

Filargo, 1409/10 Papst Alexander V., sind bekannt⁷⁰. Die geringe Verbreitung von Matheus' Werken wäre dann dadurch zu erklären, daß diese, aus welchen Gründen auch immer und im Gegensatz zu denen des Zacharias, nicht zum Konstanzer Repertoire gehörten.

Schließlich ist noch ein Name zu nennen: Egardus⁷¹. Wenn auch von ihm bisher nur zwei Glorias erhalten sind, so fällt doch deren stilistische Verschiedenheit auf. Während eines der beiden Stücke, im Kodex *Modena* überliefert, Volltextierung und Simultanstil mit einigen knappen Imitationen aufweist⁷², zeigt das andere, auf Grund dreier Fragmente rekonstruierbar, eine in allen drei Stimmen durchgeführte Isorhythmie, wobei die beiden Oberstimmen (nicht aber der Tenor) textiert sind⁷³. Das als eine Art von Motette vertonte „Furnos reliquisti“ aus *Modena* wiederum ist satztechnisch eine italienische Caccia mit textiertem Tenor⁷⁴. Diese Strukturverschiedenheiten bei Egardus hängen vermutlich damit zusammen, daß Egardus sowohl diesseits wie auch jenseits der Alpen tätig war.

Die Analysen der genannten Werke von Zacharias, Matheus und Egardus zeigen, daß Oberitalien und insbesondere der Kreis um die Päpste Alexander V. und Johannes XXIII. um 1410 Schmelztiegel verschiedener Stile gewesen sind. Eine Erklärung hierfür mag nicht nur im kulturell-künstlerischen Interesse dieser Päpste, sondern nicht zuletzt auch darin gefunden werden, daß nicht nur große Teile Italiens (Florenz!) und Frankreichs, sondern auch Savoyen und England deren Obödienz folgten. Verantwortlich aber für die große Verbreitung der Werke des Zacharias, aber auch derjenigen von Ciconia und Egardus bis hin nach Polen war mit größter Wahrscheinlichkeit das internationale Treffen von Klerikern und Musikern anläßlich des Konzils von Konstanz.

Erlenbach
Schweiz

⁷⁰ Vgl. die oben in Anm. 4 genannte Arbeit von Günther, 23 f.

⁷¹ Zu Egardus vgl. R. Strohm, *Music in Late Medieval Bruges*, Oxford Univ. Press 1984, passim (unter Ecghaerd).

⁷² Ediert in PMFC XII, Nr. 7.

⁷³ HSS *I-Pu 1225 u. 1475, NL-Uu 1845 (olim 37)*; vollständig rekonstruierte Fassung in PMFC XIII, Nr. 18.

⁷⁴ PMFC XIII, Nr. 48 und CMM 53, vol. 3, 194 ff.

A CONTEMPORARY PERCEPTION OF EARLY FIFTEENTH-CENTURY STYLE; BOLOGNA Q15 AS A DOCUMENT OF SCRIBAL EDITORIAL INITIATIVE

Margaret Bent

This paper seeks to contribute to, perhaps to complicate, the question of international style in music c.1400. It is intended in part as a corrective to the widely held assumption that modern scores necessarily provide primary access to music for purposes of stylistic investigation. Modern editions are translated interpretations, however neutral they claim to be. Even the contemporary copies on which those editions are based may embody considerable editorial activity. Only when we have informed ourselves as fully as possible about the specific initiatives that contemporary scribes exercised upon their material can we begin to relate the style of the music they copied to the intentions of its composers.

It makes little sense to consider French and Italian music of the early fifteenth century separately. Some idiosyncrasies of transmission, however, may have led us towards the consensus of an international style when they are more homogenising in effect than in intent. Music carries within its written transmission substantial possibilities for scribal interpretation, change, and indeed "criticism"; we may be dependent on the same document both for unique knowledge of a particular piece of music and, at the same time, for knowledge of its contemporary reception. In a period almost entirely without autographs, the gradual building-up from experience of bases for judgment on such matters is inevitably hard to make scientific. The manuscript Bologna, Civico Museo Bibliografico Musicale Q15 (hereafter Q15) offers documentation of discarding and change, reflecting a wide range of deliberate choices by its scribe. Erasures in manuscripts sometimes give us evidence of local revision, but I know of no case that yields such rich overall documentation as this manuscript.¹

¹ This paper presents in summary form some of the more important inferences about Q15 that are relevant to this discussion of style. They will be documented in my study of the manuscript, now in preparation. A published inventory of Q15 is in G. de Van, "Inventory of Manuscript Bologna Liceo Musicale, Q15 (olim 37)" *Musica Disciplina* II (1948): 231-257.

Table I summarises the contents and structure of the manuscript. A gathering that is listed as originating at stage I, II or III does not mean that all folios in that gathering date from that stage.

