University of Huddersfield

University of Huddersfield Repository

Ferrari, Nicolo

Settings of the Ordinary in the Late Fifteenth Century: The Masses of Firminus Caron

Original Citation

Ferrari, Nicolo (2020) Settings of the Ordinary in the Late Fifteenth Century: The Masses of Firminus Caron. Doctoral thesis, University of Huddersfield.

This version is available at http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/35482/

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/

Settings of the Ordinary in the Late Fifteenth Century: The Masses of Firminus Caron

Nicolò Ferrari

A thesis submitted to the University of Huddersfield in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Huddersfield

September 2020

Contents

Contents 2

Figures 4

Tables 7

Abstract 8

Copyright Statement 9

Acknowledgments 10

Introduction 12

A Footnote in Music History 13

Caron and the Court of Burgundy 17

A Life with No Style 18

The Masses of Firminus Caron 20

1. Firminus Caron's Masses: an Overview 27

Witnesses 27

Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cappella Sistina 14 (VatS 14) and Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cappella Sistina 51 (VatS 51) .. 27

Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, San Pietro B80 (VatSP B80) 33

Modena, Biblioteca Estense, α.M.1.13 (ModE M.1.13) 35

Trento, Museo Provinciale d'Arte, Castello del Buonconsiglio, 1376 (TrentC 89) . 38

Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare, DCCLV (VerBC 755) 40

Issues in the Textual Tradition 43

Cantus Prius Facti and Treatment of the Tenor 46

Missa Jhesus autem transiens 47

Missa Sanguis sanctorum 48

Missa L'homme armé 50

Missa Accueille ma la belle 50

Missa Clemens et benigna 53

2. Attributions to Caron in San Pietro B80: the *Missa Thomas cesus* 57

A Crusading Context? 59

The Attribution to Caron 64

Caron in Rome 67

Bruges or Rome? 70

3. Caron and the Fifteenth-Century Tradition of *Missae L'homme armé* 73

The Origin of *L'homme armé* 73

Hypotheses of Relative Chronology of the *Missae L'homme armé* 79

Treatment of *L'homme armé* in Caron's Mass 84

The Neapolitan Anonymous Masses: the Question of Attribution 92

4. Crusading and the *Missae L'homme armé*: the Case of Napoli, Biblioteca Nazionale, VI.E.40 99

The Burgundian Crusading Movement and Cultural Propaganda 101

The Cultural Impact of the Fall of Constantinople 105

Music and Crusading Propaganda 110

Crusading and *Missae L'homme armé* 114

A New Hypothesis for NapBN 40 119

The Dedication to Beatrice of Aragon 126

5. Models of Fifteenth-Century Music Editions 131

Metre and Mensuration 132

Methodology and Evaluation of Witnesses 138

Accidental Inflections and Text Underlay 141
Editions of Caron's Masses 142
6. Manuscript and Editorial Accidental Inflections 146
Manuscript Accidental Inflections 150
Editorial Accidental Inflections 155
7. On the Edition of the Texts: Issues of Text Underlay 161
Approaches to Text Underlay 162
Text Underlay in Caron's Masses 168
Conclusions 179
Editorial principles 182
Edition of Texts 186
Transcription of Text Underlay 214
Critical Apparatus 231
Missa Accueille ma la belle 231
Missa Clemens et benigna 234
Missa Jhesus autem transiens 242
Missa L'homme armé 245
Missa Sanguis sanctorum 258
Edition of Music 266
Bibliography 498

FIGURES

Figure 1: VatS 14, f. 127v; Firminus Caron, Missa L'homme armé, Kyrie 31
Figure 2: VatS 51, f. 6v; Firminus Caron, Missa Accueille ma la belle, Kyrie. 32
Figure 3: VatSP B80, f. 99r; Firminus Caron, Missa L'homme armé, Kyrie. 34
Figure 4: ModE M.1.13, f. 140v; Firminus Caron, Missa Clemens et benigna, Kyrie..... 37

Figure 5: TrentC 89, f.378v; Firminus Caron, Missa Clemens et benigna, Kyrie. 39
Figure 6: VerBC 755, f. 36v; Firminus Caron, Missa Sanguis sanctorum, Kyrie. 42
Figure 7: *Jesus autem transiens* as in Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms 893, f. 128*r*, detail. 47
Figure 8: *Sanguis sanctorum* as in Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms 893, f. 502*v*, detail. 49
Figure 9: Chanson *Accueilly m'a la belle*, New Haven, Beinecke Library for Rare Books and Manuscripts, Ms 91 ("Mellon Chansonnier"), ff. 3*v*-4*r*. 51
Figure 10: Tenor of Missa Clemens et benigna, Kyrie. 53
Figure 11: Sequence *Clemens et benigna*, as in Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms 888, f. 37*v*. 54
Figure 12: Comparison of the Tenor of *Missa Clemens et benigna* with Tenor of *Ave Jhesu Criste*. 54
Figure 13: Comparison of internal sections of the Tenor of *Ave Jhesu Criste* with Tenor of *Missa Clemens et benigna*. 55
Figure 14: Responsory *Moyses famulus domini*, as in Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms 893, f. 130*v*. 56
Figure 15: outline of the Tenor presented in the first Kyrie (26a) and the Christe (26b). 58
Figure 16: *Missa Thomas cesus*, Christe, mm. 6-9, as transcribed by Reynolds. 66
Figure 17: *Missa Thomas cesus*, beginning of Christe section; VatSP B80, f. 167*v*, detail. 66
Figure 18: Portraits of Caron identified by Reynolds. VatSP B80, f. 99*r*, detail (left); VatS 14, f. 133*r*, detail (right). 69
Figure 19: *L'homme armé* melody as in NapBN 40, f. 63*v*. 85
Figure 20: Non-cantus-firmus motives in Du Fay's and Caron's *Missae L'homme armé*. 87
Figure 21: Incipit of the Superius of *Je suis venue vers mon amy* as in the Pixérécourt Chansonnier, f. 127*v*. 88
Figure 22: Caron, *Missa L'homme armé*, Osanna, bars 187-192. 88
Figure 23: Examples taken from Reynolds, 64a) Anonyomous *Missa* in SP B80, ff. 122*v*-129*r*, Agnus II, 1-9; 64b) Okeghem(?), *Missa*, Agnus II, 1-9; 64c) Caron, *Missa L'homme armé*, Agnus II, 1-11. 89

Figure 24: Examples taken from Reynolds, 64d) Anonymous, *Missa L'homme armé* (Naples VI), Benedictus, 1-15; 64e) Anonymous, *Missa Groß Sehnen*, Osanna, 1-4. 90
Figure 25: Examples taken from Reynolds, 65a) Caron, *Missa L'homme armé*, Agnus II, 18-29; 65b) Anonymous, *Missa L'homme armé* (Naples VI), Benedictus, 29-42; 65c) Caron, *Mort ou mercy*, 1-11; Anonymous, *Missa Groß Sehnen*, Osanna II, 1-6. 91
Figure 26: Paris, Bibliothèque National, fonds français, 9087, f. 207*v*; miniature representing the Turkish siege of Constantinople. 113
Figure 27: Coat of arms in NapBN 40, f. 64*v*. 120
Figure 28: Backlit coat of arms (NapBN 40, f. 64*v*); note the crescent in the middle of the fess. 120
Figure 29: Coat of arms in London, British Library, C.3.d.2; on the left the one appearing in the initial of the Libro primo, on the right the one in the bas-de-page decoration of the first page of the *Prohemio*. 122
Figure 30: *Devise* of the Janly family below the colophon at the end of London, British Library, C.3.d.2. 122
Figure 31: *Missa Accueille ma la belle*, Credo, Supremum, bars 90-92. 150
Figure 32: *Missa Accueille ma la belle*, Kyrie, bars 14-15. 150
Figure 33: *Missa Accueille ma la belle*, Sanctus, bars 37-39. 151
Figure 34: *Missa Jhesus autem transiens*, Credo, bars 165-167, with editorial accidentals. 152
Figure 35: *Missa Accueille ma la belle*, Agnus, bars 147-149. 153
Figure 36: *Missa Clemens et benigna*, Gloria, bars 145-147. 156
Figure 37: *Missa Clemens et benigna*, Credo, bars 23-25. 157
Figure 38: *Missa Clemens et benigna*, Agnus, bars 57-59. 158
Figure 39: *Missa Sanguis sanctorum*, Sanctus, bars 135-138. 159
Figure 40: *Missa L'homme armé*, Sanctus, bars 60-63. 159
Figure 41: *Missa L'homme armé*, Kyrie, bars 36-39. 160
Figure 42: *Missa Jhesus autem transiens*, Credo. VatS 51, f. 84*v*, detail. 169
Figure 43: *Missa Clemens et benigna*, Credo. ModE M.1.13, f. 145*v*, detail. 171
Figure 44: *Missa Clemens et benigna*, Credo. TrentC 89, f. 382*v*, detail. 171

Figure 45: *Missa Clemens et benigna*, Credo. ModE M.1.13, f. 145*v*, detail. 171
Figure 46: *Missa Clemens et benigna*, Credo. TrentC 89, f. 382*v*, detail. 171
Figure 47: Missa Accueille ma la belle, Credo, VatS51, f. 12r, detail. 176
Figure 48: Missa Accueille ma la belle, Credo, bb. 209-212..... 176
Figure 49: Missa Sanguis sanctorum, Kyrie, bb. 35-38. 177

TABLES

Table 1: The Masses of Firminus Caron..... 26
Table 2: Structure of Credo, *Missa Clemens et benigna*. 43
Table 3: Structure of *cantus firmus* in Caron's *Missa L'homme armé*. 85
Table 4: Signatures in Caron's Masses. 155
Table 5: Text and music phrases correspondence in the Credo of *Missa Clemens et benigna*. 172
Table 6: Missing text in lower voices in *Missa Sanguis sanctorum*. 173

ABSTRACT

In light of the recent literature on the polyphonic settings of the *Ordinarium Missae* in the fifteenth century, and of new discoveries regarding the figure of Firminus Caron, a reassessment of his corpus of Masses has become necessary. This thesis seeks to examine the five settings composed by Caron, as well as to re-evaluate modern attribution to him of a further seven Masses; these reveal to be a useful case study that allows a scrutiny of some of the most debated issues of Medieval and Renaissance musicology.

Chapter 1 examines the situation of the textual tradition, describing the manuscripts that transmit Caron's Masses, and provides an analysis of the *cantus firmi* used and their treatment. Chapter 2 assess the modern attribution to Caron of the *Missa Thomas cesus* transmitted in the manuscript VatSP B80, the context put forward for the composition of this Mass, and the implications it would have on Caron's biography. Both the attribution and the context are rejected on the basis of an examination of the historical and cultural context, and of the stylistic methodology used. Chapter 3 and 4 deal with the fifteenth-century tradition of *L'homme armé* settings, from both a musicological and historical point of view. In Chapter 3 the origins and early chronology of the tradition are discussed, along with a new analysis of Caron's *Missa L'homme armé*. There is also a discussion on the modern attributions, to Caron and others, of the six anonymous settings transmitted in NapBN 40. Chapter 4 explores the fifteenth-century crusading movement, its propaganda, and the link with *L'homme armé* tradition. The manuscript NapBN 40 is used as a case study: a new identification of the coat of arms in the manuscript is proposed, with an assessment of its donation to Beatrice of Aragon. Chapter 5 evaluates the methodologies adopted by critical editions of fifteenth-century sacred music, in order to find methodologically sound criteria for the edition of Caron's Masses. Chapter 6 and 7 focus in detail on some philological issues related to text underlay and accidental inflections, arguing that in some case they reveal an authorial intervention. These are followed by a new complete critical edition of Caron's Masses.

These chapters contribute towards a new understanding not just of Caron's Masses but also of some general matters concerning the history of fifteenth-century music. Also, the critical edition provides a methodologically up-to-date text that can be used for any further investigation on this topic.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

i. The author of this thesis (including any appendices and/or schedules to this thesis) owns any copyright in it (the "Copyright") and s/he has given The University of Huddersfield the right to use such Copyright for any administrative, promotional, educational and/or teaching purposes.

ii. Copies of this thesis, either in full or in extracts, may be made only in accordance with the regulations of the University Library. Details of these regulations may be obtained from the Librarian. This page must form part of any such copies made.

iii. The ownership of any patents, designs, trademarks and any and all other intellectual property rights except for the Copyright (the "Intellectual Property Rights") and any reproductions of copyright works, for example graphs and tables ("Reproductions"), which may be described in this thesis, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property Rights and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property Rights and/or Reproductions.

Acknowledgments

My biggest thanks of all go to my supervisory team. Thomas Schmidt has truly been the best supervisor one could wish for, being a wonderful mentor during these past three years. It has been a privilege to work under his supervision, and I am most thankful to him for his guidance, generosity, and advice. Most of all, our supervision meetings have always been a moment I looked forward to; I will dearly treasure the hours of pleasant conversation, and exchange of ideas. Thomas continuously supported me, pushed me to sharpen my thinking, and nurtured my professional development as a scholar, his advice will serve me for long time. I would also like to express my deepest thanks to Katherine Lewis. She has opened to me the world of crusading studies, and patiently guided me through it. Her insights and suggestions have been enormously precious and have invaluably helped me in shaping my ideas on the relationship between the late medieval crusading movement and music.

The environment of the School of Music, Humanities and Media has provided me with numerous opportunities for professional development, as well as with occasions to discuss my work and receive helpful feedback. I express my thanks to Robert Adlington, Rachel Cowgill, John Bryan, Catherine Haworth, and Steven Jan. Special thanks to Lisa Colton, who has been a fantastic Director of Graduate Education, providing incessant support and help throughout the entire doctorate, as well as advice and feedback on my work, which helped me to greatly improve it.

During the course of my studies I have benefited from the help of numerous friends and colleagues who have offered feedback on various parts of this dissertation, clarified doubts, and supported my work in various ways. I am extremely grateful to Vincenzo Borghetti, Rodobaldo Tibaldi, Alexandros Hatzikiriakos, Inga Mai Groote, Daniele Sabaino, and Rob Desjardins, for their generosity with their time and advice. Parts of this thesis have been presented at various conferences, and I would like to thank all those who have provided feedback and helpful comments.

Many friends have made my time in Huddersfield extremely pleasant, providing stimulating discussions as well as happy distractions outside of research. I particularly thank Nicky Gardiner, Caroline Gill, Charlotte Mallinson, Richard Piatak, Rob Piggott, Jennifer Pradelli, Brad Parker.

More than anyone, Sarah Ashbridge has been a steady presence, with her kind words and patient ear. Unnumbered breaks from research in her company have definitely ease and made happier my journey.

A special thank you to Вулкан Пияйко. She always extended a helping hand in times of need, giving excellent advice. Her thought-provoking remarks in our conversations on the most disparate topics have broadened my knowledge, reminding me also of the world outside research.

I am very grateful for the continual encouragement my family, and in particular my parents, have been giving to me in the past three years. Sadly, my uncle Mario Ferrari passed away before he could see the conclusion of this dissertation. He was a continued source of support; he always challenged me to think broadly in our constantly stimulating sharp conversations and has been instrumental in my pursuing of a scholarly career abroad. I dedicate this dissertation to his memory.

INTRODUCTION

The figure of Caron, who flourished between the 1450s and 1470s, has enjoyed a sort of double reputation, from being internationally famous, as witnessed by his conspicuous presence in fifteenth-century Italian manuscripts and frequent references by his contemporaries, to almost total oblivion in modern times, relegated as a minor composer by most musicologists until recently, when scholarship slowly began to re-establish his place in the history of late fifteenth-century music.[1] An explanation for the relative lack of interest in Caron, at least compared to the composers associated with him in fifteenth-century treatises such as Okeghem or Busnoys, can be found in the (until recently unchallenged) way musicological scholarship has tended to focus for the late fifteenth century mainly on the trio Du Fay, Okeghem,[2] Josquin, to the near-complete neglect of other composers,[3] as well as in the paucity of biographical data, undoubtedly curious for such an important composer, available until recent archival research has been able to establish with some certainty who Caron was.

This introductory chapter focuses on the reception of Caron in musicological scholarship, showing how scholars have for long time concentrated their efforts on trying to identify who Caron was and where he was active, paying therefore less attention to his works. I then discuss the challenges posed by the lack of documentary evidence and how this influences research on Caron's Masses, which consists of five settings ascribed to him (*Missa Accueille ma la belle, Missa Clemens et benigna, Missa Jhesus autem transiens, Missa L'homme armé,* and *Missa Sanguis sanctorum*) transmitted in six manuscripts.

[1] Beside this dissertation, Caron's music has been recently revived by a number of recordings, as well as by the ongoing publication of a critical edition of Caron's works by the *Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae* edited by Murray Steib and Sean Gallagher.
[2] For the spelling of Okeghem see David Fiala, "La très véritable signature de J. de Okeghem et ses implications philologiques," *Revue de Musicologie* 105, no. 1 (2019).
[3] Tim Shephard, "Centres and peripheries of 15th-century music," *Early Music* 44, no. 3 (2016).

A Footnote in Music History

Caron is widely mentioned in theorical treatises of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Johannes Tinctoris, arguably nowadays considered as the most important theorist of the second half of the fifteenth century, refers to Caron three times: in the prologues of his *Proportionale musices* (1472-73) and *Liber de arte contrapuncti* (1477), as well as in the *Complexus effectuum musices* (1472-5).[4] In the *Prohemium* of the *Proportionale musices*, Caron is cited, along with Johannes Okeghem, Antoine Busnoys, and Johannes Regis, in a list of *moderni* considered by Tinctoris as the foremost in composition.[5] In the prologue of the *Liber de arte contrapuncti*, Caron is named again in a list of composers, who had as teachers John Dunstaple, Gilles Binchois, and Guillaume Du Fay.[6] It has also been hypothesised that Caron and Tinctoris might have known each other, or at least met, as both their names are present in Loyset Compère's motet *Omnium bonorum plena*.[7] This work, composed around 1470, has attracted the attention of scholarship due to the list of composers in the text of the *secunda pars*. Caron's name appears alongside Jean Du Sart and Busnoys as masters of song (*magistri cantilenarum*). Joshua Rifkin suggests that the motet was composed to celebrate composers variously associated with Cambrai;[8] while Rob Wegman has proposed that it originated «for a meeting held probably in or near Cambrai in the early 1470s (and organized, in all likelihood, by Compère himself)».[9]

---

[4] Gianluca d'Agostino, ed., *Johannes Tinctoris. Proportionale musices. Liber de arte contrapuncti* (Firenze: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2008). The *Complexus effectuum musices* has not yet been critically edited, it is however available online at the *Thesaurus Musicarum Latinarum*. For a discussion of the two prologues cf. Rob C. Wegman, "Johannes Tinctoris and the 'New Art'," *Music & Letters* 84, no. 2 (2003).

[5] Caron's name is further reported at the end of the third chapter of Book III, where he is said, along with Regis, Boubert, Faugues, and Courbet, to be among those *minime literati*, namely poorly educated.

[6] The other composers named by Tinctoris are, again, Okeghem, Regis, and Busnoys, as well as Guillaume Faugues.

[7] Gerald Montagna, "Caron, Hayne, Compère: A Transmission Reassessment," *Early Music History* 7 (1987): 120; Rob C. Wegman, "Fremin le Caron at Amiens: New Documents," in *Essays on Renaissance Music in Honour of David Fallows: Bon jour, bon mois et bonne estrenne*, ed. Fabrice Fitch and Jacobijn Kiel (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2011), 10.

[8] Joshua Rifkin, "Compere, "Des Pres", and the Choirmasters of Cambrai: *Omnium bonorum plena* Reconsidered," *Acta Musicologica* 81, no. 1 (2009): 59.

[9] Rob C. Wegman, "Ockeghem, Brumel, Josquin: New Documents in Troyes," *Early Music* 36, no. 2 (2008): 212.

Caron's name is also mentioned by the fifteenth-century theorist John Hothby in his *Dialogus in arte musica*, and in the sixteenth century by Sebald Heyden in *De arte canendi* (1537), where again he is discussed with Okeghem and Busnoys. In the second half of the sixteenth century Caron still appears in the theoretical writings of Adrianus Petit Coclico and Hermann Finck. Coclico writes about Caron in the *Compendium musices* (1552) criticising him, with Tinctoris, Gaffurius, Du Fay, Busnoys, Binchois, and Johannes Ghiselin, for being too occupied with speculation and theoretical rules. Finck follows Coclico in criticising those musicians in his *Practica musica* (1556). Caron's name continues to be mentioned, albeit only in passing, all the way into the eighteenth century, for example in Johann Gottlieb Walther's *Musicalisches Lexicon* (1732) and Charles Burney's *A General History of Music* (1776-1789). In the nineteenth century and in the first part of twentieth century, Caron is only briefly referred to in a few music histories, which sometimes also touch upon some of his works.[10] The first major scholarly study on Caron is the 1960 PhD dissertation by James Thomson. Thomson's dissertation was the first attempt to provide a complete overview on the figure of Caron and his works, as well as presenting a complete edition of Caron's music. Thomson also published, a few years after his dissertation, a short introductory monograph to Caron as well as a critical edition of his compositions.[11] These studies, while meritorious, are now inevitably methodologically outdated, and many of the conclusions put forward by Thomson have been superseded by subsequent musicological research; however, for a long time, they remained the main reference for any further publication that considered this composer. One of the clearest shortcomings of Thomson's research has been his dismissal of fifteenth-century evidence regarding Caron's first name, which gave rise to a number of contributions trying to exactly identify who Caron was.

While the first name of Caron, Firminus, is given twice by Tinctoris, scholars have hesitated to accept it. A Firminus le Caron does appear in an eighteenth-century

[10] James C. Thomson, "The Works of Caron: A Study in Fifteenth-Century Style" (PhD dissertation, New York University, 1960), 6-13.
[11] James C. Thomson, *An Introduction to Philippe (?) Caron* (Brooklyn: Institute of Mediaeval Music, 1964); James C. Thomson, ed., *Les œuvres complètes de Philippe Caron* (Brooklyn: Institute of Mediaeval Music, 1971-1976).

transcript of accounts from Amiens Cathedral,[12] where he is accounted for as *primus musicus* in a list of *Vicarij*, alongside two other musicians, Jacques Balochart and Pierre Boulet. This document, however, has not been considered as referring to our Caron, as it bears the date 1422. Thomson suggested that there were two musicians named Caron: Firminus, active at Amiens Cathedral in 1422, and Philippe, a musician in Cambrai in the second half of the century, mentioned as an *enfant du chœur* in a document from Cambrai Cathedral in 1470s. He also argued that Tinctoris was referring to Philippe Caron in his treatises, confusing him with Firminus, as this latter would have already been an adult in the 1420s, and in all likelihood dead by the time Tinctoris mentioned him in the 1470s.[13] Thomson's theory of discarding Firminus as the first name of Caron has been widely accepted, and several figures have been variously identified by Thomson and other scholars as the composer. As Craig Wright summarises it:

> Parmi les candidats les plus plausibles, on cite Firminus le Caron qui en 1422 était à la cathédrale d'Amiens; Jean Caron qu'on trouve à la cour de Bourgogne en 1436-74; Jean Caron qui était petit vicaire à la cathédrale de Cambrai dans les années 1450 et Philippe Caron qui était enfant de choeur puis petit vicaire à Cambrai dans les années 1470 et 1480.[14]

After much speculation, both Gerald Montagna and Sean Gallagher rejected the various identifications of Caron, stating that Firminus was most likely his first name. Montagna writes:

> The issue of Caron's forename is hardly as thorny as it has been made to seem. [...] The objection to 'Firmin' has been much overstated. Names tend to run in families, and it is possible that the Firmin at Amiens was some degree of relation to the composer. The ease with which scholars have dismissed Tinctoris is disconcerting; is it likely that the most erudite and careful musical scholar of the Burgundian era would confuse a contemporary composer with a minor musician at least a generation older?[15]

---

[12] Amiens, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms 516, f. 183*r*.
[13] Thomson, "The Works of Caron: A Study in Fifteenth-Century Style," 15-25.
[14] Craig Wright, "Musiciens à la cathédrale de Cambrai 1475-1550," *Revue de Musicologie* 62, no. 2 (1976): 216.
[15] Montagna, "Caron, Hayne, Compère: A Transmission Reassessment," 120.

Similarly, Gallagher states that: «attempts to identify the composer with a Philippe Caron have been predicated on the assumption that Tinctoris got Caron's first name wrong (twice), something for which there really is no justification».[16] As Montagna has observed, there has still been resistance in identifying the Firminus Caron mentioned by Tinctoris with the Firminus le Caron present in the account from Amiens Cathedral. However, Rob Wegman has recently been able to provide a convincing explanation for the 1422 date. Caron is named along with a Jacques Balochart, which appears also in other documents dating from 1461 until 1481, making also for him an activity in 1422 rather unlikely. Wegman notes that it is highly probable that the accounts reported in the eighteenth-century Amiens manuscript begin in 1422 but continue for a few decades, and since we know that Balochart was active after 1461, the section mentioning him and Caron could be argued to refer to the 1460s.[17]

Once established that the Firminus Caron mentioned in the account can indeed be identified as the same person cited by Tinctoris, Wegman focussed his attention on documents from Amiens city archive, in order to find more information about Caron's life. He found a plausible candidate among the various Fermin Carons present in the documents of the Amiens city archive, both the name Fermin (and its variants) and the family name Caron being well established in medieval Amiens. This candidate is Fremin le Caron, mentioned as *maistre d'école* (schoolmaster) in three documents from 1459. In these documents we can infer that the instruction he provided was partly musical, including lessons in playing the organ, that he was probably a cleric in minor orders and that he was about 25 years old, therefore being born around 1435. The name Fremin le Caron surfaces in other two later documents, from 1473 and 1475, where he is mentioned respectively as *maistre* and *sire*, meaning that he had obtained a Master of Arts degree from a University and had been ordained to the priesthood. After these last documents, no other source mention Fremin le Caron anymore, so we can suppose that

[16] Sean Gallagher, "Caron and Florence: A New Ascription and the Copying of the *Pixérécourt Chansonnier*," in *Recevez ce mien petit labeur: Studies in Renaissance Music in Honour of Ignace Bossuyt*, ed. Mark Delaere and Pieter Bergé (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2008), 83.
[17] Wegman, "Fremin le Caron at Amiens: New Documents," 11-12.

his life came to an end between 1475 and 1480.[18] Beside this evidence of activity in Amiens, the name of Caron also emerges in a document referencing to a "messe per Caron" copied in a music book from Cambrai Cathedral in 1472.[19] According to Montagna, Caron's Masses are indicative of a position involving the practice of liturgical music, and it may well be that Caron was employed at Amiens Cathedral throughout his life.[20]

CARON AND THE COURT OF BURGUNDY

Another hypothesis concerns the presence of Caron at the court of Burgundy, especially during the 1460s and 1470s. A "Carron" appears in a list of singer of the Burgundian chapel dated 1474,[21] which implies that he was present at the siege of Neuss along with Busnoys and Robert Morton.[22] Barbara Haggh proposed that this Caron might have been the *sommelier* Jean Caron, documented at the Burgundian court since 1436, although as Haggh herself noted: the name «comes further down in the list than where Jean's name usually appears»;[23] she suggested that the omission of the first name, Jean, otherwise given in a 1468 *escroes*, would simply be a peculiarity of the scribe.[24] Haggh has also found other mentions of Caron in *escroes* from the 1470s, which she assumed to refer to Jean Caron. She investigated the presence of Caron in *escroes*, reporting:

> A considerable lapse of time separates Caron entries, none of which includes a first name. After being absent from the *escroes* of 8 March, 11 March, and 23 March 1471, Caron reappears on 30 March 1471, when the court spent the night at the gates of the city of Amiens. He also visited Péronne and left the next day, just as the court departed for Abbeville. His name is absent from the surviving lists of 1472, from the summit at the abbey of St Maximin in Trier in 1473, reappears briefly in lists of July 1473, and more

[18] Wegman, "Fremin le Caron at Amiens: New Documents," 12-20.
[19] Craig Wright, "Dufay at Cambrai: Discoveries and Revisions," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 28, no. 2 (1975): 205.
[20] Montagna, "Caron, Hayne, Compère: A Transmission Reassessment," 119.
[21] Jeanne Marix, *Histoire de la musique et des musiciens de la cour de Bourgogne sous le règne de Philippe le Bon (1420-1467)* (Strasbourg: Heitz & Co., 1939), 262.
[22] Montagna, "Caron, Hayne, Compère: A Transmission Reassessment," 119.
[23] Barbara Haggh, "Busnoys and 'Caron' in Documents from Brussels," in *Antoine Busnoys: Method, Meaning, and Context in Late Medieval Music*, ed. Paula Higgins (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 303.
[24] Haggh, "Busnoys and 'Caron' in Documents from Brussels," 304.

> regularly in the last half of 1474, and periodically from April to December 1475. After Charles the Bold's death, Caron received retroactive payments for his work in 1474 and 1475. But he was not with the chapel during the battle of Neuss in the first three months of 1475; other singers were also absent.[25]

Montagna holds a different view on the matter, stating that Caron's relationship with the court of Burgundy can be considered similar to the one Du Fay had. Caron would have been required to compose secular music by the court, being associated with it only intermittently.[26] Gallagher too suggests that Caron may have been active at the Burgundian court in the 1470s alongside Busnoys, which would elucidate «why the two composers' chansons show up in so many of the same sources, in some cases with conflicting attributions».[27] This would be consistent with the *escroes* from the Burgundian court that refer to Caron only sporadically. Also, it is quite a coincidence that some accounts report Caron's presence when the court was in or near Amiens. Since the surname Caron was quite common in the Amiens area, it is plausible that the registers refer to two different Carons, namely the *sommelier* Jean and the composer Firminus. It would then be possible that some of these entries, perhaps those associated to Amiens, where we can suppose Firminus Caron was permanently employed, and the one mentioning Caron with other composers, are indeed referring to Firminus Caron.

A Life with No Style

As said above, following Thomson, most scholarship until the end of the twentieth century has been dedicated to investigating Caron's life, as well as his first name, dealing only marginally with his works, if at all. This emphasised interest towards Caron's biography can be explained by looking at the way music history has dealt with composers in general. In a compelling essay, Vincenzo Borghetti shows how one of the most common methodologies of investigation of historical musicology has been to narrate the life and works of a composer as a single intrinsic entity. Borghetti argues that since the eighteenth century it has been considered fundamental to explore a composer's

[25] Haggh, "Busnoys and 'Caron' in Documents from Brussels," 303-04.
[26] Montagna, "Caron, Hayne, Compère: A Transmission Reassessment," 119.
[27] Gallagher, "Caron and Florence: A New Ascription and the Copying of the *Pixérécourt Chansonnier*," 84.

biography in order to understand their works, as biographical data are often regarded as «the necessary prerequisite so that the works of a composer can be meaningful, as they represent in some way the artistic transfiguration of a phase or of an existential condition of that composer».[28] The "life and works" method, despite having been criticised, has been widely adopted also in Medieval and Renaissance musicology, and has enjoyed a preeminent, if not leading, position in scholarship since the 1960s which endures until today.[29]

Borghetti then focuses his examination on the figure of Johannes Okeghem, which is an extremely interesting case for the investigation of issues regarding biographical information. We do have a good amount of data regarding Okeghem's life, though it is completely meaningless to understand his artistic production. There is not a single piece of information that we can use to establish when, for whom or on which occasion, he composed certain works. As Borghetti argues: «the narration of Okeghem's biography could be the life's story of another man, interesting from many points of view, though not those musicology is looking for».[30] Therefore, he argues that the one of Okeghem is a 'biography without style', namely it does not help scholarship in understanding Okeghem's works, or how Okeghem changed his style throughout his life.[31] The lack of biographical data and documentary evidence, which could clarify when a determinate work was composed results in scholarship turning towards an investigation on stylistic grounds; however, especially in Okeghem's case, this methodology reveals itself to be completely unreliable since his works are stylistically extremely various.[32] Notwithstanding the various efforts of scholars in trying to interpret Okeghem's artistic life through a stylistic analysis, style and life «remains two realities poorly intertwined

[28] «Il necessario presupposto perché le opere del compositore in esame possano avere un significato, rappresentando queste in qualche modo la trasfigurazione artistica di una fase o di una condizione esistenziale di quel compositore». Vincenzo Borghetti, "Una biografia senza stile – Uno stile senza biografia. Raccontare la vita e l'opera di Johannes Ockeghem," *Philomusica on-line* 11 (2012): 38.
[29] Borghetti, "Una biografia senza stile – Uno stile senza biografia," 38-39, 43-45.
[30] «La narrazione della biografia di Ockeghem potrebbe essere il racconto della vita di un altro uomo, interessante da molti punti di vista, ma non quelli di cui la musicologia è in cerca». Borghetti, "Una biografia senza stile – Uno stile senza biografia," 47.
[31] Borghetti, "Una biografia senza stile – Uno stile senza biografia," 47-48.
[32] Borghetti, "Una biografia senza stile – Uno stile senza biografia," 49.

one with each other, or, better, considering the lack of definite evidence, unconvincingly intertwined. Hence, Okeghem's style is a style without life, since between the Okeghem who lives and the Okeghem who composes cannot be established any relationship worthy of the name».[33]

THE MASSES OF FIRMINUS CARON

Caron's situation is in many aspects similar to Okeghem's as described by Borghetti. We do have some information about his life, but none of them elucidate when, in what order, or for what occasions Caron might have composed any of his works. His mentions in documents as a schoolmaster, as a *maistre*, or, possibly, as an occasional member of the Burgundian chapel or courtly environment do not help at all in discovering when or for whom he composed, for example, his *Missa L'homme armé* or one of his twenty chansons. Similarly, Caron's Masses constitute a small but interesting corpus in which it is possible to observe stylistically different approaches and, more broadly, many developments in compositional techniques, such as: the integration of the Tenor voice in the four-part texture, the proliferation of the *cantus prius factus* into voices other than the Tenor, the increasing freedom of exposition and organisation of the *cantus firmus* within the polyphonic texture, and the use of the so-called 'parody technique'. This variety poses in itself a challenge to our understanding of Caron as composer. As Wegman points out, Mass composers, while exploring different musical languages that resulted in personal stylistic features, they were also influencing one another, due to the high circulation of their works throughout Europe. His comments about Okeghem's sacred works, are definitely also applicable to Caron's corpus: «if his entire sacred oeuvre had survived anonymously, one could easily believe it to be the work of four or five composers».[34] And with Caron too an evaluation conducted exclusively on stylistic grounds might produce unreliable results.

---

[33] «Rimangono due realtà tra loro poco permeabili, o, meglio, data la mancanza di prove certe, non permeabili in modo convincente. Lo stile di Ockeghem è insomma uno stile senza biografia perché tra l'Ockeghem che vive e l'Ockeghem che compone non si riesce a stabilire alcun rapporto degno di questo nome». Borghetti, "Una biografia senza stile – Uno stile senza biografia," 49.

[34] Rob C. Wegman, "The Anonymous Mass *D'Ung aultre amer*: A Late Fifteenth-Century Experiment," *The Musical Quarterly* 74, no. 4 (1990): 586.

Caron's Masses are an extremely interesting case study since many of the usual methodological approaches are here challenged by a stylistically variegated corpus as well as by a lack of relevant documentary evidence. How is it then possible to construct a narrative around Caron's Masses if no biographical landmarks are available? This dissertation, whose aim is to reassess Firminus Caron's polyphonic settings for the Ordinary in the context of late fifteenth-century music, moves within this problematic interpretative framework. As mentioned above, the corpus of Caron's Masses is limited to five settings, which have been transmitted to us with an ascription to him preserved in at least one witness. These are: the *Missa Accueille ma la belle* based on Caron's own *chanson*, the *Missa Clemens et benigna*, the *Missa Jhesus autem transiens*, the *Missa L'Homme Armé*, based on the famous tune on which around forty Masses have been composed between the fifteenth and the seventeenth century, and the *Missa Sanguis sanctorum*. In addition to these five, modern scholars have also attributed to Caron the *Missa Thomas cesus* and the six anonymous Neapolitan Masses based on *l'Homme Armé*, although these attributions raise some issues and have as a result been discussed controversially.

The only type of evidence available are the texts of the Masses themselves, copied in some of the most important manuscripts of fifteenth-century music. They constitute the obvious starting point for any research on this topic; these texts can be considered as the repository of Caron's authorial intent and require to be restored, namely critically edited, in order not only to reach a textual level as close as possible to the author, but also to contribute towards a different and new understanding of Caron's music. Thus, this thesis provides a new methodologically up-to-date critical edition of Caron's Masses, according to the most valid principle of textual criticism. The rest of the dissertation is in constant dialogue with this critical edition, namely with the texts and their compositional features, which is the necessary prerequisite for any further discussion on Caron's Masses. The analysis of these compositional techniques as well as the characteristics of the textual tradition, which have often been neglected, help us to start answering questions related to Caron's personal style. Additionally, the remarkable heterogeneity of Caron's corpus of Masses has allowed me to confront some of the most problematic issues related to

Medieval and Renaissance music scholarship, such as: methodologies of attribution, the fifteenth-century tradition of polyphonic works based on *L'homme armé* tune with their cultural and historical contexts, the methodologies of edition, and the examination of issues in the textual tradition, like text underlay or accidental inflections. From this perspective, Caron's Masses become the opportunity to examine in depth issues that are among the most debated by musicologists working on this period, and in some case to challenge widely accepted assumptions.

The first chapter provides an overview of the textual tradition, by describing its witnesses, investigating their origins and dating (in some cases highly controversial), and by examining some of the most important issues encountered in the preparation of the edition. In this chapter, I deal exclusively with the texts that have been ascribed to Caron by coeval music manuscripts. In addition, I also provide a discussion of the models used as *cantus prius facti*, and deal with their treatment within Caron's settings. I then shift my attention towards the Masses attributed to Caron by modern scholarship. In chapter two, I discuss Christopher Reynold's attribution to Caron of the *Missa Thomas cesus*, copied in the manuscript Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, San Pietro B80. Reynolds also suggests a possible context for the composition and performance of this Mass, namely the arrival in Rome of the Byzantine prince Thomas Palaiologos in 1461. I demonstrate how this hypothesis cannot be accepted for a number of reasons, suggesting that the historical context related to the papal efforts of promoting a crusade argues against the writing of this setting for Thomas Palaiologos. I examine the proposed attribution to Caron, advocating against it and showing how the evidence used by Reynolds is not conclusive. I then examine Reynold's claim of a presence of Caron in Rome, and suggest how this would be highly unlikely, concluding that the most plausible context for the composition of this Mass would be an English institution in Bruges. In chapter three, I debate the attribution to Don Giller's attribution to Caron of the six anonymous *Missae L'homme armé* preserved in the manuscript Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, VI.E.40, discussing also the competing attribution of these settings to Busnoys by Richard Taruskin. I scrutinise how both hypotheses suffer from

methodological aporias and should be rejected; I also suggest that Judith Cohen's original theory that these Masses should be attributed to different composers, possibly under the supervision of a single figure, still stands as the most likely. I also examine, from a more theoretical point of view, the ways and the reasons for which scholars often propose new attribution of anonymous works.

Chapters three and four take into consideration one of the most controversial topics of fifteenth-century musicology, namely the tradition of *L'homme armé*; this is conducted from two distinct, but entwined, perspectives: one which prioritise the musical tradition, while the other is centred on the historical and cultural context. In chapter three, I examine more generally the fifteenth-century tradition of works based on *L'homme armé*, as well as Caron's *Missa L'homme armé*. I examine the relative early dating proposed for one of the manuscripts transmitting Caron's setting, highlighting how it is unlikely that it can be included in the first generation of Masses. I discuss the copious literature published on the tradition, noting how several hypotheses on the origin and chronology of *L'homme armé* settings have been put forward, although none of them prevailed. Despite its unclear origin, it is undeniable that *L'homme armé* sparked the interest of fifteenth-century composers. I evaluate the various hypotheses on the relative chronology of the first settings, pointing out some of their methodological fallacies. I then discuss in detail Caron's setting, presenting a new analysis of its structure, which corrects a previous one. I also analyse the relations of intertextuality with other coeval polyphonic settings. In chapter four I use an interdisciplinary approach to investigate the historical and cultural context of *L'homme armé*, namely the promotion of a crusade against the Turks, in the aftermath of the fall of Constantinople in 1453. I note how musicologists almost exclusively focussed on the Burgundian Order of the Golden Fleece, not considering that the late medieval crusading movement deeply influenced many aspects of cultural, social, and political life in the fifteenth century. I discuss how crusading propaganda was not pursued exclusively through political means, but also, and mainly, through the commission of visual, literary, and musical works. I argue how the *L'homme armé* tradition is relevant to crusading also outside the Order of the Golden

Fleece. I examine in particular the Neapolitan manuscript containing six anonymous *Missae L'homme armé*, presenting an original analysis of its origin, identifying the original owner with the courtier Philibert de Janly, a member of the Burgundian lower nobility. I show how this manuscript is imbued with crusading propaganda and can indeed be linked to the crusading movement that pervaded Burgundy in the fifteenth century. I also deal with the manuscript's dedication, and subsequent donation, to Beatrice of Aragon. I contend that she was the intended recipient of the manuscript, correcting a previous claim that suggested the manuscript being meant for her husband, the King of Hungary. My hypothesis is supported by insights from gender history which reveal the distinctive role of women in the crusading movement.

Chapter five discusses different methodologies for the critical edition of fifteenth-century sacred music. Here, I evaluate some of the most important critical editions, such as those of Okeghem, Josquin, Obrecht, and Busnoys, which are considered among the best for their editorial standards, and then I examine the various critical editions of Caron's Masses. I briefly describe the editions, and then analyse in depth some of the fundamental aspects of their editorial criteria, namely those that are considered most problematic for the edition of Medieval and Renaissance music, such as the treatment of notation and the translation from the mensural system to the modern one and the methodology of evaluation of witnesses. For the former, I discuss for each edition their criteria, highlighting their flaws, concluding that the substantial difference between the mensural notational system and the modern one is often misinterpreted, and results in various hybrid systems. Regarding the evaluation of witnesses, I note how the editions examined frequently present the two same issues. Their level of update is limited to Paul Maas and the Lachmannian method, and they do not consider the main contributions made by philologies other than the classical, limiting their methods to those proposed for the edition of classical texts.

In the last two chapters, I deal with two philological issues connected with the critical editions of Medieval and Renaissance polyphonic settings, namely text underlay and accidental inflections. In both chapter I discuss the pertinent literature, and examine

specific features of Caron's Masses, both from a theoretical and from an editorial point of view. For text underlay, examined in chapter six, I consider the errors and textual interpolations, as well as the distribution of the text in the voices, showing how copyists often prioritised an aesthetic approach rather than a performing one. I examine some specific and problematic cases from Caron's Masses, and conclude by presenting the editorial criteria for the edition of the text that I have adopted. As for accidental inflections (chapter seven), after presenting some of the various trends of the scholarly literature, I discuss some interesting examples of manuscript and editorial accidental inflections, justifying some the decisions taken in the critical edition. Both text underlay and accidental inflections show the presence of different attitudes in the textual tradition of Caron's settings. I argue that in some instances it is possible to suppose a direct intervention of the composer, and highlight how these aspects are of fundamental importance in a critical edition, as they can show compositional decisions rather than mere scribal initiatives; therefore, they should not be underestimated, as it often happens.

After these chapters, there is the critical edition with its critical apparatus. I present the general editorial criteria, and discuss the organisation of the critical apparatus, which involves three different layers: the first one reports information regarding the single movements, specifying their position in the witnesses, the mensural signs, voices, clefs, and paratexts. The second layer contains the annotation relative to the edition, which discuss errors and their corrections. Finally, in the third layer I compare the readings present in other witnesses.

Table 1: The Masses of Firminus Caron.

Mass	Witness(es)	*Cantus prius factus*
Accueille ma la belle	VatS 51, ff. 6*v*–17*r*	F. Caron, *Accueille ma la belle* 3-voice chanson
Clemens et benigna	ModE M.1.13, ff. 140*v*–152*r*; TrentC 89, ff. 378*v*–388*r*	Unidentified
Jhesus autem transiens	VatS 51, ff. 46*v*–55*r*	*Jhesus autem transiens per medium illorum ibat* (Vespers antiphon, Monday 3rd week of Lent)
L'homme armé	VatSP B80, ff. 99*r*–113*r*; VatS 14, ff. 127*v*–138*r*	Anon., *L'homme armé* Monophonic tune
Sanguis sanctorum	VerBC 755, ff. 36*v*–43*r*; VatS 51, ff. 81*v*–88*r*	*Sanguis sanctorum martyrum pro Christo effusus est* (fifth antiphon, second Nocturn of Matins, *Commune plurimorum martyrum*)

1. Firminus Caron's Masses: an Overview

Witnesses

The textual tradition of Caron's Masses does not present itself as overly complicated. Of the five Masses ascribed to Caron, two have a single witness tradition, namely *Missa Accueille ma la belle* and *Missa Jhesus autem transiens* both copied in VatS 51, while the other three are transmitted by two witnesses, those are: *Missa Clemens et benigna* transmitted in ModE M.1.13 and TrentC 89, *Missa L'homme armé* copied in VatS 14 and VatSP B80, and *Missa Sanguis sanctorum* present in VatS 51 and VerBC 755. I will briefly present the manuscripts in which Caron's Masses were copied and discuss some of the issues related to the textual tradition.

Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cappella Sistina 14 (VatS 14) and Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cappella Sistina 51 (VatS 51)

VatS 14 and VatS 51 are amongst the most important and renowned manuscripts of polyphonic music of the late fifteenth century, being also the oldest sources of the Cappella Sistina. These two manuscripts were copied together, therefore they are here descripted together. VatS 14 measures 580x430 mm, it is made of 170 folia, and transmits 14 settings of the Ordinary of the Mass, as well as seven other movements (two Kyries, one Gloria, and two Kyrie and Gloria pairs). VatS 51 measures 554x414 mm, it consists of 214 *carte*, and inside it there are 17 Masses, one Gloria, and six Credos; it can be divided into three different parts: the first one, which is also the main corpus of the manuscript, was copied by the same scribes of VatS 14; while the second and third were copied later in Rome, for use by the Sistine Chapel. Part II was copied by a single scribe, who also intervened in the other two parts; while Part III was copied by the same scribe of another Cappella Sistina manuscript (VatS 35).[1] Adalbert Roth has demonstrated that

[1] Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cappella Sistina 35. The two manuscripts are descripted in Adalbert Roth, *Studien zum frühen Repertoire der päpstlichen Kapelle unter dem Pontifikat Sixtus' IV. (1471-1484): Die Chorbücher 14 und 51 des Fondo Cappella Sistina der Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana* (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1991); Richard Sherr, ed., *Masses for the Sistine Chapel. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cappella Sistina, Ms. 14* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), 2-9.

these two manuscripts were copied in Italy in the last quarter of the fifteenth century, by two scribes: α, who was from Northern France or the Low Countries, and A, an Italian;[2] whereas, the miniatures and the decorated initials were added at a later time. As Agnese Pavanello notes, these two manuscripts are of crucial importance as they «epitomize a major cultural phenomenon of the time, the transfer of Franco-Flemish polyphony to the Italian states».[3] Nevertheless, there has been much debate on their actual place of origin, and no consensus on this has been reached yet.

Roth has demonstrated that these manuscripts were in possession of the Cappella Sistina no later than 1487, during the pontificate of Innocentius VIII. However, Roth remains sceptical about a possible origin in Rome; he suggests that the manuscripts were copied in Naples in 1474 for the Aragonese court chapel and were brought to Rome by King Ferrante a year later during a state visit for the Holy Year.[4] Roth's evidence is multifaceted, as he takes into account the physical characteristics of the manuscripts, the textual tradition of the repertory there copied, as well as composers's biographies.[5] Although, Roth's main point to support his theory lies in his analysis of the various iconographic elements, such as crowned heads in decorated initials being portraits of King Ferrante, he also points out that there is a similarity between the illuminations of VatS 14 and VatS 51 and those present in some Neapolitan manuscripts.[6]

---

[2] Other eight scribes entered some music or intervened in the two manuscripts. Among these, the so-called Hand D is responsible for the Kyrie of Caron's *Missa Jhesus autem transiens*. Mitchell Brauner suggested to identify Hand D as the scribe of Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cappella Sistina 15. Mitchell P. Brauner, "Review of A. Roth, Studien zum frühen Repertoire der päpstlichen Kapelle..." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 46, no. 2 (1993): 307.

[3] Agnese Pavanello, "Fortuna on the Dolphin. Notes on an iconographic motif in Cappella Sistina 14 and 51," *Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 67, no. 1 (2017): 51.

[4] Roth, *Studien zum frühen Repertoire*, 328-88.

[5] Many works and composers included in VatS 14 and VatS 51 are also mentioned in various works by Johannes Tinctoris, active in Naples from the 1470s.

[6] Roth, *Studien zum frühen Repertoire*, 254-68. Roth's methodology of identifying some of the decoration as evidence of a Neapolitan origin has been recently criticised in Agnese Pavanello, "A Flemish Venus in Milan: Gaspar van Weerbeke's *Missa O Venus bant*," *Early Music History* 38 (2019): 111-15. However, Pavanello, while discarding Roth's hypothesis that the vase in the illumination of van Weerbeke's Mass would be an emblem of the Este house, suggests that it would be similar to one of the emblem of Ferrante of Aragon.

Roth's hypothesis has been challenged in reviews[7] which generally agreed with another theory about the provenance of the two manuscripts elaborated by Flynn Warmington. Warmington, in two papers presented at conferences in 1991 and 1994, proposed first Florence and then Venice as places of origin of VatS 14 and 51. It has to be noted that she never published her hypotheses, although they are widely reported in the literature, therefore it is almost impossible to judge their merit, but they seem again to be based on an evaluation of the illuminations. While the Florentine origin has been dismissed in Roth's article written in response to it,[8] as well as by Warmington herself as she changed idea a few years later, the Venetian theory merits to be briefly discussed. In the abstract of the 1994 paper it is suggested that three of the miniaturists whose works are present in VatS 14 and 51, although only two are mentioned, would have been active in Venice between the 1470s and 1480s. Therefore, she proposed to date the two manuscripts to c. 1480, basing her hypothesis «largely on the evolution of the floral borders and initials of one of the miniaturists, the Maestro di Pico della Mirandola».[9] Furthermore, watermarks would suggest Venice as the place of origin. However, Warmington does not offer any explanation on who, or what institution, might have commissioned the manuscripts, and how they ended up in Rome. The identification of the Masters of the Pico Pliny and of the Rimini Ovid as authors of some of the miniatures has also been confirmed by art historian Lilian Armstrong. Jeffrey Dean has instead proposed that the two manuscripts were commissioned by a papal agent from a stationer in Padua and the decoration were added in Venice and elsewhere.[10] In addition to these theories, Emilia Talamo has proposed to identify one of the miniaturists as Franco de' Russi, and suggested that

---

[7] Brauner, "Review of A. Roth, Studien zum frühen Repertoire der päpstlichen Kapelle..."; Pamela F. Starr, "Review of A. Roth, Studien zum frühen Repertoire der päpstlichen Kapelle..." *Notes* 49, no. 2 (1992); Rob C. Wegman, "Review of A. Roth, Studien zum frühen Repertoire der päpstlichen Kapelle..." *Early Music* 20, no. 1 (1992).

[8] Adalbert Roth, "Napoli o Firenze? Dove sono stati compilati i manoscritti CS 14 e CS 51?," in *La musica a Firenze al tempo di Lorenzo il Magnifico*, ed. Piero Gargiulo (Firenze: Olschki, 1993), 69-100. The impossibility of an origin in Florence is further discussed in Pavanello, "Fortuna on the Dolphin. Notes on an iconographic motif in Cappella Sistina 14 and 51."

[9] The abstract is reported in Jeffrey J. Dean, "Verona 755 and the *Incomprehensibilia* Composer," in *Manoscritti di polifonia nel quattrocento europeo*, ed. Marco Gozzi (Trento: Soprintendenza per i Beni librari e archivistici, 2004), 95. The other miniaturist cited by Warmington is the Master of the Rimini Ovid.

[10] Dean, "Verona 755 and the *Incomprehensibilia* Composer," 96.

Ferrara should be taken into consideration as place of origin for the two manuscripts, as she recognise several iconographical elements as typical of the Ferrarese school; they would have been copied there in the late 1470s and then brought to Rome by Ercole d'Este in 1486.[11] The Ferrarese origin is also supported by Richard Sherr, as some manuscripts decorated by the Pico Pliny Master were made in Ferrara too, where he may have possibly been born as well as trained. Moreover, Ferrara had a renowned court chapel, in which the repertory of the two manuscripts could have been performed, as well as being in close contact with Naples, as he agrees with Roth that the repertory may have been the one of the Aragonese chapel. Sherr argues that the cardinal Giovanni d'Aragona, son of Ferrante, might represent the link to explain how the manuscripts were brought to Rome.[12]

While none of the hypotheses mentioned is conclusive, still a number of considerations can be made. First, as Pavanello wisely points out, the Masters of the Pico Pliny and the Rimini Ovid have not been identified yet, therefore any information about their biography is mere speculation and cannot be used as evidence to establish the origin of the manuscripts.[13] In addition, there would be a way to reconcile some of the theories put forward, namely that the manuscripts originated in Naples and the illumination were either added by miniaturists active in Venice and Ferrara, or by northern artists working in Naples.[14] Sherr countered this hypothesis by arguing that if this was the case, there would be other Neapolitan manuscripts with the work of these miniaturists,[15] but we cannot know for sure as the sequence of events of the Aragonese library is still the object

---

[11] Emilia Talamo, "Schede," in *Liturgia in figura. Codici liturgici rinascimentali della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, ed. Giovanni Morello and Silvia Maddalo (Città del Vaticano - Roma: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana - De Luca Editori d'Arte, 1995), 174-78; Emilia Talamo, *Codices cantorum: Miniature e disegni nei codici della Cappella Sistina* (Firenze: Officine del Novecento, 1997).

[12] Sherr, *Masses for the Sistine Chapel. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cappella Sistina, Ms. 14*, 15-18.

[13] Pavanello, "Fortuna on the Dolphin. Notes on an iconographic motif in Cappella Sistina 14 and 51," 63. Furthermore, Pavanello points out that «no certain identification can be made without a precise analysis of hands, conducted in person in order to verify all details of the mise-en-page and techniques of painting, type of brush stroke and pigments, in addition to motifs, spatial organization and so on».

[14] This is also the conclusion of Pavanello. Pavanello, "Fortuna on the Dolphin. Notes on an iconographic motif in Cappella Sistina 14 and 51," 63-64.

[15] Sherr, *Masses for the Sistine Chapel. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cappella Sistina, Ms. 14*, 14.

of research, and after the library was dismantled in 1501 many of the manuscripts were dispersed around Europe.[16]

Figure 1: VatS 14, f. 127*v*; Firminus Caron, *Missa L'homme armé*, Kyrie.

[16] Paolo Cherchi and Teresa de Robertis, "Un inventario della biblioteca aragonese," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 33 (1990); Santiago López-Ríos, "A New Inventory of the Royal Aragonese Library of Naples," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 65 (2002).

Figure 2: VatS 51, f. 6*v*; Firminus Caron, *Missa Accueille ma la belle*, Kyrie.

Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, San Pietro B80 (VatSP B80)

VatSP B80 is a parchment manuscript made of 249 folia, measuring 357x255 mm. It contains 16 settings of the Ordinary, 14 Magnificats, 27 hymns, and 28 motets.[17] Charles Hamm suggested that the place of origin of the manuscript was northern France and reached Italy at a later stage; he based this on the repertory and paleographical analysis pointing towards the Flemish area.[18] Christopher Reynolds has argued instead for a Roman origin for VatSP B80, identifying the northern scribe Nicholas Ausquier as its main scribe.[19] Through archival research, Reynolds has also argued that the compilation of the manuscript would have been started in 1474 and completed by March 1475.[20] Reynolds also noted that the repertory there copied was already dated between one and three decades when it was copied in VatSP B80, therefore arguing that the manuscript would contain music from other older Roman collections.[21] He hypothesised the existence of three different layers, which would present works from sources copied respectively in 1458-1461, 1463, and 1473. The first six gatherings would belong to layer one, the seven following gatherings, among which there is Caron's *Missa L'homme armé*, were copied from a 1463 manuscript, although further works not belonging to the 1463 exemplar were also copied in this section; while the last seven fascicles would represent the earliest layer of music originally copied between 1458 and 1461.[22] Some final additions were included around 1500 by scribes different than Ausquier.[23] While interesting, the evidence adduced does not seem to be conclusive, and Roth has briefly criticised Reynolds's views, suggesting instead a northern provenance for the manuscript.[24] While some of the points made by Reynolds are largely open to criticism,

---

[17] The manuscript is described in Christopher A. Reynolds, "The Origins of San Pietro B 80 and the Development of a Roman Sacred Repertory," *Early Music History* 1 (1981).
[18] Charles Hamm, "The Manuscript San Pietro B 80," *Revue Belge de Musicologie / Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Muziekwetenschap* 14 (1960).
[19] Reynolds, "The Origins of San Pietro B 80 and the Development of a Roman Sacred Repertory."; Christopher A. Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513* (Berkeley - Los Angeles - London: University of California Press, 1995).
[20] Reynolds, "The Origins of San Pietro B 80 and the Development of a Roman Sacred Repertory," 281.
[21] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 100.
[22] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 98-103.
[23] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 104-09.
[24] Roth, *Studien zum frühen Repertoire*, 567-77.

the fact that the manuscript is made of quinternions would point against an origin in northern France or the Low Countries, where quaternions were the norm for music manuscripts.

Figure 3: VatSP B80, f. 99*r*; Firminus Caron, *Missa L'homme armé*, Kyrie.

Modena, Biblioteca Estense, α.M.1.13 (ModE M.1.13)

ModE M.1.13 is a parchment manuscript made of 224 folia, measuring 560x395 mm, containing 18 settings of the Ordinary of the Mass; there are no ascriptions in the manuscript, except for the *Missa L'homme armé* attributed to Guillaume Faugues, though the majority of the works are by Johannes Martini.[25] The manuscript was copied in Ferrara for the court of Duke Ercole d'Este probably around 1479-1481 by the copyist Fra Filippo de San Giorgio, as suggested by a letter to the duke.[26] As Lewis Lockwood notes, the manuscript presents some substantially different readings from the other witnesses transmitting the same works.[27] Several interpretations have been put forward to explain this peculiarity, arguing in particular about a possible editorial intervention by Martini. Lockwood was the first to hint at the possibility that the different versions would be the result of an editorial revision, possibly by Martini.[28] This hypothesis has been criticised by Elaine Moohan, who argued that the different versions are the result of an authorial intervention by the composers, and by Francesco Rocco Rossi, who suggested that absolutely Martini did not acted as editor, and the different versions are the product of the usual process of copy.[29] More recently, Murray Steib returned on the matter, arguing that the different readings ModE M.1.13 can be the result of an intervention both of the copyist and an independent editor, identified as Martini; furthermore, Steib suggests that several Masses present a section created not by their original composers.[30] In Steib's hypothesis, some minor changes in the readings were

---

[25] Lewis Lockwood, *Music in Renaissance Ferrara, 1400-1505. The Creation of a Musical Center in the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), 242; Francesco Rocco Rossi, "Le presunte 'seconde versioni' del Ms. Mod α.M.13 *[sic]*: intervento revisionale di Johannes Martini?," *Fonti Musicali Italiane* 9 (2004).

[26] Lockwood, *Music in Renaissance Ferrara, 1400-1505. The Creation of a Musical Center in the Fifteenth Century*, 249-50.

[27] Lockwood, *Music in Renaissance Ferrara, 1400-1505. The Creation of a Musical Center in the Fifteenth Century*, 266.

[28] Lockwood, *Music in Renaissance Ferrara, 1400-1505. The Creation of a Musical Center in the Fifteenth Century*, 266.

[29] Elaine Moohan, "Sources of Sacred Music for the Chapel Choir of Ercole I d'Este (1471-1505) Duke of Ferrara and the Masses of Johannes Martini" (PhD dissertation, University of Manchester, 1993). Rocco Rossi, "Le presunte 'seconde versioni' del Ms. Mod α.M.13 *[sic]*: intervento revisionale di Johannes Martini?."

[30] Murray Steib, "Herculean Labours: Johannes Martini and the Manuscript Modena, Biblioteca Estense, MS α.M.1.13," *Early Music History* 33 (2014): 183-257.

provided by the copyist, while more substantial modifications can be explained by the destination of the manuscript and its commission. ModE M.1.13 was in fact commissioned by Duke Ercole for his chapel, therefore both the selection of repertory to be included and their readings were probably supervised by someone close to the Duke, who was also active as a singer. The choices in terms of text underlay can therefore be explained as guided by political and religious reasons in order to adhere as much as possible to the Duke's wills. Martini seemed to have updated some of his works, appearing in this manuscript, and acted also as editor for others.[31] The cause of these changes seems to be mostly musical and related also to the performance of the works copied, as Steib explains: «Martini must have sung all of these masses with the court cappella and determined that the changes outlined in this article were necessary for one or another of a small number of reasons».[32]

[31] Steib, "Herculean Labours: Johannes Martini and the Manuscript Modena, Biblioteca Estense, MS α.M.1.13," 249-53.
[32] Steib, "Herculean Labours: Johannes Martini and the Manuscript Modena, Biblioteca Estense, MS α.M.1.13," 252.

Figure 4: ModE M.1.13, f. 140*v*; Firminus Caron, *Missa Clemens et benigna*, Kyrie.

Trento, Museo Provinciale d'Arte, Castello del Buonconsiglio, 1376 (TrentC 89)

TrentC 89 is one of the manuscripts of the so-called Trent Codices, consisting of seven manuscripts, which can be valued as the most important collection of fifteenth-century European polyphony. The manuscripts were copied between c. 1433 and 1477 in different areas of Europe,[33] and they transmit almost two thousand polyphonic works, mainly liturgical, from the main composers of the period, being therefore amongst the most important sources for fifteenth-century sacred and secular polyphony.

TrentC 89 is a paper manuscript consisting of 427 folia, copied in Trent between 1460 and 1466.[34] It measures 305x215 mm, and is made of 36 gatherings bound together not in the order they were copied. The level of decoration is very low, it was written in a *cursiva cancelleresca* by several copyists. Half of the works in TrentC 89 were copied by the same scribe, the principal copyist, who can be identified as Johannes Wiser, a German priest, active in Trent since 1455. He is also the principal scribe for the later Trent Codices, namely TrentC 88, TrentC 90, and TrentC 91 copied between 1453 and 1477. As mentioned, TrentC 89 does not preserve the original order in which the various gatherings were copied. Therefore, it is difficult to interpret the internal ratio of its content. In addition, as Rebecca Gerber points out, it is difficult to provide a more precise dating of the different sections, as often different inks were used at the same time, and later addition were provided.[35] However, this manuscript can be divided in seven sections, as proposed by Robert Mitchell, with Caron's *Missa Clemens et benigna*, copied

---

[33] Reinhard Strohm, "Trienter Codices," in *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart, allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Musik*, ed. Ludwig Finscher (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1998), Sachteil 9, 801-12; Reinhard Strohm, "I-TRcap 93*: Eine zentrale Sammlung europäischer Messenmusik," *Musikleben des Spätmittelalters in der Region Österreich* (2020): accessed 04/08/2020. https://musical-life.net/essays/i-trcap-93-eine-zentrale-sammlung-europaeischer-messenmusik. See also the database of the Trent Codices on the Trentino Cultura website. https://www.cultura.trentino.it/Banche-dati.

[34] Suparmi Elizabeth Saunders, "The Dating of the Trent Codices from their Watermarks, with a Study of the Local Liturgy of Trent in the Fifteenth Century" (PhD dissertation, King's College, 1983), 91. The information about the manuscript are taken from Giulia Gabrielli, "Descrizione del Codice: Tr89," *Codici musicali trentini del Quattrocento* (2014): accessed 04/08/2020. https://www.cultura.trentino.it/portal/server.pt/community/manoscritti_musicali_trentini_del_%27400/814/descrizione/22653?Codice=Tr89.

[35] Rebecca Gerber, "An Assessment of Johannes Wiser's Scribal Activities in the Trent Codices," *Musica Disciplina* 46 (1992): 65-67.

by Wiser, appearing in section six, which contains three Ordinarium cycles and various works, such as motets, Magnificat, and secular pieces.[36]

Figure 5: TrentC 89, f.378*v*; Firminus Caron, *Missa Clemens et benigna*, Kyrie.

[36] Robert James Mitchell, "The Paleography and Repertory of Trent Codices 89 and 91, together with Analyses and Editions of Six Masses Cycles by Franco-Flemish Composers from Trent Codex 89" (PhD dissertation, University of Exeter, 1989), 8-64.

Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare, DCCLV (VerBC 755)

VerBC 755 is a paper manuscript, measuring 337x241 mm, composite of two different parts copied in different places and at different times. It is a rather plain manuscript in terms of decoration, although it seems to be unfinished as there are many empty spaces left to insert decorated initials.[37] The main corpus of the manuscript, containing Caron's *Missa Sanguis sanctorum*, arrived in Verona probably in the last quarter of the fifteenth century, while the second part was copied there no later than the beginning of the sixteenth century.[38] The first part contains ten polyphonic settings of the Ordinarium, of which only five are attributed, as well as three anonymous motets. While the second part presents only anonymous works: two Masses, one Introit, and one Kyrie. Roth argues that the scribe who copied the first part of the manuscript was French or from the Low Countries, and had some kind of musical literacy, although he rules out a professional scribe.[39] Roth also suggests that VerBC 755 is closely connected with VatS 14 and VatS 51, and that they may have been copied from the same exemplar.[40] They would be a representation of Masses of the Neapolitan Aragonese court, with VerBC 755 and VatS 51 sharing four Masses, with readings similar between the two, as well as both including Tinctoris's works; therefore, Roth places the copy of VerBC 755 in Naples around the same time, or slightly later, the compilation of the two Cappella Sistina manuscripts, namely 1474.[41]

However, this manuscript has also been object of scrutiny by Dean, who reached different conclusions from Roth.[42] Dean is sceptical about the musical literacy of the copyist, noting that, despite the presence of corrections, still several mistakes remain; he argues that the copyist might have been a student at a northern Italian university, probably Padua, a semi-professional scribe and musician temporary working at a

---

[37] Only a few cadels were added, especially at the beginning of the manuscript. Other, less decorated, initials appear also in the second part of the manuscript.
[38] Roth, "Napoli o Firenze? Dove sono stati compilati i manoscritti CS 14 e CS 51?," 87.
[39] Roth, *Studien zum frühen Repertoire*, 558.
[40] Roth, "Napoli o Firenze? Dove sono stati compilati i manoscritti CS 14 e CS 51?," 87.
[41] Roth, *Studien zum frühen Repertoire*, 556-66.
[42] Dean, "Verona 755 and the *Incomprehensibilia* Composer," 93-108.

stationery.[43] Hence, he suggests that VerBC 755 was made to be sold by a university stationer where it was «display[ed] on his shelves along with all his other books for sale»,[44] and that it was bought by a Veronese religious institution, related to the local cathedral.[45] Dean's hypothesis is interesting, although not entirely convincing; the appearance of the manuscript does not seem the one of a manuscript displayed to be sold. The manuscript is not finished, lacking most of the initials. On the other hand, it seems quite implausible that the spaces for the initials were left empty for a decoration to be added at a later time, as, indeed, some initials were added here and there throughout the manuscript. Furthermore, the quality of the text with many corrections present, some of them very evident, does not suggest that it had the appearance of an item created to be sold.

[43] Dean, "Verona 755 and the *Incomprehensibilia* Composer," 95-96.
[44] Dean, "Verona 755 and the *Incomprehensibilia* Composer," 95.
[45] Dean suggested that also VatS 14 and VatS 51 might have been produced in order to be sold. Dean, "Verona 755 and the *Incomprehensibilia* Composer," 96.

Figure 6: VerBC 755, f. 36*v*; Firminus Caron, *Missa Sanguis sanctorum*, Kyrie.

Issues in the Textual Tradition

As mentioned above, the textual tradition of Caron's Masses does not present any particular challenge. The main problem in the two settings transmitted exclusively by a single witness, namely *Missa Accueille ma la belle* and *Missa Jhesus autem transiens*, is the presence of difficult readings, due to corruption of the manuscript, that often require a conjectural editorial solution. The *Missa Accueille ma la belle* also presents interventions made at a later time by another hand, which imply that this setting was actually performed in the Cappella Sistina as they mostly deal with added accidental inflections. A fermata sign in the Credo of *Missa Accueille ma la belle* was also added later in order to have a section break before the *Et incarnatus*. An intervention to the *Missa Jhesum autem transiens* also related to performance can be seen in the Tenor of the Gloria, where someone tried to propose a *Resolutio* for the canon.

The tradition of the *Clemens et benigna* setting presents some interesting variants, with a fairly correct text both in ModE M.1.13 and in TrentC 89. The main difference between the two is the tradition of the Credo, which in TrentC 89 lacks completely the second three-voice section intonated on the *Et in Spiritum*. The copying of the two manuscripts is between fifteen and twenty years distant, therefore it is quite likely that they had different antigraphs. Both Steib and Robert Mitchell have argued against the originality of the *Et in Spiritum* section,[46] although in my opinion the evidence produced is not enough to conclude that Caron was not its author. TrentC 89 version of *Clemens et benigna* features the Credo divided in four sections, while ModE M.1.13 presents five sections.

Table 2: Structure of Credo, *Missa Clemens et benigna*.

TrentC 89	ModE M.1.13
Patrem omnipotentem [○]	*Patrem omnipotentem* [○]
Qui propter [○; trio]	*Qui propter* [○; trio]

[46] Steib, "Herculean Labours: Johannes Martini and the Manuscript Modena, Biblioteca Estense, MS α.M.1.13," 222-31; Robert James Mitchell, "Mitchell Trent Editions, Critical Commentary to Nos 15-21," (2015), 720. www.diamm.ac.uk/resources/music-editions/trent-codices/

Et resurrexit [¢]	*Crucifixus* [¢]
	Et in Spiritum [¢; trio]
Confiteor [○]	*Confiteor* [○]

According to Steib, the Trent version should be considered the original one, as the second trio of the Credo is spurious, being a later addition composed not by Caron, but by Martini *ad hoc* for ModE M.1.13. Steib identifies several different elements that constitute evidence of this theory, namely: the symmetry between the Gloria and Credo, the elaboration of the *cantus firmus*, the use of repeated notes, the rhythmic motion, the use of parallel thirds, sixths, and tenths, the use of duple metre, the octave-leap cadence, and the use of imitation. Against Caron's authorship, one of the strongest elements is, according to Steib, the fact that the structure of the Credo with the second trio would not be symmetric with the Gloria since Caron often planned the two movements symmetrically. It is true that often Caron composed the Gloria and the Credo with the same structure in the *Jhesus autem transiens* and *Sanguis sanctorum* settings, at the same time though his other two Masses, *Accueille ma la belle* and *L'homme armé*, feature asymmetric movements, with the Credo having a section more than the Gloria. The Credo in ModE M.1.13 also is symmetric in structure with the Sanctus, which has the same structure of the Credo with two three-voice sections. Steib also argues that the elaboration of the *cantus firmus*, the presence of repeated notes, the slower rhythmic motion, and the use of duple metre are not consistent with the rest of the Mass. As for the *cantus firmus*, Steib points out that the other three-voice sections paraphrase a portion of the chant, and the *Et in Spiritum* section would present an out-of-place section of the chant. However, it has not yet been established definitively what was the model used by Caron and we do not know what was its original structure of the model, moreover, as Steib himself admits, the paraphrase in the *Et in Spiritum* «does not disrupt the overall structure of the cantus firmus».[47] As for the other elements, it is indeed true that they are not diffusely used in the rest of the Mass, but still there is ample evidence of their

[47] Steib, "Herculean Labours: Johannes Martini and the Manuscript Modena, Biblioteca Estense, MS α.M.1.13," 226.

presence in other Caron's settings.[48] Their use is not something alien to Caron's style, although, as Steib notes, their employment in this Mass is scarce. However, one could not exclude that Caron's intention might have been to compose a section that precisely featured those elements.[49] Steib concludes that this section was likely written by Martini, who acted as editor for the entire manuscript. Evidence supporting this are, according to Steib: the use of imitation, the presence of parallel thirds, sixths, and tenths, and the octave-leap cadence; but all three of these features are, more or less extensively, present also in Caron's settings.

Mitchell, instead, argues that both TrentC 89 and ModE M.1.13 do not transmit the original Credo. He believes that the Credo in TrentC89 is incomplete and that the *Et in Spiritum* section of ModE M.1.13 is «a 'repair job' that may contain some element of a lost original».[50] He claims that the *Et in Spiritum* is different from the other three-voice sections, being declamatory in style, and with a simple texture, featuring also some 'awkward moments', concluding that these characteristics are not those of Caron's style. Mitchell suggests that the original trio would have been similar in size, as if it were one measure longer, then the Credo would have constituted the 40% of the entire setting. He concludes that the trio was «made up from memory», in order to have a complete Credo. Mitchell's theory is not entirely convincing for the same reasons outlined above. It is indeed possible that Caron decided to have a declamatory section with a simpler texture. As for the 'awkward moments', it has to be noted that the rest of the Mass is not free of passages that at a first sight seems to go against the style of the period.[51]

---

[48] The exception being the use of duple metre in the three-voice sections, which are present exclusively in the *Missa Clemens et benigna*.

[49] Different features of this Mass are quite unique in the landscape of fifteenth-century music, such as the different signature between inner and outer voices; it seems that this Mass can be considered quite experimental in style, therefore it should not be excluded *a priori* Caron's will to compose a section entirely different from the rest of the Mass. Also, Steib seems to contradict himself as he write: «Whoever composed this Et in Spiritum clearly knew the rest of the mass and wrote in a very similar style». Steib, "Herculean Labours: Johannes Martini and the Manuscript Modena, Biblioteca Estense, MS α.M.1.13," 226.

[50] Mitchell, "Mitchell Trent Editions, Critical Commentary to Nos 15-21," 720.

[51] Mitchell discusses these 'transgressions', but fails to recognise that they are not so different from those moments that he identifies as awkward in the *Et in Spiritum* section.

Hence, I do not see any convincing evidence to invalidate a Caron's attribution of the *Et in Spiritum* section transmitted in ModE M.1.13. The version in this manuscript transmits the Credo in its most complete form, and both Steib and Mitchell's arguments do not present enough evidence to argue against it.

The *Missa L'homme armé* is transmitted in VatSP B80 and VatS 51. The quality of the text is generally better in the former, as VatSP B80 is far more accurate VatS 14. This latter in fact presents numerous errors, often irreparable if one does not consult with VatSP B80. Beyond contrapuntal errors, often easily emendable, there are many counting mistakes. The two texts seem therefore to stem from different branch of the tradition. VatSP B80 presents far better readings and it has been used as reference for the edition. This can perhaps be explained if we look at Nicholas Ausquier, which has been hypothesised being the main copyist of VatSP B80. If indeed he was from Amiens, as Wegman suggests, it would be possible to speculate that he had access to a copy of this setting very close to Caron, if not even the autograph.

The tradition of the *Missa Sanguis sanctorum* is among the multi-witness settings the least complex. Both VerBC 755 and VatS 51 have a fairly correct text, often they share the same readings, and both lacks the Agnus Dei movement. The variants between the two witnesses are mainly notational, and while there are some errors in both manuscripts; overall, the text is not badly affected by their presence. The presence of rather visible corrections in VerBC 755 is noteworthy, while often VatS 51 has the correct reading. VatS 51 has some errors corrected by a later hand, which, in turn, also introduced some more on his own. However, the two witnesses do not seem to present any disjunctive error; therefore, they are related in terms of tradition. While it is not possible to establish with certainty if one of the two acted as antigraph, this would strengthen the hypothesis that they were both copied in Naples, as Roth suggests.

Cantus Prius Facti and Treatment of the Tenor

The choice and treatment of *cantus prius facti* made by Caron for his Masses is particularly variegated and demonstrates the array of options available to composers in the late fifteenth century, spanning from chant, to secular tune, to one of his own polyphonic

chansons. The *Missae Jhesus autem transiens* and *Sanguis sanctorum* are based on chants, while *L'homme armé* uses the homonymous famous tune, and *Accueille ma la belle* is composed from Caron's chanson bearing that title. As for the *Missa Clemens et benigna*, a definitive answer on what melody or polyphonic work was chosen by Caron for this Mass has not been reached yet.

Missa Jhesus autem transiens

The *Missa Jhesus autem transiens* makes use of the Vespers antiphon *Jesus autem transiens per medium illorum ibat* sung on Monday of the third week of Lent. This antiphon is widely attested in various sources all around Europe and can be found also in some manuscripts from the area near Amiens, where Caron was active. The same melody used by Caron, who transposed it a fourth above in his Mass, is in fact copied in: Arras, Bibliothéque Municipale, Ms 893, f. 128*r* (Figure 7), a breviary from St. Vaast monastery in Arras copied in the fourteenth century; Cambrai, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms 38, f. 90*r*, which is a thirteenth-century antiphoner from Cambrai Cathedral; and Valenciennes, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms 114, an antiphoner copied in the twelfth century at the monastery of St. Amand.

Figure 7: *Jesus autem transiens* as in Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms 893, f. 128*r*, detail.

It has to be noted that while the *cantus firmus* comes from the liturgy sung during Lent, the Mass still contains the Gloria, which was not sung during this period, along with the Alleluia. This Mass, therefore, is unlikely to have been composed for performance during Lent, as its *cantus firmus* would otherwise suggest; at the same time, it is true that the

validity of the liturgy came not from the singers, but the officiant. Polyphonic settings may not reflect the liturgical prescriptions at all. A similar situation can be observed in those polyphonic Masses which have a Credo, but were composed in contexts where the Credo would not be sung, or only performed in chant. Still, it is rather implausible that this setting was performed during a period in which one of its movement would have been liturgically inappropriate. Nevertheless, there is no evidence that could indicate for which specific occasion the *Missa Jhesus autem transiens* was composed.

The elaboration of the *cantus firmus* in the Mass is quite rigid, with the melody exposed in the Kyrie, Sanctus, and Agnus at the beginning with large values, with repetition in many sections, and freely elaborated, with shorter values, towards the end of a section. The Gloria and the Credo instead present the *cantus firmus* with large values and a textual canon prescribes how the tune should be performed in the three sections. The canon, however, is not quite precise in its prescription, and requires the performer to interpret it. This may be the reason for which part of the canon, though the least problematic one, was originally resolved in VatS 51. The canon is: *Recte sursum quartam superade colori, post color aufertur remeando per dyapente, ut prius hinc iterans cum pausis tolle colores*. It can be interpreted as requiring at first the addition of a note a fourth above each coloured note. Then the melody should be sung in retrograde inversion, without the coloured notes. Finally, it should be performed forward, with the exclusion of *colores* and rests.[52]

Missa Sanguis sanctorum

The *Missa Sanguis sanctorum* is based on the antiphon *Sanguis sanctorum martyrum pro Christo effusus est*. This antiphon was widely diffused in Europe, and variously used for the celebration of martyrs; in the majority of the sources transmitting it, the chant appears as the fifth antiphon of the second Nocturn of the Matins of the *Commune plurimorum Martyrum* (Common of several martyrs). However, in the area of northern France, it appears that this chant was also used for the feast of a specific saint. The manuscripts Valenciennes, Bibliothèque Municipal, Ms 114 and Arras, Bibliothèque

[52] Emily Carolyn Zazulia, "Verbal Canons and Notational Complexity in Fifteenth-Century Music" (PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 2012), 189.

Municipal, Ms 893 (Figure 8), which also both transmit the chant *Jesus autem transiens*, use *Sanguis sanctorum* also for the feast of Saint Nicasius of Reims, celebrated on 14 December. Nicasius was a bishop of Reims, founder of the cathedral church there, and was martyred at the beginning of the fifth century. He was one of the most popular saints venerated in the archdiocese of Reims. Both abbeys where the manuscripts were copied were under the diocese of Arras, which was a suffragan diocese of Reims until the reorganisation of 1559; hence, it is not surprising to find a section dedicated to this saint in these two manuscripts. The diocese of Amiens was also part of the ecclesiastical province of Reims, and in the Amiens cathedral an apsidal chapel was dedicated to Saint Nicasius in 1340. It was later renamed after Saint Francis of Assisi in 1494, and it was the chapel of the Amiens corporation of clothiers and sock-makers. It may be possible, hence, that Caron composed his *Missa Sanguis sanctorum* for this chapel, on the day of the feast of St. Nicasius.

Figure 8: *Sanguis sanctorum* as in Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms 893, f. 502*v*, detail.

