

INTRODUCTION TO INSTALMENT 5

This instalment completes the set of cyclic Masses from Trent 89 with a new edition of the *Missa Caput* (with bias towards the Trent 89 reading) and also presents the motets and motet-like pieces from this manuscript which have not appeared in my editions so far. For reasons of brevity, this introduction only gives an outline of the motets concerned. Both the *Caput* Mass and the other Mass presented here as Appendix material (the *Missa Hilf und gib rat*) have essays devoted to them in the commentary. For the greater part of this instalment (the motets) we enter territory where musicologists and historians have generally preferred not to go. These works often involve incomplete, badly transmitted texts and musical copies. Plus dubious revised or re-texted versions of presumably older pieces which were doubtless quite complete without the revisions, and also involving a few pieces where the relative novelty of four-part texture in the fifteenth century sometimes caused poorly controlled partwriting.

It is therefore unsurprising that the motets in Trent 89 have only received limited attention in the past, and also unsurprising that the genre to which some of them belong (the Tenor motet) generally received little attention in published studies between Wolfgang Stephan's now ageing work and Julie Cumming's 1999 book.¹ The only other recent generous coverage of the subject in English is in the various sections on motets in Reinhard Strohm's The Rise of European Music 1380-1500 and in other studies which concentrate on Dufay's musical development. "Motet" in this instalment, too, has a very wide definition stretching from ceremonial pieces commemorating political events (like no. 59) to chant paraphrases which frame well-known Marian plainsongs (like nos 46 and 47) and also large-scale pieces which mark particular liturgical occasions (see no. 58, which is probably for Corpus Christi). Awkwardly, the only Latin ode setting in Trent 89 also slips into this collection but for a special reason: the pieces on either side of it (nos 34 and 36) share musical features with it and maybe also a common background too.

One can of course view surviving sources like Trent 89 merely as archaeology, but in this manuscript and in other motet sources of the period such as Mu 3154 and the Sistine manuscripts there is a considerable amount of music which deserves to be better known. This motet repertory merits the work that it sometimes takes to make such pieces performable - where indeed such a conclusion is possible which is not always the case (usually due to incomplete texts). Therefore I cite the following pieces as particularly worthy of notice and definitely worth the work involved. The Papal motet *Gregatim grex audit* (no. 60), the canonic motet *Regis celorum* (no. 57), *O sacrum manna* (no. 58), Touront's two firmly-attributed pieces in this collection (nos 42 and 43), the single work by Hermannus de Atrio (no. 54), the four-part *Regina celi* no. 44, and *Ave beatissima civitas* no. 49. I have found all of these to be elevating musical experiences.

For those used to the format of my instalments, the discussion of the *Missa Caput* is given following its critical notes. The motets which follow it here are described in small separate batches below, and my reasons for treating them like this will become clear since the works examined together tend to share common features.

1. Pieces with English associations or which follow English structural models (nos 30, 31, 32a and b, 33, 34, 35 and 36).

Levavi oculos meos (no. 30) is one of many mid-century four voice motets which seem to imitate the texture of the *Caput* Mass and similar bipartite Ordinary movements. Both sections open with introductory upper-voice duets, and the Tenors of each section begin similarly even though no cantus firmus may be involved here. The text (which it seems will only fit the two upper voices satisfactorily) is Psalm 120. The high degree of incidental dissonance, hybrid cadences and also the filler *Contras* in this short piece place it firmly around the mid-century. Elsewhere I have suggested that it may belong together with another work that has a high degree of dissonance (the *Missa Christus surrexit*) and the two may share a common composer. As a Trent 89

¹ The former (Stephan, W., Die burgundisch-niederländische Motette zur Zeit Ockeghems, Kassel, 1937) should have been translated into English long ago.

unicum it is probably one of several such pieces whose imitation of English structural models was either the work of central Europeans or maybe westerners visiting the German lands.