The music manuscripts referred to in this paper are (by sigla):

Ao: Aosta, Biblioteca del Seminario, MS A¹D19

Sometimes it can be demonstrated that a piece was available to a scribe but that he chose not to reproduce it. The repertory selected by a particular compiler, aggravated by accidents of survival, often colours our view of what was being composed at any time or place. We do not always have evidence that enables us to come as close as we can in the case of Q15 to assessing a scribal compiler's freedom of choice. Faced with a clean manuscript which is not part of a known scribal, stemmatic or institutional complex, and which exhibits no evidence of change, we cannot know whether the scribe selected pieces, or simply copied all that was available to him. The Q15 scribe excludes much of the Paduan repertory of the first decade of the century and earlier, excepting only works by Ciconia. His interest in Italian ceremonial motets by Ciconia did not extend to other motets for earlier doges and luminaries; this is why Ciconia's motets appear so isolated and can only now begin to be placed in the context of an Italian motet tradition reconstructed from fragments.² Graziosus de Padua, known from PadA, is not represented in Q15; the anonymous *O Maria* is one of very few motets appearing both in what remains of the Padua fragments and in Q15.³ Because Q15 is the sole source for much of the music it contains (notably including motets and mass movements of Ciconia and early works of Dufay), and because its versions are on the whole viable and seem accurate in pitch and rhythm, there is a danger of giving them *Urtext* status without paying sufficient

- Ven: Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana 7554, MS it.cl.IX.145
 PadA: Padua, Biblioteca Universitaria, MSS 684, 1475; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Canonici pat. lat. 229
 PadD: Padua, Biblioteca Universitaria, MSS 1106, 1225, 1283
 Q15: Bologna, Civico Museo Bibliografico Musicale, MS Q15
 Ox: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Canonici misc. 213
 OH: Old Hall Manuscript, London, British Library MS Add. 57950
 H6: Henry VI Choirbook (see Margaret Bent, "The Progeny of Old Hall: More Leaves from a Royal English choirbook", *Gordon Anthol Anderson, In Memoriam* (Institute of Medieval Music, 1984): 1-54.
 Q1: Bologna, Civico Museo Bibliografico Musicale, MS Q1
 Tr: Trent, Castello del Buon Consiglio MSS 87-93
 MuEm: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14274 (olim Mus MS 3232a)
 BU: Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, MS 2216

² See note 14.

³ Egardus is also absent, although he is represented in the Padua fragments; his music travelled to Poland from the Veneto with that of Ciconia and Zacar. His northern affiliations have now been corroborated by Reinhard Strohm, *Music in Late Medieval Bruges* (Oxford, 1985): 112.

attention to the subtler distortions that the scribe imposed in accordance with his current – and changing – cultural and musical prejudices.

The manuscript has been in Bologna since the eighteenth century, when it came into the hands of Padre Martini. Internal evidence, of local composers and topical texts, points to compilation and copying in the Veneto, possibly in Padua, over a fifteen to twenty year period between 1420 or a little earlier, and 1435 or later. With 322 compositions it is the largest and most important surviving record of early fifteenth-century music. The whole manuscript is the work of a single principal scribe. This is a crucially important recognition. To be able to set up a scribal chronology not only establishes a useful relative dating structure that can be anchored at certain points, in a way that would not be possible if the same copies had been made in an unknown chronological relationship to each other, but it also documents one musician's changing habits and taste over a period of time. Here, additionally and exceptionally, those habits can be detected not only through a changing repertory but also in successive copies of the same pieces. This scribe was a native Italian who shows, in the early parts of his work, a strongly francophile tendency, both in his choice of repertory and in how he adapts Italian repertory graphically, notationally, textually and texturally. Later in his work, he cultivated a script with Italian humanist tendencies, by which time he seems to have rejected French songs in favour of *laude*.

The manuscript now comprises 343 folios; of these, 132 belong to an original layer, begun c. 1420 or earlier and finished about 1425. The folios of the original layer share the same papers, foliation and rastra, and are decorated with initials of the same two types. After a time lapse, a second stage of work started c. 1428/30 and concluded about 1433. There are some indications that the manuscript was bound after the completion of stage I and then disbound before the second stage, when a large portion of the first-stage work was discarded. This can be inferred from pieces that survive in part in first-stage paper and script but whose facing pages have been replaced by second or third-stage copies. More substantially and strikingly, it can be inferred from the fact that 91 large capital letters found in the second-layer work are not drawn but pasted on the page. Each of these capitals conforms to one of the two first-layer types; they all have music on the back, in the first-stage script and with its rastrum.⁴ For each of these capitals, a folio of the first-stage copy was discarded. Each was cut from a now-lost folio. In a very few cases, two were cut from

⁴ In addition, an illuminated capital with music on the back has also been pasted, as have 33 small capitals without useful content.

the same folio, one each from its recto and verso. More often, however, only one capital or none at all can be accounted for to represent a leaf that must have existed; this leads to a conservative assessment of at least one hundred discarded folios. This activity is all the more puzzling for the recognition that the scribe was destroying his own work. I have been able to identify what is on the back of about a third of the pasted capitals; in nearly all cases they are from pieces that are still present in the manuscript, wholly or partially in later re-copies. In other cases, the musical fragment on the back of the capital is from a composition that is no longer represented, often indeed from a piece unknown to us from any other source.