The melody is treated quite freely throughout the Mass. There is a predominance of long values, which tend to become shorter towards cadences. The melody is usually presented once per each movement, with the exception of the Credo, which restates the incipit at the *Et in Spiritum*, which, however, is not the beginning of a new section.

Missa L'homme armé

The *Missa L'homme armé* uses the monophonic tune of *L'homme armé*, extremely popular in Mass composition during the fifteenth century and later in the sixteenth. Due to its popularity, composers frequently referred to previous settings in their own treatment of the melody. Therefore, to understand how Caron developed this Mass, what and who were his points of reference, and possibly where this Mass sits in the relative chronology of the *L'homme armé* settings, it is necessary to discuss in detail the entire tradition of works on *L'homme armé*.[53]

Missa Accueille ma la belle

The *Missa Accueille ma la belle* is the only setting by Caron that elaborates more than just the Tenor of another work. It is based on Caron's chanson *Accueilly m'a la belle au gent atour* (Figure 9). The chanson is transmitted in seven witnesses, among which there are some of the most important fifteenth-century chansonniers.[54] There are two versions of the chanson, one with an added Contratenor, and , as Perkins and Garey note in their edition of the Mellon Chansonnier, its textual tradition is generally quite complicated.[55] The same music was also re-used for the lauda *A Maria, fonte d'amore*, texted by Francesco d'Albizo, featuring the practice of the *Cantasi come*.

---

[53] See Chapter 3.

[54] The chanson is transmitted in: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fonds français 15123 ("Pixérécourt Chansonnier), ff. 6*v*-7*r*; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Ms Gr. Rés.Vm^7 676, ff. 47*v*-48*r*; Firenze, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Ms 2356, ff 40*v*-50*r*; Firenze, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Magliabechiana XIX.176, ff. 59*v*-60*r*; Dijon, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms 517 ("Dijon Chansonnier"), ff. 10bis*v*-11*r*; Trento, Museo Provinciale d'Arte, Castello del Buonconsiglio, Ms 1378 ("Trent 91"), f. 12*v*; Trento, Biblioteca Comunale, Ms 1947-4, ff. 4*v*-5*r*; New Haven, Beinecke Library for Rare Books and Manuscripts, Ms 91 ("Mellon Chansonnier"), ff. 3*v*-4*r*. The text only can also be found in the anthology *Le Jardin de plaisance et fleur de rhétorique*, compiled anonymously and printed by Antoine Vérard in Paris around 1502.

[55] Leeman L. Perkins and Howard Garey, eds., *The Mellon Chansonnier*, 2 vols. (New Haven - London: Yale University Press, 1979), vol.2, 194.

Figure 9: Chanson *Accueilly m'a la belle*, New Haven, Beinecke Library for Rare Books and Manuscripts, Ms 91 ("Mellon Chansonnier"), ff. 3*v*–4*r*.

The *Missa Accueille ma la belle* has been considered one of the most elaborated and accomplished settings of Caron, with the characteristics typical of a parody Mass. Throughout the entire setting, the four voices quote various excerpts of the chanson, and clearly the duets at the beginning of each movement resemble closely the incipit of the chanson, with a striking similarity especially in the Kyrie and Gloria. It is generally thought this Mass to be one of the last composed by Caron; however, it has to be noted that the treatment of the *cantus prius factus* has no implication towards the relative chronology of Caron's Masses, and not necessarily this setting was composed as last.

There has been much debate around Masses based on chansons, as the choice of a *cantus prius factus* undoubtedly had some relation with the liturgy and carried some meaning. As Andrew Kirkman suggests:

> To build a Mass setting around a borrowed melody is to unlock the potential of that melody for symbolic and emblematic significance. With its presence in each section of the Ordinary it weaves a continuous metaphorical thread through the

entire musical setting, and hence also through the ritual enactment of which it is part.[56]

The use of secular works in sacred music is, also, not surprising since, as Michael Long notes: «late medieval culture was so thoroughly permeated by Christian symbolism that there could be neither "an object nor an action, however trivial, that was not constantly correlated with Christ or salvation"».[57] The choice of a courtly love song, such as *Accueilly m'a la belle*, as the base for the Mass can be interpreted as a parallel for Marian devotion. As M. Jennifer Bloxam argues, the juxtaposition between a chanson and a Mass, namely between secular and sacred love, has a long tradition in the Middle Ages, with several examples not just in musical works, but also in the visual and literary traditions.[58] Since the twelfth century, the Virgin Mary was represented in literary and visual works with «themes and attitudes expressing her embodiment of the female virtues of humility, submissiveness, and tender motherhood».[59] These themes would emphasise the human aspect of the Virgin, and they must have been familiar to Caron too, since the portals of Amiens Cathedral represent Mary with these characteristics.[60] This interpretation, well-established also throughout the fifteenth century, helps us to understand also the framework of the *Missa Accueille ma la belle*, as well as other settings based on similar chansons, where an analogy is established between the courtly lady and the Virgin Mary. The Mass was possibly composed on commission, as a devotional work, namely a votive Mass, endowed by an individual, or a group such as a confraternity, in order to seek Marian intercession for its patron. It was part of the fifteenth-century trend of the courtly Marian worship, in which «the language of secular love, be it musical, or

---

[56] Andrew Kirkman, *The Cultural Life of the Early Polyphonic Mass. Medieval Context to Modern Revival* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 53.
[57] Michael Long, "Symbol and Ritual in Josquin's *Missa Di Dadi*," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 42, no. 1 (1989): 1. Long, in turn, is quoting Johan Huizinga, *The Waning of the Middle Ages. A Study of the Forms of Life, Thought, and Art in France and the Netherlands in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1919), 136.
[58] M. Jennifer Bloxam, "A Cultural Context for the Chanson Mass," in *Early Musical Borrowing*, ed. Honey Meconi (New York and London: Routledge, 2004), 6-7.
[59] Bloxam, "A Cultural Context for the Chanson Mass," 11.
[60] Bloxam, "A Cultural Context for the Chanson Mass," 11.

visual, as the communicative vehicle best suited to transport the listener, reader, or viewer into contact with the divine».[61]

Missa Clemens et benigna

The *Missa Clemens et benigna*'s *cantus prius factus* is an enigma. Several options have been put forward, although each and every one of them has some issues. The Tenor is treated rather freely throughout the Mass after a similar beginning in each movement, a feature common also to other Caron's settings; and this, naturally, does not help clarifying what the *cantus firmus* might have been. The opening of each movement features the same ascending pattern, and also internal and final sections often seem to share fragments of the same melodic material.

Figure 10: Tenor of *Missa Clemens et benigna*, Kyrie.[62]

James Thomson noted that the text of the sequence *Clemens et benigna iugi laude digna Maria* is a trope to the Osanna, associated to Marian liturgy.[63] This sequence is found also in manuscripts from northern France, such as Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms 888, however as one can see the melody does not correspond to the Tenor of the Mass (Figure 11).

[61] Bloxam, "A Cultural Context for the Chanson Mass," 21.
[62] Mitchell, "Mitchell Trent Editions, Critical Commentary to Nos 15-21," 711.
[63] Thomson, "The Works of Caron: A Study in Fifteenth-Century Style," 85-86.

Figure 11: Sequence *Clemens et benigna*, as in Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms 888, f. 37*v*.

It is indeed possible that Caron based his setting on this sequence, although set on a different melody. More recently Mitchell has suggested that scholarship should look at models that do not match the text *Clemens et benigna*. At the same time, he argued that since the Tenor has a range of more than an octave, the *cantus prius factus* should be looked for outside chant repertoire.[64] Hence, Mitchell proposed to identify the four-voice anonymous motet *Ave Jhesu Criste verbum patris*, copied in TrentC 88,[65] as the model for the *Missa Clemens et benigna*. A comparison of the Tenor of *Ave Jhesu Criste* and the one of the *Missa Clemens et benigna* suggests that the first three movements of the latter share some melodic material with the Tenor of the motet (Figure 12).

Figure 12: Comparison of the Tenor of *Missa Clemens et benigna* with Tenor of *Ave Jhesu Criste*.[66]

[64] Mitchell, "Mitchell Trent Editions, Critical Commentary to Nos 15-21," 714.
[65] Trento, Museo Provinciale d'Arte, Castello del Buonconsiglio, Ms 1375 ("Trent 88"), ff. 247*v*-248*r*.
[66] Mitchell, "Mitchell Trent Editions, Critical Commentary to Nos 15-21," 717.

Mitchell suggested that also other sections of the Tenor of the motet were used in the Mass by Caron, such as the conclusion of internal sections in the Gloria and Credo (Figure 13).

Figure 13: Comparison of internal sections of the Tenor of *Ave Jhesu Criste* with Tenor of *Missa Clemens et benigna*.[67]

Here, however, the resemblance is less compelling, as the two works shares only a few notes, arranged in a way that does not seem particularly specific of the piece, but that could have had a polygenetic origin. Nonetheless, while arguing that the motet would have been used by Caron as a model for his Mass, and identifying also other places where the Mass resembles the four-voice motet, Mitchell suggested that only the «the first-section Tenors are clearly derivative from anything external», while the rest of the Mass would rely largely on material invented by Caron.[68] Despite sharing some melodic material, there is however a feature that Mitchell underplays in his theory of the motet *Ave Jhesu Criste* as the model for Caron's Mass, namely the signature. The motet does not present in fact any flat signature in any of the voice. The flat signatures are supplied editorially by Mitchell who argued that they are required. However, this does not seem the case, as in many places throughout the motet the *b mollis* should be solmized as *durum*, to avoid any prohibited interval, that in the version transmitted by TrentC 88 are simply not present, as there is no flat signature at all. The melodic profiles of the two Tenores, therefore, are simply quite different as one present *b mollis* while the other does not.

[67] Mitchell, "Mitchell Trent Editions, Critical Commentary to Nos 15-21," 718.
[68] Mitchell, "Mitchell Trent Editions, Critical Commentary to Nos 15-21," 719.

If, indeed, we have to look at melodies that do not match the text *Clemens et benigna*, and if Mitchell is right in suggesting that only the first sections present derivative material, then there is also another option that could be taken into account as a model. That is the second responsory of the second Matins for the fourth Sunday of Lent, *Moyses famulus domini* (Figure 14).

Figure 14: Responsory *Moyses famulus domini*, as in Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms 893, f. 130*v*.

The resemblance of the incipit of the Responsory, if transposed a fourth above, is striking with the beginning of the Tenor of *Clemens et benigna*. Still, why the Tenor of the Mass would report as paratext *Clemens et benigna* and not *Ave Jhesu Criste*, or *Moyses famulus domini* remains a question. It may also well be that there was a melody for *Clemens et benigna* that simply we have not yet discovered. Still, for this Mass there is not yet a convincing answer on what was the model that Caron chose.

2. Attributions to Caron in San Pietro B80: the *Missa Thomas cesus*

Having discussed, in the previous chapter, the Masses that can be securely attributed to Caron, thanks to the presence of an ascription to him in at least one of the witnesses that transmit them, I now come to examine those Masses that have been attributed to Caron only by modern-day scholars. This chapter, and part of the next one, will hence focus on the seven anonymous Masses, one in VatSP B80 and six in NapBN 40, for which musicologists have identified some elements that led them to consider Caron as the author of those settings. I will examine the evidence put forward by scholarship and assess their validity as tools for attribution.

In addition to Caron's *Missa L'homme armé*, San Pietro B80 contains another mass attributed to Caron by Christopher Reynolds in his monograph on musical life at the Roman basilica of St. Peter.[1] This is the *Missa Thomas cesus*, transmitted anonymously at ff. 166*v*–181*r*, suggesting also a possible context for its composition and performance, which connects three different Thomases: the Byzantine prince Thomas Palaiologus, the theologian Thomas Aquinas, and the English saint Thomas Becket (Thomas of Canterbury). Neither of the hypotheses put forward by Reynolds seems entirely convincing for a number of reasons, and, in this chapter, I shall discuss and argue against them, and propose a different context for this Mass.

The Tenor of the Mass is taken from the seventh responsory of Matins, *Mundi florem*, of the thirteenth-century rhymed office for Thomas Becket *Pastor cesus in gregis medio*, celebrated on 29 December, and refers to his martyrdom, with the text reading: *Thomas cesus dum datur funeri / Novus Abel succedit veteri* (Figure 15).[2]

[1] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380–1513.*

[2] «When Thomas, murdered, is given to burial, a new Abel succeeds the old», trans. after Kay Slocum, *Liturgies in Honor of Thomas Becket* (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2004), 190.

26a.

26b.

Figure 15: outline of the Tenor presented in the first Kyrie (26a) and the Christe (26b).[3]

The feast of St Thomas Becket was widely celebrated across Europe since the early thirteenth century; its office was adopted not just in the Sarum liturgy but also by various European monastic communities which included the celebration of St Thomas in their liturgical calendar. This has resulted in the Office *Pastor cesus in gregis medio* being transmitted in more than three hundred manuscripts from Britain, Continental Europe, and Scandinavia.[4] Furthermore, the liturgy in honour of St Thomas provided both words and music for several medieval and renaissance polyphonic works.[5] Therefore, while the Office undoubtedly originated in an English context, having been composed by Abbot Benedict of Peterborough at the end of the twelfth century,[6] it is not possible to automatically assume an English provenance for the *Missa Thomas cesus*. James Cook has argued that while this would be the only known continental Mass for an English saint, the evidence suggests that *Thomas cesus* is indeed a continental Mass, with some English influence.[7] Rob Wegman also notes that this would be the earliest four-voice Mass written on the continent.[8]

---

[3] Figure taken from Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 204.
[4] Andrew Hughes, "Chants in the Rhymed Office of St Thomas," *Early Music* 16 (1988); Slocum, *Liturgies in Honor of Thomas Becket*, 98-126.
[5] Denis Stevens, "Music in Honor of St Thomas of Canterbury," *Musical Quarterly* 56, no. 3 (1970).
[6] Hughes, "Chants in the Rhymed Office of St Thomas," 185.
[7] James Matthew Cook, "Mid-Fifteenth-Century English Mass Cycles in Continental Sources" (PhD dissertation, University of Nottingham, 2014), 316-20.
[8] Rob C. Wegman, "Petrus de Domarto's *Missa Spiritus almus* and the Early History of the Four-Voice Mass in the Fifteenth Century," *Early Music History* 10 (1991): 276.

A Crusading Context?

Reynolds proposed as the context for the composition and performance of the *Missa Thomas cesus* the arrival of Thomas Palaiologos in Rome on 7 March 1461, the feast day of St. Thomas Aquinas. Thomas Palaiologos (1409/10-1465) was the last-born son of the Emperor Manuel II and Elena Dragaš, he was brought up in Mistra, then considered as the cultural capital of the Byzantine Empire, and from 1430 was Despot of Morea, sharing the government first with his elder brothers Theodore and Constantinos, later Emperor, and then solely with his brother Demetrios.[9] Although being a single entity, the Despotate of Morea was in reality split between various principalities each ruled by a member of the Palaiologos family, with Thomas governing over the Principality of Achaia, due to his marriage with Caterina Zaccaria, daughter of the Genoese prince Centurione Zaccaria. After the fall of Constantinople, Thomas and his brother Demetrios remained in Morea, as they did not pose a real threat to the Sultan Mehmed II, due to their renowned incapacity of collaborating. Already in 1439, there was the suspicion that Demetrios asked for the Turkish support of his bid to become the next Emperor. And when the Emperor John VIII died in 1448, Demetrios was perceived as a powerful opponent by Constantinos due to his association with the anti-unionist faction, which was opposing the reunion of the Latin and Greek Churches, ratified by the Council of Florence in June 1439. The terms imposed by Mehmed II greatly reduced the territory of the Despotate of Morea but allowed Thomas and Demetrios to continue being its rulers, with the payment of an annual tribute. Being confined in a reduced territory, towards the end of the 50s, Thomas and Demetrios were fighting again, and both asked for a support: Demetrios turned to the Sultan, while Thomas asked the pope Pius II for help. However, Mehmed II decided in April 1460 to annex the area, resolving in this way the continuous quarrel between the two brothers. Demetrios soon surrendered and was imprisoned, while Thomas, along with his family, fled to Corfu. In November 1460,

[9] This information and the following are largely taken from Donald M. Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor. The Life and Legend of Constantine Palaiologos, last Emperor of the Romans* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

Thomas decided to go to Italy, later reaching Rome after an invitation by the pope, and spent his last years there until his death in 1465.

Reynolds found the text of the *cantus firmus*, with the reference to Abel, as particularly fitting to Thomas Palaiologus, due to his rivalry with his brother Demetrios. Also, he believed that Thomas' arrival in Rome on the day of the feast of Thomas Aquinas was not a coincidence, as often «the arrival of a visiting dignitary [was] often carefully timed so as to coincide with some auspicious anniversary».[10] The feast of Thomas Aquinas was usually celebrated in Rome with a sung Mass during a service at the church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva. In 1457, the sermon delivered on this day compared Thomas Aquinas to the Greek John of Damascus, in an attempt to reconcile the scholastic and patristic thoughts, and the arrival of Thomas Palaiologos in Rome on this day would have offered, according to Reynolds, another occasion for associating this feast with the reconciliation between the Latin and Greek Churches.[11] Reynolds also argued that the choice of a *cantus firmus* from the office of Thomas Becket was to celebrate the martyrdom, intended as «Christian struggles and suffering».[12] As Reynolds suggested: «the choice of *cantus firmus* welcomed the fugitive Thomas as a living martyr, a "new Abel" victim of a "new Cain"»,[13] being also relevant to the relic of St. Andrew's head, brought to Rome by Thomas from Patras.[14] Furthermore, Reynolds believed that the omission of the *filioque* clause as well as the mention to the apostolic church in the Credo would have been relevant, being politically motivated by the presence of Thomas, a member of the Byzantine imperial family.[15]

However, further research on this reveals that this context is not tenable. First of all, there is no mention at all of Thomas Palaiologos attending the celebrations for St. Thomas Aquinas, and especially the service at Santa Maria sopra Minerva, where the Mass could

---

[10] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 205.
[11] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 206-07.
[12] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 207.
[13] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 207.
[14] Maya Maskarinec, "Mobilizing Sanctity: Pius II and the Head of Andrew in Rome," in *Authority and Spectacle in Medieval and Early Modern Europe. Essays in Honor of Teofilo F. Ruiz*, ed. Yuen-Gen Liang and Jarbel Rodriguez (London: Routledge, 2017), 186.
[15] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 207-08.

have been sung. It is rather reported that Thomas was received by Pius II in a consistory at the Apostolic Palace, specifically in the Camera del Pappagallo, today known as Sala dei Chiaroscuri.[16] Furthermore, it seems unlikely to say the least that the Credo, which lacks the entire section from *Et in Spiritum Sanctum* to *Et unam, sanctam…Ecclesiam*, hence omitting the famous and controversial clause *qui ex patre filioque procedit*, would have been curtailed for the reason advanced by Reynolds, namely a reconciliation between the Catholic and Orthodox denominations.[17] Thomas Palaiologos was in fact one of the participants of the Byzantine imperial family delegation at the Council of Florence in 1439, in which the controversy on the *filioque* clause of the Credo was overcome. Thomas Palaiologos is indeed depicted in the Cappella dei Magi, a famous cycle of frescoes by Benozzo Gozzoli at the Palazzo Medici Riccardi in Florence: it represents a celebration of the Council of Florence, being also an allegory of the Westernisation of the Byzantine culture.[18] The cycle was started in 1459, and it is probable that it was commissioned also in connection to the Council of Mantua, and its *terminus ante quem* is October 1461, as attested by the exchange of correspondence between Benozzo and Piero de' Medici.[19] The identification between the Magi and the Byzantine delegates is also supported by a 1461 letter from Pius II to Philip the Good of Burgundy in which the pope highlights the unification of the two Churches: «Ecce Magi venerunt ab Oriente ad stellam […] pacem […] et unionem cum occidentalibus denuntiantes».[20] Moreover, Thomas Palaiologos is addressed by Pius II as *vir catholicus* in

---

[16] Kenneth M. Setton, *The Papacy and the Levant (1204-1571). The Fifteenth Century*, vol. 2 (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1978), 228.
[17] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 207-08.
[18] Silvia Ronchey, "Tommaso Paleologo al Concilio di Firenze," in *La stella e la porpora. Il corteo di Benozzo e l'enigma del Virgilio Riccardiano. Atti del Convegno di Studi (Firenze, 17 maggio 2007)*, ed. Giovanna Lazzi and Gerhard Wolf (Firenze: Edizioni Polistampa, 2009).
[19] Silvia Ronchey, "Il "salvataggio occidentale" di Bisanzio. Una lettera di Enea Silvio Piccolomini e l'allegoria pittorica di Bisanzio nel primo Rinascimento," in *Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco (XIII-XV secolo) (Atti del Colloquio Internazionale organizzato nel centenario della nascita di Raymond-Joseph Loenertz O.P., Venezia, 1-2 dicembre 2000)*, ed. Chryssa A. Maltezou and Peter Schreiner (Venezia: Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini, 2002), 134.
[20] «Here the Magi, coming from East towards the star […], bringing peace […] and the union with the West». Ronchey, "Tommaso Paleologo al Concilio di Firenze," 138.

his 1459 encyclical *Moveat Vos*.[21] As Silvia Ronchey argues, while in 1439 Thomas Palaiologos was the youngest member of the imperial family, being therefore almost neglected in the various accounts, twenty years later at the Council of Mantua he represented one of the last descendants of this family, as well as being an heir to the throne.[22] It is worth sketching here Pius II's plan of the western rescue of Byzantium, devised with the help of the powerful cardinal Bessarion. The fall of Constantinople implied that there was no longer a Roman Emperor, and, therefore, the premises of the temporal power of the papacy, through the *Donatio Constantini*, already at the centre of debate after Lorenzo Valla's philological argument, were wavering. This plan envisaged the constitution of a new "occidental" sovereignty, Christian and Byzantine, allied with the West and under the auspices of the papacy. The "occidental refoundation" of Byzantium was a concept already devised in the first decades of the fifteenth century, through the *Heiratspolitik*, i.e. the marriage policy, of Manuel II Palaiologos and pope Martin V. It was supported by several Italian noble families, the Malatesta and the Gonzaga above all, not only financially but also politically and culturally. Thomas Palaiologos had a central role in these plans, as he would have been the first *basileus* of this New Byzantium: hence, the crusading project of reconquering Morea promulgated by the Council of Mantua in 1459.[23] It seems evident here that Thomas Palaiologos was considered instrumental for the success of the crusade of Morea, and that he was evidently considered as a Catholic; therefore, it seems unlikely that he would have had any issue with the presence of the *filioque* clause or the mention of the apostolic church in the Credo sung to celebrate him.

---

[21] Silvia Ronchey, "Orthodoxy on Sale: the Last Byzantine, and the Lost Crusade," in *Proceedings of the 21st International Congress in Byzantine Studies, London, 21-26 August 2006*, ed. Elizabeth Jeffreys and Fiona K. Haarer (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 322.
[22] Ronchey, "Tommaso Paleologo al Concilio di Firenze," 147.
[23] Ronchey, "Il "salvataggio occidentale" di Bisanzio. Una lettera di Enea Silvio Piccolomini e l'allegoria pittorica di Bisanzio nel primo Rinascimento."; Silvia Ronchey, "Il piano di salvataggio di Bisanzio in Morea," in *L'Europa dopo la caduta di Costantinopoli: 29 maggio 1453. Atti del XLIV Convegno Storico Internazionale del Centro Italiano di Studi sul Basso Medioevo - Accademia Tudertina (Todi, 7-9 ottobre 2007)* (Spoleto: Fondazione Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 2008).

Also, Reynolds proposed that the use of a melody originally destined to a martyred saint, such as Thomas Becket, would suit Thomas Palaiologos' exiled condition, as well as the fact that he brought with him the relic of the head of St. Andrew Martyr. However, here too, some historical circumstances argue against the relevance of this. The courtier George Sphrantzes writes in fact in his memoirs that Thomas was just visiting the pope and other Italian princes, and one could argue that he was likely planning to return, since he left behind his family and his court.[24] The original plan of the Council of Mantua, as mentioned, was in fact to promote a crusade for Morea and to reinstall Thomas as its ruler; therefore Pius II and Bessarion summoned him only for a "temporary exile".[25] Regarding the relic of St. Andrew, it has to be noted that Thomas played little part in it. When he arrived in Italy it was kept by the prefect of Narni, and only on 12 April 1462 was brought to Rome and presented to the pope, not by Thomas, but by a delegation of three cardinals: Andrea Oliva, Bessarion, and Francesco Piccolomini.[26] Furthermore, as Maya Maskarinec convincingly shows, Pius II in his *Commentaries* suggests that the exile of St. Andrew's relic was only temporary, and that it would have been returned to its proper place in Greece.[27] Hence, the use of such a *cantus firmus* seems less specific than what Reynolds suggested. It could not have been used to celebrate the arrival of the relic in Rome, as this did not happen in the March of 1461, but only a year later. The reference to Thomas Palaiologus's exile, as well as to the 'exile' of St. Andrew's head, may not be considered as a martyrdom, due to the fact that at the time it was perceived as only a temporary and necessary one. In conclusion, for all these reasons, the context proposed by Reynolds cannot be considered fitting the *Missa Thomas cesus*.

---

[24] Marios Philippides, ed., *The Fall of the Byzantine Empire. A Chronicle by George Sphrantzes, 1401-1477* (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1980), 84. The family of Thomas Palaiologos reached him in Italy at a later date.
[25] Ronchey, "Il piano di salvataggio di Bisanzio in Morea," 530.
[26] Ronchey, "Il "salvataggio occidentale" di Bisanzio. Una lettera di Enea Silvio Piccolomini e l'allegoria pittorica di Bisanzio nel primo Rinascimento," 140.
[27] Maskarinec, "Mobilizing Sanctity: Pius II and the Head of Andrew in Rome," 186-202.

The Attribution to Caron

Coming now to the attribution to Caron that Reynolds argued for this Mass, here too the evidence presented can be refuted. Reynold's argument uses two different evidence: melodic and stylistic analogies between Caron's works and the *Missa Thomas cesus* and the similar use of mensuration and conflicting signatures. Reynolds also postulates that Caron would have spent some time in Rome. The Roman context as well as the proposed authorship of Caron have also been extensively discussed by James Cook.[28]

As for the melodic similarities, Reynolds noted that the *Missa Thomas cesus* seems to extensively quote Caron's chanson *Le despourveu infortunée*, the text of this latter also being relevant to the exiled condition of Thomas Palaiologus. I have already discussed on Thomas's personal situation, and therefore I do not consider the text as particularly significant; however, also the melodic similarities identified by Reynolds are problematic. As also Cook notes, due to the different key signatures the quotations are not exact, and «it is clear that the B♮ in *Thomas cesus* drastically changes the melodic profile, and this may well preclude identifying the two with one another».[29] Reynolds also identifies a number of quotations between *Missa Thomas cesus* and Caron's Masses, but they all seem rather commonplace, as Cook also points out, and cannot be specifically used to suggest any kind of authorship. And even if the author of *Thomas cesus* decided to quote Caron, or any other composer, this cannot be used as evidence for authorship, but it rather may be that the author's intention was to pay a homage, or perhaps it was a just an allusion. Other stylistic features, considered by Reynolds as evidence of a possible attribution to Caron, such as the structural parallels or the cadential typologies equally seem to be not specific to Caron's style, and are profusely present in other composers's works.

Considering now the mensuration and the conflicting signatures. The mensurations used in *Thomas cesus* it is similar of some the patterns used by Caron in his Masses, however these are also quite common for fifteenth-century Masses in general, and again cannot be

[28] Cook fundamentally agrees with the proposed context, the entry of Thomas Palaiologos in Rome, put forward by Reynolds; although he is sceptical about a possible attribution of this Mass to Caron. Cook, "Mid-Fifteenth-Century English Mass Cycles in Continental Sources," 315-42.
[29] Cook, "Mid-Fifteenth-Century English Mass Cycles in Continental Sources," 329.

used as evidence for attributing authorship. The only instances in which Caron seems to depart from the usual are the *Missa Accueille ma la belle*, limited to the Gloria, and, more extensively, the *Missa L'homme armé*. However, the peculiar use in these two works is not matched anywhere in the *Missa Thomas cesus*. On the contrary, the use of *tempus perfectum prolatio minor* in the second Agnus, present in *Thomas cesus*, does not present any parallel with Caron's Masses.

As for the conflicting signature, in the *Missa Thomas cesus* the Contratenor altus bears one flat in all sections of the Mass, except the Et incarnatus in the Credo and the Pleni and Osanna I in the Sanctus. As Reynolds notes, it is quite unusual, being found only in one other work, namely the virelai *Joieux de cuer en seumellant estoy* by Solage. Indeed, some ficta issues arise from this rare signature; however, they do not seem particularly problematic. The only place where the *b* flat in the altus conflicts with another *b* is at the beginning of the Sanctus, but here the scribe provides a flat in the lower voice, in order to avoid the clash.[30] The example that Reynolds presents as highly problematic, namely the beginning of the Christe, is just the result of an erroneous reading on his part, as the first line of the Superius is notated on a six-line stave and the correct reading of the cadential movement is a *d* rather than *b* (Figures 16–17).

[30] I am not considering here those passages in which the *b* appears as a passing note.

Figure 16: *Missa Thomas cesus*, Christe, mm. 6-9, as transcribed by Reynolds.[31]

Figure 17: *Missa Thomas cesus*, beginning of Christe section; VatSP B80, f. 167*v*, detail.

Reynolds suggests that the use of a conflicting signature would be a feature that could help attributing the piece to Caron. He notes that most of Caron's Masses use conflicting signatures, such as in *Accueille ma la belle*, *L'homme armé*, and *Clemens et benigna*:[32] the first two present a flat in the three lower voices while the Superius appears with no flat signature, while *Clemens et benigna* presents flat signature only in the inner voices. Moreover, Reynolds observes that the signatures in *Clemens et benigna* are varied in some movements, as in *Thomas cesus*.[33]

The use of conflicting signatures as evidence for attributing the *Missa Thomas cesus* does not seem to be a conclusive element. First, the conflicting signature in *Accueille ma la belle*, *L'homme armé*, and *Sanguis sanctorum* is not used uniquely by Caron, and it is rather found in other polyphonic settings of the fifteenth century. The case of *Clemens et benigna* is different, as, to my knowledge, is the only Mass presenting this peculiar signature. However, it cannot be compared to *Thomas cesus*. First, contrary to what Reynolds affirms, the variation of signatures in *Clemens et benigna* happens on movement level, not within it, as in *Thomas cesus*, and it is not consistent in the two witnesses of the setting.[34] This inconsistency is, with all probability, an error of the scribe who was not

[31] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 209.
[32] He fails to note that also *Sanguis sanctorum* has the same signature as *Accueille ma la belle* and *L'homme armé*.
[33] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 212.
[34] Modena α.M.13 transmits the Mass with no flat signature in the inner voice in the Sanctus and Agnus, while TrentC 89 presents the Gloria with no flats.

familiar with this odd signature. Furthermore, the use of this signature in *Clemens et benigna*, as well as the use of accidentals in general, is a precise compositional feature, through which Caron constantly plays with the co-existence of *b durum* and *b molle* in the entire setting. This is not observed as the same level in the *Missa Thomas cesus*, where the presence of the two qualities of *b* in the altus and in one of the other three voices is carefully avoided most of the time.

Caron in Rome

Reynold's hypotheses of attributing the *Missa Thomas cesus* to Caron and to contextualise it within the celebration for the arrival of Thomas Palaiologus in Rome on the day of the feast of St. Thomas Aquinas led him to conclude that Caron must have spent some time in Rome.[35] It is not clear if the implication of a Roman period in Caron's life is a consequence of his attribution of the *Missa Thomas cesus*, or rather, as some of Reynold's arguments suggest, it is not a direct conclusion drawn exclusively from the attribution to Caron and the Roman context. The evidence presented by Reynolds to support his hypothesis are: the prevalence of Italian witnesses in the textual tradition of his works, iconographical evidence, and melodic resemblances between Caron's works and those by Johannes Pullois.[36]

Reynolds starts his argument on an Italian period for Caron, drawing from Leeman L. Perkins's view that Caron must have spent a good part of his career in Italy, probably in Florence, due to a strong presence of his compositions in Italian sources, and especially in two Florentine manuscripts, namely ParisBNF 15123 and FlorBN BR 229.[37] This theory has been criticised by Allan Atlas, who argues that «we need not insist that direct transmission by the composer was the only means of migration».[38] Indeed, the place of

---

[35] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 221.
[36] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 221-27.
[37] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fonds français 15123 (Pixérécourt Chansonnier); Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Banco Rari 229. Leeman L. Perkins, "Introduction," in *The Mellon Chansonnier*, ed. Leeman L. Perkins and Howard Garey (New Haven - London: Yale University Press, 1979), 9.
[38] Allan Atlas, "Review: The Mellon Chansonnier by Leeman L. Perkins, Howard Garey," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 34, no. 1 (1981): 142.

copy of a manuscript has often little to do with the provenance of the works transmitted inside it; the abundance of Italian sources transmitting music from composers who never worked in Italy is a clear evidence of this. Moreover, it has widely been pointed out that the lack of a substantial number of fifteenth-century French and Burgundian sources does not help in representing a realistic review of the textual transmission of plenty of fifteenth-century music. The scarce biographical data that we now possess on Caron points in a different direction from Italy, and there are a number of reasons that could explain the abundance of his works, as well of the others, in Italian sources.[39]

Furthermore, Reynolds argued that the two manuscripts transmitting Caron's *Missa L'homme armé* do include a portrait of him that would therefore provide iconographical evidence of an Italian period (Figure 18).[40] He identified as portraits the stylised profile of a man's visage at the beginning of the Mass in VatSP B80, under the capital letter "K" of the superius of the first Kyrie, and the slightly more well-defined profile of a face present in the capital letter of the second *contratenor* at the beginning of the *Et expecto* section of the Credo in the *Missa L'homme armé* transmitted in VatS 14.

[39] For example, the wide presence of northern composers in Italy, as well as the activities of Italian merchants and bankers in the Low Countries can indeed help to explain this situation.
[40] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 221-22.

Figure 18: Portraits of Caron identified by Reynolds. VatSP B80, f. 99*r*, detail (left); VatS 14, f. 133*r*, detail (right).

As anyone can clearly see, the two portraits, if indeed they can be considered as such, do not seem to portray the same person. We do not have any information about how Caron might have looked like, therefore it is not possible at all to argue, as Reynolds did, that they represent him. Moreover, in the copy of Caron's *Missa L'homme armé* transmitted in VatS 14, there are multiple human faces present as decoration of initials, so it would be interesting to know why Reynolds decided that the one present at f. 133*r* is Caron, but he did not offer any explanation about his choice. While the provenance of VatS 14 is debated, Rome does not appear as the place of its copy, therefore one should presume that Caron's profile was widely known in different places of Italy. Also, these would be the only instances in which a composer is portrayed in a manuscript of this period.[41] Furthermore, Reynolds suggested that, along with the supposed portrait in VatSP B 80, also the ascription to Caron of the *Missa L'homme armé* would be significant. It is surely interesting that the one to Caron is the only ascription present in VatSP B80, although one could argue that if indeed the *Missa Thomas cesus* is by Caron too, then why the

[41] The only manuscript to my knowledge transmitting portraits of the composers whose works are copied within it is the Squarcialupi Codex (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Mediceo Palatino 87). Naturally, the circumstances of this manuscript, as well as the geographical and chronological data, are quite different from both VatSP B80 and VatS 14.

ascription is present exclusively for the *Missa L'homme armé*? Perhaps the explanation to this ascription can be sought by looking at the copyist of VatSP B80, Nicholas Ausquier, since he may have come from the same city of Caron, Amiens.[42]

Lastly, Reynolds connected a possible Roman period for Caron with melodic similarities between his works and those of Pullois. It is not clear, however, if Reynolds used this as an evidence to prove Caron's presence in Rome or rather the other way around. He writes at a few pages distance both that: «a Roman period for Caron would explain several striking melodic resemblances between his works and those by Puyllois», and that: «I have dwelt on the musical resemblances between them because they suggest that Caron worked not merely in Italy but, at least for a time in the early 1460s, specifically in Rome in close proximity to Puyllois». Again, it seems that Reynolds argument is rather circular, as evidence used can be considered also a consequence of his hypothesis of positioning Caron in Rome. It has to be noted that Pullois was also active, both before and after his work at the papal chapel, in the Low Countries, receiving also ecclesiastic benefices in Cambrai and Utrecht,[43] therefore Caron may have come into contact with his works, and vice versa, during those periods.

Overall, it seems extremely unlikely that Caron spent any time in Rome; the scarce biographical information does not suggest it, and Reynolds hypothesis is not supported by valid evidence. Furthermore, both the context and the attribution of the *Missa Thomas cesus* proposed by him are not tenable, and therefore research should move in another direction in regard to this Mass.

Bruges or Rome?

I have so far argued against Reynold's argument which situates the composition of the *Missa Thomas cesus* for the arrival of Thomas Palaiologos in Rome, and attributes it to Caron. However, this is not the only hypothesis put forward for the context of this Mass. Cook too, as mentioned, has examined the Mass, and offered some ideas in regard to its

[42] Wegman, "Fremin le Caron at Amiens: New Documents," 11.
[43] Pamela F. Starr, "Pullois [Puyllois, Puylloys, Pyllois, Pyloys, Pilloys, Puilloys, Pylois, Pillays], Johannes [Jehan, Jean]," in *Grove Music Online* (2001).

context. He argues that this Mass, while undoubtedly continental, is "too English" to be positioned outside an English context. For Cook, the most plausible one would be the Hospital of St Thomas in Rome.[44] While admitting that this is a speculation, Cook points out that VatSP B80 contains other works having an English context: the "Two Kyries" Mass, Le Rouge's *Missa So ys emprentid* , and the *Missae Sine nomine* at ff. 113*v*–120*r* and ff. 122*v*–120*r*. However, Cook does not offer any explanation on how these works, appearing in a manuscript copied for the chapel of San Pietro, would be related to the Hospital of St Thomas. The fact that VatSP B80 was copied in Rome does not imply that its repertoire was necessarily linked to the Roman context. Repertoire, as well as musicians, travelled extensively in Europe,[45] and the link to Rome for the *Missa Thomas cesus* does not seem to be stronger than other places.

There is also another city that could provide a plausible context for this Mass: Bruges. This hypothesis was first presented by Strohm, also briefly discussed by Cook, who argued that the *Missa Thomas cesus* was part of a group of six settings, among which the only attributed one is to Petrus de Domarto, that were brought from Bruges to Rome by four singers.[46] The possible institution in which the Mass could have been composed is the English Merchant Adventurers, founded in Bruges in 1344, which had a chapel dedicated to St Thomas Becket in the Carmelite friary.[47] As Strohm notes, Bruges, as well as other Flemish centres, were known for their international culture, and indeed there is ample evidence of English music composed and performed there.[48] Furthermore, the Carmelite version of the office for St Thomas Becket are closer to those of the Sarum rite, and, as Cook notes: «they are the only continental order which can be shown to have

[44] Cook, "Mid-Fifteenth-Century English Mass Cycles in Continental Sources," 338-42.
[45] Rob C. Wegman, "Publication Before Printing: How Did Flemish Polyphony Travel in Manuscript Culture?," in *Books in Transition at the Time of Philip the Fair: Manuscripts and Printed Books in the Late Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Century Low Countries*, ed. Hanno Wijsman (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), 165-80.
[46] Reinhard Strohm, *Music in Late Medieval Bruges* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 141-42. This hypothesis is also discussed by Cook. Cook, "Mid-Fifteenth-Century English Mass Cycles in Continental Sources," 336-38.
[47] Reinhard Strohm, *The Rise of European Music* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 240.
[48] Strohm, *The Rise of European Music*, 240 ff.

used the *Mundi florem* chant in the version used in the *Thomas cesus* Mass».[49] While there is no direct evidence that the *Missa Thomas cesus* was composed in Bruges, it seems to me that the hints are compelling in suggesting that this Mass could have been composed for an English institution, the English Merchant Adventurers, whose chapel was dedicated to St Thomas Becket and where a Mass was sung every week,[50] in a city, Bruges, where English music was largely known.

[49] Cook, "Mid-Fifteenth-Century English Mass Cycles in Continental Sources," 337.
[50] Strohm, *Music in Late Medieval Bruges*, 64.

3. Caron and the Fifteenth-Century Tradition of *Missae L'homme armé*

As mentioned, Firminus Caron's *Missa L'homme armé* is transmitted by two witnesses, both preserved at the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana: VatS 14 and VatSP B80. VatS 14 contains also *Missae L'homme armé* by Du Fay, Busnoys, Regis, and Faugues, and was copied between the middle 1470s and c. 1480; VatSP B80 was probably copied in Rome between 1474 and 1476, although Christopher Reynolds has argued that Caron's Mass belongs to a discrete internal layer dating back to 1463.[1] These two manuscripts are the earliest among fifteenth-century music sources that transmit complete Masses composed on the *L'homme armé* melody. An earlier source, the Lucca Choirbook, includes a fragment of Du Fay's Mass, and has been dated around 1463 by Reinhard Strohm.[2] In terms of the relative chronology of the *L'homme armé* tradition, there is also a document from Cambrai Cathedral that cites a *missa sus l'ome arme* by Regis that was copied by Simon Mellet in 1462.[3] Therefore, if we accept that Caron's Mass in VatSP B80 dates back to 1463, his Mass, Du Fay's and the one by Regis would be the ones for which we have the earliest *termini ante quem*. However, it seems unlikely that the two Masses by Regis and Caron can be considered the first composed on this tune.

The Origin of *L'homme armé*

Before addressing the hypotheses on the relative chronology of the Masses belonging to *L'homme armé* tradition, it should be noted that many questions still pose a problem to modern scholarship, remaining substantially without a definitive answer. On the origin of the melody many hypotheses have been suggested since the discovery of the Naples manuscript, transmitting six anonymous *Missae L'homme armé*, in 1925, which provides

[1] Reynolds, "The Origins of San Pietro B 80 and the Development of a Roman Sacred Repertory."; Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 80-110.
[2] Lucca, Archivio di Stato, MS 238; on the dating cf. Reinhard Strohm, ed., *Mass Settings from the Lucca Choirbook*, Early English Church Music (London: Stainer and Bell, 2007); Reinhard Strohm, ed., *The Lucca Choirbook*, Late Medieval and Early Renaissance Music in Facsimile (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2008).
[3] Sean Gallagher, *Johannes Regis* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), 59.

the complete text of the *L'homme armé* tune.[4] Dragan Plamenac speculatated that the melody originated as the tenor of a polyphonic chanson, an idea that gained strength after the combinative chanson *Il sera par vous conbatu - L'homme armé* was discovered in the Mellon Chansonnier.[5] Leeman Perkins proposed that *L'homme armé* melody might have circulated as a monophonic song before being adopted as a chanson tenor.[6] Howard Mayer Brown characterised it as a *chanson rustique*,[7] while Reinhard Strohm proposed that it should be considered as an artistic imitation of a *chanson rustique*, made by someone who was skilled enough to notate it in *prolatio maior*; the melody would have originated in an urban environment, and it imitates the signal a watchman gives when an enemy army is approaching.[8] Maria Caraci Vela, Laurenz Lütteken, and Adalbert Roth indicate instead the promotion of a crusade against the Turks, during the Feast of the Pheasant at the Palais du Rihour in Lille on 17 February 1454, as the occasion for which the melody was composed.[9] Alejandro Planchart shares Strohm's hypothesis that *L'homme armé* is a «work of art»,[10] although he notes that its length is atypical,[11] and discards Strohm's idea that the song had an urban origin, affirming that it was written to resemble a *chanson*

---

[4] Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, Ms VI.E.40, hereafter NapBN 40. Lewis Lockwood, "Aspects of the 'L'homme armé' Tradition," *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association* 100 (1973-4): 97.

[5] New Haven, Beinecke Library for Rare Books and Manuscripts, Ms 91. The chanson is transmitted in a reworked four-voice textless version by Pieter Bordon in Roma, Biblioteca Casanatense, Ms 2856. Alejandro Enrique Planchart, "The Origins and Early History of *L'homme armé* " *The Journal of Musicology* 20, no. 3 (2003): 309; Rob C. Wegman, *Born for the Muses. The Life and Masses of Jacob Obrecht* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 71.

[6] Leeman L. Perkins, "In Memoriam Dragan Plamenac: The L'Homme Arme Masses of Busnoys and Okeghem: A Comparison," *The Journal of Musicology* 3, no. 4 (1984): 371.

[7] Perkins, "In Memoriam Dragan Plamenac: The L'Homme Arme Masses of Busnoys and Okeghem: A Comparison," 371.

[8] Reinhard Strohm, *Music in Late Medieval Bruges* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 130; Strohm, *The Rise of European Music*, 302, 465-66.

[9] Maria Caraci Vela, "Intertestualità allusiva e tecniche ipertestuali nelle messe *l'Homme Armé* del secolo XV," in *Album Amicorum Albert Dunning: in occasione del suo 65. compleanno*, ed. Giacomo Fornari (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), 24; Laurenz Lütteken, *Music of the Renaissance. Imagination and Reality of a Cultural Practice*, trans. James Steichen (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2019), 40; Adalbert Roth, "L'homme armé, le doubté turcq, L'ordre de la toison d'or: Zur „Begleitmusik" der letzten grossen Kreuzzugsbewegung nach den Fall von Konstantinopel," in *Festen und Feiern im Mittelalter*, ed. Ditlev von Altenberg, Jörg Jarmut, and Hans-Hugo Steinhoff (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1991).

[10] Strohm, *Music in Late Medieval Bruges*, 130.

[11] Planchart points out that the length of the melody does not correspond to the usual fifteenth-century rhythmic phraseology of works of art; he emphasises the numerology of the number 31, namely the number of members of the Order of the Golden Fleece, after the birth of Charles the Bold, Planchart, "The Origins and Early History of *L'homme armé* " 311.

rustique by a composer at the court of Burgundy, after 1433, year of birth of Charles the Bold, and in connection with the Order of the Golden Fleece.[12] Jaap van Benthem, instead, hints also at the possibility that the *L'homme armé* melody might have had some link with an English carol, *Princeps serenissime*.[13] He notes, after Manfred Bukofzer, that some carols shares the same stylistical features of *L'homme armé*, such as the opening fourth leap or the return of the first section at the end, and some of them have a text rich with military references. Hence, Van Benthem suggests that it is possible that these carols were known in France during the years of English occupation and that they might have influenced the melody and structure of *L'homme armé*.

Two theorists mention the earlier tradition of *L'homme armé* in their treatises, namely Pietro Aaron in his *Toscanello in musica* (1527) and Pietro Cerone in the *El melopeo y maestro* (1613). Aaron, in the first book of his treatise mention *L'homme armé* in the chapter where he talks about the way to sing with different mensural signatures;[14] here he says: «Si esistima, che da Busnois fussi trovato quel canto chiamato l'ome armé, notato con il segno puntato, et che da lui fussi tolto il tenore».[15] That led Oliver Strunk to link the origin of the tradition, and even the invention of the melody, to Busnoys. However, as Strohm points out, Aaron's affirmation has been misinterpreted and, consequently, wrongly translated: «'Trovato' is 'found', not 'composed': the perfect participles 'chiamato' and 'notato' suggest that the song already had a name and a mensuration when Busnoys found it. If they had been invented by Busnoys, Aaron would probably have written 'che chiamò lome armé e notò…'».[16] According to Strohm, Aaron intended to suggest that Busnoys was the first to use the pre-existing *L'homme armé* melody in

---

[12] Planchart, "The Origins and Early History of *L'homme armé* " 312; Alejandro Enrique Planchart, ed., *Guillaume Du Fay Opera Omnia 03/05: Missa L'homme armé* (Santa Barbara: Marisol Press, 2011), 42-43.
[13] Transmitted in London, British Library, Ms Egerton 3307, f. 64*v*. Jaap van Benthem, ed., *Johannes Ockeghem, Masses and Mass Sections. Missa L'homme armé*, vol. 2/2 (Utrecht: Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis, 1999), xii-xiii.
[14] «Cognitione, et modo di cantar segno contra a segno necessarii», Pietro Aaron, *Toscanello in musica* (Venezia: Marchio Sessa, 1523), I, chapter 38.
[15] Aaron, *Toscanello in musica*, I, chapter 38. «It is believed that by Busnois was found that song called "the armed man", notated with the dotted sign and that by him was taken the tenor» trans. after Strohm, *The Rise of European Music*, 470.
[16] Strohm, *The Rise of European Music*, 470.

another work, but also it has to be noted that Aaron's choice of verb means that the theorist was only reporting a hearsay.[17] Cerone, almost a century later, quotes Aaron in his belief that Busnoys was the first to use the tune, and adds the crucial information that the first to compose a Mass on this tune was Okeghem.[18]

While the context in which the melody of *L'homme armé* originated is not clear yet, it is evident that the melody attracted the attention of composers that started using it as the tenor for numerous polyphonic works. Earlier scholarship suggested that the first Masses on *L'homme armé* were all based on the polyphonic chanson *Il sera par vous conbatu*, however, again Strohm argues that, with the exception of the Masses by Busnoys and Obrecht, the early tradition would not be connected with the combinative chanson. Against the theory that the melody would have originated as the tenor of *Il sera par vous conbatu*, Caraci Vela argues that the chanson's allusion to war, through the use of *L'homme armé* melody in the lower voices, would have been meaningful only if it was already well known, therefore «necessarily recalling something else, earlier and outside the chanson».[19]

Rob Wegman, following Strohm's criticism, proposes a polygenetic explanation for *L'homme armé* tradition, affirming that: «perhaps the *L'homme armé* theme combined and attracted historical meanings in the same way as any other musical or literary text […], and perhaps its polyphonic history eroded and engendered many such meanings».[20] He also points out that the Masses using this melody do not show any particular internal coherence, and that to look at the Mass tradition through its relationship with *Il sera par vous conbatu* would result in taking into account a «historical and explanatory weight»

---

[17] Strohm, *The Rise of European Music*, 470.

[18] «Como vemos aver hecho Prenestina en su *Missa de Lomme armè: subiecto muy antiguo*, hallado (porquanto escrive D.Pedro Aaron en el Cap. 38 del prim. lib. del Toscanello) de Busnoys; sobre del qual, el primero que compusiesse Missa, fue un contemporaneo suyo y Maestro de Iusquin, llamado Ocheghen» Pietro Cerone, *El melopeo y maestro* (Napoli: Gargano, Nucci, 1613), XIII, 756.

[19] «Necessariamente rimandava ad altro, fuori e prima della *chanson*». Caraci Vela, "Intertestualità allusiva e tecniche ipertestuali nelle messe *l'Homme Armé* del secolo XV," 24.

[20] Rob C. Wegman, "Mensural Intertextuality in the Sacred Music of Antoine Busnoys " in *Antoine Busnoys: Method, Meaning, and Context in Late Medieval Music*, ed. Paula Higgins (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 193.

that probably was not relevant in the creation of this tradition.[21] A similar view is shared by Jesse Rodin, who affirms that *L'homme armé* had many «cultural associations», and that composers may have soon forgotten the political and historical context in which the first Masses were composed.[22]

The idea that the chanson and the Mass tradition are to be studied and considered separately led some scholars to look for a different interpretation, particularly outside the court of Burgundy. Paula Higgins proposes to move the origin of the entire *L'homme armé* tradition from the Burgundian ducal court to French courtly circles in the Loire Valley.[23] She notes, in fact, that almost no composer of the early tradition could be linked to the Burgundian court when the tradition presumably originated; instead, composers such as Okeghem and Busnoys were together in Tours around the early 1460s.[24]

Perkins, instead, in his analysis of the Masses by Okeghem and Busnoys, looks at the cultural exchanges between the French and the Burgundian courts, noting that, since in the early 1460s the relationship between the two was relatively peaceful, cultural exchanges could very well have happened between composers working for the different sides; however, he still places Burgundy as a place of crucial importance for the tradition.[25] That Burgundy is of primary importance for the *L'homme armé* tradition is affirmed also by other musicologists. William Prizer proposes to connect the *Missae L'homme armé* with the Burgundian Order of the Golden Fleece, noting that «masses on this *cantus firmus* would have been peculiarly suitable for the ceremonies of an order consisting entirely of 'armed men' (chevaliers or knights) and one that had as an original

---

[21] Wegman, "Mensural Intertextuality in the Sacred Music of Antoine Busnoys " 194.
[22] Jesse Rodin, "The *L'homme armé* tradition - and the limits of musical borrowing," in *The Cambridge History of Fifteenth-Century Music*, ed. Anna Maria Busse Berger and Jesse Rodin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 70. Rodin notes that it is hard for modern scholarship to disentangle all the possible cultural meanings of the *L'homme armé* tradition; he also, rather pessimistically, affirms that «this issue points up the futility, in most cases, of trying to link fifteenth-century sacred works with specific contexts». Rodin, "The *L'homme armé* tradition - and the limits of musical borrowing," 70.
[23] Paula Higgins, "Tracing the Careers of Late Medieval Composers. The Case of Philippe Basiron of Bourges," *Acta Musicologica* 62, no. 1 (1990).
[24] Higgins, "Tracing the Careers of Late Medieval Composers. The Case of Philippe Basiron of Bourges," 16-17.
[25] Perkins, "In Memoriam Dragan Plamenac: The L'Homme Arme Masses of Busnoys and Okeghem: A Comparison," 389-90.

goal the maintaining of the faith of the Church against the infidels».[26] Drawing on Prizer's hypothesis, Richard Taruskin noted that the number 31, namely the total number of knights of the Order of the Golden Fleece since 1433, is structurally relevant, being the total number of *tempora* in the *Et incarnatus* section from the Credo of both the Masses by Busnoys and Okeghem;[27] it is also present in all sections of Mass III and in the Credo of Mass IV of the Neapolitan set.[28] However, Alejandro Planchart notes that of the manuscripts that transmit the *Missa L'homme armé* by Okeghem only one of them, namely Cappella Sistina 35, transmit the Credo with the 31 *tempora* section.[29] He hypothesises that the version in the Chigi Codex is the original one and that the interpolated one in VatS 35 would be a revision: «one intended to assimilate the Okeghem mass to a tradition that stresses the symbolic importance of the number 31»,[30] proposing therefore that the Credo version in VatS 35 would have been reworked by Busnoys himself.

If the importance of Burgundy for the *L'homme armé* tradition is undeniable, through the Order of the Golden Fleece and the crusading movement, it is likewise true that not all the Masses should be connected to these themes. Agostino Magro, for instance, proposes as context for the composition of Okeghem's *Missa L'homme armé* the ceremony for the translation of the relics of Saint Martin of Tours, and at the same time the celebration for the victory of the Hundred Years' War, that took place at the homonymous basilica of

---

[26] William F. Prizer, "Music and Ceremonial in the Low Countries: Philip the Fair and the Order of the Golden Fleece," *Early Music History* 5 (1985): 128.

[27] Richard Taruskin, "Antoine Busnoys and the "L'Homme Armé" Tradition," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 39, no. 2 (1986): 271-72. The presence of the number 31 in the "Et incarnatus" section of Busnoys's Mass has been showed to be problematic by Wegman, suggesting, therefore, the possibility that there may be no reference at all to the Order of the Golden Fleece, Rob C. Wegman, "Letter," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 42, no. 2 (1989): 437-38.

[28] Taruskin, "Antoine Busnoys and the "L'Homme Armé" Tradition," 275-78.

[29] The two manuscripts transmitting the mass are: Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ms Chigi C.VIII.234 (so-called Chigi Codex), and Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ms Cappella Sistina 35 (hereafter, VatS 35). Planchart, "The Origins and Early History of *L'homme armé* " 336-37.

[30] Planchart, "The Origins and Early History of *L'homme armé* " 337.

Saint Martin in Tours on 10 March 1454.[31] Here, Magro hints to Higgins's hypothesis of a French genesis of the *L'homme armé* tradition, but also to Lockwood's suggestion that the melody would have originated within the context of French army reorganisation happened in the 1440s.[32]

HYPOTHESES OF RELATIVE CHRONOLOGY OF THE *MISSAE L'HOMME ARMÉ*

Beside the problem of the origin of the melody, one of the most debated issues in *L'homme armé* scholarship, given the paucity of chronological information, has been to identify who is the author of the first Mass and, subsequently, to provide a relative chronology of the fifteenth-century Masses. As Lockwood puts it:

> When we realize that we have more or less positive datings for only two of these [Masses] (Regis and Basiron), based on evidence that is something less than conclusive, it becomes clear that the largest and most intransigent problem is that of grouping the earliest Masses of the tradition, and of establishing a plausible chronology.[33]

Several hypotheses have been suggested on the matter, though not always validated by clear evidence; as Caraci Vela notes, there is the need to discern from what can be considered certain and can be used as evidence for further research, and what constitutes only a hypothesis.[34] An analysis based exclusively on stylistic considerations cannot be

---

[31] «Volue par le roi tout d'abord pour exprimer sa devotion personnelle au saint patron des rois de France, en fêtant la translation de ses reliques dans une nouvelle châsse rehaussée d'or, cette celebration fournit également une occasion inégalable de remercier le saint et sa basilique pour sa récente victoire dans la guerre de Cent ans», Agostino Magro, "Basilique, pouvoir et dévotion: Ockeghem à Saint-Martin de Tours," in *Johannes Ockeghem. Actes du XLe Colloque international d'études humanistes. Tours, 3-8 février 1997*, ed. Philippe Vendrix (Paris: Klincksieck, 1998), 89.

[32] Lockwood, "Aspects of the 'L'homme armé' Tradition," 106-07.

[33] Lockwood, "Aspects of the 'L'homme armé' Tradition," 107-08. The datings of Basiron's Mass comes from letter, dated 16 March 1484, in which Ercole d'Este requests «la messa del homo armé de Philippon nova», cf. Lockwood, "Aspects of the 'L'homme armé' Tradition," 111.

[34] Maria Caraci Vela, "Un capitolo di arte allusiva nella prima tradizione di messe *L'Homme Armé*," *Studi Musicali* 22, no. 1 (1993): 4. As Strohm sums it up: «Hypotheses are always welcome, as long as the available facts have all been taken into account but still require an interpretation», Reinhard Strohm, "Letter," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 40, no. 3 (1987): 576. Klaas van der Heide's hypothesis of Regis's Mass as the first of the tradition, and the consequent postdating of Busnoys's, Du Fay's, and Okeghem's Masses after 1467, is not supported by any evidence at all and remains highly speculative, not considering the fact that, for example, Du Fay's Mass is already attested in the Lucca Choirbook, Klaas van

used to establish a chronology of the *L'homme armé* tradition, and it should go along with documentary and palaeographic evidence, since «the dialectic between archaism and innovation […] is combined with assorted situations of cultural stratification, different from place to place and from case to case, and they influence the formation of every musician».[35] Caraci Vela notes also that the issue around the chronology has been often tackled as a sort of "sports competition", «in which each scholar wants to see his favourite musician in first place and to reach this purpose invokes the most beneficial stylistical evidence and tries then to confirm them with external elements».[36]

Notwithstanding the fact that the Masses by Regis and Caron are among those for which we have a relatively early dating, most of the scholarship considered unlikely that they are the earliest. Instead, the settings by Okeghem, Busnoys, and Du Fay, for which we have an occurrence of his Mass in the Lucca Choirbook dating around 1463, have been generally regarded as the first ones. Lockwood divides the Masses in four different groups: in the first he places the settings of Du Fay and Okeghem, affirming that they were composed no later than 1460; the second group comprises the Masses of Regis, Caron, Faugues, and Busnoys, all composed between 1460 and 1465; to the third group (1465-1470) belong the works of Tinctoris, Basiron, Vaqueras, and Josquin; in the fourth group Lockwood places the Masses composed between 1470 and 1475, namely those by Obrecht, Compère, La Rue, Brumel, Pipelare, and De Orto.[37] Perkins proposes to consider the settings by Busnoys and Okeghem as the first of the tradition, due to their relationship to both the chanson *Il sera par vous conbatu* and to Okeghem's own chanson

---

der Heide, "New Claims for a Burgundian Origin of the L'homme arme Tradition, and a Different View on the Relative Positions of the Earlies Masses in the Tradition," *Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 55, no. 1 (2005).

[35] «La dialettica fra arcaismo e innovazione […] si combina con situazioni svariate di stratificazione culturale, diverse da luogo a luogo e da caso a caso, che condizionano la formazione di ciascun musicista», Caraci Vela, "Un capitolo di arte allusiva nella prima tradizione di messe *L'Homme Armé*," 6.

[36] «In cui ciascuno studioso vuole vedere come primo arrivato il suo musicista preferito e a questo scopo invoca le ragioni stilistiche che più gli sembrano utili all'assunto, e cerca poi per esse la possibile conferma di elementi esterni», Caraci Vela, "Un capitolo di arte allusiva nella prima tradizione di messe *L'Homme Armé*," 7.

[37] Lockwood, "Aspects of the 'L'homme armé' Tradition," 107-08. Lockwood considers in total eighteen settings, and places both the Masses of Josquin and both those of La Rue in the same group. More recently, Caraci Vela lists twenty-four fifteenth-century Masses, excluding one of La Rue, and adding the anonymous settings from Bologna Q 16 and NapBN 40.

L'autre d'antan, which is in turn related to *Il sera par vous conbatu*. He places Du Fay's and Regis's Masses to a later stage of the tradition, being «considerably further removed from their putative models in particularities of mensural and notational detail».[38] He suggests also that Busnoys would be the first and Okeghem the second, due to the way he treats the borrowed materials in a more refined way, followed by Du Fay and then Regis.[39] Taruskin too makes a case for the primacy of Busnoys setting, following a suggestion by Oliver Strunk, mainly based on the notation of *cantus firmus* with *prolatio maior*, used exclusively with augmentational meaning.[40] Taruskin's hypothesis has, however, been subject to criticism, and it is now disregarded.[41] As Caraci Vela notes, one cannot consider as archaic the mensuralistic treatment of *cantus firmus* in itself, as it can be used together with other stylistic elements and compositional techniques that can be more or less advanced.[42] However, the importance of Taruskin's contribution lies in establishing the fundamental role that Busnoys had in the subsequent tradition of *L'homme armé* Masses.[43]

Both Perkins and Taruskin admitted the possibility that Okeghem might have been the first who composed a Mass on *L'homme armé*, and this hypothesis would also be supported by what Cerone says in his treatise. Fabrice Fitch makes a compelling case

---

[38] Perkins, "In Memoriam Dragan Plamenac: The L'Homme Arme Masses of Busnoys and Okeghem: A Comparison," 389.

[39] Perkins, "In Memoriam Dragan Plamenac: The L'Homme Arme Masses of Busnoys and Okeghem: A Comparison," 389-91. Perkins also turn over the argument and affirms that the settings by Busnoys and Okeghem could also belong to a later stage of the tradition, one that witnesses «a more sophisticated and self-conscious attempt to combine recognizable quotations of the borrowed material with subtle and skillful transformation of it», Perkins, "In Memoriam Dragan Plamenac: The L'Homme Arme Masses of Busnoys and Okeghem: A Comparison," 390.

[40] Taruskin, "Antoine Busnoys and the "L'Homme Armé" Tradition," 257-62.

[41] David Fallows, "Letter," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 40, no. 1 (1987). Strohm, "Letter." Wegman, *Born for the Muses. The Life and Masses of Jacob Obrecht*, 97-98. Fabrice Fitch, *Johannes Ockeghem Masses and Models* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1997), 62-63.

[42] Caraci Vela, "Intertestualità allusiva e tecniche ipertestuali nelle messe *l'Homme Armé* del secolo XV," 31.

[43] Taruskin himself admits that «even if his *Missa L'homme armé* should eventually turn out to be the second one to have been composed, Antoine Busnoys still stands as *fons et origo* of the great tradition», Taruskin, "Antoine Busnoys and the "L'Homme Armé" Tradition," 292-93. He also eventually hints at the possibility that Okeghem composed the first Mass, Taruskin, "Antoine Busnoys and the "L'Homme Armé" Tradition," 288. The centrality of Busnoys's Mass can be seen in some of the later Masses clearly indebted to his, such as those by Faugues, Caron, Basiron, Obrecht, Josquin, the six anonymous in NapBN 40, and the one in Bologna Q 16; Caraci Vela, "Un capitolo di arte allusiva nella prima tradizione di messe *L'Homme Armé*," 19.

about an early date for Okeghem's Mass, drawing a stylistic comparison with his *Missa Caput*.[44] Basing his theory on Wegman's dating of Okeghem's *Caput* and other Masses,[45] Fitch concludes that Okeghem's *L'homme armé* may be dated in the early 1450s, and may well be considered the first setting.[46] Caraci Vela substantially follows Perkins's theory, and places Okeghem's as the first Mass, followed by Busnoys's and Du Fay's settings, suggesting that Busnoys's might have composed his Mass before Du Fay, which would presuppose Busnoys's setting;[47] then, immediately after these three, would come Regis's and Caron's Masses.[48]

Planchart, instead, proposes that the tradition would have started with three works, namely *Il sera par vous conbatu*, and the two Masses by Okeghem and Du Fay, which should be dated after 1460.[49] He suggests that the chanson is by Du Fay and that it would have been composed before 1460, probably in 1459,[50] in relation to the Congress of Mantua and the declaration of war against the Turks. He strongly links the origin of the melody and the entire tradition to the Order of the Golden Fleece and he also posits the occasion in which Okeghem's Mass was composed between 1461 and 1463, namely the

---

[44] «The evidence of the part-writing in favour of an early date is both internal and external: internal, in that its greater metrical dependence on the c.f. contrasts with Ockeghem's usual practice; and external, in that its contrapuntal practice conforms to an early style. When the stylistic and theoretical affinities with *Caput* are also weighed in the balance, the inference that *L'homme armé* is a relatively early work is hard to resist» Fitch, *Johannes Ockeghem Masses and Models*, 56.

[45] Wegman, "Petrus de Domarto's *Missa Spiritus almus* and the Early History of the Four-Voice Mass in the Fifteenth Century."

[46] Fitch, *Johannes Ockeghem Masses and Models*, 56-64. Fitch's dating would also support Magro's hypothesis for the composition of Ockeghem's Mass in 1454, cf. Magro, "Basilique, pouvoir et dévotion: Ockeghem à Saint-Martin de Tours."

[47] In an earlier article, Caraci Vela highlights that the relationship between Okeghem's and Busnoys's Masses is mainly based on the motives, although the two works are stylistically very different, and the relationship between Busnoys's and Du Fay's can be seen mainly on a structural level, Caraci Vela, "Un capitolo di arte allusiva nella prima tradizione di messe *L'Homme Armé*," 19. On the priority of Du Fay's setting over Busnoy's, she disagrees with those scholars who think that the third Agnus in Du Fay's setting would have been the model for Busnoys. On the contrary, Caraci Vela affirms that Du Fay's canon is more elaborate than Busnoy's, Caraci Vela, "Intertestualità allusiva e tecniche ipertestuali nelle messe *l'Homme Armé* del secolo XV," 42.

[48] Caraci Vela, "Un capitolo di arte allusiva nella prima tradizione di messe *L'Homme Armé*," 21. Caraci Vela, "Intertestualità allusiva e tecniche ipertestuali nelle messe *l'Homme Armé* del secolo XV," 41-43.

[49] Planchart, "The Origins and Early History of *L'homme armé* " 355. He also proposes to date Busnoys's Mass to 1468, in the context of the *chapitre* of the Order of the Golden Fleece held in Bruges, Planchart, "The Origins and Early History of *L'homme armé* " 351.

[50] Planchart, *Guillaume Du Fay Opera Omnia 03/05: Missa L'homme armé*, 43.

only period in which the relationship between France and Burgundy allowed Philip the Good to request from Okeghem a Mass for the Order,[51] therefore rejecting Fitch's and Magro's hypotheses of an earlier date for Okeghem's setting.[52] In his edition of Du Fay's Mass, Planchart reiterates his hypothesis that both Masses were commissioned by the Order of the Golden Fleece, that they were performed during the *chapitre général* held in Saint-Omer in May 1461, and that Du Fay's setting can be dated between late 1460 and early 1461.[53] In his most recent monograph, he reaffirms that the Masses «were surely sung during the meeting at St-Omer».[54] However, there is no evidence at all to support this hypothesis. Planchart admits that the connection between the chanson and the Masses is tenuous, although he speculates that Du Fay would have sent *Il sera par vous conbatu* to Okeghem, and that the Masses would have been composed «almost contemporaneously and that both composers knew that the other was writing a mass on that cantus firmus».[55] However, he also contemplates the idea that Okeghem's Mass would have been composed in response to Du Fay's, proposing «that Okeghem had access to Du Fay's mass when writing his own».[56]

Gallagher in his study on Regis makes a convincing case that the *missa sus l'ome arme* copied at Cambrai in 1462 is Regis's *Missa L'homme armé/Dum sacrum mysterium* and not a lost work.[57] He also notes that the context for Regis's Mass would be liturgical, and that it does not have any relationship with the court of Burgundy and the Order of the Golden Fleece, thus reinforcing Wegman's hypothesis of a tradition with multiple meanings.[58] He agrees with the theory that Du Fay's setting predate Regis's, and that he

---

[51] Planchart, "The Origins and Early History of *L'homme armé* " 334.
[52] Planchart, "The Origins and Early History of *L'homme armé* " 355. Recently, Planchart corrected his statement, affirming that Philip the Good had already received the permission by Charles VII to recruit in France for the crusade, and that would also include commissioning a Mass to Okeghem for the occasion, Alejandro Enrique Planchart, *Guillaume Du Fay. The Life and Works* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 273.
[53] Planchart, *Guillaume Du Fay Opera Omnia 03/05: Missa L'homme armé*, 43.
[54] Planchart, *Guillaume Du Fay. The Life and Works*, 274.
[55] Planchart, "The Origins and Early History of *L'homme armé* " 326-27.
[56] Planchart, "The Origins and Early History of *L'homme armé* " 332-33.
[57] Gallagher connects the Mass with the liturgical context of the feast of St. Michael and the procession endowed by the canon Michel de Beringhen at the end of the 1450s.
[58] Gallagher, *Johannes Regis*, 59-114.

took the former as model for his Mass, with the intent to pay homage to him.[59] Following Gallagher, Rodin proposes that Regis's setting was part of the first layer of Masses, together with Du Fay and Okeghem, stating that each Mass has some unique features that were later reprised in the tradition.[60]

To sum up, at the moment there is no agreement on which Mass would have been composed as the first, and also which can be placed in the first layer of the fifteenth-century tradition of *Missae L'homme armé*; the hypothesis that Okeghem's setting initiated the tradition seems at the moment the most convincing, confirmed also by Cerone; Du Fay and Busnoys probably can be considered in the first group as well;[61] the Masses by Regis and Caron would come right after, both connected to Du Fay's. However, ultimately, answering the question of who wrote the first Mass, or establishing a precise relative chronology of the various settings, becomes less important compared to studying the intertextual relationship between the Masses or retracing their historical and cultural framework.[62]

TREATMENT OF *L'HOMME ARMÉ* IN CARON'S MASS

The treatment of the *cantus prius factus* in Caron's Mass is rather free, and, according to Planchart, does not resemble any of the other settings.[63] Caron uses the following version

---

[59] Gallagher, *Johannes Regis*, 92–93, 98.

[60] Rodin, "The *L'homme armé* tradition – and the limits of musical borrowing," 71.

[61] Busnoys's setting seems to be the most controversial one in terms of relative chronology; it is undeniable that is related both with Du Fay's and Okeghem's Masses. It has been rather widely accepted that his Mass cannot be considered as the first of the tradition, however, both the options of it predating or postdating Du Fay's seems equally plausible, as Caraci Vela notes: «Poiché il trattamento canonico nell'*Agnus III* di Dufay è meno complesso di quello di Busnois, e poiché i frammenti motivici comuni anche a Ockeghem e Busnois sembrano nella messa di Dufay più embrionali, se ne dovrebbe dedurre una prova della priorità di quest'ultimo. Ma sulla validità di quell criterio si possono anche avere dei dubbi, ed è possibile che per il Dufay della maturità l'apertura alla musica altrui si configurasse, piuttosto che come veicolo di omaggio ed emulazione, nei modi e nei limiti della nitida ma non insistita allusione, della citazione corsiva, della ripresa dei spunti nella misura e nei limiti più funzionali al proprio personale progetto», Caraci Vela, "Un capitolo di arte allusiva nella prima tradizione di messe *L'Homme Armé*," 20–21. What is certain is the crucial role that Busnoys's setting played in the later tradition.

[62] As noted by Caraci Vela, the most important and evident feature of each work on *L'homme armé* is the web of intertextual and allusive relationships that they entertain both with works on the same *cantus prius factus* and other compositions, Caraci Vela, "Un capitolo di arte allusiva nella prima tradizione di messe *L'Homme Armé*," 22; Caraci Vela, "Intertestualità allusiva e tecniche ipertestuali nelle messe *l'Homme Armé* del secolo XV," 35.

[63] Planchart, "The Origins and Early History of *L'homme armé* " 350.

of the *L'homme armé* melody (Figure 19), notably choosing not to introduce the 'underthird-reading', as van Benthem defines it,[64] as Du Fay does, following therefore the reading of the melody present in both Okeghem's and Busnoys's settings and in the Naples Masses.

Figure 19: *L'homme armé* melody as in NapBN 40, f. 63*v*.

Caraci identifies the sectional structure of the *cantus firmus* as: A^1, A^2, A^2, A^3, B^1, B^1, B^2, A^2, A^3; but the sections are frequently rhythmically and melodically varied, often with the insertion of additional free material, especially towards the end of a section.[65] However, closer scrutiny reveals that Caraci's structure is not used consistently in the settings, although the different sections of the *L'homme armé* melody do broadly appear in the order as identified by Caraci's. From an analysis of the Mass it is also possible to observe that some fragments of the *cantus prius factus*, especially A^2 and B^1, are often quoted in other voices, such as the *altus* or the *bassus* (Table 2).

Table 3: Structure of *cantus firmus* in Caron's *Missa L'homme armé*.

KYRIE	KYRIE I: A^1, A^2, A^2, A^2, A^2, A^3, A^4, A^3
	CHRISTE: B^1, B^1, B^2, A^2, A^3, free material
	KYRIE II: A^1, A^2, A^3, B^1, B^2, A^2, free material
GLORIA	ET IN TERRA: A^1, A^2, A^2, A^3, B^1, B^1, B^2, A^2 free material

[64] This reading substitutes, in the second occurrence of B^1, the last *G* with an *E*. van Benthem, *Johannes Ockeghem, Masses and Mass Sections. Missa L'homme armé*, x.

[65] Maria Caraci, "Fortuna del tenor *L'Homme Armé* nel primo Rinascimento," *Nuova Rivista Musicale Italiana* 9, no. 2 (1975): 186.

	DOMINE FILI: tacet
	QUI TOLLIS: B^1, B^1, B^2, free material,
	[TU SOLUS]: A^2, free material, B^1, B^2, free material
	CUM SANCTO SPIRITU: A^1, A^2, A^3, B^1, free material
CREDO	PATREM: A^1, A^2, A^2, A^3, B^1, B^1, B^2 free material, A^2, free material
	CRUCIFIXUS: TACET
	ET ASCENDIT: B^1, B^1, B^2, A^2, A^2, free material
	ET UNAM SANCTAM: A^2, A^1, A^2, A^3, B^1, B^1, B^2, free material
	ET EXPECTO: A^1, A^2, A^2, A^3, B^1, B^2, free material
SANCTUS	SANCTUS: A^1, A^2, A^2, A^3, FREE
	PLENI: TACET
	OSANNA: B^1, B^1, B^2, A^2, A^3, FREE
	BENEDICTUS: TACET
	OSANNA: A^1, A^2, A^2, A^3
AGNUS DEI	AGNUS I: A^1, A^2, A^2, A^3, B^1, B^2, A^1, A^2, A^2, A^2, A^3
	AGNUS II: TACET
	AGNUS III: B^1, B^1, B^2, A^2, A^3, A^3, FREE, B^2, FREE
	DONA NOBIS: A^1, A^3, A^3, A^4, A^3, B^1, B^1, B^2, FREE

However, the general modal structure and the use of conflicting signatures can be seen as modelled on Du Fay.[66] Beside the use of *L'homme armé* melody, Caron's Mass, as usual from the *Missae L'homme armé* of this period, has a complex web of intertextual references. Caraci Vela hints at the possibility that Caron reused the incipit of Busnoy's chanson *Quant j'ay au cueur* in his Mass,[67] and that the pervasive presence of four different non-cantus-firmus motives in structurally important places in Caron's Mass can be linked to Du Fay's (Figure 20).[68] The first two motives (A, in two variants, and B, in two variants) identified by Caraci Vela are present in all the incipits of the internal sections in

[66] Planchart, "The Origins and Early History of *L'homme armé* " 350.
[67] Caraci Vela, "Un capitolo di arte allusiva nella prima tradizione di messe *L'Homme Armé*," 14-16.
[68] Caraci Vela, "Intertestualità allusiva e tecniche ipertestuali nelle messe *l'Homme Armé* del secolo XV," 46-52.

Du Fay's setting and are used by Caron in the *Superius* in four of the five movements of his Mass, at the beginning of various sections, always accompanied by another motive in one of the lower voice.[69] The other two motives (identified by Caraci Vela as F and G), variations on the same fragment, appearing in both Busnoys and Okeghem's Masses, are recurrent in Du Fay's, and have been variously reprised by Caron.[70] Therefore, it seems legitimate to affirm that Caron's Mass can be considered closely related to the one by Du Fay.

Figure 20: Non-cantus-firmus motives in Du Fay's and Caron's *Missae L'homme armé*.

Beside the clear debt that Caron's Mass has to Du Fay's, Reynolds also identifies places in Caron's Mass containing quotations and allusions to other works. An example is the quotation of Busnoys's chanson *Je suis venue vers mon amy*, transmitted in the Pixérécourt Chansonnier (Figure 21),[71] present in the Benedictus of Caron's setting (Figure 22).[72]

[69] Caraci Vela, "Intertestualità allusiva e tecniche ipertestuali nelle messe *l'Homme Armé* del secolo XV," 48.
[70] Caraci Vela, "Intertestualità allusiva e tecniche ipertestuali nelle messe *l'Homme Armé* del secolo XV," 52.
[71] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds français 15123, ff. 127*v*-128.
[72] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 273.

Figure 21: Incipit of the Superius of *Je suis venue vers mon amy* as in the Pixérécourt Chansonnier, f. 127*v*.

Figure 22: Caron, *Missa L'homme armé*, Osanna, bars 187-192.

The Agnus II has been seen by Reynolds as related to a *Missa Sine nomine à 3* that he attributes to Okeghem,[73] to an anonymous Mass transmitted in VatSP B80,[74] to the *Missa Groß Sehnen* transmitted in TrentC 89,[75] and the sixth Mass from the Naples manuscript. According to Reynolds, Caron built his second Agnus on the same section from the

[73] The ascription to Okeghem has been rightly questioned by Andrew Kirkman and Fabrice Fitch, cf. Andrew Kirkman, *The Three-Voice Mass in the Later Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries: Style, Distribution and Case-Studies* (New York, London: Garland, 1995), 249-60., Fitch, *Johannes Ockeghem Masses and Models*, 177-78. The Mass is transmitted in Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare, Ms 759, dating from the 1490s.

[74] The Mass is transmitted at ff. 122-129; Reynolds argues that is stylistically similar to Bedyngham's style, Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 266.

[75] TrentC89, ff. 26*v*-41. According to van Benthem, the Mass is attributable to Johannes Tourout. Jaap van Benthem, ed., *Missa Mon oeil, Missa Groß Sehnen ich im Herzen trage*, Johannes Tourout. Ascribed and attributable compositions in 15th-century sources from Central Europe (Utrecht: Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis, 2015).

Missa Sine nomine à 3; consequently, his Agnus would have been taken as model by the anonymous composer of the sixth Neapolitan Mass (Figures 23-24).[76]

64a.

64b.

64c.

Figure 23: Examples taken from Reynolds, 64a) Anonyomous *Missa* in SP B80, ff. 122*v*-129*r*, Agnus II, 1-9; 64b) Okeghem(?), *Missa*, Agnus II, 1-9; 64c) Caron, *Missa L'homme armé*, Agnus II, 1-11.[77]

[76] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 266. Reynolds suggests that also the Agnus II from the second Neapolitan Mass might be related with Caron's one, however only the *Superius* and *Tenor* survives.

[77] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 268-69.

64d.

64e.