Admiration for English works (or a desire to modernise them) probably also results in the reworking of *Anima mea* (no. 32a) which does not improve on the original - whether the original is represented by no. 32b or another version of the piece which is now lost. The reworking gives this duple-meter and otherwise unassuming Song of Songs motet a bass-like part which creates some uncomfortable sounds, and the presumably newer version also adds a penultimate duet section which is melodically a little out of character with the rest of the piece. As with the similar reworking of the Missa *O rosa bella III*, something of the original is lost in the adaptation. Likewise, no. 31 (*Quam pulchra es*) might be the product of continental Anglophilia rather than being a stray English survival. Occurring in Strahov as well as Trent 89, this very imitative Song of Songs motet survives alongside other works in Strahov whose ‘Englishness’ is at best dubious. One of the other Song of Songs pieces in Strahov (*Surge amica mea*, ff. 206v-208r) uses a chant found in the Neumarkt Cantional, and another (*Quam pulchra es*, ff. 220v-221r) seems to be stylistically indebted to the Dunstable setting of the same text. There are also several anonymous pieces in Strahov which seem to have a stylistic debt to well-travelled works by Frye. The Trent 89 *Quam pulchra es* is a piece of quality, perhaps best compared with Leonel’s late *Quam pulchra es* setting and similar Song of Songs pieces from Trent 88. Its use of imitation is sometimes rather plodding (and there are outer-voice consecutive fifths at measure 88) but it is still one of the outstanding pieces of its type and has a movingly melismatic conclusion.

Regina celi no. 33 is perhaps an insular piece, since the Trent 89 reading involves miscopying of parts (perhaps the scribe was unused to the Tenor here being the lowest of four voices). Internally there is also the ‘error Anglorum’ feature with the lower parts being in a different mensuration from the upper parts. My reasons for suggesting English origin (or at least an English composer) include the succession of duets within a four-voice texture (as in Plummer), some irregular pre-cadential measures, and the unexpected progression to a major chord at the end of the penultimate section. This piece also seems to make no use of the well-known *Regina celi* chant, and may therefore be an extension of the tradition of antiphon settings by Dunstable and Power which are similarly free. Containing some unusual harmonies and one or two definitely unhappy progressions, it is fairly untypical of the type of English piece that one normally associates with insular works on the continent. Nevertheless, since it exists the reasons for its strangeness may help to explain its presence here.

Our final batch of pieces in this category are three which occur together in Trent 89, in a format which gives text to all voices. All three appear to have been copied together and consecutively. The first of these (no. 34, *Perpulchra / Pulchra es*) is something of a hybrid in that it starts like a duple-meter Songs of Songs motet but also has a cantus firmus Tenor. This is a distinguished-sounding and extended piece, but its lowest voice creates several small anomalies throughout and may have been the last of all voices to be added. This voice is probably an authentic part of the texture, but the whole piece can be performed without it if desired. Similar dispensability seems to affect the Ode setting *Tu ne quesieris* no. 35. Here, the second part down (the Contra) is also largely inessential and a little juggling around of the lower voices enables a three-voice version to be sung. This setting is quite like an English rhyme-royal piece or Ballade in that its main first section and ending use musical rhyme, and it is also like some English Ballades in that it opens with a pause after the first phrase (as in Frye’s *Alas, Alas*). Its mensuration (C) is another sign that it might be the work of an English composer, and indeed possibly the same man as the composer of no. 34 since it shares a similarly crowded texture. No. 35 (like Dufay’s incomplete *Iuvenis qui puellam*) also makes some effort to set the long and short syllables of its text to longer and shorter notes when melismata are not involved. No. 36 (*Gaude flore virginali*) may possibly be English merely on account of its text, since no settings of this Becket Sequence text by continental composers are known from before 1460. Thickly sonorous and extended, this is again rather like no. 34 in texture although no single one of the lower voices is dispensable. This is another distinguished setting which ought to be better known, and all three of these pieces may have been transmitted together for a single reason. They could easily be part of some courtly or civic sacred repertory from one of the northern Italian towns, perhaps picked up and taken to Trento in the baggage of Friedrich III’s return from Rome in 1452. It is known

that institutions in both Bologna and Lucca employed English musicians, and Ferrara with its Estense court was also visited by Englishmen. Perhaps only in such an environment (or a similar one amongst literati or educated churchmen) would the Ode setting have a practical purpose.

