

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 chansonniers¹. 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 itself², 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 1470s³. The following list gives all the composers so far identified in Q16 with their works⁴.

Title and Number in Q16

Agricola

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

¹ Edward Pease, "A Report on Codex Q16 of the Civico Museo Bibliografico Musicale (formerly of the Conservatorio Statale di Musica 'G. B. Martini'), Bologna", *Musica Disciplina XX* (1966), p. 57-94.

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.

³ E. Motta, "Musici alla Corte degli Sforza", *Archivio Storico Lombardo XIV* (1887, ser. 2 : IV), p. 323. The document is dated 15 July, 1474.

⁴ Titles are given as in Q16. Consult Appendix I for the more usual title of those works marked with an asterisk.

Basin	Madame faictes moy, 56
Bartolomeus Bruolo	Enterpris suis, 85
Busnois	A une dame jay fait ben, 22
	Advene que advenire, 38
	Je ne demande, 50
	Ma tres souveraine princesse, 53
	Ce nest pas moy, 61
	Laysies moy, 103
	En voiant sa dame, 105
	Fortuna desperata, 114
Caron	Seden pensser, 39
	Vous nantes poient, 54
	Helas que pour devenir, 110
	* En quuque lentor, 111
Colinet de Lannoy	Cela sans plus, 42
Compère ⁵	* Dides moy, 8
	A qui diraige ma pensser, 21
Dux Burgensis	Madame trop vous, 35
M[agister] Guglielmo (Ebreo?)	La bassa castiglia, 63
Hanart	Le servitor, 90 (tenor only)
Hayne van Ghizeghem	Amours, amours, 20
	De tous biens plens, 115
Josquin Despres	* Dux Carlus, 126
Juan de Leon	Ay que non se remediarme, 121
Johannes Martini	Des biens, 1
	Hellas comment aves, 48
	La martinella, 84
J. P.	Je ne demano de vos, 80
Morton	* Lent et scolorito, 102
Ockeghem	Partez vous male bouche, 30
	* La trentanta, 86
Juan Urrede	Nunquam fo pena maior, 116
	De vos de mi chisose, 125
Vincenet	Fortuna par ti crudele, 113

Several other pieces have conflicting attributions that remain unsettled.

Ce nest pas sans, 74	Obrecht/ van Weerbecke
Cento milia escute, 127	Busnois/ Caron
* Dieu damours, 14	Ockeghem/ J. Martini/ Malcort
Le souvenir, 119	Morton/ Tinctoris
O gloriosa, 123	Jo. Tourant/ Cecus
Rose plaisant, 112	Caron/ Jo. Dusart
* Sans avoir, 93	Busnois/ Isaac

⁵ For reasons that are unclear to me, Ludwig Finscher cites Q16 as the basis for his attribution of *Sa paine pere* (no. 49) to Compère in *Loyset Compère: (c. 1450-1518) Life and Works*. American Institute of Musicology, Musicological Studies and Documents 12 (Rome: 1964), p. 51.

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 (1487, 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 century⁶. The one piece that was certainly written in the first half of the century is Bartolomeus Bruolo's *Entrepris suis* (no. 85). Its earliest source is the third fascicle of the Oxford chansonnier (Canonici 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 Pixèrecourt, 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 radically⁷, 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 Most comparable collections of the period — the Seville (Biblioteca Colombina, 5-I-43), the Pixèrecourt (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds fr., ms. 15123), and Escorial B (El Escorial, Biblioteca del Monasterio, Ms. IV.a.24) chansonniers — do include a significant number of works by Dufay. The attribution of *Partez vous male bouche* (Q16, no. 30) to Dufay in the Montecassino manuscript, Cod. 817N, is generally considered invalid. That of Pixèrecourt to Ockeghem is more plausible on grounds of style and of relative authority of the manuscripts.

⁷ Compare the figures in columns O and A in Appendix II, the Checklist of Concordances. The closer connection with *Per* (Perugia, Biblioteca Comunale, Cod. 431 (G. 20)) and *Cas* (Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, Cod. 2856), both copied in Italy, is indicative that the repertory added is, on the whole, slightly younger than the original one.

elsewhere⁸. A large number are well known from other chansonniers of the time. Such favorites as Busnois's *Fortuna desperata*, Hayne's *De tous biens pleine*, Agricola's *Sidedero somnium*, and Urrede's *Nunquam fu pena major*, all widely copied and arranged through the early 16th century, are among these later additions to the central repertory.