Figure 24: Examples taken from Reynolds, 64d) Anonymous, *Missa L'homme armé* (Naples VI), Benedictus, 1-15; 64e) Anonymous, *Missa Groß Sehnen*, Osanna, 1-4.[78]

Moreover, Reynolds argues that the same motivic material also appears at the beginning of several further chansons,[79] and that the relationship between Caron's Mass, the sixth Neapolitan setting and the *Missa Groß Sehnen* would be strengthened also by a common

[78] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 268-69.

[79] The chansons are: the anonymous *Mon cuer de dueil*, Joye's *Mercy, mon dueil*, Hayne's *Amours, amours, trop me fiers*, Horlay's *Helas, je suis livre a mort*, and Busnoys's *Mon seul et celé souvenir.* Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 267.

quotation of the chanson *Mort ou mercy* by Caron (Figure 25).[80]

65a.

65b.

65c.

65d.

Figure 25: Examples taken from Reynolds, 65a) Caron, *Missa L'homme armé*, Agnus II, 18-29; 65b) Anonymous, *Missa L'homme armé* (Naples VI), Benedictus, 29-42; 65c) Caron, *Mort ou mercy*, 1-11; Anonymous, *Missa Groß Sehnen*, Osanna II, 1-6.[81]

[80] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 268-71.
[81] Reynolds, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513*, 270-71.

As fascinating as Reynolds' hypothesis appears, it has to be qualified in several respects. First, the motive at the beginning of the second Agnus in the higher voice (g-f-b-a-g-d) appears also in Caron's *Missa Clemens et benigna*, both at the beginning of the Kyrie, in a slightly ornamented version, and the Credo. Secondly, the motive in the lower voice in the Benedictus of the sixth Naples setting is clearly the above-mentioned motive A, pervasively used both in Okeghem's and Du Fay's settings on *L'homme armé*, as well as in Caron's one. Far less convincing is the relationship between the chanson *Mort ou mercy* and the various Masses. The motive at the beginning of the *Qui tollis* section in Caron's Mass is more reminiscent of Caraci's motive F, and, in general, the correspondence between Caron's chanson and Mass and the Naples one seems rather generic. Despite that, the correspondence between Caron's and the Naples's Masses was observed by Don Giller and led him to attribute the anonymous settings to Caron.[82]

THE NEAPOLITAN ANONYMOUS MASSES: THE QUESTION OF ATTRIBUTION

Giller's attempt to attribute the Naples Masses is not the first, since the anonymity of these settings has long interested scholarship. Already in 1929, a few years after the discovery of the manuscript, Dragan Plamenac suggested a close proximity between their style and that of Tinctoris.[83] This hypothesis has been proven untenable mainly by Judith Cohen in her survey of the Masses, in which she convincingly demonstrates that these six *Missae L'homme armé* originated in the Burgundian context.[84] According to Cohen, the *bâtarde* script and other paleographical evidence, such as the shape of the notes, support an origin outside of Italy, as well as some elements of the dedicatory poem, namely: the praise of Queen Beatrice's virtues that reached a region different far from hers, and that she brings culture to those regions, probably of Hungary. All these elements combined help us in excluding Naples and Hungary as places where the manuscript could have been copied. A stronger evidence of the Burgundian origin of this manuscript was

[82] Don Giller, "The Naples L'Homme Armé Masses and Caron: A Study in Musical Relationship," *Current Musicology* 32 (1981).
[83] Caraci, "Fortuna del tenor *L'Homme Armé* nel primo Rinascimento," 177.
[84] Judith Cohen, *The six Anonymous L'homme armé Masses in Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, MS VI E 40* (Dallas: American Institute of Musicology, 1968), 67-68.

produced only a few years ago, when Klaas van der Heide pointed out that one of the copyists of Naples also compiled the earlier layer of the manuscript Br 5557.[85]

Once the hypothesis of Tinctoris as the author of the Masses had been discarded, two other speculations have been put forward. The first, already mentioned, is the attribution to Caron by Giller, mainly based on a comparison of some motivic references, such as four different phrases used as head motives as well as four closing cadential formulas, that induced him first to consider the six Masses as the creation of a single composer, and then to affirm that «given the web of thematic references in the Naples masses along with a further interlacing of motifs in Caron's works that relate to different sections of each Naples mass, it seems that only one conclusion can be drawn: that Caron composed the Naples complex».[86] However, as Giller himself notes, the melodic fragments can be found also in works from other composers, albeit their appearance is less frequent compared to Caron's. Giller's hypothesis could also work the other way around, namely the composer, or the composers, of the Neapolitan settings could have decided to pay homage to Caron and quote some motives from his Masses.

A few years later, Taruskin proposed instead to attribute the anonymous settings to Busnoys, based on their structural features which would show an isorythmic organisation, shared with his *Missa L'homme armé*; another element that would point in favour of an attribution to Busnoys is the presence of inversion and retrograde canons as well as verbal ones.[87] Taruskin's article started a vivid debate, including also the issue of the authorship of the Naples Masses. Giller's argued that the structural features examined by Taruskin were not sufficient as the primary evidence for attribution, affirming that the melodic preferences would be «the virtual signature of a composer».[88] But as Taruskin noted in his article, Giller's chose melodic fragments that are present in other composers's

---

[85] Brussel, Koninklijke Bibliothek van België / Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, Ms 5557. der Heide, "New Claims for a Burgundian Origin of the L'homme arme Tradition, and a Different View on the Relative Positions of the Earlies Masses in the Tradition," 26-31. David Fallows, "Josquin and Trent 91: thoughts on *Omnium bonorum plena* and his activities in the 1470s," in *Manoscritti di polifonia nel Quattrocento europeo*, ed. Marco Gozzi (Trento: Provincia autonoma di Trento, 2004), 210-11.
[86] Giller, "The Naples L'Homme Armé Masses and Caron: A Study in Musical Relationship," 24.
[87] Taruskin, "Antoine Busnoys and the "L'Homme Armé" Tradition," 275-80.
[88] Don Giller, "Letter," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 40, no. 1 (1987): 144.

works and therefore are not characteristic enough to be used as an evidence towards Caron's authorship.[89] To this Giller responded, in a circular argument, that he chose those motives because he understood them «to be unique to Caron's melodic style»,[90] arguing also that no evidence had yet been presented to challenge his theory. In his response to Taruskin, Giller argues that the relationship between Charles the Bold and Busnoys cannot be used as an evidence towards Busnoys's authorship of the six settings, since it is possible that Caron encountered Charles the Bold as well.[91] In fact, Charles spent almost two weeks in Amiens in the spring of 1466, and that would have offered Caron the chance to meet not only the future duke but also Busnoys, who probably joined Charles between 1465 and 1467.[92]

Both hypotheses of attribution suffer from a methodological fallacy. Giller's most evidently, and by his own admission, in that he decided to base his attribution on the sheer quantity of melodic correspondence between the Naples Masses and Caron's. The accumulation of melodic similarities does not constitute an evidence at all that they should be attributed to a specific composer. Taruskin, on the other hand, considers only the structural features of the Masses, which equally cannot be considered a sufficient evidence.

The conferral of attribution is not a neutral operation, as noted by Caraci Vela,[93] and has several consequences. Lisa Colton states that:

> Authorial attribution can add weight to the perceived significance of music, and invites us to reflect on questions of genesis, reception, personal style, influence and value. In short, it

[89] Taruskin, "Antoine Busnoys and the "L'Homme Armé" Tradition," 280.
[90] Giller, "Letter," 144.
[91] Giller, "Letter," 145. Taruskin's criticism to this possible meeting was based on the belief that Caron was mentioned as *primus musicus* in 1422 and therefore it could have been unlikely that he would have met Charles forty-four years later, Richard Taruskin, "Letter," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 40, no. 1 (1987): 150-51. However, as Wegman has shown, it seems that Caron would have been born between 1430 and 1435, making therefore at least possible Giller's speculation, Wegman, "Fremin le Caron at Amiens: New Documents."
[92] Paula Higgins, "*In hydraulis* Revisited: New Light on the Career of Antoine Busnois," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 39, no. 1 (1986): 74.
[93] Maria Caraci Vela, *La filologia musicale. Istituzioni, storia, strumenti critici. Approfondimenti*, 3 vols., vol. 2 (Lucca: Libreria Musicale Italiana, 2009), 194.

> has helped writers to view pieces as worthy of modern scholarly activities such as edition, public performance, critical contemplation and recording, often at the expense of anonymous repertoire.[94]

Notwithstanding, it could be considered one of the most delicate operations that a musicologist, or a scholar in general, can do. Attributing authorship has often lacked a proper methodology and relied heavily on a scholar's own competence and intuition. This is evident in Giller's contribution, as it is based exclusively on his "feeling" that those melodic features are constitutive of Caron's style. Needless to say that this course of action has been heavily criticised. Already Gianfranco Contini pointed out that «a great caution is required to determine if a certain stylistic feature or system of stylistic features can really be considered as an internal signature»,[95] concluding that the statistical analysis cannot be considered a valid method for attribution since «those indicators, or some of them, identify 'genre' structures common for more than one person, while conversely more than one structure coexist in the same person».[96] Caraci Vela also addresses this issue, from a musicological perspective, affirming that often scholars misunderstand the concept of style, confusing it with features that can be found in composers belonging to the same culture, and that the accumulation of those features cannot be used to establish who was the author of a certain work, but rather its geographical and chronological setting.[97] Barry Brook, in a seminal contribution, strongly disapproved the method, or better the lack of method, used by scholars to establish the authenticity of a work, as he notes: «usually in fact there is no method involved at all but only the superficial

---

[94] Lisa Colton, *Angel song. Medieval English music in history* (London and New York: Routledge, 2017), 65.
[95] «Occorre una grande oculatezza nel determinare se un certo stilema o sistema di stilemi possa davvero essere considerato una firma interna», Gianfranco Contini, *Breviario di ecdotica* (Milano - Napoli: Ricciardi, 1985), 56.
[96] «Quegli indici, o una loro parte, individuano strutture di 'genere', comuni a più personalità, mentre viceversa in uno stesso individio convivono più strutture», Contini, *Breviario di ecdotica*, 56.
[97] «Una pericolosa tendenza a confondere lo stile, proprio ad un individuo – che non si coglie a livello di superficie, nella presenza di particolari stilemi, bensì a livello profondo, nei modi peculiari del loro impiego – con il complesso delle scelte tecnico-compositive, formali, di linguaggio musicale, di organico e così via, che possono essere comuni a più individui afferenti ad una medesima cultura. La frequenza statistica di questi ultimi elementi [...] può provare l'appartenenza di un testo musicale ad un ambito cronologico e geografico particolare o addirittura ad una scuola, ma non quella ad un autore piuttosto che ad un altro», Caraci Vela, *La filologia musicale. Istituzioni, storia, strumenti critici. Approfondimenti*, 2, 195.

comparison of a few characteristics in a few pieces, with equal portions of dubious intuition and wishful thinking thrown in».[98] Brook too noted how scholars often relied on their personal intuition, and proposed a methodology in which a thorough stylistic analysis may be used with external evidence, trying therefore to eliminate subjectivity from these kind of operations. His methodology consists of establishing a full stylistic profile of a composer, that takes into account the different genres and the span of a composer's life, and then to analyse the works of the composer comparing them to significant different samples. The results of this analysis, according to Brook, can only tell us if a certain work may be attributed to a specific composer, without any assurance.[99] Brook's theory, while methodologically sound, is not really practical; furthermore, it still relies heavily on a stylistic approach, which cannot give any certainty if not supported also by external evidence.[100]

Caraci Vela, in another article, addressed specifically the attribution of the Neapolitan settings. She agrees with the fact that the Masses can be considered close to Busnoys's style.[101] Even so, Caraci Vela resolutely argues against an attribution to Busnoys; she identifies seven features that can be associated with Busnoys's style, namely: a) the mensural treatment of the *cantus firmus*; b) the expansion of the vocal range, especially in the lower range; c) the presence of imitation in structurally relevant passages; d) fragments in progression in the melodies; e) complete, long-range melodies in the voices; f) melodies that span over the entire vocal range and reach the climax by ascending steps. However, as Caraci Vela notes, these features can be found in the works of others, both on their own and in combination, invalidating their usefulness as an attribution tool. In

[98] Barry S. Brook, "Determining Authenticity through Internal Analysis: A Multifaceted Approach (with Special Reference to Haydn's String Trios)," in *Joseph Haydn: Bericht über den Internationalen Joseph Haydn Kongress, Wien, Hofburg, 5.-12. September 1982* (München: G. Henle Verlag, 1986), 552.
[99] Brook, "Determining Authenticity through Internal Analysis: A Multifaceted Approach (with Special Reference to Haydn's String Trios)," 554.
[100] Caraci Vela, *La filologia musicale. Istituzioni, storia, strumenti critici. Approfondimenti*, 2, 195-96.
[101] Caraci Vela, "Intertestualità allusiva e tecniche ipertestuali nelle messe *l'Homme Armé* del secolo XV," 31-32.

the Naples settings, the features a), c) and d) are consistently present, while others are occasionally or not at all present, as well as not being featured in all the six settings.[102]

In conclusion, it seems likely that Cohen's original hypothesis that the Masses are the product of a joint effort of different composers, perhaps under the supervision of Busnoys himself, is still the most valid one.[103] It may be possible that Caron and Busnoys, as well as others, took part in the composition of one of these settings, but one can only affirm it as a speculation.[104]

The lack of attribution, and the consequent status of anonymity, of these Masses is not an uncommon feature for the polyphony of this period. As Lütteken notes:

> From an historical perspective […] authorship stands as a secondary and comparatively recent determinant of the work concept. Until well into the fifteenth century, authorial attribution was not a dominant feature of musical transmission but only one of several possibilities. […] It is thus clear that only as a result of complicated historical processes did authorship become an essential condition for work character. It was neither necessary nor inevitable.[105]

Colton too notes that often it was considered superfluous to ascribe music works, drawing a comparison with other pieces of art that remained anonymous, such as stained

---

[102] Caraci Vela, "Intertestualità allusiva e tecniche ipertestuali nelle messe *l'Homme Armé* del secolo XV," 32.
[103] Cohen, *Six Anonymous L'homme armé Masses*, 68-70.
[104] Caraci Vela too supports the hypothesis of a multi-authorial project; she also notes that «pur tenendo presente che il *cantus firmus* è in ciascuna messa solo un frammento della melodia *L'homme armé*, un compositore che si fosse cimentato per sei volte (sette, se si dovessero accettare le attribuzioni a Caron o a Busnois [...], ciascuno dei quali è autore anche di una messa sull'intera melodia) con lo stesso tipo di soggetti [...] sarebbe stato un autentico *monstre* e avrebbe di gran lunga superato in anticipo compositori come Josquin, Morales, Palestrina, che, scrivendo ciascuno due messe su quello stesso *cantus firmus*, intesero dare prova della eccezionale fertilità della propria fantasia», [«Keeping in mind that the *cantus firmus* in each mass is only a fragment of the *L'homme armé* melody, a composer that took on for six times (seven, if one accepts the attribution to Caron or Busnois [...], who authored each a mass on the complete melody) the challenge to write on the same subjects [...] would have been considered a real prodigy and surpassed composers such as Josquin, Morales, Palestrina, who, writing each two masses on the same *cantus firmus*, intended to show the exceptional fertility of their creativity»] Caraci Vela, "Un capitolo di arte allusiva nella prima tradizione di messe *L'Homme Armé*," 6-7.
[105] Laurenz Lütteken, "The work concept," in *The Cambridge History of Fifteenth-Century Music*, ed. Anna Maria; Rodin Busse Berger, Jesse (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 59. On this matter also cf. Michele Calella, *Musikalische Autorschaft. Der Komponist zwischen Mittelalter und Neuzeit* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2014).

glass windows or devotional images.[106] The necessity of attributing authorship is an operation, as already noted, that has an impact on modern scholarship, but it should be kept in mind that is possible that sacred works might have been purposely copied without an attribution, due to their link with religious devotion. The case of the Neapolitan Masses may well represent a good example of music that was conceived with a specific purpose that transcended the work of art and for which an authorial attribution was expendable.[107] However, without any new evidence, the survey of the intricate web of allusions, and intertextual relationships, as well as allegorical and political subtexts, conveyed in this manuscript, is far more interesting than answering the question of who wrote these Masses.

[106] Colton, *Angel song. Medieval English music in history*, 65.
[107] It should be pointed out that the lack of ascriptions in this manuscript is the result of a loss of the first pages of each setting; hence, we do not know if the Masses actually reported their author(s).

4. Crusading and the *Missae L'homme armé*: the Case of Napoli, Biblioteca Nazionale, VI.E.40

As observed, scholarship has long been connecting fifteenth-century *L'homme armé* settings, as well as the origin of the melody itself, with the crusading movement, and especially with the Burgundian environment and the Order of the Golden Fleece. The first scholar to draw attention to this was Ruth Hannas in 1952, who suggested to associate *L'homme armé* settings with the crusading against the Turks, also positing that the melody may have been «expressly composed for propaganda purposes».[1] Hannas mentioned in particular the chanson *Il sera par vous conbatu – L'homme armé* transmitted anonymously in the Mellon Chansonnier, which provides a direct link to the fight against the Turks by combining *L'homme armé* with different material: the Superius sings an irreverent poem about a member of the Burgundian chapel, Symon le Breton, who is about to go on a crusade against the Turks, while the Tenor and the Contratenor sing various portions of *L'homme armé* simultaneously. In 1972, Geoffrey Chew proposed to consider the armed man of the song as an allegory of the Turk which needed to be vanquished, and linked the *Missae L'homme armé* with papal attempts to commit rulers all over Europe to take part in a crusade against the Turks.[2] However, it was only in 1985 that scholarship started to focus specifically on the Burgundian crusading movement. William Prizer suggested a connection between the *Missae L'homme armé* and the Order of the Golden Fleece, a chivalric order founded by the duke Philip the Good in 1430.[3] However, it has to be noted that reducing the investigation of the Burgundian crusading movement only to the Order of the Golden Fleece, as many have done, it would be a serious misrepresentation of its reality, which was much more nuanced and complex than the interpretation given by most of musicological scholarship. Also, until recently, scholarship on late medieval crusading has tended to focus on the Burgundian evidence,

---

[1] Ruth Hannas, "Concerning Deletions in the Polyphonic Mass Credo," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 5, no. 3 (1952): 168.
[2] Geoffrey Chew, "The Early Cyclic Mass as an Expression of Royal and Papal Supremacy," *Music & Letters* 53, no. 3 (1972): 267.
[3] Prizer, "Music and Ceremonial in the Low Countries: Philip the Fair and the Order of the Golden Fleece."

often leaving aside other European crusading movements; this overexposure of the Burgundian crusading environment is the result of an abundance of evidence related to this entity, as much as a tendency to often focus on Western Europe.

Over the past few years, there has been a growing interest in the literary, artistic, and cultural manifestations of the late medieval crusading movement, resulting in an interdisciplinary turn in the field of crusading studies. It is in fact undeniable that the crusading movements impacted the cultural and artistic sphere, and many stimulating and innovative studies on this have been published.[4] Unfortunately, the musical side does not feature along the literary and visual material in these studies, and the musical dimension of crusading still has to be made known to crusade scholars in general.[5] On the other hand, musicologists have often overlooked the importance crusading played in shaping the European cultural environment and did not engage with crusading scholarship.[6]

It is worth noting that historical scholarship has tended to overlook late medieval crusading; often considering this movement as residual of the earlier crusading efforts and not worthy of studying. In the traditionalist and classical view on crusading, the fall of Acre in 1291 coincides with the end of crusading, even though medieval society did not perceive that crusading was a concluded effort. It is true that many great changes occurred after the thirteenth century, but crusading was far from fading in the fifteenth century, being still of central interest for many. The crusading movement and its rhetoric deeply permeated European society and many people's lives in this period and beyond. Yet, crusading changed itself to something quite different from what it used to be until the fourteenth century, shaping European society in new ways. As Norman Housley

---

[4] An example being Lee Manion, *Narrating the Crusades. Loss and Recovery in Medieval and Early Modern English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014); Elizabeth Lapina et al., eds., *The Crusades and Visual Culture* (London and New York: Routledge, 2015).

[5] Some research has been published over the past few years on how crusading interacted with liturgy, although mainly from a textual point of view. See Amnon Linder, *Raising Arms: Liturgy in the Struggle to Liberate Jerusalem in the Late Middle Ages* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003); M. Cecilia Gaposchkin, *Invisible Weapons. Liturgy and the Making of Crusade Ideology* (Ithaca, NY – London: Cornell University Press, 2017).

[6] In the few instances in which crusading has been considered by musicologists in relation to late medieval music works Richard Vaughan's monographs on the dukes of Burgundy is often the only scholarship cited.

argues: «the deepest impact of the crusade lay not, as in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, in the raising and despatch of large armies of armed pilgrims, but in the way preaching, rhetoric and liturgy of the crusade moulded a rapidly changing European society».[7] It is true that various endeavours continued, such as in Iberia where the Catholic powers moved war against the Emirate of Granada, or in the Baltic, with the war between the Teutonic Order and Lithuania, even though often they did not involve large scale armies but rather small groups or individuals. Also, crusading ceased to be almost exclusively perceived as armed intervention, as the risk of failure was too high, resulting in a possible invasion of Europe by Ottoman armies. However, it remained an «inspirational ideal, commanding consistent interest and respect»,[8] and the cultural array of propaganda it solicited, especially after the crucial event of the fall of Constantinople in 1453, constituted a fundamental pillar of cultural life in the late Middle Ages. The threat posed by the Ottoman Empire towards Europe spans almost two centuries, from 1396 until the end of the sixteenth century, and it could be considered one of the most important crusading issues that European rulers had to deal with during the fifteenth century.[9] In 1444 Turkish armies reached Belgrade, and had conquered most of the territories of the Byzantine Empire, but it is only with the capture of Constantinople in 1453 that a crusading effort against them started being perceived as necessary, and even then it was strongly influenced by the Western political situation.[10]

The Burgundian Crusading Movement and Cultural Propaganda

Amongst all European powers, Burgundy was by far the one in which the crusading message appealed most to its rulers. They had nurtured various crusading projects since the end of the fourteenth century, with the duke Philip the Bold, and his son John the Fearless, who took part in the so-called "Crusade of Nicopolis" in 1396 against the Turks,

---

[7] Norman Housley, "Introduction," in *Crusading in the Fifteenth Century. Message and Impact*, ed. Norman Housley (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 11.
[8] Norman Housley, *The Later Crusades: From Lyons to Alcazar, 1274-1580* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 419.
[9] For a general overview of the Ottoman military actions and European responses see Housley, *The Later Crusades: From Lyons to Alcazar, 1274-1580*, 80-150.
[10] Norman Housley, *Crusading and the Ottoman Threat, 1453-1505* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 10.

resulting in a decisive defeat for the European armies and in the capture of John the Fearless, held prisoner by the Ottomans for almost a year.[11] As Housley points out, Nicopolis was perhaps the worst defeat and a crushing humiliation of the Western allies against the Turks, with longstanding political and financial implications. After being released, both Philip the Bold and John the Fearless, who became duke in 1404, did not plan for any other crusading enterprise, mainly due to the European political circumstances, above all the Hundred Years' War, which prevented the organisation of another crusade and monopolised the resources. However, Nicopolis resulted in the affirmation of Burgundy, and its ruler, as a major European power, especially from a financial point of view, and in a shift from the king of France to the Burgundian duke as focal point of the crusading effort. It was John's son, Philip the Good, duke from 1419 until his death in 1467, who started planning new crusading endeavours. In the first thirty years of his reign, Philip sought both internal and external support for a crusading effort to reconquer the territories once occupied by Christians, as outlined in Jean Germain's homily at the chapter of the Order of the Golden Fleece held at Mons in 1451.[12]

The support for a crusade was not universal amongst Burgundian courtiers and feudal vassals, and a considerable number of nobles were explicitly against a crusade.[13] The duke not only faced an internal lively debate, but also needed to establish a leading position on the late-medieval geopolitical stage.[14] The affirmation of a crusading identity, through propaganda, was seen by the dukes of Burgundy as a powerful tool that could help them achieving the necessary political capital in order to fulfil their aims both in Burgundy and in Europe. As Rolf Strøm-Olsen notes: «the symbolic landscape of crusade was cleverly and intricately joined to a discourse designed to promote the emerging dynastic goals

---

[11] For a discussion of the Nicopolis expedition, cf. Housley, *The Later Crusades: From Lyons to Alcazar, 1274-1580*, 73-79.
[12] Jacques Paviot, "Burgundy and the Crusade," in *Crusading in the Fifteenth Century. Message and Impact*, ed. Norman Housley (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 72.
[13] Andrew Glen Heron, "'Il fault faire guerre pour paix avoir' : crusading propaganda at the Court of Duke Philippe le Bon of Burgundy (1419-1467)" (PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1991), 4.
[14] Rolf Strøm-Olsen, "Political Narrative and Symbolism in the Feast of the Pheasant (1454)," *Viator. Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 46, no. 3 (2015): 322.

and political expression of the Burgundian house».[15] One of the main issues was the relationship between the Burgundian rulers and the king of France, as the Burgundian Valois family had originally derived from the royal family of France, hence, was still formally subordinated to the French crown. Furthermore, some of the Burgundian Valois's domains were vassals of the Holy Roman Emperor. Hence, the duke found himself between two of the most powerful rulers of Europe, both having a "special relationship" with the pope: as Richard Walsh notes, the Emperor «had always enjoyed a titular pre-eminence among medieval rulers in the West», and the Kings of France «whose unique position in the eyes of the Church was signified by the title of Most Christian King».[16] The duke's first need was therefore to emancipate Burgundy from both the Emperor and the French king. Crusading, with the construction of a Burgundian crusading tradition through propaganda, was perceived as a suitable mean to achieve this with the creation of a separate cultural identity. French rulers, in particular, were not occupying anymore a foremost position as crusading leaders.[17] However, Philip's goal was not to openly declare independence, as he was more interested in reinforcing his power and political authority, and becoming the leader of a European crusading enterprise would have well served these aspirations.[18] Crusading was indeed perceived as a crucial dimension of rulership: being a ruler implied that one should be a crusader.[19] Consequently, being recognised as a crusading leader was seen as a sign of

[15] Strøm-Olsen, "Political Narrative and Symbolism in the Feast of the Pheasant (1454)," 340.
[16] Richard J. Walsh, "Charles the Bold and the crusade: politics and propaganda," *Journal of Medieval History* 3, no. 1 (1977): 60.
[17] Elizabeth Johnson Moodey, "Illuminated Crusader History for Philip the Good of Burgundy (1419-1467)" (PhD dissertation, Princeton University, 2002), 289.
[18] Strøm-Olsen, "Political Narrative and Symbolism in the Feast of the Pheasant (1454)," 321.
[19] The gendered implications of crusading and rulership have been recently investigated in Natasha R. Hodgson, Katherine J. Lewis, and Matthew M. Mesley, eds., *Crusading and Masculinities* (London and New York: Routledge, 2019). Cf. in particular Katherine J. Lewis, "...doo as this noble prynce Godeffroy of boloyne dyde. Chivalry, masculinity, and crusading in late medieval England," in *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Natasha R. Hodgson, Katherine J. Lewis, and Matthew M. Mesley (London and New York: Routledge, 2019), 311-28; Robert B. Desjardins, ""Lest his men mutter against him": Chivalry and artifice in a Burgundian crusade chronicle," in *Crusading and Masculinities*, ed. Natasha R. Hodgson, Katherine J. Lewis, and Matthew M. Mesley (London and New York: Routledge, 2019), 329-44.

prestige and could be considered a sort of political and moral counterbalance to their lack of official independence.[20]

Crusading became central in fifteenth-century Burgundy and imbued deeply its cultural life. As Elizabeth Johnson Moodey suggests, crusading was not promoted in Burgundy exclusively through political means but also, and especially, through works of art, which constituted the essence of crusading propaganda.[21] The importance of crusading propaganda, and particularly of the Burgundian model, has been highlighted by scholarship as fundamental in order to understand properly the later crusading movement. Jacques Paviot talks of Burgundy as a «repository of an older idea of crusade»,[22] and Andrew Heron speaks of its propaganda as «a vital register and reflector of civic unity and morale since it reacts, as a "conservative force", against perceived changes within society».[23] Furthermore, crusading propaganda in Burgundy served as an internal political and social unifying element through the Turkish threat towards Christian society, as well as a tool to increase the power of its rulers in the fragmented European political framework. Therefore, artistic patronage thrived in Burgundy and served the purpose of defining the national identity and strengthening the power of the duke.

Philip sought support for a crusade both among his own courtiers and nobles, and in other European courts, through a careful mix of diplomacy and ceremonial appeals, as well as the creation of the Order of the Golden Fleece in 1430.[24] As Robert Desjardins argues, these were also sustained through literary propaganda, in the forms of reworked traditional chivalric literatures, which «flattered Burgundian self-perceptions and excited the chivalric imagination; they also served to underwrite ducal crusading polices».[25] Furthermore, this kind of literary production fulfilled also the purpose of distinctively

---

[20] Walsh, "Charles the Bold and the crusade: politics and propaganda," 60.
[21] Moodey, "Illuminated Crusader History for Philip the Good of Burgundy (1419-1467)."
[22] Paviot, "Burgundy and the Crusade," 70.
[23] Heron, "'Il fault faire guerre pour paix avoir' : crusading propaganda at the Court of Duke Philippe le Bon of Burgundy (1419-1467)," 31.
[24] Robert B. Desjardins, "Writing and Imagining the Crusade in Fifteenth-Century Burgundy: The Case of the Expedition Narrative in Jean de Wavrin's Anciennes Chroniques d'Angleterre" (PhD dissertation, University of Alberta, 2010), 53-54.
[25] Desjardins, "Writing and Imagining the Crusade in Fifteenth-Century Burgundy: The Case of the Expedition Narrative in Jean de Wavrin's Anciennes Chroniques d'Angleterre," 53.

identifying the Burgundian Valois dynasty from the French royal one; in their appropriation and reworking of the past these works resulted in being highly politicised, as David Wrisley points out, with their aim being «to reshape a political landscape through the writing of history».[26] Philip's early crusading project were ignored by European courts, one of the reasons being the lack of papal leadership; and also the internal support by Burgundian aristocrats seemed to be rather precarious.[27] But the situation was soon to change significantly.

The Cultural Impact of the Fall of Constantinople

On 29 May 1453, after a siege lasting only fifty-three days, Constantinople, capital of the Byzantine Empire, fell to the Ottoman armies led by the young Sultan Mehmed II. It was reported, perhaps hyperbolically, that the last Byzantine Emperor, Constantinos XI Palaeologus, died while defending the walls of the city and that during the siege and after the fall, around four thousand inhabitants were killed, women and boys were raped, hundreds of citizens were enslaved, and, after its fall, the city was sacked by Turks soldiers. The loss of the capital of Christendom's eastern empire produced a profound emotional impact in the rest of Europe, not only for the military and political implications of the Ottoman possession of one of the most important cities in the Mediterranean Sea, but also, and more importantly, because now the Turks were actively threatening all of Europe. This meant that a united response was felt both necessary and appropriate: «suddenly a holy war against the Turks seemed not only politically but also morally inescapable».[28] However, as Housley points out, «both the scale of the efforts involved and their impact on contemporaries' […] lives are undeniable. This was the last substantial attempt by the Church to persuade the faithful to take collective military action […] to defend shared values and achieve common goals».[29] Nevertheless, the

---

[26] David Joseph Wrisley, "The Loss of Constantinople and Imagining Crusade at the Fifteenth-Century Court of Burgundy," *al-Abhath* 55 (2007): 89.
[27] Desjardins, "Writing and Imagining the Crusade in Fifteenth-Century Burgundy: The Case of the Expedition Narrative in Jean de Wavrin's Anciennes Chroniques d'Angleterre," 54.
[28] Housley, *Crusading and the Ottoman Threat, 1453-1505*, 55; Desjardins, "Writing and Imagining the Crusade in Fifteenth-Century Burgundy: The Case of the Expedition Narrative in Jean de Wavrin's Anciennes Chroniques d'Angleterre," 55.
[29] Housley, *Crusading and the Ottoman Threat, 1453-1505*, 1.

range of intellectual responses and cultural propaganda after the fall of Constantinople, investigated by Nancy Bisaha in her seminal monograph,[30] are of fundamental importance, not only for the understanding of late fifteenth-century culture but also for later events.

Thanks also to the almost coeval invention of letterpress printing, a wide range of literature on the Turks started circulating in Europe. The array of it was much more varied than during previous crusading periods and resulted in different kinds of perceptions of the Ottoman enemy, based on the audiences' various expectations, which were determined by their cultural «milieu, education, and proximity to the Ottoman frontier».[31] The fall of Constantinople thus stands as a watershed moment in perceptions of the Turks: as Housley argues, the *imago Turci*, the 'image of the Turk', was more nuanced than the previous existing *imago Saraceni*, 'image of the Saracen', and it «impacted in different ways in different parts of the Catholic world».[32] Especially humanists, one of the most dynamic and ambitious cultural groups, crafted an entirely new rhetoric to justify and encourage the war against the Ottomans. They were, as Bisaha notes, one of the most affected categories, and led to a change in their discourses, «precipitating a crystallization of rhetoric into a recognisable discourse on the Turks»,[33] in which they were portrayed as the 'new barbarians', and disseminating a portrayal of them as enemies of civilization.[34] Before 1453, the perception of Islam against Christendom was only one of the many factors in the crusading movement, as often European Christians pursued other objectives such as the possession of Holy Land or the expansions of their influence, territory and wealth, and Islam was perceived as a mere obstacle in fulfilling those ambitions.[35] By contrast, in the second half of the fifteenth century, humanists created something completely new and tremendously influential:

---

[30] Nancy Bisaha, *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004).
[31] Norman Housley, ed., *The Crusade in the Fifteenth Century. Converging and Competing Cultures* (London - New York: Routledge, 2017), 2.
[32] Housley, *The Crusade in the Fifteenth Century. Converging and Competing Cultures*, 7.
[33] Bisaha, *Creating East and West*, 61.
[34] Bisaha, *Creating East and West*, 62.
[35] Bisaha, *Creating East and West*, 15.

their responses to the Ottoman advance continued to impact Western thoughts on Turks and Islam for centuries, affecting even our contemporary perception.

The events of 1453 provided «compelling conditions under which humanists constructed a coherent vision of Western culture and its inherent superiority to other societies».[36] This became a «crucial moment of cultural self-definition in responding to the Turkish outsider» while simultaneously crafting a powerful notion of Western society.[37] As Bisaha demonstrates, this challenges Edward Said's model of a Western discourse of the East: shifting the attention from colonialism to the humanistic rhetoric on the Turks, encompassing a judgement of European moral and cultural superiority to the East.[38]

Humanists extensively turned to earlier examples, medieval but especially ancient, often adapting them to strengthen their argument. They reinforced the humanistic concept of 'Western civilisation', in terms that could still nowadays be considered valid, and fashioned the European notion of the other. Humanistic cultural propaganda portrayed the Turks as «brutes who savagely destroyed books» and pauperised the classical heritage of the Greek East, even though they were aware of Ottomans' cultural and literal achievements.[39] The humanistic interpretation of the classical tradition, modelled into an even broader and more powerful notion than the Greeks or Romans knew, became one of the most important modes to estimate, and usually dismissing, other cultures. Walter Mignolo has noted how literary works ignoring the classical style established by the humanistic culture especially by authors with heterogeneous ancestry or cultural background were often overlooked.[40] Humanists used the classical past as a guide for everything they wrote, including crusading. However, the ancient models were strained very creatively to fit the humanistic agenda. As Bisaha brilliantly summarises:

> The image of the barbarian provided humanists with a powerful, multifaceted discourse of Self and Other. Deceptively simple and seemingly redundant of

---

[36] Bisaha, *Creating East and West*, 182.
[37] Bisaha, *Creating East and West*, 7.
[38] Bisaha, *Creating East and West*, 6.
[39] Bisaha, *Creating East and West*, 182.
[40] Walter Mignolo, "The Darker Side of the Renaissance: Colonization and the Discontinuity of the Classical Tradition," *Renaissance Quarterly* 45, no. 4 (1992).

> classical tropes, the Turks as barbarians invited a complex set of cultural, historical, and psychological tools with which humanists envisioned and sought to control them intellectually. It comforted humanists to feel that even as Europeans were losing ground to the Turks they were somehow "better" than their foes and would certainly rise again. And yet, despite the specific context in which "barbarian" became synonymous with Turk, humanists soon began to stretch their use of the word. They started to apply the term indiscriminately to the larger Muslim world – even though for several centuries Westerners had regarded Arab culture as highly advanced.[41]

In the end, a crusade was promulgated on 14 January 1460 by Pope Pius II, but nothing substantial came from it, mainly due to the lack of interest of European powers. Nevertheless, in the aftermath of the fall of Constantinople, the pope, as well as other European rulers, started to perceive more favourably the diplomatic efforts of Philip the Good, who in turn tried to build consensus within his noblemen through a spectacular ceremonial appeal, the *Banquet du Voeu du Faisan*, one of the grandest events of late medieval society. The Feast of the Pheasant was a spectacular event held at the Palais du Rihour in Lille on 17 February 1454, organised by the duke to promote a crusade for the liberation of Constantinople. Its fall presented Philip with the pretext to pursue further his emancipation from France, as he could now claim rights on the Eastern imperial throne, through his kinship with Baldwin of Flanders-Hainaut, Latin emperor in 1204.[42] The Feast has been seen as a «ceremonial *Gesamtkunstwerk*» in which music, theatre, images, and motifs played all a crucial role.[43] In fact, the entire staging of the Feast was a complex web of references and allusions designed to represent the duke as the heir of the early medieval Christian crusading tradition, as well as to position Burgundy, through a lavish display of luxury, as the only political power with enough resources to undertake a crusade. The role of luxury and splendour in Burgundy was pivotal in the affirmation of

[41] Bisaha, *Creating East and West*, 78.
[42] Paviot, "Burgundy and the Crusade," 73.
[43] Strøm-Olsen, "Political Narrative and Symbolism in the Feast of the Pheasant (1454)," 317-18.

its "independence" from the king of France and in the neutralisation of the duke's lack of royal status.[44] Not only did the dukes appropriate the French rituals, but they exploited their symbolic language and imagery of crusading culture as well.[45] As far as concerning the internal debate, as Arjo Vanderjagt notes, the decades of propaganda, realised through neo-chivalric literature, reworking of historical and mythical past, and rituals, provided a strong ideology and a common identity among the Burgundian aristocracy that might be considered preliminary to a sense of national identity.[46] The importance of rituals in Burgundian society has been highlighted already by Johan Huizinga in his seminal work *Herfstij der Middeleeuwen*,[47] in which he argued that they were important both on a political and emotional level: ceremonies achieved political aims through an emotional response, induced by intricate and highly refined rituals: the stimulation of senses were of capital importance.[48]

Even if nothing substantial resulted from the Feast of the Pheasant, the dukes of Burgundy started to be identified in Europe as a crusading role model, rulers from which help might be obtained when planning a crusade. Their power and prestige increased, implicitly diminishing their subordination to the Emperor and the King of France. And this attitude can be observed also in the heir of Philip the Good, Charles the Bold. He fashioned himself throughout his life as a crusader, and actively propagated representations of himself as a virtuous prince and faithful catholic; and even if he never really planned a crusade as his father had done, he was well aware of the potency of crusading propaganda for strengthening his political ambitions.[49] With Philip the Good, crusading became a central aspect of kingship, with many rulers, even well into the

---

[44] Vincenzo Borghetti, "Music and the representation of princely power in the fifteenth and sixteenth century," *Acta Musicologica* 80, no. 2 (2008): 191.
[45] Strøm-Olsen, "Political Narrative and Symbolism in the Feast of the Pheasant (1454)," 322.
[46] Arjo J. Vanderjagt, "Ritualizing Heritage: Jason and the Argonauts at the Burgundian Feast of the Pheasant (1454)," in *Negotiating Heritage. Memories of the Middle Ages*, ed. Mette B. Bruun and Stephanie A. Glaser (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), 183.
[47] Huizinga, *The Waning of the Middle Ages. A Study of the Forms of Life, Thought, and Art in France and the Netherlands in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*.
[48] Andrew Brown and Graeme Small, eds., *Court and Civic Society in the Burgundian Low Countries c. 1420-1530* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 28-32.
[49] Walsh, "Charles the Bold and the crusade: politics and propaganda," 76-77.

sixteenth century such as Francis I of France, the Holy Roman Emperors Charles V and Maximilian II, and Henry VIII of England, expressing enthusiastic, although often artificial, crusading claims.[50]

Music and Crusading Propaganda

The presence of music during the Feast of the Pheasant is testified by Olivier de la Marche in his *Mémoires*: in the chronicle he recounts performances of instrumental music, motets and chansons; he also recalls two songs with their titles, as part of the *L'entremectz du serf*: *Sauvegard de ma vie* and *Je ne vis oncques la pareille*, variously attributed to Binchois and Du Fay.[51] Another work has been linked to the *Banquet*, namely one of Du Fay's lamentations on the Fall of Constantinople, *O tres piteulx – Omnes amici eius*, also known as *Lamentatio Sanctae Matris Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*. This has been confused with the lament performed by a personification of the Mother Church during the Feast, which has a completely different text.[52] This lament, along with three others also on the fall of the Constantinople, is mentioned in a letter Du Fay wrote to Giovanni and Piero de' Medici:[53] the year is not given in the letter, and it has variously been dated either to 1454 or 1456.[54] Both Fallows and Planchart agree on 1456 since, as Armand Grunzweig argued, in the letter is mentioned a journey that Du Fay, along with the rest of Duke Louis of Savoy's household, took to France and the only possible one that would chronologically fit with the composition of the Lament is the journey that happened in December 1455; therefore the letter must be dated to 1456.[55] However, even if it can reasonably be ruled out that the *Lamentatio* was written for the

---

[50] Housley, *The Later Crusades: From Lyons to Alcazar, 1274-1580*, 421-56.
[51] M. Jennifer Bloxam, "'I have never seen your equal': Agricola, the Virgin, and the Creed," *Early Music* 34, no. 3 (2006): 391-95.
[52] Planchart, *Guillaume Du Fay. The Life and Works*, 241.
[53] Firenze, Archivio di Stato, Mediceo avanti il Principato, Filza 6, 765r.
[54] Frank A. D'Accone, "The Singers of San Giovanni in Florence during the 15th Century," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 14, no. 3 (1961): 318-19.
[55] David Fallows, *Dufay* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1982), 71. Planchart, *Guillaume Du Fay. The Life and Works*, 240. Grunzweig's dating is discussed in Wright, "Dufay at Cambrai: Discoveries and Revisions," 190.

occasion of the Feast of the Pheasant, its close connection with Burgundian crusading rhetoric and propaganda is quite evident.

The Ottoman advance contributed to the creation of many laments, which were often sung as well as copied and printed so that they could be transmitted to a broad audience, both literate and illiterate, to apprise them of the events. They functioned as "repositories of memory" and kept alive the fall of Constantinople and the Turkish threat in the minds of several generations.[56] Rima Devereaux discusses Du Fay's *Lamentatio*, along with other two texts produced for the Duke Philip the Good,[57] as they concern «the West's painful experience of the frontier between itself and Byzantine Constantinople, reinforced by the Ottoman Turks' conquest of the city».[58] Devereaux shows the complexity of the relationship between West and Constantinople throughout medieval literature, and how the West "imitated and assimilated" Constantinople, taking the city as a sort of utopia.[59] She argues that in Dufay's *Lamentatio* the imagined frontier between East and West is prevailed through solidarity, as the text draws a parallel between Constantinople and Jerusalem, as both are compared to Christ's suffering. She notes that solidarity and compassion are part of Burgundian propaganda:[60] in fact, as David Wrisley suggests: «the first reaction to loss is […] to forge a community around a shared notion of what is lost»,[61] and «from the shock of the loss of Constantinople, Philip […] "*seemed to*" forge a community around such complex mythological and historical imagery».[62] Devereaux also points out that the illuminations in Broquière's *Voyage d'Outremer* are a step further than Du Fay's text, as they entertain the possibility of a crusade not only to reconquer Constantinople, but also to reconstruct and colonise it; and Molinet's *Complainte* «transforms the historical crusading context that was implicit in the illuminated

---

[56] Bisaha, *Creating East and West*, 61.
[57] The other two texts discussed are: Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Voyage d'Outremer* (Paris, Bibliothèque National, fonds français, 9087) and Jean Molinet, *Complainte de Grèce*.
[58] Rima Devereaux, "Reconstructing Byzantine Constantinople: Intercession and Illumination at the Court of Philippe Le Bon," *French Studies* 59, no. 3 (2005): 299.
[59] Devereaux, "Reconstructing Byzantine Constantinople," 299-300.
[60] Devereaux, "Reconstructing Byzantine Constantinople," 302.
[61] Wrisley, "The Loss of Constantinople," 90.
[62] Wrisley, "The Loss of Constantinople," 93.

manuscript of Broquière into an explicit programme».[63] These three texts are therefore closely related one to another in their setting out Burgundian's crusading programme: while Du Fay outlines it in theological terms, Broquière and Molinet plainly discuss the recovering of the city and its reconstruction «in the imminent and concrete future of the crusade».[64] As Wrisley notes, the "codicological performances" of Broquière's text, in which the miniatures are a "logical extension" of the text,[65] «illustrate the ability of ideologues at the court of Burgundy to consolidate the histories and myths of the crusades in their attempt to situate the duke in the political geography of a nascent Europe» and these "codicological readings" are a tool for understanding the political ideology behind these cultural artifacts.[66]

[63] Devereaux, "Reconstructing Byzantine Constantinople," 306.
[64] Devereaux, "Reconstructing Byzantine Constantinople," 310.
[65] The six illuminations represent the presentation of the manuscript to its patrons Philip VI of France and Philip the Good, the preparation for the military expedition, the siege of Constantinople, and Jerusalem. Wrisley, "The Loss of Constantinople," 98.
[66] Wrisley, "The Loss of Constantinople," 112.

Figure 26: Paris, Bibliothèque National, fonds français, 9087, f. 207*v*; miniature representing the Turkish siege of Constantinople.

In an engrossing essay, Gabrielle Spiegel notes that «the power of any given set of representations derives in large part from its social context and its relation to the social and political networks in which it is elaborated»,[67] and suggests that the best way to analyse a text would be to concentrate on its "moment of inscription", as «it represents the moment of choice, decision, and action that creates the social reality of the text».[68] In fairness, this was not new to medieval historians, who for long time had looked at the social milieu in their research,[69] although, Spiegel's article provided a social approach to literary texts and their «situated uses of language», combining the needs of literary criticism and historical research, and, therefore, suggesting that «only a minute examination of the form and content of a given work can help to define its relationship with its context».[70] Donovan shows how this would be relevant not just for literary texts but also for illuminations: the historical importance of a manuscript can be investigated through its patron's motives and the artist's creative choices; miniatures are present «according to the patron's wishes, representing the conjunction of the patron's and the artist's choices, both of which are informed by the historical context of each's interests».[71] This methodology can also be applied to works of music, extending it also to later receptions and appropriations, as in the case I am about to discuss.

CRUSADING AND *MISSAE L'HOMME ARMÉ*

The polyphonic settings of the *Ordinarium Missae*, the highest of the genres of fifteenth-century music, can indeed be seen also through the lens of propaganda. The *Missae L'homme armé* are a clear example of the Burgundian cultural policy, as the armed man of

[67] Gabrielle M. Spiegel, "History, Historicism, and the Social Logic of the Text in the Middle Ages," *Speculum* 65, no. 1 (1990): 83-84.
[68] Spiegel, "History, Historicism, and the Social Logic of the Text in the Middle Ages," 84.
[69] See for example, Peter Burke, *The Italian Renaissance. Culture and Society in Italy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987).
[70] Helmut Reimitz, "The social logic of historiographical compendia in the Carolingian period," in *Herméneutique du texte d'histoire*, ed. Osamu Kano (Nagoya: Graduate School of Letters, Nagoya University, 2012), 17-28.
[71] Erin K. Donovan, "Imagined Crusaders: The *Livre d'Eracles* in Fifteenth-Century Burgundian Collections" (PhD dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2013), 2.

the *cantus firmus* can be identified, among other things, with the duke himself.[72] As Laurenz Lütteken argues, the *l'homme armé* song directly refers to the crusading ideal of a war against the Turks, as well as to its main supporters, the dukes of Burgundy; and this can be identified as the political context of inscription, which in turn, when used as the *cantus prius factus*, makes the Mass itself a call for a crusade.[73] According to Lütteken, the Mass can be interpreted as a ritual act essentially intended to create and strengthen a common social identity, through a standardised sequence of action, texts, and gestures. Furthermore, the execution of this ritual can be seen as an eminently political act, due to its goal of generating a consensus, that is a common identity, between members of different social structures.[74] While usually the political meanings remain implicit and are not directly alluded to in the Mass, Lütteken claims that the late fifteenth century was primarily a moment of crisis, and the threat posed to the Christian identity by the Turks made it necessary to explicitly politicise the political message of the Mass.[75] In affirming this, he draws from the works of Peter Burke and the sociologist Edward Shils. Burke affirms that the functionality of rituals is endangered when the identity they seek to establish is shattered; while Shils offers a drastic interpretation arguing thatrituals are always modes of reacting against crisis phenomena.[76] Rituals and crises are therefore deeply intertwined in a complicated and constant relationship.

In relation to the *L'homme armé* tradition, one manuscript, in particular, stands out as the product of Burgundian propaganda, that is the manuscript NapBN 40, which contains six anonymous *Missae L'homme armé*. These Masses have mostly attracted the attention of musicologists due to the combination of anonymous transmission with a highly intriguing genre, but especially because they survive in such a beautiful and uniquely laid

---

[72] Borghetti, "Music and the representation of princely power in the fifteenth and sixteenth century," 199-201.
[73] Laurenz Lütteken, "Ritual und Krise. Die neapolitanischen «L'homme armé» - Zyklen und die Semantik der Cantus firmus-Messe," in *Musik als Text. Bericht über den Internationalen Kongreß der Gesellschaft für Musikforschung. Freiburg im Bresgau 1993*, ed. Hermann Danuser and Tobias Plebuch (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1998), 209.
[74] Lütteken, "Ritual und Krise," 214.
[75] Lütteken, "Ritual und Krise," 215.
[76] Edward Shils, "Ritual and Crisis," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences* 251, no. 772 (1966).

out source, as well as having a unique structure: each of the first five Masses, composed for four voices, uses a different consecutive portion of the *L'homme armé* melody as *cantus firmus* in the tenor. A verbal enigmatic canon suggests to the singer how the *cantus firmus* of each Mass should be executed. The sixth Mass, for five voices, finally, sets the complete melody. The canons, as argued by Vincenzo Borghetti, act as a gloss to the *cantus firmus* and highlight both its musical and symbolical pre-eminence.[77] This is also visually conveyed in the manuscript both by the *mise-en-page*, where the Tenor is always clearly separated from the other voices, but especially by the fact that the absence of *L'homme armé*, namely when the Tenor tacet, is signalled in the other voices by the use of red ink, a unique feature amongst music manuscript of this period. It is evident that these Masses must be considered as a whole, or even a "cycle". Under the historical circumstances of late fifteenth century, the semantic field of these six Masses becomes clear to understand. Here the crusading call suggested by Lütteken becomes stronger and stronger throughout each Mass, culminating in the final settings, where the complete melody of *l'homme armé* is finally presented. The canons, as well as the tropes in the Kyrie and Gloria, clarify further the crusading context. The text is therefore complemented and reinforced by clarifying contexts and paratexts. The subordination of the ritual text to the song on which the Masses is here evident, as in order to be performed they require paratextual canons. This reflects the process of crisis argued by Lütteken: the political meaning of the Mass is threatened and needs to be highlighted by the explicit inclusion of political references.

The exceptional and interlinked structure of these settings points towards a planned effort to create something coherent and unique, that can, in all likelihood, be connected with the ducal attempt to identify himself as leader of the crusade. The link to the duke of Burgundy is provided in the dedicatory epigram, on the last page of the manuscript, where we find mentioned the name '*Charolus*', identified as Charles the Bold. This, together with palaeographical evidence, would point towards a Burgundian origin of the

[77] Borghetti, "Music and the representation of princely power in the fifteenth and sixteenth century," 205.

manuscript, sometime between 1465 and 1475.[78] As mentioned, one of the most interesting features of the six Masses is the use of canons and tropes intertwined with references to classical literature and crusading rhetoric, as Lütteken has shown.[79] In order to perform each *cantus firmus,* one has to decipher an enigmatic canon full of Virgilian allusions. The final canon unveils that most of the verses can be traced directly back to the *Aeneid* by recalling the first verse of the epic, and through this key it is possible to recognise a number of other citations.[80] The *Aeneid* was a central text during the Middle Ages and had undergone a process of Christianization since the late fourth century. It was also used for crusading propaganda, by drawing a parallel between the fall of Troy and the fall of Constantinople or Jerusalem, and Aeneas was a symbol of the prince-armed man.

The presence of references to Aeneas in settings of the *Ordinarium Missae* would also reinforce the concept of Christians as true heirs of Troy. This was necessary as between the fourteenth and fifteenth century a small but important minority of humanists, such as Coluccio Salutati, one of the most important humanists as well as the powerful chancellor of Florence, argued that one of the reasons the Turks had to invade the West, and in particular Italy, was their right to reclaim it, as they were the heirs of Trojans. Some even started comparing the Turks and their leaders to the ancient Romans, especially for their military skills.[81] The sultan Mehmed II himself referred to this belief in an alleged letter to the pope Nicholas V.[82] These interpretations were strongly opposed by the majority and especially by Enea Silvio Piccolomini, later pope Pius II, who instead depicted the Ottomans as savages and descendants of the barbarian Scythes and affirmed that the Romans were the true heirs of Troy.[83] In the aftermath of the fall of Constantinople this latter opinion became prevalent, but still, the late medieval crusading movement strikes

---

[78] Cohen, *Six Anonymous L'homme armé Masses*.
[79] Lütteken, "Ritual und Krise."
[80] Lütteken, "Ritual und Krise," 210.
[81] Bisaha, *Creating East and West*, 43-93. A. Blake Denton, "The Medieval Canon and the Renaissance Image of the Turk: A Brief Historiography of Pre-Modern European Conceptions of the Muslim World," *Madison Historical Review* 12 (2015). https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/mhr/vol12/iss1/5.
[82] Strøm-Olsen, "Political Narrative and Symbolism in the Feast of the Pheasant (1454)," 329.
[83] Bisaha, *Creating East and West*, 90.

sometime as rather incoherent. This is evident in Burgundy, where crusading was still strongly tied to chivalry and the threat posed by the Ottoman armies was less pressing than in other parts of Europe; as Housley brilliantly sums it up: «if fighting the Turks was to have chivalric value then the enemy must be a worthy opponent».[84] From this perspective the chivalric duel proposed during the Feast of Pheasant by the Philip the Good against Mehmed II in order to defend the Church acquires profound significance: the duel of Aeneas and Turnus can indeed be interpreted as a model for the challenge set by Philip the Good.[85] Furthermore, the choice of Aeneas was not accidental as the dukes of Burgundy claimed to be his descendants through the Frankish king Clovis and, most importantly, Charlemagne, perceived at the time as a crusading hero.[86] The relevance of ancestry has been proven of crucial value by historiography on crusading. As Nicholas Paul argues, it constituted one of the most important source of identity for the members of a noble family and it «can reveal how members of particular noble communities thought about crusading».[87] Moreover, the transmission of stories about crusading ancestors created a dynastic identity that would be «mutually intelligible throughout the community of European nobility».[88] The importance of material objects was also crucial for nobility, with Elisabeth van Houts arguing for the existence of a «material culture of memory».[89] Numerous luxury objects existed with the aim to preserve and pass down the past of a family. These objects, labelled by anthropologist Annette Weiner as "inalienable wealth", act «as a vehicle for bringing past time into the present, so that the histories of ancestors, titles, or mythological events become an intimate part of a person's present identity».[90] Paul also suggested that the unique appearance of these objects played a key role in establishing their function as memorabilia. The possibility that music manuscripts

---

[84] Housley, *The Later Crusades: From Lyons to Alcazar, 1274-1580*, 382.
[85] An interpretation strengthened also by the biblical parallel drawn between the duel of Aeneas with Turnus and the one between David and Goliath Lütteken, "Ritual und Krise," 212.
[86] Marie Tanner, *The Last Descendant of Aeneas: the Hapsburgs and the Mythic Image of the Emperor* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 277.
[87] Nicholas L. Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps. The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012), 16.
[88] Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps. The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages*, 60.
[89] Elisabeth van Houts, *Memory and Gender in Medieval Europe: 900-1200* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999).
[90] Annette B. Weiner, "Inalienable Wealth," *American Ethnologist* 12, no. 2 (1985): 210.

were not necessarily meant for performance and that they could offer a different aesthetic experience is a concept already explored,[91] and I would argue that the Naples manuscript may be considered as one of those objects.

A New Hypothesis for NapBN 40

While the name of the duke Charles is mentioned in the epigram, this manuscript cannot be directly linked to the duke. In fact, along with the dedication the last folio of the manuscript (f. 64*v*) presents, below the epigram, a coat of arms along with a *devise* (motto), so far unidentified. Judith Cohen, in her monograph on this manuscript, mentioned that research in some European library was fruitless,[92] and the hypothesis, put forward by Barbara Haggh,[93] to identify the coat of arms as the one of the de Clercq family, and specifically of Charles de Clercq, a prominent courtier at the Habsburg-Burgundian court at the beginning of the sixteenth century does not bear scrutiny. While Charles was a renowned bibliophile, and indeed a music manuscript has been linked to him,[94] the coat of arms present in NapBN 40 cannot be identified as his, as a close examination of the manuscript reveals.[95] Haggh describes the coat of arms as having a blue field with a fess and three besants, two above and one below the fess.[96] Whereas, de Clercq's arms present a golden fess, the one in NapBN 40, even though oxidised, still has some silver traces, and the three charges are not besants but I would suggest they be described as cinquefoils; moreover, within the fess it is possible to recognise a red

---

[91] Jane Alden, "Reading the Loire Valley Chansonniers," *Acta Musicologica* 79, no. 1 (2007); Thomas Schmidt, "Making Polyphonic Books in the late Fifteenth and early Sixteenth Centuries," in *The Production and Reading of Music Sources: Mise-En-Page in Manuscripts and Printed Books Containing Polyphonic Music, 1480-1530*, ed. Thomas Schmidt and Christian T. Leitmeir (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018), 99.

[92] Cohen, *Six Anonymous L'homme armé Masses*, 11. Cohen researched the coat of arms in: Naples (Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele III), Venice (Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana), Budapest (Egyetemi Könyvtar), and Brussels (Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België - Bibliothèque royale de Belgique).

[93] Barbara Haggh, "Charles de Clerc, Seigneur de Bouvekercke, and Two Manuscripts: Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, MS 215-16, and Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, MS VI E 40," in *The Burgundian-Habsburg Court Complex of Music Manuscripts (1500-1535) and the Workshop of Petrus Alamire*, ed. Bruno Bouckaert and Eugeen Schreurs (Leuven: Alamire Music Publishers, 2003), 185-202.

[94] Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België - Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, ms. 215-216. Haggh, "Charles de Clerc," 185. BrusBR 215-6 bears in fact at the beginning the coat of arms of Charles de Clercq's wife, Anne Annoke.

[95] The manuscript has been examined in person on 6 March 2020.

[96] Haggh, "Charles de Clerc," 200.

crescent. Finally, a close examination of the *devise* shows that the reading "Que par dieu soit", proposed by Cohen,[97] is erroneous and it should instead be read as "De par dieu soit" (Figures 27-28), which is not associated to any motto of the de Clercq family.

Figure 27: Coat of arms in NapBN 40, f. 64*v*.

Figure 28: Backlit coat of arms (NapBN 40, f. 64*v*); note the crescent in the middle of the fess.

Indeed, a coat of arms like the one just described along with the *devise* "De par dieu soit" appears also in a 1476 incunabulum of Cristoforo Landino's Italian translation of Pliny

[97] Cohen, *Six Anonymous L'homme armé Masses*, 11.

the Elder's *Historia Naturalis*, published in Venice by Nicolaus Jenson, today preserved at the British Library.[98] Copies of this edition were printed in an elegant humanist font with blank spaces left and no capital letters at the beginning of each book and chapters so that each copy could be customised with illuminated capitals and decoration, often with the coat of arms of the buyer.[99] The coat of arms appears twice in the copy of the British Library: at the beginning of the *Libro primo* as a decoration of the illuminated capital letter and at the beginning of the *Prohemio* where the coat is inserted in a bas-de-page decoration (Figure 29). Along with the arms, the *devise* can be found in the decoration of the border both at the beginning of the *Libro primo* and in the borders of the *Prohemio*. Moreover, it appears at the end of the book in a handwritten *bâtarde* rubric below the colophon, along with the name Ianly (Figure 30). This de Janly family, whose name is variously spelled, was a Burgundian noble family which had a coat of arms described as: «d'azur a une fasce d'argent, accompagnée de trois quinte-feûilles de mesme».[100] This coat of arms along with the *devise* can thus be identified beyond any reasonable doubt as the same one that appears in NapBN 40.

[98] London, British Library, C.3.d.2.

[99] Florence Edler de Roover, "New Facets on the Financing and Marketing of Early Printed Books," *Bulletin of the Business Historical Society* 27, no. 4 (1953): 228. Andrea Rizzi, "Editing and Translating Pliny in Renaissance Italy: Agency, collaboration and visibility," *Renaessanceforum - Journal of Renaissance Studies* 14 (2018): 125-27.

[100] «Blue with a silver fess combined with three cinquefoils of the same colour». Louvan Geliot, *Le vraye et parfaite science des armoires ou l'indice armorial de feu maistre* (Paris: Frederic Leonard, 1664), 458.

Figure 29: Coat of arms in London, British Library, C.3.d.2; on the left the one appearing in the initial of the Libro primo, on the right the one in the bas-de-page decoration of the first page of the *Prohemio*.

Figure 30: *Devise* of the Janly family below the colophon at the end of London, British Library, C.3.d.2.

Among the various members of the de Janly family, three of them are possible candidates for an association with NapBN 40 for reasons of chronology: Jean de Janly and his two sons. In an eighteenth-century list of Philip the Good's household there is a reference to a Jean de Tenarre, lord of Janly, who acted as adviser and chamberlain, and was ennobled by Philip the Good in 1433 and since then known as «Compte Jean Girard de Janly».[101] Philip the Good nominated him bailiff and *grenetier* of the salt-granary of Chalon-sur-

[101] Louis-François-Joseph de La Barre, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France et de Bourgogne* (Paris: Julien-Michel Gandouin et Pierre-François Giffart, 1729), 220.

Saône.[102] In the ducal *Comptes de l'argentier*, Jean (d. after 1474) is mentioned as ducal councillor and *maître des requêtes de l'hôtel* under Philip the Good and Charles the Bold, namely the person in charge of examining commoners' requests and petitions to the ducal household. In 1467, he was also duke Philip's envoy to the King of Naples, according to the *Comptes* and the memoirs of Philippe de Commynes, a nobleman and diplomat.[103] His name appears in the list of the members of the Grand Conseil de Malines, also known as the Parliament of Mechelen, namely the highest court of law in the Burgundian Low Countries, founded and chaired by the duke Charles the Bold in 1473,[104] he was probably promoted there sometimes in the first half of 1474 as mentioned in the *Comptes*.[105] Due to his role as *maître*, it is possible to infer that he had a university education, a background also common to other ambassadors.[106] In 1426, Jean de Janly married Jeanne de Mâlain, daughter of Oudot of Mâlain;[107] he had two sons and one daughter: Antoine, Philibert, and Odette. Antoine (d. after 1519) was lord of Verchisy and Lays;[108] he is variously mentioned in the *Comptes* as *grand page* of Charles the Bold in

---

[102] Jean Martin, "L'église cathédrale Saint-Vincent de Chalon-sur-Saone. Pierre tombales & documents historiques," in *Mémoires de la société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Chalon-sur-Saone* (Chalon-sur-Saone: Émile Bertrand, 1906), 13. The *grenetier* was the officer responsible for the *grenier à sel*, namely the place where all the salt produced in the region was stored so that the ducal monopoly was ensured. The *grenetier* was also in charge of the *gabelle*, the tax due for the purchase of salt. Malcolm G. A. Vale, *Charles VII* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1974), 244.

[103] Anke Greve and Émilie Lebailly, eds., *Comptes de l'Argentier de Charles le Téméraire, duc de Bourgogne*, vol. 1 (Paris: Boccard, 2001), 446; Philippe de Commynes, *The Historical Memoirs of Philip De Comines* (London: William McDowall, 1817), 120. A few years later, in 1470, Charles the Bold sent him to the fief of Hesdin, in Montreuil, to take care of some unmentioned ducal business. Valérie Bessey, Véronique Flammang, and Émilie Lebailly, eds., *Comptes de l'Argentier de Charles le Téméraire, duc de Bourgogne*, vol. 3/1 (Paris: Boccard, 2008), 387-88.

[104] Other sources report that he died in 1471, cf. Charles Bigarne, "Les capitaines du chateau de Beaune, études généalogiques," *Société d'histoire, d'archéologie et de littérature de l'arrondissement de Beaune. Mémoires année 1886* (1887): 119.

[105] Valérie Bessey and Sébastien Hamel, eds., *Comptes de l'Argentier de Charles le Téméraire, duc de Bourgogne*, vol. 4 (Paris: Boccard, 2009), 111-12.

[106] Anne-Brigitte Spitzbarth, *Ambassades et ambassadeurs de Philippe le Bon, troisième duc Valois de Bourgogne (1419-1467)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), 252-54. Spitzbarth mentions a Jean de Jauly as ambassador to the King of Aragon in Naples in 1467, proposing to identify him as Jean Joly, who led a mission regarding the boundaries between Burgundy and France in 1463, cf. Spitzbarth, *Ambassades et ambassadeurs*, 99.

[107] Lord of Lux and Demigny, ennobled by Philip the Good in 1433, and then appointed as his counsellor in 1439, cf. Henri Beaune and Jules D'Arbaumont, *La noblesse aux états de Bourgogne de 1350 à 1789* (Dijon: La Marche, 1864), 230.

[108] Martin, "L'église cathédrale," 13.

1468,[109] *valet servant* in 1470,[110] and *écuyer tranchant*, namely the person responsible for cutting the meat and serving the duke, in 1471.[111] Philibert (d. c.1512) was *protonotaire* of the Holy See, dean of the cathedral of Chalon-sur Saône in 1475,[112] and member of the Parlement of Burgundy in Beaune in 1474,[113] he was also famous for his singular erudition and for his mastering of Hebrew.[114] It is quite clear that, notwithstanding their recent rise to nobility, we are dealing with members of a prominent family and well-regarded by both dukes Philip and Charles, given their roles in the government of the Burgundian domains.

Both Jean and Antoine can be excluded as their coat of arms is undifferentiated, i.e. not presenting a crescent within the fess, as they were the successive heads of the family; Antoine's coat of arms probably had a *brisure*, a mark of cadency, in his coat while his father was alive, but usually the eldest son's one is a *lambel*, while the *croissant*, the crescent, was usually reserved for younger sons. Therefore, it is most likely that Philibert de Janly was the member of the family using the coat of arms with the crescent; this is also testified by the presence of a handwritten rubric in the incunabulum reading: "Prothonotaire de Rouray".[115] As mentioned, Philibert was renowned for his erudition, and it is not unlikely that he had an interest in a book such as the Pliny translation. Furthermore, his status of new courtiers can be helpful in interpreting his choices in terms of book and manuscript collection. The Burgundian court, as Hanno Wijsman notes, was a socially mobile environment: office holders were often granted a noble title for their service by the duke. Many of these new courtiers, such as the de Janly family,

---

[109] Anke Greve and Émilie Lebailly, eds., *Comptes de l'Argentier de Charles le Téméraire, duc de Bourgogne*, vol. 2 (Paris: Boccard, 2002), 253.
[110] Bessey, Flammang, and Lebailly, *Comptes de l'Argentier, vol. 3/1*, 400.
[111] Bessey and Hamel, *Comptes de l'Argentier, vol. 4*, 33; Louis Prosper Gachard, "Analectes historiques, Cinquième série," *Compte-rendu des séances de la commission royale d'histoire* 9 (1857): 121.
[112] Martin, "L'église cathédrale," 13.
[113] Pierre Palliot, *Le Parlament de Bourgongne, son origine, son etablissement, et son progrés* (Dijon: Pierre Palliot, 1649), 17.
[114] Palliot, *Parlament de Bourgongne*, 17; Pierre de Saint-Julien, *De l'origine des Bourgongnons, et antiquité des estats de Bourgongne* (Paris: Nicolas Chesneau, 1581), 327.
[115] Rouray was a small village under the diocese of Chalon-sur Saône as well as seat of a *maison de plaisance* of the duke of Burgundy, Jean Joseph d'Expilly, *Dictionnaire géographique, historique et politique des Gaules et de la France*, vol. 6 (Amsterdam: Desaint & Saillant, 1770), 541.

were coming from the French Burgundy, being this a deliberate choice of Philip the Good in order to even out the administrative elite and unify his various domains in the Low Countries. They generally had a different educational background from that of the high nobility, with most of new courtiers having a university education. Their position was further strengthened through political marriages, especially in the generations subsequent to their original ascent, and their status was enhanced through arts patronage, such as the commission (or, in the case of the Jenson incunabulum, the purchase) of lavishly illuminated manuscripts and books. There is a trend in book and manuscript ownership in Burgundy: the taste of the duke was emulated by high nobility, and they were in turn imitated by new courtiers; however, this latter category, due to its university educational background, also used to collect scholarly, humanistic books.[116] Jane Alden has shown how the bibliophile interest of new courtiers regularly extended to books of polyphony, as the Loire Valley Chansonniers belonged to the milieu of the French *noblesse de robe*, secretaries and notaries ennobled for their service to the crown and higher nobility.[117] Alden notes that the new courtiers' efforts of emulating the higher nobility involved the commission and acquisition of works of arts as well as manuscripts and literary works, being also this social category quantitatively more accountable than the royals and aristocratic families.[118] She also points out that musical competence was sought by new courtiers, due to its association to the more established nobility.[119]

While the Pliny text is a good example of humanistic ambitions, NapBN 40 well represents an alignment with one of the duke's foremost interests: crusading. There is considerable evidence that Philibert, and the de Janly family more generally, shared this involvement with the crusades, an interest that was of pivotal importance in the

---

[116] Hanno Wijsman, *Luxury Bound. Illustrated Manuscript Production and Noble and Princely Book Ownership in the Burgundian Netherlands (1400-1550)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), 481-83.
[117] Jane Alden, *Songs, Scribes, and Society. The History and Reception of the Loire Valley Chansonniers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 167-241. Joanna Frońska has also established the association of the chansonnier London, British Library, Royal Ms 20 A.xvi to a French noble family belonging to the new courtiers. Joanna Frońska, "London, British Library, Royal Ms 20 A. XVI," in *The Production and Reading of Music Sources. Mise-en-page in manuscripts and printed books containing polyphonic music, 1480-1530*, ed. Thomas Schmidt and Christian T. Leitmeir (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018), 263-68.
[118] Alden, *Songs, Scribes, and Society*, 169.
[119] Alden, *Songs, Scribes, and Society*, 187.

Burgundian court. Odette, the daughter of Jean de Janly and Philibert's sister, was the first wife of Olivier de la Marche, who married her around 1455.[120] Olivier de la Marche was a central figure of the Burgundian state under Philip the Good and Charles the Bold: he had a distinguished career as courtier and diplomat and, more importantly, played a pivotal role in the organisation of the ceremonies at the court. Above all else, he was deeply involved in the organisation of the Feast of the Pheasant.[121] Furthermore, the choice of a crescent as a *brisure* for Philibert's coat of arms might have been a way to show his support for the ducal crusading effort. The *croissant* was in fact a charge that was added by nobles to show their involvement in a crusade, or that of their ancestors.[122]

The Dedication to Beatrice of Aragon

The epigram at the end of the Naples manuscript clearly states at the beginning: "Ad serenissimam Ungarie Reginam", explicitly naming Beatrice of Aragon in the first line.[123] Since the dedicatory epigram at the end of the manuscript is in a hand different from that of the main body of the manuscript and added onto a blank page, it is not possible to establish if the manuscript was commissioned by de Janly specifically to be donated to Beatrice or if it was gifted to her at a later date. It is unlikely that Philibert de Janly

---

[120] Henri Stein, *Olivier de la Marche. Historien, poète et diplomate Bourguignon* (Paris: Picard, 1888), 83; Marie-Thérèse Caron, *Les voeux du Faisan, noblesse en fête, esprit de croisade. Le manuscrit Français 11594 de la Bibliothèque Nationale de France* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 291.

[121] Alistair Millar, "Olivier de la Marche and the Court of Burgundy, c.1425-1502" (PhD dissertation, The University of Edinburgh, 1996).

[122] Louis de Magny, *La science du blason, accompagnée d'un armorial général des familles nobles de l'Europe* (Paris: Institut Heraldique, 1858), 83.

[123] Beatrice of Aragon (1457-1508) was the daughter of King Ferrante I of Naples and Queen Isabella of Clermont. She was engaged with King Matthias 'Corvinus' Hunyadi of Hungary in 1474 and married him in Hungary two years later, being also crowned as Queen of Hungary. After Matthias's death in 1490, she continued to be Queen and married with Vladislaus II in 1490, King of Bohemia and of Hungary. In 1500, Beatrice's marriage was declared void by the pope, and Beatrice decided to return to Naples, arriving there in 1501. She then spent her final years at the Castello Aragonese on the island of Ischia, near Naples. The entire epigram reads: "Ad serenissimam | Ungarie Reginam | Regia pro<ge>nies regi nupta beatrix | Qua sub sole viget nulla probandi magis, | Te tua virtutum series lustrata per orbem | Nunciat; ut nostris sis quoq*ue* nota locis, | Tu modo divinos cultus regionibus istis | Extollens, cantus aducis ipsa modos, | O pietas miranda nimis laudanda q*ue*, maius | Hoc regina tibi quod decus esse potest, | Rex hostes fidei vincit, Regina colendo | Magnificat sanctam sublevat atq*ue* fidem, | Quam bene concordi iunxerunt numina lecto | Quos natura facit moribus esse pares, | Hinc licet ignotus, dominam te munere tantam | Ausus adire fui, servulus ipse tuus, | Charolus hoc princeps quondam gaudere solebat | Conveniet, certum est, moribus idq*ue* tuis, | Hoc capias igitur quaeso, videas q*ue* libenter; | Munus ab ignoto saepe placere solet, | I<a>m v<al>eas foelix cum caro coniuge semper | Augeat in nostram fortis uterq*ue* fidem".

directly knew Beatrice, as testified in the dedication where it is said that the manuscript is a "munus ab ignoto", a gift from one unknown; it is however probable that Jean de Janly was a figure known to the Neapolitan Aragonese household, due to his role as duke's envoy there. As for the motives, Marcel Mauss, in his seminal book *Essai sur le don*,[124] highlighted that gifts are part of a system of exchange implying some sort of reciprocation, with Natalie Zemon Davis suggesting that books were specifically donated for social purposes going outside the range of strict reciprocity.[125] It may well be that Philibert's intent was to establish a relationship with Beatrice in order to enhance his status as noble. As Schmidt argues, there is a «"public relations" value of being associated with a person of high rank or social status, with the possible benefit of achieving a higher standing in one's own professional context or in society at large».[126] Manuscripts participated in what Brigitte Buettner defines "asymmetric relationships", being almost exclusively presented as gifts from those of lower rank to members of the higher nobility.[127] Buettner investigates the early fifteenth-century ceremony of the *étrennes*, the ritual exchange of gifts on New Year's Day at the Valois court. These gifts (also called *étrennes*) were used among nobles to strengthen their position and their social connections.[128] Manuscripts rarely featured as presents among same-rank nobles, being often considered simply not enough; established nobles preferred jewels, goldworks, and other items of decorative art, while manuscripts were gifted by new courtiers to rulers

[124] Marcel Mauss, *The Gift. The form and reason for exchange in archaic societies* (London: Routledge, 2002). The importance of musical gifts has been extensively researched, cf. Tim Shephard, "Constructing Identities in a Music Manuscript: The Medici Codex as a Gift," *Renaissance Quarterly* 63, no. 1 (2010); Rob C. Wegman, "Musical Offerings in the Renaissance," *Early Music* 33, no. 3 (2005); Giovanni Zanovello, "'You Will Take This Sacred Book': The Musical Strambotto as a Learned Gift," *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 141, no. 1 (2016).
[125] Natalie Zemon Davis, "Beyond the Markets: Books as Gifts in Sixteenth-Century France: The Prothero Lecture," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 33 (1983): 87.
[126] Thomas Schmidt, "Dedicating Music Manuscripts: On function and form of paratexts in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century sources," in *«Cui dono lepidum novum libellum?». Dedicating Latin Works and Motets in the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Ignace Bossuyt et al. (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2008), 83.
[127] Brigitte Buettner, "Past Presents: New Year's Gifts at the Valois Courts, ca. 1400," *The Art Bulletin* 83, no. 4 (2001): 604.
[128] Buettner, "Past Presents," 600.

and aristocrats.[129] Wijsman notes how from 1445 duke Philip the Good largely received manuscripts from new courtiers.[130] While there are instances in which members of the higher nobility, such as Lodewijk van Gruuthuse and Louis de Luxembourg, gave manuscripts as gifts, often this was still upwards,[131] and generally it was much more common as choice of gift for new courtiers.[132]

Despite her explicit mention, Beatrice has been considered by Ronald Woodley as a mere intermediary, her husband King Matthias 'Corvinus' Hunyadi of Hungary being the real recipient of this gift.[133] According to Woodley, the reason to dedicate the manuscript to Beatrice and not to Matthias was motivated by the delicate political situation between Burgundy and Hungary. Although the two realms were on friendly terms, an alliance was not possible at the time due to the political tensions with the Holy Roman Emperor. Woodley also assumed that the crusading allusions better suited Matthias, because of his war efforts against the Ottomans. However, we should still consider Beatrice as the intended recipient of the manuscript. Recent scholarship has highlighted that a continuous alliance did exist between Burgundy and Hungary.[134] Moreover, Beatrice's role could have been rather more active than what one might imagine. She was surely capable of understanding the allusions contained in the manuscript, since she received the same education of boys, as customary for the House of Aragon, and was therefore familiar with Virgil, having received manuscripts of his works as a gift from his father.[135]

---

[129] Buettner, "Past Presents," 604-09. On the central, and often neglected, role of applied arts see Marina Belozerskaya, *Rethinking the Renaissance. Burgundian Arts across Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
[130] Wijsman, *Luxury Bound*, 246.
[131] Lodewijk van Gruuthuse presented a manuscript to Charles VIII of France and Edward IV of England, and Louis de Luxembourg probably gave a manuscript to the duke of Savoy.
[132] Wijsman, *Luxury Bound*, 539-45.
[133] Ronald Woodley, "Tinctoris's Italian Translation of the Golden Fleece Statutes: A Text and a (Possible) Context," *Early Music History* 8 (1988): 186-87.
[134] Attila Bárány, "King Matthias and the Western European Powers," ed. István Draskóczy et al., *Matthias Rex 1458-1490 – Hungary at the Dawn of the Renaissance* (Budapest: ELTE, Centre des hautes études de la Renaissance, 2013).
[135] Péter Farbaky, "Patrons and Patterns: The Connection between the Aragon Dynasty of Naples and the Hungarian Court of Matthias Corvinus," *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti* 41 (2017): 24. On the ways in which women's various reading interests intertwine with their political roles see Katherine J. Lewis, "Women and Power," in *Historians on John Gower*, ed. Stephen H. Rigby and Echard Siân (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2019).

she was described as a strong woman and in 1477 accompanied Matthias on active campaign against the Turks, being present at the military camp in Pozsnoy.[136] She had a good knowledge of music, having been tutored by one of the most important music theorists of the time, Johannes Tinctoris, who dedicated to her three of his treatises and also compiled the Mellon Chansonnier as a wedding gift, which contains the chanson *Il sera par vous–L'homme armé.* Therefore, she might have been already familiar with the tune. Moreover, she was coming from a family with a strong crusading tradition, and research has re-evaluated the involvement of women in the crusading movement. Women were invested with the role of preserving the family tradition and often were the repository of its crusading past. They were, as Nicholas Paul argues, «strong, although often invisible links in the chain of family memory».[137] Both Beatrice and her husband Matthias were deeply imbued with the new humanistic rhetoric. In a letter from 1480, the humanist Marsilio Ficino exhorts Matthias exhorts Matthias to fight the Turks and compares him to Hercules. A sharp contrast appears in humanistic writings between Matthias and the Turks, with the former portrayed as a protector of high culture due to his patronage of humanism and arts.[138] The Virgilian references in the six Neapolitan Masses become therefore applicable also to the new owners of the manuscript. In fact, Hercules, as Matthias was called, appears in Virgil's epic, and stands clearly as a model for Aeneas. Moreover, it is quite plausible that both Beatrice and Matthias, with their strong crusading familiar traditions and acquaintance with humanistic writings, understood the classical references as part of the new cultural framework.