Various explanations suggest themselves for this curious procedure – although the impression abides of an underlying eccentricity resistant to explanation. In some cases, the recopying was evidently done to change the order of pieces. The scribe brought together some pieces that are related musically and had previously been physically separated. In other cases he brought together pieces that do not seem to be musically related but which he wanted to place adjacently. He was prepared to undertake partial or entire recopying of pieces in order to add a piece to or remove it from a particular location, or to effect a regrouping. Some genres were eliminated altogether or maintained only passively. It even appears that the folios that remain intact from the original manuscript as it stood in 1425 may amount to only a third of what was there at that stage – a manuscript of perhaps 300 folios. To over a hundred surviving folios from that original compilation must be added the nearly a hundred large capitals cut from discarded folios, as well as the further folios required to project completions of pieces left incomplete by the removals, an allowance for gatherings of pieces and genres that were not recopied into the later manuscript, and also the evidence of expansion within the first layer that rests on alterations to original folio numbers. 146 new folios were added at stage II, some of them devoted to recopies of material discarded from stage I, and some of them left blank at this time. The third stage follows on with little break in time or detectable script chronology from the second. After using some of the blank folios inserted at stage two, it proceeds with distinct rastra, papers, foliation and script features; this accounts for approximately the final third of the manuscript as we now have it. Thus, the manuscript has returned to roughly its original size before it was dismantled, but its material and contents are considerably different.

The latest datable piece in the first stage, and one of the latest pieces to be copied in that stage, is Christoforus de Monte's motet *Plaudite decus* of 1423. When the copying order, as judged by script features, corre-

sponds to the composition order, as judged by datable texts, prompt transmission seems likely. There is a clear break in the script chronology between stages I and II; some features that entered the script late in stage I (especially the mannered gothic form of final s) have already disappeared by the time stage II was started. Assuming a hiatus of about five years, 1425–30, is consistent with the evidence of biographies and datable compositions, and allows the manuscript to have remained bound and its contents undisturbed for a decent interval of time.

Some of the second-layer pieces are known to have been composed in the late 1420s (notably Dufay's *Missa Sancti Jacobi* which opens the stage-II work), so that their place in the script chronology cannot fall earlier than that. The third stage, which seems to have followed from the second without a long break, but with changes of paper, script style, rastrum etc, includes some pieces composed no earlier than the early 1430s. These known datings in turn provide *termini post quos*. One important anchor for dating purposes is Feragut's motet *Excelsa civitas Vincencia*. This piece is one of several clues that point to Vicenza as the possible location of the scribe and his manuscript after he had parted company from the unidentified institution that may have commissioned and provided materials for the original compilation. The hypothesis that he took over the manuscript as a personal project is encouraged by the deterioration of his access to good paper and to an illuminator between stages I and II (with the single exception of the capital for the *Sancti Jacobi Mass*), as against the higher-quality materials available to him throughout stage I. While we must allow for the possibility that he was following patronly or institutional guidelines in some of his editorial policies or repertory selection and arrangement for stage I, we need not presume that for his later work.

As well as referring to the city, the text of *Excelsa civitas Vincencia* celebrates its bishop. As others have observed, the name of Petrum Emilianum (bishop of Vicenza 1409–33) has been crossed out and replaced by that of Franciscum Maripitro (i.e. Francisco Malipiero, elected bishop in 1433). In Ox, the motet appears with the name of the later bishop and without evidence of change; that copy at any rate must date from 1433 or later. When was the Q15 copy made, and for which bishop? Pirro was the first to draw attention to the alteration,⁵ and has been followed by all other scholars in the apparently reasonable presumption that the motet was written for Pietro Emiliano, probably for his enthronement

⁵ André Pirro, *Histoire de la Musique de la fin du XIV^e siècle à la fin du XV^e* (Paris, 1940): 65.

