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INTRODUCTION

The second booklet of *Ex Codicis* Series II is devoted to Introit settings and isolated Mass Ordinary settings from Trent 89. Most of the manuscript’s pieces in both categories are presented here, and those not presented are excluded for valid reasons. 1 Few of these works have been published before, probably for the following reasons. Firstly, in comparison with the Introits in Trent 90 and Trent 88 the examples presented here are relatively insignificant in number. Secondly the Mass Ordinaries are for the most part heavily chant-dependent, and their generally unambitious designs signify that this type of composition (which had a certain pride of place in the first half of the fifteenth century) ceded that pre-eminence to the cyclic Mass in the second half of the century.

With the notable exception of Clibano’s Credo setting, many of these pieces may not be western; Germanic features emerge most clearly in Sanctus no. 17 (which uses an Ordinary chant as Tenor cantus firmus whose use may have been regionally restricted), Introit no. 1 (which uses a German-variant parent chant), and Sanctus no. 18 (another Tenor cantus firmus setting, which is similar to pieces in Strahov that use chant-notation Tenors). Others hold on to musical devices which were beginning to become archaisms by the 1450’s; Kyrie no. 12’s polyphony ends with a passage of anacrusis hocket, and Gloria no. 14 is probably one of the last pieces of its type to use a texture consisting of two or-less equal top voices plus a supporting Tenor and Contra. The Kyrie trope settings (nos 7-11) are possibly also some of the last polyphonic examples of their type. Most of their texts are shortened, and their extensive use of triple meter is an element that became unfashionable in the last quarter of the century. The disappearance of such tropes from Germanic sacred music, too, may well have something to do with various monastic reforms.2

These pieces are scattered throughout Trent 89 but some of them are given successively; Introits nos 1-3 occur together, and so do Kyrie tropes 7 and 8. Kyrie 12 and Gloria 13 are also copied together, and Kyrie tropes nos 9-11 likewise occur as a batch, presumably being put together with the intention of keeping similarly-texted Mass Ordinaries as sets (another earlier-fifteenth-century habit which seems to have died out as the cyclic Mass came into its own). Few of these pieces have concordances, but Clibano’s Credo setting was a well-known piece that appears in another four sources (one of these being Petrucci’s *Fragmenta Missarum* print of 1505). The main scribes of Trent 89 (Johannes Wiser plus various assistants) copied most of these settings, but it is notable that a subsidiary hand was responsible for nos 12, 13 and 5 - a point that I will return to below. The predominant method of chant setting in these works is Superius paraphrase, but nos 17 and 18 feature Tenor cantus firmus throughout, and other pieces feature partial use of Tenor-based chant. 3 In contrast to the Trent 91 chant settings, too, some of the Superius chant elaborations are considerable: compare the polyphony of Kyrie no. 12 with the editorially provided chant sections, and the Superius voices of the three Kyrie *fons bonitatis* settings.

The Clibano Credo is rather the exception amongst these pieces on account of its modernity and smooth partwriting. The other settings seem older (some perhaps dating from the early 1450’s) and many of them permit a certain level of dissonance. Whilst *Salve sancta pares* no. 2 is another smoothly written setting (albeit with an old-fashioned filler Contratenor) the pieces surrounding it in Trent 89 (nos 1 and 3) both contain passages of unhappy partwriting. No. 1 has more or less unavoidable structural diminished fifths at 111 and 143, and the partwriting in no. 3 at 125-126 involves consecutive seconds and a Tenor-Contratenor seventh. Possibly the middle one of these three settings served as the model for the two outer ones. Likewise, Introit no. 4

1 The Introit *Seclote quioniam* (DTÖ no. 538) is part of a plenary cycle (the Missa Beati Anthonii). Introit no. 558 (*Salve sancta pares*) has already been presented in part I of this series; another *Salve sancta pares* setting (no. 674) has stylistic affinities with the Trent 91 Missa *Sig saul und hail* and is probably part of that work, and Sanctus no. 551 seems to be connected to the Gloria-Credo pair on *Beatae Dei genitrix* (nos 552 and 553). These three movements therefore seem to make up a scribes-assembled cycle by themselves.


3 The latter is evident in nos 5, 7, 9, 11, 15 and 16.
contains solecisms (such as the exposed sixths at 94 and 109) and Introit no. 5 abounds in clumsy progressions such as consecutive fifths (at 2-3, 37, 113-114 and elsewhere). Introit no. 6 is not free of unhappy moments, either (see the Superius-Contratenor seventh at 115). Likewise, Kyrie no. 7 has an unusual accented dissonance (at the third beat of 23) and Kyrie no. 11 seems to demand cadences involving the typical 'false consonance' B flat / G sharp problem at 37-39, 85-86 and 100-101. Likewise the Kyrie and Gloria nos 12 and 13 are not free of contrapuntal problems, and the composer of Sanctus no. 17 gives his outer voices in consecutive triads at 2-3. Other instances of poor partwriting could be cited here, but I have three significant reasons for highlighting awkward passages. Firstly, these dissonances do not necessarily detract from the quality of the music: in the presumably quite fast pace of cut-C some of the above passages tend to pass almost unnoticed. Secondly, the fact that such passages occur indicates that this music needs a little more editing than usual (similar problems tend to crop up in the Strahov Ordinary settings).