It is here evident how the manuscript NapBN 40 can be considered as a unique witness of the various sides that crusading propaganda entailed in the late Middle Ages. Its unique structure as well as the network of protagonists of the later crusading history

[136] Valery Rees, ""A woman of valour": towards a reappraisal of the presence of Beatrix of Aragon in the Hungarian Court," ed. István Draskóczy et al., *Matthias Rex 1458-1490 – Hungary at the Dawn of the Renaissance* (Budapest: ELTE, Centre des hautes études de la Renaissance, 2013). 5.
[137] Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps. The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages*, 16.
[138] Bisaha, *Creating East and West*, 75.

unravelled by its commission and donation show how we are in front of one of the most extraordinary objects of its period.

5. Models of Fifteenth-Century Music Editions

In this chapter I will examine various models of critical editions of fifteenth-century sacred music. I will discuss their criteria and highlight their merits and criticalities. I have chosen in particular to focus on four editions, namely those of Josquin, Obrecht, Okeghem, and Busnoys, since they are regarded today as among the best critical editions of fifteenth-century music, and are often praised as a model for others. Furthermore, these editions present the works of four of the most renowned and studied late medieval and Renaissance composers, and due to the variety of the repertoire they are an interesting case study that can illuminate how to set the criteria for other critical editions of fifteenth-century works.

. While they share the same publisher, namely the *Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis*, the *New Josquin Edition*, the *New Obrecht Edition* and the edition *Johannes Ockeghem, Masses and Mass Sections* greatly differ in various terms, such as the number scholars involved in the project (from more than twenty to one) and the editorial criteria.[1]

Preparations for the *New Josquin Edition* can be traced back to the 1970s, with a series of 'Reports of the Josquin Meetings' published by Willem Elders, in which were discussed the editorial procedures to adopt in the edition.[2] The first volume of the edition, however, reached publication only in 1987 and the last one has been published in 2016. In total, 30 volumes, of which the first contains a complete inventory of the sources, have been published with more than twenty musicologists involved in this *magnum opus*. The

[1] *The New Josquin Edition (NJE).* (Utrecht: Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis, 1987-2016); *Jacob Obrecht, Collected Works (New Obrecht Edition).* (Utrecht: Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis, 1983-1999); Jaap van Benthem, ed., *Johannes Ockeghem, Masses and Mass Sections*, 3 vols. (Utrecht: Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis, 1994-2005).

[2] Willem Elders, "Reports of the First Josquin Meeting," *Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 24, no. 1 (1974); Willem Elders, "Short Report of the Second Josquin Meeting. Utrecht 1974," *Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 25, no. 1 (1975); Willem Elders, "Short Report of the Fourth Josquin Meeting. Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., 1977," *Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 28, no. 1 (1978); Willem Elders, "Short Report of the Third Josquin Meeting. Utrecht 1975," *Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 26, no. 1 (1976).

editorial criteria adopted in the actual edition are formalised in the *General Introduction*, present in every volume, and sometimes differ from what was published in the Short Reports.

The New Obrecht Edition, or *Jacob Obrecht, Collected Works*, consists of 18 volumes spanned between 1983 and 1999, under Chris Maas as general editor and a few other editors. It was preceded solely by an article by Maas himself, which is a complete survey of Obrecht's works and sources.[3] The editorial criteria are presented in the *General Introduction*, published in each volume.

Johannes Ockeghem, Masses and Mass Sections was published between 1994 and 2005, in three volumes, each one divided in four fascicles, all edited by Jaap van Benthem. In 1997 van Benthem published an article illustrating some of the editorial principles used in his edition,[4] these principles are also present at the beginning of every fascicle, as *Editorial Preface*.

To these three editions, a fourth needs to be added: Richard Taruskin's edition of the Latin-texted works of Antoine Busnoys. Busnoys's edition, published in 1990 by The Broude Trust, is divided in two volumes, the first presenting a general introduction and the music, and the second devoted to the commentary.[5] Although, compared to other editions here discussed, it is not a complete edition of the works of Busnoys, it is worth of discussion due to the relevance of the author for fifteenth-century sacred music and some interesting solutions elaborated by the editor.

METRE AND MENSURATION

Regarding metre and mensuration, it is possible to observe different approaches in the critical editions mentioned above. One of the most used is the reproduction of the mensuration signs from the original source with unreduced note values. This

---

[3] Chris Maas, "Towards a New Obrecht Edition. A Preliminary Worklist," *Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 26, no. 2 (1976).
[4] Jaap van Benthem, "Johannes Ockeghem - Masses and Mass Sections: Some Principles of the Edition," *Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 47, no. 1 (1997).
[5] Richard Taruskin, ed., Antoine Busnoys Collected Works. Part 2, The Latin-Texted Works, 2 vols. (New York: The Broude Trust, 1990).

combination is adopted in the *New Josquin Edition* justified with the intent of preserving the main features of both the original notation and the proportional signs.[6] Other editions retaining mensuration signs and note values without reduction are those edited by Jaap van Benthem, the one of Okeghem's Masses as well as the more recent one of Johannes Tourout's works.[7] In both van Benthem declares that the editions transmit the original note values of the various manuscripts, but their realisation is based on completely different rules compared to those of the mensural notation, following modern practice, such as, for example, by providing all ternary values with a dot.[8]

Another approach is offered by the *New Obrecht Edition*: here we find no indication of time in the main text, although the mensuration signs are reproduced in the diplomatic *incipit* preceding every section, and a reduction of the note values (1:2) is generally applied.[9] Reduction of values has been the common practice until recent times, and has been justified with the desire to use short values, instead of longer ones, as they are more habitual for the readers.[10]

Busnoys's edition by Richard Taruskin, instead, presents a text with a ratio of note values to the original notation as 2:1 in *integer valor*, 4:1 when *diminutio* is applied and 1:1 with *augmentatio*. One of the most interesting features of this edition is its interpretation of «tempo relationships», as called by Taruskin, particularly for the various exegeses related to ¢, even in the same piece.[11]

The several disadvantages of applying a reduction to original values have been masterfully explained by Ruth DeFord. She believes that original notation's features go

---

[6] *The New Josquin Edition (NJE)*, General introduction.
[7] Jaap van Benthem, ed., Johannes Tourout, Ascribed and Attributable Compositions in 15th-century Sources from Central Europe (Utrecht: Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis, 2015-).
[8] van Benthem, *Johannes Ockeghem, Masses and Mass Sections*, Editorial preface; van Benthem, "Johannes Ockeghem - Masses and Mass Sections: Some Principles of the Edition," 221; van Benthem, *Johannes Tourout, Ascribed and Attributable Compositions in 15th-century Sources from Central Europe*, Editorial preface.
[9] *Jacob Obrecht, Collected Works (New Obrecht Edition)*, General Introduction.
[10] James Grier, *The Critical Editing of Music: History, Method, and Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 170.
[11] It is particularly interesting the interpretation of the tempus imperfectum diminutum for the Mass *O Crux lignum triumphale*. Taruskin, *Antoine Busnoys Collected Works. Part 2, The Latin-Texted Works*, 49-51.

further than the «literal representation of note durations», and their transmission is easier if the notation is preserved as it is, i.e. without reduction. DeFord also compares the reduction of note values to pitch transposition, affirming that the connotations of the latter are far more complex than just intervals' representation. Furthermore, she affirms that the application of reduction to original values entails issues regarding the use of barlines and beams.[12]

The choice of preserving original mensuration signs is particularly favoured by James Grier, who wrote that there is no need to have modern time signature, as it can deceive the readers; moreover, the beats implied in modern time signatures were unknown to this music.[13] Although very common, this attitude leaves itself open to criticism. In particular, Maria Caraci Vela tackled the question more than once, wisely stating that the syntactic order between different notational systems (the mensural and the modern) is never identical and therefore it is impossible to faithfully reproduce one in the other.[14] The notation is not a self-referential system, but something that continuously interacts with the musical thought and its cultural reference framework and it is explained through them.[15] Therefore, an interpretative and critical operation is required when translating from a notation to another: it cannot be just a pre-set correspondence of symbols. Alternative solutions are therefore legitimate, due to the ambiguities typical of the notation.[16] She concludes affirming that: «The renounciationof interpretation […] is then combined with a worship of the sign, which is always diplomatically preserved,

---

[12] Ruth I. DeFord, *Tactus, Mensuration, and Rhythm in Renaissance Music* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 472.
[13] Grier, *The Critical Editing of Music: History, Method, and Practice*, 164.
[14] It is here implied that a transcription is analogous to a translation, a concept shared, among others, by Margaret Bent and Thomas Schmidt. Margaret Bent, "Editing Early Music: The Dilemma of Translation," *Early Music* 22, no. 3 (1994); Margaret Bent, "The Limits of Notation in Defining the Musical Text," in *L'edizione critica tra testo musicale e testo letterario*, ed. Renato Borghi and Pietro Zappalà (Lucca: Libreria Musicale Italiana, 1995); Thomas Schmidt-Beste, "Editorial Text Underlay Revisited," in *Early Music Editing: Principles, Historiography, Future Directions*, ed. Theodor Dumitrescu, Karl Kügle, and Marnix van Berchum (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013).
[15] Maria Caraci Vela, "Le specificità dei testi musicali e la filologia: alcuni problemi di metodo," *Filologia mediolatina* 2 (1995a): 48; Maria Caraci Vela, "Introduzione," in *Le notazioni della polifonia vocale dei secoli IX-XVII*, ed. Maria Caraci Vela, Daniele Sabaino, and Stefano Aresi (Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2007), XI.
[16] Caraci Vela, "Le specificità dei testi musicali e la filologia: alcuni problemi di metodo," 48-52.

according to the usual misinterpretations; the result is that a notation already not much talkative becomes in fact silent».[17]

Caraci Vela, in her seminal book on music philology, also gives useful insights on the use of mensuration signs. In her opinion, the editor should not keep the original mensuration signs nor create non-existent modern time signature. In her words: «A transcription that does not manage to transliterate in an adequate manner, and *safeguard not the literal content but the spirit* of whatever is being transcribed, will not, even through discussion elsewhere, improve any problems that were not resolved *in the text*».[18] In addition to these considerations, the conflation between two different notational systems results in something that is neither one nor the other, producing a new type of notation, often different from one edition to another. This is not limited to the use of original mensuration signs but involves also, for example, the renounce to ties and the use of mixed barlines for value exceeding the measure.

Furthermore, this practice is not particularly friendly to performers or even scholars; a case in point is the second Agnus Dei from the *Missa L'homme armé super voces musicales* by Josquin as edited by Jesse Rodin.[19] Here each of the three voices bears a different mensuration sign (3, ○, and ¢) and the transcription with unreduced values presents three different *semibreves* each one having a different value: three *semibreves* of the Superius are equal to one of the Altus and two of the Bassus. This attitude of respect of the "original" is often considered praiseworthy in a critical edition, although, most of the time, it proves to be quite uncritical. As Thomas Schmidt points out: «The measure of a critical edition is not the degree of closeness with which it follows the extant sources, but

[17] «La rinuncia a interpretare […] si combina poi con il culto del segno e la sua tutela a oltranza affidata, secondo il consueto equivoco, alla diplomatica e così può accadere che una notazione per noi poco loquace si trasformi di fatto in una scrittura musicale muta». Caraci Vela, "Le specificità dei testi musicali e la filologia: alcuni problemi di metodo," 56.
[18] Maria Caraci Vela, *Musical Philology: Institutions, History, and Critical Approaches*, trans. Elizabeth MacDonald, vol. 1 (Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2015), 166.
[19] Jesse Rodin, ed., *New Josquin Edition, Masses based on secular monophonic songs II* (Utrecht: Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis, 2014).

whether the changes and decisions made by the editor are well-documented and well-reasoned».[20]

Different and interesting approaches can be found, for example, in critical editions of other repertoires, such as the Italian Ars Nova and sixteenth-century sacred music. Well-thought criteria for transcribing the original notation into modern notation are formulated by Michele Epifani in his critical edition of Italian Ars Nova *cacce*,[21] and, more relevant to the repertoire here examined, in the National Edition of the Works of Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, whose criteria are elaborated by Francesco Luisi.[22] In contrast to the approach of the editions discussed above, Luisi agrees with Caraci Vela on the principles of translation from the mensural to the modern notation. In his opinion, a thoughtful consideration of the semiology and a correct interpretation of the notation prevent from an uncritical attitude, helping also the performance.[23] Therefore, the edition renounces to the original mensuration signs in the text, employing exclusively fractional markings, since «the survival in modern notation of some of these signs, carrying connotations too distant from the original intent, is a strong risk: it can lead to inaccuracy and misleading effects».[24]

Strictly related to these matters, there is also the choice of what kind of barlines the editor should adopt and also where they should be placed. According to DeFord, a score needs barlines for the alignment of different voices, and they should regularly separate significant mensural units.[25] She suggests taking as point of reference the compositional *tactus* and placing the barlines accordingly since this attitude let readers and performers «to see where the rhythm conform to the mensuration and where they do not».[26] However, this choice could lead to shorter bars than the common standard of modern

---

[20] Schmidt-Beste, "Editorial Text Underlay Revisited," 109.
[21] Michele Epifani, "Una prospettiva ecdotica per le notazioni del Trecento italiano," in *Musica e poesia nel Trecento italiano. Verso una nuova edizione critica dell'Ars Nova*, ed. Maria Sofia Lannutti and Antonio Calvia (Firenze: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2014); Michele Epifani, *La caccia nell'Ars Nova italiana. Edizione critica e commentata dei testi e delle intonazioni* (Firenze: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2019).
[22] Francesco Luisi, "The national edition of the works of Palestrina," *Polifonie* 2, no. 3 (2002).
[23] Luisi, "The national edition of the works of Palestrina," 280.
[24] Luisi, "The national edition of the works of Palestrina," 285.
[25] DeFord, *Tactus, Mensuration, and Rhythm in Renaissance Music*, 471.
[26] DeFord, *Tactus, Mensuration, and Rhythm in Renaissance Music*, 471.

scores, so DeFord advises that the editors should choose between a regular barring on *tactus* and an irregular one based on rhythmic groups, although both approaches are discretional. Among the most used types of barlines we find barlines through the staff (i.e. standard barlines), and *Mensurstriche*, which are barlines that goes between the staves and not through them. There are also editions which do not print any barlines and some which use smaller barlines or a tick only on the fifth line of the staff, although these can produce practical difficulties in the reading of music. *Mensurstriche* are praised, among others, by Grier as it looks like a middle ground between the original notations, with no bars, and the modern one. The advantages, according to him, would be avoidance of ties, values not split between different bars, helping, therefore, the performers in avoiding accents, as it would be with standard barlines.[27] Grier stressed the fact that *Mensurstriche* avoid «metrical stress in non-metrical music» although he admitted that present users are now educated enough not to stress the first note after the barlines;[28] also, barlines make easier rhythm comprehension and relationships between voices. This practice has been criticised by Edward Lowinsky,[29] and, more recently, by DeFord, who points out that impossible independent barring of voices is one of the major setbacks of *Mensurstriche*.[30]

The editions of Josquin, Okeghem, and Obrecht here considered use standard barlines except when note values exceed the measure, in this case they retain the value (i.e. beams between barlines are not used), adopt dotted barlines, and the note value is not given in the next measure; this procedure has the same practical problem of *Mensurstriche* when used in the end of a line, as most values will continue in the following stave, thus necessitating anyway the use of ties to help performers and other users. Moreover, barlines are omitted when *color temporis* is present. Taruskin's edition adopts modern barlines as well, though Taruskin stresses their danger in performance, since they could convey a modern metrical interpretation.[31] Hence, he opts for a solution that, from his

[27] Grier, *The Critical Editing of Music: History, Method, and Practice*, 165.
[28] Grier, *The Critical Editing of Music: History, Method, and Practice*, 166.
[29] Edward E. Lowinsky, "Early Scores in Manuscript," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 13, no. 1 (1960).
[30] DeFord, *Tactus, Mensuration, and Rhythm in Renaissance Music*, 471-72.
[31] Taruskin, *Antoine Busnoys Collected Works. Part 2, The Latin-Texted Works*, xxiv.

point of view, is convenient for both scholars and performers, by leaving internal "beats", as he called them, without beams or ties.[32]

METHODOLOGY AND EVALUATION OF WITNESSES

The general methodology of an edition and the criteria for evaluating witnesses are among the most important aspects in a critical edition. Obviously, *the* method for critical editions does not exist, and therefore we face different *modi operandi* in editions of fifteenth-century sacred music.

The *New Obrecht Edition* is substantially based on the principles elaborated by the so-called *New Stemmatics*, which is the application of «stemmatic criteria in the area of criticism of medieval and Renaissance musical texts, with the aim of giving coherence to the witnesses in complex manuscript or mixed traditions and of evaluating the value of the reciprocal relations».[33] However, one of the main limits of this tendency, illustrated by Caraci Vela, is its massive reliance on outdated methodological literature, such as Paul Maas' *Textkritik*.[34] Supporters of *New Stemmatics* did and do not engage with neo-Lachmann trends of Italian philology, and, as Caraci Vela notes, their latest update is Giorgio Pasquali's *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*,[35] published in 1934.[36]

---

[32] Taruskin, *Antoine Busnoys Collected Works. Part 2, The Latin-Texted Works*, xxv.
[33] Caraci Vela, *Musical Philology: Institutions, History, and Critical Approaches*, 1, 100.
[34] Paul Maas, *Textkritik* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1927).
[35] Giorgio Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* (Firenze: Le Monnier, 1934).
[36] Caraci Vela, *Musical Philology: Institutions, History, and Critical Approaches*, 1, 100-01. This criticism has been extended by Caraci Vela to Anglo-American musical philologists in general: «In recent years, we got used to a certain *modus operandi* of Anglo-American musical philogists, which indefectibly present two constants. First, they read and study exclusively (or, in the best case, almost exclusively) things written in English: but within philological studies the most advanced schools and the most authoritative scholars do not necessarily express themselves in that language. Second, while it is commendable their attempt to enrich their formation (usually solidly lachmannian, with no further updates), they do not turn their attention firstly to publications pertinent to the discipline, but they think to integrate their framework with variously assorted critical-exegetical readings, with the certainty of combining therefore methodological accuracy with breadth of views. «Negli ultimi anni ci siamo abituati ad un certo *modus operandi* dei filologi musicali anglosassoni, che indefettibilmente presenta due costanti. La prima è che essi leggono e studiano esclusivamente (o, nella migliore delle ipotesi, quasi esclusivamente) quanto è scritto in inglese: ma in filologia le scuole più avanzate e gli studiosi più autorevoli non si esprimono necessariamente in quella lingua. La seconda è che, nel pur apprezzabile tentativo di arricchire la propria formazione (di solito solidamente lachmanniana, senza ulteriori aggiornamenti), invece di rivolgere l'attenzione in prima istanza ai contributi disciplinari pertinenti, essi pensano d'integrare il quadro con letture critico-esegetiche

Specifically, the aim of the *New Obrecht Edition* «has been to reproduce a text as close to the archetype as possible. [...] Where the source material allows, the approximation of the archetype has been achieved through stemmatic reconstruction. [...] Where a reconstruction has been attempted, the interrelationships of the sources for each composition are indicated by a stemma, and its divisions into the various branches are justified by the citation of one or more significant variants for each».[37] A few problems arise from this declaration of intent: first, the division between different lines of tradition of the *stemma* cannot be justified by significant variants but by the presence of conjunctive monogenetic errors. This can be a difficult task due to the fact that in Medieval and Renaissance music the concept of error is indefinite and can be confused with an alternative reading or a licence.[38] Moreover, the *New Obrecht Edition* often offers uneconomical *stemmata* with "anomalous" readings that contradict them. This methodology has been criticised by Caraci Vela, since is not always possible to produce a *stemma*, especially when this cannot be sufficiently supported. The feeling here is that the results of applying such a methodology is a «sterile stemmatic obsession».[39]

According to Caraci Vela, the philology of medieval and Renaissance musical texts should rely more upon the coeval literary philologies rather than on the classical one. Some interesting perspectives come indeed from Romance philology, in particular Cesare Segre and D'Arco Silvio Avalle formulate stimulating reflections, relevant also to musical philologists. According to them, two originals exist: one of the author, and one of the scribe. The latter is real and the former is, to quote Segre, «an ideal entity, not a material one: it is the trascription of the original as the author wished to do, but could not do».[40] These two originals institute a dialogue between them, since no scribe copies

---

variamente assortite, nella certezza di coniugare così rigore metodologico e ampiezza d'orizzonti». Maria Caraci Vela, "Review of Grier, The Critical Editing of Music," *Il Saggiatore Musicale* 6, no. 1 (1999): 267.

[37] *Jacob Obrecht, Collected Works (New Obrecht Edition)*, General Introduction.

[38] Schmidt-Beste, "Editorial Text Underlay Revisited," 107.

[39] Maria Caraci Vela, "Problemi di diffrazione nel repertorio polifonico del Quattrocento," in *L'edizione critica tra testo musicale e testo letterario*, ed. Renato Borghi and Pietro Zappalà (Lucca: Libreria Musicale Italiana, 1995b), 377.

[40] «Un ente di carattere ideale, non materiale: è la trascrizione dell'originale quale l'autore desiderava fare, ma non ha mai potuto fare». Cesare Segre, "Riflessioni sulla critica testuale," in L'edizione critica tra testo

completely passively; therefore, Segre coined the term «diasystem»,[41] which he defines as the system resulting from the compromise between the text's linguistic and stylistic system and the own system of the copyist.[42] Avalle writes about the existence of different «points of view», the one of the original and the one of the manuscripts, and their relationships.[43] He criticised those editions which regard the manuscripts as pure abstractions,[44] writing:

> The original of the scribe presents, indeed, some advantages on the scientific level. In fact, it constitutes a *reality* that is only waiting to be read and possibly interpreted. The reconstructed original of the author, instead, is a mere *working hypothesis*. Moreover, what is interesting from an historical-reconstructive point of view is not the author's message, often misunderstood and humiliated, either transmitted by original autographs or somehow reconstructed by keen editors, but rather the way in which this message has been read and interpreted.[45]

Moreover, due to the different layers of a text, Segre, along with the majority of romance philologists, suggests accepting in an edition the language of one manuscript because of its undeniable historical reality instead of the ahistorical language of the editor.[46] On musical texts, a similar attitude is favoured by Margaret Bent, who points out that the

---

musicale e testo letterario, ed. Renato Borghi and Pietro Zappalà (Lucca: Libreria Musicale Italiana, 1995), 5.

[41] Cesare Segre, *Avviamento all'analisi del testo letterario* (Torino: Einaudi, 1985), 376-77.

[42] Segre, "Riflessioni sulla critica testuale," 5.

[43] D'Arco Silvio Avalle, "La funzione del «punto di vista» nelle strutture oppositive binarie," *Lettere italiane* 40 (1993). This article was later reprinted in D'Arco Silvio Avalle, *La doppia verità* (Firenze: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2002).

[44] D'Arco Silvio Avalle, "La critica testuale," in *Grundriss der romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters*, ed. Hans R. Jauss and Erich Köhler (Heidelberg: Winter, 1972). Now reprinted in Avalle, *La doppia verità*, 136.

[45] «L'originale dell'amanuense presenta, è vero, alcuni vantaggi sul piano scientifico. Esso, infatti, costituisce una realtà che attende unicamente di essere letta ed eventualmente interpretata. L'originale dell'autore ricostruito, invece, è una pura ipotesi di lavoro. Inoltre quello che interessa dal punto di vista storico-ricostruttivo non è tanto il messaggio dell'autore, spesso incompreso e umiliato, sia esso garantito da originali autografi oppure ricostruito in qualche modo da editori volenterosi, quanto il modo in cui è stato letto e interpretato». D'Arco Silvio Avalle, "La filologia romanza e i codici," in *La filologia romanza e i codici*, ed. Saverio Guida and Fortunata Latella (Messina: Sicania, 1993). Now reprinted in Avalle, *La doppia verità*, 209.

[46] Segre, "Riflessioni sulla critica testuale," 5.

faithful reproduction of all features of a text was not always a scribe's priority. A copy may represent just the reception of a piece, with intentional and legitimate variations from the composer's text.[47]

The *New Josquin Edition*'s method, instead, adopt the best-text approach, which involves the *recensio* and *collatio* of all witnesses; the results of these operations are then used by the editor to establish the main witness or witnesses on which the edition is based on.[48] However, in the Critical Commentary of the edition we find a *stemma*, that does not follow the principles of the so-called Lachmann method but, here too, relies upon different readings rather than conjunctive monogenetic errors. Taruskin's edition of Busnoys uses the method of the best-text as well. A close examination of the different witnesses is conducted by the editor which correctly establishes relationships between them through the presence of conjunctive errors, and not variants. However, the editor chooses not to reports differences of clefs, ligatures, and *minor color*. Van Benthem's Okeghem edition does not offer in the introduction any hints on the method followed by the editor. From the exam of one fascicle of the edition,[49] it looks like a *Quellenmischung*: the text presented is a conflation of readings from different witnesses, since variant readings given concurrently with the music are taken from each witness, creating a probably never existed textual level, thus, lacking any critical sense. The apparatus is somehow hierarchically differentiated as some variants are given with the music while others are in the remarks at the end of each volume.

Accidental Inflections and Text Underlay

Other areas interesting in the evaluation of critical editions are those tackling aspects of the text which were not accurately pinned down, particularly accidentals and *musica ficta*, and text underlay. Generally speaking, the application in the text of accidentals and text underlay is mainly editorial, often based on musical theorists (although not always coeval)

---

[47] Margaret Bent, "Early Music Editing, Forty Years On: Principles, Techniques, and Future Directions," in *Early Music Editing: Principles, Historiography, Future Directions*, ed. Theodor Dumitrescu, Karl Kügle, and Marnix van Berchum (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), 258-59.
[48] *The New Josquin Edition (NJE)*, General introduction.
[49] Jaap van Benthem, ed., *Johannes Ockeghem, Masses and Mass Sections. Missa De plus en plus*, 3 vols., vol. 2/1 (Utrecht: Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis, 1995).

and on readings of the witnesses; therefore, what we observe is the result of a mere hypothesis, more or less supported according to different editions. The main issue here is that often editors do not discuss in detail what is their rationale behind the application of accidental inflections or the placement of text underlay. In many cases there is no discussion at all, and, when there is one, often it is quite meagre, with a consequent mechanical application of rules taken from treatises. It has also to be noted, as Thomas Schmidt argues, that somehow text underlay is hierarchically subordinated to musical text and also to accidentals and *ficta*.[50] Hence, editions often have various problems when addressing this issue. The *New Obrecht Edition* does not record variants of syllable underlay but only those of phrase underlay and does not offer different formal readings in the Critical Commentary. The *New Josquin Edition*, instead, places phrase underlay according to the source which «seems to give the proper correlation between music and text»,[51] while syllable underlay is the result of different parameters like underlay in sources, musical structure and style of composition. A more radical approach has been used by Jaap van Benthem in his editions: all text underlay is editorial, retaining fifteenth century spelling but with modern capitals and punctuation, relegating a complete survey of original text underlay in the Additional remarks.

EDITIONS OF CARON'S MASSES

Currently there are available two complete editions of Caron's Masses and three partial editions. The two complete editions are: James Thomson's from his PhD dissertation, and Jaap van Benthem's edition made for the ensemble "The Sound and The Fury".[52] Other editions including Caron's Masses are: Richard Sherr's edition of manuscript Cappella Sistina 14, Rex Eakins's edition of Cappella Sistina 51, and the edition of Trent 89 by Robert Mitchell.[53] Van Benthem's edition lacks any commentary or introduction,

---

[50] Schmidt-Beste, "Editorial Text Underlay Revisited."
[51] *The New Josquin Edition (NJE)*, General introduction.
[52] Thomson, "The Works of Caron: A Study in Fifteenth-Century Style."; Thomson, *Les œuvres complètes de Philippe Caron*; Jaap van Benthem, ed., *Firminus Caron. Masses & Chansons* (Wien: FraBernardo, 2012).
[53] Sherr, *Masses for the Sistine Chapel. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cappella Sistina, Ms. 14*; Rex Eakins, ed., *An Editorial Transnotation of the Manuscript Capella Sistina 51, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Città del Vaticano. Liber Missarum* (Ottawa: The Institute of Mediaeval Music, 1999-2005); Mitchell, "Mitchell Trent Editions, Critical Commentary to Nos 15-21."

being conceived for the practical use of an ensemble. However, it has substantially the same approach of other editions procured by van Benthem, such as: unreduced values, retaining of mensural signs, and use of dotted barlines. Although generally accurate, due to the lack of any apparatus or commentary, it is impossible to understand some of editor's decision, like for example on which witness van Benthem based his edition in those cases where more than one is available.

Thomson's PhD dissertation on the works of Caron has been the first survey on the composer, offering a study on both his sacred and secular works and a complete edition. Thomson's dissertation dates back to 1959, hence it inevitably bears the signs of time, especially in the edition. Values have been quartered, C-clefs have been retained for the inner voices, and much of the barring is irregular, according to what the editor believed being the rhythmic and logical grouping of notes. Attention is paid to text underlay and *ficta* problems. There is no critical apparatus, and no justification for the editor's choices. Moreover, Thomson does not acknowledge the existence of the Veronese witness for the *Missa Sanguis sanctorum*.

Richard Sherr edited the manuscript Cappella Sistina 14 in which is transmitted Caron's *Missa L'homme armé*. His editorial principles stand out for the use of unreduced values, the translation of mensural signs with modern signatures, and the use of modern barlines; nevertheless, an infelicitous choice is the changing of time signatures for long passages in *tempus imperfectum*, justifiable only in the case of proportional time. Unfortunately, almost no information is devoted to the application of *musica ficta* and to text underlay. Moreover, he declares that «while the concordant sources have been collated, not all details of these other sources are recorded. Significant alternative readings are listed in footnotes to the music or in the commentary».[54] Thus, the reader lacks important information regarding other sources and the absence of structured critical apparatus is noticeable.

[54] Sherr, *Masses for the Sistine Chapel. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cappella Sistina, Ms. 14*, 47.

Between 1999 and 2005, Rex Eakins edited the manuscript Cappella Sistina 51, which preserves three of Caron's Masses.[55] Despite being a meritorious initiative, it is impossible not to notice a few issues in its realisation. Regarding editorial criteria, values have a reduction ratio of 2:1, the mensural signs are preserved in the edition, barlines have been substituted by a tick barline on the fifth line and there is no use of beams. Some indication regarding *musica ficta* have been implemented but none is present about text underlay. The apparatus is not clearly formalised, mixing different levels of information, and it should be noted that the section dedicated to the other witnesses bears the title «Concordances», which philologically is not the correct term, although widely used.

The critical edition of TrentC 89 by Robert Mitchell presents Caron's *Missa Clemens et benigna*, and it can be accessed through the website of the Digital Image Archive of Medieval Music (DIAMM).[56] The editorial principles are accessible through the DIAMM website, as well. Original note values have been retained and modern barlines are used, although they are not diversified when simultaneous mensurations are present. Mensuration signs have been preserved with equivalents suggested in those pieces with more than one mensuration; however, Mitchell tends to favour the equivalence of the Minim between ○ and ◌, which has been questioned by more than one scholar.[57] Also, in this edition there is no reference to any policy regarding *musica ficta* and text underlay. The Critical Commentary is fairly accurate, albeit there is no explanation about its organisation, therefore sometimes it is hard to understand. In regard to Caron's Mass preserved in TrentC 89, this edition has the merit of offering some interesting insights

[55] Eakins, *An Editorial Transnotation of the Manuscript Capella Sistina 51, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Città del Vaticano. Liber Missarum*.
[56] Robert James Mitchell, "The Robert Mitchell Trent Codices Editions," in *DIAMM* (2015-2020). https://www.diamm.ac.uk/resources/music-editions/trent-codices/.
[57] Minim equivalence is supported by only two theorists in fifteenth century, Johannes Tinctoris and Franchino Gaffurio. Anna Maria Busse Berger has demonstrated that most theorists prefer the equivalence of the Brevis, and that Tinctoris and Gaffurio would not reflect the coeval practice, but rather wish to propose a notational reform. This equivalence would also present a problem in performing sections in ¢. Since it would result in a 2:1 ratio between ○ and ¢, resulting either in a tempo too slow in the former, or too fast in the latter. Anna Maria Busse Berger, *Mensuration and Proportion Signs: Origins and Evolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 51-86; Alejandro Enrique Planchart, "The Relative Speed of "Tempora" in the Period of Dufay," *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle* 17 (1981).

on its model. However, a major inconsistency of the editor is present, since Mitchell believes that one section of the Credo is spurious, it is puzzling to find it in the main text.

6. Manuscript and Editorial Accidental Inflections

As already observed, mensural notation is rather under-prescriptive, compared to the modern one, when it comes to the exact definition of pitches, especially when we consider accidental inflections, both written and implicit. The determination of a pitch came after the performer evaluated closely the part he was singing, and this could also be modified by how his part interacted with the other voices. Therefore, pitches established on the manuscript could be modified by the performer after their placement in both linear and vertical contexts. As Margaret Bent, amongst others, rightly points out, the term *musica ficta*, widely used to talk about editorial interventions on pitches, is just partially correct, as accidentals (notated and non-notated) are not always *extra manum*, since they may belong also to the realm of *musica recta*.[1] It would be better to talk about accidental inflections, as Karol Berger suggests,[2] in general, distinguishing those that appear in manuscripts from those that should be added by the editor, always remembering that it would be a limitation to «equate *musica ficta* with editorial accidentals».[3] It should be however clear that 'accidental' can be a problematic term as well since its meaning in modern notational practice only partially overlaps with the one it had in the Medieval and Renaissance theoretical frame of reference. The issue of editorial accidentals and *musica ficta* has been one of the most discussed in the musicological literature, and it would go beyond the aim of this chapter examining the whole problem, least of all proposing a 'univocal solution'. Instead, here I will present the numerous problems that emerge from a philological point of view, being conscious that often more than one solution is available to the editor. As David Fallows amusingly observes: «if a group of musicologists were absolutely to agree on the principles they could then be sent into different rooms and would almost certainly produce entirely different solutions for the same piece».[4] The fact that more than one solution is often possible clearly leads towards the domain of performance, as it is evident that where and when inflecting a note was a decision left to the singer-performer most of the time. It

[1] Margaret Bent, *Counterpoint, Composition and Musica Ficta* (New York: Routledge, 2002), 105.
[2] Karol Berger, *Musica ficta, Theories of Accidental Inflections in Vocal Polyphony from Marchetto da Padova to Gioseffo Zarlino* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
[3] Margaret Bent, "Musica Recta and Musica Ficta," *Musica Disciplina* 26 (1972): 81.
[4] Elizabeth Eva Leach, David Fallows, and Kate Van Orden, "Recent Trends in the Study of Music of the Fourteenth, Fifteenth, and Sixteenth Centuries," *Renaissance Quarterly* 68, no. 1 (2015): 203.

should, however, be clear that it would not be an acceptable solution to leave the text as it appears in its witnesses, both because accidental inflections are part of the text and because in a critical edition there is a translation from a notational system into another, the latter being much more prescriptive than the former, requiring, therefore, the integration of all the features common in modern notation. Karol Berger in his seminal monograph draws an interesting comparison between the abbreviations used in literary language and implicit accidentals in music, stressing that both these practices did not mean that the author was not interested in their decoding. Berger affirms that accidental inflections belong to the text of the work, and its identity did not change in performances, as it happens with dynamics or fingering.[5] As he points out:

> It is true, of course, that implied accidental inflections were a matter of performance practice, but it does not follow that they belonged to what I have called here the domain of variable performance as opposed to the domain of invariable text. Once we realize that most of the implied inflections belong to the musical text, and that the modern attitude to notation, unlike the attitude shared by early musicians, requires that the text be fully notated, we must conclude that spelling out the inflections implied in the sources is the inescapable responsibility of the editor.[6]

As mentioned, there is no agreement on where and how heavily the editor should intervene adding editorial accidentals. When we look at the primary evidence, namely treatises, we soon realise that they often are difficult to interpret, and theorists often disagreed one with each other. Treatises often come from a broad range, both geographical and chronological; also, it is not easy to distinguish if their instructions on the matter were meant to be relevant for composers or performers. The two main issues raised in treatises are those named respectively *causa necessitatis* and *causa pulchritudinis*. The former deals with the correction of dissonant

---

[5] Berger, *Musica ficta, Theories of Accidental Inflections in Vocal Polyphony from Marchetto da Padova to Gioseffo Zarlino*, 166. Carl Dahlhaus deals with the two domains by elaborating the concept of *abstrakter Kontrapunkt* which strongly highlights the difference between notation and its realisation. He distinguished between two different kind of counterpoint: the abstract counterpoint which is present in the 'text', and the harmonic counterpoint, dealing with concrete intervals and the application of accidentals, which is typical of the performance, therefore being susceptible of modifications every time it is performed. Carl Dahlhaus, "Tonsystem und Kontrapunkt um 1500," *Jahrbuch des Staatlichen Instituts für Musikforschung Preußischer Kulturbesitz* (1969).
[6] Berger, *Musica ficta, Theories of Accidental Inflections in Vocal Polyphony from Marchetto da Padova to Gioseffo Zarlino*, 171.

structural intervals, such as augmented or diminished fourths, fifths, octaves, and unisons, while the latter is about the colouration of an imperfect consonance moving to a perfect consonance. However, theorists do not always agree when specific intervals should be inflected as some gave precedence to correction of melodic intervals while others state that simultaneous intervals should have the precedence over melodic ones. This led to different interpretations of accidentals by musicologists, especially on the number of interventions required both for *causa necessitatis* and *pulchritudinis*. Edward Lowinsky and Margaret Bent can be ascribed to the category of musicologists who believe that the editor should try to correct imperfect intervals that are created from the placement of an accidental in order to rectify a non-harmonic relation, in a sort of 'chain reaction'.[7] Other musicologists propose a pre-eminence of vertical relations over horizontal, such as Hughes, who writes that «almost no evidence of the period supports the conventional modern claim that melodic tritones were prohibited in early music: if anything, there are more hints suggesting the opposite conclusion in certain circumstances».[8] Urquhart, instead, proposes that the correction of linear imperfect intervals should prevail over vertical ones.[9] And at the opposite end, there is Thomas Brothers, who affirms that «the music has been precisely and completely notated»; he sees *musica ficta* (i.e. accidentals) «as a tool available to the composer […] for expressive purpose, more than as an issue that is clarified by

[7] Cf. the essay of Lowinsky in Willem Elders, "Reports of the First Josquin Meeting " *Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 24, no. 1 (1974): 53-69; Edward E. Lowinsky, "The Goddess Fortuna in Music: With a Special Study of Josquin's "Fortuna dun gran tempo"," *The Musical Quarterly* 75, no. 4 (1991); Bent, "Musica Recta and Musica Ficta."; Margaret Bent, "Diatonic Ficta," *Early Music History* 4 (1984); Margaret Bent, "Diatonic *ficta* revisited: Josquin's *Ave Maria* in Context," *Music Theory Online* 2, no. 6 (1996). http://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.96.2.6/mto.96.2.6.bent.html; Bent, *Counterpoint, Composition and Musica Ficta*..

[8] Andrew Hughes, *Manuscript Accidentals: Ficta in Focus 1350-1450* (Rome: American Institute of Musicology, 1972), 85.

[9] Peter W. Urquhart, "Cross-Relations by Franco-Flemish Composers after Josquin," *Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 43, no. 1 (1993); Peter W. Urquhart, "Three Sample Problems of Editorial Accidentals in Chansons by Busnoys and Ockeghem " in *Music in Renaissance Cities and Courts. Studies in Honor of Lewis Lockwood*, ed. Jessie Ann Owens and Anthony M. Cummings (Warren, MI: Harmonie Park Press, 1996); Peter W. Urquhart, "Calculated to Please the Ear: Ockeghem's Canonic Legacy," *Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 47, no. 1 (1997); Peter W. Urquhart, "False Concords in Busnoys," in *Antoine Busnoys: Method, Meaning, and Context in Late Medieval Music* ed. Paula Higgins (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999). Urquhart's results have been challenged, amongst others, by Bent. Margaret Bent, "On False Concords in Late Fifteenth-Century Music: Yet Another Look at Tinctoris," in *Théorie et analyse musicales 1450-1650*, ed. Anne-Emmanuelle Ceulemans and Bonnie Blackburn (Louvain-la-Neuve: Département d'histoire de l'art et d'archéologie, Collège Érasme, 2001).

performance practice».[10] Brothers's theory has some aporias, highlighted by Bonnie Blackburn in her review of his monograph. Blackburn questions Brothers, stating that he «is selective in accepting the evidence of the sources, and rather too willing to explain away evidence that does not fit his theories».[11] She concludes her review with some reflection that can be considered of general interest for the issues here discussed:

> We can depend neither on the sources to provide a full notation of accidentals nor on the theorists to give us hard-and-fast rules for the performance of unnotated inflections: we must approach the notation in the knowledge that it is neither complete nor faulty but rather underprescriptive from our modern perspective though not from theirs, and attempt to bring to its realization the skills and training of the musician of the time.[12]

One of the most consistent insights on accidentals is the already mentioned Berger's monograph.[13] Berger notes that there are two kinds of evidence: theory and music sources. They are strictly related as the latter cannot be clearly interpreted without the former.[14] He thinks that an understanding of the various treatises is the *conditio sine qua non* that then leads to the examination of sources; therefore, his book deals only with theoretical literature. Berger's approach encountered some criticism,[15] however, it is undeniable that it offers a fundamentally consistent theory and should be considered as the essential basis for every further consideration on the matter, therefore it has been used as the main point of reference in this chapter.

---

[10] Thomas Brothers, *Chromatic Beauty in the Late Medieval Chanson: an Interpretation of Manuscript Accidentals* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 43.
[11] Bonnie J. Blackburn, "Reviewed Work: Chromatic Beauty in the Late Medieval Chanson: An Interpretation of Manuscript Accidentals by Thomas Brothers," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 51, no. 3 (1998): 634.
[12] Blackburn, "Reviewed Work: Chromatic Beauty in the Late Medieval Chanson: An Interpretation of Manuscript Accidentals by Thomas Brothers," 636.
[13] Berger, *Musica ficta, Theories of Accidental Inflections in Vocal Polyphony from Marchetto da Padova to Gioseffo Zarlino*.
[14] Berger, *Musica ficta, Theories of Accidental Inflections in Vocal Polyphony from Marchetto da Padova to Gioseffo Zarlino*, xiii.
[15] Daniel Leech-Wilkinson, "Review: Accidental Inflection," *The Musical Times* 30, no. 1754 (1989); Peter W. Urquhart, "Ficta vs. "Ficta". Review of Musica Ficta: Theories of Accidental Inflections *by Karol Berger (Cambridge, 1987)*," *Historical Performance* 2 (1989).

Manuscript Accidental Inflections

Caron's Masses witnesses generally do not present many written accidentals, a feature common with many fifteenth-century music manuscripts. One of the things that emerge from the analysis of manuscript accidentals is that it can be difficult to find a logic in the way accidentals are placed, as sometimes witnesses of the same Mass display accidentals in different places. Also, it is not always easy to find a rationale, as sometimes they can be found in obvious places, while, in ambiguous situations, we do not have any clue on how they should be interpreted. For example (Figure 31), in the Credo from *Missa Accueille ma la belle* we find:

Figure 31: *Missa Accueille ma la belle*, Credo, Supremum, bars 90-92.

It is evident that the *bb*♭ here is placed to avoid the tritone with the preceding *f*, moreover, at the same time of *bb*♭ we have the Altus singing an *f*. Therefore, the placement of this accidental seems quite redundant, the equivalent of a modern cautionary accidental. A case in which the addition of an accidental would have been helpful can be found at the beginning of the Kyrie of the *Missa Accueille ma la belle* (Figure 31).

Figure 32: *Missa Accueille ma la belle*, Kyrie, bars 14-15.

Here it is not obvious how one should consider the *bb* at 15,2. From a horizontal point of view, it should be considered *bb-mi*, as it goes towards the *e* at the end of the bar, while from a vertical point of view the presence of *F* in the *bassus* would require that the *bb* would be solmized as *fa*. In this case, my preference went towards *bb-fa*, considering what Tinctoris

states in his *Liber de natura et proprietate tonorum*, namely that in case of a conflict between vertical and horizontal relations, the former prevails on the latter.[16]

In other cases, we have the so-called cautionary accidentals. This notion as elaborated by Don Harrán has been heavily criticised.[17] However, in some cases, it is clear that they suggest to the singer on how to solmize a note. For example, in the Kyrie of *Missa Accueille ma la belle*, bar 93, the Supremum has *ff*♭, here, clearly, the accidental does not tell the performer to lower a semitone the note, but just to solmize it as *fa*, since the movement of the Altus is *a*-*b*♭, preventing, therefore, a *mi contra fa*.

The majority of manuscript accidentals deal with correction *causa necessitatis*, most of them are B♭ (or, as in the case of the *Missa Jhesus autem transiens*, E♭), which have been inflected to correct fourths and fifths, or octaves, both vertical and horizontal. A few cases are worthy of further discussion, such as bar 39 of the Sanctus from *Missa Accueille ma la belle* (Figure 33).

Figure 33: *Missa Accueille ma la belle*, Sanctus, bars 37-39.

Here, the *f*♯ in the Supremum produces an interesting chain reaction with the other Fs present in the lower voices, namely the *f* in the Altus, which along with the *g* creates a parallel unison

[16] Berger, *Musica ficta, Theories of Accidental Inflections in Vocal Polyphony from Marchetto da Padova to Gioseffo Zarlino*, 119.

[17] Don Harrán, "New Evidence for Musica Ficta: The Cautionary Sign " *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 29, no. 1 (1976); Don Harrán, "More Evidence for Cautionary Signs," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 31, no. 3 (1978); Irvine Godt, "Letter from Irvine Godt," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 31, no. 2 (1978); Irvine Godt, "Letter from Irvine Godt," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 32, no. 2 (1979); Urquhart, "Cross-Relations by Franco-Flemish Composers after Josquin," 23-24.

with the Supremum, the second *f* still in the Altus at b. 39,3, and the *F* in the Bassus at b. 39,5. It also prevents the *bb* in the *supremum* to be solmized as *fa*, and, basically, shifts all the voices on a hexachord built on D for a few bars.

The same situation happens also at the end of the Credo of the *Missa Jhesus autem transiens* (Figure 34). This would perhaps suggest that it can be regarded as a distinguishing compositional feature; considering also the unique partial signature that can be found in the *Missa Clemens et benigna*, it would be possible that Caron used accidental inflections as a tool to variegate the music and to play with the expectations of the listeners.

Figure 34: *Missa Jhesus autem transiens*, Credo, bars 165-167, with editorial accidentals.

Another manuscript accidental which is rather interesting is the *b*♮ at b. 148 in the Altus of the Agnus from again the *Missa Accueille ma la belle* (Figure 35). Here, one would have to solmize it as *fa* because of the key signature having one flat, but also because of the phrase *F-G-a-b-a-b-c* etc. Instead, here we have a ♯ on the first *b*, placed under the note probably by a later hand, resulting in the creation of a major third between the G in the Bassus and the *b* in the Altus. The entire passage remains however problematic, because the second *b* in the Altus is in a vertical relation with the *f* of the Tenor, and then the third *b* is related with the *e* of the Tenor. So, we would have *b-mi*, *b-fa*, and then again *b-mi* in order to avoid a *mi contra fa*. My decision, however, is that the first *mi*-sign should prevail over vertical considerations for the second *b* since they are both properly resolved, namely the *b-mi* is going a diatonic semitone

up and the *f-fa* is going a diatonic semitone down, and also it is placed in a weak metrical position.[18]

Figure 35: *Missa Accueille ma la belle*, Agnus, bars 147-149.

Most of the manuscript accidentals deal with correction *causa necessitatis*, especially in Masses with conflicting signatures most of them are B♭ present in the top voice, this is also the case of the E♭ present the *Missa Jhesus autem transiens*. E♭ are also occasionally found in all the other Masses apart from *Clemens et benigna*, and, accordingly, A♭ in *Jhesus autem transiens*. This might show that, often, when an accidental beside B♭ was required *causa necessitatis* the scribe was rather meticulous in its explicitation.

Caron's Masses have also clef-signatures, namely a flat placed on the staff immediately after the clef in two or more voices.[19] The only Mass which presents clef-signature in all voices is *Jhesus autem transiens*. Three Masses omit signature in the highest voice (*Accueille ma la belle*, *L'homme armé* – except in the second and third Agnus where we have a flat signature also in the Discantus –, and *Sanguis sanctorum*), while *Missa Clemens et benigna* omits flat signature in both

[18] The persistence of the natural sign beyond the first B seen here can be compared to the concept of 'appendancy', as defined by John Milsom. In his edition of Thomas Tallis's and Willam Byrd's *Cantiones Sacrae 1575*, he defines 'appendancy' as the «continued force beyond the note it [the accidental] immediately precedes», and that an on-stave flat or sharp would be in force until there is a rest, a stave-end, or another accidental. The case here examined, however, present a stave-end after the second *b* in the Altus, while the solmization as *b*-mi is carried on also in the next stave. John Milsom, ed., *Thomas Tallis and William Byrd, Cantiones Sacrae 1575*, vol. 56, Early English Church Music (London: Stainer & Bell, 2014), xxiv-xxxvi.

[19] The term clef-signature was first defined by Milsom in Milsom, *Thomas Tallis and William Byrd, Cantiones Sacrae 1575*, xxv.

the Discantus and the Bassus. In these cases, we have the so-called partial signatures or conflicting signatures, an issue which has been variously interpreted by musicologists.[20] Berger, talking about signatures in general, distinguishes between 'accidental signatures' and 'key signatures'. As he explains 'key signature' denotes the transposition of the melody retaining all the intervals. Regarding conflicting signatures Berger affirms that they were used to avoid imperfect fifths and to provide the *clausula cantizans* automatically in a cadence, agreeing here with the conclusion reached by Lowinsky forty years earlier.[21] He argues that «in a piece with different signatures in different voices, the function of the signature in the mode-defining part was to effect a transposition of the mode, while differing signatures in other parts should be considered to 'conflict' with that of the mode-defining one mainly in order to ensure perfect fifths against it».[22] On how to treat them in an edition, Christian Berger proposed to ignore the fact that one voice has no signature and treat it exactly like the others.[23] Conversely, Kevin Moll offers an interesting approach, using as a case in point the Credo from Liebert's Mass;[24] Moll's theory offers a consistent approach on how to choose between B-*fa* and B-*mi*, namely whether or not to add a ♭, according to what Marchetto da Padova says in his *Lucidarium*. After considering potential accidentals that should be introduced due to *causa pulchritudinis* and *necessitatis*, he prefers B-*mi* when the melody is ascending and B-*fa* when descending,[25]. The advantage of Moll's hypothesis is that it does not conflict with what Berger affirms about the reason for the existence of conflicting signatures. In my edition, Moll's interpretation has been of help, however, it should be noted that what he proposes should not be automatically and systematically adopted indiscriminately but it requires evaluation on a case-by-case basis.

The signature of the *Missa Clemens et benigna* is unique among fifteenth-century works. The witnesses of this Mass disagree on the placement of the signature in the movements, ModE M.1.13 has this particular signature in the first three movements, while both the Sanctus and

---

[20] Kevin Moll, "Realizing Partial Signatures around 1400: Liebert's Credo as a Test Case," *Performance Practice Review* 10, no. 2 (1997): 248-49.
[21] Edward E. Lowinsky, "The Function of Conflicting Signatures in Early Polyphonic Music," *The Musical Quarterly* 31, no. 2 (1945).
[22] Berger, *Musica ficta, Theories of Accidental Inflections in Vocal Polyphony from Marchetto da Padova to Gioseffo Zarlino*, 69.
[23] Moll, "Realizing Partial Signatures around 1400: Liebert's Credo as a Test Case," 249.
[24] Moll, "Realizing Partial Signatures around 1400: Liebert's Credo as a Test Case."
[25] Moll, "Realizing Partial Signatures around 1400: Liebert's Credo as a Test Case," 250.

the Agnus do not present any signature. TrentC 89, instead, has this signature in all movements except the Gloria. According to Steib, this is a lapse of the copyists of both manuscripts, and he suggests retaining the signature in the Altus and Tenor for the whole Mass.[26] In my edition I retained this signature in all movements, as I believe that it was a deliberate choice of the composer to use the alternation between *B-fa* and *B-mi* as a compositional technique. This can be suggested especially from the Bassus, which shows evidently that the voice has been composed with particular care towards the use of *B*, also considering the presence of manuscript accidental inflections in that voice.

Table 4: Signatures in Caron's Masses.

Mass	**Signature**	**Notes**
Accueille ma la belle	–, ♭, ♭, ♭	Chanson: –, ♭, ♭
Clemens et benigna	–, ♭, ♭, –	ModE M.1.13: no signature in Sanctus and Agnus TrentC 89: no signature in Gloria
L'Homme armé	–, ♭, ♭, ♭	Agnus II, III: ♭, ♭, ♭, ♭
Jhesus autem transiens	♭, ♭, ♭, ♭	
Sanguis sanctorum	–, ♭, ♭, ♭	

Editorial Accidental Inflections

With regards to editorial interventions, I opt for right intervals vertically, often sacrificing the horizontal line. Also, successive false relations are often tolerated. However, accidental inflections *causa pulchritudinis* pose a challenge to the editor. They should be used in cadential movements, but it is not always straightforward when we are facing a cadence and when not. How many voices should be involved, for example, is a question that often is raised; is the presence of a *clausula cantizans* and a *clausula tenorizans* enough to have a cadence or should another voice be involved? Text underlay, also, most of the time does not help in establishing a cadence. And even when it is quite easy to recognise a cadence in the text adding the inflections can be rather tricky.

[26] Steib, "Herculean Labours: Johannes Martini and the Manuscript Modena, Biblioteca Estense, MS α.M.1.13," 223.

A case in point is the *Missa Clemens et benigna* which offers some interesting cadential situations (Figure 36).

Figure 36: *Missa Clemens et benigna*, Gloria, bars 145-147.

The presence of a cadence here is suggested both by text, and by the typical movement of the Discantus. The usual cadence, with a *clausula cantizans* in the Discantus, would clash with the *c* in the Altus, which is preceded by a *b*-fa, and therefore should be solmized as *c*-sol. A solution would be to have a phrygian cadence , namely a semitonal descending motion on the *e* in the Tenor, which would have been solmized as *e*-fa, but it cannot be realised as it would require correcting also the *a* in the Bassus, which is not possible because of the *d* just before it. Therefore, I chose to colour the Discantus to realise the *clausula cantizans*, although this operation is not immune of its own issues. This would in fact results also in the correction of the *c* in the Altus, in order to avoid a simultaneous false relation with the *cc* in the Discantus. The *c*♯ means that the previous *b* should be interpreted as *mi*, requiring therefore the *f* in the Tenor to be solmized as *mi*. However, I put this last accidental inflection between brackets as both the voices resolve by semitone in contrary motion, therefore a diminished fifth would be tolerated.

Figure 37: *Missa Clemens et benigna*, Credo, bars 23-25.

Here too the procedure is similar to the example above (Figure 37). The realisation of a *clausula cantizans* in the Discantus would result in a clash with the *c* in the Altus. As in the example above, a phrygian solution, with an *e*♭ is not possible, since it would encounter the same issue discussed above. I opt therefore to realise the *cantizans* in the Discantus, and inflect the *c* in the Altus as well. But the colouration of the *c* in the Altus requires, also, the correction of the *f* in b. 25, to preserve the perfect fourth, making the following Fs too as *mi*; this choice is supported also by the use of F♯ in the *Missae Accueille ma la belle* and *Jhesus autem transiens*, as seen above.

This approach, which corrects the false relation between the *cc* in the Discantus and the *c* in the Altus, would not be shared by Theodor Dumitrescu, who in a 2004 journal article analyses the status of sharps, arguing that they were not associated with solmization as *mi*.[27] He analyses Tinctoris's and other theorists's theoretical writings, highlighting that *mi contra fa* would not apply in cadential situations, where a sharp sign causes a false consonance.[28] This view stems from the fact that in a cadential leading tone coloured with a *diesis* sign the solmization would not apply. Therefore, he claims that «Notes sharpened through *diesis*-function do not cause *mi contra fa*. [...] If the prohibition of *mi contra fa* does not cover the cases of sharpening associated with the *diesis*, then the theoretical disapproval of the latter situations [clashes caused by *diesis*-

[27] Theodor Dumitrescu, "The Solmization Status of Sharps in the 15th and 16th Centuries," *Studi Musicali* 33, no. 2 (2004).
[28] Dumitrescu, "The Solmization Status of Sharps," 279.

function] is reduced significantly».[29] However, the examples discussed by Dumitrescu, namely Regis's *Missa L'homme armé* and Okeghem's *Missa Au travail suis*, present a leading tone sharpened with a *diesis* that are found in the manuscripts that transmit those works. He does not discuss how an editor should behave in a controversial situation such as the one we find in Caron's *Missa Clemens et benigna*. One cannot rule out that the scribe simply forgot to add a *diesis* sign to the voices that do not present it, and therefore create a false consonance, or that it in performance the *diesis* would have been added by the singers. Furthermore, as I argue, Caron's *Missa Clemens et benigna* is a highly experimental work, that constantly plays with the audience with the different qualities of B, and these cadential situations, that undoubtedly are exceptional, are just another example of his choices in the use of accidentals.

Cadences on *A* can be realised both with a *clausula cantizans* G♯-*A* or with a *tenorizans* B♭-*A*. Usually it is preferable to opt for the sonority belonging to the realm of *musica vera* although not always is possible, as we can see in this example (Figure 38):

Figure 38: *Missa Clemens et benigna*, Agnus, bars 57-59.

Here, I opt to correct the *b* in the Tenor due to the presence of *e* in the Altus, and to colour the *f*, and subsequently the *g*, in the Discantus to realise the cadence. The *f-mi* is preserved also

[29] Dumitrescu, "The Solmization Status of Sharps," 283.

after the cadence, and the *b* in the Altus is inflected as *mi*, due to both horizontal and vertical considerations.

A similar situation happens also where both the voices have the same key signature. Here (Figure 39), the presence of *E* in the Bassus at bars 135 and 136 requires to solmize the *B* as *mi* in the Bassus, as well as the *b* in the Tenor, and to inflect the *G* and the *F* in order to fulfil the cadence.

Figure 39: *Missa Sanguis sanctorum*, Sanctus, bars 135-138.

Horizontal considerations can also lead to a phrygian cadence where one would not expect it, as in this segment from the Sanctus of *Missa L'homme armé* (Figure 40):

Figure 40: *Missa L'homme armé*, Sanctus, bars 60-63.

Here, I decided for a phrygian cadence due to horizontal consideration, the colouration of *c* in the Altus would require also to realise *b* as *mi*, but that is prevented by the presence of *f* in the previous bar; therefore, I opted for an *e-fa* in the Discantus, and to leave the Altus as it is.

Finally, there is the matter of imitation and if the editor should preserve the same succession of intervals in different voices. I decided to respect it as much as possible, but always as an editorial suggestion, therefore the inflection is between brackets, as we can see in this example (Figure 41).

Figure 41: *Missa L'homme armé*, Kyrie, bars 36-39.

7. On the Edition of the Texts: Issues of Text Underlay

Text underlay is one of the most complex issues in the edition of sacred music of the fifteenth-century. Moreover, text underlay in the music of the second half of fifteenth century has not been investigated as much as in the music of early fifteenth century and sixteenth century. Too many questions remain without answer for this period. However, just addressing those questions can further our perception on how text was dealt with by late fifteenth-century musicians. For the editor, it is no solution to try to slavishly follow a witness which was clearly negligent in the alignment between notes and syllables, and it would be equally dangerous to underlay a text according to sixteenth-century rules. Sixteenth-century treatises surely must be taken into account since, as Honey Meconi points out, their general consensus on underlay rules leads us to believe that existed an earlier common tradition;[484] they also sometimes offer insights to fifteenth-century underlay practices, such as in Thomas Morley's *A Plaine and Easie Introduction to Practicall Musicke*, published in 1597, where he writes: «one whose name is *Iohannes Dunstaple* (an ancient English author) hath not onlie devided the sentence, but in the verie middle of a word hath made two long rests».[485] As Jonathan King suggests, fifteenth-century composers were interested in music-text issues on a larger scale rather than exactly pinning down which syllable should be sung on which note. Meconi argues that more than one option was available to performers when underlaying the text, and that «instead of asking what the 'correct' underlay for a piece might be, we should ask what options the performer would have had».[486] However, we should bear in mind that the text underlay transmitted in a manuscript, regardless of its level of accuracy, «has the support of at least one fifteenth-century musician: the scribe».[487] Therefore, the editor's starting point when it comes to text underlay should always be the witness(es). Graeme Boone suggested that scholars would be able to learn «the rules of common procedure» through a careful examination of the witnesses and by comparing them with «the hypothetical text-setting principles it [the underlay] seems to

[484] Honey Meconi, "Is underlay necessary?," in *Companion to Medieval and Renaissance Music*, ed. Tess Knighton and David Fallows (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 285.
[485] Thomas Morley, *A Plaine and Easie Introduction to Practicall Musicke* (London: Peter Short, 1597), 178.
[486] Meconi, "Is underlay necessary?," 286.
[487] Jonathan King, "Texting in Early Fifteenth-Century Sacred Polyphony" (DPhil dissertation, University of Oxford, 1996), 122.

indicate (or violate) in relation to the music».[488] A rather different approach has been suggested by Warwick Edwards in various of his writings.[489] He argues that the issue of text underlay is «one that lies largely outside contemporary perception of what constitutes the essence of the 'composed' work. At every stage in transmission – from composer through scribe to singer – it is intuitive rather than consciously learnt».[490]

Approaches to Text Underlay

Text underlay involves the graphic relationship between two different systems of communication: text and music. Margaret Bent speaks about «two separate languages neither of which can be incorporated into the other».[491] Moreover, it is impossible to establish what was the intention of the composer about it, if there was one; most of the times, in fact, we are dealing with the initiatives of the scribes. As King suggests, music memorised by the copyist is the principal starting point for the manuscript image. The 'scribal sound-image', i.e. the written execution, of texted music is embodied in manuscript texting.[492] In order to understand the scribes' intentions when copying Caron's Masses, we have to recognise how they intended text underlay; whether their *modus operandi* was performance-oriented or the underlay of text was subject to a more aesthetical approach; Thomas Schmidt usefully points out that scribes had to carefully assess their priorities, when choosing how to lay the text; therefore, we, today, have to carefully assess these priorities, as their decisions may have been taken purely from instinct.[493] Scribes might have prioritised a uniform and good-looking page, rather than giving assistance

---

[488] Graeme M. Boone, *Patterns in Play. A Model for Text Setting in the Early French Songs of Guillaume Dufay* (Lincoln, London: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 13.
[489] Warwick Edwards, "Text Underlay in Marguerite of Austria's Chanson Album Brussels 228," in *Muziek Aan Het Hof Van Margaretha Van Oostenrijk*, ed. Greta Moens-Haenen (Peer: Musica, 1987); Warwick Edwards, "Phrasing in Medieval Song: Perspectives from Traditional Music," *Plainsong and Medieval Music* 5 (1996); Warwick Edwards, "Alexander Agricola and Intuitive Syllable Deployment," *Early Music* 34, no. 3 (2006); Warwick Edwards, "Word Setting in a Perfect World: The Case of Obrecht's Motets," *Journal of the Alamire Foundation* 3 (2011); Warwick Edwards, "Text Treatment in Motets around 1500: The Humanistic Fallacy," in *On the Relationship of Imitation and Text Treatment? The Motet around 1500*, ed. Thomas Schmidt-Beste (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012); Warwick Edwards, "Understanding Fifteenth-Century Chansonniers," *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 138, no. 1 (2013); Edwards, "Text Treatment in Motets around 1500: The Humanistic Fallacy."
[490] Edwards, "Alexander Agricola and Intuitive Syllable Deployment," 409.
[491] Margaret Bent, "Text Setting in Sacred Music of the Early Fifteenth-Century: Evidence and Implications," in *Musik und Text in der Mehrstimmigkeit des 14. Und 15. Jahrhunderts, Vorträge des Gastsymposions in der Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel, 8. Bis 12. September 1980*, ed. Ursula Günther (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1984), 273.
[492] King, "Texting in Early Fifteenth-Century Sacred Polyphony," 5.
[493] Schmidt, "Making Polyphonic Books," 85.

to the performers, by providing them with an unambiguous note-syllable coordination. This can be done by tracking down those hints that let us suppose that the scribes were attentive towards the text placement; these are, as Margaret Bent identifies: the presence of guide-lines between note and syllable that helps the alignment of the text with the music; the coordination between text and music at stave-breaks; syllables or notes erased to refine the alignment.[494] Amongst Caron's Masses, *Accueille ma la belle*, transmitted only in VatS 51, has both occasional guide-lines and breaks from line to line, not due to lacking of space, and it can be considered Caron's Mass where the scribe placed the text with greatest care. On the other hand, the feeling that the placement is more casual, with scarce note-syllable alignment, comes from the TrentC 89 version of the *Missa Clemens et benigna*; here we have a conspicuous use of abbreviation, words are rarely divided in syllables, and there is a vague relationship between textual and musical phrases. Howard Mayer Brown, talking about note-text alignment, usefully separates between «phrase underlay» and «syllable underlay»; the former pertaining to the correlation between phrases of text and phrases of music, despite the lack of accurate indication of which note belongs to which syllable.[495] Phrase underlay is also the most common type of texting found in music manuscripts of this period.

As Schmidt notes, critical editions of music before 1600 treat the problem of text and text underlay rather unevenly.[496] Editions of music from the Ordinary of the Mass in particular tend to focus only on the "rules" of text underlay rather than on text in general. Usually, in fact, for this type of texts it is rare to have a dedicated section in the critical editions of music of this period; this attitude comes from the fact that these texts were and are extremely well-known and therefore they bear the highest degree of standardisation and formalisation. However, one of the most problematic features that scholars encounter when preparing a critical edition is indeed the text: not only for the well-known problem of the relationship between music and text, namely the note-syllable alignment, but also for the numerous omissions that often are present, and for the discrepancies between different witness in both terms of completeness and underlay. This issue, particularly relevant to the Credo during the entire fifteenth century,

[494] Bent, "Text Setting in Sacred Music of the Early Fifteenth-Century: Evidence and Implications," 275.
[495] Howard Mayer Brown, "'Lord, have mercy upon us": Early Sixteenth-Century Scribal Practice and the Polyphonic Kyrie," *Text: Transactions of the Society for Textual Scholarship* 2 (1985): 93.
[496] Schmidt-Beste, "Editorial Text Underlay Revisited."

could make one wonder to what degree the text needed to be liturgically correct. But, as Bonnie Blackburn points out: «the presence or absence of words in musical settings is largely irrelevant, since the liturgical rite is entrusted to the officiant and clergy, not the singers».[497] Blackburn's remarks have been questioned by Jesse Rodin, who affirmed that: «this explanation only begs the question: Why do so many contemporary settings of the Credo […] include the full text?».[498] The answer to Rodin's question is that, as Rodobaldo Tibaldi notes: «above all it should never be forgotten that polyphonic music, even when it is composed for a liturgical text, matches it but never substitutes it».[499] Therefore, also the possible textual interpolations, including the potential intonation of the *cantus firmus* text, do not affect the validity of the liturgical rite.[500] In Caron's Masses we can observe two small interpolations, both occurring in the Credo. In the *Missa Accueille ma la belle* we have «passus *EST* et sepultus est»; while in the *Missa Jhesus autem transiens* we can find «et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto *NATUS* ex Maria virgine». This particular textual interpolation can also be found in other settings of the Credo throughout the fifteenth century, two of them transmitted also in manuscripts related to Caron's masses tradition, such as in Tinctoris's *Missa Secundi toni irregularis* (VerBC 755, f. 21*v*), De Clibano's *Missa Et super nivem dealbabor* (VatS 51, f. 14*v*),[501] and in the setting of the Credo on *Homo quidam fecit* (TrentM 93, f. 291*v*; TrentC 90, f. 219*v*). It has to be noted that the presence of word *natus* in the text of the Credo has a precedent in liturgy, as it is present in another, older version of the Credo: the *Symbolum Apostolorum*, which indeed reads at the third clause: «qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto natus ex Maria virgine». This version of the Credo was still very much present in the fifteenth century, also in iconography, a famous example being the frescoes in the Siena Baptistery of San Giovanni by Vecchietta. Therefore, a contamination of the Apostles' Creed in the Credo of the aforementioned musical settings can be hypothesized.

---

[497] Bonnie J. Blackburn, "Masses Based on Popular Songs and Solmization Syllables," in *The Josquin Companion*, ed. Richard Sherr (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 53, n. 6.
[498] Jesse Rodin, "Finishing Josquin's "Unfinished" Mass: A Case of Stylistic Imitation in the *Cappella Sistina* " *The Journal of Musicology* 22, no. 3 (2005): 413.
[499] Rodobaldo Tibaldi, "Italian sacred music of the 17th century: some reflections and thoughts about several recent modern editions," *Polifonie* 1, no. 1 (2001): 183.
[500] Therefore, in my edition I have chosen to retain the interpolations, and, in the *Missa Jhesus autem transiens*, I have underlaid the text of the *cantus firmus* in the Tenor.
[501] Information courtesy of Jeffrey Dean.

In the Masses of Caron, but also in most of the fifteenth-century music, usually the highest voice is the one that bears the most complete text, while the Tenor often has text cues, if not labels, and sometimes only the text of the *cantus prius factus*. The Altus and the Bassus are the least standardised voices for the quantity of text; the former tends to behave more like the Discantus, while the latter is usually more similar to the Tenor; but it is not unusual that, in some witnesses, the Altus have only text underlay for the beginning of each section of every movement and then only text cues, or that the text is underlaid only when this voice is in duo with the top one. Thomas Schmidt argues that notes are signs having their own patterns, which are neutral in untexted voices, as they did not imply the addition of text in performance. This is corroborated also by the presence of ligatures, showing a neutral view of the scribe on words.[502] When we find omissions in the *discantus*, generally they are caused by the presence of rests in the voice, a scribe's lapse, or by a deliberate decision of the scribe. Within single Masses we also find different approaches to the text underlay, the Credo and the Gloria are the movements that have usually a more accurate alignment note-syllable due to the quantity of text that there is to underlay. In these two movements we observe the highest divergence between the various voices, as here usually the Discantus, and sometimes the Altus, have much more text than the Tenor (and the Bassus, usually). Conversely the Kyrie, the Sanctus and the Agnus behave similarly as they have in common relatively short texts, that therefore are almost entirely underlaid in all voices. Although the ratio between the quantity of text and music make the alignment note-syllable less precise than in the longer movements.[503] As Brown reminds us, there is a strong feeling of abstraction in these movements, differing from the longer Gloria and Credo, due to their particular words-music correlation.[504] Edward Wickham proposes a helpful distinction between 'composed' and 'uncomposed' text, the latter being

[502] Schmidt, "Making Polyphonic Books," 68-69.
[503] In my edition I have chosen to present exactly the number of intonations as present in the witness on which the musical text is based on. I also have chosen to adopt the spelling *leyson*, without the *e*, as it would be pointless to decide where the *e* of *Kyrie* ends and where the *e* of *eleyson* begins. On this matter, cf. Antonio Chemotti, ed., *I Kyrie di Tr93* (Roma: Istituto Italiano per la Storia della Musica, 2014), 40-49.
[504] Brown, "'Lord, have mercy upon us": Early Sixteenth-Century Scribal Practice and the Polyphonic Kyrie," 94.

«fluid, arbitrary, indeterminate».[505] A very fine line, according to Wickham, is drawn between the functions of the composer/scribe and the performer .[506]

The problem of interpreting these issues in a modern edition stems from the modern rigid notion of the relationship between text and music. In fifteenth century there was a rather different idea of the prescriptive value of the text, as Vincenzo Borghetti points out that ties between music and writing were quite loose in this period: the Choirbook layout, typical of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century music manuscripts, shows a common ground between two different conceptions: one that perceives music as pure sound, the other that feels the necessity of writing it down; this creates a tension between a chirographical-visual culture and an aural one.[507] One of the things that Borghetti argues not being exactly pinned down in writing are pitches: the visual element was not enough for performers, they required the hearing dimension as well.[508] He writes: «for a civilisation strongly influenced by orality the written representation of a sonic reality results in an idea of the musical page necessarily different from those civilisations that have reached a higher level in the internalisation of writing».[509] Maria Caraci Vela points out that there are different degrees of textual definitions of written tradition, some of them able to steer memory in recalling information already internalised.[510] Would it, therefore, be possible to correlate the practice of text underlay to unwritten traditions? She identifies different kinds of interaction between written and unwritten traditions, one of them being of some relevance for texting issues. Namely, «when some types of notation present themselves not as finished musical writings but rather as aid to the memory, implying an experienced knowledge of coeval performance practice; after this knowledge has ceased they

---

[505] Edward Wickham, "Realization and Recreation: Texting Issues in Early Renaissance Polyphony," *Journal of the Alamire Foundation* 3, no. 1 (2011): 155.
[506] Wickham, "Realization and Recreation: Texting Issues in Early Renaissance Polyphony," 150.
[507] Vincenzo Borghetti, "Il suono e la pagina. Riflessioni sulla scrittura musicale nel Rinascimento," in *La scrittura come rappresentazione del pensiero musicale*, ed. Gianmario Borio (Pisa: ETS, 2004), 99, 104.
[508] «Nel leggere la musica – come successione di altezze – il solo elemento visivo non era di per sé un sostegno sufficientemente sicuro perché l'esecutore potesse affidarvisi totalmente: esso non bastava a stabilire i rapporti reciproci delle altezze, la cui fissazione sulla pagina tralasciava una serie di decisioni che potevano essere prese solo quando alla vista subentrava o si affiancava l'udito, la dimensione sonora» Borghetti, "Il suono e la pagina. Riflessioni sulla scrittura musicale nel Rinascimento," 108.
[509] «Per una civiltà condizionata da forti influssi dell'oralità la rappresentazione scritta di una realtà sonora ha come risultato una concezione della pagina musicale necessariamente diversa da quelle che hanno raggiunto uno stadio più elevato nell'interiorizzazione della scrittura» Borghetti, "Il suono e la pagina. Riflessioni sulla scrittura musicale nel Rinascimento," 103.
[510] Caraci Vela, *La filologia musicale. Istituzioni, storia, strumenti critici. Approfondimenti*, 2, 40.

are no longer decipherable without making a valid reconstructive hypothesis of that practice».[511] Text underlay in less-texted movements therefore would act as a memory aid for performers, both in what words they should sing (especially in the cases of motets or secular music), and in a rather general alignment between music and text, the rest being left to performers' decision. This would be confirmed by Adrian Petit Coclico, which in his *Compendium musices* writes: «incipiat tandem non solum recte, sed etiam ornate canere, et artificiose, suaviter, et colorate pronunciare, recte intonare, *et quamlibet syllabam suo in loco, suis sub notis collocare*».[512] It is then clear, from Coclico's account, that note-syllable alignment was left to the singer rather than the composer, who probably defined only the phrase underlay. Schmidt argues that scribes in the less texted movements (Kyrie, Sanctus, and Agnus dei) would prioritise a «visual (rather than musical) 'composition' of the page».[513] He also affirms that it would be pointless trying to interpret scribes' behaviour as related to performance as they are more interested in «the visual arrangement on the page than anything else».[514] Hence, modern frustration in dealing with texting in those movements stem from the fact that scribal practices were very different from our presuppositions; to quote again Schmidt: «what the scribe does here is very careful indeed; he just takes care in doing something other than what we expect him to do».[515]

Another thing to keep in consideration is the behaviour of the Tenor as it often presents beside the Mass Ordinary texts also the cantus-firmus text, more or less complete. For Caron, a good example is the *Missa Jhesus autem transiens*, especially the Gloria and the Credo. In recent years,

---

[511] «Quando alcuni tipi di notazioni si presentano non come compiute scritture musicali ma piuttosto come sussidi alla memoria, che presuppongono una dimestichezza ben collaudata con la prassi esecutiva del loro tempo, cessata la quale non sono per noi decifrabili senza una valida ipotesi ricostruttiva di tale prassi», Caraci Vela, *La filologia musicale. Istituzioni, storia, strumenti critici. Approfondimenti*, 2, 11.

[512] Adrian Petit Coclico, *Compendium musices descriptum ab Adriano Petit Coclico, discipulo Josquini de Pres* (Nuremberg: Johann Berg, Ulrich Neuber, 1552), Bijr-Bijv. «He will then begin to sing, not only as [the music] is written but also with embellishments, and to pronounce skillfully, smoothly and meaningfully, to intone correctly and to place any syllable in its proper place under the right notes», italics mine, translation after Berger, *Musica ficta, Theories of Accidental Inflections in Vocal Polyphony from Marchetto da Padova to Gioseffo Zarlino*, 2. One could argue that what Coclico's says is not relevant for the time period here examined, however as Berger points out: «it is likely that Coclico's curriculum corresponds to the normal course of instruction received by a music student not only in the early sixteenth century, but throughout most of the period to be examined in this book [ca. 1300 – ca. 1560]» Berger, *Musica ficta, Theories of Accidental Inflections in Vocal Polyphony from Marchetto da Padova to Gioseffo Zarlino*, 2.

[513] Schmidt, "Making Polyphonic Books," 87.

[514] Schmidt, "Making Polyphonic Books," 87.

[515] Schmidt, "Making Polyphonic Books," 87.

scholars have suggested that these texts were sung, as often text of the *Ordinarium* are difficult to match with the melodies of the *cantus prius factus*.[516] On this matter, Schmidt clarifies that the performance aspect is not prioritised by scribal strategies, as the presence of both texts was the prime concern of copyists, being less interested in their performance.[517]

TEXT UNDERLAY IN CARON'S MASSES

Examining text underlay and scribal strategies in Caron's Masses the obvious starting point is the music notation. When examining the witnesses, we have to consider that scribes may have been limited in the practical realisation of text underlay; these limitations could undermine the congruence between text and music. Both Schmidt and King point out that one of the characteristics that restrict the scribe's freedom to organise the text consistently is the amount of space available in relation to music.[518] Schmidt argues that the consistence between musical and textual phrases can be challenged by the music occupying more space than the text, and vice versa (with the former being more frequent). King notes that: «notes and syllables are not one-dimensional objects. While in most music hands longs, breves, semibreves […] are usually the same width, syllables by contrast can consist of anything from a single minim stroke (-i-) to eight minim strokes (-mum-)».[519] Moreover, syllable alignment with a particular note is also determined both «by the need to leave space for subsequent syllables, or by the desire not to extend into the margin» and by «the desire to keep the syllables of polysyllabic words together».[520] The presence of many abbreviations can, for example, be explained by a narrowly spaced music, such as in the Gloria and Credo of the *Missa Clemens et benigna* in TrentC 89. The scribe's attitude towards the text can also be pragmatically influenced by the 'interference' of music in the space reserved for the text, especially in the Cappella Sistina manuscripts. There, in fact, the text is often spaced not for reason of alignment with the music but due to the

[516] Thomas Schmidt-Beste, "Textunterlegung," in *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. Ludwig Finscher (2nd edition, Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1998), 489-91; Alejandro Enrique Planchart, "Parts with Words and without Words: the Evidence for Multiple Texts in Fifteenth Century Masses," in *Studies in Performance of Late Medieval Music*, ed. Stanley Boorman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
[517] Schmidt, "Making Polyphonic Books," 89.
[518] Schmidt, "Making Polyphonic Books," 85; King, "Texting in Early Fifteenth-Century Sacred Polyphony," 68-73.
[519] King, "Texting in Early Fifteenth-Century Sacred Polyphony," 68.
[520] King, "Texting in Early Fifteenth-Century Sacred Polyphony," 70, 73.

presence of stems or notes on the first line; this feature can be explained by the scribe's priority of presenting a good-looking page.

