prague, Strahov Monastery, D.G. IV. 47.
Entrepris suis shows that some features of the special stylistic group in Q16 were not without precedent in written art music; but Entrepris stands out as an isolated example. Furthermore, rather than providing a model (from our point of view) for the Q16 group, the relationship is probably just the reverse. Distinctive as the one known early 15th-century composition in Q16, Entrepris suis may well have survived in this collection precisely because of its kinship to the compositions of special formal design.

Evidently, clues to possible influences on this idiom, or to its origins, must be sought outside the repertory preserved in chansonniers of the mid-15th century. Among possible conjectures, the theory that the idiom may be an instrumental one, that these unusual pieces may have been conceived for instrumental performance, seems the most plausible. The dogged repetitions of phrases and the sequences, which impart clear shape and direction to individual phrases, perform a formal function that in vocal pieces of the time is largely served by text. From a modern point of view, the quick cross-currents of motives in the sequential passages appear particularly suited to instrumental performance. To be clear, such texture requires a high degree of sharp, precise articulation in all parts. In the schematic designs, one may also read signs of improvisational practices typical of any century. Such signs are multiplied in the propensity for intervallic parallelisms that extend even to untoward successions of perfect intervals. The characteristic irregular rhythmic groupings that in orthodox modern transcription require frequent changes of metric signature may also betray habits of instrumental improvisation.

In view of such considerations, it is indeed tempting to propose that these pieces were written for instruments—even to claim that Q16 represents an instrumental repertory of the late 15th century, a repertory consisting of vocal pieces, arrangements of pre-existent tunes, and compositions conceived originally for instrumental performance. Yet such an hypothesis must be tempered: first, by the realization that it is based on a modern conception of what an “instrumental style” might be like; second, by the fact that our actual knowledge of 15th-century instrumental style is extremely limited, gleaned as it is more from accounts of performances than from written music. Furthermore, such schematic devices, while perhaps idiomatic to a developing instrumental practice, need not be confined to it. To cite but one conspicuous case, masses of Josquin (which are surely vocal) composed in the late 1480s and 90s show a marked pre-occupation with sequence, ostinato, and closeimitations.

Even though the argument from internal characteristics is inconclusive, a few suggestive external details offer some support for the theory that Q16 represents an instrumental repertory. Least conclusive, but still significant, is the fact that text is provided for none of the compositions in the central collection of Marsilis, and is found in only three special cases among the additions. To be sure, consistent provision of text is rare in 15th-century chansonniers, and is limited largely to carefully prepared presentation copies. But consistent lack of text appears equally unusual. For instance, both the Escorial B and the Seville chansonniers, which share with Q16 the nature of large collections compiled in Italy in the late 15th century, contain a number of texted pieces, particularly Italian ones. The determining factor is clearly not care in planning the collection, for both Escorial B and Seville show signs of being compiled rather more erratically than Q16. The Casanatense manuscript, on the other hand, resembles Q16 in having no texts beyond brief incipits, but it, too, may preserve a number of compositions written for instruments (see below).

As to other purpose for Q16 itself, lack of decoration argues against

94 To be sure, such a conception is widely accepted. Helmuth Osthoff, for example, calls attention to extended sequences, short motives, frequent scaliswise motion and rhythmic irregularity as characteristic in works by Josquin that he supposes to be instrumental (Josquin Desprez II, p. 231-238). Helen Hewitt notes similar traits in the "instrumental trios" of the Odhecaton (see above, note 22). On the other hand, some observers tend to be more cautious in identifying instrumental idiom, as can be deduced by comparing Howard Brown's list of pieces in the Odhecaton "almost certainly originally conceived for instruments" (Instrumental Music Printed Before 1600 (Cambridge, Mass.: 1965), p. 10) with the number suggested by Hewitt.


96 For example, the masses Faisant regretz, La sol fa re mi, and L'homme armé super voces musicales. For a basically sound chronology of these works, see H. Osthoff, Josquin Desprez I, especially p. 156 ff. The masses seem to postdate the Q16 repertory, though perhaps by only a few years. Might the stylistic process involve an assimilation of instrumental idioms into vocal music?

97 The textual pieces are Alia causa (no. 124), a special piece of descriptive genre, text in superius only; Recorder domine (no. 130), the two-voiced example appended to the latin treatise, upper voice only; and Si celio scendere (no. 84) a much later addition, probably from the 16th century. The first two lines of the strambotto are underlaid in the transcript; the complete text is supplied underneath the bass.
the possibility that the manuscript was compiled principally for ceremonial or ornamental purposes. This impression is strengthened by the manner and nature of the primary additions which suggest that the repertory was actually being assembled for use.