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 proposes⁹.

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: $\text{C} \cdot$. 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 example¹⁰. The remaining addi-

⁸ All four of these might well have some narrowly local association with Q16. *Recordare domine* (no. 130) is a brief "study piece" connected with the Latin treatise on f. 150'-152. The other three — *La rocca defermee* (no. 122), *Alla cazza* (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*.

tions seem 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 castiglya*). The intermixture of hands is summarized in the following diagram.

	<i>Numbers</i>
Marsilius (Hand A)	1-63
Hand F	64
Marsilius	65-107.
Hand C	108
Hand B	109-123 (S and T)
Hand C	123 (contra)
	124-127
Hand D	128
Hand C	129-130
Hand E	131

Two compositions inscribed in the original index do not appear in the manuscript as it now stands. *Cordes moy* (*Acordes moy* of Busnois?)¹¹ is indicated by hand *C* for folio Cxxxvj, 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?)¹² 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 fu pena major* (no. 116), but the other two *Aay que non se remediarme* (no. 121) and *De vos de mi chisose* (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, *Nos espante mi partida* (no. 87), known only from Q16¹³.

¹¹ A four voiced version of this piece is printed in *Harmonice Musices Odhecaton A*, edited by Helen Hewitt (Cambridge, Mass.: 1942), p. 290.

¹² The attribution is recorded in the Schedelsche Liederbuch (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cim 351a (Mus. ms. 3232)). Other concordances are listed by Edward Kottick, "The Chansonnier Cordiforme", *Journal of the American Musicological Society* XX (1967), p. 22, number 4 in the inventory.

¹³ The unica are *Quien es podra* (no. 66), *Avenando de mi au[ta]do* (no. 70), *Amadores sospirar* (no. 81), and *Reyne muy nobles* (no. 99). The single concordance

The Spanish ties of the codex are thus more central than Mr. Pease seems willing to acknowledge, even though their exact nature is still unclear¹⁴. 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 in 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 Naples¹⁵.

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 Q16¹⁶. 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 chanson¹⁷. 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

for number 87 is Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Magliab. XIX, 59, f. 229'-230. In two other Q16 compositions — *Per la ausencia* (no. 9) and *La taurina* (no. 19) — the incipit might be either Spanish or Italian; the given text is too brief for positive judgement.

¹⁴ MD XX, p. 59. I agree with Mr. Pease in rejecting Anglès'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: 1962), 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. Anglès, "El 'Chansonner français' de la Columbina de Sevilla", *Estudis Universitaris 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.

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 phrases¹⁸. 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.

Example 1 Loysot denisot f. 15' - 16

* change to O3 in original. $\diamond = \downarrow$

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 syncopations¹⁹.

The beginning of *Mon bien imparfait* (no. 18)²⁰ 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 taurina (no. 19) is also characterized by extended sequences and close imitation of short motives. The partwriting is better than in *Aime la*

¹⁸ 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 $\frac{2}{2}$. The triple section ending the piece should begin as a $\frac{6}{4}$.

¹⁹ The opening of J. P.'s *Je ne demano* published by Mr. Pease shows a similar rhythmic dependence between parts. The combination varies between superius and tenor (opening), superius and contratenor (m. 18-20) and tenor and contratenor (between phrases of the upper voice).

²⁰ This piece is an unicum, differing completely from the *Mon bien imparfait* in the Escorial B manuscript, f. 71'-72.

Example 2a *Aime la plus bella*

Example 2b (*Aime la plus bella*)

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 nest 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 contratenor²¹.

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 Josquin²². 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 century²³.

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 Oesterreich*, vol. 28. *Maudit soit* (p. 94-5), *Wolauß 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. 102, printed in the same series, vol. 4, p. 80), which is put by the modern editors into the category of *spielstück*. 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

²⁴ To be sure, such a conception is widely accepted. Helmuth Osthoff, for example, calls attention to extended sequences, short motives, frequent scalewise 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 tricinia” 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.

conception of what an “instrumental style” might be like²⁴; 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 music²⁵. 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 close imitations²⁶.