As said, Caron's Masses present in the various witnesses, and also inside a single witness, different degrees of attention towards the text underlay. VatS 51, which transmits the *Missae Accueille ma la belle*, *Jhesus autem transiens* and *Sanguis sanctorum*, does not present a unique behaviour when it comes to the text. Schmidt noted that, in general, Cappella Sistina manuscripts have a more «'aesthetic' approach to texting».[521]

However, this seems not to be the case for Caron's Masses in which there is not necessarily an 'aesthetic' scribe's behaviour but rather a pragmatic one. This can be seen in the *Missa Jhesus autem transiens*, where we have the text of the Mass Ordinary in all voices, except for the Tenor that in the longer, more texted movement (Gloria and Credo) has only the text of *cantus firmus*; the text is neatly underlaid with separation of syllables and breaks from line to line just occasional, and sporadic omissions in the Gloria and the Credo. This attitude can be assimilated to the "isochronic texting", defined by King as such: "When a phrase has more notes than syllables the scribe tend to allow syllables to occur at regular intervals".[522] The *Missa Sanguis sanctorum* too seems to have the same attitude to texting, but, differently from *Jhesus autem transiens*, here we have text cues in the lower voices; here it can be seen a sort of 'aesthetic'attention of the scribe towards a more appealing texting. At f. 84*v* towards the end of the first section of the Credo we have the word *nobis* split between two different phrases (Figure 42).

Figure 42: *Missa Jhesus autem transiens*, Credo. VatS 51, f. 84*v*, detail.

Clearly the syllable -*bis* here must be intended on the *semibrevis* preceding the rest and not on the first *minima*. However, shifting the syllable avoids its overlapping with stems of the following line, and creates an evenly spaced line of text. In VerBC 755, the other witness of

[521] Schmidt, "Making Polyphonic Books," 88.
[522] King, "Texting in Early Fifteenth-Century Sacred Polyphony," 151.

this Mass, on the contrary, the scribe placed the syllables with a performative attitude without thinking about producing a "visually appealing" page.
The same attitude can be observed in the *Missa Accueille ma la belle* which presents the most pragmatic approach, amongst these three settings, since, as already noted above, we have guide-lines that help alignment between notes and syllables, and a lot of words divided in syllables.
The same situation as in VatS 51 happens also, as one could imagine, in VatS 14, which transmits the *Missa L'Homme armé* alongside VatSP B80. Differently from the witness from the St. Peter archive, which itself is a manuscript less visually appealing than the Cappella Sistina's one, VatS 14 presents a rather complete text with a «phrase underlay» approach. VatSP B80 differently favours a complete texting only in the top voice, while the Triplum has underlay only when is in duo with the Discantus.

The *Missa Clemens et benigna* too present itself a quite different text underlay in its two witnesses. While the Modenese witness has a neat, almost complete text with a pretty accurate text-note alignment, TrentC 89 instead presents a cursive and full of abbreviation text underlay, common also to the others Trent codices. Generally, it can be said that the scribe's intention was not attentive to any alignment between text and notes, and also the «phrase underlay» is quite vague. Both witnesses omit some portion of text; ModE M.1.13 lacks "filium dei unigenitum" and "genitum non factum", while TrentC 89 leaves out "et invisibilium" at the beginning and "crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato passus et sepultus est". Moreover, TrentC 89 does not transmit the entire three parts section, both music and text, from "Et in Spiritum Sanctum" until "Et unam sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam". Murray Steib investigates the textual changes in the Modenese manuscript, arguing that some omissions of short portions of text in ModE M.1.13 can be explained as a lapse of the scribe.[523] Usually, when the top voice is resting, the omitted text is often found in one or more of the other voices (as in the case of the *Missa Sanguis sanctorum*, transmitted in VerBC 755); but in ModE M.1.13 there is a complete omission in all voices of the words 'genitum non factum' in the Credo of the *Missa Clemens et benigna*. This is explained by Steib simply as a scribe's

[523] Steib, "Herculean Labours: Johannes Martini and the Manuscript Modena, Biblioteca Estense, MS α.M.1.13," 190.

distraction, as they would be performed by the other parts, being, therefore, an unintended consequence of the structure of the text.[524] Steib concludes that: «these missing words doubtlessly would be sung by the other voices at this point, but since they were not fully texted, the source gives the illusion of a textual omission».[525] Although, it has to be noted that the version in TrentC 89 has a rather different text disposition. It presents the words 'filium dei unigenitum' and 'genitum non factum' in the highest voice; conversely it omits 'et invisibilium' at the beginning, present instead in ModE M.1.13 (Figures 43-46).

Figure 43: *Missa Clemens et benigna*, Credo. ModE M.1.13, f. 145*v*, detail.

Figure 44: *Missa Clemens et benigna*, Credo. TrentC 89, f. 382*v*, detail.

Figure 45: *Missa Clemens et benigna*, Credo. ModE M.1.13, f. 145*v*, detail.

Figure 46: *Missa Clemens et benigna*, Credo. TrentC 89, f. 382*v*, detail.

In general, we face two different relations between music and text in the two witnesses; the first phrase "Patrem omnipotentem" corresponds with the same music phrase in both witness, but already with "factorem celi et terre" there is a difference in the two manuscripts. TrentC 89 underlays all the text under the second phrase while ModE M.1.13 splits it between two music

[524] I presume that Steib also explains the omission of "filium dei unigenitum" in the same way.
[525] Steib, "Herculean Labours: Johannes Martini and the Manuscript Modena, Biblioteca Estense, MS α.M.1.13," 190, n. 21.

phrases with a large melisma on “terre”. Here in the table, the correspondence between portion of text and the nine music phrases of the first part of the Credo.

Table 5: Text and music phrases correspondence in the Credo of *Missa Clemens et benigna*.

	TrentC 89	**ModE M.1.13**
1	Patrem omnipotentem	Patrem omnipotentem
2	Factorem celi et terre	Factorem celi
3	Visibilium omnium	Et terre
4	Et in unum dominum Iesum Christum	Visibilium omnium et invisibilium
5	Filium dei unigenitum	Et in unum dominum Iesum Christum
6	Et ex patre natum ante omnia secula, deum de deo	Et ex patre natum ante omnia secula, deum de deo
7	Lumen de lumine, deum verum de deo vero	Lumen de lumine, deum verum de deo vero
8	Genitum non factum	Consubstantialem patri
9	Consubstantialem patri per quem omnia facta sunt.	Per quem omnia facta sunt.

Hence, it would be legitimate to wonder whether there was a common antigraph and, if so, what was its aspect; namely, did exist at some point a version of the Mass where the lower voices were texted? If so the scribe of TrentC 89 decided to deliberately neglect it, and to provide a different, almost complete, underlay in the *discantus*; of course, there would be still the problem of the omission of the words ‘et invisibilium’ at the beginning.

Differences in text underlay are also present in the third section of the Credo, as the entire first phrase “Crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato passus et sepultus est” is omitted in TrentC 89. As Steib argues, it is probable that the section was originally intended with the omitted text, as at the beginning of the section «in the Trent version, the text fits with a short melisma, but the correspondence seems non-specific, even generic» and further on, where we

have respectively in ModE M.1.13 “Et ascendit in celum” and in TrentC 89 “Et iterum venturus est”, «there are simply not enough notes to accommodate the text as underlaid in Trent, but again the text from ModD fits perfectly»[526].

The issue of missing text that would have been sung in other voices raises also the question of how the singer could have known that they had to sing that part, and how would a scribe ensure that the singers reached that portion of text at that precise point? All these questions find an answer when we look at the Gloria and Credo of the *Missa Sanguis sanctorum* both in VatS 51 and VerBC 755. Here indeed some portions of text are also missing in the texting of the top voice, usually because it rests. Often, however, at least one of the other voices has the missing text.

Table 6: Missing text in lower voices in *Missa Sanguis sanctorum*.

		VatS 51	**VerBC 755**
GLORIA			
1	Laudamus te, benedicimus te, adoramus te, glorificamus te	Altus; Bassus	Altus; Bassus
5	Iesu Christe	Tenor; Bassus	
10	Iesu Christe	Tenor	Tenor;
CREDO			
1	Visibilium omnium et invisibilium	Altus[527]; Bassus	Altus; Bassus[528]
7	Et homo factus est	Tenor; Bassus	Bassus
15	Et apostolicam ecclesiam		Tenor

To these we should also add another portion of text missing in the Discantus but present in another voice. The clause “Et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum” in fact appears only in the Altus in the version of the Mass transmitted in VerBC 755. However here we have a different

[526] Steib, "Herculean Labours: Johannes Martini and the Manuscript Modena, Biblioteca Estense, MS α.M.1.13," 194.
[527] The words *et invisibilium* are missing.
[528] The word *omnium* is missing.

situation compared to the other insertions of missing text in the lower voices, since this time the Discantus is not resting but continues singing going directly from "In remissionem peccatorum" to "Et vitam venturi seculi". These two portions of text are only divided by a *breve* rest. So, while the Discantus is singing "Confiteor unum baptisma" the Altus sings "Et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum"; therefore, here we have two voices, at least, singing different texts simultaneously. The appearance of the missing text in lower voices in this Mass strengthens Steib's hypothesis of a scribe's lapse in the underlaying of the text, as it would be possible to think that at some point there was a version of the Mass with texted lower voices, yet the issues on its actual performativity remain. It could also be hypothesised that was Caron's intention to split texts in different voices, as both witness of the tradition agree on it, being, therefore, an important account on the composer's intentions.

As we have seen in this brief survey on text underlay, the investigation of fifteenth-century sacred music texting practices leaves the editor open to different possible solutions. Many contributions from the scholarly literature often disagree one with each other, and it is clear that it is not possible to elaborate general rules that can always be applied in every situation, especially for the period here in exam. Even when we look at a limited corpus of texts, such as Caron's Masses, we observe different behaviours in the tradition, and only through a thorough evaluation of witnesses the editor is able to present a well-reasoned solution, even if, perhaps, others would be "correct" as well. What is evident from an in-depth analysis of texting in Caron's Masses is that both the composer and the scribes left some aspects to the singers' skills. As it happens with the notation, the editor needs to translate text underlay, as it would be impossible just to reproduce it as closely as possible to the one present in the witnesses, something that it is limited also by modern typographical solutions.[529] Also, the analysis of text underlay shows us that different behaviours of texting were possible (a case in point, as we have just seen, the text of the Credo in *Sanguis sanctorum* and *Clemens et benigna*), therefore the best solution is to adopt slightly different policies on text underlay according to the witness(es).

Editorial Criteria

[529] On this matter cf. Schmidt-Beste, "Editorial Text Underlay Revisited," 134-39.

I have provided an edition of the texts, a transcription of text underlay, and the text under the edition of the music. In the first, the text is presented, edited for every voice in which it appears, and it is divided in clauses. Errors have been tacitly corrected and the graphic variants have been normalised (e.g. consubstantialem/cumsubstantialem, mundi/mondi, Pilato/Pillato, Sabaoth/Sabbaoth). In case of a Mass transmitted by more than one witness, the text is presented synoptically, so that the reader can easily compare the two versions. Punctuation and capital letters follow the modern use. Unrealised initials have been rendered with subscript capitals, abbreviations have been tacitly resolved, the archigrapheme *u* is separated in *u* and *v* according to the modern practice, spelling with *y* and *j* have been made uniform to *i*, and the allotropes *ti* and *ci* expressing assibilated sound, typical of medieval latin, have been rendered only with *ti*. In case of truncated or incomplete words, geminated consonants transcribed as simple, and missing letters the edition adds the lacking parts in italic (e.g. glor*ificamus*, vi*vificam*tem, pec*c*ata etc). When there are omissions in the text, it has been decided to integrate them between angle brackets and reduced font size only in the highest voice, usually the one that bears the most complete text among all voices, and, concerning the Gloria and the Credo, if the omitted portion does not appear in any other voice. In all other cases the omission is marked with an asterisk; this is valid also for voices other than the highest, but only when we are dealing with proper text underlay and not just text cues.

The transcription of text underlay reports the text as it is in the witnesses, so I tried to represent separation of syllables, missing letters, abbreviations, etc. This is to give an idea of how the text looks like and what was the scribe's general attitude towards the text, its completeness, and the way it is realised. The text underlay is transcribed for every voice; changes of line, of section, and of page are signalled (respectively by |, /, and //); a single dash (-) indicates that space was left because already occupied, often by stems or notes; a double dash (--) shows that syllables are separated; the underscore (_) signals the space between different words; and the hash sign (#) is used when there is a material *lacuna* and the text is not readable.

The edition of the music has text underlay according to the witness used as principal one for the edition of the music. I tried to follow as close as possible phrase underlay of the witness. Textual omissions and interpolations have been retained. Spelling follows the principles adopted in the edition of the text. In some cases, when text underlay is different between the

witnesses, namely the witness not used as the principal one bears more text in the lower voices or has a clearer underlay than the main witness, the text in the edition is presented in italics. Text is in italics also when integrated editorially. I have decided not to force text underlay in lower voices where it is evident that the music does not allow it properly. When the text is added according to a secondary witness which does not present the same ligatures as the main one, I have underlined the syllables under the ligature. The same happens when I had to split ligatures to fit the text in the Discantus. The choice of underlaying the text according to the phrase underlay of the main, and in some cases only, witness sometimes present some criticalities. While most of the time it is a reliable methodology, that undoubtedly finds its logic in the scribe's behaviour, there are however a few instances where the editor, in order to accommodate the words under a phrase, needs to break some 'rules' of text underlay. That is the case, for example, of *Missa Accueille ma la belle*, where in the Credo I decided to underlay more than one syllable under a ligature.

Figure 47: *Missa Accueille ma la belle*, Credo, VatS51, f. 12*r*, detail.

As one can see here (figure 47) the clause *et cumglorificatur* needs to be accommodated in a phrase between two rests, which does not have enough notes for the syllables if one respects the rule of one syllable for each ligature. Therefore, I have opted to split the c.o.p. ligature, and underlaid the syllable -*fi*- of *conglorificatur* under the second element (figure 48).

Figure 48: *Missa Accueille ma la belle,* Credo, bb. 209-212.

Another instance can be found a few bars later, in the Supremum (bb. 244-246), where the final syllables of the word *resurrectionem* are underlaid under two ligatures. Also in this case I decided to respect phrase underlay. In a controversial article, David Fallows takes a strong a

view on ligatures, affirming that ligatures are a «purely scribal whim, just an alternative way of writing notes», and that they should not be used by the editor for text underlay.[530] Schmidt argues that the role of ligatures in late medieval polyphony has still not yet been fully explained, being a graphic device chosen by the scribe, who could have also opted to notate the same figuration also in an unligated manner.[531] As one can observe in the critical apparatus of Caron's Masses, there are many instances in which witnesses diverge in the use of ligatures, and this inevitably has consequences on text underlay. Hence, it is possible that other manuscripts transmitting the Credo of *Missa Accueille ma la belle* those ligatures are not present at all, or even that phrase underlay is completely different. This happens especially, as Schmidt notes, in voices other than the Discantus, which present little text in the witnesses. Furthermore, the decision of using the text copied in the witnesses causes another issue, namely what to do with repeated notes? In some instances, there are some phrases that present repeated notes, which should accommodate different syllables, but there is no text at all. My approach here has been conservative since I decided not to add any editorial textual repetition. Moreover, while theoretical literature, albeit only from the sixteenth century onward, is quite clear on the fact that repeated notes should be sung with different syllables, polyphonic works often present an abundance of repeated notes without any indication of text underlay. A case in point is one of the typical cadential movement of this period (figure 49).

Figure 49: *Missa Sanguis sanctorum*, Kyrie, bb. 35-38.

In this case, and in many others, it would be counterintuitive to place the syllable *-son* under the first *bb* and then repeat *leyson* under the remaining notes. Thus, I have avoided to intervene in those cases where repeated notes would entail an editorial repetition of the text.

It is evident that this editorial approach is only one of the many that are possible. I have tried to present a text underlay coherent with what can be found in the manuscripts, avoiding a heavily

[530] David Fallows, "A Word About Ligatures," *Early Music* 41, no. 1 (2013): 107.
[531] Schmidt, "Making Polyphonic Books," 66-67.

edited text underlay, which would inevitably be a personal choice. Text underlay is one of the most debated issues of fifteenth-century music, and the scope of this chapter was to present the copious issues that the editor faces when editing this music, leaving to the performer the freedom of accepting the choices made in this edition.

Conclusions

The present study was designed to investigate Firminus Caron's polyphonic Masses within the framework of investigating a composer for which documentary evidence is scarce and is mainly constituted by Caron's works themselves. Nevertheless, a number of conclusions can be drawn. First, the corpus of polyphonic settings for the *Ordinarium Missae* cannot so far be deemed to include any further work beside those ascribed to him in coeval manuscripts; modern attempts of attributing to Caron the anonymous *Missa Thomas cesus* preserved in VatSP B80 and the six *Missae L'homme armé* transmitted by NapBN 40 should not be accepted, as they are based on methodological inconsistencies. Still, the investigation of these anonymous settings shows some interesting information regarding their possible contexts. The *Missa Thomas cesus* did not originate in Rome: it was most likely composed in Bruges, and the crusading context proposed by Reynolds must be discarded as well, due to a number of incongruities. The manuscript NapBN 40, transmitting the six anonymous *Missae L'homme armé*, originated in Burgundy, commissioned by a member of the lower nobility, Philibert de Janly, and was later donated to Beatrice of Aragon. Its content, context, and donation can be traced back to the late medieval crusading movement, which often disseminated its rhetoric through works of art. The crusading rhetoric can also be seen as the reason for the abundance of fifteenth-century polyphonic works based on *L'homme armé* due to its pervasiveness in Burgundian and European cultural life. This tradition also included a Mass by Caron, which belong to the early tradition, being composed in all likelihood after those of Okeghem, Du Fay, Busnoys, and connected, due to the use of similar motives, to Du Fay's Mass.

One of the main objectives of this dissertation was to provide also a new complete critical edition of Caron's Masses, according to the latest and most valid methodological standards. Besides the usual editorial work, this operation entailed the examination of a number of critical editions, those today considered as the golden standard of fifteenth-century sacred music, which gave me the opportunity to analyse how different editors behaved when facing some of the most common issues of late medieval and Renaissance music. The results of this appraisal directly informed the editorial criteria that I have chosen in my edition. I have also devoted

two chapters to the exploration of two of the most debated issues between musicologists, namely text underlay and accidental inflections.

After noting that most critical editions resort to an almost mechanical application of sets of rules provided by fifteenth- and sixteenth-century theoretical literature, dedicating little space to the discussion of problematic situations and their choices, I have thoroughly discussed the presentation of both text and accidental inflections in the witnesses of Caron's Masses, as well as the decisions I have taken in my edition. Of course, there is no such thing as a definitive critical edition, and each edition and the choices there contained are an act of interpretation. Therefore, the suggestions I have made in terms of editorial accidental inflections or text underlay are only just one of the many possible options. Nevertheless, they are informed by an understanding of Caron's Masses as a corpus, and keep as main landmark the manuscripts, since they are the only evidence we have. Furthermore, the investigation of text underlay and accidental inflections has shown that Caron might have taken an active role in choosing how the text should appear in his Masses, and used accidental inflections as a compositional tool.

The findings from this study make several contributions to the current literature. Caron's Masses are a case study the allowed me to touch upon several critical aspects of fifteenth-century music, such as: methodology of attribution, the *L'homme armé* tradition, the cultural context of polyphonic compositions, the methodologies of a critical edition, and the analysis of text underlay and accidental inflections as stylistic markers.

Certainly, this dissertation and the critical edition merely constitute the starting point for any further research on Caron's Masses. The scope of this study was limited to an investigation of Caron's polyphonic settings of the Ordinary, mainly from a textual point of view. This was necessary, since musicologists mostly focused on the lack of biographical data on Caron, therefore, an introductory study that considered recent findings on late fifteenth-century music, updating the scarce literature on this composer, was necessary. This study did not attempt a comprehensive evaluation of Caron's personal style, analysing in-depth the compositional techniques adopted by the composer. Still, a few stylistic traits can be inferred throughout the thesis, but a full investigation on this would go beyond the aim of this dissertation. Some features of Caron's compositional techniques are of extreme interest, such as

his counterpoint and dissonances (as in *Missa Clemens et benigna*, Gloria, bb. 114-116), or the use of imitation (*Missa Accueille ma la belle*, Kyrie, bb. 61-63) are unquestionably worth of further exploration.

Several questions still remained to be answered. Further studies could not only address Caron's style and his position in the landscape of fifteenth-century music, but also new research could examine more closely the cultural context of late fifteenth-century Masses. The insights gained from this study on the pervasive role that the crusading movement played in late medieval cultural life could be expanded in order to investigate its role beyond the *L'homme armé* tradition. Finally, the significant implications for the understanding of how text underlay and accidental inflections could be a compositional tool can not only inform future critical editions but also be relevant also for other composers.

EDITORIAL PRINCIPLES

VOICES

The names of the voices are written above the stave, if editorial they are comprised in square brackets. Usually the highest voice bears no denomination, if present will be derived from other compositions preserved in the manuscript otherwise will be named as Discantus.

CLEFS

The original clefs have been substituted by the modern G clef on second line, suboctave G clef on second line, F clef on the fourth line. The most appropriate clef is chosen exclusively according to the *ambitus* of the voice, so that ledger lines are avoided as much as possible. The original clefs are stated in the Critical Apparatus.

METRE AND MENSURATION

The five Masses are edited in modern notation observing the following principles: all the note values have been correspondingly transcribed without halving or quartering. Exceptions have been made where proportional notation calls for changes, according to the mathematical ratio required. In one case I decided instead of halving the notation in the parts in proportion to augment the notation of the only part without proportional indication. It is the case of the sections in *tempus imperfectum* of the Gloria and the Credo of the *Missa Jhesus autem transiens*. Here the Tenor, which have a canon, is in *tempus imperfectum* while the other voices are in *tempus imperfectum diminutum*. This would usually require halving those section but I opted to augment the Tenor as I think the other voices, going directly to another mensuration sign without stop would be performed too quickly if diminished since the notation is *alla semibreve*, and not differentiated from the one of the *tempus integer*.

I decided to adopt modern time signatures in my edition according to the table in the slide. I differentiate the time signatures for the *tempi diminuti* according to the *tactus*, if *alla breve* with a consistent notation with large note values based on the breve I opt for the indication $\frac{3}{1}$ or $\frac{2}{1}$; if *alla semibreve*, namely when the notation is not different from that one of *tempi integri*, I opt for the indication $\frac{3}{2}+\frac{3}{2}$ or $\frac{2}{2}+\frac{2}{2}$.

- The ancient *figurae* establish a relationship of 1:1 or 1:2 with the modern values according to the following principles:

○	$\frac{3}{1}$
⊂	$\frac{2}{1}$
⊂̣	$\frac{6}{2}$
ϕ	$\frac{3}{1}$ / $\frac{3}{2}+\frac{3}{2}$
¢	$\frac{2}{1}$ / $\frac{2}{2}+\frac{2}{2}$
○2	$3\times\frac{2}{1}$
○3	$3\times\frac{3}{1}$
ϕ3	$2\times\frac{3}{2}$

- Final *longae* and *maximae*, lacking real value, are rendered with the corresponding value of the mensuration in use, with a fermata sign.
- Presence of an extra half *tactus* at cadences is represented by extending the bar without notice.
- Modern bar lines are used for each staff and modern ties are used for values exceeding the measure.
- Proportions are indicated above the staff without changing the time signature.

Ligaturae and *Colores*

Ligaturae and *colores* are rendered by the usual symbols, i.e. horizontal square brackets for the former and angle brackets for the latter.

Accidental Inflections

The original accidentals are given in the text as in modern practice and are valid only for the note involved and its immediate repeats. Accidentals present in collated witnesses are given in the text in brackets. Editorial accidentals are placed above the note involved and have a prescriptive function.

Text Underlay

Text underlay is supplied according to the witness used as the principal one for the edition of the music. I tried to follow as close as possible phrase underlay of the witness. Textual omissions and interpolations have been retained. Spelling follows the principles adopted in the edition of the text. When text underlay is different between the witnesses, namely the witness not used as the principal one bears more text in the lower voices or has a clearer underlay than the main witness, the text in the edition is presented in italics. Text is in italics also when integrated editorially. When the text is added according to a secondary witness which does not present the same ligatures as the main one, I underline the syllables under the ligature. The same happens when I had the text is fitted under split ligatures.

Critical Apparatus

The Critical Apparatus is negative and is divided in three sections. The first one is an introductive profile of the composition and include:

- *Incipit*: the first word of the verbal text in the highest voice;
- List of the witnesses, of which the first is the manuscript used as reference, here are indicated also the beginning and the ending *folia*.
- Mensuration signs;
- Voices and clefs; name of the voices and relative clefs;
- Paratexts, the inscriptions are expressed diplomatically, unrealised initials are subscripted;
- Additional remarks;

The second section of the Apparatus is devoted to the textual remarks, in which I explain where and why I diverged from the main witness; I also present any feature of the witness that cannot be reproduced in the edition. The third section of the Apparatus reports different readings present in other witnesses. Entries in the second and third layers of the Apparatus involve the following parameters: pitch, note value, notational variants, like *ligaturae*, *colores*, and *puncta*, (excluding those which are merely graphic). The identification of the *locus* is formalised as follows: voice, measure(s), notes and rests specified according to their position within the bar via Arabic numerals. The pitches are expressed according to the Guidonian system and in italic, pitches within a *ligatura* are joined through a dash.

Abbreviations

D	*Discantus*	L	*Longa*	col	*Color*
S	*Supremum*	B	*Brevis*	lig	*Ligatura*
CtA	*Contratenor Altus*	Sb	*Semibrevis*	p.a.	*Punctum additionis*
CtB	*Contratenor Bassus*	M	*Minima*	p.p.	*Punctum perfectionis*
CtP	*Contratenor Primus*	Sm	*Semiminima*		
CtS	*Contratenor Secundus*	Cr	*Croma*		
Tr	*Triplum*	( )	Rest		
T	*Tenor*				

Edition of Texts

Missa Accueille ma la belle

Kyrie

Supremum:

1) Kyrie leyson, Kyrie leyson, Kyrie leyson.
2) Christe leyson, <Christe> leyson.
3) Kyrie leyson.

Contratenor Altus:

1) Kyrie leyson.
2) Christe leyson.
3) Kyrie leyson

Tenor:

1) Kyrie leyson.
2) Christe leyson, Christe leyson.
3) Kyrie leyson.

Contratenor Bassus:

1) Kyrie leyson.
2) Christe leyson.
3) Kyrie leyson.

Gloria

Supremum:

1) Et in terra pax hominibus bone voluntatis.
2) Laudamus te, benedicimus te, adoramus te, glorificamus te.
3) Gratias agimus tibi propter magnam gloriam tuam,
4) Domine deus, rex celestis, deus pater omnipotens.
5) Domine fili unigenite, Iesu Christe.
6) Domine deus, agnus dei, filius patris.
7) Qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis;
8) qui tollis peccata mundi, suscipe deprecationem nostram.
9) Qui sedes ad dexteram patris, miserere nobis.
10) Quoniam tu solus sanctus, tu solus Dominus, tu solus altissimus, Iesu Christe,
11) cum Sancto Spiritu in gloria dei patris.
12) Amen.

Contratenor Altus:

1) Et in terra pax hominibus bone voluntatis.

2) Laudamus te, benedicimus te, adoramus te, glorificamus te.
3) Gratias agimus tibi propter magnam * tuam,
4) Domine deus, rex celestis, deus pater omnipotens.
5) Domine fili unigenite, Iesu Christe.
6) Domine deus, agnus dei, filius patris.
7) Qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis;
8) qui tollis peccata mundi, suscipe deprecationem nostram.
9) Qui sedes ad dexteram patris, miserere nobis.
10) Quoniam tu solus sanctus, tu solus Dominus, tu solus altissimus, *
11) cum Sancto Spiritu in gloria dei patris.
12) Amen.

TENOR:

2) Laudamus te, benedicimus te
4) Domine deus, rex celestis, deus pater omnipotens.
5) Domine fili unigenite, Iesu Christe
7) Qui tollis
8) Qui tollis peccata mundi
9) Ad dexteram patris, miserere nobis.
10) Quoniam tu solus sanctus
11) Cum Sancto Spiritu in gloria dei patris.
12) Amen

CONTRATENOR BASSUS:

2) Laudamus te, benedicimus te, adoramus te, *glo*rificamus te,
3) * propter magnam gloriam tuam
4) Domine * rex celestis, deus pater omnipotens
5) Domine fili unigenite, Iesu Christe.
7) Qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis
8) qui tollis peccata mundi, suscipe deprecationem nostram.
9) Qui sedes ad dexteram patris, miserere nobis.
10) Quoniam tu solus * tu solus Dominus, tu solus *
11) cum Sancto Spiritu in gloria dei patris.
12) Amen.

CREDO

SUPREMUM:

1) Patrem omnipotentem factorem celi et terre visibilium omnium et invisibilium.
2) Et in unum dominum Iesum Christum, filium dei unigeni*tum*,
3) et ex patre natum ante omnia secula.
4) Deum de deo, lumen de lumine, deum verum de deo vero.
5) Genitum non factum consubstantialem patri, per quem omnia facta sunt.

6) Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de celis.
7) Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine et homo factus est.
8) Crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato passus et sepultus est. .
9) Et resurrexit tertia die secundum scripturas,
10) et ascendit in celum, sedet ad dexteram patris.
11) Et iterum venturus est cum gloria iudicare vivos et mortuos cuius regni non erit finis.
12) Et in Spiritum Sanctum dominum et vivificantem, qui ex patre filioque procedit.
13) Qui cum patre et filio simul adoratur et conglorificatur,
14) qui locutus est per prophetas.
15) Et unam sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam.
16) Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum.
17) Et expecto resurectionem mortuorum,
18) et vitam venturi seculi.
19) Amen.

CONTRATENOR ALTUS:

1) Patrem omnipotentem factorem celi et terre visibilium omnium et invisibilium.
2) Et in unum dominum Iesum Christum, filium dei unigenitum,
3) Et * patre natum ante omnia secula.
4) deum de deo, lumen de lumine, deum verum de deo vero.
5) Genitum non factum consubstantialem patri, per quem omnia facta sunt.
6) Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de celis.
7) Et incarnatus * de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine et homo factus est.
8) Crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato passus et sepultus est.
9) Et resurrexit tertia die secundum scripturas,
10) et ascendit in celum, sedet ad dexteram patris.
11) Et iterum venturus est cum gloria iudicare vivos et mortuos *
12) * -que procedit.
13) Qui cum patre et filio * adoratur et conglorificatur,
14) Qui locutus est per prophetas.
15) Et unam sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam.
16) Confiteor unum baptisma *
18) Et vitam venturi seculi.
19) Amen.

TENOR:

2) Et in unum dominum.
10) Et ascendit.
14) Qui locutus est per prophetas.
15) Et unam sanctam.
16) Confiteor unum baptisma.
18) Et vitam venturi seculi.
19) Amen.

CONTRATENOR BASSUS:

2) Et in unum dominum Iesum Christum, filium dei unigenitum,
3) Et ex patre natum ante omnia secula.
4) deum de deo, lumen de lumine
7) Et incarnatus de Spiritu Sancto.
8) Crucifixus etiam pro nobis.
10) Et ascendit in celum sedet ad dexteram patris.
11) Cuius regni.
12) Qui ex patre filioque procedit.
13) Qui cum patre.
14) Qui locutus est per prophetas.
15) Et unam sanctam, catholicam.
16) Confiteor unum
18) Et vitam venturi seculi.
19) Amen.

SANCTUS

SUPREMUM:

1) Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus Sabaoth.
2) Pleni sunt celi et terra gloria tua.
3) Osanna in excelsis.
4) Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini.
5) Osanna in excelsis.

CONTRATENOR ALTUS:

1) Sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus Sabaoth.
2) Pleni sunt celi et terra gloria tua.
3) Osanna in excelsis.
4) Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini.
5) Osanna in excelsis

TENOR:

1) Sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus Sabaoth.
3) Osanna in excelsis.
5) Osanna in excelsis

CONTRATENOR BASSUS:

1) Sanctus Dominus deus Sabaoth.
3) Osanna in excelsis
5) Osanna in excelsis

AGNUS DEI

SUPREMUM:

1) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis.
2) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis.
3) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi dona nobis pacem.

CONTRATENOR ALTUS:

1) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis.
2) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis.
3) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi dona nobis pacem.

TENOR:

1) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis.
3) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi dona nobis pacem.

CONTRATENOR BASSUS:

1) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis.
3) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi dona nobis pacem.

MODE M.1.13	TRENTC 89
KYRIE DISCANTUS: 1) Kyrie leyson. 2) Christe leyson. 3) Kyrie leyson. CONTRATENOR ALTUS: 1) Kyrie leyson. 2) Christe leyson. 3) Kyrie leyson. TENOR: 1) Kyrie leyson. 2) Christe leyson. 3) Kyrie leyson. CONTRATENOR BASSUS: 1) Kyrie leyson. 2) Christe leyson. 3) Kyrie leyson.	KYRIE DISCANTUS: 1) kyrie eleyson. 2) Christe eleyson. 3) Kyrie eleyson. CONTRATENOR ALTUS: 1) Kyrie 2) Christe 3) Kyrie TENOR: 1) Kyrie 2) Christe 3) Kyrie CONTRATENOR BASSUS: 1) Kyrie 2) Christe 3) Kyrie
GLORIA DISCANTUS: 1) Et in terra pax hominibus bone voluntatis. 2) Laudamus te, benedicimus te, adoramus te, glorificamus te, 3) gratias agimus tibi propter magnam gloriam tuam, 4) Domine deus, rex celestis, deus pater omnipotens. 5) Domine fili unigenite, Iesu Christe, 6) Domine deus, agnus dei, filius patris. 7) Qui tollis peccata m*u*ndi miserere nobis; 8) qui tollis peccata m*u*ndi, suscipe deprecationem nostram.	GLORIA DISCANTUS: 1) et in terra pax hominibus bone voluntatis. 2) Laudamus te, benedicimus te, adoramus te, glorificamus te, 3) gratias agimus tibi propter magnam gloriam tuam, 4) Domine deus, rex celestis, deus pater omnipotens. 5) Domine fili unigenite, Iesu Christe, 6) Domine deus, agnus dei, filius patris. 7) Qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis; 8) qui tollis peccata mundi suscipe, deprecationem nostram

9) Qui sedes ad dexteram patris, miserere nobis. 10) Quoniam tu solus sanctus, tu solus Dominus, tu solus altissimus, Iesu Christe, 11) cum Sancto Spiritu in gloria dei patris. 12) Amen. CONTRATENOR ALTUS: 1) Et in terra pax hominibus bone voluntatis. 2) Laudamus te. 3) gloriam tuam. 4) Domine deus, rex celestis, deus pater omnipotens. 5) Domine fili unigenite, iesu christe 6) Domine deus, agnus dei. 7) Qui tollis peccata. 11) Cum Sancto Spiritu in gloria. TENOR: 2) Laudamus te. 8) Qui tollis deprecationem nostram. 9) qui sedes ad dexteram. 10) tu solus altissimus. 11) Cum Sancto Spiritu. CONTRATENOR BASSUS: 2) Laudamus te. 3) gloriam. 4) Domine deus, rex celestis. 7) Qui tollis. 11) Cum Sancto Spiritu.	9) Qui sedes ad dexteram patris, miserere nobis. 10) Quoniam tu solus sanctus, tu solus Dominus, tu solus altissimus, Iesu Christe, 11) cum Sancto Spiritu in gloria dei patris. 12) Amen. CONTRATENOR ALTUS: 1) Et in terra. 4) Domine deus, rex celestis. 7) Qui tollis. 11) Cum Sancto Spiritu. TENOR: 7) Qui tollis. 11) Cum Sancto. CONTRATENOR BASSUS: 1) Et in terra. 4) Domine deus, rex celestis. 7) Qui tollis. 11) Cum Sancto Spiritu.
CREDO DISCANTUS:	CREDO DISCANTUS:

1) Patrem omnipotentem factore*m* celi et terre visibilium omnium et invisibilium.
2) Et in unum dominum Iesum Christum, <filium dei unigenitum>,
3) et ex patre natum ante omnia secula.
4) deum de deo, lumen de lumine, deum verum de deo vero.
5) <Genitum non factum> consubstantialem patri, per quem omnia facta sunt.
6) Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de celis.
7) Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine et homo factus est.
8) Crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato passus et sepultus est.
9) Et resurrexit tertia die secundum scripturas,
10) et ascendit in celum, sedet ad dexteram patris.
11) Et iterum venturus est cum gloria iudicare vivos et mortuos cuius regni non erit finis.
12) Et in Spiritum Sanctum dominum et vivificantem, qui ex patre filioque procedit.
13) Qui cum patre et filio simul adoratur et conglorificatur,
14) qui locutus est per prophetas.
15) Et unam sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam.
16) Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum.
17) et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum,
18) et vitam vitam venturi seculi.
19) Amen.

CONTRATENOR ALTUS:

1) Patrem omnipotentem factorem celi.
6) Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram.

1) patrem omnipotentem factorem celi et terre visibilium omnium <et invisibilium>.
2) Et in unum dominum Iesum Christum, filium dei unigenitum,
3) et ex patre natum ante omnia secula.
4) deum de deo, lumen de lumine, deum verum de deo vero.
5) Genitum non factum consubstantialem patri, per quem omnia facta sunt.
6) Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de celis.
7) Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine et homo factus est.
9) Et resurrexit tertia die secundum scripturas,
10) et ascendit in celum, sedet ad dexteram patris.
11) Et iterum venturus est cum gloria iudicare vivos et mortuos cuius regni non erit finis.
16) Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum.
17) Et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum,
18) et vitam venturi seculi.
19) Amen.

CONTRATENOR ALTUS:

1) Patrem omnipotentem.
6) Qui propter nos homines.

7) de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria. 8) Crucifixus etiam pro nobis.	
	9) Et resurrexit.
11) Cuius regni non. 12) Et in Spiritum Sanctum dominum et vivificantem. 13) simul adoratur. 16) Confiteor.	16) Confiteor unum baptisma.
TENOR:	TENOR:
1) Visibilium omnium. 2) unum dominum Iesum. 8) Crucifixus et sepultus est.	1) Patrem.
	9) Et resurrexit.
16) Confiteor baptisma. 17) resurrectionem mortuorum.	16) Confiteor unum baptisma.
CONTRATENOR BASSUS:	CONTRATENOR BASSUS:
1) Visibilium omnium. 6) Qui propter nos. 8) Crucifixus etiam.	1) Patrem omnipotentem. 6) Qui propter nos homines.
	9) Et resurrexit.
12) Et in Spiritum. 13) simul. 16) Confiteor.	16) Confiteor unum baptisma.
SANCTUS	SANCTUS
DISCANTUS:	DISCANTUS:
1) Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus Sabaoth. 2) Pleni sunt celi et terra gloria tua. 3) Osanna in excelsis. 4) Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini. 5) Osanna in excelsis.	1) ſanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus Sabaoth. 2) Pleni sunt celi et terra gloria tua. 3) Osanna in excelsis. 4) Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini. 5) Osanna in excelsis.
CONTRATENOR ALTUS:	CONTRATENOR ALTUS:

1) Sanctus * Dominus *. 2) Pleni sunt celi et terra *. 3) Osanna in ex*celsis*. 4) Benedictus qui venit in nomine * 5) Osanna in * TENOR: 1) Sanctus, sanctus. 3) Osanna in ex*celsis*. 4) Benedictus. 5) Osanna in ex*celsis*. CONTRATENOR BASSUS: 1) Sanctus, sanctus. 2) Pleni sunt. 3) Osanna. 4) Benedictus qui venit. 5) Osanna in.	1) Sanctus. 2) Pleni sunt. 3) Osanna. 4) Benedictus. 5) Osanna. TENOR: 3) Osanna primus. 5) Osanna secundus. CONTRATENOR BASSUS: 1) Sanctus. 2) Pleni sunt celi. 3) Osanna. 4) Benedictus. 5) Osanna.
AGNUS DEI DISCANTUS: 1) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis. 2) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis. 3) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi dona nobis pacem. CONTRATENOR ALTUS: 1) Agnus dei. 2) Agnus dei, qui. 3) Agnus dei, * nobis pacem. TENOR: 1) Agnus dei, peccata mundi. 2) Agnus dei, miserere. 3) Agnus dei, qui. CONTRATENOR BASSUS:	AGNUS DEI DISCANTUS: 1) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis. 2) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis. 3) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi dona nobis pacem. CONTRATENOR ALTUS: 1) Agnus. 2) Agnus. 3) Agnus. TENOR: 1) Agnus. 2) Agnus. 3) Agnus dei †. CONTRATENOR BASSUS:

1) Agnus dei.	1) Agnus.
2) Agnus dei.	2) † Agnus.
3) Agnus dei.	3) † Agnus.

Missa Jhesus autem transiens

Kyrie

Supremum:

1) Kyrie eleyson.
2) Christe leyson.
3) <Kyrie> eleyson.

Contratenor Altus:

1) Kyrie eleyson.
2) Christe leyson.
3) Kyrie eleyson.

Tenor:

0) Jhesus autem transiens.
1) Kyrie leyson.
2) Christe eleyson.
3) Kyrie eleyson.

Contratenor Bassus:

1) Kyrie eleyson.
2) Christe eleyson.
3) Kyrie eleyson.

Gloria

Supremum:

1) Et in terra pax hominibus bone voluntatis.
2) Laudamus te, benedicimus te, adoramus te, glorificamus te,
3) gratias agimus tibi propter magnam gloriam tuam,
4) Domine deus, rex celestis, deus pater omnipotens.
5) Domine fili unigenite, Iesu Criste,
6) Domine deus, agnus dei, filius patris.
7) Qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis;
8) Qui tollis peccata mundi, suscipe deprecationem nostram.
10) Quoniam tu solus sanctus, tu solus Dominus, tu solus altissimus, Iesu Christe,
11) cum sancto spiritu in gloria dei patris.
12) Amen.

Contratenor Altus:

1) Et in terra pax hominibus bone voluntatis.
2) Laudamus te, benedicimus te, adoramus te, glorificamus te,
3) gratias agimus tibi propter magnam tuam gloriam,

4) Domine deus, rex celestis, deus pater omnipotens.
5) Domine fili unigenite, Iesu Christe,
6) Domine deus, agnus dei, filius patris.
7) Qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis;
8) Qui tollis peccata mundi, suscipe deprecationem nostram.
10) Quoniam * tu solus Dominus, tu solus altissimus, Iesu Christe,
11) Cum sancto spiritu in gloria dei patris.
12) Amen.

TENOR:

0) Jhesus autem transiens.

CONTRATENOR BASSUS:

1) Et in terra pax hominibus bone voluntatis.
2) Laudamus te, benedicimus te, adoramus te, glorificamus te,
3) gratias agimus tibi propter magnam gloriam tuam,
4) Domine deus, rex celestis, deus pater omnipotens.
5) Domine fili unigenite, Iesu Christe,
6) Domine deus, agnus dei, filius patris.
7) Qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis;
8) Qui tollis peccata mundi, suscipe deprecationem nostram.
10) Quoniam tu solus sanctus, tu solus Dominus, tu solus altissimus, Iesu Christe,
11) Cum sancto spiritu in gloria dei patris.
12) Amen.

CREDO

SUPREMUM:

1) Patrem omnipotentem factorem celi et terre visibilium omnium et invisibilium.
2) et in unum Dominum Iesum Christum, filium dei unigenitum,
3) et ex patre natum ante omnia secula.
4) deum de deo, lumen de lumine, deum verum de deo vero.
6) qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de celis.
7) Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine et homo factus est.
8) Crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato passus et sepultus est.
9) Et resurexit tertia die secundum scripturas,
10) Et ascendit in celum, sedet ad dexteram patris.
11) Et iterum venturus est cum gloria iudicare vivos e mortuos cuius regni non erit finis.
12) Et in Spiritum Sanctum dominum et vivificantem, qui ex patre filioque procedit.
13) Qui cum patre et filio simul adoratur et conglorificatur,
14) qui locutus est per prophetas.
15) Et unam sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam.
16) Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum.

17) Et expecto resurectionem mortuorum,
18) Et vitam venturi seculi.
19) Amen.

CONTRATENOR ALTUS:

1) Patrem omnipotentem factorem celi et terre visibilium omnium et invisibilium.
2) et in unum Dominum Iesum Christum, filium dei unigenitum,
3) Et ex patre natum ante omnia secula.
4) deum de deo, lumen de lumine, deum verum de deo vero.
5) Genitum non factum consubstantialem patri, per quem omnia facta sunt.
6) qui propter nos homines *.
7) Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto * et homo factus est.
8) Crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato passus et sepultus est.
9) Et resurexit tertia die secundum scripturas,
10) et ascendit in celum, sedet ad dexteram patris.
11) et iterum venturus est cum gloria iudicare vivos et mortuos cuius regni *.
12) Et in Spiritum Sanctum dominum et vivificantem, qui ex patre filioque procedit.
15) Et unam sanctam, catolicam et apostolicam ecclesiam.
16) Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum.
17) Et expecto resurectionem mortuorum,
18) Et vitam venturi seculi.
19) Amen.

TENOR:

0) Jhesus autem transiens, per medium illorum ibat.

CONTRATENOR BASSUS:

1) Patrem omnipotentem factorem celi et terre visibilium omnium et invisibilium.
2) Et in unum dominum Iesum *, filium dei unigenitum,
3) et ex patre natum ante omnia secula.
4) deum de deo, lumen de lumine, deum verum de deo vero.
5) Genitum non factum consubstantialem * omnia facta sunt.
6) Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de celis.
7) Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine et homo factus est.
8) Crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato passus et sepultus est.
9) Et resurexit tertia die secundum scripturas,
10) Et ascendit in celum, sedet ad dexteram patris.
11) Et iterum venturus est * iudicare vivos et mortuos cuius regni non erit finis.
12) Et in Spiritum Sanctum dominum et vivificantem, qui ex patre filioque procedit.
15) Et unam sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam.
16) Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum.
17) Et expecto resurectionem mortuorum,
18) Et vitam venturi seculi.
19) Amen.

Sanctus

Supremum:

1) Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus Sabaoth.
2) Pleni sunt celi et terra gloria tua.
3) Osanna in excelsis.
4) Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini.
5) Osanna in excelsis.

Contratenor Altus:

1) Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus Sabaoth.
3) Osanna in excelsis.
5) Osanna in excelsis.

Tenor:

0) Jhesus autem transiens.
1) Sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus Sabaoth.
3) Osanna in excelsis.
5) Osanna in excelsis.

Contratenor Bassus:

1) Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus Sabaoth.
2) Pleni sunt celi et terra gloria tua.
3) Osanna in excelsis.
4) Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini.
5) Osanna in excelsis.

Agnus Dei

Supremum:

1) Agnus dei, qui tollis <peccata> mundi miserere nobis.
2) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis.
3) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi dona nobis pacem.

Contratenor Altus:

1) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis.
3) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi dona nobis pacem.

Tenor:

0) Jhesus autem transiens.
1) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis.
3) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi Dona nobis pacem.

Contratenor Bassus:

1) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis.
2) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis.
3) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi dona nobis pacem.

Missa L'homme armé	
VatSP B80	**VatS 14**
Kyrie Discantus: 1) Kyrie leyson. 2) Christe leyson. 3) Kyrie leyson. Triplum: 1) Kyrie *. 2) Christe leyson. 3) Kyrie leyson. Tenor: 1) Kyrie leyson. 2) Christe leyson. 3) Kyrie leyson. Contratenor: 1) Kyrie leyson. 2) Christe leyson. 3) Kyrie *.	Kyrie Supremum: 1) Kyrie leyson. 2) Christe leyson. 3) Kyrie leyson. Contratenor Altus: 1) Kyrie leyson. 2) Criste leyson. 3) Kyrie leyson. Tenor: 1) Kyrie leyson. 2) Christe leyson. 3) Kyrie leyson. Contratenor Bassus: 1) Kyrie leyson. 2) Criste leyson. 3) Kyrie *.
Gloria Discantus: 1) Et in terra pax hominibus bone voluntatis. 2) laudamus te, benedicimus te, adoramus te, glorificamus te, 3) gratias agimus tibi propter magnam gloriam tuam, 4) Domine deus, rex celestis, deus pater omnipotens. 5) Domine fili unigenite, Iesu Christe, 6) Domine deus, agnus dei, filius patris. 7) Qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis; 8) qui tollis peccata mundi, suscipe deprecationem nostram.	Gloria Supremum: 1) Et in terra pax hominibus bone voluntatis. 2) laudamus te, benedicimus te, adoramus te, glorificamus te, 3) Gratias agimus tibi propter magnam gloriam tuam, 4) Domine deus, rex celestis, deus pater omnipotens. 5) Domine fili unigenite, Iesu Christe, 6) Domine deus, agnus dei, filius patris. 7) Qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis; 8) Qui tollis peccata mundi, suscipe deprecationem nostram.

9) qui sedes ad dexteram patris miserere nobis.
10) Quoniam tu solus sanctus, tu solus Dominus, tu solus altissimus, Iesu Christe,
11) Cum Sancto Spiritu in gloria dei patris.
12) Amen.

TRIPLUM:

1) Et in terra pax hominibus bone voluntatis.
2) laudamus.

5) Domine fili unigenite, Iesu Christe,
6) domine deus agnus dei filius patris.
7) Qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis.

10) tu solus altissimus, Iesu Christe.

TENOR:

3) Gratias agimus.

7) Qui tollis peccata mundi.

11) Cum Sancto Spiritu.
12) Amen.

CONTRATENOR:

2) Laudamus te.
9) qui sedes ad dexteram patris miserere nobis.
10) Quoniam tu solus sanctus, tu solus Dominus, tu solus altissimus, Iesu Criste,
11) Cum Sancto Spiritu in gloria dei patris.
12) Amen.

CONTRATENOR ALTUS:

1) Et in terra pax hominibus bone voluntatis.
2) laudamus te, benedicimus te, adoramus te, glorificamus te,
3) gratias agimus tibi propter magnam gloriam tuam,
4) Domine deus, rex celestis, deus pater omnipotens.
5) Domine fili unigenite, Iesu Christe,
6) domine deus, agnus *, filius patris.
7) Qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis;
8) Qui tollis peccata *.
9) Qui sedes ad dexteram patris miserere nobis.
10) * Tu solus altissimus, Iesu Christe,
11) cum Sancto Spiritu in gloria dei patris
12) Amen.

TENOR:

2) Laudamus te.
3) Gratias agimus tibi propter magnam gloriam tuam,
4) Domine deus, rex celestis, deus pater omnipotens.
7) Qui tollis;
8) Qui tol*l*is peccata mundi, suscipe deprecationem nostram.
10) Tu solus altissimus, Iesu christe,
11) cum sancto spiritu in gloria dei patris.
12) Amen.

CONTRATENOR BASSUS:

2) Laudamus te, benedicimus te, adoramus te, glorificamus te,
3) gratias agimus tibi propter magnam gloriam tuam,

7) Qui tollis peccata.

11) Cum Sancto Spiritu.

4) Domine deus, rex celestis, deus pater omnipotens.
7) Qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis;
8) Qui tollis peccata mundi, suscipe deprecationem nostram.
9) Qui sedes ad dexteram patris miserere nobis.
10) Quoniam tu solus sanctus, tu solus dominus, tu solus altissimus, Iesu Christe,
11) Cum sancto spiritu in gloria dei patris.
12) Amen.

CREDO
DISCANTUS:

0) Patrem omnipotentem factorem celi et terre visibilium omnium et invisibilium.
1) <et in unum dominum Iesum Christum>, filium dei unigenitum,
2) et ex patre natum ante omnia secula.
3) deum de deo, lumen de lumine, deum verum de deo vero.
4) Genitum non factum consubstantialem patri, per quem omnia facta sunt.
5) Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de celis.
6) et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine et homo factus est.
7) Crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato passus et sepultus est.
8) Et resurrexit tertia die secundum scripturas,
9) Et ascendit in celum, sedet ad dexteram patris.
10) Et iterum venturus est cum gloria iudicare vivos et mortuos cuius regni non erit finis.
11) Et in Spiritum Sanctum dominum et vi*vifican*tem, qui ex patre filioque procedit.

CREDO
SUPREMUM:

1) Patrem omnipotentem factorem celi et terre visibilium omnium et invisibilium.
2) et in unum dominum Iesum Christum, filium dei unigenitum,
3) et ex patre natum ante omnia secula.
4) deum de deo, lumen de lumine, deum verum de deo vero.
5) Genitum non factum consubstantialem patri, per quem omnia facta sunt.
6) Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de celis.
7) Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine et homo factus est.
8) Crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato passus et sepultus est.
9) et resurexit tertia die secundum scripturas,
10) Et ascendit in celum, sedet ad dexteram patris.
11) Et iterum venturus est cum gloria iudicare vivos et mortuos cuius regni non erit finis.
12) Et in Spiritum Sanctum dominum et vivificantem, qui ex patre filioque procedit.

12) Qui cum patre et filio simul adoratur et conglorificatur,
13) qui locutus est per prophetas.
14) Et unam sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam.
15) Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum.
16) Et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum,
17) et vitam venturi seculi.
18) Amen.

TRIPLUM:

1) Patrem omnipotentem.

2) filium dei unigenitum.

7) et homo factus est.

8) Crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato passus et sepultus est.

9) Et resurrexit tertia die secundum scripturas,
10) et ascendit in celum.

12) Qui ex patre filioque procedit.
13) Qui cum patre et filio.

17) Et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum.

13) Qui cum patre et filio simul adoratur et conglorificatur,
14) qui locutus est per prophetas.
15) Et unam sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam.
16) Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum.
17) Et expecto resurectionem mortuorum,
18) et vitam venturi seculi.
19) Amen.

CONTRATENOR ALTUS:

1) Patrem omnipotentem factorem celi et terre visibilium omnium et invisibilium.
2) Et in unum dominum Iesum Christum, filium dei unigenitum,
3) Et ex patre natum ante omnia secula.
4) Deum *, lumen de lumine, deum verum de deo vero.
5) genitum non * consu*b*stantialem patri, per quem omnia facta sunt.
6) Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de celis.
7) Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine et homo factus est.
8) Crucifixus eciam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato passus et sepultus est.
9) Et resurexit tertia die secundum scripturas,
10) Et ascendit in celum, sedet ad dexteram patris.
11) Et iterum venturus est cum gloria iudicare vivos et mortuos cuius regni non erit finis.
12) et in Spiritum Sanctum dominum et vivifica*n*tem, qui ex patre filio*.

15) Et unam sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam.

TENOR:

1) Et invisibilium.

10) Et ascendit in celum.
12) Qui ex patre filioque procedit.

17) Et expecto.

19) Amen.

CONTRATENOR:

1) Patrem omnipotentem.
2) Filium dei unigenitum.
3) Et ex patre.

10) Et ascendit in celum sedet.

16) Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum.
17) Et expecto resurectionem mortuorum,
18) Et vitam venturi seculi.
19) Amen

TENOR:

2) Et in unum dominum, Iesum Christum,
4) deum de deo, lumen de lumine, deum verum de deo vero.
6) Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de celis.
7) Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine et homo factus est.
10) Et ascendit in celum, sedet ad dexteram patris.

15) Et unam sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam.
16) Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum.
17) Et expecto resurectionem mortuorum,
18) et vitam venturi seculi.
19) Amen.

CONTRATENOR BASSUS:

2) Et in unum dominum Iesum Christum, filium dei unigenitum,
3) et ex patre natum ante omnia secula.
4) deum de deo, lumen de lumine, deum verum de deo vero.
5) Genitum non factum consubstantialem patri, per quem omnia facta sunt.
6) Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de celis.

12) Qui ex patre filioque procedit.

17) Et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum.

7) Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine et homo factus est.
10) Et ascendit in celum, sedet ad dexteram patris.
11) Et iterum venturus est cum gloria iudicare vivos et mortuos cuius regni non erit finis.
12) et in Spiritum Sanctum dominum et vivificantem, qui ex patre filioque procedit.
13) qui cum patre et filio simul adoratur et conglorificatur,
14) qui locutus est per prophetas.
15) Et unam sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam.
16) Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum.
17) Et expecto resurectionem mortuorum,
18) et vitam venturi seculi.
19) Amen.

SANCTUS

DISCANTUS:

1) Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus Sabbaoth.
2) Pleni sunt celi et terra gloria tua.
3) Osanna in excelsis.
4) Benedictus qui venit qui venit in nomine Domini.
5) Osanna in excelsis.

TRIPLUM:

1) Sanctus, sanctus *.
2) Pleni sunt celi et terra gloria tua.
3) Osanna in excelsis.
4) Benedictus qui venit in nomine domini.
5) Osanna in excelsis.

TENOR:

1) Sanctus.
3) Osanna.

SANCTUS

SUPREMUM:

1) Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus Sabaoth.
2) Pleni sunt celi et terra gloria tua.
3) Osanna in excelsis.
4) Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini.
5) Osanna in excelsis.

CONTRATENOR ALTUS:

1) Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus Sabaoth.
2) Pleni sunt celi et terra gloria tua.
3) Osanna in excelsis.
4) Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini.
5) Osanna in excelsis.

TENOR:

1) Sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus Sabaoth.
3) Osanna in excelsis.

5) Osanna in excelsis. CONTRATENOR: 1) Sanctus. 3) Osanna in excelsis. 5) Osanna in excelsis.	5) Osanna in excelsis. CONTRATENOR BASSUS: 1) Sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus Sabaoth. 3) Osanna in excelsis. 5) Osanna in excelsis.
AGNUS DEI DISCANTUS: 1) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis. 2) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis. 3) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi dona nobis pacem TRIPLUM: 1) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis. 2) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis. 3) Agnus dei, * dona nobis pacem TENOR: 1) Agnus dei, qui tollis. 3) Agnus dei, * dona nobis pacem. CONTRATENOR: 1) Agnus dei. 3) Agnus dei, dona nobis.	AGNUS DEI SUPREMUM: 1) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis. 2) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miser*e*re nobis. 3) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi dona nobis pa*cem* CONTRATENOR ALTUS: 1) Agnus dei, qui tollis * nobis. 2) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis. 3) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi dona nobis pacem. TENOR: 1) Qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis. 3) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi dona nobis pacem. CONTRATENOR BASSUS: 1) Qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis. 3) Agnus dei, qui tollis peccata mundi dona nobis pacem.

MISSA SANGUIS SANCTORUM	
VERBC 755	**VATS 51**
KYRIE DISCANTUS: 1) ᴋyrie ele*y*son. 2) Christe eleyson. 3) ᴋyrie eleyson. CONTRATENOR ALTUS:	KYRIE DISCANTUS: 1) Kyrie leyson. 2) Christe leyson. 3) Kyrie leyson. CONTRATENOR ALTUS:

1) Kyrie leyson.
2) Christe leyson.
3) Kyrie leyson.

TENOR:

1) Kyrie leyson.
2) Christe leyson.
3) Kyrie leyson.

CONTRATENOR BASSUS:

1) Kyrie leyson.
2) Christe eleyson.
3) Kyrie leyson.

1) Kyrie leison.
2) xpriste leyson.
3) kyrie leyson.

TENOR:

1) Kyrie leyson.
2) Christe leyson leyson.
3) Kyrie leyson.

CONTRATENOR BASSUS:

1) Kyrie leyson.
2) Christe leyson.
3) Kyrie leyson.

GLORIA

DISCANTUS:

1) Et in terra pax hominibus bone voluntatis.
3) Gratias agimus tibi propter magnam gloriam tuam,
4) Domine deus, rex celestis, deus pater omnipotens.
5) Domine fili unigenite, <Iesu Christe>,
6) Domine deus, agnus dei, filius patris.
7) Qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis;
8) Qui tollis peccata mundi, suscipe deprecationem nostram.
9) Qui sedes ad *d*exteram patris miserere nobis.
10) Quoniam tu solus sanctus, Tu solus dominus, Tu solus altissimus *,
11) cum Sancto Spiritu in gloria dei patris.
12) Amen.

CONTRATENOR ALTUS:

1) Et in terra pax hominibus bone voluntatis.
2) Laudamus te, benedicimus te, adoramus te, glorificamus te,
3) gratias agimus tibi.

GLORIA

DISCANTUS:

1) Et in terra pax hominibus bone voluntatis.
3) Gratias agimus tibi propter magnam gloriam tuam,
4) Domine deus, rex celestis, deus pater omnipotens.
5) Domine fili unigenite *,
6) Domine deus, agnus dei, filius patris.
7) Qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis;
8) Qui tollis peccata mundi, suscipe deprecacionem nostram.
9) Qui sedes ad dexteram patris miserere nobis.
10) Quoniam tu solus sanctus, Tu solus dominus, Tu solus altissimus, Iesu *,
11) cum Sancto Spiritu in gloria dei patris.
12) Amen.

CONTRATENOR ALTUS:

1) Et in terra pax hominibus bone voluntatis.
2) Laudamus te, benedicimus te, adoramus te, glorificamus te,
3) gratias agimus tibi propter magnam gloriam tuam,
4) Domine deus, rex celestis, deus pater omnipotens.

6) Filius patris.
7) Qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis;
8) Qui tollis peccata mundi, suscipe deprecationem nostram.
11) Cum Sancto.
12) Amen.

TENOR:

3) Gratias agimus tibi propter.
4) Domine deus.
5) Unigenite.
6) filius patris.
8) Qui tollis peccata mundi, suscipe deprecationem nostram.
10) Iesu Christe.
11) Cum Sancto.
12) Amen.

CONTRATENOR BASSUS:

2) Laudamus te, benedicimus te, glorificamus te,
3) gratias agimus tibi

6) filius patris.
8) Qui tollis peccata mundi, suscipe deprecationem nostram.
10) Iesu Christe,
11) cum Sancto Spiritu in gloria dei patris.
12) Amen.

6) Domine deus, agnus dei, filius patris.
7) Qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis;
8) Qui tollis peccata mundi, suscipe deprecationem nostram.
11) * in gloria dei patris.
12) Amen.

TENOR:

3) Gratias agimus tibi propter.

5) unigenite Iesu Christe.
6) filius patris.
8) Qui tollis peccata mundi, suscipe deprecationem nostram.
10) Iesu Christe.
11) in gloria dei patris.
12) Amen.

CONTRATENOR BASSUS:

2) Laudamus te, benedicimus te, adoramus te, glorificamus te,
3) gratias agimus tibi propter magnam gloriam tuam.
5) Domine fili unigenite, Iesu Christe,
6) Domine deus, agnus dei, filius patris.
8) Qui tollis peccata mundi, suscipe deprecationem nostram.

11) Cum Sancto in gloria dei patris.
12) Amen.

CREDO

DISCANTUS:

1) patrem omnipotentem factorem celi et terre *.
2) Et in unum dominum Iesum Christum, filium dei unigenitum,
3) Et ex patre natum <ante omnia secula>.

CREDO

DISCANTUS:

1) Patrem omnipotentem factorem celi et terre *.
2) Et in unum dominum Iesum Christum, filium dei unigenitum,
3) Et ex patre natum ante omnia secula.

5) <Genitum non factum> consubstantialem patri, per quem omnia facta sunt.
6) Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de celis.
7) Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine *.
8) Crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato passus et sepultus est.
9) Et resurrexit tertia die secundum scripturas,
10) et ascendit in celum, sedet ad dexteram patris.
11) Et iterum venturus est cum gloria iudicare vivos et mortuos cuius regni non erit finis.
12) Et in Spiritum Sanctum dominum et vivificantem, qui ex patre filioque procedit.
13) Qui cum patre et filio simul adoratur et conglorificatur,
14) qui locutus est per prophetas.
15) Et unam sanctam, catholicam <et apostolicam ecclesiam>.
16) Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum.
18) Et vitam venturi seculi.
19) Amen.

CONTRATENOR ALTUS:

1) Patrem omnipotentem factorem celi et terre visibilium omnium.

9) Et resurrexit tertia die secundum scripturas,
10) Et ascendit in celum, sedet.
11) Et iterum venturus est cum gloria iudicare vivos et mortuos cuius regni non erit finis.
17) Et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum.

5) <Genitum non factum consubstantialem patri>, per quem omnia facta sunt.
6) Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de celis.
7) Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine *.
8) Crucifixus etiam pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato passus et sepultus est.
9) Et resurrexit tertia die secundum scripturas,
10) et ascendit in celum, sedet ad dexteram patris.
11) Et iterum venturus est cum gloria iudicare vivos et mortuos cuius regni non erit finis.
12) Et in <Spiritum> Sanctum dominum et vivificantem, qui ex patre filioque procedit.
13) Qui cum patre et filio simul adoratur et conglorificatur,
14) qui locutus est per prophetas.
15) Et unam sanctam, <catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam>.
16) Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum.
18) Et vitam venturi seculi.
19) Amen.

CONTRATENOR ALTUS:

1) Patrem omnipotentem factorem celi et terre visibilium omnium et invisibilium.
2) Et in unum.
9) Et resurexit tertia die secundum scripturas,
10) Et ascendit in celum, sedet ad dexteram patris.
11) Et iterum venturus cum gloria iudicare.

18) Et vitam venturi seculi.
19) Amen.

19) Amen.

TENOR:

2) Et in unum dominum Iesum Christum, filium dei unigenitum.

8) Et sepultus est.
11) Cuius regni non erit finis.
15) Et apostolicam ecclesiam.
16) Confiteor unum.

19) Amen.

CONTRATENOR BASSUS:

1) Visibilium omnium et invisibilium.
7) Et homo factus est.

11) Cuius regni non erit finis.
12) Et in Spiritum.

19) Amen.

TENOR:

2) Et in unum dominum.
7) Et homo factus est.
8) Sub Pontio Pilato passus et sepultus est.
11) Cuius regni non erit finis.

18) Et vitam venturi seculi.
19) Amen.

CONTRATENOR BASSUS:

1) Visibilium et invisibilium.
7) Et homo factus est.
8) Sub Pontio Pilato passus et sepultus est.
11) Cuius regni non erit finis.

18) Et vitam venturi seculi.
19) Amen.

SANCTUS

DISCANTUS:

1) ˢanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus Sabbaoth.
2) Pleni sunt celi et terra gloria tua.
3) Osanna in excelsis.
4) ᴮenedictus qui venit in nomine Domini.
5) Osanna in excelsis.

CONTRATENOR ALTUS:

1) Sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus Sabbaoth.
2) Pleni sunt celi.
3) Osanna in excelsis.

SANCTUS

DISCANTUS:

1) Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus Sabaoth.
2) Pleni sunt celi et terra <gloria tua>.
3) Osanna in excelsis.
4) Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini.
5) Osanna in excelsis.

CONTRATENOR ALTUS:

1) Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus Sabaoth.
2) Pleni sunt celi.
3) Osanna in excelsis.

4) benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini.
5) Osanna in excelsis.

TENOR:

1) Sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus.
2) Tua.
3) Osanna in excelsis.
4) Qui venit in nomine Domini.
5) Osanna in excelsis

CONTRATENOR BASSUS:

1) Sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus Sabbaoth.
2) Gloria tua.
3) Osanna in excelsis.
4) Qui venit in nomine Domini.
5) Osanna in excelsis.

4) Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini.
5) Osanna in excelsis.

TENOR:

1) Sanctus, sanctus.

3) Osanna in excelsis.
4) Qui venit in nomine Domini.
5) Osanna in excelsis.

CONTRATENOR BASSUS:

1) Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus deus Sabaoth.
2) Gloria tua.
3) Osanna in excelsis.
4) Qui venit in nomine Domini.
5) Osanna in excelsis.

Transcription of Text Underlay

Legend

Bold: Illuminated Capital
| change of line
/ change of section
// change of page
- space left due to already occupied space
-- syllables separated
_ space between different words
material *lacuna*

Missa Accueille ma la belle

Kyrie

S: **K**yrie_ ley-son Kyrie_ |_ ley—son_ Kyrie_ | |_ leyson_ / Criste_ |_ ley--son_ |_ ley-son_ // **K**yrie| | |_ ley--son

CtA: **K**yrie_ | |_ ley--|--son_ / Cripste_ | |_ ley--son // **K**-yrie_ | | |_ ley--|--son_

T: Kyrie Acueille- malabelle- |_ leyson_ / Criste_ |_ leyson_ Xp̄e |_ ley--son // Kyrie_ | |_ ley--son_

CtB: Kyrie_ |_ ley--|--son / Criste_ ley_ |_ son_ //_ Kyrie_ | |_ ley--son

Gloria

S: **E**T in terra_ pax | homībus_ bone volunta-tis laudam⁹ te bene-dilcim⁹ te_ adoramus_ te_ glīficamuste Grās agim⁹_ ti--bi_ proplter magnaʒ- glīaʒ tuam dn̄e deus rexcelestis deus pa--ter om|ni--potens_ dn̄e filii unigenite ih̄u_ xp̄e_ / **D**omine_ deus_ Agnus_ | de--i_ filius_ pa--tris // **Q**ui tollis pctā mū--di_ misere-re nolbis Qui tollis pctā_ mū--di- suscipe_ deprecatiōeʒ |- nrām Qui_ se--des_ addexteram pa-tris- miserere_ no--|--bis Qūi tu solus sanc-tus tu solus_ dn̄s tu solus altissimus_ iesu | xp̄e_ Cū sancto_ sp̄u_inglā_de--i_pa--tris_| A--me--n_

CtA: **E**T in terra pax_ hominibus bone_ volunta_|_tis_ lauda--m⁹te benedici⁹_ te |_ adoramus te_ glorificam⁹ te Grās agim⁹_ tibi_ | prop--ter_ magn-ā tuā_ dn̄e deus rex celestis deus_ pater_ | om--ni--po-tēs- Dn̄e filii- unige-nite ihū xp̄e_ / Dn̄e_ deus | agnus_ Agnus_ dei_ |_ filius pa--tris_ //_ Qui tollis pctā mū-di misere--re nob̄ Qui tollis pctā | mūdi_ susci-pe deprecation--nē nrām_ Qui sedes |_ addexteram prīs_ miserere nobis Quī- tu solus sanctus Tu solus dolmi--nus tu solus altissim⁹_ Cū sancto spū_ inglā_ dei_ |-patris_ Amen_

T: laudamus te benedicim⁹ te_ dn̄e delus rex celestis deus pater omp̄-otē dn̄e filii unigēite ih̄u xp̄e_ // Qui tollis Qui tolł pctā mūdi_ Addexteraʒ prīs miserere | nobis Quī tu solus sanct⁹_ Cum | sancto spū in glīa dei pris A--men_

CtB: laudam⁹ te_ bene-dici⁹ te_ adoram⁹ te #i|ficam⁹ te_ꝓpter magnā glīa tuā_ dñe- rex celestis deus pal ter omīpotens_ dñe filii unigenite iħu_ xp̄e_ // Qui tollis pctā- mū--di miserere no-bis_ Qui tollis pctā | mūdi suscipe depcatiōe3_ nrām_ Qui sedes addexterā | patris miserere_ nobis Quī tu solus Tu solus dñs- Tu solus-| Cū sancto spū_ in gloria_ dei_ patris |_ A--m--en_

CREDO

S: **P**Atrem- omīpotē-tem factoren celi et ter--|re visibiliū- omñi et_ invi-sibilium_ Et inul-nū-dominū iesu3 xp̄m- filiū dei- unigēi Et- ex- p·- natū- añ | omīa secu--la Deum de de deo lum̄ de lumine_ deu3 veru3_ dedeo | ve--ro_ Genitum- nō factū_ cōsubstancialē pat· per quē omīa facta sūt q̃ꝓpt nos | hoīes_ etꝓpter nrām salu-tem descen-_dit_ decelis_ | Et īcarnatus ē de spū sancto ex m· ⁿgine_ et hō fact⁹- est- Crucifix⁹ ēt |-ꝓnobis subponcio pilato_ passus- ē et sepul-tus est // **E**T resur--xit ter-cia_|_ de-_i_ se--cun--|--dum_ scrip--tu--|ras / Et ascend· ī ce--lum sedet addexterā prīs- et iterū ventur⁹ | est cū glīa judica--re vivos et mortuos cui⁹ regni nō erit |- fi--nis-_ et ī sp̄m_ sanctū dm̄n et vivifi-cantem_ Qui ex patre fillio-que rpocedit_ Qui cū prē et filio simul- adoratur_ et cūglīfical-catur_ Qui locutus est per_ pro--phe--tas_ // **E**T- unā sanctā catholica3 et apostolicam-_ eccle-|--siam_ Confiteor_ unū baptisma ī remissi|onē pcto2_ Et ex pecto resurectiōe3 mortuo2 Et vitā venturi seculi A--|--men_

CtA: **P**Atrem om--ni--potētem factorē celi et ter--re_ visibilium om|nium et_ in--visibiliū_ Et ī unū dm̄u ihm̄ xp̄m filiū dei unigēitū | Et_ prē natū- añ oīa secula_ deū de deo lumē de luīe deū ve2 de deo ⁿo- Genitū |_ nō factū con-substācialē prī per qūe oīa facta sūt Quiꝓpter nos-hoīes | etꝓpter- nr̄a- salutem descendit de celis- Et incar⁹- de spū- sancto | ex m·- ⁿgīe et hō fact⁹ ē- Crucifixus ēt pro nobis sub pōcio pilato passus | et sepul-tus est // **E**T_ resure--xit_ tercia_ di--|-e- secun--dum scriptu|_ras / **E**t_ ascendit In celum sedet addexterā prīs Et iterū ventur⁹ est- cū glā | judicare vivos et- mortuos_ Que proce--dit_ Qui cū prē et filio |- adoratur et cūglīfica--tur Qui locutus ē- perꝓphetas_ // **E**T unam sanctā- catholica3 et apostolicā eclīam | Confiteor unū baptisma_|_ Et vitam_ venturi seculi A--m--e--n_

T: Et ī unū dñ3_|_ // Et ascendit_|_ Qui locutus ē ꝑꝓphetas_ // Et unā sanctā_ | Confiteor unū baptisma_ Et vitā venturi | seculi A--men_

CtB: Et ī unū dm̄n iħm xp̄m_ filiū dei unigeī|tū Et ex- prē- natū añ oīa secula deū de deo lumē de luīe_|_ Et incarnat⁹ | de spū sancto_ Crucifixus ētꝓ nob̄_ // Et ascendit_ in celū sedet addexterā patris_|_ Cuius regni_ | Qui ex prē- filio--que procedit_ Qui cū prē_|_ Qui locutus ē per_ prophe_tas_ // Et_ unam sanctā catholica3_| Confiteor- unū_ | Et vitam venturi seculi_ A--me--n_

SANCTUS

S: **S**Anctus_|- Sanc--|--tus_ Sanc--tus_|_ domi--nus deus_|_ saba--|--oth / Pleni_|_ sunt_ ce-_li- et terra glori--|--a_ tu--a_ // **O**San--|--na_ In_ ex--|--cel--sis / Bene--|--dic--tus qui venit_ In nomi--|--ne_ do-mi--ni_ / Osanna--na in_ ex--|--cel--sis_

CtA: **S**Anctus_ San--ctus_ | dñs_|_|_ deus_ saba--oth_|_ / Pleni_ sunt-_ celi |- et_ ter--ra_ Gloria-_ tu--a_ // Osan-na--|--na_ in_ excel--|--sis_ / Bene-dic--tus Qui |_ ve--nit_ in_ nomine_ domi--|--ni_ / O-San--na_|- In_ ex--cel--sis_

T: Sanctus_ Sanc--tus_ dñs_ del--us_ saba--oth_ // Osanna--na_ In ex--|--cel--sis_ / OSanna_|_ In ex--cel--sis_

CtB: Sanctus_ do--|mi--nus_ de--|--us_|_ saba--oth_ // OSanna_ | In ex--cel--|sis_ / O-Sanna_ in ex--|--cel--sis_

AGNUS DEI

S: **A**Gnus_ de--|--i_ qui-_ tollis_|_ pe-ca--ta_ mū--di_ misere--|--re_ no--bis_ / **A**Gnus_ de--i_ qui tol--|--lis pecca-ta- mū--di_ mil-sere--re no--bis_ // **A**Gnus- de--|--i Qui_- tollis_ | peca--ta_ mū--di_ do--|na_ no--|--bis pa--cem_

CtA: **A**Gnus_ | de--i_ Qui_ tollis_ pctā_|_ mūdi_ | misere--re_ no--bis / **A**Gnus_ de--i_ Qui |- tollis_ pctā_ mū--di_ misere--re |- no--bis_ // **A**Gnus_ de--|--i_ Qui_ tollis_ | pctā_ mū--di_ dona_|_ nobi_ pa--|--cem_

T: AGnus dei Qui tol--lis_ pctā_ mū--|--di_ miserere_ no--bis_ // AGnus de-i_ Qui tollis_ pe-cata_|_ mū--di_ do-na_ no--|--bis_ pa--cem_

CtB: Agnus_ de--i_ qui_|_ tollis pctā_ mū--di_ mise--|--re--re_ no--bis_ // A-Gnus_ de--i_ Qui | tollis_ pctā_ mū--|--di_ Do-na_ no--|--bis_ pa--cem_

Missa Clemens et benigna

Mode m.1.13	**TrentC 89**
Kyrie	Kyrie
D: **K**yrie_|_ leyson / **C**hriste_|_ leyson / **K**-yrie_|_leysō CtA: **K**yrie_ leyson / **C**hriste_|_ ley-sō / **K**yrie_|_ leysō T: **K**y-rie_ Clemēs et benigna_ leyson / **C**hriste_ leyson / **K**yrie_ leyson CtB: **K**yrie_|_ ley-son_ / **C**hriste_|_ leyson_ / **K**yrie_|_ leyson_	D: yrie_ eleyson_ / xp̄e_ eleyson_ / Kyrie_ eleyson_ CtA: Kyrie_ / xp̄e_ / Kyrie_ T: Kyrie_ / xp̄e_ / Kyrie_ CtB: Kyrie_ / xp̄e_ / Kyrie_
Gloria	Gloria
D: **E**T in terra pax hōi--bus bone_ vo-lūta--tis |_ lauda-m⁹ te bn̄dicimus_ te_ adoramus te_ glorifi|camus_ te_ grās_ agimus_ ti--bi_ ꝑꝑ |_ magnā_ gloriā_|_ tu--am // **D**omine_ deus- rex_ cele--stis deus_ | p̄r̄ omī--potens_ dn̄ē fi|--li_ unigeni--te_ iesu_ chri|ste- dn̄ē_ de--us agnus_ de--i_ filius |_ pa--tris // **Q**ui tollis_ peccata mondi_ miserere no-bis q̣ tollis pctā | mōdi suscipe_ depcationē_ no|strā Qui sedes ad dexterā pa--tris_ miserere_ no--|--bis qūi- tu- solus sanct⁹- tu solus- dn̄s_ tu solus | altissi--mus_ iesu_ chri--ste // **C**ū san-cto_ spiri--tu- ī gl-o--ria_ de-i | pa--tris_ A--|--men CtA: **E**t in terra pax hominibus_ bo-ne volūta|--tis_ laudam⁹ te_|_|_ gloriā_ tu--|--am // **D**n̄ē de⁹- rex celestis_ de⁹_ p̄r̄_ oīps_| dn̄e_ fili_ unigenite_ ie-su_|_ xp̄e_ dn̄e_ de-⁹_ agnus dei|_ // **Q**ui tollis pctā_ // **C**ū sancto_ spū_ in glīa_ T: **L**audamus te_ Clemens- et benigna // // **Q**ui tollis_ depcationē_ nrāʒ_ qui | sedes_ ad dexterā_ tu sol⁹ altissim⁹|_ // **C**ū sancto spū CtB: **L**audamus te_|_ glīa|_ // **D**-omine deus rex cele-stis_// **Q**ui tollis_ // **C**ū sanc-to-spū_	D: T in terra pax homīb9_ bone voluntatſ_ Laudam9 te_ bn̄di|cim9_ te_ Adorā9 te-glorifi--|cam9 te_ Gratias agī9 tibi ꝑpter magnam_ gloriam_ tu|--am // Domē_ deus_ rex_ celestſ_ deus-| pater_ omīpo—tens Dn̄ē fili_|_ unigenite_ ihu_ xp̄e_ Domē de9 agnus |_ dei_ filius_ pa—tris // Qui_ tollis_ pctā mdi miserẻ nob q̣ tolł pctā | mdi_ suscipe depcatiōeʒ nrām Qui sedes addexterā prſ miserẻ_|_ nobis_ Quōʒ tu solus_ sanctus- Tu sol9 dn̄s tu sol9 altissī9|_ ihu xp̄e / Cum sancto spū_ in gloria dei_| patris_ A--men CtA: Et in t⁹ra_ // Dn̄ē deus rex celestſ_ // Qui tollis_ / Cum sc̄to spiritu_ T: Clemens et benigna_ // // Qui tollis_ / Cum sc̄to_ CtB: Et in t⁹ra_ // Dn̄ē deus rex celestſ_ // Qui tollis_ / Cum sc̄to spū_
Credo	Credo

