

INTRODUCTION TO INSTALMENT 6

This penultimate instalment of the Trent 91 edition is rather a mopping-up exercise since it gathers together three sorts of music. Firstly, pieces by westerners (and those that are probably by westerners) which have not otherwise appeared in this series. Secondly, there are another two sets of pieces which are probably of central European origin but whose composers remain unknown. The first of these sets are the lied-based Masses in Trent 91 and associate works. The second is a series of Vespers hymn settings which are stylistically fairly uniform and which all have monorhythmic or near-monorhythmic and chant-carrying Superius parts.

The lied-based Masses here (nos 116 and 117) are the easiest to describe. Both owe much to the triple-meter style of Barform lied with low Contra as found in the Schedel and Glogau collections. Like their model songs, these Masses are rather short-winded and are similar to the Masses on *Wünslichen schön* and Schedel no. 114 in Trent 89. In both nos 116 and 117 the cantus firmus Tenors are given in straightforward fashion, and the Missa *Sig säld* features more material from its main model's Superius than the Missa *Zersundert* does. In some places the *Sig säld* Mass also features block quotation of its parent material. In contrast, the Missa *Zersundert* has clearer signs of borrowing extra material from additional songs than the *Sig säld* Mass, and the *Zersundert* Credo has a succession of several different lied incipits in its internal sections. This is akin to the 'quodlibet' style of writing as found in a few pieces in Glogau and also in the Superius of Compère's *Au travail suis*.¹

The two Magnificat settings given in this instalment (nos 118 and 119, the latter from Trent 89) are very similar to the Masses described above and it should come as no surprise that these two Magnificats may also contain song references in their internal sections - despite chant being their primary borrowed material. Both Masses and both Magnificat settings could possibly be the work of a single anonymous, and the Masses share certain shortcomings. In each Mass there are passages where the higher Contra seems rather carelessly added, and both Masses alter or expand their scoring in their final movements. In the Missa *Zersundert* this results in a higher Contra with an unusually wide leap at Agnus 13-14. In the Missa *Sig säld*, the higher Contra has an unavoidable second with the Superius at Credo, measure 2. Finally regarding this group of pieces, a single Kyrie trope in Trent 89 which I have previously published might also belong to the same anonymous set. That piece too seems to conceal a single song reference despite being otherwise chant-based like the Magnificat settings here.²

The Vincenet and Faugues Masses and the two musician-motets in Trent 91 are probably present there for different reasons. Adelyn Leverett put forward a persuasive case for the Faugues Bassedanse Mass being in the Trent 91 frontispiece collection due to the next piece in the manuscript (the Missa *Regina celi*) sharing structural features with it. Likewise, it does not stretch the imagination too much to account for the musician-motets being present as admirable examples of how to construct pieces with organised Tenors. Busnois's *In hydraulis* with its freely invented Tenor proceeding from O to C and then cut-C would provide a good example of Tenor organisation to imitate, and likewise Compère's *Omnium bonorum* provides an example of how pre-existent polyphonic material (in this case *De tous biens plaine*) can be treated in a twin-section composition. I am therefore expanding Leverett's hypothesis a little by suggesting that these motets in the frontispiece collection might have a didactic purpose, which might also explain why this section of Trent 91 ends with a group of two- and three- voice Benedicamus settings. The very short two-voice pieces here would serve well for basic partwriting tuition. In the process of exploring links between Martini and this section of Trent 91, the connection between this manuscript and the Innsbruck source Mu 3154 (which also contains the Busnois motet) has been a little overlooked. Many concordant readings between these two manuscripts are close, and the same is true of the two copies of *In hydraulis*. I would not be surprised to find that the Trent 91 copy directly descends from Mu 3154 since their shared features in terms of small errors and accidentals are perhaps too close to believe otherwise.

¹ Published in Finscher, L. (ed), Loyset Compère Opera Omnia (5 vols, 1958-1972), V, no. 8.

² *Ex Codicis* II/II no. 11.

The two Vincenet Masses given here (*Sine nomine* and *O gloriosa regina*) are probably present in Trent 91 due to the composer's fairly extended career which included spells at the Savoyard court and Naples. Previously it was thought that one source containing a Vincenet Sanctus (Strahov) probably dated from the 1480's, and that works by Vincenet and Cornago were present in Strahov due to the Naples-Hungarian royal marriage which also generated the copying of the Mellon chansonnier. Strahov is now known to be earlier and was probably being compiled in the late 1460's. The Trent 91 copy of Vincenet's Missa *O gloriosa regina* looks significantly less developed than its concordance in CS 51 and I have therefore taken the Trent reading as my edition basis. This makes the CS 51 version look like the revision which it probably is, since the opposite idea of the Trent reading being a simplification is not convincing when details are examined. The three-voice Vincenet Mass given here has a different problem. 'Too many hypotheses' in twentieth-century studies have resulted in this short Mass prematurely being given the status of a freely-composed piece, followed by attempts at assigning different model songs to it which do not seem to be convincingly reflected in the work's texture. I suspect that the right model for this piece may be an incomplete Rondeau in SevP (*Fausse langue*) and attempts to apply parts of the song to the Mass also help with a partial reconstruction of the song. However, in attempting such reconstructions I cannot rule out the possibility that a better candidate for the origin of the repeated passages in this Mass might still be found. These Masses are well-written and seriously neglected works. In comparison with Martini - for example - Vincenet has attracted less attention from serious modern performers, possibly because no corpus of instrumental music by him survives.