Lastly, a certain carelessness in partwriting during this period is by no means an exclusively German phenomenon, but the presence of awkward passages in these pieces (as in certain later works by Finck) is best mentioned rather than fig-leafeed. Such music can be difficult for editors to handle, too: while I have left the fifths at the start of Sanctus no. 17 unemended, a similar instance near the opening of Kyrie 12 (at the Contratenor, measure 3) has been emended because leaving the passage unaltered would be unflattering to the rest of the setting.

The parent chants used in some of these pieces tend to reinforce the idea of non-western origin. I have already mentioned that the first and penultimate pieces in this booklet have clear signs of central European chant models. Introit no. 3 perhaps shares the same origin since it is very similar in design and texture to no. 1. The Kyrie Magne Deus setting (no. 9) is also likely to be for non-western use, since there are other settings in in Strahov and LoD. Similarly, Sanctus no. 17's unelaborated-looking Tenor is very close to the version of the parent chant in the Passau Gradual, so that setting too may have originated in the Empire. There is a possibility that the composer may be western, though. This setting's use of upper-voice consecutive fifths, patches of sesquialtera in the two topmost voices and Tenor cantus firmus are reminiscent of the Strahov Missa Hilt und gib rat, which is the work of a certain 'Philippus', referred to in that source with an abbreviation meaning either that he was French or (less possibly) a Franciscan. However at the same time these two works are otherwise not that close, so these are only tentative thoughts about no. 17's composer. Likewise, whilst there is little at first sight beyond the same scribal hand in nos 12 and 13 to suggest that these are a specifically composed Kyrie-Gloria pair, the style of both is similar and the Gloria seems to be a precursor of the type of Mass setting exemplified by Johannes Aulen's three-voice cycle. The Kyrie cum jubilo (no. 11) may also turn out to be central European for a variety of reasons - most importantly that this setting (which is textless in Trent 89) will happily accept the Kyrie trope text as given in the Kuttenberg Graduale.

Secondly, it occurs next to a Magnificat in Trent 89 which is probably by the same composer as the Trent 91 Missa Sig sāld und hail, and the Kyrie and Magnificat share a certain similarity of style and short-winded phrasing akin to that in polyphonic lieders.

We must be more circumspect about the provenance of other pieces in this collection: Kyrie fons bonitatis settings must have been fairly common in both continental and English polyphony collections. Setting no. 7 (which is attributed to 'T' in Strahov) has imitative essential voices, and the Tenor contains a little more of the elaborated parent material than the Superius. Its imitative manner is perhaps suggestive of the 'T' being Johannes Touront (another composer who seems to have worked in the Empire), but the piece is still fairly well removed from his more developed works. In contrast, setting no. 8 (which is given immediately following 7 in Trent 89) is a simple


5 Vienna, Österreichisches Nationalbibliothek, ms. 15.501; notated fifteenth/sixteenth century Gradual from Kutna hora (Bohemia).

6 Regarding the Missa Sig sāld anonymous and his probable contributions to the later Trent Codices, see Mitchell, R., 'Trent 91, first steps towards a stylistic classification' (Studies in the Trent Codices I, Sudbury, 2003). pp. 13-17. The Magnificat cited above is notable on account of its likely reference to the Trent 89 lied Wunsch alles lustes.

7 The imitative style of this piece was singled out in Sparks, E., Cantus Firmus in Mass and Motet, 1420-1520 (University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963), pp. 174-175.
Superius paraphrase setting. Resemblances with the previous piece may be misleading here: the two may only sound as though they have common material because they use the same parent chant. Setting no. 10 seems to be one of those pieces about which we remain virtually clueless: its use of Superius figures which might be described as ‘English’, cadential drive (at the end of the Christe) and an old-fashioned-looking Contra mean that it could come from virtually anywhere in musically literate Europe. Similarly, Gloria no. 14’s distinguishing features (apparently free composition, twin upper voices, telescoping and use of duple metre) leave us fairly clueless concerning its origins. This could possibly be an English work on account of its panconsonant style and rather bland harmonies (which are slightly reminiscent of Bedingham’s Se belle) but its use of cut-C may suggest otherwise. 8

Virtually free composition also seems to be a feature of Sanctus no. 16 – an extended and sonorous setting which seems to display minimal use of its likely parent chant. However, this is one work which can be given a likely home since it occurs Trent 89 following Touront’s troped Recordare setting. It also shares the same mensural layout as the Sanctus of Touront’s Missa Mon oeil, uses patches of contrasting scoring like the latter, and the lowest voice (a ‘Tenor bassus’) often fulfils the function of a Tenor part as in the latter Mass. The final ‘excelsis’ is also rhythmically similar to the coda-like passages which end each movement of Touront’s Mass. Sanctus no. 16 is therefore quite likely to be his – a suggestion reinforced by the tendency of both this setting and Recordare towards thickish textures with crossing lower voices.