D: **P**Atrem_ omīpoten--tē_ facto-re celi_ et ter--|--re_ visibiliū_ oīu3_ et invisibi--liū |_ et in unū domi-nū iesū xp̄m_ et ex pr̄ē_ na--tu3_| ante_ oīa secula deū de de--o_ lumē_ de lumine_ deū ve|rū de deo vero_ cū--substātialē_ pa--tri ꝑ quē_ oīa_|_ facta_ sūt // **Q**ui ꝑꝑ_ nos homi--nes et ꝑꝑ nostrā | salutē_ descen--dit_ de ce--lis_ et in-car-natus|_ ext de spū_ san-cto_|_ ex maria_ virgine_ et ho--mo_ fa--|--ctus_ est // **C**rucifixus etiā_ pro nobis sub pontio_ pilato passus et sepul|-tus_ est_ et resuřexit_ tertia die_ secūdū_|_ scripturas_ et ascendit ī_ celū sedet ad dexterā_ pa--|--tris_ et ite4_ venturus est_ cū glori--a iudica|--re_ vivos et mortuos_ cui^{9} regni_ nō erit finis_ // **E**t in sp̄m sanctū dn̄m_ et vivifi-cātē qui ex pr̄ē_ filioq3_ pro|--ce--dit_ qui cū_ pr̄ē et filio simul adoratur_ et cūglorificatū $\overset{i}{q}$ locut^{9} ē ꝑ ꝓpphetas_ et unā sanctā catholicā et apostolicā | eccle--siam / Confiteor unū baptis--ma_ ī remissio--nē |_ peccato--4_ et expecto resuřectionē_ mortuo4_ et | et vitā_ vitā_ venturi seculi_ A--|--men_

CtA: **P**atrē_ omī-potentē- facto-rē_|_ celi_ // **Q**ui ꝑꝑ- nos- hoīnes_ et ꝑꝑ nrā3_|_ de sp̄ū sc̄to_ ex maria_ // **C**rucifixus etiā ꝓ nobis_|_|_|_ Cui^{9} regni nō // **E**t in sp̄m-sanctū dn̄m- et vivificātē_|_ simul adoratur_|_ / Confiteor_

T: **V**isibiliū oīu3 Clemēs et benigna_ unū dn̄3 iesū_ // // **C**rucifixus_ et sepultus_ ē_ // **C**on-fiteor baptisma_ resuřectio-nē mõtuo4_

CtB: **V**isibiliū oīu3_ // **Q**ui ꝑꝑ nos_ // **C**rucifixus etiā_ // **E**t in sp̄m_ simul_|_ / **C**onfiteõ_

D: Atrem_ omīpotēte3- factoē3 celi 2 ťre visibiliū_ Et ī unū | dm̄n ih̄m_ xp̄m_ filiū_ dei unigenitū_ Et | ex pr̄ē- natū_ an̄_ oīa_ secula deū d^{7} deo_ lumē d^{7} luīē deū | verſ d^{7} deo vero_ Genitū nō fc̄tm_ 9sb̄ale3 pr̄ī ꝑ q_ oīa facta sūt // Qui ꝓpt_ nos_ homiēs- et ꝓpt nra3 salutē descēdit_ | de_ celis_ Et incarnat9_ ē_ de sp̄ū_ san_|_cto_ ex maria virgine_ et homo_ fac--|--fac—tus_ est // Et resuřexit ťtia_ die_ scd̄m scripturas_ et asced^{t} in | celū_ sedet ad dexterā pr̄ſ Et it̄m vēt3 ē cū gloria iudica--|re vivos_ et_ mortu—os- cui9 regni-nō- e|rit_ finis_ / Confiteor unū bap^{ma}_ in remissionē pc̄tō--|rū Et expceto_ resuřectione3 moruor4_ et vitā | venturi_ seculi_ A—men

CtA: Pr̄ēm oīpotente3_ // Qui ꝓpt^{9} nos hoīes_ // Et resurrexit_ / Confiteor unū bap^{ma}_

T: Pr̄ēm Clemens et benigna_ // // Et resurrexit_ / Confiteor unū baptisma_

CtB: Pr̄ēm oīpotente3_ // Qui ꝓpt^{9} nos homīes_ // Et resurrex^{t}_ / Confiteor unū baptisma_

SANCTUS

D: **S**An--ctu-s_ San--ctus |_ San--ctus_ domi--|nus de--us- saba--oth / **P**-leni_ sūt-ce--li_ et ter--|--ra_ gloria_ tu--a // **O**sanna_|_ in ex-celsis_ / **B**-enedictus_ qui-ve-nit ī- no-mi-ne_ domi--|--ni / **O**sanna_|_ in ex-celsis_

SANCTUS

D: Anc—tus- Sanctus_ Sanc—tus_ | domi—nus_ de—us- sana--|--oth / Pleni_ sunt_ celi_ et ter|--ra gloria_ tu—a // Osan—na_ in- ex--|--celsis_ / Benedictus_ qui venit- in no--|--mīe_ domini / Osanna_|_ in excel—sis_

CtA: **S**anctus_ domin^{9}_ / **P**-leni- sūt- celi- et terra_ // **O**sanna- in ex / **B**enedictus q̣ ve-nit ī nomine_ / **O**sanna_ in_ T: **S**-anctus_ Sanctus_ // **O**sanna_ in ex_ // **O**-sanna in ex_ CtB: **S**-anct^{9}_ Sanctus_ / **P**-leni- sūt_ // **O**sanna_ // **B**enedictus qui venit_ / **O**sanna- in_	CtA: Sanctus_ / Pleni sunt_ // Osanna_ / Benedictus_ / Osanna_ T: Clemens et benigna_ // Osanna p^{9} / Osanna 2^{9} CtB: Sanctus_ / Pleni sūt celi_ // Osanna_ / Benedictus_ / Osanna_
AGNUS DEI	AGNUS DEI
D: **A**-gnus_ dei_ qui tollis- pecca--ta | mū--di misere--re no--bis / **A**gnus_ de-i- qui- tolli-s pc̄ta mū--di_ misere--lre_ no--bis / **A**gnus dei qui- tol--lis pc̄ta- mū--di_ dona nobis pacē_ CtA: **A**g-n-us dei_ / **A**gnus dei qui / **A**gnus de-i_|_ nobis pacē_ T: **A**gnus dei_ peccata mūdi_ / **A**gnus dei_|_ miserere_ / **A**gnus dei qui_ CtB: **A**gnus- de-i_ / gnus dei_ / **A**gnus dei_	D: Agnus_ dei_ qui tol—lis pc̄tā mūdi_ | misere—re no—bis / Agnus_ dei_ qui_ | tol—lis pc̄tā mūdi misere—re_ no—bis / Agnus dei q̣ tollis_ pc̄tā mundi_ Dona nōb pacē CtA: Agnus_ / Agnus_ / Agnus_ T: Agnus_ / Agnus_ / Agnus dei † CtB: Agnus_ / Agnus_ / Agnus_

Missa Jhesus autem transiens

Kyrie

S: K--yrie_|_ eley--son / Xp̄e_|_ ley--son / | |_ eley--son

CtA: K--yrie_|_ eley--son / Xp̄e_|_|_ ley--son / K--yrie_|_|_eley--son

T: Jh̄s_ autem transiens Kyrie leyson / Xp̄e_ eley--son / Kyrie_|_ eley--son

CtB: Kyrie_|_ eley--son / Xp̄e_|_|_ eley--son / Kyrie_|_|_ eley--son

Gloria

S: **E**T in_ terra pax hominibus_ bone_ voluntatis |_ Laudamus te_ Benedicimus te Adoramus te Glorificamus te_|_ Gracias agimus_ tibi_ propter_ mag--nam_|_ gloriam_ tuam_ Domine deus rex celestis_ deus pater om|--nipotens domine fili unigenite_ ihesu_|_ criste_ domine deus_ agnus dei_| filius_ patris_ // Qui tollis_ peccata_ mundi_ miserere_|_ nob--is_ Qui_ tollis_ pec--ca--ta mundi- sus|cipe_ depreca-tionem_ nostra_ quonia3 tu solus_ sanc--|--tus_ Tu_ solus_ dominus_ tu so|llus_ altissimus_ jhe--su_|_ xpri--ste_ Cum sancto spiritu_| ī gloria_ dei_ patris_ A--M--E--N_

CtA: **E**T_ in_ terra_ pax ho-minib9 bone_ voluntatis_ Laudamus | te Benedicimus te Adoramus e glorificamus te Gratias_ agi-mus_ tibi|_ propter magna3 tu-am glo--riam domine deus_ rex cele|--tis deus pater omnipotens_ domine fili_ uni|genite_ ihesu xpriste_ Domine deus agnus_ dei_ gilius patr--is // **Q**ui_ tollis peccata_ mundi_ miserere_ nobis|- Qui tollis_ peccata_ mundi_ miserere_| nobis Qui tollis peccata- mundi su-scipe deèrecationem- nrām_|- Quoni-am- tu solus dominus_ Tu_ solus_ altissimus|_ Jhesu_ xpriste_ Cum- sancto_|- spiritu_ in gloria_ dei_ pa-tris_ A--M--E--N

T: Jhe-sus autem transiens_ // Jhesus autem transiens_

CtB: Et in terra pax hominibus bone voluntatis Laudam9 te | Benedicimus te- Adoramus te glorificamus te gratias_ agimus_|_ tibi_ pro-pter_ magnam gloriam_ tuam- dn̄ē deus rex cellestis_ de9 pater omnipotens domine fili unigenite_ ihesu xpri|ste_ domine deus agnus dei_ filius_ patris_ // **Q**ui tollis_ pec--cata_ mundi_ miserere | nobis_ Qui toll-is peccata mundi_ suscipe deprecationem | nr̄a3 quoniam tu_ solus sanctus Tu solus dominus_ Tu solus_| altissimus_ Jhesus_ xpriste_

Credo

S: **P**Atrem_ omnipotentem_ factorem_ celi_|_ et_ terre_ visinilium omnium_ et_ invisibilium_ et in | unum: dominum_ ih̄m xp̄m filium dei unigenitum_ et ex_|_ patre natum añ omīa secula_ deum verum de_ deo ver-o lumē de | lumine deum verum_ de deo_ vero_ qui propter nos_ homines | et propter_ nostrum salutem_ descendit de celis_ Et incarnates |_ est de spiritu sancto_ natus ex maria virgine et homo factus est_ // **C**Rucifixus etia3 pro nobis sub pontio pulato_ passus et sepultus est_| Et resurexit tercia die_ secundum scripturas_ Et ascend^{t} |_ in celum sedet ad dexteram pr̄is Et iterū venturus est cu3 gla iudicare vivos et |_ mortuos_ cuius regni non erit finis Et in spiritum sanctum dn̄m et vivificante3 | Qui ex pr̄ē filio3- procedit Qui cū pr̄ē et filio s̄it adoratur et conflorificat^{2} q locultus ē p ꝓph̄as Et una3 sc̄ta3 catho·^{ca3} 7 apl̄ica3

ecc̄la3 Confiteor unum baptisma in | remissionem peccatorum_ Et expect resurectione3 mortuo2 Et vitā vēturi sc̄li Amen

CtA: **P**Atrem_ omnipotentem_ factorem celi et ter-re- visibilium_ om-ni|um- et- invisibilium et in unum do-minum Jhesum xpristum filium dei unifenitum |_ Et ex patre natum ante omnia se-cula deu3- de deo Lumen- de Lumine deum veru3 | de deo- vero Ge-nitum- non factum_ consubstantialem patri per quem omnia | facta sunt qui ꝓpter nos homi-nes_ Et incarnates ē de_ spū sc̄o et homo fc̄s 3 // **C**Rucifixus etiam pro nobis sub pontio pylato passus et sepultus est|_ Et resur-ex-it tertia die secundum scrip-turas 7 ascendit ī- celu3 sedet | sed3 ad dexterā p̄rīs 7 ite2-vētur9 ē- cum gloria iudica-re_ vivos et mortuos cui9 regni | Et in_ sp̄3 sc̄m dn̄m et vivifican-te3- q ex p̄rē filioq3 ꝓ-cedit Et una3 sc̄ā3 | catolica3 et ap̄lica3 ecclesia3_ Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem | pc̄o2 Et expect resurrection-e3 mortuo-2_ Et vita3 venturi sc̄lī A--M--E--N

T: Jhesus autem transiens_ per medium illorum |_ ibat_ // Jhesus_ autem transiens per medium Illoru3 Ibat_

CtB: **P**Atre3 omnipotentem_ fac--tore3 celi et terre_ visibiliu3 om̄ī | et invisibiliu3 Et- in unum dn̄m J̄hm filium- dei unigenitum et ex p̄rē natū an̄ oīa | scła- deum- de deo lumen de lumine deum verum de deo vero_ Genitum nō factu3 con|substantiale3 oīa fcta s̄ſ Qui propter nos homines et propter nostrum salute descēdit | de celis_ Et incarnates est de sp̄ū sancto ex maria vgine 7 hō fc̄s est // **C**Ru-cifixus etiam pro nobis sub pontio pilato passus et sepult9 ē E resurex^{t} |_ tercia die_ sc̄d̄m scripturas Et ascēd^{t} ī celū sed3 ad dexterā p̄rīs Et ite2 vētur^{9} ē iu|dicare vivos et_ mortuos_ C-uius regni nō erit finis Et ī sp̄3 sc̄m dn̄3 | et vivificante3 q ex p̄rē filioq3 ꝓcedit Et una3 sc̄ā3 catholica3 et ap̄lica3 ecc̄ā3 Confi_|teor unum baptisma in remissione3 peccatorum_ Et expecto_| resurectionem mortuo2 Et vitam venturi seculi A--M--E--N

SANCTUS

S: **S**Anctus_ Sanc--tus_| Sanc--tus_ do|--minus_ deus_ saba--|--oth / Pleni_ sunt_ | celi_ et_ terra glori--|--a_ tu--a_ // **O**San--na_|_ in_ ex--cel--|--sis / Benedic--|--tus_ qui ve--nit_ in_|_ no--mine do--|--mi--ni / O-san--na_|_ in_ excelsis_

CtA: Sanctus_ Sanc-tus_|_ Sanc--tus_ domi|--nus_ deus_ Saba--oth_ // **O**Sanna_ in_ ex--|--celsis--sis / / O--sanna_|_ in_ ex--celsis

T: Jhesus autem transiens Sanctus_ Sanctus_| dominus_ deus_ Sabaoth_ // **O**Sanna_|_ in_ excelsis_ / Osanna_ in ex--celsis_

CtB: **S**Anctus_ Sanctus_ Sanc--|--tus_ domi--|--nus_ deus_ | sa--baoth_ / Pleni_ sunt_ ce--|--li et_ ter--ra_ glo--ria_|_ tua_ // **O**Sanna_|_ in_ ex--celsis_ / Benedic--tus_ qui_ ve--|nit_ in_ nomine_ domi--|--ni_ / Osanna_|_ in_ excel--sis

AGNUS DEI

S: **A**Gnus_ de--i_ qui_|_ tollis_ mun--di_ miserere_ no--|--bis / Agnus_|_ dei_ qui_ tollis_ pec-ca-ta|_ mun--di_ miserere_|_ nobis_ // **A**Gnus_ dei_ qui_|_ tollis_ pec-ca--ta_ mū--di / Dona_ nobis_|_ pacem_

CtA: Agnus dei_|_ qui tollis peccata | mundi_ miserere_ nobis_ // **A**Gnus_ dei_ qui tollis_|_ peccata_ mundi_ / dona_ nobis_|_ pacem_

T: Jhe-sus autem transiens Agnus dei qui tollis peccata |_ mundi_ miserere nobis // **A**Gnus_ dei qui_ tollis_ peccata_|_ mundi / Dona_ nobis_|_ pacem_

CtB: **A**Gnus_ dei qui_|_ tollis peccata_ mundi- mi-serere_|_ nobis_ / Agnus_|_ dei_ qui_ tol--lis_ pecl--cata_ mundi_ misere--re_|_ nobis_ // **A**Gnus_ dei_ qui_|_ tollis_ pec--cata_ mun--di / don-a_ nobis_|_ pacem_

VATSP B80	VATS 14
KYRIE	**KYRIE**
D: **K**yrie_|_ leyson_ // Xpriste_|_ leyson_ / Kyrie_|_|_ leyson_ Tr: Kyrie_|_ // Xpriste_|_ leyson / Kyrie_|_|_|_ leyson T: lōme_ lhōme- lhōme arme kyrie_ leyson // Xpriste_|_ leyson_ / Kyrie_|_|_ leyson_ Ct: kyrie_|_| leyson_ // Xpriste_|_ leyson / Kyrie_|_|_	S: **K**yrie_|_ ley--son_ / Xp̄e_|_ ley-son / **K**yrie_|_ ley--son CtA: Kyrie_|_ ley--son_ / Criste_|_ ley--son_ / Kyrie_|_|_ ley--son_ T: lome lome arme Kyrie_ ley--son / Xp̄e_|_ ley--son_ / Kyrie_|_ ley--son_ CtB: Kyrie_|_ ley--son_ / Criste_|_ ley-son_ / Kyrie_|_|_
GLORIA	**GLORIA**
D: **E**T in terra_ pax homini--|--bus bone_ volūta--tis_| laudamus_ te_ benedicim⁹_ te_ Adoram⁹|_ te_ glo-ri--fica--|--m⁹_ te_ Gra-tias_ agi-mus- tibi_| ꝑꝑ- magnā- gl̄ā3 tuā_ dn̄ē d⁹ rex_ ce|--lestis_ deus_ pr̄_ omnipotens_ // Domine_ fili_ unifenite_ ihesu_ xpriste|_ dn̄ē_ deus_ agn⁹_ dei_ filius|_ pa--tris / Qui_ tollis pc̄ta mūdi miserere- no--bis qui tollis | pc̄ta_ mūdi_ suscipe depcationē_ nostrā_ qui sedes | ad dexterā pr̄is miserere nōb- qūī tu solus sanctus_ tu sol⁹ | dn̄s: tu solus altissim⁹_ ih̄u_ xp̄e_ // **C**ū- st̄ō- sp̄ū_ in_ glori|_ dei_ patris_ A|--men_ Tr: **E**T- in terra_ pax_ homībus_| bone- vo-lū--tatis_ lauda⁹_ // Domine_ fili_ unigenite_ ihesu- xpriste dn̄ē | deus_ agn⁹ dei_ filius_| pa--tris / Qui tollis | pc̄ta_ mū-di_ miserere no-bis_|_ tu sol⁹ | altissim⁹_ ihesu_ xpriste_ // T: lhōme lhōme arme Gratias agim⁹_ // Qui tollis pc̄ta mūdi_ // Cū sancto_ spiritu_|_ Amen_ Ct: Laudam⁹- te_ // Qui tol̄l̄_ peccata_ // Cum_ sancto_ spiritu_	S: **E**T in terra_ pax_ hominibus | bone volunta--tis_ laudamus | te benedicimus_ te_ Adoramus te glorificamus_ te_ Grās | agimus_ tibi_ propter_ ma--gna3_ gloriam tuam_ dolomine deus rex celestis_ deus pater_ omnipo--tens_ / **D**omine_ fili unigeni--te- Jhū_ xp̄e_ domine deus | agnus_ dei_ filius_ pa--|--tris_ // **Q**ui tollis pc̄ta_ mundi_ miserere_ no--bis_ Qui | tollis pc̄ta mūdi_ suscipe depcationem_ no--stram_ qui sedes | addexterā pr̄is_ miserere_ nobis- Qūī tu solus_ sanctus_ Tu solus_ domi|nus Tu solus altissimus_ Jh̄u_ criste_ / **C**um sancto_ spiri_tu_ In gloria dei_ patris_|- A--M--E--N_ CtA: **E**T in terra_ pax_ hominibus bone | volunta--tis_ laudamus te benedicimus te Adoramus|_ te_ glorificamus te_ Grās_ agimus_ tibi_ppter- magna3 | gloriam tuam domine deus rex celestis deus pater omnipotens_ / Domine_ fili_ unigenite_ Jh̄u xp̄e_ domine_ deus agn⁹ |_ filius_ pa--tris_ // **Q**ui tollis pc-cata mūdi miserere nobis Qui tollis peccata |_ Qui sedes addexteram patris miserere_ nobis_ | Tu solus altissimus_ Jhū_ xp̄e_ / Cum sancto_ spiritu_ In_ gloria_ dei_|_ patris_ A--men_

	T: laudamus te_ Grās agim⁹ tibi ppter magna3 gloria3 tuā dol|mine deus rex celestis deus pater omnipo--tens // Qui tollis_ Qui tolis pc̄ta mūdi suscipe depcatione3 nostraml_ Tu solus altissimus_ Jhū_|_ xp̄e_ / Cum sancto spū_ in gloria_ dei_|_ patris_ A--men_ CtB: laudamus- te benedicimus te- adoramus te_ | glorificamus te Grās_ agimus tibi_ꝑpter magna3_| gloriam tuam_ dn̄e deus rex celestis_ de-us pater_|_ omnipo--tens_ // Qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis Qui tollis | peccata mundi suscipe deprecationem nostram Qui sedes addexterā | patris miserere nobis Qui̇̄ tu solus sanctus Tu solus dn̄s tu solus altissimus Jh̄u_|_ xp̄e_ / Cum- sancto spiritu_ In_ gloria_|_ dei_ patris_ A--men_
Credo	**Credo**
D: **P**Atrem_ omī-potētē_ factorem celi 7 tr̄e | visibi--liū_ omī_ et invi-sibi--liū|_|_ // filiū dei_ unige--nitum et | ex pr̄ē_ natū añ_ omīa se--cula- deū de deo lumē | de- lumīe_ deū ve4 de deo vero geni-tū_ | nō factū 9substantialē_ pr̄i̇_ ꝑ quē omīa | facta sūt_ qui propter nos homīes 7ꝑp nrā3 sa-lutē_|_ descendit de ce-lis- et- incar-nat⁹ est de sp̄ū st̄o | ex maria_ virgine 7 homo_ factus_ est // Crucifixus- etiam_ pro_ nobis_ sub- pontio | pilato_ passus _ et_ sepultus_ est_|_ Et resurrexit tertia_ die_ | secūdū_ scripturas_ / Et ascendit in celū_ sedet_ ad dexteram- pr̄i̇s et ite4 ventur⁹| est_ cū_ gloria_ iudicare vivos et | mortuos cui⁹ regni non_ erit finis et ī sp̄m st̄3 dn̄m ꝙ vi|_ // tem qui ex pr̄ē- filio--q̄ procedit_ qui cū | pr̄ē_ et- gi-lio simul adorat²_ et- cūl--glorificatur_ qui locut⁹ est ꝑ prohetas|_ Et unā sāctā_ ca--tholicam | et apostolicam_ ec--cle--siam_ Confiteor | unū baptisma ī remissionem_ pc̄torum_ // Et expecto_ resurrectionem_ mortuorū_|_ et_ vitam_| venturi_ seculi |_ A--|--men_ Tr: Pa-trē- omīpo-tentem_ // filiū dei unigenitū_|_|_|_|_ et homo_ factus_ est_ //	S: **P**Atrem omnipotentem_ factorem_ celi_ et terre visibili--lum_ omnium_ et_ in--visibili--um_ et in unū dol-minū_ Jh̄m_ xp̄m_ filium dei_ unigenitum_|_ et ex pr̄ē natū ante omnia secu--la_ deū de deo_ lumen de luīe deum verum_|_ de deo_ ve--ro_ genitū nō factū_ cōsubstancialem_ patri_ per que3 omīa | facta sūt Qui ꝑ nos ho^es^- et ꝑp nr̄ā3_ salutā descēd·^t^ de celis_ Et īcarnatus_ est_ de sp̄ū | sancto_ ex maria virgine_ et homo factus_ est_ // **C**rucifixus etiam_ pro nobis sub poncio_ pillato_ passus et sepultus_|_ est_ et rsurexit tercia die sc̄dm_ scripturas_ | **E**t ascendit ī celū_ sedet addexteram_ patris_ et iterū ventur⁹ ē 9 gl̄ĩa | Judicare vivos et mortuos_ Cui⁹ regni nō erit_ fi--nis_ et in sp̄m sc̄tm dn̄m et_| vivicate3 Qui ex patre_ gilioque procedit qui 9 pr̄ē et filio simul_ adorat² et 9gl̄ificatur qui locutus_ est_ | per prophetas_ / Et unā sanctam catholicam_ et apostolicam ecclesiam | Confiteor unum baptisma_ in remissionem_ pc̄to--rum_ // **E**T expecto_ resurectionem_ mortuo|--rum_ Et_ vitam_ venturi_ secu|--li_ A--|--me--n_

Crucifixus_ etiam_ pro_ nobis_|_ sub pontio_ pilato_|_ passus et sepult⁹ est et resurrexit | tercia cie scđm̄- scripturas / Et ascendit in celū // qui ex pr̄ē filio--ꝗ procedit_ qui cū pr̄ē et filio // Et expecto_ resurrectionem mortuoꝛ_

T: lhōme lhōme- arme Et invisibiliū // // Et ascendit in celū_ // Qui ex pr̄ē filio--ꝗꝓce--dit_ // Et ex-pecto_|_|_ A--men

Ct: PAtrem omnipoten-tem_ // filiū dei unigenitū_ // Et ascendit- in celū- sedet // qui ex pr̄ē_ filio-ꝗꝓcedit_ // Et expecto_ resurrectionem_ mortuoꝛ_

CtA: **P**Patrem omnipotentem factorem celi et terre visibiliū omnium_ | et invisibilium_ Et in unū dn̄m̄_ jħm_ xp̄m_ filiū_ dei unigenitū | Et ex pr̄ē_ natum_ ante oīa_ secula_ deū- lumen de luīe deū veꝛ- de deo | vero genitū non- cōsustācialē pr̄ī per q̄ oīa- fact aunt- Qui ꝑpter nos hoīes | et ꝓpter- nostrā- salute descend·ᵗ de celis Et incarnates est de sp̄ū sancto ex maria virgine | et homo_ factus_ est_ // **C**Rucifixus eciam pro nobis sub poncio pillato_ passus et sepuiltus|_ est_ Et resurexit tercie die- scđm̄_ | scripturas / Et ascendit in celum sedet addexteram patris et iteꝛ ventur⁹ est con glīa Judicare | vivos et mortuos Cuius- regni nō- erit finis_ et- in sp̄m̄ sanctū dn̄m̄ et vivificalte qui ex_ pr̄ē- filio_ / Et unā sanctam catholicaꝫ et apostolicā ecc̄ħiaꝫ Confiteor unū |- baptisma in remissionem_ pc̄to--rum_ // **E**T expecto_ resurectionem_ mortuoꝛ_ | Et vitam_ venturi_ seculi_|_ A--men_

T: Et in unū dn̄m̄- iħm xp̄m deū de deo lumē de luīe deū verū de deo vero | Qui ꝑpter nos hoīes- et ꝓpter nostrā salutā descendit de celis Et | incarnates est de sp̄ū sancto ex maria virgine et homo factus est_ // Et ascendit ī celū sedet addexterā pr̄īs_|_ / Et unam sanctaꝫ_ | catholicaꝫ et apostolicā ecc̄ħiaꝫ Confiteor unū baptisma in remissionē_ pc̄to--rum_ // Et expect_ resurectionem_ mortuorum_| Et vitam_ venturi_ seculi_ A--|--men_

CtB: Et in unum- dn̄m̄ iħm xp̄m | fi-liū- dei- unigeni-tū et ex patre- natū añ omīa secula deum de deo lumen | de- lumīe_ deū veꝛ de deo vero- genitū nō factū- cōsubstancialem patri_ | per quē omīa facta sūt_ Qui propᵗ nos hōies- et ꝑpter nr̄aꝫ salutē descendit de celis_ E incar|natus est de sp̄ū sancto ex maria virgine_ et homo_ factus est_ // Et ascen-dit ī celū sedet- addex-teram patris et iteꝛ venturus | est cō gloria iudicare vivos et mortuos Cuius regni nō- erit finis_ et ī sp̄m̄ sanctō do|minū et vivificātē qui ex

	pr̄ē filioque ꝑced·[t] qui cō pr̄ē filio simul addorat·[2] et cōglorifcat[2] q̣ locut[9] ē ꝑ ꝓphetas | Et unā sanctam catholica3 et apostolicam ecc̄lia3 Cōfiteor unū baptisma in remissiōe3 pc̄torum // Et expceto_ resurectionem_ mortuorum_|_ et_ vitam_ venturi_ seculi_|_ A--m--e--n_
SANCTUS	**SANCTUS**
D: **S**anctus_ sanctus|_|_ Sanctus_ dn̄s_|_| deus_ sabba--|--oth // Pleni_ sunt_ celi_|_ et terra_ gloria_|_|_ tu--a / Osanna_|_ in excel--|--sis // **B**Ene--dictus_ qui venit_|_ qui_|_ venit_ In_ nomine_|_ dn̄ī_ / O-sanna_|_|_ in_ excel--sis_ Tr: **S**anctus_ sanctus_ // Pleni_ sunt_ celi_ et terra|_| gloria_|_ tu--a / O-sanna_|_|_|_in_ excel--sis_ // Benedictus_|_ qui venit_|_ In_| nomine- domini_ / Osanna|_|- In_ excel--sis_ T: Sanct[9]_ // Osanna_ // Osanna_ in ex cel--sis_ Ct: Sanctus_ // Osanna_|_ in_ excelsis-_ // Osanna_|_ in_ excel--sis	S: **S**Anc--tus_ Sanctus--|--tus_ Sanc--|--tus_ domi--nus_ de--|--us saba--|--oth // **P**leni_ sunt celi_ et ter|--ra- glori|--a_ tu--|--a_ / Osanna_ in excel--|--|--sis_ // **B**Enedictus_ qui ve--|--nit_ In nomine_|_ domi--ni_ / **O**sanna_ In escel--|--sis_ CtA: **S**Anctus_ Sanctus--|--tus_ Sanctus_|_ dominus_ deus_|_ saba--oth_ // **P**leni_ sunt_ celi_| et_ ter--ra_ glo--|--ria_ tu--a_ / Osanna_|_ In excel--|--sis_ // **B**enedictus_ qui_ ve--|--nit_ in nomine|_ domi--ni_ / Osanna_ In ex--|--cel--sis_ T: Sanctus Sanctus dn̄s_ deus_ saba--|--oth // Osanna_ In excel--|--sis_ // Osanna_ In ex--cel--sis_ CtB: Sanctus_ Sanctus_|_ domi--nus_ | de--us saba--|--oth // Osanna_|_ In_ excel--|--sis // Osanna_ In excel--|--sis_
AGNUS DEI	**AGNUS DEI**
D: **A**gnus_ dei qui_ tollis|_ peccata_|_ mūdi_|_|_ miserere_|_|_ no--bis_ // Agnus-dei_|_ qui tollis_|_| peccata_ mūdi Miserere_ no--bis_ // Agnus_ dei_|_ qui | tollis_ peccata_ mūdi / Dona |_|_ nobis_ pa--cem_ Tr: A- gn[9]_ dei_|_|_ qui_ tollis_|_|_| peccata_ mūdi_ Miserere_ nobis // Agnus_ dei_|_|_ qui_ tollis_ peccata_ | mūdi_ Miserere_| nobis_ // Agnus dei_|_|_ (/) Dona|_|_ nobis_ pacem_ T: A-gnus_ dei- qui_ tollis_ // // Agnus_ dei_|_ / Dona_|_ nobis_|_ pacem Ct: Agnus dei_ // // A-gnus- dei_|_|_ / Dona-nobis_	S: **A**Gnus_ de--|--i_ Qui_ tollis_ pc̄ta|_ mon--di_ mise|--re--re_ no--bis_ / Agnus_ de--i_ Qui | tollis_ pc̄ta_ mondi_ miserre_ | no--bis_ // **A**Gnus_ de--i_ Qui | tol--lis_ peccata_|_ mun--di_ Dona_|_ no--bis_ pa-- CtA: **A**Gnus_ de--i_ qui--|--i- Qui_ tollis_|_|_ no--bis_ / AGnus_ de--|--i- Qui tollis pc̄ta_ mondi_ mise|rere_ no--bis_ // Agnus dei_ Qui_ tollis_|_ peccata_ mun--|--di_ Dona_|_ no--bis_ pa--|--cem_ T: Qui- tollis_ peccata ,pmdo_ misere--|--re_ no--bis_ // AGnus_ dei_ Qui tollis | pecca--ta_ mun--di_ | do--na_ nobis_ | pa--cem_

CtB: Qui tol--lis_ peccata_|_ mondi_|_ misere--re_ no--bis_ // AGnus_ dei_ Qui_ tollis_|_ pc̄ta_ mū--di_ dona_|_ no--bis_|_ pa--cem_

Missa Sanguis sanctorum

VerBC 755	VatS 51
Kyrie	Kyrie
D: yrie_|_ Eleson / Xpriste_|_ eleyson / yrie_|_ eley--son	S: **K**yrie_|_ ley--son / Xp̄riste_|_|_ leyson_ / Kyrie_|_ ley--|-son
CtA: _Kyrie_ Ley--son / Xp̄e_ Leyson / Kyrie_|_ Ley--son	CtA: Kyrielei--|--son / priste_ ley--|--son_ / yrie_|_ ley--|--son
T: Sanguis sancto4_ Kyrie_ Leyson_ / Xp̄e_ Le--yson_ / Kyrie_ Ley--son	T: Kyrieley--son_ / Cristeleyson_|_ leyson_ / Kyrieley--|--son
CtB: _Kyrie_ Ley--son / Xpriste_ Eley--son / Kyrie_|_ Leyson	CtB: Kyrie_|_ leyson / Xpriste_|_ leyson / Ky--|--rie_ ley--|--son
Gloria	Gloria
D: T in terra pax homini--b3_ bone volunta--tis | Gratias_ agimus_ Ti--bi propter_ magnā gloriam_ tu--|am domi--ne de--us_ Rex_ ce--les--tis deus | pater omni--po--tens dn̄ē fili unigeni--te Domine de9 agn·9 | de--i_ fi--li--us pa--tris // Ui_ tol-lis_ pec--ca--ta_ mū--di_|_ mi--se--re--re_ no--bis_ Qui tollis pc̄ta mū|--di suscipe dep̄cationē nostrā Qui sedes adexteram_ pa--tris | miserere_ no--bis Qui̇̃ tui solus_ sanc--tus_ | Tu solus domin·9_ Tu solus_ altissi--m9 Cū | sancto spiri--tu In gl̄ā dei_ pa--tris_ A--men_	S: **E**T in terra pax ho-mini-b9-- bone volun|tis Gr-ās agim9- tibi_ propter | magnam gloria3 tua3_ domine deus rex celestis_|_ de-us pater omnipotens- domine fili- uni|ge-nite domine deus_ agnus_ dei_| filius_ patris_ // **Q**ui tollis_ pecca-ta mundi_|_ miserere_ nobis_ Qui toll|--lis peccata mundi_ suscipe deprecacionem nr̄a3- Qui- | se-des ad dexteram patris misere- nobis_ Quoniā tu solus | sanctus_ Tu solus dominus Tu solus-alitssimus ihesu- | Cum sancto spiritu in gloria dei patris_| A--M--E--N
CtA: _Et in terra pax hominibus bone volū--tatis_ Laudam9 te | benedicim·9_ te_ adoram·9 te glorificamus_ te_ Gratias agimus | Tibi_|_|_ Filius_ pa--|--tris_ // _Qui tollis pc̄ta mūdi miserere no--bis_|_ Qui Tollis pc̄ta mūdi susci-pe deprecationē nostrā_|_|_|_ Cū sancto_ Amen_	CtA: Et in tera- pax homībus bone volūta-tſ | Lauda-m9 te- benedicim- te Ado-ra-mus Glorificam9 | te_ Gracias ag-i-m9 tibi- propter m-ag-na3 | gloria3 tua3 Domine deus re-x celestis deus pater_ omni--|--potēs_ Domine-deus_ agnus_|_ dei filius_ pr̄īs_ // Qui tollis-pecca--ta mundi_| miserere- no-bis_ Qui tollis peccata mundi | suscipe deprecatione3 nostra3_|_|_|_ in_ | gloria_ dei_ patris_ Amen_
T: Gratias a-gi-m9_ T-i-bi propter_ Domine | de--us_ unigeni--te_ Filius_ pa--tris // Qui tollis pc̄ta mūdi suscipe deprecastionē | nostrā_ Jhesu_ xpris--te_ Cū sancto_ A--men_	T: -Grās agimus tibi ꝑpter_ | ihesu xpriste_ unigenite filius_ patris_|_ // Qui tollis peccata mundi suscipe deprel|cationē nrām ihesu xpriste_ | in gloria dei patris Amen
CtB: Laudam9 te benedicim9- te- glorificam9 te_|_ Gratias agim9- Tibi_|_|_ filius pa--tris // Qui tollis pc̄ta mūdi suscipe deprecationē	CtB: Laudamus te benedicimus te Adoramus te | glorificamus t-e Gracias agi-mu-s tibi-ꝑpter magnam gloria3 | tua3- domine fili

nostram|_|_ Jhesu_ xpris--te_ Cū sancto-spiritu In | gl̄ā dei patris A--men_	unige-nite ihesu xp̄e- domine deus | agnus dei_ filius_ patris_ // Qui tollis peccata mundi suscipe depre|cacionem nrām_|_ Cum sancto | in gloria dei patris_ Amen_
CREDO	CREDO
D: Atrem oñipotētem_ Factorē celi Et Terre--|--re Et ī unū dn̄m̄_ Jhesum_ xpris--tū filiū dei unigenitum |_ Et ex pr̄ē_ natū_ 9--s̄b̄stantialem pr̄ī ꝑ- quē omnia facta_|_ sunt Qui ꝓp̄t nos homi--nes et ꝓpter nostrum_ salutem_ | descendit de_ ce--lis_ Et Incarnatus_ est de sp̄ū sanc--|--to Ex- maria-virgine_ Crucifixus | Etiam pro nobis_ sub pontio_ pila--to_ passus_ et | sepultus_ est // T Resurrexit tertia die_ Secūdū_ scriptu--ras Et ascendit in | celū sedet_ addexterā patris Et Iterū ventur·[9] ē 9 gl̄ā Iudicare_ vivos et- mor--|tu--os Cui·[9] Regni nō erit finis Et In sp̄m̄ sc̄tm domi--num Et vivifican--|te3 Qui ex pr̄ē et filio--q̄ procedit Qui cū pr̄ē et filio simul adorat·[2] Et cūglorifica|--tur Qui locut·[9] est ꝑ ꝓphetas Et unā sancta3 Chāca3_ | Confiteor unū baptisma_ In Remissionem peccato2 Et vitam ventu|ri secu--li_ A--men	S: **P**Atrem omnipotente3 factorem_ celi_ et_ ter--|--re Et_ in unum dominum ih̄m xpristum filiu3|_ dei unigenitum Et- ex pr̄ē-natum ante omnia se-cula | per quē oīa facta s̄t- Qui propter nos homines et ꝓpter nr̄ā3_ | salute descendit_ de_ celis_ Et incarnates est-de spiritu|_ sancto ex ma--ria_ virgine_ Crucifixus etiam | pro_ no--bis_ sub_ pontio_ pylato_ passus_ et sepultus_|- est_ // **E**T resurexit tercia die_ secundu3 scripturas_ Et | ascendit in celū- sedet ad- dexteram patris 7 ite2 vētur[9] | est cum gloria iudicare vivos et mortuos cui[9] regni non erit finis Et ī | sanctum dominum et v-ivificāte3 q̄ ex pr̄ē filioq̄ ꝓcedit Qui cum patre | et filio simul adoratur_ et_ conglorificatur_ Qui locutus ē | per prophetas Et una3 sanctā Confiteor unu3 Baptisma ī remis|sionē peccato2 Et vitam venturi seculi Amen_
CtA: _Patrem omnipotētem factorem celi Et Terre visibiliū omī_ // _Et Resurrexit tertia die scūd scrip-turas Et a-scendit ī celū sedet | Et Iterū ventur[9] est 9 glora Iudicare vivos 7 mortuos_ Cui[9] Regni nō erit finis |_|_ Et expecto Resurrectionē mortuo2|_ A--men	CtA: Patrem omnipotente3 factorem celi_ | 7 terre_ visibi-liū omī 7 invisibiliu3 Et- in unum_ // Et resurexit 3ª· die sc̄d3 sc̄pturas Et ascendit_ | in celum sed3 addexta3 pr̄īs Et ite2 vētur[9] cū gl̄ā iudicare|_|_|_|- Et vitam venturi seculi_ Amen_
T: _Et in unū dn̄m̄ Jhesū xp̄m filiū dei-unigenitū |_ Et sepultus_ est_ // Cuius- Regni nō erit finis_ | Et apostolicā_ ecclesia--am_ Confiteor_ unū_| A--men	T: Sanguis sancto2 Et_ in unum dn̄m̄_|_ et homo fc̄ts 3 Sub pontio pylato pass[9] 7 sep̄lt[9] est // Cuius regni nō erit finis_|_|_ Et vitam venturi seculi Amen_
CtB: _Visibiliū ōniū Et In--visibilium|_|_|_|_ Et homo_ factus_ est_ // -Cuius Regni non-erit finis Et In sp̄m̄|_|_|_ A--men	CtB: Visibilium_| et invisibi-lium_|_|_ Et homo- factus est_ | Sub pontio pylato passus et sepultus est_ // Cuius regni non erit finis_|_|_|_ Et vitam venturi seculi Amen_
SANCTUS	SANCTUS
D: Anc--tus | Sanc--tus do--mi--|nus de--us sab--|--ba--oth Ple--ni- sunt ce--li Et_ terra | gl̄ā tu--a Osan--na In excel--sis // Ene--dic--	S: **S**Anctus_ san--ctus_|_ Sanc--tus_ do--|minus_ de--us_|_ sabaoth Pleni_|_ sunt celi et terra_ Osanna_ in_ excelsis_|_ // **B**Enedic--

|--tus Qui ve--nit In no|--mi--ne do--mi--ni | Osanna_ In ex--cel--|--sis

CtA: _Sanctus_ sanc--tus|_ domi-nus de--|--us sab--ba--oth_|_ Pleni_ sunt_ cel--li Osan|na_ In_ ex--cel--sis // _Enedictus_ qui venit_ in- no--|--mi--ne_| do--mi--ni Osanna_|_ In_ Ex--cel--|--sis

T: _Sanctus sanct·[9]_ dn̄s deus_|_ Tu-a_ Osanna In_ excel--sis_ // _Qui venit In nomine dn̄ī_ | do--mi--ni Osanna_ In_ ex--cel--|--sis

CtB: Sanctus_ sanct[9]_ dn̄s_ de|--us sab--|--ba--oth_ Glori|a_ Tu--a Osanna_ In | ex--cel--sis // Qui- ve--nit_ in nomi--ne | Do--mi--ni_ -Osanna_ In ex--cel--|--sis_

|--tus_ Qui ve--|--nit in_ nomine_ do--|--mini Osanna_ in_|_ excelsis_

CtA: Sanc-tus_|_ Sanctus_ sanct[9]_|_ do--mi--nus_ deus sabaoth_|_ Pleni sunt celi_ | Osanna_ in _ excelsis_ // **B**Ene--dictus_|_ Qui venit_ | in_ nomine_ do--|mini_ Osan--na_|_ in excelsis_

T: Sanctus sanctus_|_ Osanna_ in excelsis_ // Qui venit_ in_ | nomine_ domini_ Osanna_|_ in excelsis_

CtB: Sanctus sanctus_ sanctus do--|minus_ deus_|_ Sabaoth_| Gloria tu--a Osanna_ in_ excel--|--sis_ // Qui_ venit_ in_|_ nomine_ domini_ Osanna|_ in_ excel--|--sis_

Critical Apparatus

Missa Accueille ma la belle

Kyrie

Incipit: Kyrie

Witness: **VatS 51**, ff. 6*v*–8*r*

Mensuration signs: Kyrie ○; Christe ¢; Kyrie ϕ

Voices and clefs: [*Supremum*] C1; *Contra*[*tenor Altus*] C3–C2; *Tenor* C3; *Contra*[*tenor Bassus*] F3

Paratexts: 'Caron' top of f. 6*v*; 'Acueille malabelle' stave 7, f. 6*v*; 'Ꝟte' staves 6 and 10, f. 7*r*

Text Remarks:

S	27,3	Sm
CtA	30, 6	black
S	14,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtA	14,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtA	65,1	erased corona
CtB	65,1	erased corona
CtA	116,7	difficult reading due to manuscript corruption, conjectural

Gloria

Incipit: Et in terra

Witness: **VatS 51**, ff. 8*v*–10*r*

Mensuration signs: Et in terra ○; Domine Deus S: ○, ⊂, ¢; CtA: ○, ϕ3; Qui tollis ¢Voices and clefs: [*Supremum*] C1; *Contra*[*tenor Altus*] C3; *Tenor* C3; *Contra*[*tenor Bassus*] F3

Paratexts: 'Duo' stave 6, f. 8*v* and stave 5 f. 9*r*; 'dñe de9' stave 10 f. 9*r*

Text Remarks:

S	15,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtA	15,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtA	89,2	*b*
CtA	155,4	Sm
T	168,1	♯ under the note, added later

CREDO

INCIPIT: Patrem omnipotentem

WITNESS: **VatS 51**, ff. 10*v*–13*r*

MENSURATION SIGNS: Patrem omnipotentem ○; Et resurrexit ○, ○3; Et ascendit ¢; Et unam sanctam ϕVOICES AND CLEFS: [*Supremum*] C1; *Contra*[*tenor Altus*] C3; *Tenor* C3; *Contra*[*tenor*] *Bassus* F3

PARATEXTS: 'Duo' stave 1, ff. 11*v*–12*r*; '℣te' stave 6 f. 12*r*; 'verte' stave 10 f. 12*r*

TEXT REMARKS:

CtA	16,2	stem missing, due to corruption of ms.
S	20,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtA	20,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtB	71,3–4	difficult reading due to corruption of ms., conjectural
CtA	104,3–105,1	black
S	120,1	*punctum* after the note
T	214,1	♯ under the note, added later

SANCTUS

INCIPIT: Sanctus

WITNESS: **VatS 51**, ff. 13*v*–15*r*

MENSURATION SIGNS: Sanctus ○; Osanna I ¢; Osanna II ϕ

VOICES AND CLEFS: [*Supremum*] C1; *Contra*[*tenor Altus*] C3; *Tenor* C3–C2; *Contra*[*tenor Bassus*] F3–F2

PARATEXTS: 'Duo' stave 6, f. 13*v*, stave 5 f. 14*r*, stave 3 ff. 14*v*–15*r*; 'pleni tacet' stave 10 ff. 13*v*–14*r*; 'Benedict9 tacet' stave 9 ff. 14*v*–15*r*

TEXT REMARKS:

S	4,3	black
S	11,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtA	31,1	*color*
S	39,1	♯ added later
CtA	42,6	M
S	66,5	Sm
S	166,2	*c*, corrected to avoid the clash with *b*♭ in CtA

AGNUS DEI

INCIPIT: Agnus Dei

WITNESS: **VatS 51**, ff. 15*v*–17*r*

MENSURATION SIGNS: Agnus Dei I ○; Agnus Dei II ¢

VOICES AND CLEFS: [*Supremum*] C1; [*Contratenor Altus*] C3; *Tenor* C3; *Contra*[*tenor Bassus*] F3

PARATEXTS: 'Duo' stave 5, ff. 15*v*–16*r*; '29 agnus tacet' stave 9 f. 15*v*; '29 tacet' stave 10 f. 16*r*

TEXT REMARKS:

CtA	12,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtB	23	difficult reading due to corruption of ms., conjectural
CtB	33,3–6	difficult reading due to corruption of ms., conjectural
CtA	132,2	*c*, corrected to avoid the clash with *b*♭ in CtA
CtB	139,2	*F*, corrected to avoid the clash with *g* in CtA
CtA	148,1	♯ under the note, added later
T	152,3	difficult reading due to corruption of ms., conjectural

Missa Clemens et benigna

Kyrie

Incipit: Kyrie

Witness: **ModE M.1.13** ff. 140*v*–141*r* • **TrentC 89** ff. 378*v*–379*r*

Mensuration signs: Kyrie ○; Christe ¢; Kyrie: ϕ (Mod) • ○ (Tr89)

Voices and clefs: [*Discantus*] C1; *Contratenor Altus* C3; *Tenor* C3; *Contratenor Bassus* F3

Paratexts: **ModE M.1.13** 'Caron: Clemens et benig̃' top of f. 140*v*; 'Tenor' stave 7, f. 140*v*; 'Clemēs et benigna' stave 7, f. 140*v*; 'Contra' stave 1, f. 141*r*; 'Bassus' stave 5, f. 141*r* • **TrentC 89** 'Tenor' stave 5, f. 378*v*; 'Contrā 1⁹' stave 1, f. 379*r*; 'Conī bass⁹' stave 5, f. 379*r*

Comparison with TrentC 89

CtA	1,1	B, Sb
CtB	1,1–2,2	L col–B col, B
D	3,2	♭
CtA	4,4	correction from M to Sb
T	5,1	Sb, Sb
D	9,4–5	*g* M p.a., *f* Sm, *f* Sm, *e* Sm
CtA	9,4	missing
D	11,1–12,1	B, Sb
T	17,1	lig
CtB	18,2	no ♭
D	19,3–20,2	*cc* Sb p.a., *bb* M, *bb* M, *aa* M
CtB	27	no lig
CtB	27,2–28,1	lig
CtB	28–29	no lig
D	35,2–36,1	no lig, no col
CtB	37–38	no lig
CtA	39–42,1	*gg* Sb, *dd* M p.a., *ee* Sm, *ff* Sb, *gg* Sb, *ff* Sb col, *ee* M col, *cc* Sb–*dd* Sb, *cc* Sb, *aa* B
T	49,3	correction from Sm to M
D	51,4–7	*g* Sb, *f* M

Gloria

Incipit: Et in terra

Witness: **ModE M.1.13** ff. 141*v*–145*r* • **TrentC 89** ff. 379*v*–382*r*

Mensuration signs: Et in terra ○; Qui tollis ¢; Cum Sancto Spiritu ϕ

VOICES AND CLEFS: [*Discantus*] C1; *Contratenor Altus* C3; *Tenor* C3; *Contratenor Bassus* **ModE M.1.13** F3–F4 • **TrentC 89** F3

PARATEXTS: **ModE M.1.13** 'Tenor' stave 7, ff. 141*v*, 143*v*, 144*v*; 'Contra' stave 1, ff. 142*r*, 143*r*, 144*r*, 145*r*; 'Bassus' stave 7, f. 142*r*, stave 6, ff. 143*r*, 144*r*, 145*r*; 'tenor tacet' stave 7, f. 142*r*; • **TrentC 89** 'Tenor' stave 6, ff. 379*v*, 381*v*; 'Clemens et benigna' stave 6, f. 379*v*; 'Contrā 1[9]' stave 1, ff. 380*r*, 382*r*, stave 5, f. 380*v*; 'Tenor 2 Bassus' stave 5, f. 380*r*; 'Contra 2 bassus' stave 1, f. 381*r*, stave 5, f. 382*r*

TEXT REMARKS:

D	9,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtA	9,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtB	45,3	*C*, correction *ope codicum* to avoid the clash with *dd* in the D

COMPARISON WITH TRENTC 89

CtA	–	no flat key signature
T	–	no flat key signature
CtA	9,1	*signum congruentiae* missing
T	9–13	lig
D	13,1–2	lig
CtB	13,2–14,1	no lig
CtA	16,2–3	lig
D	18,2	correction from (B) to (Sb)
CtA	23,3–24,1	Sb p.a.
CtA	23,3–24,2	lig
CtA	25,5–7	M p.a., C, C
CtB	31,2	*F* Sb, *D* Sb
T	32,3	*a*
CtB	34,4–5	Sb p.a.
D	40,1	*dd* Sb, *dd* M
CtA	44,4–5	lig
CtA	45,2	correction from Sm to M
CtB	45,3	*D*
CtB	46,3–47,1	lig
D	48,4–49,2	*g* Sm, *f* M, (M), *d* M p.a., *e* Sm
CtA	49,3–4	M, M
D	54,1–2	*dd* M, *ff* M, *ee* M
CtB	55,1–2	B p.p.
CtB	59,3–4	Sb p.a.
CtA	72,2	col
CtB	73,1	no lig
CtB	75–76	lig

CtB	77–78	lig
D	78,1	♭
CtA	79–80	no lig
CtB	80	no lig
CtB	80,2–81,1	lig
CtB	81	no lig
D	81,2	(Sb)
CtB	81,2–82,1	lig
CtB	82	no lig
CtA	82,1–3	*bb* M, *aa* Sm, *bb* Sm
D	83,2–84,1	B
CtB	89	no lig
CtB	89,2–90,1	lig
CtB	90	no lig
CtB	92–93	no lig
CtB	94	no lig
CtB	94,2–95,1	lig
CtB	95–96	no lig
CtB	111,2–112,1	no lig
CtA	119,2–120,1	no lig
CtA	120	lig
CtA	120,2–121,1	no lig
CtA	121	lig
CtA	121,2–122,1	no lig
D	140	no lig
D	140,2–141,1	lig
D	145,1–2	lig
CtA	145,1–2	lig
CtA	145,3–146,1	no lig
CtA	146,1–2	lig
CtB	148,3–4	lig
CtA	155,3–156,2	*d* Sb, *d* M, *d* Sb

Credo

Incipit: Patrem omnipotentem

Witness: **ModE M.1.13** ff. 145*v*–149*r* • **TrentC 89** ff. 382*v*–385*r*

Mensuration signs: Patrem ○; Crucifixus ¢; Confiteor ○

Voices and clefs: [*Discantus*] C1; *Contratenor Altus* C3; *Tenor* C3; *Contratenor Bassus* F3

Paratexts: **ModE M.1.13** 'Tenor' stave 7, ff. 145*v*, 147*v*, stave 8, f. 148*v*; 'Clemēs et benigna' stave 7, f. 145*v*; 'Contra' stave 1, ff. 146*r*, 147*r*, 148*r*, 149*r*; 'Bass9' stave 7, f. 146*r*; 'tenor tacet',

stave 8, f. 146*r*; 'Bassus' stave 6, ff. 147*r*, 148*r*, 149*r*; • **TrentC 89** 'Tenor' stave 6, f. 382*v*, stave 7, f. 384*v*; 'Contra 1[9]' stave 1, f. 383*r*, stave 5, f. 383*v*; 'Conī[02] bassus' stave 6, f. 383*r*; 'Contratenor bassus' stave 1, f. 384*r*; 'Contra[02] 1[9]' stave 1, f. 385*r*; 'Contra[02] 2 bassus' stave 5, f. 385*r*

TEXT REMARKS:

CtA	12,1	*signum congruentiae*
D	30,3	*f* Sb added *ope codicum* to avoid hypometry
CtB	38,5	G, correction *ope codicum* to avoid the clash with *a* in CtA and *aa* in T
CtA	235	(Sb) added *ope codicum* to avoid hypometry

COMPARISON WITH TRENTC 89

CtA	12,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtA	12,1	B p.p.
CtA	14,2–3	M, M
CtA	16,1	Sb, Sb
CtA	25,5–26,2	Sb p.a.
D	28,6	*e*
D	30,3	*f* Sb
D	32,4–5	M, M
CtA	34,1	col
CtB	38,5	*F*
D	39,2–3	Sb col, M col
T	39,3–4	lig
CtA	41,2	Sb, M
CtA	46,1–2	B p.p.
CtB	47,1–2	no lig
CtB	47,2–3	lig
D	49,2–3	correction from C to Sm
D	51,3	♭
CtB	55,1–2	B p.p.
CtA	60,1	♯
CtB	60,4–5	lig
CtA	61,3–4	lig
D	64,3–5	M p.a., C, C
D	68,4–5	M p.a., Sm
CtA	68,5–69,1	lig
D	69,2–3	M p.a., Sm
D	73,2–3	Sb col, M col
CtB	75,2	*F*
CtB	79,2	*G*
CtA	89,2	*d*

CtA	100,3-101,1	B
T	104-105	L
T	106-107	L no lig
CtB	110-113	lig Sb-Sb, lig B-L
CtB	114	no lig
T	117,2-118,1	no lig
T	118,3-120,1	lig
CtA	119,2-120,1	lig
CtA	120,2	no lig
CtA	126-127	lig
CtA	128-129	no lig
CtB	131-132	lig
D	132	lig
CtB	133,2-134,2	Sb, B
CtB	159-161	lig
CtB	162	lig
-	165-229	missing
D	231,2-3	*cc* Sb p.a.
CtA	231,3	no col
CtA	235-236	(Sb), *f* M p.a., *g* Sm, *aa* Sb, *aa* Sb p.a., *g* Sb p.a.
D	236,5-7	M, Sm, Sm
D	245,2-3	Sb col, M col
T	245,4-246,1	no lig

SANCTUS

INCIPIT: Sanctus

WITNESS: **ModE M.1.13** ff. 149*v*-151*r* • **TrentC 89** ff. 385*v*-387*r*

MENSURATION SIGNS: Sanctus ○; Osanna I ¢; Benedictus ○

VOICES AND CLEFS: [*Discantus*] C1; *Contratenor Altus* C3; *Tenor* C3; *Contratenor Bassus* F3

PARATEXTS: **ModE M.1.13** 'Tenor' stave 7, f. 149*v*, stave 6, f. 150*v*; 'pleni tacet' stave 9, f. 149*v*; 'Contra' stave 1, ff. 150*r*, 151*r*; 'Bassus' stave 6, f. 150*r*, stave 5, f. 151*r*; • **TrentC 89** 'Tenor' stave 6, f. 385*v*, stave 5, f. 386*v*; 'Clemens et benigna' stave 6, f. 385*v*; 'Contra 1°' stave 1, ff. 386*r*, 387*r*; 'Contra 2 bassus' stave 5, f. 386*r*; 'Contra^{02}' stave 4, f. 387*r*

TEXT REMARKS:

D	9,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtA	9,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtB	19,3	*E*, correction *ope codicum* to avoid the clash with *dd* in D and *f* in CtA and T

CtB	31,3	*G*, correction *ope codicum* to avoid the clash with *aa* in D and *a* in CtA
T	88	(B) added *ope ingenii*

Comparison with TrentC 89

CtA	-	flat key signature
T	-	flat key signature
CtA	9,1	*signum congruentiae*
D	10,2-3	no lig
CtB	13,1	col
D	14,1-2	Sb p.a.
CtA	14,4-15,4	Sb p.a., M, M
T	16,1	no col
D	16,4-17,1	Sb, M
T	18,1	no col
CtB	19,3	*D*
CtB	22,3-4	M, M
CtB	26,1	*d*
D	31,3	*bb*
CtB	31,3	*F*
D	35,1-2	Sb col, M col
CtB	36,3-4	lig
CtA	43-45,1	no lig
CtB	47-49	lig
CtA	47,2-48,1	lig
CtA	48,2-49,1	no lig
T	49-51	L, (B)
D	62,2-65,1	lig
D	68,2-69,1	no lig
CtB	68,2-69,1	no lig
T	69	no lig
CtB	69	lig
D	69,2-71,1	no lig
D	69,2-70,1	lig
T	69,2-70,1	lig
T	70-71,1	no lig
CtB	70-71,1	no lig
CtA	71,2-72,1	lig
CtB	75	lig
CtB	75,2-77,1	no lig
T	76-79	lig
CtB	78-79	no lig
CtB	79	*Γ*
T	80-88	missing
CtB	85,1-2	no lig

CtB	87,5	no ♭
D	92,2-3	*ff* M, *ee* M
CtB	93,4-95,1	no lig
T	95,2-3	M p.a., Sm
CtB	95,4-96,1	no lig
CtB	98,4	*F*
CtA	98,5	*aa* M

Agnus Dei

Incipit: Agnus Dei

Witness: **ModE M.1.13** ff. 151*v*–152*r* • **TrentC 89** ff. 387*v*–388*r*

Mensuration signs: Agnus Dei I ○; Agnus Dei II ¢; Agnus Dei III ○

Voices and clefs: [*Discantus*] C1; *Contratenor Altus* C3; *Tenor* C3; *Contratenor Bassus* F3

Paratexts: **ModE M.1.13** 'Tenor' stave 6, f. 151*v*; 'Contra' stave 1, f. 152*r*; 'Bassus' stave 6, f. 152*r*; • **TrentC 89** 'Tenor' stave 5, f. 387*v*; 'Contra^{02} 1^{9}' stave 1, f. 388*r*; 'Contra^{02} 2 bassus' stave 5, f. 388*r*;

Text Remarks:

D	6,1	*signum congruentiae*

Comparison with TrentC 89

CtA	–	flat key signature
T	–	flat key signature
CtA	6,1	*signum congruentiae*
T	8,1-9	-B, *f* M, *e* M, *d* B, *c* Sb
CtB	14,2	*a* Sm, *b*♭ Sm
T	18,4-5	M p.a., Sm
D	19,2-4	*e* Sb-*d* Sb
CtA	20,2-3	*e* Sm, *d* Sm, *c* M, *e* M
CtA	21,5-22,3	*f* M p.a., *e* Sm, *d* Sb
CtA	28	no lig
CtA	28,2-29,1	lig
CtA	29,2	no lig
CtB	33,2-34,1	no lig
CtA	46-47	-*b* B-*c* Sb col, *b* Sm col, *a* Sm col
D	50	no lig
CtB	50-51,1	lig
T	53-54	lig
T	55-59	lig

D	56,3–57	*aa* M, *g* M, *bb* Sb p.a., *aa* Sm, *g* Sm
CtA	58,1	no lig
D	58	missing
CtB	64,2	*F*
CtB	69	B, Sb

Missa Jhesus autem transiens

Kyrie

Incipit: Kyrie

Witness: **VatS 51**, ff. 46*v*–47*r*

Mensuration signs: Kyrie ○; Christe ¢/𝐂 (S); Kyrie ϕ

Voices and clefs: [*Supremum*] C1; [*Contratenor Altus*] C3–C4; *Tenor* C3; [*Contratenor*] *Bassus* C4

Paratexts: 'Tenor' stave 7, f. 46*v*; 'Jhs̄ autem transiens' stave 7 f. 46*v*; 'Bassus' stave 7, f. 47*r*

Text Remarks:

S	21	Mensuration sign 𝐂. Probably the scribe forgot the *virgula*.
S	60,5–6	Sm. Corrected to avoid hypermetry.

Gloria

Incipit: Et in terra

Witness: **VatS 51**, ff. 47*v*–49*r*

Mensuration signs: Et in terra ○; Qui tollis: ¢/𝐂 (T); Cum Sancto Spiritu: ϕ

Voices and clefs: [*Supremum*] C1; [*Contratenor Altus*] C3–C4; *Tenor* C3–C4; [*Contratenor Secundus*] C4

Paratexts: 'Caron' top of f. 47*v*; 'Canon | Recte sursum quarta3 superade colori | post color aufert^{2} ꝑmeando per dyapēte | Ut prius hinc iterās cū pausis tolle colores' stave 7 f. 47*v*; 'Tenor' stave 8, ff. 47*v*, 48*v*; 'Jhesus autem transiens' stave 8, ff. 47*v*, 48*v*; 'Contratenor 2^{9}' stave 6, f. 48*r*

Text Remarks:

S	9,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtA	9,1	*signum congruentiae*
S	35,1	*signum congruentiae*
Ct2	35,1	*signum congruentiae*
T	55	(B), B G. The rest has been removed to avoid hypermetry.
CtA	98,1–2	difficult reading due to corruption of ms., conjectural

Credo

Incipit: Patrem omnipotentem

WITNESS: **VatS 51**, ff. 49*v*–51*r*

MENSURATION SIGNS: Patrem omnipotentem ○; Crucifixus ¢/○ (T); Confiteor ϕ

VOICES AND CLEFS: [*Supremum*] C1; [*Contratenor Altus*] C3–C4; *Tenor* C3; [*Contratenor Bassus*] C4

PARATEXTS: 'Tenor' stave 9, f. 49*v*, stave 8, f. 50*v*; 'Jhesus autem transiens' stave 9, f. 49*v*, stave 7, f. 50*v*; 'per medium illorum ibat' staves 9–10, f. 49*v*

TEXT REMARKS:

S	8,2	difficult reading due to corruption of ms., conjectural
S	9,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtB	9,1	*signum congruentiae*
S	37,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtB	37,1	*signum congruentiae*
S	79,1	*signum congruentiae*
S	122,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtA	122,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtB	122,1	*signum congruentiae*

SANCTUS

INCIPIT: Sanctus

WITNESS: **VatS 51**, ff. 51*v*–53*r*

MENSURATION SIGNS: Sanctus ○; Osanna I ¢; Osanna II ϕVOICES AND CLEFS: [*Supremum*] C1; *Contratenor* [*Altus*] C3–C4; *Tenor* C3–C4; [*Contratenor Bassus*] C4

PARATEXTS: 'Tenor' stave 9, f. 51*v*; 'Jhesus autem transiens' stave 9, f. 51*v*; 'duo' stave 5, f. 51*v*, stave 8 f. 52*r*, stave 3 f. 52*v*, stave 7, f. 53*r*; 'Pleni tacet' stave 10 f. 51*v*, stave 4, f. 52*r*; 'Benedictus tacet' stave 9 f. 52*v*, stave 3, f. 53*r*

TEXT REMARKS:

S	8,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtB	8,1	*signum congruentiae*
S	23,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtA	35–59	38 (B)
S	57,6	p.a. missing
CtA	104–154	56 (B)
T	104–154	48 (B)
CtB	145,1	difficult reading, p.a. conjectural

AGNUS DEI

INCIPIT: Agnus Dei

WITNESS: **VatS 51**, ff. 53*v*–55*r*

MENSURATION SIGNS: Agnus Dei I ○; Agnus Dei II ¢

VOICES AND CLEFS: [*Supremum*] C1; *Contratenor* [*Altus*] C3–C4; *Tenor* C3; [*Contratenor Bassus*] C3–C4

PARATEXTS: 'Tenor' stave 9, f. 53*v*; 'Jhesus autem transiens' stave 9, f. 53*v*; 'Contratenor' stave 1, f. 54*r*; 'Duo' stave 5, f. 53*v*, stave 7, f. 54*r*; 'Scd̄s agnus tacet' stave 10 f. 53*v*, stave 3, f. 54*r*; 'Verte folium' stave 10, f. 54*r*

TEXT REMARKS:

S	7,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtB	7,1	*signum congruentiae*
T	28–74	32 (B)
CtB	38,3–4	difficult reading, conjectural

MISSA L'HOMME ARMÉ

KYRIE

INCIPIT: Kyrie

WITNESS: **VatSP B80** ff. 99*r*–100*r* • **VatS 14** ff. 127*v*–128*r*

MENSURATION SIGNS: Kyrie ○; Christe ¢; Kyrie ϕ

VOICES AND CLEFS: **VatSP B80** [*Discantus*] C1; *Contratenor Secundus* C3; *Tenor* C3; *Contratenor Primus* C4 • **VatS 14** [*Discantus*] C1–G2; *Contra*[*tenor Altus*] C3; *Tenor* C3; *Contra*[*tenor Bassus*] C4

PARATEXTS: **VatSP B80** 'F. caron' top of f. 99*r*; 'vt̄ē foliū' stave 2, f. 99*r*; 'Tenor' stave 3, f. 99*r*, stave 6, f. 99*v*; 'lōme lhōme lhōme arme' staves 3, f. 99*r*; 'Contſ^or^ 2^9^' stave 4, f. 99*r*, stave 1, f. 100*r*; 'Contſ^or^ p̄^9^' stave 6, f. 99*r*, stave 6, f. 100*r* • **VatS 14** 'Caron' top of f. 127*v*; 'Tenor' stave 7, f. 127*v*; 'l'ome lome arme' stave 7, f. 127*v*; 'Contra' stave 1 and 6, f. 128*r*

COMPARISON WITH VATS 14

T	3,1	Sb M
CtS	3,3–4	M p.a. Sm
T	5,6–6,1	Sb
D	6,2	no ♭
T	6,6–7,2	no lig
D	10,4–5	Sb *d*
CtS	11,1–2	lig
T	11,1–2	Sb M Sb M
T	12,2	*d*
D	12,4–5	M p.a. *g* Sm *f* Sm *f* Sm *e*
CtS	14–16	no lig
CtS	16–18	lig
CtS	19,1–2	no lig
D	24,2	♭
CtP	28–32	lig
CtP	33–36	lig
CtS	34,1–2	lig
D	37,2–38,1	Sb p.a. M
CtS	38,1	Sb Sb
CtS	39,1–2	no lig
D	40,2–41,1	Sb p.a. *aa* M *g*
CtP	49,1–2	lig
D	51,5–52,2	col
CtS	52,1–2	no col

CtS	52,4–53,1	lig
CtP	54,3–4	no lig
D	55,4	*cc*
T	56,2	no ♯
T	56,4–57,1	Sb M
CtS	57,2–3	col
D	57,3–4	col
D	57,6–58,2	col
D	59,6–60,1	lig
D	60,1	no ♭
CtP	60,1–2	lig
T	61,5–62,2	col
D	62,5–6	col
D	65,1–2	no lig
D	65,4	♭

GLORIA

INCIPIT: Et in terra

WITNESS: **VatSP B 80** ff. 100*v*–102*v* • **VatS 14** ff. 128*v*–130*r*

MENSURATION SIGNS: Et in terra ○; Domine fili unigenite ○; Qui tollis ¢; Cum sancto spiritu ϕ

VOICES AND CLEFS: **VatSP B80** [*Discantus*] C1; *Triplum* C3; *Tenor* C3; *Contratenor* C4 • **VatS 14** [*Discantus*] C1; [*Contratenor Altus*] C3; *Tenor* C2–C3; *Contra*[*tenor Bassus*] C4

PARATEXTS: **VatSP B80** 'Tenor' stave 8, ff. 100*v*, 101*v*, stave 4, f. 102*v*; 'lhōme lhōme arme' stave 8, f. 100*v*; 'Triplū' top left of ff. 101*r*, 102*r*, stave 6, f. 102*v*; 'Contra^or^' stave 7 f. 101*r*; 'Duo' stave 1, ff. 101*v*, 102*r*; 'Contſ^or^' stave 7, f. 102*r*, stave 8, f. 102*v*; 'Vt̄ē foliū' stave 6, f. 102*r*; 'volve foliū', bottom right of f. 102*r* • **VatS 14** 'Duo' stave 6, f. 128*v*, stave 5, f. 129*r*; 'Tenor' stave 9, f. 128*v*, stave 7, f. 129*v*; 'Verte' stave 8, f. 128*v*, stave 6, f. 129*r*; 'dñe fili tacet' stave 10, ff. 128*v*, 129*r*; 'Contra' stave 7, f. 129*r*, stave 6, f. 130*r*

TEXT REMARKS:

D	14,1	originally notated as Sm, corrected in M by the scribe
Tr	36,4	originally notated as Sm, corrected in M by the scribe
Ct	38,1	*D*, corrected in *a* according to VatS 14 to avoid the clash with the *c* in T
T	149	(B) added according to VatS 14
Tr	165,2	*c*, corrected in *d ope ingenii* to avoid the clash with the *bb* in D and the *d* in T

Comparison with VatS 14

Tr	5,1–2	col
D	5,3	Sb
D	5,5	Sb
Tr	5,5	M *c* Sb *a*
D	12,2–3	col
D	13,3	no ♭
D	14,2–3	col
Tr	16,4–5	col
D	18,1	*signum congruentiae*
Tr	18,1	*signum congruentiae*
Tr	19,3–20,1	no lig
Tr	22,3–4	col
D	24,1–2	col
Tr	24,1–2	no lig
Tr	25,2–3	col
Ct	28,4	no ♭
Tr	36,1–2	col
D	36,5–37,2	col
Ct	38,1	*a*
D	39,2–3	col
D	41,3	no ♭
D	41,3–4	col
Tr	43,1	B Sb
Tr	48,5–6	col
T	49,3	Sb M
D	50,5–51,2	col
Tr	52,2–3	col
Ct	54,3–4	lig
Ct	56,1	'divisi', other note is *d*
Tr	58,1–2	no lig
D	68,3–5	no col
Tr	79,3–4	no col
D	82,5	Cr *aa* Cr *g*
Tr	83,4	Cr *a* Cr G
D	85,7	Sm
D	104,1–2	no lig
Tr	110,1–2	no lig
Tr	112–113	no lig
Tr	118,1–2	no lig
Ct	118,1–2	no lig
D	125,2	no ♭
T	125–129	lig

D	127-129	(B) Sb *f*-Sb *g*-B p.a. *bb*
T	131,1	no ♭
T	131,1-2	no lig
T	131,2	*c*
Ct	141,2-142,1	lig
D	146,4	no ♭
D	146,4-147,2	col
T	149	(B)
Tr	164,1-165,1	no lig
D	167,1-2	Sb p.a. *g* M *f* M *f* M *e*
Tr	173,1-174,2	no col
Tr	173,1-2	no lig
D	180,6-181,2	lig
T	181,1-2	lig
Tr	184,2	Sb Sb
T	185,5-6	col
T	188,2-3	no lig
D	189,1-2	no lig
Tr	190,2-3	col
Ct	191,2	♭

CREDO

INCIPIT: Patrem omnipotentem

WITNESS: **VatSP B 80** ff. 102*r*-107*r* • **VatS 14** ff. 130*v*-133*r*

MENSURATION SIGNS: Patrem omnipotentem ○; Et ascendit ○2; Et unam sanctam ○3; Et expecto ϕ

VOICES AND CLEFS: **VatSP B80** [*Discantus*] C1; *Contratenor primus* / *Triplum* C3; *Tenor* C3; *Contratenor Secundus* C4 • **VatS14** [*Discantus*] C1; *Contra*[*tenor Altus*] C3; *Tenor* C3; *Contra*[*tenor Bassus*] C4

PARATEXTS: **VatSP B80** 'Tenor' stave 5, f. 103*r*, stave 9, f. 104*v*, stave 7, f. 105*v*, stave 6, f. 106*v*; 'lhōme lhōme arme' stave 5, f. 103*r*; 'Cōtſ^or^' stave 6, f. 103*v*; 'Cōtſ^or^ 2^9^' stave 9, f. 103*v*, stave 8, f. 105*r*; 'Tenoriȝ Residuū' stave 8, f. 103*v*; 'Triplū' stave 1, f. 104*r*, top left of f. 105*r*; 'Cōtſ 2^9^' stave 7, f. 104*r*, stave 5, f. 106*r*, stave 6, f. 107*r*; 'Duo' stave 1, ff. 104*r*, 104*v*; 'Contſ^or^ p̄^r9^' stave 5, f. 105*r*; 'Contſ p̄^r9^' stave 1, f. 106*r*; 'Verte foliū' stave 4, f. 106*r*; 'Cōtſ p̄^r9^' stave 1, f. 107*r* • **VatS 14** 'Tenor' stave 8, ff. 130*v*, 131*v*, stave 7, f. 132*v*; 'Pontra' stave 1, f. 131*r*; 'Contra'

stave 6, f. 131*r*, stave 7, ff. 132*r*, 133*r*; 'Crucifixus tacet' stave 10, f. 131*r*; 'Duo' stave 1, ff. 131*v*, 132*r*; 'Verte' stave 6, f. 132*r*; 'Ꝑte' stave 7, f. 107*v*, stave 8, ff. 108*v*, 109*v*

TEXT REMARKS:

Tr	18,1	*signum congruentiae*
T	18	(B) added *ope ingenii* according to the *signum congruentiae*
Ct	18	(B) added *ope ingenii* according to the *signum congruentiae*
Tr	29,1	punctum after the note
Tr	71,3–72,5	reading missing in VatSP B80 due to a probable eye-skip of the scribe from the first (M) at 71,2 directly to 73,1
D	128,4	missing in VatSP B80, added according to VatS 14 to avoid hypometry
D	220,3	*g*, corrected in *f ope ingenii* to avoid the clash with the *f* in Tr
Ct	253,2	*a*, corrected in *b* according to VatS 14 to avoid the clash with the *G* in T

COMPARISON WITH VATS 14

Ct	1–21	21 (B)
D	11,4	no ♭
Tr	11,5–6	col
D	11,6–12,4	col
D	14,1–2	col
D	19,1	*signum congruentiae*
Tr	19,1	*signum congruentiae*
Tr	20,3–21,1	no lig
Tr	22,1	B Sb
Tr	23,2	Sm *g* Sm *f*
Tr	23,5–6	col
Tr	24,2	*aa*
Tr	24,3–4	col
Tr	25,2–3	col
Ct	26,2	*G*
Tr	26,3	*c*
T	27,1–28,2	no lig
D	27,4–5	col
Tr	28,3–4	no lig
Tr	29,2–3	col
Tr	29,6	Cr *e* Cr *f*
Tr	30,4–31,1	Sb (M)
D	31,1–2	col
Tr	32,2–3	col
Tr	33,1–2	no lig
D	34,1–2	col
Ct	34,5–6	no col

Tr	35,3-4	col
Tr	35,4	*g*
D	38,1	Sb
Tr	38,2-3	col
D	39,1	Sb p.a.
Tr	39,1-2	col
Tr	40,2-3	col
D	42,3-4	col
Tr	43,2-3	col
D	43,4-5	M p.a. *aa* Sm *g* Sm *g* Sm *f*
Tr	46,1-2	M *D* (M)
D	46,4-5	col
D	48,3-49,1	Sb M
Tr	49,1-2	col
Ct	49,3-4	col
D	49,4-5	col
D	50,2-3	col
Tr	51,6-52,2	col
D	52,4-5	col
Tr	53,2-3	col
D	54,2-3	col
D	54,4-5	M p.a. *g* Sm *f* Sm *f* Sm *e*
Tr	55,3-4	Sm Sm
D	56,1-2	col
Tr	56,1	B Sb
T	57,1	♯
Tr	57,2	*G*
Tr	58,2-3	col
D	58,3-59,1	no lig
T	60,2-3	no lig
D	60,3-4	col
Tr	60,4-61,1	no lig
T	61,5-6	col
Ct	65,1-2	col
Tr	66,6-7	col
D	69,1	(M) M *g*
Tr	69,5-72,4	Sm *d* Sm *e* M *f* B *d* Sb *g* M *f* (M) M *b* M *a* Sb *F* M *G* M *a* M *F* Sb *a*
Ct	70,3	*F*
T	71,2	absent
Ct	73,4	Sm *F* Sm *E*
Tr	75,4-76,1	lig
D	82,6-83,2	col
D	83,3-4	no col
D	87,2-3	col
D	89,8-90,2	col

Tr	90,1–2	col
D	91,2	no ♭
Tr	105–113	lig
D	112,2	B Sb
D	115,1–2	no lig
D	118,5–119,2	col
D	125,1–2	no lig
T	125,1–2	no lig
D	128,3	M *cc* M *bb*
Tr	129,1–2	no lig
Tr	129,2–130,2	B *g* Sb *d*
Ct	133,1–2	lig
Ct	134,1–2	lig
Tr	136,1–2	no lig
Ct	136,1–2	no lig
Tr	141,1–142,1	no col
T	142,1–145,1	lig
D	142,3–143,1	Sb p.a. *bb* M *g*
T	145,1–2	no lig
Tr	147,1–2	col
Tr	149,1–2	no lig
Tr	152,1–2	no lig
Tr	154,1	no lig
Tr	160,1–161,1	B Sb
Tr	163,1–2	no lig
Tr	166,1–2	lig
Ct	171,1–2	no lig
D	180,4–181,2	col
D	182,1–3	Sb *aa* Sb *d*
D	184,4–185,2	no lig
Tr	195,2–3	no col
T	196,2	no col
T	205–206	lig
D	211,1	no ♭
Tr	214,1–2	lig
Ct	214,2	no col
Tr	217,1–218,2	col
T	218,1–2	lig
Ct	220,2–221,1	lig
D	220,3–221,1	lig
Ct	221,2–223,1	lig
T	221,3–223,1	lig
Ct	222,2	absent
D	232,2	*e*
Tr	236,1–2	col

Tr	239,3-240,1	no lig
Ct	240,3-4	lig
D	241,2-3	col
Ct	242,1	♭
D	245,4-246,1	lig
D	245,5-246,1	*e*
Ct	247,3	Sb *G*
Ct	248,1	absent
T	249,1	*G*
Ct	250,1	no ♭
Ct	253,2	*b* ♭
Ct	254,4-5	col

SANCTUS

INCIPIT: Sanctus

WITNESS: **VatSP B80** ff. 107*v*–110*r* • **VatS 14** ff. 133*v*–136*r*

MENSURATION SIGNS: Sanctus ○; Osanna I ¢; Pleni ○2; Osanna II ○

VOICES AND CLEFS: **VatSP B80** [*Discantus*] C1; *Triplum* / *Contratenor primus* C3; *Tenor* C3-C4; *Contratenor Secundus* C4 • **VatS 14** [*Discantus*] C1; [*Contratenor Altus*] C3; *Tenor* C3; *Contra*[*tenor Bassus*] C4