in 1409. In turn, this dating of the piece has been used to document the early appearance of certain important musical features (including fermata chords, octave-leaping contratenor cadences, and the so-called treble-dominated or chanson motet style in which a melodic top part, distinct in range, carries tune and text and is accompanied by a lower, textless tenor-contratenor pair). The apparently firm dating of the piece in turn led Gallo and Mantese to propose an otherwise undocumented association of Feragut with Vicenza around 1409.⁶ The manuscript evidence, however, weakens its credentials as a datable reference point for the musical coinage of 1409. A slight difference of alignment for "petrum emilianum" in relation to the other words on that line can be seen in the photograph reproduced by Gallo and Mantese; it turns out itself to be over an erasure – evidently of the name "franciscum maripitro". This copy of the motet must therefore date from after the new bishop was known, i.e. not before 1433. The first change, from the new bishop's name to the old, was made almost immediately; the script and ink colour of the now visible writing of "petrum emilianum" are compatible with their surroundings. The visible "re-correction" to "franciscum maripitro" was made years later, by the scribe who prepared the index and made other contributions of foliation and ascription (evidently someone close to Feragut and Vicenza) before the second and final rebinding of the manuscript in the late 1430s. Vacillation as to whose name should appear in the copy therefore reflects greater complexity than, as at first appears, the recycling of an old piece for a new bishop. Was the scribe copying a new composition which he decided to turn into a tribute to the bishop he had known? Or was he copying an older piece which he first tried to update, and then decided to restore to its rightful honoree, the old bishop? The uncertainty provokes speculation about the nature of this scribe's antiquarian interest, especially in view of his choices in retaining and discarding other motets, notably those by Ciconia, which he continued to recopy long after the death of both composer and dedicatees. The Vicenza motet has been taken as an orientation point for musical style chronology; whether or not it was actually composed in 1433, it can clearly no longer be considered a piece certainly composed in 1409. That the earlier dating could raise eyebrows without seeming unthinkable has certainly blurred our sense of style chronology for the first third of the century, by providing too early a date for some of its paradigmatic stylistic features.

⁶ Alberto Gallo and Giovanni Mantese, *Ricerche sulle origini della cappella musicale del duomo di Vicenza* (Venice, 1964). This volume includes a transcription of the motet, and a facsimile of the Q15 page on p. 56, showing the erasure and deletion here discussed.

It also exposes the perils of writing history around the anchorage points of technically definable phenomena in compositions presumed to be securely dated. This motet at any rate has close ties to Vicenza not only for the composition, but for this copy, which may have been in Vicenza during the 1430s.

The scribe had specific ideas about repertory that coloured not only what pieces he chose to present but the order in which he presented them. These ideas changed over the period of his work on the manuscript. Those changes he made in pieces for which we are uniquely dependent on him sometimes radically affect the musical substance, so that our entire understanding of certain composers and genres may be coloured or distorted by the filter he has imposed upon them. Songs and Magnificats have been mentioned above as two genres strongly affected by the refurbishing of the manuscript. They were perhaps the most serious casualties of the scribe's agenda of repertorial renewal and discarding.

Some French-texted songs were originally copied at tops of pages, as can be deduced from the evidence of fragments of text on the backs of the larger surviving cut capitals. These capitals are of types that now occur only at tops of pages; hence, there may well have been at least one whole gathering of songs in the original form of the manuscript from which they were removed. Songs are now present only as page fillers (with small capitals or none at all), added at the very end of stage I (as determined on evidence of script); no new additions of songs were made after stage I; the only songs in a later script are partial recopies as completion of the song required. This probably means that French songs held a receding importance for this scribe – in keeping with a general recession of his Francophilia. It could, on the other hand, mean that he decided at this point to divide the sacred and secular repertories, giving songs an even higher status by copying them into an entirely separate song manuscript which has not survived. The generally Francophile nature of the scribe's repertory choice and presentation during the early stage of the compilation takes a different turn only a decade later. In the mid 1430s he still embraces many French tastes, but has allowed his script to become Italianate, humanistic, purged of French gothic elements. In addition, he includes *laude* as page-fillers where in the early 1420s he had used French secular songs.

The earliest copies of the songs tend to present the discant and tenor parts (and sometimes also the contratenor) with text, following Italian practice. The later recopies have textless, more heavily ligatured tenors and contratenors. Some of the earliest Mass movements to be copied are also presented with texted lower parts, a practice also associated mainly with Italian manuscripts at the time, and especially with Zacar. But the

scribe's growing northern taste found expression, at this early stage of his work, in an increasing tendency to present works of all kinds with their lower parts ligatured and untexted, movements whose concordances sometimes give them with text, as in Q1. This may tell us more about the cultural signals this scribe was trying to give than about whether the music was conceived to be performed in one or the other way.

There is a major gap in our knowledge of the early fifteenth-century polyphonic Magnificat; quite simply, none survive. Magnificat settings were however included in the original stage of Q15, as we can tell from fragments on backs of capitals and from one rejected leaf which was used as a pastedown; they were all eliminated, presumably by the scribe's choice. Later, in the 1430s, he copied some new-style fauxbourdon Magnificats, works which cannot have been composed much earlier than that, and certainly not as early as the first-stage work of the early 1420s from which the fragments must date. There is nothing in the verbal text of a Magnificat that would render it obsolete; the renewal of repertory can only reflect a change of preference in musical style. Such a preference contrasts strikingly with the scribe's interest in Ciconia's motets for long-dead dignitaries composed in the first decade of the century, which he was copying and recopying fifteen to twenty years later, textually intact, but with significant musical modernisation.