2. Expansion and variation of standard textures (nos 37, 38, 39, 40, 41-43 and 60).

The last item in this group (no. 60, *Gregatim grex audit*) has been numerically separated from the others in this edition by necessity. I wanted to leave its presentation for as long as possible during compilation of my work just in case a return to looking at it produced anything previously unnoticed. My reasons for doing this will become clear in due course.

The development of sacred part-music from the 1420's to the 1470's is full of innovations, some of which became part of mainstream composing methods and some of which - as in any other age - fell out of fashion. One such innovation fairly early in the century was an expanse in the range of Contratenor parts, perhaps reaching one extreme with the Contra of the EscA revised version of Fontaine's *J'ayme bien celui* which spans two octaves. As four-part writing became more common there arose various approaches to stratifying the voices, but the lower voices of no. 37 (*Gaude Regina*) take the otherwise little-used route of having three lower 'concordans' parts as crossing supporting voices with none of these being a structural Tenor. Both Contras here have a range of an octave and a sixth, and the so-called 'Tenor' sometimes behaves like a bass part but has no fourths against the Superius. As a consequence of the constant voice-crossings this is a difficult work to sing effectively. Its second section is brief, and neither does it seem to be that well-written (see the poorly constructed imitation at measures 61-66). This motet would almost be beneath notice apart from fact that the presence of the piece before it in Trent 89 (*Gregatim grex audit*, no. 60) perhaps provides an insight into this unusual texture. *Gregatim* too has unusual ranges, with the higher Contra spanning fifteen notes and the lower Contra again spanning an octave and a sixth. The higher Contra in this piece acts as the lower voice in upper-voice duet pairings, and also at the final cadence it has the octave-leap which one might more normally find as a function of the lower Contra. Which is as odd as the voice-crossings in its companion piece.

Gaude Regina is possibly a central tradition work, since its second section opens rather like a Bergerette setting of the Busnois era might. Likewise *Gregatim* - which is a work of greater ambition - imitates the length and dense textures of Tenor motets but seems to be freely composed. It may be by the same man as *Gaude Regina* in view of the shared unusual ranges. In *Gregatim* the two initial Tenor phrases (at 27-46) are melodically related and the second repeats some melodic moves of the first but a fifth higher. Further suggestion that the Tenor is free is provided by its second-section opening where it leaps an octave.² There is much in this motet similar to works by Faugues and other central tradition composers such as elegant trio work, imitative duets, and use of small values in drive passages (see measures 23-26). But that is not to say that it might be by Faugues. It merely uses clichés common in the work of a whole generation of composers. The slightly incomplete text honours both Pope Nicholas V (1447-1455) and St. Gregory, with the particular significance of both having something to do with the ending of plague outbreaks. This helps to provide a likely context for the motet, since Rome was crowded with pilgrims during the Jubilee year 1450 and predictably plague broke out in the summer and autumn. It was partly because of this that seven Papal singers left their positions between March and August 1450, and at least three died. *Gregatim* probably celebrates the end of the epidemic and is therefore likely to date from the end of 1450 or early 1451. We know the names of some of the singers employed in Rome at the time, including 'Rubino', Richardus Herbare, and Andreas de Palermo. Any one of these singers who was from the north might have written the motet, or possibly others whose careers are imperfectly known despite the Pope hiring singers frequently in the late 1440's.³ One of these was Johannes Pullois, although I hesitate to connect him with this particular piece. Here again I suggest that the collection point for this music and its arrival in Trento might have been Friedrich III's coronation visit to

² Over several years I have looked repeatedly at the first-section Tenor's opening theme (which begins on D, then goes down to A, and up to C and D) in the hope that the pitches might hide some substitution code for 'G R E G...' or maybe even 'B A R B...'. But since all of these efforts have failed I have probably been looking too hard.

³ See Reynolds, C. Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1480-1513 (Berkeley, 1995) pp. 34-39.