PARATEXTS: **VatSP B80** 'Tenor' stave 7, f. 107*v*, stave 8, ff. 108*v*, 109*v*; 'Pleni tacet' stave 8 f. 107*v*; 'Verte foliū' stave 8 ff. 107*v*; 'Triplū' top left of f. 108*r*; 'Contſ 2^{9}' stave 7, f. 108*r*, stave 8, ff. 109*r*, 110*r* (perpendicular); 'Duo' stave 1, ff. 108*v*, 109*r*, 110*r*; 'Contſ p̄^{9}' stave 4, f. 109*v* (perpendicular), 110r (perpendicular); 'Benedictus tacet' stave 6, f. 110*r* • **VatS 14** 'Verte' stave 5 and 9, f. 133*v*, stave 10, f. 134*r*, stave 6, f. 135*r*; 'Tenor' stave 9, f. 133*v*, stave 8, ff. 134*v*, 135*v*; 'Contra' stave 7, f. 134*r*, stave 8, ff. 135*r*, 136*r*; 'Duo' stave 1, ff. 134*v*–136*r*; 'benedictus tacet' stave 10, f. 135*r*

TEXT REMARKS:

Ct	39,3	*D*, corrected in *E* according to VatS 14 to avoid the clash with the *E* in Tr

COMPARISON WITH VATS 14

Tr	3,3-4	Sb *e*
Tr	4,1-5,3	Sb *g* M *f* M *e* Sb *g* Sb *d* M *c*
D	9,7-10,4	Sm p.a. *ee* Cr *dd* M *ff* M p.a. *ee* Sm *dd*

Tr	15,1	*signum congruentiae*
D	22,1	no ♭
D	22,2-3	col
Tr	24,1-2	no lig
Ct	24,1-2	lig
Tr	24,3-4	col
D	27,3-4	col
Tr	28,4-5	col
Tr	29,5	*G*
T	31-32	absent
Tr	32,3-4	lig
Tr	33,3	*a*
D	35,3-4	col
Tr	36,1-2	col
D	38,2	no ♭
Tr	38,5-39,2	col
Ct	39,3	*E*
D	40,1	B Sb
Ct	40,1	no col
D	42,4-43,1	M p.a. *bb* Sm *cc*
Tr	43,4-44,1	no lig
Tr	45,4-5	no lig
D	56,1-58,1	lig
Tr	63,1-65,1	L B
D	72,1-73,1	no lig
Tr	72,1-73,1	no lig
Tr	75,2-76,1	lig
D	76,1-2	no lig
Tr	76,2	no lig
D	77,3-78,3	Sb col *dd* Cr col *cc* Cr col *bb*
D	83,2-84,1	lig
D	89,1	no lig
D	91,1-92,1	no lig
Tr	92,1-93,1	no lig
D	96,3	Sm *e* Sm *d*
Tr	98,4-99,1	no lig
T	109-111	no lig
Tr	116,1-2	no lig
D	117,3-119,1	no lig
Tr	119,1-120,1	no lig
D	121,1	L
D	123,1	absent
D	125,1-127,1	lig
Ct	125,1-130,1	lig
Tr	125,1-2	lig

Tr	125,2	*b*
Ct	131,2	no ♭
Tr	133,1-2	no lig
Tr	134,2-135,1	*g*
Tr	136,1-2	M M
D	137,1	no lig
Tr	139,1-2	lig
D	146,2-148,1	lig
Tr	147,1-2	no lig
D	154,1-2	lig
Tr	178,1-179,1	no lig
D	183,2	Sb p.a.
D	184,1	absent
Tr	185,1-2	lig
D	190,2-191,1	lig
Tr	193,3-4	no lig
D	194,2	no lig
D	200,3	Sb p.a.
D	201,1	absent
Tr	205,1-2	col
D	216,3	*e*
Ct	217,3-4	lig
D	218,1-2	col
Ct	218,2-3	col
Tr	218,4-219,2	M p.a. *e* Sm *d* M *e*
Tr	221,2-222,1	B L

AGNUS DEI

INCIPIT: Agnus Dei

WITNESS: **VatSP B80** ff. 110*v*-113*r* • **VatS 14** ff. 136*v*-138*r*

MENSURATION SIGNS: Agnus Dei I ○; Agnus Dei II ¢; Dona nobis ○

VOICES AND CLEFS: **VatSP B80** [*Discantus*] C1; *Contratenor primus* C3; *Tenor* C3-C4; *Contratenor secundus* C4 • **VatS 14** [*Discantus*] C1-G2; *Contra*[*tenor Altus*] C3; *Tenor* C2-C3; *Contra*[*tenor Bassus*] C4

PARATEXTS: **VatSP B80** 'Tenor' stave 8, f. 110*v*, stave 6, f. 112*v*; 'Contſ' stave 1, f. 111*r*; 'Contſ 2[9]' stave 8, f. 111*r* (perpendicular), stave 6, f. 113*r* (perpendicular); 'Duo' stave 1, ff. 111*v*-112*r*; 'Verte foliū' between staves 5 and 6, f. 111*v*; 'Residuū c9tſ[2u3]' stave 9, f. 112*v*; 'Resid[m] ī fine p[ri] pag' stave 8, f. 113*r* • **VatS 14** 'Duo' stave 5, ff. 136*v*, 137*r*; 'Tenor' stave 8, f. 136*v*,

stave 7, f. 137*v*; 'agn^{9} tacet' stave 9 f. 136*v*; 'Contra' stave 8, f. 137*r*, stave 1, f. 138*r*, stave 7, f. 138*r*; '2^{9} agn^{9} tacet' stave 10, f. 137*r*

TEXT REMARKS:

CtP	38,3	in VatSP B80 present another Sb *d* before the Sb p.a., it is here accepted the reading in VatS 14 to avoid hypermetry
D	85,3	originally notated as M, then the stem was abraded

COMPARISON WITH VATS 14

D	1,2	no ♭
D	11,2-3	col
D	12,3	♭
D	13,2	*e*
D	13,3-4	col
D	14,1-2	lig
D	14,2-3	col
D	15,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtP	15,1	*signum congruentiae*
D	18,4-5	col
D	20,1-2	col
D	20,3	Sb p.a.
D	20,5	absent
D	21,2-3	col
CtP	24,1-2	col
D	25,2-3	col
D	27,3	*aa*
D	27,3-28,1	lig
D	28,1	no ♭
D	28,1-2	col
D	28,5-29,2	no lig
CtP	29,3-4	col
CtS	29,4	♭
D	29,5	♭
D	29,5-30,4	col
T	32,2	♯
T	32,4-33,1	Sb M
D	33,1-2	col
T	34,1	*f*
CtP	34,1-3	Sb *c* M p.a. *d* Sm *e*
D	34,2	no ♭
T	34,2-3	col
CtP	34,6-7	col
D	37,1-2	col

CtP	40,3–4	M p.a. Sm
CtP	45,2–48,1	lig
CtP	47,2–48,2	col
D	58,3	M *f* Sb *bb*♭ M *aa* M *bb*
D	59,3–60,2	no lig
CtP	60,2	*d*
CtP	61,2	M *d* Sb *b*–Sb *a* M *b*
D	74,3–4	col
D	77,1	*g*
D	82,3–83,1	lig
CtP	82,3–83,1	lig
CtP	83,2–3	lig
T	88,1–89,1	(Sb) B *g*
CtP	95,2–97,2	material lacuna
D	98,2–100,1	lig
T	99,2–100,1	B Sb
CtS	105,2–110,1	lig
CtP	105,3–107,1	Sb–Sb
CtS	111,1	no ♭
CtS	112,1–2	no lig
CtP	114,1–115,1	lig
T	117,1–118,1	lig
D	123,2–125,1	lig
D	127,2	♭
D	127,2–129,1	lig
CtP	127,2–129,1	lig
CtP	128,2–129,1	col
D	129,2–130,1	no lig
CtP	129,3–130,2	dittography
D	130,2–132,1	lig
D	132,2–133,1	lig
CtS	133,1–2	lig
CtP	133,3	absent
CtP	134,1–2	lig
CtS	134,1–135,1	lig
D	136,1	♭
CtS	138,4	*E*
D	139,1–2	col
CtP	140,1	Sm
CtP	140,5	M
T	142,1–2	Sb M Sb M
CtS	142,2–3	lig
CtP	143,1–2	lig
T	143,3	originally M, the stem was abraded and added another M later as in VaSP B80

T	144,3	Sb M
D	144,4–5	col
CtP	145,1–2	M *g* M *e*
T	145,1–2	Sb M Sb M
T	148,1–2	Sb M Sb M
T	148,2	♯
D	149,1–2	col
D	149,3–150,1	lig
T	150,1–2	Sb M Sb M
T	151,1	Sb M
T	151,2–152,1	lig
D	151,7	♭
D	151,7–152,2	col
D	152,3–4	no col
T	154,4–5	Sm *F* M *G*
D	155,4–5	col

MISSA SANGUIS SANCTORUM

KYRIE

INCIPIT: **VerBC 755** Kyrie • **VatS 51** Kyrie

WITNESS: **VerBC755** ff. 36*v*–37*r* • **VatS 51**, ff. 81*v*–82*r*

MENSURATION SIGNS: Kyrie ○; Christe ¢; Kyrie ○

VOICES AND CLEFS: **VerBC 755** [*Supremum*] C1–G1; [*Contratenor Altus*] C3; [*Tenor*] C3; [*Contratenor Bassus*] F3 • **VatS 51** [*Supremum*] C1; *Contratenor* [*Altus*] C3; *Tenor* C3; *Contratenor Bassus* F3

PARATEXTS: **VerBC 755** 'Sanguis sanctorꝫ' stave 8 f. 36*v* • **VatS51** 'Caron' top of f. 81*v*; 'Tenor' stave 7, f. 81*v*; 'Contratenor' stave 1, f. 82*r*; 'Contratenor Bassus' stave 6, f. 82*r*

TEXT REMARKS:

T	5,3	notated as the first element of a lig c.o.p.
S	8,3–9,5	portion of text marked with a circle and rewritten, then crossed out, after the ending of the first Kyrie, probably by another scribe. The main text has the following reading: M *aa*, M *f*, Sb *aa*, Sb *g*, M p.a. *aa*, Sm *g*, Sb *f*, M *e*
S	23,2–24,1	originally in VerBC 755 *aa*, corrected by the scribe

COMPARISON WITH VATS 51

CtB	1,1–2,3	lig Sb *a*–Sb *F*, Sb *D*, lig Sb *D*–Sb *a*, Sb *F*
CtB	3,5–4,1	no lig
S	5,2	♭
CtB	6,1	*G*
S	7,2	no ♭
S	7,2–3	col
S	9,3	*f*
CtA	10,1	lig B *a*–L *c*
CtB	10,1	*F*
S	19,1–2	no lig
S	20,1–2	no lig
S	23,1–24,1	lig
T	23,2–24,1	no lig
S	24,2–5	Sb *aa*, M *g*
CtA	24,2–3	Sb *f*
CtA	30,1–2	no lig
T	31,2–33,1	no lig
S	33,1–2	no lig

T	33,2–35,1	no lig
S	34,1	no ♭
S	34,1–2	no lig
T	34,2–35,2	col
CtB	34,1–2	lig
S	35,1–36,2	no lig
CtB	35,1–40,1	lig
CtA	38–40	L *g*
S	42,3–4	no lig
CtB	44,2	M p.a. *F*, Sm *E*
CtB	45,3–4	col
CtA	47,1–2	col
S	47,2–3	col
CtA	48,1	*g*
CtA	49,2–3	no col
S	50,3–4	col
CtA	51,1–2	(M), Sb *e*
CtB	52,2	no col
CtA	53,2–3	col
S	54,5	no ♭

Gloria

Incipit: **VerBC 755** $_{E}$t in terra • **VatS51** Et in terra

Witness: **VerBC 755** ff. 37*v*–39*r* • **VatS51** ff. 82*v*–84*r*

Mensuration signs: Et in terra ○; Qui tollis ¢

Voices and clefs: **VerBC755** [*Supremum*] C1; [*Contratenor Altus*] C3; [*Tenor*] C3; [*Contratenor Bassus*] F3 • **VatS 51** CS51 [*Supremum*] C1; *Contra*[*tenor Altus*] C3; *Tenor* C3; [*Contratenor*] *Bassus* F3

Paratexts: • **VatS 51** 'Tenor' stave 8, ff. 82*v*, 83*v*; 'Verte folium' stave 10, f. 82*v*, stave 6, f. 83*r*; 'Contra' stave 1, ff. 83*r*, 84*r*; 'Bassus' stave 7, ff. 83*r*, 84*r*

Text Remarks:

CtA	13,4	originally notated as a M, the stem was crossed out and then abraded
CtA	19,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtB	21,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtA	87,2	originally *f*, then abraded and corrected
CtB	94,1	*signum congruentiae*
S	125,1–2	lig c.o.p., corrected according to VatS 51

COMPARISON WITH VATS 51

S	2,1–2	Sb
CtA	6,4–5	Sb *f*
CtA	9,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtB	10,2–3	col
CtA	14,5–6	col
CtA	14,6	*g*
CtA	15,1–3	M *f*
CtB	19,2–20,2	lig
CtA	21,1	*signum congruentiae*
S	21,1	♭
CtA	22,3–4	lig
T	23,1–24,2	lig
S	27,2–3	col
S	28,3–5	M, Sm, Sm
CtA	28,3–5	M p.a., Cr, Cr
CtA	28,7–8	Sm *a*
CtB	33,2–3	no lig
CtA	33,4–5	Sb p.a.
CtA	34,1–2	M, M
S	34,2–3	Sb
CtB	34,2–4	col
CtA	34,2–4	col
CtA	36,1–2	lig
CtB	36,1–2	lig
CtB	36,3	no lig
CtA	39,3–40,1	no lig
S	41,1–3	Sb *aa*, Sb *g*
CtB	45,3–4	no lig
CtB	47,1	no ♭
S	47,2–3	col
CtB	47,2–3	col
S	47,3	*e*
CtB	53,3–4	no lig
S	53,4–54,1	Sb p.a. *d*
CtA	56,1–2	no lig
T	60,1–2	B
S	60,2	♭
S	62,1	♭
T	63,1–2	col
CtB	63,3	*E*
CtB	64,2–3	no lig
CtA	65–66	no *a*
CtB	65,4	*F*

CtA	73,2–74,1	no lig
S	86,1–2	no lig
S	89,3–4	Sb *cc*
S	90,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtA	90,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtA	97,4–98,1	no lig
CtA	104,1–105,1	no lig
CtA	109,3–110,1	M *e*, M *e*, M *d*
CtB	110,1–111,1	no lig
CtB	116,1	no lig
CtB	121,1–2	no lig
S	125,1–2	M, M; it is possible to see lig c.o.p., as in VerBC 755, abraded; correction made by another scribe
S	127,1–2	B
CtB	128–143	lig
S	143,1	(B)
CtA	143,1–144,1	no lig
CtA	145,3–146,1	no lig
CtA	150,2–151,1	no lig
S	152,3–153,4	B *aa*, Sb *g*
CtA	154,2–155,1	no lig
CtB	155,1–156,1	no lig
CtB	158,1–161,1	lig
CtA	158,3–159,4	B *a*, Sb *G*
S	159,2–4	Sm *c*, Sm *b*, Sb *c*
S	173,1	L
CtA	173	(B) before lig
CtA	176,1–177,1	no lig
S	177,2	*g*
T	179	(B) before lig
CtB	181,1–183,1	lig
CtA	181,2–183,1	no lig
CtA	183,2–185,1	no lig
CtB	187	Sb *D* before M; later addition
CtB	188,1	abraded
S	191,1	no ♭
S	192,1–193,1	no lig

CREDO

INCIPIT: **VerBC 755** patrem omnipotentem • **VatS 51** Patrem omnipotentem

WITNESS: **VerBC 755** ff. 39*v*–41*r* • **VatS 51** ff. 84*v*–86*r*

MENSURATION SIGNS: Patrem omnipotentem ○; Et resurrexit ¢

VOICES AND CLEFS: **VerBC 755** [*Supremum*] C1; [*Contratenor Altus*] C3; *ᵀenor* C3; [*Contratenor Bassus*] F3 • **VatS 51** CS51 [*Supremum*] C1–G2; *Contratenor* [*Altus*] C3; *Tenor* C3; [*Contratenor*] *Bassus* F3

PARATEXTS: **VerBC 755** 'Verte foliū ad Residuum' stave 8, f. 39*v*; 'ᵀenor' stave 8, f. 40*v* • **VatS 51** "Sanguis sanctorꝫ' stave 9, f. 84*v*; 'Tenor' stave 9, f. 84*v*, stave 8, f. 85*v*; 'Contratenor' stave 1, ff. 85*r*, 86*r*; 'Bassus' stave 6, f. 85*r*, stave 7, f. 86*r*

TEXT REMARKS:

CtA	13,1	*signum congruentiae*
T	19	rest added *ope ingenii*, according to *signa congruentiae*
CtA	20,3	*signum congruentiae*
CtB	20,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtB	48,3	originally notated as a M, then the stem was abraded
CtB	54,2	originally notated as a M, the stem was crossed out and then abraded
S	135,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtA	135,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtA	137,2–139,1	originally notated as a L, then the stem was abraded. The L is retained in the text according to VatS 51
CtB	143,1	*signum congruentiae*
T	166–171	later addition in the stave above
T	224,2	originally *d*, abraded and corrected in *c*
CtA	261,1	p.a. abraded

COMPARISON WITH VATS 51

CtA	2,1–3,1	lig
S	11,2–3	col
CtA	11,2–3	col
CtB	16,5–17,1	no lig
CtA	19,2–3	col
CtA	19,3	*f*
CtA	19,4–5	Sb *f*
S	20,2	*signum congruentiae*
CtA	23,1–2	lig
CtA	23,3–4	col
CtA	26,1–2	col
S	29,2–3	col
S	29,5–7	col Sb *bb* M *aa*
CtA	31,2–5	col
S	37,2–3	col
CtB	37,4–5	col
CtA	42,2	*d*

CtA	43,5–6	col
CtB	44,7	M *C*, M *C*
S	45,3	♭
S	46,5–6	M, M
CtA	47,1–2	no lig
S	48,3	*cc*
S	50,4–5	col
S	52,2–3	col
CtA	52,5–53,1	no lig
CtA	53,3–4	col
T	54–55	no lig
S	61,2–3	col
CtB	66,1–2	no lig
CtB	66,3–4	col
S	77,2–3	col
S	77,5	♭
S	78,2–3	col
CtA	78,2–79,1	*a*
S	79,2–3	no lig
CtA	79,2	no lig
S	93,3–94,2	B *cc*
S	102,1–2	col
S	102,3–103,4	B *aa*, Sb *g*
CtA	117,1–2	no lig
CtA	128,1–2	no lig
S	129,1–3	col
CtA	131,1–2	no lig
S	132,1–133,1	no lig
CtA	135–136	no lig
CtB	137,1–142,1	lig
CtA	137,2–139,1	L
CtA	139,2–141,1	no lig
CtA	144,1–145,1	no lig
CtA	145,1	(B)
CtB	146,1–148,1	no lig
CtA	147,1–149,1	no lig
CtB	152,1	no lig
CtB	152,1	Sb *D*, Sb *D*
CtA	157,1–2	no lig
CtA	160,1–2	no lig
CtB	163,1–2	no lig
CtB	181,1	no lig
CtA	197,12	lig
CtA	197,2	*f*
CtA	200,2–3	Sb *g*

CtA	201,1-2	no lig
T	214-220	lig
CtA	232,1-2	no lig
CtA	234,1-235,1	lig
CtA	240,1-242,1	lig c.o.p., lig
T	242,1-245,1	no lig
S	243,1-245,1	lig
CtA	243,1-244,1	no lig
CtA	247,1-2	no lig
S	251,2	♭
T	253-256	no lig
CtA	265,1	absent
CtB	266,2-267,3	B *c*, Sb *a*

SANCTUS

INCIPIT: **VerBC 755** ꞩanctus • **VatS 51** Sanctus

WITNESS: **VerBC 755** ff. 41*v*-43*r* • **VatS 51** ff. 86*v*-88*r*

MENSURATION SIGNS: Sanctus ○; Benedictus ¢; Osanna II ϕ

VOICES AND CLEFS: **VerBC 755** [*Supremum*] C1; [*Contratenor Altus*] C3; [*Tenor*] C3; [*Contratenor Bassus*] F3 • **VatS 51** [*Supremum*] C1-G2; *Contratenor* [*Altus*] C3; *Tenor* C3; [*Contratenor*] *Bassus* F3

PARATEXTS: **VerBC 755** 'Verte foliū ad Residuum' • **VatS 51** 'Tenor' stave 8, ff. 86*v*, 87*v*; 'Contratenor' stave 1, f. 87*r*; 'Bassus' stave 6, f. 87*r*, stave 7, f. 88*r*

TEXT REMARKS:

S	4,2	notated as the first element of a lig c.o.p.
CtA	8,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtB	14,2	*signum congruentiae*
S	33,2	*cc* in VerBC 755, corrected according to VatS 51
S	34,2-3	Sm
S	84,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtA	84,1	*signum congruentiae*
CtB	88,1	*signum congruentiae*
T	144,1	♮ under the note

COMPARISON WITH VATS 51

S	5,1-2	lig
CtA	6,8-7,1	M *c*, M *b*

CtA	8,1–9,2	B p.p., (Sb), M *c*
CtB	11,3	*E*
CtA	12,5–13,2	no lig
CtA	14,1–2	B
T	15,1–16,1	no col
CtA	16,1–2	B
T	16,2–17,1	B
S	18,1–2	no lig
CtB	18,1–2	no lig
CtA	19,3–4	col
CtA	20,1–2	no lig
S	33,2	*bb*
S	34,2–3	Sm *f*
S	35,2–3	col
T	35,2–3	col
CtB	37,4–5	Sb
S	38,2	no ♭
CtB	41,4	no col
T	59,2–3	col
T	61,1	absent
S	82,2–83,1	no lig
S	99,1	Sb, Sb
S	99,1–100,1	no lig
CtA	100,1–2	no lig
T	101,1	Sb, Sb
CtB	111,1–2	no lig
S	121,1	no lig
CtB	126,1–2	lig
S	127,1–2	M, M
T	144,1	no ♮
CtB	145,1–2	lig
S	145,2	♭
CtA	149,2–3	B
CtA	152,1	*a*
CtA	152,4–7	Sm, Sm, Cr, Cr
CtA	153,2–3	M p.a. *f*, Sm *e*

Edition of Music

Index

Missa Accueille ma la belle 267

Missa Clemens et benigna 323

Missa Jhesus autem transiens 362

Missa L'homme armé 405

Missa Sanguis sanctorum 456

Missa Accueille ma la belle

Kyrie

16
e
ri - e
21
ley -
26
ley - - -

31
ley - - - son. Chri -
son.
ley - - - son. Chri -
son.
36
ste
ste
42

48
ley - - - - - - son,
Chri -
ley - - - - son,
Chri -
54
ste
ste
60
Chri -

66
ste
Chri -
ley - - - - - - -
72
ste
78

84
90
ley - - - -
ley - - - -
ley - - -
96
son. Ky - ri -
son. Ky - ri -
son. Ky -
son. Ky -

101
e
e
ri – e
ri – – – e
106
111

116
ley - - - -
121
126
ley - - - - - son.
son.
ley - - - - - - son.
ley - - - - son.

Gloria

[*Supremum*]

Et in ter - - - ra

Contra[*tenor Altus*]

Et in ter - ra pax ho-mi - ni - bus bo -

Tenor

Contra[*tenor Bassus*]

6

pax ho -

ne vo - lun - ta - - - - -

11

mi - ni - bus bo - ne vo - lun - ta - tis.

tis. Lau -

Lau -

Lau -

16

Lau - da - mus te, be - ne - di - ci - mus

da - mus te, be - ne - di - ci - mus te,

da - mus te, be - ne - di - ci -

21

te, a - do - ra - mus te, glo - ri - fi - ca - mus te.

a - do - ra - mus te, glo - ri - fi - ca - mus te.

da - - - - - - mus te,

mus te, a - do - ra - mus te,

26

Gra - ti - as a - gi - mus ti - - - bi prop -

Gra - ti - as a - gi - mus ti - bi

be - ne - - - - di -

glo - ri - fi - ca - mus te.

31

ter ma - gnam glo - ri-am tu - am. Do -

prop - ter ma - gnam tu - am.

ci - mus te.

Prop - ter ma - gnam glo -

36

mi-ne de - us, rex ce - les - tis, de - us pa -

Do - mi - ne de - us, rex ce - les - tis, de - us

Do - mi - ne de - us, rex

ri - am tu - am. Do - mi - ne, rex ce -

41

ter om - ni - - - -

pa - ter om - - - ni -

ce - les - tis, deus pa - ter om - ni - po -

les - tis, de - us pa - ter om - ni - po - - -

46

po - tens. Do - mi-ne fi - li u - ni - ge-ni -

po - tens. Do - mi-ne fi - li u-ni - ge -

tens. Do - mi-ne fi - li

tens. Do - mi-ne fi - li u - ni - ge - ni - te, Ihe - su

51

te, Ie - su Chri - ste. Duo Do - - - mi -

ni - te, Ie - su Chri - ste. Duo Do - mi - ne de - us, a -

u - ni - ge - ni - te, Ie - su Chri - ste. [tacet]

Chri - - - - ste. D*omi*ne De*us* tacet

56

ne de - - - - - - -

61

us, a - - - gnus de -

gnus, a - gnus de -

66
i, fi - - - li - us
i,
69
pa - - - - - - - -
fi - lius pa - - - - - -
74
tris. Qui tol - lis pec - ca -
tris. Qui tol - lis
Qui
Qui
79
ta mun - - - - - -
pec - ca - ta mun - - -
tol - lis pec - ca - ta

85

di, mi - se - re - re no - - bis.

di, mi - se - re - re no - bis. Qui

mun - di, mi - se - re - re no - bis.

91

Qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun -

tol - lis pec - ca - - - ta mun -

su - - - sci - - - -

Qui tol -

97

di, su - sci - - - -

di, su - sci - - - pe

pe

lis pec - ca - ta mun - di, su -

103

pe de - pre - ca - ti - o - nem no -

de - pre - ca - ti - o - nem no - stram.

sci - pe de - pre - ca - ti - o - nem

109

stram. Qui se - - - des ad

Qui se - - des ad dex - - -

pa -

no - stram. Qui se - des ad

115

dex - te - ram pa - - - tris,

te - ram pa - - - - tris, mi -

tris

dex - te - ram pa - tris,

121

mi - se - re - re no - - - -

se - re - re no - bis Quo - - - ni -

tu so - lus sanc - - -

mi - se - re - re no - bis

127

bis Quo - ni - am tu so - lus sanc -

am tu so - lus sanc - tus, tu

tus

Quo - ni - am tu so - - -

133

tus, tu so - - - lus do - mi - nus,

so - lus

tu so - - - - - lus

lus, tu so - lus

139

tu so - lus al - tis - si - mus,

do - mi - nus, tu so - lus

do - mi - nus Ie -

do - - - mi - nus, tu

145

Ie - su Chri - - - - ste.

al - tis - si - mus. Cum Sanc -

su Chri - - - ste

so - - - lus. Cum

151

Cum Sanc - to Spi - ri - tu,

to Spi - ri - tu, in glo - ri - a

in

Sanc - to Spi - ri - tu, in

157
in glo - ri - - a de - - -
de - - - - -
glo - - - - ri - a
glo - ri - a de - i
163
i pa - - - - tris.
i pa - - - -
pa - tris
pa -
169
A - - - - - -
tris. A - - - - -
A - - - -
tris. A - - - - -

175
men.
181
men.
men.
men.

Credo

[Supremum]
Pa - - trem om - ni - po - ten -
Contra[tenor Altus]
Pa - - - - trem om - ni - po -
Tenor
Contra[tenor] Bassus
6
tem, fac - to - rem ce - li et ter -
ten - tem, fac - to - rem ce - li
11
re, vi - si - bi - li -
et ter - re, vi - si - bi - li - um om -

16

um om - ni - um et in - vi - si - bi - li - um.

ni - um et in - vi - si - bi - li - um. Et

Et

Et

21

Et in u - num Do - mi - num

in u - num Do - mi - num Ie - sum Chri - stum, fi -

in u - num

26

Ie - sum Chri - stum, fi - li - um de - i u -

li - um de - i u - ni - ge - ni - tum. Et ex pa - tre na -

Chri - - - - -

do - mi - num Ie - sum Chri - stum, fi - li - um de - i u -

31

ni-ge - ni-tum. Et ex pa - tre na -

tum an - te om-ni - a se - cu - la.

stum

ni - ge - ni - tum. Et ex pa - tre

36

tum an-te om - ni - a se - cu - la.

De - um de de - o, lu - men de lu-mi - ne, de -

de - um

na - tum an - te om - ni - a se - cu -

41

De - um de de - o, lu - men de lu -

um ve - rum de de - o ve - ro.

ve - - - - - - - -

la. De - um de de - o, lu -

46

mi - ne, de - um ve - - - rum

Ge - ni - tum non fac - tum con - sub -

rum de de - o ve - - ro

men de lu - mi - ne. de - um ve -

51

de de - o ve - ro. Ge - ni -

stan - ti - a - lem pa - - tri, per quem

rum de de - o ve - ro. Ge - ni - tum non

56

tum non fac - tum con - sub - stan - ti - a -

om - ni - a fac - ta sunt. Qui prop - ter

con - sub - stan - ti - a - lem pa - tri

fac - tum con - sub - stan - ti - a - lem pa -

61
lem pa - tri, per quem om - ni -
nos ho - mi - nes et prop -
tri per quem om - ni - a
65
a fac - ta sunt. Qui prop - ter nos ho - mi -
ter nos - tram sa - lu - tem, de -
de - - - scen - - -
fac - ta sunt. Qui prop - ter nos ho -
70
nes et prop - ter no - stram sa - lu - tem,
scen - dit de ce - - - -
dit de ce - lis
mi - nes. Et

75
de - scen - - - - dit de ce -
lis. in - car - na - tus de
in - car - na - tus de Spi - ri - tu Sanc -
80
lis. Et in - car - na - tus est de Spi - ri - tu Sanc - to
Spi - ri - tu San - cto ex Ma - ri - a vir - gi -
Ex Ma - ri - a
to. Ex Ma - ri - a vir - gi - ne et
85
ex Ma - ri - a vir - gi - ne, et ho - mo fac -
ne, et ho - mo fac - tus est.
Et ho - mo fac - tus
ho - mo fac - tus est. Cru -

90

tus est. Cru-ci-fi-xus e-ti-am pro no-

Cru-ci-fi-xus e-ti-am pro no-bis

est. - - - - - - pro no-

ci-fi-xus e-ti-am pro no-

95

bis sub Pon-ti-o Pi-la-to,

sub Pon-ti-o Pi-la-to, pas-

bis

bis sub Pon-ti-o Pi-la-

100

pas-sus est et se-pul-tus est. Duo Et

sus et se-pul-tus est. Duo Et re-

se-pul-tus est. [tacet]

to pas-sus et se-pul-tus est. [tacet]

105

re - sur - re - - - - xit

sur - re - - - xit ter - ti - a di -

110

ter - ti - a di - - -

e

115

e se - cun - - - - - -

se - cun - - - dum scrip - tu -

120

dum scrip - - - tu -

125

ras.

ras.

129
Et a - scen - dit in ce - - lum,
Et a - scen - dit in ce - lum,
Et in
Et a -
135
se - det ad dex - te - ram pa -
se - det ad dex - te - ram pa -
scen - dit in ce - lum, se -
141
tris. Et i - te - rum ven - tu - rus
tris.
i - - - - - te - - -
det

147

est cum glo - ri - a iu - di - ca -

Et i - - - - te - rum

rum

ad dex - te - ram

153

re vi -

ven - tu - rus est cum glo - ri - a iu -

mor -

pa - - - tris

159

vos et mor - - - tu - os, cu - ius

di - ca - re vi - vos

tu - - -

et mor - tu - os.

165
re - gni non e - rit fi - - - nis
et mor - - -
os.
Cu - ius re - gni.
171
Et in Spi - ri - tum Sanc - tum, do - mi - num
tu - - - os.
Et in Spi - ri - tum Sanc - tum
177
et vi - vi - fi - can - - - tem,
do - mi - num et vi - vi - fi - can - tem, qui

183

qui ex pa - tre fi - li - o - que

que

ex pa - tre fi - li - o - que

189

pro - ce - - - dit. Qui cum

pro - ce - - - - - - dit.

Qui cum

pro - ce - - - dit.

195

pa - tre et fi - li - o si - mul

Qui cum pa - tre

Qui cum

201

a - do - ra - tur et cum - glo -

et fi - lio a - - - - do - ra -

fi - li - o.

pa - tre et

207

ri - fi - ca - - - - - - tur,

tur et cum - glo - ri - *fi* - ca -

Qui

cum glo - ri - fi - ca - - - tur.

213

qui lo - cu - tus est per pro -

tur, qui lo - - - -

lo - - - - - - cu - tus

Qui lo - - - cu - tus est per

219

phe - - - - tas.

cu - tus est per pro - phe - tas.

est per pro - - - phe - tas.

pro - phe - tas.

225

Et u - nam sanc - tam ca - tho - li - cam et a - po - sto - li -

Et u - nam sanc - tam ca -

Et u - nam sanc - - - tam

Et u - - - - -

230

cam ec - cle - - - si - am.

tho - li - cam et a - po - sto - li - cam ec - cle - si - am. Con -

ca - - - tho - li - cam ec - cle - si - am.

nam sanc - tam ca - tho -

235

Con - fi - te - or u - num bap - ti - sma in

fi - te - or u - num bap - tis - ma

Con - fi - te - or u -

li - cam ec - cle - si - am. Con - fi -

240

re - mis - si - o - nem pec - ca - to - rum et ex - pec - to re - sur -

num bap - tis - ma

te - or u - num bap - tis - ma in re - mis - si -

245

rec - *ti* - o - *nem* mor - tu - o - rum et vi - tam ven - tu - ri se - cu - li.

et vi - tam ven - tu - ri se - cu - li.

et vi - tam ven - tu - ri se - cu - li.

o - nem pec - ca - to - rum, et vi - tam ven - tu - ri

250
A - - - - - men.
A - - - - - men.
A - - - - - men.
se - cu - li. A - - - men.

Sanctus

[Supremum]
Sanc – – – – – – – –
Contra[tenor Altus]
Sanc – – – – tus,
Tenor
Contra[tenor Bassus]
6
sanc – – – – – – – –
11
tus, sanc – – – – –
tus
Sanc – – – – – – – –
Sanc – – – – – – – –

16

Do - mi - nus

tus,

tus

21

tus, sanc -

sanc - - - - tus

Do - - - -

26

tus

Do -

mi - - - - - - - nus

31

Do - mi - - - - - -

mi - - - nus

de - - - - - - -

36

nus de - us

de - - - - - - -

41

Sa - - - ba - - - - -

de -

us

us

46
us
Sa - - - - -
51
Sa - - - ba -
ba - - -
Sa - ba - - - - - -
56
oth.
oth.
oth.
oth.

61
Duo
Ple - - - ni
Duo
Ple - ni
Pleni tacet
Pleni tacet
66
sunt ce - - - -
sunt ce - li
71
li et ter - ra glo - ri -
et ter - - - ra glo - ri - a
76
a tu -
tu - - - - -

81
a. O - san -
a. O - - - -
O - - - -
O - san -
87
san - - - - - - -
93
san - - - - - - -

99
na
105
na
na
na
111
in
in
ex -
in
ex -

117
ex - - - - - - -
in
ex -
123
cel - - - - - - -
cel -
129
cel - - - -
cel - - -

135
Duo
sis.
Be – ne –
Duo
sis.
Be – – –
Benedict*us* tacet
sis.
Benedict*us* tacet
sis.
141
ne –
147
dic – – – –
dic – – – – –
153
tus
tus
159
qui ve – – – nit in no –
qui ve –

165
mi - - - - - - - -
nit in no - mi - ne
171
ne Do - mi -
Do - mi - - -
177
183
ni. O - - - - -
ni. O - san - - -
O - - - - -
O - - - san -

189

san – – – na in

na

san – – – – – – –

na in

195

ex – – – – – – – –

in ex – – –

na in ex – – – –

ex – – – – – – – –

201

cel – – – – sis.

cel – – – – sis. –

cel – – – – – sis.

cel – – – sis.

Agnus Dei

[*Supremum*]

A – – – – – – gnus

[*Contratenor Altus*]

A – – – – – – – –

Tenor

Contra[*tenor Bassus*]

6

de – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – gnus

11

– – i, qui

de – i, qui tol – – – lis

A – – – – – –

A – – – – – –

16

tol – – – – – – –

pec – ca – – – –

– – – – gnus

– gnus de – – – i, qui

21

lis pec – ca – – – –

ta

de – – – i, qui tol –

tol – lis pec –

26

ta mun – – – – – – di,

mun – di,

– – – – lis

ca – ta mun – – – – –

31

mi – se – re – – – –

mi – se – re – – – re

pec – ca – ta mun – – – –

– – di, mi – se – – – re –

36

– – re no – – –

no – – –

– – di, mi – se –

– – – re no – – – –

41

– – – – bis. Duo A – –

– – – – bis. Duo A – –

re – re no – – – bis. *Secundus* Agnus tacet

– – – – bis. *Secundus* tacet

46

– – – – gnus de –

– – – gnus

52

– – i,

de – – –

58

qui tol – – – – – –

– – – – – – – –

64

– – – – – lis pec –

– – – – i, qui tol –

70

ca – – – – – – ta mun –

– lis pec – ca – – –

76

– – – – – – – di,

– – – – – ta mun –

82
mi - - - se - re - re
- - di, mi - se - re - re
88
no - - - - - -
no - - - - - - -
94
bis. A - - - - - -
bis. A - - - - - -
A - - - - - -
A - - - - - -
99
- - gnus de - - - -
- - - - - - gnus
gnus
- - gnus de -

104
de
de
i,
109
i,
qui
i,
114
qui
tol
tol
qui

119

– – – – – – – –

– – – – i,

– – – – – – – lis

tol – – – – – – lis

124

– – – – lis pec – – –

qui tol –

pec – – – – ca –

129

ca – – – – – – –

– – – – – – – lis

pec – – – ca – ta

– ta mun – – – – – –

134
ta
mun –
pec – ca – – – – – –
mun – – – –
– – – – – – – –
139
– – – – di,
– – ta mun – – – – – di,
– – – – – – – di,
– – – – – – di,
144
do – – – – na
do – na
do – – – – –
do – – – – na

149

no – – – – – – –

no –

– – na no – – – – –

no –

154

– – – – – – – –

bis pa –

bis pa – – – – –

– – – – – – – –

159

– – – – bis pa – – –

– – – – – – – –

– – – – – – – –

– bis

165
– – – – – – cem.
– – – – – cem.
– – – – – – cem.
pa – – – – – cem.

Missa Clemens et benigna

Kyrie

17
– – – – – – ste
– – – ste
– – – ste
– – – ste
23
29
ley –
ley – – – – –
ley – – –
ley – – – –

35
son. Ky
son. Ky
son. Ky ri
son. Ky
41
ri e
ri e
e
ri e
47
ley son.
ley son.
ley son.
ley son.

Gloria

[Discantus]
Et in ter - ra pax ho - mi - ni -
Contra[tenor Altus]
Et in ter - ra pax ho - mi - ni -
Tenor
[Contratenor] Bassus
6
bus bo - ne vo - lun - ta - tis. Lau -
bus bo - ne vo-lun - ta - tis. La - u -
Lau - - -
Lau - - -
11
da - mus te, be - ne - di - ci - mus te,
da - mus te, be - ne - di - ci - mus
- - da - - - mus
- - - - da - - - - -

16

a - do - ra - mus te, glo - ri - fi - ca - mus

te a - do - ra - mus te. Gra -

te. Gra - -

mus te. Gra -

21

te. Gra-ti - as a - gi - mus ti - bi prop -

- ti - as a - gi - mus ti - bi prop -

- - ti - as a - gi - mus ti - bi,

- - ti - as a - gi - mus ti - bi prop -

26

ter ma - - - - - - gnam

ter ma - - - - - gnam

ma - gnam

ter ma - - - - gnam

31

glo - ri - am

glo - ri - am tu -

glo - ri - am tu - - -

glo - - - ri - - - am

36

tu - am. Do - mi - ne de - us,

- - am. Do - - - - mi -

- - *am.* Tenor tacet

tu - am. Do - - - mi -

41

rex ce - les - tis, de - us pa - ter om - ni -

ne de - us, rex ce - les - tis, de - us pa - ter

ne de - us rex ce - les - tis, de - us pa -

46

– – – po – tens. Do-mi – ne fi –

om – ni – po – tens. Do – mi – ne fi – – –

ter om – ni – po – tens. Do – mi – ne fi –

51

li u – ni – ge – ni – – – – te, Ie –

li u-ni – ge – ni te, Ie – su Chri – ste. Do –

li u – ni – ge – ni – te, Ie – su Chri – ste.

56

su Chri – ste. Do-mi – ne de – us, a – –

mi – ne de – – – us, a – gnus de –

Do – mi – ne de – us, a – gnus

61

gnus de – i, fi – li – us pa – –

– i, *fi – li – us pa –*

de – – – i, fi – li – us

66

– – – tris. Qui tol – lis

– – – *tris.* *Qui* *tol* – *lis pec* –

Qui

pa – – – *tris.* *Qui* *tol* –

72

pec – ca – ta mun – di,

ca – – – *ta* *mun* – *di,*

tol – – – – lis.

– – – – *lis*

78

mi – se – re – re no – bis. Qui tol – lis pec – ca –

qui *tol* – *lis* *pec* – *ca* – *ta*

pec – *ca* – – – *ta.*

pec – *ca* – *ta*

84

ta mun - di, su - sci - pe

mun - di su - sci - pe de -

De - - - pre -

mun - - - - di su -

90

de - pre - ca -

pre - ca - ti - - - o - nem nos -

ca - tio - nem nos - tram.

sci - pe de - pre - ca - ti -

96

ti - o - nem nos - tram. Qui

- - - - - - tram.

- - o - nem nos - tram.

102

se - des ad dex - te - ram pa - - -

Qui se - des ad dex - te - ram pa -

qui se - des ad dex - te -

108

- - tris, mi - se - re - re no -

- - tris, mi - - - se -

- - ram mi - - - se - re -

Pa - tris mi - se - - - re - re

114

- - - - - bis. Quo - ni - am

re - re no - bis. Quo - ni -

re no - - - bis.

no - bis. Quo -

120
tu so - lus sanc - tus, tu so - lus do -
- am tu so - lus do - mi -
ni - am tu so - lus sanc - tus, tu - so - lus do -
126
- mi - nus, tu so - lus al -
- - nus,
Tu so -
mi - nus, tu so -
132
tis - si - mus, Ie -
al - - - tis - si - mus, Ie -
lus al - tis - - - -
- - - - lus, Ie - su

138

su Chri - - - - ste.

su Chri - - - - ste.

- - - - si - mus.

Chri - - - ste.

143

Cum Sanc - to Spi - ri - tu, in

Cum Sanc - to Spi - ri - tu, in glo -

Cum Sanc - - - to Spi - - -

Cum Sanc - to Spi - ri - tu in glo -

148

glo - ri - a de - i pa - - - tris.

ri - a *de - - - i pa - tris. A -*

- - ri - tu in glo - ri - a de - i pa - tris.

ri - a de - - - i pa - tris. A -

153
A - - - - - - men.
- - - - - - - men.
A - - - - - - men.
- - - - - - - men.

Credo

[Discantus]
Pa - - - trem om - ni - po -
Contra[tenor Altus]
Pa - - - - - trem om - ni - po - ten -
Tenor
[Contratenor] Bassus
6
ten - tem, fac - to - rem ce - li et ter -
- - tem, fac - to - rem ce - li et ter -
11
- - re, vi - si - bi - li - um
- - re, vi - si - bi - li - um
Et
Et

16

om - ni - um et in - vi - si - bi - li - um. Et

om - ni - um et in - vi - si - bi - li - um.

in - vi - si bi - li - um.

in - vi - si - bi - li - um.

21

in u - num Do - mi - num Ie - sum Chri - stum.

Do - mi - - - num, Chri - stum fi - li -

Ie - sum Chri - stum fi -

Ie - sum Chri - stum fi - li - um

26

Et ex pa - tre na - tum an -

- um de - i u - ni - ge - ni - tum. Na - tum

li - um de - i u - ni - ge - ni - tum, et ex pa - tre na - tum an -

de - i u - ni - ge - ni - tum, et ex pa - tre na - tum an -

31

te om - ni - a se - cu - la. De - um de de - o

an - te om - ni - a se - cu - la. De - um de de -

- te om - ni - a se - cu - la. De -

te om - ni - a se - cu - la. De - um

36

lu - men de lu - mi - ne, de - um ve - rum de de - o ve -

o, lu - men de lu - mi - ne, de - um ve - ro de de - o ve - ro.

um de de - o, lu - mi - ne, de - um ve - rum de de - o ve -

de de - o, lu - mi - ne, de - um ve - rum de de - o ve -

41

ro.

Ge - ni - tum non fac - - - -

ro.

ro. Ge - ni - tum non fac -

46

Con - sub - stan - ti - a - lem pa - tri, per quem

tum, con - sub - stan - ti - a - lem pa -

Con - - - sub - stan - - - ti - a - lem

tum con - sub - stan - ti - a - lem pa - tri per

51

om - ni - a fac - ta sunt. Qui

tri per quem om - ni - a fac - ta sunt. Qui

pa - tri per quem om - ni - a fac - ta sunt.

Tenor tacet

quem om - ni - a fac - ta sunt. Qui prop -

56

prop - ter nos ho - mi - nes et prop -

prop - ter nos ho - mi - - - nes

ter nos ho - mi - nes et prop - ter nos - tram

61

ter nos-tram sa-lu-tem, de - scen - dit de ce -

et prop - ter *no-stram sa-lu - tem de - scen - dit de*

sa - lu - tem de - scen - dit de ce -

66

- - lis. Et in - car - na - tus est de Spi -

ce - lis. Et in - car - na - tus de Spi -

- - lis. Et in - car - na - tus est de

71

ri - tu Sanc - to ex

ri - tu Sanc - - - - - to

Spi - ri - tu Sanc - - - - to ex

76

Ma - ri - a vir - gi - ne, et ho - - mo fac -

ex Ma - ri - a vir - gi - ne, *et ho - mo fac -*

Ma - ri - a vir-gi - ne et ho - mo fac -

81
- - - tus est.
- - - tus est.
- - - tus est.
87
Cru - ci - fi - xus e - ti - am pro
Cru - ci - fi - xus e - ti - am pro
Cru - - - - - ci - - -
Cru - ci - - - - fi - - -
93
no - bis sub Pon - ti - o Pi - la - to,
no - bis sub Pon - ti - o Pi - la - to, pas - sus
fi - - - - xus. Et
- - xus.

99

pas - sus et se - pul - tus est.

et se - pul - tus est.

se - pul - tus est

Et se - pul - tus

105

Et re - sur - re - xit ter - ti - a di -

Re - sur - - - - re - xit

di - e

est. Re - - - sur - re -

111

- - e se - cun - dum

ter - ti - a di - e se - cun -

se - cun -

- - *xit, scrip -*

117

scrip - tu - - - - - ras. Et

dum scrip - tu - ras.

- - dum scrip - tu - ras. A -

- - tu - ras

123

a - scen - dit in ce - lum, se -

Et a - scen - - - dit in ce - lum,

- scen - - - - dit pa - - -

et a - - - - -

129

det ad dex - te - ram pa - - - -

se - det, pa -

- - - tris

- - - scen - dit, dex - te -

135
- - tris. Et i - te - - -
tris.
ram. Et i - te -
141
rum ven - tu - rus est cum glo - ri -
Ven - tu - rus
- - rum ven - tu - rus est,
147
a iu - di - ca - - - re vi - vos
est iu - di - ca - re vi - vos
mor - - - -
mor - - - - - - -

153

et mor - tu - os, cu - ius re -

et mor - tu - os, cu - ius

- - - - tu - os,

tu - - - - os, cu - ius re -

159

- - gni non e - rit fi - nis.

re - gni, fi - - - - nis. -

fi - - - nis.

gni non e - rit fi - nis.

165

Et in Spi - ri - tum Sanc - tum, Do - -

Et in Spi - ri - tum Sanc - tum, Do -

[Tenor tacet]

Et in Spi - ri - tum Sanc -

171

mi - num et vi - vi - fi - can - tem,

mi - num et vi - vi - fi -

- - *tum,* *fi* -

177

qui ex pa - tre fi - li - o - que

can - tem, *fi* - *li* - *o* - *que*

- - - - - *li* - *o* - *que*

183

pro - - - ce - - - - -

pro - - - - *ce* - - -

pro - *ce* - - - - *dit.*

189

dit. Qui cum pa - tre

dit. *Qui* *cum* *pa* - *tre,* si -

195

et fi - li - o si - mul a - do - ra -

mul a - do - ra - - - - -

Si - - - mul a - do - ra - - -

201

tur et con - glo - ri - fi - ca - - -

tur *et con - glo - ri - fi - ca -*

tur et con - glo - ri - fi - ca -

207

tur, qui - lo - cu - tus est per pro - phe -

tur per pro - phe - tas.

tur, qui lo - cu - tus est per

213

tas. Et u - nam sanc - tam ca - tho - li -

Et u - nam sanc - tam ca - tho -

pro - phe - tas. Ca - tho - li -

219
- - cam et a - po - sto - li - cam
li - cam et a - po - sto - li -
- - cam et a - po - sto - li -
225
ec - cle - - - si - - - am.
cam ec - cle - - - - si - am.
cam ec - cle - si - am.
230
Con - fi - te - or u - num bap - ti - sma in re - mis - si - o -
Con - fi - te - or u - num bap - tis -
Con - fi - te - or
Con - fi - te - or u - num bap - tis - ma in re -

236

nem pec - ca - to - rum et ex-pec-to re-sur-rec-ti-o-

- *ma in re - mis - si - o - nem pec - ca - to - rum, mor-*

bap - tis - ma, re-sur - rec - ti - o - nem mor - tu - o -

mis - si - o - nem - pec - ca - to - rum,

242

nem mor-tu - o - rum et vi - tam ven-tu-ri se - cu - li. A -

tu - o - rum et vi - tam ven - tu - ri se - cu - li. -

rum *et vi - tam ven - tu - ri se - cu -*

et vi - tam ven - tu - ri se - cu - li. A -

248

- - - - - - - men.

A - - - - - - men.

- - *li. A - - - - - men.*

- - - - - - *men.*

Sanctus

[*Discantus*]

Sanc – – – – – – – –

Contra[*tenor Altus*]

Sanc – – – – – – – –

Tenor

[*Contratenor*] *Bassus*

6

tus, sanc – – – – tus, sanc –

tus, *sanc* – – – – *tus,* *sanc* –

Sanc – – –

Sanc – – –

11

– – – – – tus Do-mi –

– – – – *tus* *Do* – *mi* – –

– – – – tus, sanc – – – –

– – – – tus, sanc – – – tus

16

– – – – nus de – us

– – – – *nus de* – – – *us*

tus *Do* – *mi* – *nus de* – *us Sa* –

Do – *mi* – – *nus de* – *us Sa* –

21

Sa – – – – – ba – – –

Sa – – – – *ba* –

– – – – – – *ba* – – –

– – – – – *ba* – – –

26

oth. Ple – ni sunt

oth. Ple – ni sunt ce –

Pleni tacet

oth.

oth. Ple – ni sunt *ce* –

31

ce – li et ter – – – ra glo-

– – li et ter – – – – ra

– – *li et ter – – – ra glo –*

36

– ri – a tu – – – –

glo – ri – a tu – – –

ri – a tu – – – – –

41

a. O – – – – san – – –

a. O – san – – – – –

O – – – – – san –

a. O – – – – san – – –

47
na
na
53
na
na
in
in
59
in
ex
ex
in
ex

65
cel
ex cel
71
cel sis
sis
cel sis.
sis.
77
Be ne dic
Be
Be ne

82

tus qui ve - nit in no - mi - ne

- ne - dic - tus qui ve - nit in no - mi -

- dic - tus qui ve - nit *in* *no - mi* -

87

Do - mi - ni. O - san -

ne *Do - mi - ni.* O - - - san -

O - san -

ne Do - mi - ni. O - san -

91

- - - - - - - -

- - - - na in *ex -*

- - - - na in

- - - - na in

96
na in ex - cel - - - sis.
cel - - - - - sis.
ex - - - cel - - - - sis.
ex - - - cel - - - sis.

Agnus Dei

[*Discantus*]

A – – – gnus de –

Contra[*tenor Altus*]

A – gnus de –

Tenor

[*Contratenor*] *Bassus*

6

i, qui tol – lis pec – ca –

i, *pec* – *ca* –

A – gnus de – i,

A – – – – gnus de – i,

11

– – ta mun – – – – di,

– – *ta* *mun* –

pec – ca – – – – – ta mun –

pec – *ca* – *ta* *mun* – – – – –

16
mi - se - re - - - re
- - di mi - se - re - re no -
- - di mi - se - re - re no -
- - di mi - se - re - re no -
21
no - - - - bis. A - gnus
- - - - bis. A -
- - - - bis. A -
- - - - bis. A -
26
de - i, qui
- - gnus de - i,
- - - - gnus de - i,
- - gnus de - - - i,

32

tol - lis pec - ca - ta

qui *tol - lis* *mun -*

tol - lis mun - - -

tol - - - lis mun -

38

mun - - - di, mi -

- - *di* *mi - se -*

di

- - *di*

44

se - - - re - - - re no -

re - - - - - re

mi - se -

mi -

50

– – – – – – – –

no – – – – – – – –

– – – re – re

se – *re* – *re* *no* –

56

– – – bis. A – gnus de – i,

– – *bis.* A – gnus de –

A – gnus

bis A – gnus de –

62

qui tol – lis pec – ca – ta mun –

i,

de – i, qui *tol* – *lis* *pec-ca* – – *ta* *mun* –

i, *qui* *tol* – *lis* *pec* – *ca* – *ta* *mun* – *di*

67
di, do - na no - bis pa - cem.
no - bis pa - - - cem.
di do - na no - bis pa - cem.
do - na no - bis pa - cem.

Missa Jhesus autem transiens

Kyrie

[*Discantus*]

Ky - ri - e

[*Contratenor Altus*]

Ky - ri - e

Tenor

Jh*esu*s autem transiens

[*Contratenor*] *Bassus*

Ky - - ri - e

6

Jhe - sus au - - - tem tran -

11

- si - - - ens

16
ley - - - - - - son.
ley - - - - - - son.
Ky - ri - e ley - son.
ley - son.
21
Chri - - - - - - - -
Chri - - - - - ste
Chri - - - - - ste
Chri - - - - - - - ste
27
ste

33
39
45
ley – – – – – – – –

51
ley -
ley - - - - -
- - - - - - - -
57
- - - - - - - son.
- - - - - - - son.
- - - - - son.
ley - - - - - - son.
62
Ky - ri - e
Ky - ri - - - e
Ky - - - ri - e
Ky - ri - e

68
74
ley - - -
80
ley - - - - son.
ley - - - son.
- - - - - - son.
ley - - - son.

Gloria

Canon: Recte sursum quartam superade colori
post color aufertur remeando per dyapente
ut prius hinc iterans cum pausis tolle colores

[*Discantus*]

Et in ter - ra pax ho - mi - ni - bus bo -

[*Contratenor Altus*]

Et in ter - ra pax ho - mi - ni - bus

Tenor

Contratenor [*Secundus*]

Et in ter - ra pax ho - mi - ni -

6

ne vo - lun - ta - tis. Lau -

bo - ne vo - lun - ta - tis. Lau - da - mus te, be - ne -

Jhe - - -

bus bo - ne vo - lun - ta - tis. Lau - da-mus te, be -

11

da-mus te, be - ne - di - ci - mus te,

di - ci - mus te, a - do - ra - mus

sus au -

- ne - di - ci-mus te, a - do - ra - mus te, glo - ri - fi - ca -

16

a - do - ra - mus te, glo - ri - fi - ca - mus te.

te, glo - ri - fi - ca - mus te. Gra - ti - as a -

- - tem tran - - - si -

mus te. Gra-ti - as a - gi - mus ti -

21

Gra - ti - as a - gi - mus ti - bi prop-ter

gi - mus ti - bi prop-ter ma -

- - ens

- - - - - bi prop - ter ma -

26

ma - gnam glo - ri - am tu - am. Do-mi-ne

gnam tu - am glo - ri - am. Do-mi-ne de -

gnam glo - ri - am tu - am. Do-

31

de-us, rex ce-les - tis, de - us pa-ter om - ni - po - tens.

- - - us, rex ce - les - - - -

per

mi-ne de-us, rex ce-les-tis de - us pa - ter om-ni-po - tens. -

36

Do - mi - ne fi - li u - ni - ge - ni - te,

tis, de - us pa - ter om - ni - po - tens.

me - - - - - di -

Do - mi - ne fi - li u - ni - - -

41

Ie - - - su Chri - - - -

Do-mi - ne fi - li

- *um il - lo - rum*

- - ge - ni - te, Ie - su Chri -

46
ste. Do - mi - ne de - us, a -
u - ni - ge - ni - te, Ie - su Chri - ste. Do - mi -
i - - - - - - - -
ste. Do - mi - ne de - us, a - gnus de - i,
51
gnus de - i, fi - li - us pa - tris.
ne de - us, a - gnus de - i, fi - li - us pa - tris.
- - - - - - - bat.
fi - li - us pa - - - - - tris.
56
Qui tol - - - lis pec -
Qui tol - - - - -
Jhe - - - - - - -
Qui tol - - - lis

61
ca - ta mun - - - -
lis pec - ca - - - ta mun -
- - - - - - - -
pec - ca - - - - - -
66
di, mi - se - re - re
- - - - di, mi - se - re - re
- - - - - - - -
ta mun - - - -
71
no - - - - - - - -
no - bis. Qui tol -
- - - - - - - -
- - - - di, mi - se - re -

76
bis. Qui tol -
- - - - - - - -
sus au -
re no - bis.
81
lis pec - ca - ta
- - lis pec - - -
tem tran - si - ens per
86
mun - di, su - sci - - -
ca - ta mun -
Qui tol - - - lis

91

pe de - pre - ca - ti - o - nem

- - - - - di, mi -

me - - - - - - - -

pec - ca - ta mun - di,

96

nos -

se - re - re

- - - - - - - -

su - sci - pe de - pre - ca - ti - o - nem

101

- - - tram. Quo - ni - am tu so -

no - bis. Qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun-

- - - - - - - -

nos - - - tram. Quo -

107
lus sanc - - - - tus, tu
di, su - sci - pe de - pre - ca - ti - o - nem no -
- - - - - - - -
ni - am tu so - lus sanc - - -
113
so - - - -
- - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - -
tus, tu so - lus Do - mi - mi - nus,
119
lus Do - mi - nus, tu
- - - - stram. Quo - niam
dium il - - - - -
tu so - lus

125
so - lus
tu so - lus Do -
lo - - - - - rum
al - tis - - - si - mus,
131
al - tis - si - - - - mus,
- - mi - nus, tu so - lus al -
i - - - bat
Ie -
137
Ie -
tis - si - mus,
su Chri - - - -

143

– – – su Chri – – –

Ie – – –

– – – ste.

149

– – – – – – – –

– – su Chri – – – ste.

155

ste. Cum Sanc – to Spi –

Cum Sanc – – – to Spi-ri –

Jhe – – – sus au – – –

Cum Sanc – to

160
ri - tu, in glo - - - ri - - -
tu, in glo - ri - a de -
tem tran - - - si -
Spi - ri - - - - - tu, in glo - ri -
165
a de - i pa - - - - tris.
i pa - - -
ens per
a de - - - - - - i
170
A - - - - - - men.
tris. A - - - - - - men.
me - dium il - lo - rum i - - - bat.
pa - - - - tris. A - men.

Credo

[*Discantus*]

Pa - trem om - ni - po - ten - tem, fac - to -

[*Contratenor Altus*]

Pa - trem om - ni - po-ten - tem, fac-to - rem ce -

Tenor

[*Contratenor Bassus*]

Pa - trem om - ni - po - ten - tem, fac-

6

rem ce - li et ter - re, vi -

li et ter - re, vi - si-bi-li - um om - ni -

Jhe - - -

to - rem ce - li et ter - re, vi - si-bi-li-um

11

- si - bi-li-um om - ni - um et in-vi - si - bi - li -

- um et in - vi - si - bi - li - um. Et

sus au -

om-nium - et in - vi-si - bi-li - um. Et in u - num Do - mi -

16

– – um. Et in u – num Do-mi –

in u – num Do – mi-num Ie – sum Chri – stum, fi –

– – tem tran – – – si –

– – num Ie-sum, fi – lium de – i u – ni – ge –

21

num Ie-sum Chri-stum, fi – li-um de – i u – ni-ge – ni – tum. Et ex

– li – um de – i u – ni – ge-ni – tum.

– – ens

ni – tum. Et ex pa-tre na – tum an – te om – ni-a se – cu – la de-

26

pa – tre na-tum an-te om – ni – a se – cu – la. De – um de

Et ex pa – tre na – tum an-te om – ni-a se – cu – la. De-um de de-

um de de – o, lu-men de lu-mi – ne, de-um ve – rum

31

de - o, lu-men de lu-mi-ne, de-um ve-rum de de - o

- o, lu - men de lu - mi - ne, de - um ve - rum

de de - o ve - ro. Ge - ni - tum non fac - tum con-sub-stan-tia-lem,

36

ve - ro. Qui prop - ter nos ho -

de de - o ve-ro. Ge - ni - tum non fac - tum con -

per me - - -

om-ni-a fac-ta sunt. Qui prop - ter nos ho - mi -

41

mi - nes et prop - ter no - stram sa - lu -

sub-stan - ti - a - lem pa - tri, per quem om - ni -

- - di - um il - lo -

nes et prop - ter no - stram sa - lu -

46

tem, de - scen - dit de ce - lis. Et in-car-na - tus

a fac - ta sunt. Qui prop - ter nos ho - mi - nes.

- - rum i - bat.

tem, de-scen - dit de - ce - lis. Et in-car-na - tus

51

est de Spi - ri-tu Sanc - to ex Ma-ri - a vir -

Et in-car-na - tus est de Spi - ri - tu Sanc - to, et

est de Spi - ri - tu Sanc - to ex Ma - ri - a vir - gi -

56

gi - ne, et ho - mi fac - tus est. Cru - ci - fi - xus

ho - mo fac - tus est. Cru - - -

Jhe - - -

ne, et ho - mo fac - tus est. Cru - - -

62
e - ti - am pro no - bis sub Pon - ti - o Pi - la - to,
ci - fi - xus e - ti - am pro no - nis sub Pon - ti -
- - - - - - - -
ci - fi - xus e - ti - am pro no - bis
68
pas - sus et se - pul - tus est.
o Pi - la - to, pas - sus et
- - - - - - - -
sub Pon - ti - o Pi - la - to,
74
Et re - sur - re - xit ter - ti - a di - e
se - pul - tus est.
- - - - - - - sus
pas - sus et se - pul - tus est.

80

se - cun - dum scrip - - - tu - ras.

Et re - sur - re - xit ter - ti - a

au - tem tran - si -

Et re - - - sur - re - xit ter -

86

Et a - scen - dit in ce - lum, se -

di - e se - cun - - - dum

ens per

- ti - a di - e se - cun - dum

92

det ad dex - te - ram pa - tris. Et i -

scrip - tu - ras. Et a - scen - dit

me - - - - -

scrip - tu - ras. Et a - scen - dit in ce -

98
te - rum ven - tu - rus est cum glo - ri - a
in ce - lum, se - det ad dex - te -
- - - - - - - -
lum se - det ad dex -
104
iu - di - ca - re vi - vos et mor - tu - os,
ram. Et i - te - rum ven - tu - rus est
- - - - - - - -
te - ram pa - tris. Et i - te - rum ven - tu - rus est
110
cu - ius re - gni non e - rit fi - nis.
cum glo - ri - a iu - di - ca - re
- - - - - - - -
iu - di - ca - re vi - vos et mor -

116

Et in Spi - ri-tum Sanc-tum, Do-mi-num et vi-vi - fi - can-

vi - vos et mor - tu - os, cu - ius re - gni

- - - - - - - -

tu - os, cu-ius re - gni non e - rit fi - nis

122

tem, qui ex pa - tre fi - lio - que

et in Spi - ri - tum Sanc - tum,

dium il - - - - -

et in Spi - ri - tum Sanc -

128

pro - ce - dit. Qui cum pa -

do - mi - - - -

lo - - - - - rum

tum, Do - mi - num

134

tre et fi - lio si - mul a - do -

- num et vi - - - vi - fi - - -

i - - - bat

vi - vi - fi - can - tem,

140

- ra - tur et con - glo - ri - fi - ca - tur, qui

- - can - tem, qui ex pa - tre fi - li - o - que

qui ex pa - tre fi - lio - o - que.

146

lo - cu - tus est per pro - phe - tas. Et u - nam sanc -

pro - ce - dit. Et u - nam sanc - tam ca - tho - li - cam

Et u - nam sanc - tam ca - tho - li - cam et a - po -

152

- - tam ca - tho - li-cam et a - po-sto - li - cam ec - cle -

et a - po - sto - li - cam ec - cle - si -

- sto - li - cam ec - cle - si -

158

siam. Con - fi - te - or u - num bap - ti -

am. Con - fi - te - or u - num

Jhe - - - sus au - - -

am. Con - fi - te - or u - num bap-ti - sma

163

sma in re - mis - si - o - nem pec-ca - to -

bap - tis - ma in re - mis - si - o - nem pec - ca - to - rum

tem tran - - - si -

in re - mis - si - o - nem pec-ca - to - rum et

168
rum et ex - pec-to re - sur - rec - ti - o - nem mor - tu - o - rum
et ex - pec - to re - sur - rec - tio - nem mor - tu -
ens per
ex - pec - to re - sur - rec - ti - o - nem mor -
173
et vi - tam ven - tu - ri se - cu-li. A - men.
o - rum et vi - tam ven - tu - ri se - cu - li. A - men.
me - dium il-lo - rum i - - - bat.
tu - o - rum et vi - tam ven - tu-ri se - cu - li. A - men.

Sanctus

[*Discantus*]

Sanc – tus, sanc – – – –

Contratenor [*Altus*]

Sanc – – – – tus, sanc –

Tenor

Jhesus autem transiens

[*Contratenor Bassus*]

Sanc – – – – tus, sanc – – –

6

– – – – tus, sanc –

– – – – tus, sanc – – – –

Jhe – – – sus

– – – – tus, sanc – – – –

11

– – – – – – – –

– – – – – – – – tus

au – – – tem tran –

– – – – – – – –

16
tus Do - - - mi - nus de -
Do - mi - nus
siens
tus Do - - - - mi -
21
- - - - us Sa -
de - - - - us Sa - - -
Sanc - - - -
- - - - nus de -
26
- - - ba - - - - -
- - - ba - - - - -
- - tus, sanc - tus Do - mi -
us Sa - - - - - - -

31

– – – – – – oth. Duo Ple –

– – – – – – oth. Pleni tacet

nus de – us Sa – ba – – – oth. Pleni tacet

– ba – – – – – oth. Duo Ple –

36

– – – – – ni sunt ce –

– – ni sunt

41

– – – – – li et ter –

ce – – – – li et ter –

46

– – – – ra glo – – – –

– – – – ra glo – – – –

51

– – ri – a tu – – – –

ri – – – a tu – – –

56
a.
a.
60
O san
O san
O
O
66
san

72
san
78
na
84
na in ex -
na in ex - cel -
na in

90
cel
in
ex cel
96
ex cel
102
sis. Duo Be ne dic
sis. Benedictus tacet
sis. Benedictus tacet
sis. Duo Be ne dic

108
114
tus qui ve
tus qui
120
ve
126
nit in no
nit in
132
mi
no - mi
138
ne Do
ne Do mi

144

– – – – – – mi –

– – – – – – – –

150

– – – – – – – ni. –

– – – – – – – ni.

155

O – – – – – – –

O – san – – – – – –

O – – – – – – san –

O – san – – – – – – –

160

– san – – – – – na in ex – cel –

– – na

– – na in

– – na

166
– – – – – – sis.
in ex – cel – – – – sis.
ex – cel – – – – sis.
in ex – cel – sis.

Agnus Dei

[*Discantus*]

A – gnus de – – – –

Contratenor [*Altus*]

A – – – – gnus de – – –

Tenor

[*Contratenor Bassus*]

A – – – – – – – –

6

– – i, qui tol –

– – – – – – – –

Jhe – – – sus au – – – tem

– gnus de – – – i, qui

11

– – lis *pec-ca* – *ta* mun – – – –

– – – – – – – –

tran – – – si – – – – –

tol – – – –

16

di, mi - - - - - se -

- - i, qui tol - lis pec - ca -

ens A - gnus de - i,

lis pec - ca - ta mun -

21

re - re no - - - - - -

ta mun-di, mi - se-re - re no - -

qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun - di, mi -

di, mi - se - re - re

26

- - - bis. Duo A - gnus

- - - bis. *Secundus* agnus tacet

- se - re - re no - bis. *Secundus* agnus tacet

no - - - bis. Duo A -

31

de – – – – – –

gnus

37

– – – – – – – –

de – – –

43

i, qui tol –

i, qui tol –

49

– – – – – – lis pec –

– – – – – – – –

55

– ca – – – ta

lis pec – ca – ta

61

mun – – – – di, mi – se – re –

mun – – – di, mi – se – re –

67
re
– – re no –
73
no – bis. A – – – – gnus
A – – – – –
A – – – – –
– – bis. A – gnus
79
de – – – – – –
gnus de – – i,
– – – gnus de – – –
de – – – – i,

85
i, qui
qui tol - lis
- - - - i, qui
qui
91
tol - - - -
tol - lis
tol - lis
97
lis pec - ca - ta
pec - ca - ta
pec - ca - - - ta
pec - ca - - - - ta

103
mun – – – – –
mun – – – – – – –
mun – – – –
mun – – – –
109
– – di, do – na
– – di, – – – do – na
– – – di,
– – – di, do –
115
no – – – – – –
no – – – –
do – na no –
na no –

120
– – – – bis pa – – –
bis
– – – – bis pa – – – –
– – – bis
125
– – – – – – cem.
pa – – – – – cem.
– – – – – – cem.
pa – – – – cem.

Missa L'homme armé

Kyrie

17
ste
ste
23
29

35
ley -
41
- - - son. Ky - ri - e
ley - son. Ky - ri - e
ley - son. Ky - ri -
ley - son. Ky - ri - e
47
e

52
57
62
ley - - - - son.
ley - - - - - son.
ley - - - - - son.
ley - - - - - son.

Gloria

[Discantus]
Et in ter - ra
Triplum
Et in ter - ra
Tenor
Contratenor
6
pax ho - mi - ni - - - bus bo -
pax ho - mi - ni - bus bo -
11
ne vo - lun - ta - - - tis.
ne vo - - - - - lun -

16

Lau - da - mus te be - ne - di -

- - ta - tis. Lau - da - - -

Lau - - - da -

Lau - - - - da -

21

ci - mus te, a - do - ra - mus

mus te, be - ne - di - ci - mus te, a - do - ra - mus

mus te.

mus te, be - ne - di - ci -

26

te, glo - ri - fi - ca - - -

te, glo - ri - fi - ca - mus te.

mus te, a - do - ra - mus te, glo - ri - fi - ca -

31

mus te. Gra - ti - as

Gra - ti - as a - gi - mus

Gra - ti - as a -

mus te. Gra - ti - as a - gi - mus ti - bi

36

a - gi - mus ti - bi prop - ter ma - gnam glo - ri -

ti - bi prop - ter ma - gnam glo - ri -

gi - - - - mus ti -

prop - ter ma - - - gnam glo - ri - am tu - am.

41

- am tu - am. Do - mi - ne de - us, rex ce -

am tu - am. Do - - - mi - ne d -

bi prop - ter ma - gnam

Do - mi - ne de - us, rex ce -

46

les - - - - - tis, de - us

us, rex ce - les - tis de - us pa - ter

Do - mi-ne de - us, rex ce - les - tis, de - us

- les - tis, de-us pa - ter

51

pa - ter om - ni-po - - - - tens.

om - ni - po - - - - - tens.

pa - ter om - ni - po - - - tens.

om-ni - po - - - - tens.

56

Duo

Do - mi-ne fi - li u - ni - ge-

Duo

Do - mi - ne fi - li u -

62

ni - - - te, Ie - su Chri - - - ste.

- ni - ge - ni - te, Ie - su Chri -

68

Do - mi - - - ne de - us, a - gnus

ste. Do - mi - ne de - us, a - gnus

74

de - i, fi - li us pa - - -

de - i, fi - li - us

80

- - - - - - - -

pa - - - - - - -

86

tris. Qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun -

tris. Qui tol - lis

Qui

92

di, mi - se - re - re

pec - - - - ca - ta mun - di -

tol -

98

no - - - - - bis.

mi - se - re - re - no - - - bis. -

- *lis pec - ca - ta mun - di,*

104

Qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun -

Qui tol -

mi - se - re - re no -

110

di, su - sci - pe de - pre - ca - ti -

lis pec - ca - ta. Qui

bis. Qui tol - - - lis

116

o - nem no - - - stram. qui

se - des ad dex -

pec - ca - ta mun - di, su - sci -

122

se - des ad dex - te - ram

te - ram pa - tris, mi - se -

- - - pe de - pre - ca - ti -

128

pa - tris, mi - se - re - re no -

- *re* - *re* *no* - *bis*

- *o* - *nem* *no* - *stram.*

134

bis. Quo - ni - am tu so -

Qui se - - - *des ad dex* - *te* -

140

lus sanc - tus, tu so -

- *ram pa* - *tris, mi* - *se* - *re* - *re no* - *bis.* *Quo* - *ni* -

146

lus Do - mi - nus, tu so -

tu

Tu so - lus al -

am tu so - lus sanc - tus, tu so -

152

lus al - - - tis - - - si -

so - - - - lus al - tis -

tis - - - si - - - - -

lus Do - mi - nus, tu so -

158

- mus, Ie - - - su

si - mus, Ie - - - su

- mus, Ie - - - - su

- lus al - tis - si - mus, Ie - su

164
Chri - - - ste.
Chri - - - - ste.
Chri - - - - - ste.
Chri - - - - - ste.
170
Cum Sanc - to Spi - ri - tu,
Cum Sanc - to Spi - ri - - -
Cum Sanc - to Spi - ri - tu, in glo - ri - a
Cum Sanc - to Spi - ri - tu, in glo -
176
in glo - ri - a
- - tu, in glo - ri - a de - i
de - i
ri - a de-

182
de - i pa -
pa - tris. A -
pa - - - - - - -
i pa - - - - tris. A -
187
tris. A - - - - - men.
- - - - - - men.
tris. A - - - - - men.
- - - - - - men.

Credo

[Discantus]
Pa - trem om - ni - po - - - ten -
Triplum
Pa - - - trem om - ni - po - ten -
Tenor
Contratenor
6
tem, fac - to - rem ce - li et ter - re, vi - si - bi -
tem, fac - to - rem ce - li et ter -
11
li - - - um om - ni - um et in - vi -
- - - - re, vi - si - bi - li - um om - ni - um

16

si - bi - li - - - - um. Et

et in - vi - si - bi - li - um. Et in

Et

21

in u - num Do - mi - num Ie - sum Chri - -

u - num Do - mi - num Ie - sum Chri - stum, fi -

in u - num Do - mi - num Ie - sum Chri - stum, fi - li -

26

- - stum, fi - li - um de - - - i u - ni -

li - um de - i u - ni - ge - ni - tum. Et ex pa - tre

um de - i u - ni - ge - ni - tum. Et ex pa -

31

ge - ni - tum. Et ex pa - tre na - tum an-te

na-tum an - te om - ni - a se - cu - la. De -

tre na - tum an - te om-ni - a se - cu - la.

36

om-ni-a se - cu - la. De - um de de - o,

- um, lu - men de lu - mi - ne, de - um ve -

De - um de de - - - o, lu - men de lu - mi -

41

lu - men de lu - mi - ne, de - um ve - rum de

rum de de - o ve - ro. Ge - ni-tum non

ne, de - um ve - rum de de - o ve - ro.

46

de - o ve - ro. Ge - ni - tum non fac -

fac - tum con - sub - stan - ti - a - lem pa - tri, per quem

Ge - ni - tum non fac - tum con - sub - stan -

51

tum con - sub - stan - ti - a - lem - pa - tri, per

om - ni - a fac - - - ta sunt. Qui prop -

Qui

ti - a - lem pa - - - tri, per quem om -

56

quem om - ni - a fac - ta sunt. Qui prop - ter nos ho - mi -

ter nos ho - mi - nes et prop - ter

prop - - - - ter nos ho - mi -

- ni - a fac - ta sunt. Qui prop - ter nos

61

nes et prop - ter no - stram sa - lu - tem, de -

no - stram sa - lu - tem, de - scen - dit de

nes et prop - ter no - stram sa - lu - tem,

ho - mi - nes et prop - ter no - stram sa - lu - tem, de -

66

- scen - dit de ce - lis. Et in - car - na - tus

ce - - - lis. Et in - car - na - tus est

de - scen - dit de ce - lis. Et in - car - na - tus est

scen - dit de ce - lis. Et in - car - na - tus est de Spi - ri - tu

71

est de Spi - ri - tu Sanc - to ex Ma - ri - a vir - gi - ne,

de Spi - ri - tu Sanc - to ex Ma - ri - a vir - gi - ne,

de Spi - ri - tu Sanc - to ex Ma - ri - a vir - gi -

Sanc - to ex Ma - ri - a vir - gi - ne, et ho - mo fac -

76

et ho-mo fac - tus est. Duo Cru - ci - fi -

et ho - mo fac - tus est. Duo Cru - ci -

ne, et ho-mo fac - tus est.

- tus est.

81

xus e - ti - am pro no - bis sub Pon - ti - o Pi - la -

fi - xus e - ti - am pro no - bis sub Pon - ti - o Pi - la -

86

to pas-sus et se - pul - tus est.

to pas - sus et se - pul - tus est.

91

Et re-sur-re - xit ter - ti - a di-e se - cun-dum

Et re - sur-re - xit ter - ti - a di - e se - cun-dum

96
scrip - tu - - - - ras. Et a - scen -
scrip - tu - - - - ras. Et
Et
101
dit in ce - lum, se - det ad
a - scen - - - - dit in
a - - - - scen - - -
107
dex - te - - - ram pa - tris. Et i -
ce - - - - - - - -
- - - - dit

113

– – te – rum ven – tu – rus est

– – lum, se – det ad dex – te – ram

in ce – lum, se – det ad

119

cum glo – ri –

pa – tris. Et i – te – rum ven – – –

Se – – – – – –

dex – te – ram

125

a iu – di – ca – – re vi –

– tu – rus est cum

det ad dex – te – ram pa – tris

pa – tris. Et i – te – rum

131

vos et mor - tu - os, cu - ius re -

glo - - - ri - a iu - di - ca - re vi - vos

ven - - - tu - rus est cum

137

gni non e - rit fi - nis. Et in Spi -

et mor - tu - os, cu - ius

glo - ri - a iu - - - di -

143

ri - tum Sanc - tum, Do - mi - num et vi - vi - fi -

re - gni non e - rit fi -

- - ca - re vi - vos et

149

- can - tem, qui ex pa - tre fi -

nis. Et in Spi - ri - tum

mor - tu - os, cu - ius

155

- li - o - que pro - ce - dit.