Whether the grouping of works in a manuscript served a particular purpose, whether it was arbitrary, or whether it reflects the slavish reproduction of a model cannot always be discerned from internal evidence. Q15 is our only source for many Mass movements that are grouped in cycles or pairs, including several by Dufay. Some but not all of the pairs stand up to commonly-accepted criteria of unification by compositional intent, such as the use of head-motives, compatible ranges and textures. For those that do not meet such criteria, we need to enquire why the scribe placed certain pieces together. In some cases it might have been by default, but often he went to considerable lengths to bring together pieces that had originally been copied in separated positions – as we can tell from the backs of the cut capitals. The scribe had been prepared, especially at stage I, to pair unrelated works by different composers; the Gloria no. 35 by Lantini is followed by Dufay's Credo no 36; both date from the earliest stage. The Dufay Gloria-Credo pair nos. 107–8 were both originally present in the stage-I manuscript, but with different and unknown neighbours; another consequence of this recopying will be discussed below. There is evidence of considerable change, but not necessarily change that is consistent in itself, or that follows any criteria we might devise. This should give us pause before we take as evidence of composer identity pairings made by this or indeed any scribe, unless their linkage is

supported independently by internal evidence. Even some of the attributions to Dufay may need reexamination in the light of the reasons underlying the pairings on which they depend.

The scribe brought together some musically unified pairs that had been separated in the first state of this manuscript. A similar separation happens in the closely contemporary English Old Hall manuscript, evidently because musical composition was in this respect ahead of conventions of manuscript organisation which still arranged mass sections by movement rather than by cycle. The slightly later English manuscript of Henry VI's chapel continues the conservative arrangement of mass sections by movement even though unified composition was presumably even more established by the time it was planned.⁷ In Q15 the more progressive original plan included cycles and pairs. The parts of the book that were most radically dismantled include (but are not confined to) those that break this pattern and present movements of the same type consecutively. However, this scribe in making his own subsequent additions in the 1430s copied cycles of hymns, Glorias and Kyries. These cycles engaged him more during stage III than did the idea of Ordinary cycles, of which he had copied a few in the preceding years, starting with the *Sancti Jacobi* compilation.

The Mass cycles in Q15 pose some interesting questions. Gloria and Credo settings overwhelmingly outnumber settings of the Kyrie, Sanctus and Agnus. This balance largely corresponds with what we can infer from survivals in other fragmentary Italian manuscripts of the time. But we must recognise that the sometimes inscrutable and changing policies of this scribe have surely distorted the statistics of survival. At the earliest stage of copying, the manuscript began, as it still does, with a group of Ordinary cycles. Four such cycles now open the manuscript (see Table II). If there were ever more, the capital letters of their suppressed movements have vanished, perhaps because there was no opportunity to reuse them. The evidence of foliation, and of the extent of this section only up to the middle of a gathering, point away from it having been more extensive. Two of these cycles present Gloria-Credo pseudo-pairs (not internally unified) by already dead Veneto composers, Ciconia and Zacar. Each of these pairs is flanked by Kyrie, Sanctus and Agnus movements by Lantini and Dufay respectively. That Dufay wrote complete mass cycles is well known; Lantini's *Verbum incarnatum* cycle is also complete and unified. I believe that here the Q15 scribe wanted to present Ciconia and Zacar in places of honour, and that, in the absence of Kyrie, Sanctus and Agnus movements by them, he supplied those movements

⁷ Henry VI Choirbook (see n. 1; Bent, "The Progeny of Old Hall . . .").

from elsewhere, i.e. from works by Lantini and Dufay. It is possible, furthermore, that in order to do this, he had to break up intact, musically-unified cycles, discarding the unwanted movements – if he preserved them elsewhere it was not where we can now find them – leaving us with the perhaps erroneous impression that Dufay and Lantini wrote partial cycles consisting only of Kyrie, Sanctus and Agnus. Besseler's Dufay edition uses the term *Fragmenta tripartita*;⁸ but to recognise that they must either have been plundered from complete cycles or put together from disparate movements raises several questions about early Mass unity that must await a longer study. The Lantini movements used in the first cycle are quite strongly unified, and include also the introit *Salve Sancta Parens* and the Sanctus troped *Marie Filius*. The scribe's desire to concoct a Mary Mass around a Ciconia Gloria (troped *Spiritus et alme*) and an unrelated Ciconia Credo, may have been stronger than his respect for unity by style or composer, or even than his desire to preserve the hypothetical matching Lantini Gloria and Credo. The view that groups of Kyrie, Sanctus and Agnus were composed as internally unified units without Gloria and Credo has been encouraged mainly by their presence in Q15. Cycle 2 is the so-called Sine Nomine Mass of Dufay, whose unity and relationship to *Resvelliés vous* has been argued by David Fallows.⁹ It is presented as a cycle only in this manuscript, although all the movements exist separately in Ao and Ven. Cycle 4 is a hybrid English compilation; a musically disparate Gloria and Credo by Gervasius and Dunstable, followed by Benet's Sanctus-Agnus pair, were originally preceded by a now-lost Kyrie, which our trusty scribe later eliminated, perhaps because it was English, perhaps because it was not. In any case, it adds an extra twist to the precarious career of the English Kyrie on the continent. This may be the first documented case of the deliberate rejection of an English Kyrie by a continental scribe, and may even have helped to start a habit with well-known consequences for the study of English Mass cycles preserved in continental manuscripts. The possible loss of a gathering of Kyries from the beginning of the Old Hall manuscript has certainly aggravated the rocky career in modern musicology of the elusive phenomenon of the English Kyrie preserved in England.