Rome, which may also account for a batch of Magnificat antiphons settings in Trent 89 that are otherwise only known from SP B80.⁴

Numbers 38 and 39 (*O florens rosa* and *O castitatis lilium*) represent a different sort of experimentation. Possibly as a result of the transmission of the well-circulated *O pulcherrima* song-motet (which may be the work of Plummer) there are a series of stylistic imitations of this motet - or something like it - which mostly seem to be the work of Touront. The earliest piece in this vein is possibly the *Ave vivens hostia* setting in Ao-IV, and this group of pieces is characterised by finals on D, imitative writing, and the use of sesquialtera in O mensuration. Numbers 38 and 39 look like logical steps along this route, but only no. 39 survives with a Touront attribution. *O florens rosa* is another piece with one dispensable lower voice (this time the Contra secundus).⁵ Genuine four-voice use of this imitative style can be seen in no. 42, Touront's troped *Recordare* setting. This sonorous and remarkably imitative piece has more work in it than most contemporary chant settings of its type, therefore somewhat justifying its well-circulated survival. The other four-voice piece in this group (no. 40, *Resonet in laudibus*) may only be the work of somebody in the 'Touront circle' (if there ever was such a thing) rather than the composer himself. Like Touront's *Pange lingua* setting, no. 40 takes well-known parent material and reworks it as an imitative setting with two equal upper voices. Small discrepancies and clumsinesses throughout may indicate the work of a pupil here rather than an established master, as might the setting of whole sections in sesquialtera. This not a feature of any surviving Touront works.

Density of polyphonic work characterises both *O dulcis Jhesu* (no. 41) and *Compangant omnes* (no. 43). The former seems to be a logical end for Touront's imitative three-part experiments, since for much of this piece the Superius and Tenor are in pseudo-canon with additional imitative support from the filler Contra. The *Missa Fa Ut* (Instalment 2 no. 12) has some imitative writing which is very similar to that in no. 41, and this is another work in which Touront's authorship is likely. The next step into making this rather restricted style of writing into a developable resource was to make the Contra bass-like, and *Compangant omnes* is one of a few notable Touront works which does this. Maybe the prototype for such pieces was an *O speciosa* setting which survives in Strahov and is less harmonically active than no. 43 and Touront's other admirable song-motet - his three-part *O florens rosa* in Trent 88.⁶

3. The evolution of chant settings into large-scale pieces (nos 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51 and 52).

This category postdates the English achievement of writing multisectional works on well-known devotional texts like *Salve Regina* and *Alma redemptoris*, as in works by Dunstable and Power. Our knowledge of continental equivalents to English motets is patchy before relatively early four-part pieces like the Pullois *Flos de spina* (perhaps written around 1450) but the troped *Regina celi* setting no. 44 is probably not much later. It sets the *Alle Domine* trope as in an older *Regina celi* setting by Brassart, and in view of the density of the four-part writing and the imitative framing of the trope section I used to suspect that this might be a work of Touront akin to his troped *Recordare*. But now I think differently. No. 44 is perhaps by a different man, whose writing is imitative but also rather longwinded and stodgy. Perhaps a good performance might dispel that experience of the piece, but at the same time this is definitely one of the denser-sounding *Regina celi* settings of the period. There is also a very similar setting of the same chant and trope for four voices in Mu 3154.⁷ It therefore

⁴ The idea that these Magnificat antiphons arrived in Trento like this was probably first voiced in Strohm, R. 'European politics and the distribution of music in the early fifteenth century' in EMH I (1981) pp. 305-323.

⁵ *O pulcherrima* is published in Gerber, R. (ed), Sacred Music from the Cathedral at Trent (Chicago and London, 2007), no. 20. In Trent 88 this piece - like the Trent 89 *O florens rosa* - also has an added lower Contra which does not improve its texture.

⁶ For *O speciosa* see Strahov ff. 212v-213r. My coverage of the Touront motets (and pieces which might be his) is particularly brief here since I have covered the subject twice before in other studies and articles.

⁷ Mu 3154 ff. 30v-32r (no. 24).

seems that different centres sometimes produced similarly styled chant settings, as can also be seen from the number of Kyrie *Fons bonitatis* settings in the Trent manuscripts and [Strahov](#).