Sanc - tum, Do - mi - num et vi - vi -

re - - - gni non e - rit

161

Qui cum pa - tre et

- fi - can - tem, qui ex pa -

fi - nis. Et in Spi -

167
fi - li - o si - mul a - do - ra - tur
tre fi - lio
ri - tum Sanc - tum, Do - mi -
173
et con -
num et vi - vi - fi - can - tem, qui ex pa - tre fi - li - o -
179
- glo - ri - fi - ca - tur, qui lo - cu -
que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum pa - tre si - mul a - do - ra -

185

- tus est per pro - phe - tas.

tur et con-glo-ri - fi-ca - tur, qui lo - cu - tus

191

Et u - nam sanc -

Et u - nam sanc-tam ca-

Et u - nam sanc - tam

est per pro - phe - tas. Et u - nam sanc -

197

- - tam ca - tho - li - cam et a -

tho - - - li - cam et a - po-sto-li-cam

ca - tho - li - cam et a - po - sto - li - cam ec -

tam ca - tho - li-cam et

203

- po - sto - li - cam ec - - - cle -

ec - cle - si -

cle - si - am. Con - fi - te -

a - po - sto - li - - -

209

- si - am. Con - fi - te - or

- - - am Con - fi - te - or u - num

or u - num bap - tis - ma

- - - cam ec - cle - si - am. Con - fi - te -

215

u - num bap - tus - ma in re - mis - si - o - nem

bap - tis - ma in re - mis - si - o - nem

in re - mis - si - o - nem pec -

- - or u - num bap - tis - ma in re - mis -

221
pec - ca - to - rum. Et ex - pec - to
pec - ca - to - rum. Et ex - pec - to
ca - to - rum.
si - o - nem. Et ex - pec -
226
re - sur - rec - ti - o - nem mor - tu - o -
re - sur - rec - ti - o - nem mor - tu - o -
Et ex - pec - to re - sur - - -
to re - sur - rec - ti - o - - - nem
231
- - - - rum et vi - tam
- - - - rum et vi - tam ven -
rec - - - ti - o - - - nem
mor - tu - o - rum et

236

ven - tu - - - ri se - - -

tu - ri se - cu - - - li.

mor - tu - o - rum

vi - tam ven - tu - ri

241

cu - li.

et vi - tam ven - tu - ri se - cu -

se - cu - li.

246

A - - - - - -

A - - -

- - li. A - - - - -

A - - - - -

251
men.
men.
men.
men.

Sanctus

[Discantus]
Sanc – – – – – – – –
Triplum
Sanc – – – – – – – –
Tenor
Contratenor Secundus
6
tus, sanc – – – – – – –
tus, sanc – – – – – –
11
– – – – – – – tus,
– – – – – – – tus
Sanc –
Sanc –

16

sanc - - - - - - -

- - - - - - *tus,*

- - - *tus, sanc* - - - - -

21

- - - - tus Do - mi -

sanc - tus

- - - - *tus*

26

- - nus de - - - - us Sa -

Do - mi - - - - -

31
ba
Do - mi - nus
nus de -
36
de - - - us
us Sa -
41
Sa - ba
ba

46

oth. Duo Ple - ni

Duo Ple - ni

oth. pleni tacet

- *oth.*

52

sunt ce - - - - -

sunt

58

- - - - - - - li

ce - - - - - - - li

64

et

et ter -

70

ter - - - - - - -

- - - - - - - -

76
82
ra
ra
88
glo - ri
glo - ri
94
a
a tu -
100
tu

106
a. O san
a. O
O
O
112
san
san
san
118
na
na
na

124
in ex - - - cel - - -
130
- - - - - - - -
136
- - - - - - - -
in

142
in ex - cel - - - - -
148
in
154
ex - cel - - - - -
ex - cel - - - - -

160
– – – sis. Be – – – ne –
Duo
– – – sis. Be – ne –
– – – – sis.
– – – sis.
Benedictus tacet
166
– – – dic – – – – –
– – – – dic – – – – –
172
– – – – tus qui ve –
– – – – tus
178
– – – – nit,
qui ve – nit
184
qui

190

ve – – – – – – – –

in

196

nit in no – mi – ne Do –

no – mi – ne Do – mi –

202

mi – ni. O – san – – – –

– – ni. O – san – – – – –

O – san – – – –

O – san – na

207

– – – – na

– – – – na in ex –

na

212
in ex - cel -
- - - - - cel - - - -
in ex -
217
- - - - - - - sis.
- - - - - - - sis.
in ex - cel - - - sis.
- cel - - - - - - sis.

Agnus Dei

[Discantus]
A – – – – – – – –
Contratenor Primus
A – gnus de – – –
Tenor
Contratenor Secundus
6
– – gnus de – – – – –
– – i, qui
11
– – – – – – – i,
A –
A –

16

qui tol - lis pec - ca -

qui tol - lis pec - ca - - -

- - gnus de - i,

- - gnus de - i, *qui*

21

- - - - - - - -

- - - - *ta mun - di,*

qui tol - lis *pec -*

tol - - - lis pec - ca - ta

26

- - ta mun - - - - -

ca - ta mun - di,

mun - - - -

31
di, mi - se - re - re
mi - se - re - re
mi - se - re - - - - re
di, mi -
36
no - - - - - - -
no - - - - - -
no - - -
se - re - re no -
41
- - - bis. A - - - gnus
Duo
- - - bis. A - gnus
Duo
- - - bis.
- - - bis.

47

de – – –

de –

53

– – – – – – – –

– – – – – – – –

59

– – – – – – – i,

– – – – – – – *i,*

65

qui tol – – –

qui *tol* – *lis*

71

lis pec – ca – – – ta

pec – – – *ca* – *ta* *mun* –

77

mun – di, mi – se – re – – – re

– – *di,* *mi* – *se* – *re* – *re* *no* –

83

no - - - - bis. A -

- - - - - - bis. A -

A -

A -

89

- - - - - - - gnus

- - gnus

- gnus

- - - - gnus

95

de - - - - - -

de - - - i,

de - - - - - - -

101
i,
qui tol
i,
de i, qui
107
lis pec ca
qui tol lis pec ca
tol
113
lis

119
qui tol -
- - - - - - ta
ta mun -
pec - ca - ta
125
- - lis
mun - - - - -
- - - - - - - -
mun - - - - -
131
pec - ca - ta mun - di,
- - - - - - - -
- - di,
- - - - - - - di,

137
do - - - - - - -
di,
do - - - - - - -
do - - - - na
do - na no - - - bis
142
- - na no - - - - -
- - - - - - - -
147
bis pa - - - - -
na no - - - bis
no - bis pa - - - -

152
– – – – – – – cem.
pa – – – – cem.
– – – – – – – cem.
pa – – – – cem.

Missa Sanguis sanctorum

Kyrie

17
ste
23
29
ley
ley

35
ley – – – son. Ky – ri –
ley – son. Ky – ri –
– – son. Ky – – –
– son. Ky – ri –
43
– – – – e
– e
ri – – – e
e
48
ley – – – –
ley – – –
–

53
son.
son.
ley son.
ley son.

Gloria

[*Discantus*]

Et in ter-ra pax ho - mi - ni - bus bo - ne vo -

Contra[*tenor Altus*]

Et in ter - ra pax ho - mi - ni - bus

Tenor

[*Contratenor*] *Bassus*

6

- lun - ta - - - - tis.

bo - ne vo - lun - ta - - - tis. Lau - da - mus te,

Lau - da -

11

be - ne - di - ci - mus te, a - do - ra - mus te, glo - ri -

mus te, be - ne - di - ci - mus te, *a - do -*

16

Gra - ti - as

- - fi - ca - mus te. Gra - ti - as a - gi -

ra - mus te, glo - ri - fi - ca - mus - te.

21

a - gi - mus ti - - - bi prop - ter

mus ti - bi *prop* -

Gra - - - ti - - - - as

Gra - ti - as a - gi - mus ti -

26

ma - gnam glo - ri - am tu - am. Do - mi -

- - - *ter ma - gnam glo - ri - am*

a - gi -

- - bi *prop - - - ter ma - gnam*

31

- ne de - us, rex ce - les -

tu - am. Do - mi - ne de - us, rex ce - les-

mus ti - bi prop - - - ter

glo - - - ri - am tu - am Do - mi -

36

- - - - tis, de - us

tis, de - us pa - ter om - ni - - -

ma - gnam glo - ri - am.

ne fi - li u - ni - ge - ni - te,

41

pa - ter om - ni - po - tens. Do - mi-ne fi -

- - - po - - - tens.

Ie - su

46

li u-ni-ge - ni - te.

Ie - su Chri - - -

Chri - - - ste. Do - mi - ne de -

51

Do - mi - ne de-us, a - gnus de - - - -

Do - mi - ne de - us,

ste. u -

us, a - - - - gnus

56

- - i, fi - li -

a - gnus de - i, fi - li -

- - - - - ni - ge - ni - te.

de - - - - i fi - li - us

61
us pa - - - - - - tris.
us pa - - - - - tris.
Fi - li - us pa - tris.
pa tris.
66
Qui tol - - - - -
Qui tol - lis pec - ca -
72
- - - lis pec - ca - - -
ta mun - di mi - se - re -

78

ta mun - di, mi -

re no - - - - - bis.

84

- se - re - re no - - - -

Qui tol -

90

bis. Qui

lis pec - ca - ta mun - di, su -

Qui

Qui

96

tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun -

sci - pe de - - - pre -

tol - - - - - - - -

tol - - - - - lis

102

- - - - - - di, su - sci -

- - ca - ti - - - o - nem

lis,

pec - ca - - - ta mun - di

108

pe de - pre - ca - ti - o - nem no - stram. Qui

no - - - - - stram.

su - sci - pe. Qui se -

114

se - des ad dex - te - - ram

des dex - te - ram

120

pa - tris, mi - se - re - - -

ad dex - te - ram pa - - - tris mi - se -

su - sci - pe

mi - se - re - - - re

126

- - re no - - - - bis. Quo -

- - re - re. Quo - ni - - -

de - pre - ca - ti - o - nem no - - -

no - bis.

132

ni - am tu so - lus sanc - - - -

- *am* *tu* *so* - *lus*

- - - - - - - -

138

- - - tus, tu

sanc - - - *tus* *tu* *so* -

- - - stram.

144

so - lus Do - mi - nus, tu

- *lus* *do* - *mi* - *nus,* *tu*

150

so - lus al - tis - - - si - - -

so - - - - lus al - tis -

al - tis -

156

- - - - - - mus.

- si - - - - - mus.

Ie -

- - si - - - - mus.

162

- - - - - su Chri -

Ie - su Chri -

168
Cum Sanc -
Cum
- - - - - - - ste
- - - - - ste.
174
to Spi - ri - - - - tu,
Sanc - to *Spi - ri - tu, in*
Cum
Cum Sanc - to Spi - ri - - -
180
in glo - ri - a de - i pa - tris.
glo - ri - - - a
Sanc - to
- tu, in glo - ri - a

186

A - - - - - - - -

de - i pa - - - - tris. A -

de - - - i pa - tris. A - - -

192

- - - - men.

- - - men.

A - men.

- - - - - men.

Credo

[Discantus]
Pa - trem om - ni - po - ten - tem, fac -
Contra[tenor Altus]
Pa - trem om - ni - po - ten - tem,
Tenor
[Contratenor] Bassus
6
to - rem ce - li et ter - - - - - -
fac - to - rem ce - li et ter - - - -
11
re.
re, vi - si - bi - li - um om - ni -
Vi - si - bi - li - um

16

Et in

um *et in - vi - si - bi - li - um. Et*

Do -

et in - vi - si - bi - li - um.

21

u - num Do - mi - num Ie - sum Chri -

in u - num Do - mi - num Ie - sum Chri -

mi - - - num Ie - sum

Do - mi - num Ie - - - sum Chri -

26

stum, fi - li - um de - i u-ni - ge-ni - tum.

stum, fi - li - um u - ni - ge - ni -

Chri - - - - - stum

stum

31

Et ex pa - tre na - - - tum. Con-sub -

tum.

Et ex pa - tre na - tum. Con-

36

stan - ti - a - lem pa - tri, per quem om - ni - a fac - ta

fac - ta

sub - stan - ti - a - lem pa - tri per quem om - ni - a fac - ta

41

sunt. Qui prop - ter nos ho - mi -

sunt. Qui prop - ter nos ho - mi -

Et in

sunt. Qui prop - ter nos ho - mi - nes et prop -

46

nes et prop - ter no - stram sa - lu - tem,

nes et prop - ter no - stram sa - lu -

u - - - num Do - mi - num.

ter nos - tram sa - lu - tem de -

51

de - scen - dit de ce - lis.

tem de - scen - dit de ce - lis. Et

scen - dit de ce - - - lis.

56

Et in - car - na - tus est de Spi - ri - tu Sanc -

in - car - na - tus est de Spi - ri - tu Sanc -

61
to ex Ma -
to.
Et ho -
66
ri - a vir - gi - ne.
Et ho - mo fac -
mo fac - - - -
71
Cru - ci - fi - xus e - ti - am pro no -
Cru - ci - fi - xus e - ti - am pro no -
tus est.
tus est.

76
bis sub Pon - ti - o Pi - la - to,
bis sub Pon - ti - o Pi - la - to pas -
Sub Pon - ti - - - o Pi -
Sub Pon - ti - o Pi - la - to, pas -
81
pas - sus et se - pul - tus
sus et se - pul - tus est.
la - - - to, pas - - - sus et se - pul - tus
sus et se - pul - tus est.
86
est. Et re - sur - re - xit
Et re - sur -
est.

92
ter - ti - a di - e se -
re - xit se - cun -
98
cun - - - dum scrip - tu - - -
dum scrip - tu - - - - ras.
104
ras. Et a - scen - dit
Et a - scen - dit in ce -

110

in ce - lum, se - det ad dex - te - ram

lum se - det ad dex - te -

116

pa - tris. Et i - te -

ram pa - tris.

122

rum ven - tu - rus est cum glo - ri - a iu - di - ca -

Et i - te - rum ven - tu - rus est cum glo -

128
re vi - vos et mor - tu -
ri - a iu - di - ca - re
134
os, cu - ius re - gni non
vi - - - vos
140
e - rit fi - nis. Et
et mor - tu - os,

146

in Spi - ri - tum Sanc - tum, Do - mi -

cu - - - ius re - gni non

152

num et vi - vi - fi - can -

e - - - - - - - rit

158

tem, qui ex pa - tre fi - li - o - que pro -

fi - nis. *qui ex pa - tre*

qui ex pa - tre fi -

164
ce - dit. Qui cum pa -
fi - li - o - que pro - ce - dit. Qui
lio - - - - que cum
170
tre et fi - li -
cum pa - tre et
pa - tre
176
o si - mul a - do - ra - tur
fi - li - o si - - - -

182
et con - - - glo - ri - fi - ca -
mul
et con - - - - - -
188
a - do - ra - tur
glo - - - ri - - - fi - ca -
194
tur, qui lo - cu -
qui lo - cu - tus
tur

200
tus est per pro - phe -
est per pro - phe - tas
206
tas. Et u - nam sanc - tam ca - tho -
212
li - cam.
Et
Et u - nam sanc -

218
a - po - sto - li - cam
tam ca - tho - li - cam ec - cle - - -
224
Con - fi - te - or
Et ex - pec -
ec - cle - si - am.
si - am Con -
230
u - num bap - ti - - - - -
to re - sur - rec - ti - o - nem mor - tu - o -
fi - - - te - - - or

236

sma in re - mis - si - o -

rum

Et vi - tam

242

nem pec - ca - - - to - rum.

Et vi -

Et

ven - - - tu -

248

Et vi - tam ven -

tam ven - tu - ri se - cu - - -

vi - tam ven - tu - - - ri

ri

254
tu - ri se - cu - li. A -
li. A -
se - cu - li.
se - cu - - - - - li.
261
men.
men.
A - - - men.
A - - - - men. - - - -

Sanctus

[*Discantus*]

Sanc – – – – – – – –

Contra[*tenor Altus*]

Sanc – – – – – – – –

Tenor

[*Contratenor*] *Bassus*

6

– – – – tus,

– – – – tus, sanc – – –

Sanc – – – –

11

sanc – – –

– – – – – tus

Sanc –

– – tus, sanc – – – tus Do –

16

– – – – – – – tus

Do – mi – – – –

– – – – – – – tus,

– – mi – nus de – – – – –

21

Do – – – – – – – mi –

nus de – – – – – –

– – – – – – – –

26

– – nus de – – – – – –

– – us

sanc –

– – us Sa – – – – –

31
us Sa – – – – – – –
Sa ba –
tus Do – mi – nus de –
– – – – – – – –
36
– – – ba – – – – oth.
– – – oth. Ple –
us. Sa – ba – oth.
ba – oth.
41
Ple – ni sunt ce – – – –
ni sunt ce – – – –

46

li et ter - ra glo - ri - a tu - a.

li

tu -

Glo - ri - a

51

O - san - - -

O - san - na in

- - - - a. O -

tu - - - a. O - san - na

56

- - na in ex - cel - - - -

ex - cel - - - - - -

san - na in ex - cel - - - - -

in ex - cel - - - -

61
sis. Be - - - - ne -
- sis. Be - ne - - - - -
- sis.
- sis.
67
- - - - - - - -
- - - - - - dic -
73
dic - - - - - - - -
- tus qui ve - nit in

79
tus
no
Qui
85
qui ve
Qui
91
mi
ve

97

– – – nit in no –

– – – – – – ne

ve – nit

– – – – nit

103

– – – – mi – – – ne

Do – – – –

in no – – – –

in

109

Do – – – – – –

mi – – – – – – – –

– mi – ne Do – mi – ni,

no – mi – ne

115
mi
121
ni
Do
127
ni.
Do
mi

133

O - san -

O - san -

mi - - - - - - ni. -

- - - - - - - ni.

139

- na in

na in

O - - - san - - - -

O - san - na in ex - cel -

145

ex - cel - - - - - -

ex - cel - - - - - - -

na in ex - cel -

- - - - - - - -

150
sis.
sis.
sis.
sis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aaron, Pietro. *Toscanello in musica.* Venezia: Marchio Sessa, 1523.

Adler, Guido "Über Textlegung in den 'Trienter Codices'." In *Riemann-Festschrift: Gesammelte Studien; Hugo Riemann zum sechzigsten Geburstage*, edited by Carl Mennicke, 51-54. Leipzig: Hesse, 1909.

Alden, Jane. "Reading the Loire Valley Chansonniers." *Acta Musicologica* 79, no. 1 (2007): 1-31.

———. *Songs, Scribes, and Society. The History and Reception of the Loire Valley Chansonniers.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Allaire, Gaston. "Debunking the Myth of Musica Ficta." *Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 45, no. 2 (1995): 110-26.

Atlas, Allan. "Review: The Mellon Chansonnier by Leeman L. Perkins, Howard Garey." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 34, no. 1 (1981): 132-43.

Avalle, D'Arco Silvio. "La critica testuale." In *Grundriss der romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters*, edited by Hans R. Jauss and Erich Köhler, 538-58. Heidelberg: Winter, 1972.

———. *La doppia verità.* Firenze: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2002.

———. "La filologia romanza e i codici." In *La filologia romanza e i codici*, edited by Saverio Guida and Fortunata Latella. Messina: Sicania, 1993.

———. "La funzione del «punto di vista» nelle strutture oppositive binarie." *Lettere italiane* 40 (1993): 213-20.

Bárány, Attila. "King Matthias and the Western European Powers." In *Matthias Rex 1458-1490 – Hungary at the Dawn of the Renaissance,* edited by István Draskóczy, Iván Horváth, Gábor Kiss Farkas, Ernő Marosi and Vilmos Voigt Budapest: ELTE, Centre des hautes études de la Renaissance, 2013.

———. "Matthias Corvinus and Charles the Bold." *Chronica* 12 (2016): 69-88.

Beaune, Henri, and Jules D'Arbaumont. *La noblesse aux états de Bourgogne de 1350 à 1789.* Dijon: La Marche, 1864.

Belozerskaya, Marina. *Rethinking the Renaissance. Burgundian Arts across Europe.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Bent, Margaret. "Accidentals, Counterpoint and Notation in Aaron's Aggiunta to the Toscanello in Musica." *The Journal of Musicology* 12, no. 3 (1994): 306-44.

———. *Counterpoint, Composition and Musica Ficta.* New York: Routledge, 2002.

———. "Diatonic Ficta." *Early Music History* 4 (1984): 1-48.

———. "Diatonic *ficta* revisited: Josquin's *Ave Maria* in Context." *Music Theory Online* 2, no. 6. (1996). Accessed 08/03/2018. http://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.96.2.6/mto.96.2.6.bent.html.

———. "Early Music Editing, Forty Years On: Principles, Techniques, and Future Directions." In *Early Music Editing: Principles, Historiography, Future Directions*, edited by Theodor Dumitrescu, Karl Kügle and Marnix van Berchum, 241-71. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013.

———. "Early Music Editing, Forty Years On: Principles, Techniques, and Future Directions." In *Early Music Editing: Principles, Historiography, Future Directions*, edited by Theodor Dumitrescu, Karl Kügle and Marnix van Berchum, 241-71. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013.

———. "The early use of the sign ϕ." *Early Music* 24, no. 2 (1996): 199-226.

———. "Editing Early Music: The Dilemma of Translation." *Early Music* 22, no. 3 (1994): 373-74; 76-92.

———. "The Limits of Notation in Defining the Musical Text." In *L'edizione critica tra testo musicale e testo letterario*, edited by Renato Borghi and Pietro Zappalà, 367-72. Lucca: Libreria Musicale Italiana, 1995.

———. "The Limits of Notation in Defining the Musical Text." In *L'edizione critica tra testo musicale e testo letterario*, edited by Renato Borghi and Pietro Zappalà, 367-72. Lucca: Libreria Musicale Italiana, 1995.

———. "Musica Recta and Musica Ficta." *Musica Disciplina* 26 (1972): 73-100.

———. "On False Concords in Late Fifteenth-Century Music: Yet Another Look at Tinctoris." In *Théorie et analyse musicales 1450-1650*, edited by Anne-Emmanuelle Ceulemans and Bonnie Blackburn, 65-118. Louvain-la-Neuve: Département d'histoire de l'art et d'archéologie, Collège Érasme, 2001.

———. "On the Interpretation of ϕ in the Fifteenth Century: A Response to Rob Wegman." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 53, no. 3 (2000): 597-612.

———. "Text Setting in Sacred Music of the Early Fifteenth-Century: Evidence and Implications." In *Musik und Text in der Mehrstimmigkeit des 14. Und 15. Jahrhunderts, Vorträge des Gastsymposions in der Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel, 8. Bis 12. September 1980*, edited by Ursula Günther, 291-326. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1984.

Bentley, Jerry H. *Politics and Culture in Renaissance Naples.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Berger, Christian. "Hexachord und Modus: drei Rondeaux von Gilles Binchois." *Bäsler Jahrbuch für historische Musikpraxis* 17 (1993): 71-87.

Berger, Karol. *Musica ficta, Theories of Accidental Inflections in Vocal Polyphony from Marchetto da Padova to Gioseffo Zarlino.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Bessey, Valérie, Véronique Flammang, and Émilie Lebailly, eds. *Comptes de l'Argentier de Charles le Téméraire, duc de Bourgogne* Vol. 3/1. Paris: Boccard, 2008.

Bessey, Valérie, and Sébastien Hamel, eds. *Comptes de l'Argentier de Charles le Téméraire, duc de Bourgogne* Vol. 4. Paris: Boccard, 2009.

Bigarne, Charles. "Les capitaines du chateau de Beaune, études généalogiques." *Société d'histoire, d'archéologie et de littérature de l'arrondissement de Beaune. Mémoires année 1886* (1887).

Bisaha, Nancy. *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Blachly, Alexander. "Mensuration and Tempo in 15th-Century Music. Cut Signatures in Theory and Practice." PhD dissertation, Columbia University, 1995.

Blackburn, Bonnie J. "Masses Based on Popular Songs and Solmization Syllables." In *The Josquin Companion*, edited by Richard Sherr, 51-87. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

———. "Reviewed Work: Chromatic Beauty in the Late Medieval Chanson: An Interpretation of Manuscript Accidentals by Thomas Brothers." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 51, no. 3 (1998): 630-36.

Bloxam, M. Jennifer. "A Cultural Context for the Chanson Mass." In *Early Musical Borrowing*, edited by Honey Meconi, 5-28. New York and London: Routledge, 2004.

———. "'I have never seen your equal': Agricola, the Virgin, and the Creed." *Early Music* 34, no. 3 (2006): 391-407.

Boone, Graeme M. *Patterns in Play. A Model for Text Setting in the Early French Songs of Guillaume Dufay.* Lincoln, London: University of Nebraska Press, 1999.

Boorman, Stanley. "Notational Spelling and Scribal Habit." In *Studies in the Printing, Publishing and Performance of Music in the 16th Century*, 65-109. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1995.

Borghetti, Vincenzo. "Il suono e la pagina. Riflessioni sulla scrittura musicale nel Rinascimento." In *La scrittura come rappresentazione del pensiero musicale*, edited by Gianmario Borio, 89-124. Pisa: ETS, 2004.

———. "Una biografia senza stile – Uno stile senza biografia. Raccontare la vita e l'opera di Johannes Ockeghem." *Philomusica on-line* 11 (2012): 38-62.

Brauner, Mitchell P. "Have Mercy! Texting and Performing the Kyrie from Cappella Sistina Manuscripts." In *Der Fondo Cappella Sistina als musikgeschichtliche Quelle*, edited by Adalbert Roth and Thomas Schmidt-Beste, 32-47. Città del Vaticano: Capellae Apostolicae Sixtinaeque Collectanea Acta Monumenta, 2001.

———. "Review of A. Roth, Studien zum frühen Repertoire der päpstlichen Kapelle...". *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 46, no. 2 (1993): 306-12.

Brett, Philip. "Text, Context, and the Early Music Editor." In *Authenticity and Early Music. A Symposium*, edited by Nicholas Kenyon, 83-114. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Brook, Barry S. "Determining Authenticity through Internal Analysis: A Multifaceted Approach (with Special Reference to Haydn's String Trios)." In *Joseph Haydn: Bericht über den Internationalen Joseph Haydn Kongress, Wien, Hofburg, 5.-12. September 1982*, 551-57. München: G. Henle Verlag, 1986.

Brothers, Thomas. *Chromatic Beauty in the Late Medieval Chanson: an Interpretation of Manuscript Accidentals.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Brown, Andrew, and Graeme Small, eds. *Court and Civic Society in the Burgundian Low Countries c. 1420-1530*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.

Brown, Howard Mayer. "In Alamire's Workshop: Notes on Scribal Practice in the Early Sixteenth Century." In *Datierung und Filiation von Musikhandschriften der Josquin-Zeit*, edited by Ludwig Finscher, 15-63. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983b.

———. "“Lord, have mercy upon us”: Early Sixteenth-Century Scribal Practice and the Polyphonic Kyrie." *Text: Transactions of the Society for Textual Scholarship* 2 (1985): 93-110.

———. "Music and Ritual at Charles the Bold's Court: The Function of Liturgical Music by Busnoys and his Contemporaries." In *Antoine Busnoys: Method, Meaning, and Context in Late Medieval Music*, edited by Paula Higgins, 53-70. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

———. "Text Underlay." In *A Florentine Chansonnier from the Time of Lorenzo the Magnificent: Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale MS Banco Rari 229*, edited by Howard Mayer Brown, 168-80. Chicago; London: Chicago University Press, 1983a.

———. "Words and Music in Early 16th-Century Chansons: Text Underlay in Florence, Biblioteca del Conservatorio, Ms Basevi 2442." In *Formen und Probleme der Überlieferung mehrstimmiger Musik*, edited by Ludwig Finscher, 97-141. Munchen: Kraus International, 1981.

Buettner, Brigitte. "Past Presents: New Year's Gifts at the Valois Courts, ca. 1400." *The Art Bulletin* 83, no. 4 (2001): 598-625.

Burke, Peter. *The Italian Renaissance. Culture and Society in Italy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Busse Berger, Anna Maria. *Mensuration and Proportion Signs: Origins and Evolution.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Calella, Michele. *Musikalische Autorschaft. Der Komponist zwischen Mittelalter und Neuzeit.* Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2014.

Caraci, Maria. "Fortuna del tenor *L'Homme Armé* nel primo Rinascimento." *Nuova Rivista Musicale Italiana* 9, no. 2 (1975): 3-36.

Caraci Vela, Maria. "Intertestualità allusiva e tecniche ipertestuali nelle messe *l'Homme Armé* del secolo XV." In *Album Amicorum Albert Dunning: in occasione del suo 65. compleanno*, edited by Giacomo Fornari, 21-69. Turnhout: Brepols, 2002.

———. "Introduzione." In *Le notazioni della polifonia vocale dei secoli IX-XVII*, edited by Maria Caraci Vela, Daniele Sabaino and Stefano Aresi, IX-XV. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2007.

———. "La dama di palazzo e il 'nobile ornamento'. L'esercizio della musica come spazio di libertà e di cultura." In *Costumi educativi nelle corti europee (XIV-XVIII secolo)*, edited by Monica Ferrari, 31-42. Pavia: Pavia University Press, 2010.

———. *La filologia musicale. Istituzioni, storia, strumenti critici. Approfondimenti.* 3 vols. Vol. 2, Lucca: Libreria Musicale Italiana, 2009.

———. "Le specificità dei testi musicali e la filologia: alcuni problemi di metodo." *Filologia mediolatina* 2 (1995a): 43-56.

———. *Musical Philology: Institutions, History, and Critical Approaches.* Translated by Elizabeth MacDonald. Vol. 1, Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2015.

———. "Problemi di diffrazione nel repertorio polifonico del Quattrocento." In *L'edizione critica tra testo musicale e testo letterario*, edited by Renato Borghi and Pietro Zappalà, 373-78. Lucca: Libreria Musicale Italiana, 1995b.

———. "Review of Grier, The Critical Editing of Music." *Il Saggiatore Musicale* 6, no. 1 (1999): 265-72.

———. "Un capitolo di arte allusiva nella prima tradizione di messe *L'Homme Armé*." *Studi Musicali* 22, no. 1 (1993): 3-21.

Caron, Marie-Thérèse. *Les voeux du Faisan, noblesse en fête, esprit de croisade. Le manuscrit Français 11594 de la Bibliothèque Nationale de France.* Turnhout: Brepols, 2003.

Caron, Marie-Thérèse, and Denis Clauzel, eds. *Le banquet du Faisan. 1454: l'Occident face au défi de l'Empire ottoman.* Arras: Artois Presses Université, 1977.

Cerone, Pietro. *El melopeo y maestro.* Napoli: Gargano, Nucci, 1613.

Chemotti, Antonio, ed. *I Kyrie di Tr93.* Roma: Istituto Italiano per la Storia della Musica, 2014.

Cherchi, Paolo, and Teresa de Robertis. "Un inventario della biblioteca aragonese." *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 33 (1990): 109-347.

Chew, Geoffrey. "The Early Cyclic Mass as an Expression of Royal and Papal Supremacy." *Music & Letters* 53, no. 3 (1972): 254-69.

Coclico, Adrian Petit. *Compendium musices descriptum ab Adriano Petit Coclico, discipulo Josquini de Pres.* Nuremberg: Johann Berg, Ulrich Neuber, 1552.

Cohen, Judith. "Munus ab ignoto." *Studia Musicologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 22, no. 1 (1980): 187-204.

———. *The six Anonymous L'homme armé Masses in Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, MS VI E 40.* Dallas: American Institute of Musicology, 1968.

Colton, Lisa. *Angel song. Medieval English music in history.* London and New York: Routledge, 2017.

Contini, Gianfranco. *Breviario di ecdotica.* Milano - Napoli: Ricciardi, 1985.

Cook, James Matthew. "Mid-Fifteenth-Century English Mass Cycles in Continental Sources." PhD dissertation, University of Nottingham, 2014.

Csapodi, Csaba. "La biblioteca di Beatrice d'Aragona, moglie di Mattia Corvino." In *Italia ed Ungheria: dieci secoli di rapporti letterari*, edited by Mátyás Horányi, 113-33. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1967.

Curtis, Gareth R. K. "Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale MS. 5557, and the Texting of Dufay's "Ecce ancilla Domini" and "Ave regina celorum" Masses." *Acta Musicologica* 51, no. 1 (1979): 73-86.

D'Accone, Frank A. "The Singers of San Giovanni in Florence during the 15th Century." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 14, no. 3 (1961): 307-58.

d'Agostino, Gianluca, ed. *Johannes Tinctoris. Proportionale musices. Liber de arte contrapuncti*. Firenze: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2008.

———. "Note sulla carriera napoletana di Johannes Tinctoris." *Studi Musicali* 28 (1999): 327-62.

Dahlhaus, Carl. "Tonsystem und Kontrapunkt um 1500." *Jahrbuch des Staatlichen Instituts für Musikforschung Preußischer Kulturbesitz* (1969): 7-18.

de Commynes, Philippe. *The Historical Memoirs of Philip De Comines.* London: William McDowall, 1817.

de La Barre, Louis-François-Joseph. *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France et de Bourgogne.* Paris: Julien-Michel Gandouin et Pierre-François Giffart, 1729.

de Magny, Louis. *La science du blason, accompagnée d'un armorial général des familles nobles de l'Europe.* Paris: Institut Heraldique, 1858.

de Roover, Florence Edler. "New Facets on the Financing and Marketing of Early Printed Books." *Bulletin of the Business Historical Society* 27, no. 4 (1953): 222-30.

de Saint-Julien, Pierre. *De l'origine des Bourgongnons, et antiquité des estats de Bourgongne.* Paris: Nicolas Chesneau, 1581.

Dean, Jeffrey J. "Verona 755 and the *Incomprehensibilia* Composer." In *Manoscritti di polifonia nel quattrocento europeo*, edited by Marco Gozzi, 93-108. Trento: Soprintendenza per i Beni librari e archivistici, 2004.

DeFord, Ruth I. "The *mensura* of ϕ in the works of Du Fay." *Early Music* 34, no. 1 (2006): 111-36.

———. "On Diminution and Proportion in Fifteenth-Century Music Theory." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 58, no. 1 (2005): 1-67.

———. *Tactus, Mensuration, and Rythm in Renaissance Music.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

———. "Tempo Relationship between Duple and Triple Time in the Sixteenth Century." *Early Music History* 14 (1995): 1-51.

Denton, A. Blake. "The Medieval Canon and the Renaissance Image of the Turk: A Brief Historiography of Pre-Modern European Conceptions of the Muslim World." *Madison Historical Review* 12. (2015). https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/mhr/vol12/iss1/5.

Desjardins, Robert B. ""Lest his men mutter against him": Chivalry and artifice in a Burgundian crusade chronicle." In *Crusading and Masculinities*, edited by Natasha R. Hodgson, Katherine J. Lewis and Matthew M. Mesley, 329-44. London and New York: Routledge, 2019.

———. "Writing and Imagining the Crusade in Fifteenth-Century Burgundy: The Case of the Expedition Narrative in Jean de Wavrin's Anciennes Chroniques d'Angleterre." PhD dissertation, University of Alberta, 2010.

Devereaux, Rita. "Reconstructing Byzantine Constantinople: Intercession and Illumination at the Court of Philippe Le Bon." *French Studies* 59, no. 3 (2005): 297-310.

d'Expilly, Jean Joseph. *Dictionnaire géographique, historique et politique des Gaules et de la France.* Vol. 6, Amsterdam: Desaint & Saillant, 1770.

Donovan, Erin K. "Imagined Crusaders: The *Livre d'Eracles* in Fifteenth-Century Burgundian Collections." PhD dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2013.

———. "A Royal Crusade History: The *Livre d'Eracles* and Edward IV's Exile in Burgundy." *The Electronic British Library Journal*. (2014). Accessed 01/02/2018. http://www.bl.uk/eblj/2014articles/article6.html.

Dumitrescu, Theodor. "The Solmization Status of Sharps in the 15th and 16th Centuries." *Studi Musicali* 33, no. 2 (2004): 253-83.

Dumitrescu, Theodor, Karl Kügle, and Marnix van Berchum, eds. *Early Music Editing: Principles, Historiography, Future Directions*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013.

Eakins, Rex, ed. *An Editorial Transnotation of the Manuscript Capella Sistina 51, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Città del Vaticano. Liber Missarum*. Ottawa: The Institute of Mediaeval Music, 1999-2005.

Edwards, Warwick. "Alexander Agricola and Intuitive Syllable Deployment." *Early Music* 34, no. 3 (2006): 409-26.

———. "Phrasing in Medieval Song: Perspectives from Traditional Music." *Plainsong and Medieval Music* 5 (1996): 1-22.

———. "Text Treatment in Motets around 1500: The Humanistic Fallacy." In *On the Relationship of Imitation and Text Treatment? The Motet around 1500*, edited by Thomas Schmidt-Beste, 91-116. Turnhout: Brepols, 2012.

———. "Text Underlay in Marguerite of Austria's Chanson Album Brussels 228." In *Muziek Aan Het Hof Van Margaretha Van Oostenrijk*, edited by Greta Moens-Haenen, 33-47. Peer: Musica, 1987.

———. "Understanding Fifteenth-Century Chansonniers." *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 138, no. 1 (2013): 187-205.

———. "Word Setting in a Perfect World: The Case of Obrecht's Motets." *Journal of the Alamire Foundation* 3 (2011): 52-75.

Elders, Willem, ed. *The New Josquin Edition (NJE)*. Edited by Willem Elders. Utrecht: Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis, 1987-2016.

———. "Reports of the First Josquin Meeting." *Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 24, no. 1 (1974): 20-82.

———. "Short Report of the Fourth Josquin Meeting. Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., 1977." *Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 28, no. 1 (1978): 31-37.

———. "Short Report of the Second Josquin Meeting. Utrecht 1974." *Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 25, no. 1 (1975): 54-64.

———. "Short Report of the Third Josquin Meeting. Utrecht 1975." *Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 26, no. 1 (1976): 17-40.

Epifani, Michele. *La caccia nell'Ars Nova italiana. Edizione critica e commentata dei testi e delle intonazioni.* Firenze: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2019.

———. "Una prospettiva ecdotica per le notazioni del Trecento italiano." In *Musica e poesia nel Trecento italiano. Verso una nuova edizione critica dell'Ars Nova*, edited by Maria Sofia Lannutti and Antonio Calvia, 189-234. Firenze: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2014.

Fallows, David. *Dufay.* London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1982.

———. "Embellishment and Urtext in the fifteenth-century song repertories." *Basler Jahrbuch für Historische Musikpraxis* 14 (1990): 59-85.

———. "Josquin and Trent 91: thoughts on *Omnium bonorum plena* and his activities in the 1470s." In *Manoscritti di polifonia nel Quattrocento europeo*, edited by Marco Gozzi, 205-12. Trento: Provincia autonoma di Trento, 2004.

———. "The Last Agnus Dei: or: The Cyclic Mass, 1450-1600, as forme fixe." In *Polyphone Messen im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert: Funktion, Kontext, Symbol*, edited by Andrea Ammendola, Daniel Glowotz and Jürgen Heidrich, 53-63. Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2012.

———. "Letter." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 40, no. 1 (1987): 146-48.

———. "A Word About Ligatures." *Early Music* 41, no. 1 (2013): 104-07.

Farbaky, Péter. "Patrons and Patterns: The Connection between the Aragon Dynasty of Naples and the Hungarian Court of Matthias Corvinus." *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti* 41 (2017): 23-31.

Fiala, David. "La très véritable signature de J. de Okeghem et ses implications philologiques." *Revue de Musicologie* 105, no. 1 (2019): 145-58.

Filippi, Daniele V. "'Audire missam non est verba missae intelligere...': The Low Mass and the *Motetti* missales in Sforza Milan." *Journal of the Alamire Foundation* 9, no. 1 (2017): 11-32.

Fitch, Fabrice. *Johannes Ockeghem Masses and Models.* Paris: Honoré Champion, 1997.

Frońska, Joanna. "London, British Library, Royal Ms 20 A. XVI." In *The Production and Reading of Music Sources. Mise-en-page in manuscripts and printed books containing polyphonic music, 1480-1530*, edited by Thomas Schmidt and Christian T. Leitmeir, 263-83. Turnhout: Brepols, 2018.

Gabrielli, Giulia. "Descrizione del Codice: Tr89." *Codici musicali trentini del Quattrocento.* (2014). https://www.cultura.trentino.it/portal/server.pt/community/manoscritti_musicali_trentini_del_%27400/814/descrizione/22653?Codice=Tr89.

Gachard, Louis Prosper. "Analectes historiques, Cinquième série." *Compte-rendu des séances de la commission royale d'histoire* 9 (1857): 103-256.

Gallagher, Sean. "Caron and Florence: A New Ascription and the Copying of the *Pixérécourt Chansonnier*." In *Recevez ce mien petit labeur: Studies in Renaissance Music in Honour of Ignace Bossuyt*, edited by Mark Delaere and Pieter Bergé, 83-92. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2008.

———. *Johannes Regis.* Turnhout: Brepols, 2010.

Gaposchkin, M. Cecilia. *Invisible Weapons. Liturgy and the Making of Crusade Ideology.* Ithaca, NY - London: Cornell University Press, 2017.

Geliot, Louvan. *Le vraye et parfaite science des armoires ou l'indice armorial de feu maistre.* Paris: Frederic Leonard, 1664.

Gerber, Rebecca. "An Assessment of Johannes Wiser's Scribal Activities in the Trent Codices." *Musica Disciplina* 46 (1992): 51-77.

———. "Ligature and Notational Practices as Determing Factors in the Text Underlay of Fifteenth-Century Sacred Music." *Studi Musicali* 20 (1991): 45-67.

Giller, Don. "Letter." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 40, no. 1 (1987): 143-46.

———. "Letter." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 40, no. 1 (1987): 143-46.

Godt, Irvine. "Letter from Irvine Godt." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 31, no. 2 (1978): 358-88.

———. "Letter from Irvine Godt." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 32, no. 2 (1979): 364-67.

Goodman, Nelson. *Languages of Art. An Approach to a Theory of Symbols.* Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1968.

Greve, Anke, and Émilie Lebailly, eds. *Comptes de l'Argentier de Charles le Téméraire, duc de Bourgogne* Vol. 1. Paris: Boccard, 2001.

———, eds. *Comptes de l'Argentier de Charles le Téméraire, duc de Bourgogne* Vol. 2. Paris: Boccard, 2002.

Grier, James. *The Critical Editing of Music: History, Method, and Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Günther, Ursula, ed. *Musik und Text in der Mehrstimmigkeit des 14. Und 15. Jahrhunderts, Vorträge des Gastsymposions in der Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel, 8. Bis 12. September 1980*. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1984.

Haar, James. "Music as Visual Object: The Importance of Notational Appearance." In *L'edizione critica tra testo musicale e testo letterario*, edited by Renato Borghi and Pietro Zappalà, 97-128. Lucca: Libreria Musicale Italiana, 1995.

Haggh, Barbara. "The Archives of the Order of the Golden Fleece and Music." *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 120, no. 1 (1995): 1-43.

———. "Busnoys and 'Caron' in Documents from Brussels." In *Antoine Busnoys: Method, Meaning, and Context in Late Medieval Music*, edited by Paula Higgins, 295-315. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

———. "Charles de Clerc, Seigneur de Bouvekercke, and Two Manuscripts: Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, MS 215-16, and Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, MS VI E 40." In *The Burgundian-Habsburg Court Complex of Music Manuscripts (1500-1535) and the Workshop of Petrus Alamire*, edited by Bruno Bouckaert and Eugeen Schreurs, 185-202. Leuven: Alamire Music Publishers, 2003.

Hamm, Charles. "The Manuscript San Pietro B 80." *Revue Belge de Musicologie / Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Muziekwetenschap* 14 (1960): 40-55.

Hannas, Ruth. "Concerning Deletions in the Polyphonic Mass Credo." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 5, no. 3 (1952): 155-86.

Harrán, Don. "How to "Lay" the "Lay": New Thoughts on Text Underlay." *Musica Disciplina* 51 (1997): 231-62.

———. "In Pursuit of the Origins: The Earliest Writing on Text Underlay (c. 1440)." *Acta Musicologica* 50, no. 1 (1978): 217-40.

———. "Letter from Don Harrán." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 31, no. 2 (1978): 388-95.

———. "More Evidence for Cautionary Signs." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 31, no. 3 (1978): 490-94.

———. "New Evidence for Musica Ficta: The Cautionary Sign." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 29, no. 1 (1976): 77-98.

———. "New Light on the Question of Text Underlay Prior to Zarlino." *Acta Musicologica* 45, no. 1 (1973): 24-56.

———. "Text Underlay." In *Grove Music Online*, 2001.

———. "Vicentino and His Rules of Text Underlay." *The Musical Quarterly* 59, no. 4 (1973): 620-32.

———. *Word-Tone Relations in Musical Thought: from Antiquity to the Seventeenth-Century.* Neuhausen: American Institute of Musicology, 1986.

Harris, Jonathan. "Despots, Emperors, and Balkan Identity in Exile." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 44, no. 3 (2013): 643-61.

———. *The End of Byzantium.* New Haven

London: Yale University Press, 2010.

———. "A worthless prince? Andreas Palaeologus in Rome, 1465-1502." *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 61 (1995): 537-54.

Heron, Andrew Glen. "'Il fault faire guerre pour paix avoir' : crusading propaganda at the Court of Duke Philippe le Bon of Burgundy (1419-1467)." PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1991.

Higgins, Paula, ed. *Antoine Busnoys: Method, Meaning, and Context in Late Medieval Music*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

———. "*In hydraulis* Revisited: New Light on the Career of Antoine Busnois." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 39, no. 1 (1986): 36-86.

———. "Tracing the Careers of Late Medieval Composers. The Case of Philippe Basiron of Bourges." *Acta Musicologica* 62, no. 1 (1990): 1-28.

Hodgson, Natasha R., Katherine J. Lewis, and Matthew M. Mesley, eds. *Crusading and Masculinities*. London and New York: Routledge, 2019.

Honemann, Volker. "The Marriage of Matthias Corvinus to Beatrice of Aragón (1476) in Urban and Court Historiography." In *Princes and Princely Culture 1450-1650*, edited by Martin Gosman, Alasdair A. MacDonald and Arjo J. Vanderjagt, 213-26. Leiden-Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2005.

Housley, Norman, ed. *The Crusade in the Fifteenth Century. Converging and Competing Cultures*. London - New York: Routledge, 2017.

———. *Crusading and the Ottoman Threat, 1453-1505.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

———, ed. *Crusading in the Fifteenth Century. Message and Impact*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

———. "Introduction." In *Crusading in the Fifteenth Century. Message and Impact*, edited by Norman Housley, 1-12. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

———. *The Later Crusades: From Lyons to Alcazar, 1274-1580.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Hudson, Barton. "On the Texting of Obrecht's Masses." *Musica Disciplina* 42 (1988): 101-27.

Hughes, Andrew. "Chants in the Rhymed Office of St Thomas." *Early Music* 16 (1988): 185-201.

———. *Manuscript Accidentals: Ficta in Focus 1350-1450.* Rome: American Institute of Musicology, 1972.

Huizinga, Johan. *The Waning of the Middle Ages. A Study of the Forms of Life, Thought, and Art in France and the Netherlands in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1919. Herfsttij der middeleeuwen: Studie over levens- en gedachtenvormen der vertiende en vijftiende eeuw in Frankrijk en de Nederlanden.

King, Jonathan. "Texting in Early Fifteenth-Century Sacred Polyphony." DPhil dissertation, University of Oxford, 1996.

———. "Texting Practices in Manuscript Sources of Early Fifteenth-Century Polyphony." *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 124, no. 1 (1999): 1-25.

Kirkman, Andrew. *The Cultural Life of the Early Polyphonic Mass. Medieval Context to Modern Revival.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

———. "The polyphonic mass in the fifteenth century." In *The Cambridge History of Fifteenth-Century Music*, edited by Anna Maria Busse Berger and Jesse Rodin, 665-700. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

———. *The Three-Voice Mass in the Later Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries: Style, Distribution and Case-Studies.* New York, London: Garland, 1995.

Lapina, Elizabeth, April Jehan Morris, Susanna A. Throop, and Laura J. Whatley, eds. *The Crusades and Visual Culture*. London and New York: Routledge, 2015.

Leach, Elizabeth Eva, David Fallows, and Kate Van Orden. "Recent Trends in the Study of Music of the Fourteenth, Fifteenth, and Sixteenth Centuries." *Renaissance Quarterly* 68, no. 1 (2015): 187-227.

Leech-Wilkinson, Daniel. "Review: Accidental Inflection." *The Musical Times* 30, no. 1754 (1989): 213.

Lewis, Katherine J. "...doo as this noble prynce Godeffroy of boloyne dyde. Chivalry, masculinity, and crusading in late medieval England." In *Crusading and Masculinities*, edited by Natasha R. Hodgson, Katherine J. Lewis and Matthew M. Mesley, 311-28. London and New York: Routledge, 2019.

———. "Women and Power." In *Historians on John Gower*, edited by Stephen H. Rigby and Echard Siân, 323-50. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2019.

Linder, Amnon. *Raising Arms: Liturgy in the Struggle to Liberate Jerusalem in the Late Middle Ages.* Turnhout: Brepols, 2003.

Lockwood, Lewis. "Aspects of the 'L'homme armé' Tradition." *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association* 100 (1973-4): 97-122.

———. *Music in Renaissance Ferrara, 1400-1505. The Creation of a Musical Center in the Fifteenth Century.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Long, Michael. "*Arma virumque cano*: Echoes of a Golden Age." In *Antoine Busnoys: Method, Meaning, and Context in Late Medieval Music*, edited by Paula Higgins, 133-54. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

———. "Symbol and Ritual in Josquin's *Missa Di Dadi*." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 42, no. 1 (1989): 1-22.

López-Ríos, Santiago. "A New Inventory of the Royal Aragonese Library of Naples." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 65 (2002): 201-43.

Lowinsky, Edward E. "Early Scores in Manuscript." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 13, no. 1 (1960): 126-73.

———. "The Function of Conflicting Signatures in Early Polyphonic Music." *The Musical Quarterly* 31, no. 2 (1945): 227-60.

———. "The Goddess Fortuna in Music: With a Special Study of Josquin's "Fortuna dun gran tempo"." *The Musical Quarterly* 75, no. 4 (1991): 81-107.

———. "The Problem of Text Underlay." In *The Medici Codex of 1518*, edited by Edward E. Lowinsky, 90-107. Chicago - London: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Luisi, Francesco. "The national edition of the works of Palestrina." *Polifonie* 2, no. 3 (2002): 279-89.

Lütteken, Laurenz. "Come nasce una «cappella»? L'istituzionalizzazione della musica nel Quattrocento." In *Corti rinascimentali a confronto. Letteratura, musica, istituzioni*, edited by Barbara Marx, Tina Matarrese and Paolo Trovato, 13-25. Firenze: Franco Cesati Editore, 2003.

———. *Music of the Renaissance. Imagination and Reality of a Cultural Practice.* Translated by James Steichen. Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2019.

———. "Ritual und Krise. Die neapolitanischen «L'homme armé» - Zyklen und die Semantik der Cantus firmus-Messe." In *Musik als Text. Bericht über den Internationalen Kongreß der Gesellschaft für Musikforschung. Freiburg im Bresgau 1993*, edited by Hermann Danuser and Tobias Plebuch, 207-18. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1998.

———. "Ritual und Krise. Die neapolitanischen «L'homme armé» - Zyklen und die Semantik der Cantus firmus-Messe." In *Musik als Text. Bericht über den Internationalen Kongreß der Gesellschaft für Musikforschung. Freiburg im Bresgau 1993*, edited by Hermann Danuser and Tobias Plebuch, 207-18. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1998.

———. "The work concept." In *The Cambridge History of Fifteenth-Century Music*, edited by Anna Maria; Rodin Busse Berger, Jesse, 55-68. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Maas, Chris, ed. *Jacob Obrecht, Collected Works (New Obrecht Edition)*. Edited by Chris Maas. Utrecht: Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis, 1983-1999.

———. "Towards a New Obrecht Edition. A Preliminary Worklist." *Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 26, no. 2 (1976): 84-108.

Maas, Paul. *Textkritik.* Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1927.

Magro, Agostino. "Basilique, pouvoir et dévotion: Ockeghem à Saint-Martin de Tours." In *Johannes Ockeghem. Actes du XLe Colloque international d'études humanistes. Tours, 3-8 février 1997*, edited by Philippe Vendrix, 79-100. Paris: Klincksieck, 1998.

Maier, Christoph T. "The roles of women in the crusade movement: a survey." *Journal of Medieval History* 30, no. 1 (2004): 61-82.

Manion, Lee. *Narrating the Crusades. Loss and Recovery in Medieval and Early Modern English Literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Marix, Jeanne. *Histoire de la musique et des musiciens de la cour de Bourgogne sous le règne de Philippe le Bon (1420-1467).* Strasbourg: Heitz & Co., 1939.

Martin, Jean. "L'église cathédrale Saint-Vincent de Chalon-sur-Saone. Pierre tombales & documents historiques." In *Mémoires de la société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Chalon-sur-Saone*, 1-125. Chalon-sur-Saone: Émile Bertrand, 1906.

Maskarinec, Maya. "Mobilizing Sanctity: Pius II and the Head of Andrew in Rome." In *Authority and Spectacle in Medieval and Early Modern Europe. Essays in Honor of Teofilo F. Ruiz*, edited by Yuen-Gen Liang and Jarbel Rodriguez, 186-202. London: Routledge, 2017.

Mauss, Marcel. *The Gift. The form and reason for exchange in archaic societies.* London: Routledge, 2002.

Meconi, Honey, ed. *Early Musical Borrowing*. New York - London: Routledge, 2004.

———. "Is underlay necessary?". In *Companion to Medieval and Renaissance Music*, edited by Tess Knighton and David Fallows, 284-91. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Mendel, Arthur. "The Purposes and Desirable Characteristics of Text-Critical Editions." In *Modern Musical Scholarship*, edited by Edward Olleson, 14-27. Stocksfield: Oriel Press, 1978.

Mignolo, Walter. "The Darker Side of the Renaissance: Colonization and the Discontinuity of the Classical Tradition." *Renaissance Quarterly* 45, no. 4 (1992): 808-28.

Milano, Ernesto. "I codici corviniani conservati nelle biblioteche italiane." In *Nel segno del corvo. Libri e miniature della biblioteca di Mattia Corvino*, 65-93. Modena: Il Bulino, 2002.

Millar, Alistair. "Olivier de la Marche and the Court of Burgundy, c.1425-1502." PhD dissertation, The University of Edinburgh, 1996.

Milsom, John, ed. *Thomas Tallis and William Byrd, Cantiones Sacrae 1575* Vol. 56, Early English Church Music. London: Stainer & Bell, 2014.

Mitchell, Robert James. "Mitchell Trent Editions, Critical Commentary to Nos 15-21." 2015. www.diamm.ac.uk/resources/music-editions/trent-codices/

———. "The Paleography and Repertory of Trent Codices 89 and 91, together with Analyses and Editions of Six Masses Cycles by Franco-Flemish Composers from Trent Codex 89." PhD dissertation, University of Exeter, 1989.

———. "The Robert Mitchell Trent Codices Editions." In *DIAMM*, 2015-2020. https://www.diamm.ac.uk/resources/music-editions/trent-codices/.

Moll, Kevin. "Realizing Partial Signatures around 1400: Liebert's Credo as a Test Case." *Performance Practice Review* 10, no. 2 (1997): 248-54.

Montagna, Gerald. "Caron, Hayne, Compère: A Transmission Reassessment." *Early Music History* 7 (1987): 107-57.

Moodey, Elizabeth Johnson. *Illuminated Crusader Histories for Philip the Good of Burgundy.* Turnhout: Brepols, 2012.

———. "Illuminated Crusader History for Philip the Good of Burgundy (1419-1467)." PhD dissertation, Princeton University, 2002.

Moohan, Elaine. "Sources of Sacred Music for the Chapel Choir of Ercole I d'Este (1471-1505) Duke of Ferrara and the Masses of Johannes Martini." PhD dissertation, University of Manchester, 1993.

Morley, Thomas. *A Plaine and Easie Introduction to Practicall Musicke.* London: Peter Short, 1597.

Nicol, Donald M. *The Immortal Emperor. The Life and Legend of Constantine Palaiologos, last Emperor of the Romans.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Palliot, Pierre. *Le Parlament de Bourgongne, son origine, son etablissement, et son progrés.* Dijon: Pierre Palliot, 1649.

Pasquali, Giorgio. *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo.* Firenze: Le Monnier, 1934.

Paul, Nicholas L. *To Follow in Their Footsteps. The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012.

Pavanello, Agnese. "A Flemish Venus in Milan: Gaspar van Weerbeke's *Missa O Venus bant*." *Early Music History* 38 (2019): 107-39.

———. "Fortuna on the Dolphin. Notes on an iconographic motif in Cappella Sistina 14 and 51." *Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 67, no. 1 (2017): 51-67.

Paviot, Jacques. "Burgundy and the Crusade." In *Crusading in the Fifteenth Century. Message and Impact*, edited by Norman Housley, 70-80. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

———. *Les ducs de Bourgogne, la croisade et l'Orient: fin XIVe siècle-XVe siècle.* Cultures et civilisations médiévales. Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2003.

Perkins, Leeman L. "In Memoriam Dragan Plamenac: The L'Homme Arme Masses of Busnoys and Okeghem: A Comparison." *The Journal of Musicology* 3, no. 4 (1984): 363-96.

———. "Introduction." In *The Mellon Chansonnier*, edited by Leeman L. Perkins and Howard Garey, 1-32. New Haven - London: Yale University Press, 1979.

———. "Text placement." In *The Mellon Chansonnier*, edited by Leeman L. Perkins and Howard Garey, 137-48. New Haven - London: Yale University Press, 1979.

———. "Toward a Rational Approach to Text Placement in the Secular Music of Dufay's Time." In *Papers Read at the Dufay Quincentenary Conference, Brooklyn College, December 6-7, 1974*, edited by Allan Atlas, 102-14. Brooklyn: Brooklyn College, 1976.

———. "Towards a Theory of Text-Music Relations in the Music of the Renaissance." In *Binchois Studies*, edited by Andrew Kirkman and Dennis Slavin, 313-29. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Perkins, Leeman L., and Howard Garey, eds. *The Mellon Chansonnier*. 2 vols. New Haven - London: Yale University Press, 1979.

Philippides, Marios, ed. *The Fall of the Byzantine Empire. A Chronicle by George Sphrantzes, 1401-1477*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1980.

Pietschmann, Klaus. "L'homme armé. Militärische Symbolik in der Ordinariumsvertonung um 1500." In *Zeichen des Militärischen am Fürstenhof im frühneuzeitlichen Europa*, edited by Peter-Michael; Hahn and Matthias Müller, 25-37. Berlin: Lukas Verlag, 2017.

Plamenac, Dragan. "La chanson de L'homme armé et le MS VI.E.40 de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Naples." In *Annales de la Féderation archéologique et historique de Belgique. Congrès jubilaire sous les auspices des Ministeres des Sciences et Arts, des Affaires étrangeres et de la ville de Bruges* 229-30. Bruges: Féderation Archéologique et Historique de Belgique, 1926.

———. "Zur 'L'homme armé'-Frage." *Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft* 11 (1929): 376-83.

Planchart, Alejandro Enrique, ed. *Guillaume Du Fay Opera Omnia 03/05: Missa L'homme armé*. Santa Barbara: Marisol Press, 2011.

———. *Guillaume Du Fay. The Life and Works.* Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

———. "Guillaume Du Fay's Benefices and His Relationship to the Court of Burgundy." *Early Music History* 8 (1988): 117-71.

———. "Parts with Words and without Words: the Evidence for Multiple Texts in Fifteenth Century Masses." In *Studies in Performance of Late Medieval Music*, edited by Stanley Boorman, 227-51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

———. "The Relative Speed of "Tempora" in the Period of Dufay." *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle* 17 (1981): 33-51.

Prizer, William F. "Brussels and the Ceremonies of the Order of the Golden Fleece." *Revue Belge de Musicologie / Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Muziekwetenschap* 55 (2001): 69-90.

———. "Music and Ceremonial in the Low Countries: Philip the Fair and the Order of the Golden Fleece." *Early Music History* 5 (1985): 113-53.

Reaney, Gilbert. "Text Underlay in Early Fifteenth-Century Musical Manuscripts." In *Essays in Musicology in honor of Dragan Plamenac on his 70th Birthday*, edited by Gustave Reese and Robert J. Snow, 245-51. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1969.

Rees, Valery. ""A woman of valour": towards a reappraisal of the presence of Beatrix of Aragon in the Hungarian Court." In *Matthias Rex 1458-1490 – Hungary at the Dawn of the Renaissance,* edited by István Draskóczy, Iván Horváth, Gábor Kiss Farkas, Ernő Marosi and Vilmos Voigt Budapest: ELTE, Centre des hautes études de la Renaissance, 2013.

Reimitz, Helmut. "The social logic of historiographical compendia in the Carolingian period." In *Herméneutique du texte d'histoire*, edited by Osamu Kano, 17-28. Nagoya: Graduate School of Letters, Nagoya University, 2012.

Reynolds, Christopher A. "The Counterpoint of Allusion in Fifteenth-Century Masses." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 45, no. 2 (1992): 228-60.

———. "The Origins of San Pietro B 80 and the Development of a Roman Sacred Repertory." *Early Music History* 1 (1981): 257-304.

———. *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter's, 1380-1513.* Berkeley - Los Angeles - London: University of California Press, 1995.

Rifkin, Joshua. "Compere, "Des Pres", and the Choirmasters of Cambrai: *Omnium bonorum plena* Reconsidered." *Acta Musicologica* 81, no. 1 (2009): 55-73.

Rizzi, Andrea. "Editing and Translating Pliny in Renaissance Italy: Agency, collaboration and visibility." *Renaessanceforum - Journal of Renaissance Studies* 14 (2018): 117-38.

Rocco Rossi, Francesco. "Le presunte 'seconde versioni' del Ms. Mod α.M.13 *[sic]*: intervento revisionale di Johannes Martini?". *Fonti Musicali Italiane* 9 (2004): 7-15.

Rodin, Jesse. "Finishing Josquin's "Unfinished" Mass: A Case of Stylistic Imitation in the Cappella Sistina." *The Journal of Musicology* 22, no. 3 (2005): 412-53.

———. "The *L'homme armé* tradition - and the limits of musical borrowing." In *The Cambridge History of Fifteenth-Century Music*, edited by Anna Maria Busse Berger and Jesse Rodin, 69-83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

———, ed. *New Josquin Edition, Masses based on secular monophonic songs II*. Utrecht: Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis, 2014.

Ronchey, Silvia. "Bisanzio Continuata. Presupposti ideologici dell'attualizzazione di Bisanzio nell'età moderna." In *Lo spazio letterario del Medioevo. La cultura bizantina*, edited by Guglielmo Cavallo, 691-727. Roma: Salerno, 2005.

———. "Il "salvataggio occidentale" di Bisanzio. Una lettera di Enea Silvio Piccolomini e l'allegoria pittorica di Bisanzio nel primo Rinascimento." In *Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco (XIII-XV secolo) (Atti del Colloquio Internazionale organizzato nel centenario della nascita di Raymond-Joseph Loenertz O.P., Venezia, 1-2 dicembre 2000)*, edited by Chryssa A. Maltezou and Peter Schreiner, 125-50, 529-44. Venezia: Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini, 2002.

———. "Il piano di salvataggio di Bisanzio in Morea." In *L'Europa dopo la caduta di Costantinopoli: 29 maggio 1453. Atti del XLIV Convegno Storico Internazionale del Centro Italiano di Studi sul Basso Medioevo - Accademia Tudertina (Todi, 7-9 ottobre 2007)*, 517-31. Spoleto: Fondazione Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 2008.

———. "Malatesta/Paleologhi. Un'alleanza dinastica per rifondare Bisanzio nel quindicesimo secolo." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 93, no. 2 (2000): 521-67.

———. "Orthodoxy on Sale: the Last Byzantine, and the Lost Crusade." In *Proceedings of the 21st International Congress in Byzantine Studies, London, 21-26 August 2006*, edited by Elizabeth Jeffreys and Fiona K. Haarer, 313-44. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

———. "Tommaso Paleologo al Concilio di Firenze." In *La stella e la porpora. Il corteo di Benozzo e l'enigma del Virgilio Riccardiano. Atti del Convegno di Studi (Firenze, 17 maggio 2007)*, edited by Giovanna Lazzi and Gerhard Wolf, 135-59. Firenze: Edizioni Polistampa, 2009.

Roth, Adalbert. "L'homme armé, le doubté turcq, L'ordre de la toison d'or: Zur „Begleitmusik" der letzten grossen Kreuzzugsbewegung nach den Fall von Konstantinopel." In *Festen und Feiern im Mittelalter*, edited by Ditlev von Altenberg, Jörg Jarmut and Hans-Hugo Steinhoff, 469-79. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1991.

———. "Napoli o Firenze? Dove sono stati compilati i manoscritti CS 14 e CS 51?". In *La musica a Firenze al tempo di Lorenzo il Magnifico*, edited by Piero Gargiulo, 69-100. Firenze: Olschki, 1993.

———. *Studien zum frühen Repertoire der päpstlichen Kapelle unter dem Pontifikat Sixtus' IV. (1471-1484): Die Chorbücher 14 und 51 des Fondo Cappella Sistina der Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.* Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1991.

Routley, Nicholas. "A Practical Guide to 'musica ficta'." *Early Music* 13, no. 1 (1985): 59-71.

Saunders, Suparmi Elizabeth. "The Dating of the Trent Codices from their Watermarks, with a Study of the Local Liturgy of Trent in the Fifteenth Century." PhD dissertation, King's College, 1983.

Schmidt, Thomas. "Dedicating Music Manuscripts: On function and form of paratexts in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century sources." In *«Cui dono lepidum novum libellum?». Dedicating Latin Works and Motets in the Sixteenth Century*, edited by Ignace Bossuyt, Nele Gabriëls, Dirk Sacré and Demmy Verbeke, 81-108. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2008.

———. "Making Polyphonic Books in the late Fifteenth and early Sixteenth Centuries." In *The Production and Reading of Music Sources: Mise-En-Page in Manuscripts and Printed Books Containing Polyphonic Music, 1480-1530*, edited by Thomas Schmidt and Christian T. Leitmeir, 3-100. Turnhout: Brepols, 2018.

Schmidt, Thomas, and Christian Thomas Leitmeir, eds. *The Production and Reading of Music Sources. Mise-en-page in manuscripts and printed books containing polyphonic music, 1480-1530*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2018.

Schmidt-Beste, Thomas. "Editorial Text Underlay Revisited." In *Early Music Editing: Principles, Historiography, Future Directions*, edited by Theodor Dumitrescu, Karl Kügle and Marnix van Berchum, 105-39. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013.

———. "Private or Institutional – Small or Big? Towards a Typology of Polyphonic Sources of Renaissance Music." *Journal of the Alamire Foundation* 1 (2009): 13-26.

———. "Textunterlegung." In *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, edited by Ludwig Finscher, 478-93. 2nd edition. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1998.

———. "Textunterlegung in den Alamire-Handschriften." In *The Burgundian-Habsburg Court Complex of Music Manuscripts (1500-1535) and the Workshop of Petrus Alamire*, edited by Bruno Bouckaert and Eugeen Schreurs, 37-57. Leuven: Alamire, 2003.

———. "Textunterlegung und Textdeklamation." In *Komponieren in der Renaissance, Lehre und Praxis*, edited by Michele Calella and Lothar Schmidt, 272-95. Laaber: Laaber, 2013.

Schmidt-Beste, Thomas; Vorholt, Hanna. "Mise-en-page in Choirbooks, ca. 1450-1550." *Gazette du livre médiéval* 55, no. 2 (2009): 31-42.

Schubert, Peter, and Julie E. Cumming. "Text and Motif c. 1500: A New Approach to Text Underlay." *Early Music* 40, no. 1 (2012): 3-13.

Segre, Cesare. *Avviamento all'analisi del testo letterario.* Torino: Einaudi, 1985.

———. "Riflessioni sulla critica testuale." In *L'edizione critica tra testo musicale e testo letterario*, edited by Renato Borghi and Pietro Zappalà, 3-8. Lucca: Libreria Musicale Italiana, 1995.

Setton, Kenneth M. *The Papacy and the Levant (1204-1571). The Fifteenth Century.* Vol. 2, Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1978.

Shephard, Tim. "Centres and peripheries of 15th-century music." *Early Music* 44, no. 3 (2016): 475-79.

———. "Constructing Identities in a Music Manuscript: The Medici Codex as a Gift." *Renaissance Quarterly* 63, no. 1 (2010): 84-127.

———. "Constructing Identities in a Music Manuscript: The Medici Codex as a Gift." *Renaissance Quarterly* 63, no. 1 (2010): 84-127.

Sherr, Richard, ed. *Masses for the Sistine Chapel. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cappella Sistina, Ms. 14.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Shils, Edward. "Ritual and Crisis." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences* 251, no. 772 (1966): 447-50.

Simon, Alexandru. "Matthias Corvinus' Anti-Ottoman Policies in the Early 1470': Political Patterns, Military Actions and Late Medieval Propaganda." In *Matthias Rex 1458-1490 – Hungary at the Dawn of the Renaissance,* edited by István Draskóczy, Iván Horváth, Gábor Kiss Farkas, Ernő Marosi and Vilmos Voigt Budapest: ELTE, Centre des hautes études de la Renaissance, 2013http://renaissance.elte.hu/?page_id=452.

Slocum, Kay. *Liturgies in Honor of Thomas Becket.* Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2004.

Spiegel, Gabrielle M. "History, Historicism, and the Social Logic of the Text in the Middle Ages." *Speculum* 65, no. 1 (1990): 59-86.

Spitzbarth, Anne-Brigitte. *Ambassades et ambassadeurs de Philippe le Bon, troisième duc Valois de Bourgogne (1419-1467).* Turnhout: Brepols, 2013.

Starr, Pamela F. "Review of A. Roth, Studien zum frühen Repertoire der päpstlichen Kapelle...". *Notes* 49, no. 2 (1992): 536-38.

Steib, Murray. "Herculean Labours: Johannes Martini and the Manuscript Modena, Biblioteca Estense, MS α.M.1.13." *Early Music History* 33 (2014): 183-257.

Stein, Henri. *Olivier de la Marche. Historien, poète et diplomate Bourguignon.* Paris: Picard, 1888.

Stevens, Denis. "Music in Honor of St Thomas of Canterbury." *Musical Quarterly* 56, no. 3 (1970): 311-48.

Strohm, Reinhard. "Does Textual Criticism Have a Future?". In *L'edizione critica tra testo musicale e testo letterario*, edited by Renato Borghi and Pietro Zappalà, 193-212. Lucca: Libreria Musicale Italiana, 1995.

———. "I-TRcap 93*: Eine zentrale Sammlung europäischer Messenmusik." *Musikleben des Spätmittelalters in der Region Österreich.* (2020). Accessed 04/08/2020. https://musical-life.net/essays/i-trcap-93-eine-zentrale-sammlung-europaeischer-messenmusik.

———. "Letter." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 40, no. 3 (1987): 576-79.

———, ed. *The Lucca Choirbook*, Late Medieval and Early Renaissance Music in Facsimile, vol. 2. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2008.

———, ed. *Mass Settings from the Lucca Choirbook*, Early English Church Music, vol. 49. London: Stainer and Bell, 2007.

———. *Music in Late Medieval Bruges.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

———. *The Rise of European Music.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart, allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Musik. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1998.

Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart, allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Musik. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1998.

Strøm-Olsen, Rolf. "Political Narrative and Symbolism in the Feast of the Pheasant (1454)." *Viator. Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 46, no. 3 (2015): 317-42.

Talamo, Emilia. *Codices cantorum: Miniature e disegni nei codici della Cappella Sistina.* Firenze: Officine del Novecento, 1997.

———. "Schede." In *Liturgia in figura. Codici liturgici rinascimentali della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, edited by Giovanni Morello and Silvia Maddalo. Città del Vaticano - Roma: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana - De Luca Editori d'Arte, 1995.

Tanner, Marie. *The Last Descendant of Aeneas: the Hapsburgs and the Mythic Image of the Emperor.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

Taruskin, Richard. "Antoine Busnoys and the "L'Homme Armé" Tradition." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 39, no. 2 (1986): 255-93.

———, ed. *Antoine Busnoys Collected Works. Part 2, The Latin-Texted Works*. 2 vols. New York: The Broude Trust, 1990.

———. "Letter." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 40, no. 1 (1987): 146-48.

Thomson, James C. *An Introduction to Philippe (?) Caron.* Brooklyn: Institute of Mediaeval Music, 1964.

———, ed. *Les œuvres complètes de Philippe Caron*. Brooklyn: Institute of Mediaeval Music, 1971-1976.

———. "The Works of Caron: A Study in Fifteenth-Century Style." PhD dissertation, New York University, 1960.

Tibaldi, Rodobaldo. "Italian sacred music of the 17th century: some reflections and thoughts about several recent modern editions." *Polifonie* 1, no. 1 (2001): 163-90.

Towne, Gary. "A Systematic Formulation of Sixteenth-Century Text Underlay Rules (Part I)." *Musica Disciplina* 44 (1990): 255-87.

———. "A Systematic Formulation of Sixteenth-Century Text Underlay Rules (Part II)." *Musica Disciplina* 45 (1991): 143-68.

Urquhart, Peter W. "Calculated to Please the Ear: Ockeghem's Canonic Legacy." *Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 47, no. 1 (1997): 72-98.

———. "Cross-Relations by Franco-Flemish Composers after Josquin." *Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 43, no. 1 (1993): 3-41.

———. "False Concords in Busnoys." In *Antoine Busnoys: Method, Meaning, and Context in Late Medieval Music*, edited by Paula Higgins, 361-87. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

———. "Ficta vs. "Ficta". Review of Musica Ficta: Theories of Accidental Inflections *by Karol Berger (Cambridge, 1987)*." *Historical Performance* 2 (1989): 35-38.

———. "Three Sample Problems of Editorial Accidentals in Chansons by Busnoys and Ockeghem." In *Music in Renaissance Cities and Courts. Studies in Honor of Lewis Lockwood*, edited by Jessie Ann Owens and Anthony M. Cummings, 465-81. Warren, MI: Harmonie Park Press, 1996.

Vale, Malcolm G. A. *Charles VII.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1974.

van Benthem, Jaap, ed. *Firminus Caron. Masses & Chansons*. Edited by Jaap van Benthem. Wien: FraBernardo, 2012.

———. "Johannes Ockeghem - Masses and Mass Sections: Some Principles of the Edition." *Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 47, no. 1 (1997): 221-23.

———, ed. *Johannes Ockeghem, Masses and Mass Sections*. 3 vols. Utrecht: Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis, 1994-2005.

———, ed. *Johannes Ockeghem, Masses and Mass Sections. Missa De plus en plus*. 3 vols. Vol. 2/1. Utrecht: Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis, 1995.

———, ed. *Johannes Ockeghem, Masses and Mass Sections. Missa L'homme armé* Vol. 2/2. Utrecht: Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis, 1999.

———, ed. *Johannes Tourout, Ascribed and Attributable Compositions in 15th-century Sources from Central Europe*. Utrecht: Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis, 2015-.

———, ed. *Missa Mon oeil, Missa Groß Sehnen ich im Herzen trage*. Edited by Jaap van Benthem, Johannes Tourout. Ascribed and attributable compositions in 15th-century sources from Central Europe, vol. 1. Utrecht: Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis, 2015.

van der Heide, Klaas. "New Claims for a Burgundian Origin of the L'homme arme Tradition, and a Different View on the Relative Positions of the Earlies Masses in the Tradition." *Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 55, no. 1 (2005): 3-33.

van Houts, Elisabeth. *Memory and Gender in Medieval Europe: 900-1200.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999.

Vanderjagt, Arjo J. "Ritualizing Heritage: Jason and the Argonauts at the Burgundian Feast of the Pheasant (1454)." In *Negotiating Heritage. Memories of the Middle Ages*, edited by Mette B. Bruun and Stephanie A. Glaser, 173-89. Turnhout: Brepols, 2008.

Vaughan, Richard. *Charles the Bold: The Last Valois Duke of Burgundy.* Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002.

———. *Philip the Bold. The Formation of the Burgundian State.* Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002.

———. *Philip the Good: The Apogee of Burgundy.* Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002.

Villard, Leon Jacques. "Text Underlay in the Mass Ordinary of Dufay and some of his Contemporaries." PhD dissertation, Northwestern University, 1960.

Walsh, Richard J. *Charles the Bold and Italy (1467-1477): Politics and Personnel.* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005.

———. "Charles the Bold and the crusade: politics and propaganda." *Journal of Medieval History* 3, no. 1 (1977): 53-86.

Warmington, Flynn. "The Ceremony of the Armed Man: The Sword, the Altar, and the *L'homme armé* Mass." In *Antoine Busnoys: Method, Meaning, and Context in Late Medieval Music*, edited by Paula Higgins, 89-130. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

Wegman, Rob C. "The Anonymous Mass *D'Ung aultre amer*: A Late Fifteenth-Century Experiment." *The Musical Quarterly* 74, no. 4 (1990): 566-94.

———. *Born for the Muses. The Life and Masses of Jacob Obrecht.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

———. "Concerning Tempo in the English Polyphonic Mass, c. 1420-70." *Acta Musicologica* 61, no. 1 (1989): 40-65.

———. "Different Strokes for Different Folks? On Tempo and Diminution in Fifteenth-Century Music." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 53, no. 3 (2000): 461-505.

———. "Fremin le Caron at Amiens: New Documents." In *Essays on Renaissance Music in Honour of David Fallows: Bon jour, bon mois et bonne estrenne*, edited by Fabrice Fitch and Jacobijn Kiel, 10-32. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2011.

———. "Johannes Tinctoris and the 'New Art'." *Music & Letters* 84, no. 2 (2003): 171-88.

———. "Letter." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 42, no. 2 (1989): 437-43.

———. "Mensural Intertextuality in the Sacred Music of Antoine Busnoys." In *Antoine Busnoys: Method, Meaning, and Context in Late Medieval Music*, edited by Paula Higgins, 175-214. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

———. "Musical Offerings in the Renaissance." *Early Music* 33, no. 3 (2005): 425-37.

———. "New Data Concerning the Origins and Chronology of Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, Manuscript 5557." *Tijdschrift van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis* 36 (1986): 5-25.

———. "Ockeghem, Brumel, Josquin: New Documents in Troyes." *Early Music* 36, no. 2 (2008): 203-15, 17.

———. "Petrus de Domarto's *Missa Spiritus almus* and the Early History of the Four-Voice Mass in the Fifteenth Century." *Early Music History* 10 (1991): 235-303.

———. "Publication Before Printing: How Did Flemish Polyphony Travel in Manuscript Culture?". In *Books in Transition at the Time of Philip the Fair: Manuscripts and Printed Books in the Late Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Century Low Countries*, edited by Hanno Wijsman, 165-80. Turnhout: Brepols, 2010.

———. "Review of A. Roth, Studien zum frühen Repertoire der päpstlichen Kapelle...". *Early Music* 20, no. 1 (1992): 152-53.

———. "What is 'Acceleratio Mensurae'?". *Music & Letters* 73, no. 4 (1992): 515-24.

Weiner, Annette B. "Inalienable Wealth." *American Ethnologist* 12, no. 2 (1985): 210-27.

Wibberley, Roger. "Josquin's Ave Maria: Musica Ficta versus Mode." *Music Theory Online* 2, no. 5. (1996). http://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.96.2.5/mto.96.2.5.wibberley.html.

———. ""Mode versus Ficta" in context." *Music Theory Online* 2, no. 7. (1996). http://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.96.2.7/mto.96.2.7.wibberley.html

Wickham, Edward. "Realization and Recreation: Texting Issues in Early Renaissance Polyphony." *Journal of the Alamire Foundation* 3, no. 1 (2011): 147-66.

Wijsman, Hanno. *Luxury Bound. Illustrated Manuscript Production and Noble and Princely Book Ownership in the Burgundian Netherlands (1400-1550).* Turnhout: Brepols, 2010.

Woodley, Ronald. "The *Proportionale musices* of Iohannes Tinctoris: a critical edition, translation and study." PhD dissertation, University of Oxford, 1982.

———. "Tinctoris's Italian Translation of the Golden Fleece Statutes: A Text and a (Possible) Context." *Early Music History* 8 (1988): 173-244.

Wright, Craig. "Dufay at Cambrai: Discoveries and Revisions." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 28, no. 2 (1975): 175-229.

———. *The Maze and the Warrior: Symbols in Architecture, Theology, and Music.* Cambridge, MA - London: Harvard University Press, 2001.

———. "Musiciens à la cathédrale de Cambrai 1475-1550." *Revue de Musicologie* 62, no. 2 (1976): 204-28.

Wrisley, David Joseph. "The Loss of Constantinople and Imagining Crusade at the Fifteenth-Century Court of Burgundy." *al-Abhath* 55 (2007): 85-112.

Zanovello, Giovanni. "'You Will Take This Sacred Book': The Musical Strambotto as a Learned Gift." *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 141, no. 1 (2016): 1-26.

Zazulia, Emily Carolyn. "Verbal Canons and Notational Complexity in Fifteenth-Century Music." PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 2012.

Zemon Davis, Natalie. "Beyond the Markets: Books as Gifts in Sixteenth-Century France: The Prothero Lecture." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 33 (1983): 69-88.