One of the capitals establishes that the Credo of Dufay's *Sancti Jacobi* Mass was present in the stage-I work, thus corroborating views put forward by Planchart and Fallows that the cycle was assembled from

⁸ *Guillelmi Dufay, Opera Omnia, Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae* 1, vol. 4., ed. Heinrich Besseler, (Rome, 1962).

⁹ See David Fallows, *Dufay* (London, 1982): 165–170.

separate Ordinary movements.¹⁰ The cycle occupies a special place in Q15 by virtue of its illuminated capital; it begins stage II of the scribe's work after a gap of perhaps a few years. It is the only extant copy of this novel composite cycle of Ordinary and Proper movements, and may indicate a special relationship between composer and scribe. The Q15 scribe may also have distorted our view of what was and was not composed at this time; he may have suppressed or assembled some complete cycles, and he may have given us fewer Sanctus and Agnus settings than actually existed.

The initiatives exercised by the scribe of Q15 with respect to contratenor parts is one of the most intriguing aspects of his presentation, and the one which may have the most profound effect on how we understand individual pieces, as opposed to larger issues of genre grouping and classification, or of more local details of notation that, however telling as cultural signals or conceptual pointers, may not radically affect the substance of the music.

The fact that there was a single main scribe enables us to establish from the script chronology the order in which the versions were copied. In some cases, the recopies were evidently undertaken for the purpose of adding or eliminating contratenor parts.

In No. 242, Antonio de Civitate (Cividale), *Pie pater domenicæ*, a contratenor was added at stage III to a piece originally copied at stage I without it. In No. 243, Antonius Romanus, *Ducalis sedes*, the stage-I copy of the contratenor was aborted because there was insufficient room; it was recopied at stage II in more compressed form. The version of this piece in BU lacks a contratenor, is notated in different values¹¹, and the name of the doge Thomas Mocenigo has been removed and replaced by "N".

Ciconia's *O felix templum* went through no fewer than three incarnations in Q15. In example 1, c originally faced a but is now part of a rejected bifolio at the end of the manuscript. It has a problematic contratenor. The recopied recto, b, removes the contratenor, restoring the piece to a three-part form consistent with Ciconia's own unadulterated examples and the tradition within which he composed them. But the

¹⁰ See Alejandro Planchart, "Guillaume Dufay's Masses: A View of the Manuscript Traditions", *Dufay Quincentenary Conference*, ed. Allan Atlas (Brooklyn, 1976): 26–60, and David Fallows, *Dufay*.

¹¹ The occurrences of notational translation between Q15 and other manuscripts demand more detailed interpretation than can be offered here. In this case, unusually, it is Q15 that retains what may have been the original notated values, and BU that apparently modernised the mensuration.

version that consisted of a and c as facing pages was itself a stage II re-copy of a version that was originally in stage I. Music on the backs of the capitals that were on the other sides belongs to what were the ends of the two first staves of the upper parts. Capitals taken from both facing pages (with neighbouring music on the backs) were reused for the recopy. Moreover, it can be inferred that this original copy was so spaced (in relation to the known ruling procedure of stage I) that it could not have had a contratenor. Three stages: without, with, and without contratenor can be traced for this piece, and are the only detectable reasons for recopying. The number of pieces so affected, and the uniqueness of the contratenors, makes it unlikely that the scribe gained access to new copies of all these pieces, some of them quite old and not otherwise widely distributed. So it becomes likely, given that he worked over a protracted period of time, that he may himself have been the composer of these parts. We can infer anyway that he had the skill to take musical initiatives, but to realise just how extensively and freely he did so gives us extra reason to be sceptical of his innocence as a transmitter of other composers' intentions.

It cannot even be claimed that the scribe had a period of predilection for "added contratenors" which he then outgrew; the contra of *Pie pater* was added at the same script stage (III) that saw the removal of the *O felix* contratenor. The number of pieces so affected, and the uniqueness of many of these parts to Q15 makes it unlikely that the scribe gained access to new versions of the pieces in order to add the contras. The nature of his initiatives, and details of their execution, rather, makes it almost certain that he was himself the composer of at least some of these parts. He may himself have performed the same service for other pieces including some motets by Ciconia, thus masking for us their prototypical form as Italian motets for two equal cantus parts and free accompanying tenor.