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 Marsilius, and is found in only three special cases among the additions²⁷. 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 texting 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

²⁵ On the ability of some 15th and 16th-century instrumentalists to read musical notation see Heinrich Bessler, “Umgangsmusik und Darbietungsmusik im 16. Jahrhundert”, *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft* XVI (1959), p. 21-43, and Howard Brown, *Music in the French Secular Theater, 1400-1550* (Cambridge, Mass.: 1963), p. 147-151.

²⁶ 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?

²⁷ The texted pieces are *Alla caza* (no. 124), a special piece of descriptive genre, text in superius only; *Recordare domine* (no. 130), the two-voiced example appended to the latin treatise, upper voice only; and *Si ch’io scendesse* (no. 64) a much later addition, probably from the 16th century. The first two lines of the strambotto are underlaid in the soprano; 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 castiglyya* (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 Canti C (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 castiglyya*, 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

Example 3 *Le servitor*

²⁸ See the essay by Manfred Bukofzer in *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Music* (New York: 1950), p. 195 ff. The piece is printed there, p. 199-200. Otto Gombosi discusses this composition along with several later polyphonic settings of the Spagna tune in *Composizione di Meser Vincenzo Capirola* (1955), p. XLI ff.

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

designated for this ensemble³⁰) by F[rancisco] de la Torre preserved in the Cancionero Musical de Palacio³¹.

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 Canti C, and is probably a popular tune³². 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 *Vostre amour*

³⁰ On the *alta* and its music see the entry "Alta" by Heinrich Bessler, *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 españole de los Siglos XV y XVI*, edited F. Asenjo y Barbieri (Buenos Aires: [1945]), no. 439.

³² Canti C, no. 92, *Une filleresse/ Vostre amour/ Sil ya compaignon/ Une filleresse*. 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*³³ 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*

♩ = ♪

Bassus

The second of these pieces, *Ile fantazies de Joskin*³⁴, 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).

³³ Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, Cod. 2856, f. 78'-80. A recent inventory of this manuscript has been published by José M^a. Llorens, "El Códice Casanatense 2.856 identificado como el Cancionero de Isabella d'Este (Ferrara), esposa de Francesco Gonzaga (Mantua)", *Anuario Musical* XX (1965) (Barcelona: 1967), p. 161-176.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 87'-88, attributed also to "Joschin" above the title.

Example 6 *Ile fantazies de Joskin*

♩ = ♪

Tenor

Bassus

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 attention³⁵. This clef is extremely rare in secular music of the 15th century; the Q16

³⁵ Mr. Pease enumerates them in his report (*MD XX*, p. 61). The titles are *Mon bien imparfait* (no. 18), *Mirando lochy de costeyi* (no. 26), *De piage core duro* (no. 47) and *Per la goula* (no. 77).

examples are in fact the only ones known to me³⁶. 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 imparfait*, 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 contratenors 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"³⁷. Tinctoris does not elaborate upon the nature of such low contratenors or specify whether they might even descend *extra manum*³⁸, 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"³⁹. Although the complete text is

³⁶ The gamma-clef is more common in sacred music and appears, among other places, in Ockeghem's five part *Missa Fors seulement* and in the *Missa a trium vocum* of Tinctoris.

³⁷ "Imos tamen contratenores semper: ac sepe reliquos: tibiaibus adjuncti tubicines: ea tuba quam superius tromponem ab Italis: et sacque-boute a gallicis appellari diximus: melodiosissime clangunt." Quoted from Karl Weinmann, *Johannes Tinctoris (1445-1511) und sein unbekannter Traktat "De Inventione et usu musicae"* (reprint by W. Fischer, 1961), p. 37. Translation after A. Baines, "Fifteenth-Century Instruments in Tinctoris's 'De Inventione et Usu Musicae'", *The Galpin Society Journal* III (March, 1950), p. 21.

³⁸ Tinctoris gives a theoretical discussion of cadences *extra manum* in his *Liber de natura et proprietate tonorum* and even writes some examples with a gamma-clef, but he does not comment on means of performance. The passage is edited in *Scriptorum de Musica Medii Aevi* IV, ed. E. Coussemaker, 1876 (reprint 1963), p. 37-39.

not extant, the musical style and the longer text incipit found in the Seville chansonnier — f. 15, *Hahu ahu apres l'escoufle* (Ho holla pursue the hawk) — establish the hunting-song nature of this piece⁴⁰. *Alla bataglia* of the Pixérécourt chansonnier may also be numbered among these descriptive chansons⁴¹. Although not strictly a hunting song, both textual and musical style are of that genre.