A similarly thick-textured approach to the *Salve Regina* text is seen in no. 47, which survives with a Dufay attribution but which has close counterparts in [Trent 89](#) with works that are chant settings of probable central European origin. I have made the case for this *Salve Regina* being anonymous elsewhere, so I will not repeat the details of those arguments here.⁸ Both nos 44 and 47 seem to come from the German-speaking lands, as perhaps does the *Ave vivens hostia* setting no. 45. Strictly speaking the parent chant in no. 45 is a Sequence melody, but its popular tone helped to ensure its dispersal as a cantio. The first half of the chant is paraphrased in the Superius, and the second half is given more or less unelaborated in its Tenor. This short piece may be the work of the anonymous who also composed the *Wünslichen schön* and *Wiplich figur* Masses given in Instalment 1, since its first section is similar in style to triple-meter sections of the former Mass.

Different approaches to the *Salve Regina* text are seen in nos 46 and 48. *Salve Regina* no. 46 sets the famous antiphon in a simple three-voice texture with a wide-ranging Contra. Although most of the setting is a Superius paraphrase, elements of the chant appear in both lower voices. The duet sections (which are arrestingly simple and frequently use unison imitation) help to make this an intimate-sounding setting whose music effectively carries the plea of its text. I have no idea where this setting comes from, but it may be western on account of its sound partwriting and melismatic final sections. No. 48 sets the *Salve Regina* text in alternatim fashion much like Obrecht's four-part alternatim setting. The polyphonic sections set the chant transposed a fifth down, as Tenor cantus firmus in an imitative texture which involves all four voices. This setting is also noteworthy because of its complex sesquialtera subsection, and because of the way in which the range of the transposed chant affects its weaving in and out of the other voices. In the last polyphonic section the chant rises to high Tenor G, temporarily making the Tenor the highest voice. I make a special plea here for this and also no. 46 being worthy of good modern performances. In addition to being noteworthy they have been available in older editions for over a century but have still not been recorded sympathetically.

No. 51 (the motet with *Hilf und gib rat* as its cantus firmus) is dealt with in the commentary since this edition also includes the associate Mass as Appendix material. All movements of the Mass and also the motet have a formal and bipartite layout and a scoring scheme throughout which tends to be relatively unvaried. It is of particular relevance to this Mass and its composer ('Philippus') that no. 50 *Salve Regina / Le serviteur* is very close in style and is probably the work of the same man. No. 50 - like the Mass - has a relatively high-pitched Superius and begins each of its sections with long upper-voice imitative duets. Also the full sections in both works are fairly unadventurous (the *Salve Regina* first section is less imitative than its parent chanson) and sesquialtera in one voice alone at a time appears in the duple sections of both the *Hilf und gib rat* Mass and no. 50. The chanson Tenor in the latter - transposed a tone up - is not given two full statements in the motet. Instead, the second section has a shortened cantus firmus.

O beata infantia no. 52 is more polished, and its presence in Roman sources and also the Innsbruck source [Mu 3154](#) perhaps suggests circulation gained by some respect for its qualities. This motet with a Nativity antiphon as a Superius paraphrase is extensive, it has a little lower-voice activity in small values, and it uses other sophistications like brief pedal-points, varied imitation, some small values in the lower voices and cadential drive (for example, at its very end). Its fellow-traveller in some readings is the Pullois *Flos de spina* motet, which has given rise to the idea that both might be the work of Pullois. Despite the similar length and scoring of both works I am not sympathetic to this, chiefly because the Pullois piece is less advanced and includes a dubious progression which is not found in the other motet.⁹ I would therefore prefer *O beata infantia*

⁸ Mitchell, R., 'Musical counterparts to the 'Wilhelmus Dufay' *Salve Regina* setting in MunBs 3154' in [TVNMM LIV/1](#) (2004) pp. 9-22.

⁹ Measure 17 of the first section of *Flos de spina* contains a progression where one internal voice has the unsyncopated middle line of a doubled leadingnote cadence, while another middle voice simultaneously has the same middle part of the cadence formula syncopated (giving an uncouth A-G friction) before going to F rather than A. Both *O beata infantia* and this Pullois piece have been given good recorded performances by The Clerks Group, respectively on the CDs Gaudeamus GAU 188 and Hyperion H55288.

to remain anonymous. Also (as a concession to the simple truth that these sources are often not authoritative) I give directions in my critical commentary as to how the [Trent 89](#) reading of *O beata infantia* might be improved by using a few variants from other sources. This I hope is reasonable in the pursuit of a good performing version, as there is nothing to say that [Trent 89](#) is always ‘authoritative’ merely because it is the subject of this edition.