The case of Dufay's Gloria and Credo (Besseler No. 5, Q15 Nos. 106-7) now poses a particularly intriguing question. Both movements were present in the original state of the manuscript, but they were not adjacent as are these later recopyings. Because they were eliminated at stage II and their capitals reused before the two movements were reinstated as a pair at stage III, the two movements must have been copied from a different source. They are indeed musically unified. What is curious here is that the stage III copies each occupy two openings – the Gloria is shown as Ex. 2. The brackets added to the upper two parts indicate the music visible at stave-ends in the capital surviving from the stage-I copy. The recto on the cut-out capital accommodated more music on a line than did the later, complete copy. On the recto, stave 1 ended near the beginning of stave 2, stave 2 near the end of stave 3, and stave 3 of the same part takes us to the first line of the next opening ("creeping" spacing), proving that

the Gloria originally occupied a single opening. The pages at that stage were uniformly ruled with eight staves to the page. With this spacing, each top part for the entire Gloria would have required at least six staves and more likely seven, the tenor three or four, the contratenor four or five. Even if the Amen had been copied on a second opening, there would still have been insufficient room for the contratenor in the first-stage copy, and I believe that it was not present. A similar demonstration can be made for the Credo, though the evidence is less full. That is not to say that Dufay did not compose these contratenors, though the question is surely begged. These contratenor parts are much more integral to the composition than they are in the Ciconia motets, but evidently, at that stage of his work, our scribe did not think so. In the case of this widely-circulated Gloria-Credo pair, unlike that of the older motets, it seems likely that another copy became available, enabling the scribe to reverse his earlier suppression of the contratenors. This may be a motive for some other recopies, too, and would have been consistent with his early liking for the texture of two top parts and tenor, as are his copies of Ciconia's *Venecie mundi splendor* and *O Padua* without added contras, and of the anonymous *O Maria virgo davitica* with just a solus tenor and two top parts, rather than with the tenor and contratenor that were available in the Veneto to Frater Rolandus Monachus, the scribe of PadD. No source earlier than Q15 contains any of the contratenors that seem to have originated there.

Another case of recopying that can be studied in complete form is a Gloria that occurs twice in Q15, both times anonymously, as No. 80 in the manuscript, and also on the initial bifolium, later removed from the body of the volume for use as the index.¹² The version of this Gloria appearing as No. 1 is in three parts without the Alius contratenor – which may have been composed by our scribe. Characteristically, in copying No. 80 at stage III, he spread over two openings what at stage II had been copied on a single opening (No. 1), partly for the sake of accommodating the extra part. This Alius contratenor seems in many ways more conservative than the demonstrably older contratenor, which has conspicuous V-I cadential movement. The later contratenor sometimes substitutes octave leaps for V-I progressions, and at other times prefers to be in the middle of a more old-fashioned 6/3-8/5 progression; the older contratenor, on

¹² The version used in Reaney's edition, *Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae* XI, vol. 2, (American Institute of Musicology, 1959), corresponds to Q15, no. 80; no. 1 is not mentioned. In a confusing part of the later Q15 index, this Gloria seems to be attributed to Brassart; in Ao it is assigned to Johannes LeGrant.

the other hand, follows the more progressive technique of remaining below the tenor (V-I) or using the octave leap.¹³

Some pieces, notably the motets of Ciconia, carry clear internal evidence of having been conceived in Italian notation. In the case of *O felix templum* this is supported by the Italian notation of the Oxford copy. In other pieces, the translation into French notation introduces unavoidable mensural solecisms which betray the origin of the piece in Italian notation. In other pieces, erasures support the claim that a translation has been effected.

The scribe of Q15 was not merely a contemporary perceiver and critic. He was evidently a composer himself, if not a major one. But he affected the way in which much music has come down to us, and his work may have been at least an indirect source for copies of this repertory in MuEm, Ox, BU, Tr, Ao.

Q15 contains a clearly international repertory in many important senses. But its contents reach us through the tinted spectacles of its editor-compiler-scribe, who cultivated French and Italian features and mannerisms at different times during the protracted gestation of the manuscript. He may have imposed on our view of the history of music some distorted and dismembered mass cycles; he may have suppressed some contratenor/tenor pairs in favour of solus tenors (not so labelled), as in *O Maria*. He added contratenors, possibly to make pieces sound more French. He apparently discarded songs, Magnificats and at least some motets. He translated pieces conceived in Italian notation (notably Ciconia's motets) into French notation.