Searching for more positive indications, we find in Q16 at least two pieces that undoubtedly stem from a tradition of instrumental arrangements and improvised performance. *La bassa castiglyea* (no. 63) is well known as the earliest extant polyphonic version of a *basse dance* 28. The tune (elsewhere labelled *La Spagna*) is stated in the tenor in long note values while the superius spins out a decorative, somewhat repetitious discantus above. The second (no. 90), also a duo, is an arrangement of the upper voice of Dufay's (?) *Le servitor* 29; the newly composed tenor is attributed to Hanart in *Cantigas de Cänti G* (no. 137). The style of this arrangement, with a slower moving cantus profiled against an active, florid line, is close to that of *La bassa castiglyea*, as can readily be seen from the opening measures (Ex. 3). The case for instrumental performance is strengthened by the stylistic similarity of these two works with the three-voice piece for *alta* (apparently the sole extant example of 15th-century music specifically designated for this ensemble 30) by F[ancisco] de la Torre preserved in the Cancionero Musical de Palacio 31.

*Vostre amour* (no. 3) may also belong to this group of instrumental arrangements of a pre-existent tune. The repetitive melody in the superius appears texted and with more abbreviated cadential formulas as the tenor of a quodlibet in *Cantigas de Cänti G*, and is probably a popular tune 32. The voice designated *Tenor* frequently crosses above the superius and is considerably more ornate. The mechanical sequence that animates the first and final cadences brings this piece stylistically within the idiom that I take to be instrumental as do the parallel fifths (but slightly decorated) imbedded within it (Ex. 4).

Example 4

```
Example 3 Le servitor
```


29 Besseler has rejected the Dufay attribution of the popular three-voiced setting provided in the Montecassino manuscript (*Guilemi Dufay. Opera Omnia. Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae* 1: VI, p. XIV).

30 On the alta and its music see the entry "Alta" by Heinrich Beuser, *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* I, col. 378-379. Keith Polk discusses the alta and its practices at more length in "Improvisation and Instrumental Music in the Late Middle Ages", a dissertation in progress at the University of California, Berkeley.

31 Madrid, Biblioteca del Real Palacio, Ms. 2-I-5, f. 223. The tenor is the *basse dance known as the Re di Spagna*. The composition is printed in *Cancionero Musical español de los Siglos XV y XVI*, edited F. Añón y Barrientes (Buenos Aires: [1945]), no. 439.

32 Cantu G, no. 92, *Une fileressera/ Vostre amouer/ Si la compagnon/ Une filere*<ref>

The melody also closely resembles the popular tune *Adieu mes amours a dieu vous command* incorporated in Josquin's *Adieu mes amours on m'attent*, but since the middle phrases of that tune do not appear in *Vostre amour*, the question of actual relationship must be left open.
Two pieces from the Casanatense chansonnier may also furnish some tangible conception of a contemporary instrumental style, for the abstract titles of both suggest instrumental far more than vocal intent. Johannes Martini's *Fuge la morie* incorporates many of the compositional procedures observed in the Q16 pieces discussed above, but the repetitive, formulaic construction of its bass exceeds any standard of schematic design set in Q16 (Ex. 5). The common device of repeating phrases in alternation is telescoped by Martini into a phrase of canon between superius and tenor at the beginning of both first and second partes. For the remainder of each section, the patterned bass assumes the leading role. The *secunda pars* is essentially a composite of fragmentary sequences.

Example 5  
*Fuge la morie, prima pars*

The second of these pieces, *Ile fantazies de Joskin*, is less neat in design, more retrospective in style. Tenor and superius still form a distinct two-voice framework and carry the main motives while the *contrabassus* is subsidiary motivically and contrapuntally, even to the extent of an archaic octave leap in the first and final cadences. The rather dull, repetitive lines, facile parallel counterpoint, and frequent sequences recall the idiom of *Aime la plus bella* and *La taurina*. Parallel triads within the first sequence belie the skilled composer (Ex. 6).

The close resemblance between the basic techniques of the special group of compositions in Q16 and these two pieces in the Casanatense manuscript is striking. Clearly both groups share a common stylistic idiom, one that differs in general rhythmic, motivic, and contrapuntal procedures from the typical chanson idiom developing between 1460-1490. That this style may be intimately connected with instrumental performance, and that it may take its roots in contemporary instrumental improvisation, is a more conjectural claim, requiring firmer support than is presently available. Detailed study of 15th-century instrumental ensembles, improvisational practices, and compositions written in this "peripheral" style will be necessary in order to reach more certain conclusions.