University of California, Berkeley

³⁹ *MD XX*, p. 63.

⁴⁰ The composition is discussed by D. Plamenac in "A Reconstruction of the French Chansonnier in the Biblioteca Colombina, Seville", *The Musical Quarterly* XXXVII (1951), p. 523, and printed there (in the Bologna Q16 version), p. 536-7. In the catalogue of musical incipits for Q16 (*MD XX*, p. 85) Mr. Pease incorrectly gives the clef of the contratenor, which is omitted by the scribe, as third-line G. It should be an alto clef.

⁴¹ Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds fr., ms. 15123, f. 8'-9.

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*).

<i>Alternate Incipit</i>	<i>Q16 Incipit</i>
A ceste derniere venue	Ceste dermen venue, 106
Amice ad quid venisti (FP)	Dictes le moy, 17
Bone dame plaisant	Jone dame plaisant, 45
Dictes moy toutes	Dictes le moy, 17
Dites moy bella (CG) or	
Dites moy toutes vos penser	Dides moy, 8
Dune belle/Coquille bobille (Dij)	Cochilie, 131
Elend (Ricc 2, Mun)	Lent et scolorito, 102
Entre Peron et Saim Quaintin	Environ la sainte valentin, 43
Fuggir non posso (Pix)	En quuque lentor, 111
Helas madame	Dux Carlus, 126
Il estoit vray	Sil estoit, 59
J'abandone	Je nabandone, 109
Jay bien haver	Jay bien et honore, 6
La stagnetta	Ce nest pas, 74
Laissez dangier'	Laysies moy, 103
Loin de vous	Jong de vous, 104
Madame helas	Dux Carlus, 126
Malheur me bat	Dieu damours, 14
Malagrata (P 676)	Sans avoir, 93
Non sia gyamay (MC)	Madame trop vous, 35
O gloriosa regina	O gloriosa domina, 123
Or est mon bien (Pix)	Madame trop, 35
Qui dieu vous (Ricc 2)	En quuque lentor, 111
Robert (P 504)	Jay bien et honore, 6
S'amours vous fui (Per 431)	Sans avoir, 93
Vive madame	Lent et scolorito, 102

APPENDIX II: CHECKLIST OF Q16 CONCORDANCES

The first column gives the *siglum* of the manuscript or print; the last column the order numbers of pieces in Q16 found in that source. An asterisk by this number means that the composition is also attributed in that source. The two central columns give the number of concordances within the main divisions of Q16 — under O the compositions in the original collection of Marsilius, under A the added pieces. The two groups are separated in the last column by a slanting bar (/).

Most of the *sigla* used here may be identified from the list given by Dragan Plamenac in "A Reconstruction of the French Chansonnier in the Biblioteca Colombina, Seville", *The Musical Quarterly* XXXVIII (1952), p. 89-91. The few additional *sigla* needed are explained below. A dagger by the *siglum* (†) indicates a source that I have not seen and for which I have therefore simply reproduced the citations of others.

This checklist is comprehensive but by no means exhaustive. Several peripheral sources that have but a single concordance with Q16 have been omitted. The purpose is primarily to give an impression of the principal connections of Q16.

ADDITIONAL SIGLA

CMP	Madrid, Biblioteca del Real Palacio, Ms. 2-I-5 (Cancionero Musical de Palacio)
Colomb	Seville, Biblioteca Colombina, Ms. 7-I-28
Cop 1848 2°	Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Ms. 1848 2°
Esc B	El Escorial, Biblioteca del Monasterio, Ms. IV.a.24
F 59	Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Magliab. XIX, 59
Heil	Heilbronn, Gymnasialbibliothek, Ms. X.2 (Bass partbook only)
Ox Can 213	Oxford University, Bodleian Library, Canonici Misc. 213
P 504	Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Réserve Vm ⁷ 504
Sev	Seville, Biblioteca Colombina, Ms. 5-1-43 and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, n.a. fr. 4379, f. 1-42'. The reconstructed manuscript has been published in facsimile, edited by D. Plamenac, <i>Facsimile Reproduction of the Manuscripts Sevilla 5-I-43 & Paris N.A. Fr. 4379 (Pt. 1)</i> . Institute of Mediaeval Music, Publications of Mediaeval Musical Manuscripts No. 8, Brooklyn, N.Y.: 1962.