Despite one prominent western musician in the Germanic world (Touront) producing AAB-form pieces which might have been lieder, nothing has otherwise yet been found to connect a central-tradition composer to Germanic-looking pieces like the *Sig säld* Mass.³ Likewise, the hymn settings at the end of this instalment (nos 130-138) look like they were intended for German centres but there are no clues to who their composer(s) might have been. That these pieces form a composer-group (or possibly two composer groups) is likely due to their shared use of monorhythmic or near-monorhythmic and chant carrying Superius voices plus common style features such as mostly bass-like Contras, generally active lower parts, and Superius parts in mensuralised chant notation which change to full mensural notation for their endings (as in nos 130 and 131). Even when the Superius part is mostly monorhythmic but in white notation (as in no. 134) the final Superius measures sometimes use more active rhythms than the preceding passages of breves.

I suspect that at least nos 130-134 here form a composer group, along with the Kyrie, Sanctus and Agnus settings nos 75-77 in this edition (which also tend towards monorhythmic treatment of their respective chants). The Sanctus and Agnus use a chant which was probably local to central Europe, no. 130 is the Vespers hymn for St. Afra and associate martyrs (the patron saints of Augsburg) and *Nova veniens* no. 133 uses a fairly elaborate form of its usual chant whose closest relative may be the version from the hymnal section of Spec. Likewise, the closest melodic comparison with the rarely set chant of no. 132 that I can find is in a polyphonic setting from one of the Annaberg manuscripts. I therefore think there is little doubt that hymns nos 130-134 are from a Germanic centre. Another important feature of these pieces is that some of them have little sophistications which do not always seem successful or properly copied. For example, Kyrie no. 75 has part of its Superius in sesquialtera, but there is nothing in the mensuralised chant notation of this part to indicate this. Also, nos 130-133 all open by using C mensuration in their chant-carrying Superius parts while the lower voices use cut-C. Similarly Kyrie no. 75 starts with its Superius in cut-C with the lower voices using O, and no. 131 has a short patch of internal sesquialtera in just its Tenor. No. 134 even has a fourth voice canonically derived from the Superius, but the canon is derived in a fairly difficult way and this piece otherwise seems self-sufficient without it. Additionally, although these settings are modern-sounding there are some dissonances in them which perhaps indicate that the composer was no distinguished master. For example, no. 130 has a weak progression involving a first-inversion construct (at 15-17) and the continued lower-voice

³ Schedel no. 38 is a three-voice piece of Touront's which is in AAB form, and the similarly short Strahov f. 247v piece by him possibly uses the same scheme. The latter also has an intabulation in Bux (no. 230).

movement at the final cadence of no. 133 (at 80-81) looks unconventional. The second group of hymns here (nos 135-138) also include some odd partwriting like the unavoidable Superius-Tenor seventh in no. 138 (at 24) and the unusual II-I progression without a Superius third in no. 136 at 22-24. This second set of pieces may not necessarily need separating out from the others here as a composer group but two of them chiefly use square black chant notation for their Superius parts (nos 135 and 136) and no. 137 is another piece with Germanic chant connections (the melody used here is of central European origin). *Pange lingua* no. 138 is also the only one of these settings to have a concordance (in this case in Wr2016, a source of probable Silesian or Saxon origin from around 1500).

For most of these settings the simply presented or slightly embellished chant-carrying voice serves aptly as a basis for reconstructing chant models. No. 137's chant carrying voice is also practically identical with the cantus firmus Tenor of another setting of the same text in Berlin 40021. But in two cases (nos 130 and 133) the composer(s) concerned seems to have embellished the monorhythmic chant-carrying part with more stepwise or ornamental pitches than are present in any other versions of those chants that I have encountered. For these pieces I have therefore provided the editorial chant verses using simpler forms of the melodies concerned. Embellishment of chant either in its own right or embellished monorhythmic versions of chant in part-music are not unknown elsewhere. *Salve Regina* no. 79 in this edition seems to have to stepwise additions to its chant which might be compositional licence, and the Spec chant for *Nova veniens* used in this edition (see no. 133) is certainly not the only version of this chant which seems to add extra notes to older versions.⁴ It might seem odd to performers that the chant and polyphony sections of nos 130 and 133 present different versions of their parent chants, but I suggest in these particular cases that there is no viable alternative since the monorhythmic Superius parts were probably developed a little by the composer setting them. He may have done this simply to make the topmost voice easier to handle together with his supporting voices.

Another feature which places these settings close to their chant origins is the appearance of small vertical lines in voices which use Gothic neumes. These seem to be for the clarification of underlay, and in chant manuscripts of similar vintage such dividing lines are sometimes in red.⁵ In addition nos 136-138 all end by converging on unison E, although the cadential routes by which they do this differ. No. 130 also has a similar cadence but includes a third in its final progression. My reasons for separating out nos 135-138 from the other hymns discussed here are straightforward. 135 and 136 occur together in Trent 91 and share the same type of notation for their Superius voices. Neither setting seems to elaborate its chant Superius much, and the same is probably true of nos 137 and 138. These pieces also generally lack the mensural sophistications of the other settings previously described, although no. 135 has a mensural ending for its Superius. Chant settings similar to these occur over much of western and central Europe in the period 1470-1530, and the tendencies described here (monorhythmic chant treatment and occasionally poor partwriting) are common to many more pieces of the same sort whether they are hymn settings or use other chant types.

To conclude, I wish to record my thanks here to the following people who helped to make finishing this instalment possible. Margaret Bent, Pawel Gancarczyk, Rex Eakins, Lenka Hlavkova, Jaap van Benthem, Lisa Johnson, Peter Wright, Reinhard Strohm and Leofranc Holford-Strevens.

.....

NB: for those printing out the following scores in sequence, the first page of music is on a left-hand page.

⁴ *Salve Regina* no. 79 (like many of the hymns in this instalment) gives most of its chant-carrying passages in chant notation with mensural traits.

⁵ As in the 1481 notated Breviary Wrocław, University Library ms I O 110 (from Glogau) where such red vertical lines are frequent.