Our final piece in this category (*Ave beatissima civitas*) is an extended Superius chant paraphrase using many of the same stylistic ‘bag of tricks’ as *O beata infantia*. Pedal-points, imitative texture, and rhythmic sophistication make this one of the most absorbing pieces of work in this instalment. So far as I know it seems to be the only fifteenth century setting of a relatively rare antiphon which - in its original form - has an alphabetically acrostic text by Aquinas. Although its size, unusual ending on E and its generally Phrygian-mode manner might prompt resemblances with works by Ockeghem, this might be another piece produced by a westerner in German employment since its parent chant may have been largely restricted to the German- and Flemish-speaking lands. It provides an apt conclusion-point to the selection of piece discussed so far, which takes the history of the motet types concerned into the 1450’s and ‘60’s.

4. Routes not taken by mainstream development (nos 53, 54 and 55).

This category is rather arbitrary, but conveniently groups together some works whose context needs discussion. *Sancta genitrix* no. 53 takes its opening imitative cue from Molinet’s chanson *Aime qui voudra*, and otherwise the origin of no. 53 seems to be somewhat in dispute. This is because the ‘instrumental’ lobby amongst fifteenth-century specialists rather claimed it as property of their own before there was much investigation of the [Trent 89](#) texted version. This version may be more authentic than the later textless readings, and it may also be representative of a very small number of Germanic pieces which take their cue from a pre-existing secular piece and expand it polyphonically. Another is the *Elend du hast* setting in [Glogau](#) (no. 18) though this is clearly secular and also includes some internal material reminiscent of Busnois’s *Quand ce viendra*. However, outside the realm of keyboard music there are few similar examples of adaptations like these.

Hermannus de Atrio’s *In Mariam vite viam* (no. 54) is similarly almost on its own, being a rather grand setting of a Vespers hymn text which includes chant elements. It may have been performed as a Vespers item, as might its stylistic counterpart piece the *O beatorum* setting in [Munich 3154](#). This too seems to contain chant elements, but I cannot trace the text continuation of *O beatorum* incipit. The [Trent 91](#) *Ut queant laxis* setting as well as several hymn settings in [Leipzig 1494](#) also bear witness to Germanic taste for Vespers piece on the grand scale, but what little we know about Hermannus suggest that there are not many more pieces like these to find. We are not even sure if ‘Armanno di Atrio’ was German or Flemish. He went south to find employment in Florence (where he is documented in 1491-92) and if he continued to produce polyphony it may have been in less demanding styles.¹⁰ He may also have been the similarly named man working at ’s-Hertogenbosch until 1514. No. 55 (*Ave mundi spes / Gottes namen*) has been in print for over 100 years and is one of a few pieces that argue for an occasional liking of giantism amongst German-based musicians of the time. An earlier five-part work from the same region may be the Magnificat setting [Trent 89](#) ff. 398v-401v.¹¹ Since *Ave mundi spes* is short it may have been intended as a Deo gratias substitute or for similar use at the conclusion of Vespers. The complete *Leise cantus firmus* is given in the Tenor secundus (the fourth voice down in our score) and other internal voices quote lesser or greater parts of its initial lines in imitation. However, the composer does not achieve his delayed-entry eight parts without a few solecisms and uncomfortable sounds. My version

¹⁰ See D’Accone, F., ‘The Singers at San Giovanni in Florence during the 16th century’ in [JAMS](#) XIV (1961) pp. 307-358 (see pp. 343-345 in particular) and the David Fallows article on Hermannus in [The New Grove](#).

¹¹ Further on the late-fifteenth century musician Johannes von Soest and nine- and twelve-part compositions of his described by Rudolph Agricola in a letter to Barbireau, see Pietschmann, K. and Rozenski, S. Jr., ‘Singing the self: the autobiography of the fifteenth-century German composer and singer Johannes von Soest’ in [EMH](#) 29 (2010), pp. 119-159.

is probably heavily edited by the standards of some specialists, since I suspect that both Trent 89 and the tidier-looking source Mu 3154 contain errors.