CHECKLIST

<i>Sigla</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>Catalogue Number of Concordant Pieces</i>
† BM 2	0	1	114
† BM 3	0	3	114, 115, 120

<i>Sigla</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>Catalogue Number of Concordant Pieces</i>
Brux	0	1	117
Canti B	2	0	21, 42*
Canti C	1	4	90*/ 112*, 114, 116, 127
Cas	8	7	14*, 17, 20*, 21*, 42*, 56*, 84*, 86*/ 109, 110*, 112*, 115*, 117*, 123*, 127*
C.G.	10	5	1, 8, 14*, 17, 20, 22, 42*, 54, 83, 84*/ 110*, 113*, 116*, 117*, 127*
CMP	0	3	116*, 121*, 125*
Colomb	0	3	116*, 121, 125
Cop	1	2	75/ 115, 119
Cop 1848 2°	2	3	6, 8/ 115, 117, 119
Cord	2	5	44, 86/ 113, 115, 119, 120, 127
Dij	12	7	8*, 22, 37, 43, 57, 75, 86, 100, 102, 103, 105*, 106/ 110*, 115*, 119, 120, 127, 129, 131
EscB	1	1	20/ 120
F 59	15	7	1*, 6, 14*, 17*, 20, 39*, 42*, 45, 48*, 49, 50*, 54, 56, 84*, 87/ 110*, 112*, 113, 115, 117*, 120, 127*
† F 121	0	2	114, 115
F 176	2	2	42, 43/ 116, 119*
F 178	3	5	6*, 17*, 42*/ 115*, 116, 117*, 126*, 127
FP	2	6	17*, 74/ 110*, 114, 115, 117*, 120, 123
Glog	3	4	20, 84, 85/ 109, 110, 113, 127
Heil	3	0	8, 21, 74
Lab	4	4	8, 20, 22*, 105/ 110*, 115, 119, 120
MC	5	2	5, 20, 30*, 35, 100/ 108, 115
Mel	3	2	22, 86*, 104/ 113*, 115*
† Niv	1	2	103*/ 120, 131
Odh	4	7	6, 14*, 20*, 74*/ 110, 113*, 115, 116, 117, 120, 126
Ox Can 213	1	0	85*
P 504	6	1	6, 8, 14, 21, 42, 74/ 115
P 676	1	5	93*/ 110, 114, 115, 117*, 123
Pav	1	1	100/ 115*
Per	6	10	1, 20, 35*, 63*, 93*, 102*/ 108, 110, 113, 114, 115, 116*, 119, 120, 123*, 127
Pix	22	10	4, 20, 30*, 35, 38*, 39, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 51, 52, 53*, 54*, 55, 56, 61*, 84, 86, 102/ 110, 111*, 112, 113, 115, 116, 119, 120, 123, 127*
Q17	1	2	42*/ 116, 117*
Q18	1	4	14/ 110, 113, 116, 117*
Ricc 1	3	3	6, 8, 20/ 109, 115, 117
Ricc 2	3	7	39, 43, 102/ 111, 115, 116, 117, 119, 123, 126
† Seg	2	5	6*, 20*/ 110*, 114*, 116, 117*, 119*
Sev	11	8	4, 20, 33, 42, 51, 53, 54, 56, 58, 59, 84/ 108, 110, 113, 115, 120, 123, 126, 127
SG 1	1	0	14

<i>Sigla</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>Catalogue Number of Concordant Pieces</i>
SG 2	0	2	114, 117
Tor	2	0	6, 8
Tr 89	2	1	20*, 84*/ 110
Tr 91	1	1	84/ 123
Ver	2	7	6*, 84/ 110, 113, 116, 117, 123, 126, 127
† WW	1	0	42
Wolf	3	5	35, 43, 75/ 110, 115, 119, 120, 127
† Zw	2	1	6*, 74*/ 126*