Since the question of performance medium is of considerable importance to Q16, the gamma-clef compositions claim particular attention. This clef is extremely rare in secular music of the 15th century; the Q16

---

33 Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, Cod. 2856, f. 78'-80. A recent inventory of this manuscript has been published by José M. Llorens, "El Códice Casanatense 2856 identificado como el Cancionero de Isabella d'Este (Ferrara), esposa de Francesco Gonzaga (Manual)", *Anuario Musical* XX (1965), (Barcelona: 1967), p. 161-176.

34 *Ibid.*, f. 87'-88, attributed also to "Joschin" above the title.
examples are in fact the only ones known to me. These pieces, all unica, stand apart from the usual chanson repertory in other respects. Three have Italian text incipits, and so may well have some quite local connection with Q16. The one with French incipit, _Mon bien in parfait_, is one of the pieces with "instrumental" characteristics. All four lie in a predominantly low range, both upper voices being easily accommodated on a staff with modern bass clef. The contra tenors descend as far as a fifth (in one instance a major sixth) below gamma.

If the repertory of Q16 is indeed instrumental, how might such low ranges have been realized in contemporary instrumental ensembles? A hint of one possible means can be gleaned from Tinctoris's fragmentary treatise _De inventione et usu musicae_. In considering ensembles of shawms (called in contemporary usage the _alta_), Tinctoris states: "But always for the lowest contratenor parts and often for others, brasses are added to shawms. These brass instruments — which, as was said above, are called _trompone_ in Italy and _sacque boute_ in France — sound very beautiful." Tinctoris does not elaborate upon the nature of such low contratenors or specify whether they might even descend _extra manum_, but his remarks at least show an awareness of the instrumental resources needed to perform low contratenor parts, and indicate their presence within one standard type of ensemble. While the total range of the gamma-clef compositions in Q16 would not be suited to the _alta_, they could perhaps have been played by a group of _trompone_ or by _trompone_ and _bombards_ (not necessarily at modern standard pitch), or by a trio of low viols.

As a final addition to Mr. Pease's remarks, the chanson _Hau haula_ (no. 58) should be added to his list of "rare examples of the late-fifteenth century type of caccia or hunting song." Although the complete text is not extant, the musical style and the longer text incipit found in the Seville chansonnier — _I. 15, Hahu ahu apres l'escoffe:_ (Ho holla pursue the hawk) — establish the hunting-song nature of this piece. _Alta bataglia_ of the Pixércourt chansonnier may also be numbered among these descriptive chansons. Although not strictly a hunting song, both textual and musical style are of that genre.

University of California, Berkeley
APPENDIX I: ALTERNATE TEXT INCIPITS

A significant number of pieces in Q16 bear textual incipits different from those common in other sources. The following alternate incipits added to Mr. Pease’s alphabetical index (MD XX, p. 78-81) ease the problem of locating concordances. The wording of some of these alternate titles represents a consensus I have drawn from the concordances. I have standardized the spelling to a limited extent since this list is purely for purposes of cross-checking.

When a title is special to one manuscript, its siglum is given in parentheses (See Appendix II for identification of sigla).

---

Alternate Incipit

A ceste derniere venue
Amice ad quid venisti (FP)
Bone dame plaisant
Dictes moy toutes
Dites moy bella (CG) or
Dites moy toutes us penser
Dune belle/Coquille bobille (Dij)
El en d (Rice 2, Mun)
Entre Peron et Saim Quaintin
Fuggir non posso (Pix)
Helas madame
I estoit vray
Jay bien haver
La stagnetta
Laissez dangler’
Loix de vous
Madame helas
Malheur me bat
Malagrata (P 676)
Non sia g Yamay (MC)
O gloriosa regina
Or est mon bien (Pix)
Qui dieu vous (Ricc 2)
Robert (P 504)
S’amours vous fui (Per 431)
Vive madame

Q16 Incipit

Ceste derniere venue, 106
Dictes le moy, 17
Jene dame plaisant, 45
Dictes le moy, 17
Dides moy, 8
Cochilie, 131
Lent et scolorito, 102
Environ la sainte valentin, 43
En quipe lenteur, 111
Dux Carlus, 126
Sio estoit, 59
Je nabandone, 109
Jay bien et honore, 6
Ce n’est pas, 74
Laylayes moy, 103
Dux Carlus, 126
Dieu damous, 14
Sans avoir, 93
Madame trop vous, 35
O gloriosa dominia, 123
Madame trop, 35
En quique lenteur, 111
Jay bien et honore, 6
Sans avoir, 93
Lent et scolorito, 102
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sigla</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brux</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canti B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canti C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.G.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colomb</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gop 1848 2*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cord</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dij</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EscB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 121</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 176</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 178</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glog</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hei</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odh</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox Can 213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 594</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 676</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pav</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricc 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricc 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>