5. Canonic pieces and individual motet survivals of some importance (nos 56, 57, 58, 59 and 61).

No. 57 (*Regis celorum*) is surely a piece worthy of admiration, since its four sections each consist of double canons. In each section the two upper parts are canons at the unison and the three lower parts are independently canonic. Our version attempts to edit these so that a strictly canonic reading results. *Regis celorum* is also notable for its use of natural signs to indicate naturals rather than upward inflections (in which function they sometimes appear in Ars Nova music and earlier fifteenth century sources). Only one other work in Trent 89 uses naturals in the same way as *Regis celorum*, and this is the Gloria-Credo pair on *Beata Dei genitrix*. Both works are also alike in their sometimes casual treatment of dissonance, and they could conceivably be the work of the same person. A western composer is likely for the Gloria-Credo pair, so if I am right in associating them then this takes *Regis celorum* out of the part of the Trent repertory which is in ‘international limbo’ and gives it a believable provenance. The length of *Regis celorum* gives the sequence of canonic entries and ostinato-like progressions in the lower voices a certain predictable quality, but it is a worthy ancestor of later large-scale canonic motets such as the Pierre de la Rue *Pater de celis* setting. *Regis celorum* also has counterparts in two motets with canonic Discantus voices in Mu 3154. The first of these is by Paulus de Broda (and also possibly the second) but both seem to be stylistically later efforts than *Regis celorum* since they have real bass parts.¹² Therefore there might not be any connection between this composer and the Trent 89 motet.

O sacrum manna (no. 58) is notable because it may be one of the last medieval structured cantus firmus motets, along with a few middle-period examples by Dufay. No. 58’s Tenor statements, rhythmically panelled upper parts and tripartite structure echo a long line of works whose immediate predecessors include the Binchois *Nove cantum melodie* and several Dunstable works. Our knowledge of such pieces in the 1430’s and 1440’s seems incomplete, but *O sacrum manna* seems to prove its pedigree by virtue of its closeness to the Gloria-Credo pair mentioned above. Extended harmonies on sustained Tenor values, tripartite layout and a similarity of Superius behaviour all make it suggestible that this is another piece by the same composer. In Trent 89 this motet follows *Regis celorum* too. In my previous discussion of the Gloria-Credo pair I was quite reluctant to attribute it to any known composer, and I kept back the possible association with the two motets mentioned here because it would have made my essay on *Beata Dei genitrix* over-extended and perhaps less credible. Now all of the works in question are available in the same edition format readers may look at the case for themselves. Here I think we might have a single western anonymous whose knowledge of canon, organised layout and large-scale construction seems make him a respectable part of the central tradition.

No. 56 (*Benedicta sit sancta Trinitas*) is - like no. 55 - a large-scale item of questionable quality. Its reliance on mensuration canon and then ordinary canon is not achieved without some poor partwriting, and its position in Trent 89 (preceding *Regis celorum*) is not necessarily indicative of where it might come from or who wrote it. This is one of many pieces in the Trent Codices which yield little information regarding origin. Neither do we know much more about the *Adoretur* motet (no. 59) despite the fairly clear information given by some of its five simultaneous texts that it celebrates the initial recapture of Bordeaux by French forces in 1451. Its cantus firmus Tenor *Pacem Deus reddidit* (‘God has restored peace’) and the propagandist imagery of its texts make this an interesting sideline to the later career of Charles VII. Musically *Adoretur* is quite unlike anything else that we have, calling as it does for Superius singers who can reach high G and perhaps also voice-doublings indicated by some very poorly written divisi notes. In fact it resembles pieces with fairly simple opening sections in O mensuration and joined duet panels by the English (who Charles VII’s general the Comte de Dunois had just thrown out of Gascony). *Adoretur* has some unusual sounds including major-minor contrasts, accented sixths and doubled leadingnote formulas in wider octave spacings than are usual (see measures 119-123). Given its high topmost part I wonder if it is at all representative of a now-lost French

¹² Mu 3154 nos 20 and 21. Like many items in the earlier layer of this manuscript, no. 21 is textless.