The relationship of the scribe of this manuscript to Dufay himself is not known. He had prompt and good access to Dufay's early works. Was it he who instigated or assembled the *Sancti Jacobi* Mass? He acquired the Dufay hymn cycle that was completed by Feragut and Lymburgia. This scribe's versions of Italian motets and other pieces with added contratenors gained currency in the Veneto; he had prompt access to almost all the early compositions of Dufay between the Council of Constance and his service with the Malatesta. For all these reasons, there is some possibility that Dufay knew Ciconia's motets in the versions of the Q15 scribe. If so, was he influenced by this model for the Italian motet when

¹³ At bar 21, no. 1 incorrectly has the notes c-b and therefore could not have served as the model for no. 80, but is more closely related to the second copy of the piece in Ao. At bar 71, f-g in the treble are omitted in Q15 no. 80 only; this version could not have been a model for no. 1 on these grounds as well as those of script chronology.

he came to write his own first Italian motet *Vasilissa*, evidently the first true fusion point of Italian and French techniques?¹⁴

Even if we stop short of claiming that the scribe of Q15 influenced the course of music history then, it is not going too far to say that he has influenced our perception of it now. His presentation conditions our reception of the features on which we base our discussion of style and repertory. We have to recognise his often deliberate operations upon the very features on which we base our stylistic classifications. His changing biases, prejudices and goals served to homogenise styles that he received in more distinct form, before adapting them to look or indeed to sound like ambassadors of international style.

Princeton University, Princeton N.J.

¹⁴ *Vasilissa* has a chant Tenor and an essential contratenor, but otherwise sounds like the Ciconia pieces. See my "The Fourteenth-Century Italian Motet", to appear in Certaldo, *L'Ars Nova Italiana del trecento VI*.

Table I

Summary of Contents and Structure

Gathering	folios	main contents	stage of origin of gathering
0	176-7 (from XVII)	Gloria, index	II
I	1-12	Mass cycles	I
II	13-23	cycles	I
III	24-35	cycles, pairs	I
IV	36-47	pairs	I
V	48-59	pairs	I
VI	60-71	pairs	I
VII	72-84	pairs	I
VIII	85-96	pairs	I
IX	97-110	pairs	II
X	111-120 (incl. 111, 112 bis)	pairs	II
XI	(1-13)	<i>Kyries, pairs, cycle</i>	III
XII	(14-20)	<i>pairs, miscellaneous</i>	III
XIII	121-32	Dufay, S. Jacobi	II
XIV	133-44	pairs, Lymburgia cycle	II
XV	145-56	mass movements	II
XVI	157-70 (no 168)	pairs	I
XVII	171, 178-82 (see 0)	mass movements	II
XVIII	183-94	mass, magnificat, motets	II
XIX	195-206	motets	II
XX	(1-13)	<i>motets</i>	III
XXI	207-18	motets	II
XXII	219-30	motets	I
XXIII	231-42	motets	I
XXIV	243-54	motets	I
XXV	255-64	motets	I
XXVI	265-76	motets	II
XXVII	277-88	motets	II
XXVIII	[289], (1-11)	<i>motets</i>	III
XXIX	(12-20), [21-22]	<i>magnificats</i>	III
[XXX]	224v-5 (from XXII)	motets	I, II

Songs are present as page-fillers in gatherings I-V, VIII, XVI, XXII-XXIV (all stage I folios) and one recopy in IX.

Table II

Mass cycles in Q15-I

	CYCLE 1		CYCLE 3		
1	Salve sancta	A. de Lantins	15v-16	Kyrie	Dufay
1v-2	Kyrie	[A. de Lantins]	16v-17	Gloria	Z[acar] Micinella
2v-4	Gloria	Ciconia	17v-19	Credo	Z[acar] Cursor
4v-6	Credo	Ciconia	19v-20	Sanctus	Dufay [Vineux]
6v-7	Sanctus	A. de Lantins	20v-21	Sanctus	Loqueville [Vineux]
7v-8	Agnus	A. de Lantins	21v-22	Agnus	Dufay
	CYCLE 2		CYCLE 4		
8v-9	Kyrie	Dufay	[Kyrie removed at stage II]		
9v-11	Gloria	Dufay	22v-23	Gloria	Gervasius de anglia
11v-13	Credo	Dufay	23v-24	Credo	Johannes dunstaple anglicus
13v-14	Sanctus	Dufay	24v-25	Sanctus	Jo benet Anglicus
14v-15	Agnus	Dufay	25v-26	Agnus	Jo benet de anglia

Two systems of musical notation for Ex. 1. Each system consists of two staves. The notation is mensural, with square neumes on a four-line staff. Latin lyrics are written below the staves. The first system is marked with a circled 'A' and the second with a circled 'B'.

A single system of musical notation for Ex. 1, C, consisting of two staves with mensural notation and Latin lyrics. It is marked with a circled 'C'.

Ex. 1, A, B, C. Ciconia, *O felix templum*.

Two systems of musical notation for Ex. 2. Each system consists of two staves. The notation is mensural, with square neumes on a four-line staff. Latin lyrics are written below the staves. The first system is marked with a circled 'A' and the second with a circled 'B'.

Two systems of musical notation for Ex. 2. Each system consists of two staves. The notation is mensural, with square neumes on a four-line staff. Latin lyrics are written below the staves. The first system is marked with a circled 'C' and the second with a circled 'D'.

Ex. 2, A, B, C, D. Dufay, *Gloria* No. 5.