Chapel Royal repertory, in which case we might have lost significant amounts of music. But neither its texts nor its music are distinguished, and I find no reason for associating it with the work of any composer who we can name. In Trent 89 *Adoretur* follows the English-looking *Regina celi* setting no. 33. It also shares some odd-looking voice placement with the latter and I remain uncertain as to why this might be so. Finally, *Odas clangat* (no. 61) is another item that I left for the very end of this batch in the hope of finding out more about it. It seems to be a fairly early Tenor motet on an unknown cantus firmus, and has two imitative upper parts. More or less textless in Trent 89, it has been given an editorial text here in the hope that sung performance will make it better appreciated. It contains old-style consecutive octave doublings at doubled leadingnote cadences, and therefore represents a slightly older aesthetic than most of the pieces presented here. Nevertheless *Odas clangat* may still date from around 1450. It may be another piece connected to musicians around Touront since the word ‘odas’ also occurs in cantio texts in Strahov,¹³ and additionally because a short piece of upper-voice imitation (at 12-14) is extremely similar to some imitation in *O dulcis Jhesu* no. 41 which is also attributable to Touront (see measures 33-35). Imitative twin Discantus texture with a supporting part is also found in Touront’s cantio *Ave virgo*. Furthermore, in Trent 89 *Odas clangat* precedes *Compangant omnes* no. 43, and both were entered into the manuscript by what looks like the same subsidiary scribe.

To conclude, perhaps the most important element of this discussion is that nearly two-thirds of the motets and motet-like pieces in Trent 89 were perhaps written in places ‘not too far from home’ in the sense of the Tyrol being the Trent manuscripts’ place of origin. ‘Not too far’ in this connection meaning transmission from Germanic centres further north, or from Italy in the opposite direction. Internationally transmitted survivals also occur, but where they are found here most seem to be identifiable by at least basic terms of reference.¹⁴ Some of my transcriptions of these pieces have been in old boxes since the late 1970’s, and have been subject to many revisions. It is a good feeling to finally show what I have done with them to the outside world. I also happily recall rehearsals directed by Nick Sandon in 1981 when I was the ‘Contra secundus’ in a one-per-part performance and private recording of *Gaude flore* no. 36. Hopefully this motet will not have to wait another 35-40 years before it is properly recorded again.

It remains for me to thank people who contributed to this instalment, notably Leofranc Holford-Strevens whose readings and translations of the Latin texts in the following items I feel honoured to have (nos 34, 37, 39, 43a and b, 49, 51b and c, 52, 53, and 55-59).¹⁵ He also kindly wrote the editorial text for no. 61 after I made a messed-up attempt at it. Thanks here also go to Peter Wright, Margaret Bent, David Fallows, Jeffrey Dean, Reinhard Strohm and Bonnie Blackburn for various bits of encouragement, lending, draft-reading and similar help. Lastly I mention here the work of Louis Gottlieb, whose 1958 thesis on the Trent 89 Masses was a source of inspiration when I started this project. My complete transcriptions of the Masses in this series now replaces his, but much of what he wrote about the works concerned is still worth reading even after sixty years of circulation.

.....

¹³ Strahov no. 217 (*Nobis instant carminis odas*). Text published in Snow, The Manuscript Strahov..., I, pp. 148-149.

¹⁴ This is perhaps the best place to mention that discoveries concerning motet texts do not happen every day, and that when new finds turn up there is often a lack of proper places to reveal them. Therefore I use this space to reveal two discoveries in sources related to the Trent Codices. The text to the Strahov motet *O intemerata* (ff. 222v-224r) is found as a prayer text in a Rouen Book of Hours now preserved in Prague (National Library, ms XXIII G.59 f. 21v). In addition, the textless piece Mu 3154 no. 40 (attributed to ‘Jo. De Salice’) opens with a Superius which is very like the German-variant version of the hymn *Chorus nove Jherusalem*. The text of the first two verses (AH 50 p. 285) can be underlaid satisfactorily to the music, making this a hymn-motet probably similar in function to nos 41 and 54 in this edition.

¹⁵ As a reminder, this series does not translate every Latin text used. Translations are only given for those texts for which no other translation seems to be available, and which are immediately relevant texts to the works concerned.