Two points should become apparent from the above discussions: firstly, the obscure origins of these settings make it very difficult to allot ‘correct’ parent chant insertions to each of them. I have generally relied on Passau Rite chants and other Germanic equivalents due to the lack of anything more specific. Secondly, the Mass Ordinary chants cited above had a plethora of liturgical assignments in the different local Rites of fifteenth-century Empire; I refer readers to the commentary on the Kyrie trope settings for some examples. In addition, the chants used in the Kyrie and Gloria nos 12 and 13 are not paired in the Passau Rite, and neither is the Gloria chant (BOS 43) given an Easter destination. Therefore this pair (if they are a compositional pair) may have been written for somewhere in the southern Empire outside the Passau diocese.

Gloria no. 13 is particularly significant in several respects: firstly, despite some crabbed counterpoint it is highly imitative and more elaborate than most of the other pieces presented here. Its texture approaches that of central-repertoire ‘Phrygian’ pieces, and it is also significant that the partwriting involves pseudo-imitation. Evidently the composer of this piece (who is also likely to have been the composer of the preceding Kyrie) was somewhat influenced by western music, and it is also fascinating that an adjacent piece in Trent 89 (Spiritus Domini no. 5) is again in the same scribal hand and also has characteristics betraying an interest in western music. This Introit’s busy Contratenor and patches of Superius-Tenor imitation are somewhat reminiscent of Caron’s chansons, which were appreciated in other parts of the the German-speaking world as their survival in the Glogau partbooks show. 9 Nos 12, 13 and 5 may therefore be by a single man, and a further nearby work in Trent 89 (the brief motet Sancta genitriz no. 675, which reworks Molinet’s Aime qui voudra) possibly also forms part of this group. It is copied by the same hand as the pieces cited, shares the busy texture of Gloria no. 13, and also a little of the uncomfortable writing found in Introit no. 5. 10

The remaining pieces to be considered represent quite different traditions. Sanctus no. 18 is one of a relatively large group of Ordinary settings with largely unelaborated-looking monorhythmic

8 Regarding Se belle (a piece with a garbled attribution and missing text), see Fallows, D., ‘English Song Repertoires of the Mid-fifteenth century’ in PRMA 103 (1976-77), pp. 61-79.
10 Most specialists seem to prefer the idea that this reworking of Molinet’s chanson originated in the secular sphere; two other sources give it ‘foxtail’ titles (Der fohsch schwantz and Coda di volpe). In support of Trent 89 providing the probably original and sacred version, I offer the following points: (i) Trent 89 is the oldest of the sources; (ii) only in Trent 89 is this piece accompanied by others which compare well with it, and (iii) the sacred Trent 89 text seems to fit the music well and is therefore possibly not a mere addition to a pre-existant instrumental piece.
chant Tenors, and the setting presented here repeats short passages of polyphony where the Tenor repeats melodic formulas. Last of all, Clibano’s extensive and powerful-sounding Credo setting (no. 15) stands apart from everything else presented here by virtue of its relatively wide distribution, its bass-like lowest voice and also its cantus firmus use. The well-known Credo chant is also distributed between the three topmost voices with some degree of textural contrast. The composer (‘Nicasius de Clibano’) is possibly the Nicaise Dupuis who was premier chaplain at the Burgundian court chapel from 1440 and served there until well into the mid-century.¹¹

One disadvantage of presenting all of these settings together is that performers will not easily be able to make up a set of Mass Ordinaries from the settings presented. Trent 89 gives no isolated Agnus settings, and the Clibano Credo is perhaps so different from the other settings that it may not be considered a suitable piece to combine with any of them. Nevertheless since little general interest has been shown in Trent 89’s Ordinary settings before, it is perhaps best to present them together in the hope that their varied and unusual aspects will grow to be appreciated. Finally, I do urge potential performers to read my critical commentary on each piece that they choose for singing; while I have provided full text in many cases, vocalisation (or part-vocalisation) of some lower voices seems to be closer to the conditions under which some of these settings might have been sung.

EDITORIAL POLICY

(i) Original note-values are retained in all works, with whole-measure rests being indicated by semibreve rests instead of breve rests (except in items featuring 02 mensuration). All items are barred according to units of tempus, and in all items the original clef, mensuration sign and first few notes are given on a prefatory stave. The range of each voice is also indicated according to the nearest whole tone, and each voice is given the most appropriate modern clef (treble, octavetenor or bass). C-clefs are not used for this purpose. In items where there are simultaneous but different mensurations the barring is numbered by the most convenient unit of tempus.

(ii) Manuscript voice-names have been retained. When a work is copied onto more than one page-opening, the sources more or less consistently repeat the voice-names for the lower voices. Such repeated titling is ignored.

(iii) Some manuscript accidentals have been retained even where they might be thought superfluous (ie: a single flattened B occurring in a work in which the voice concerned already has a single-flat signature); some sharps and flats in the sources seem to indicate naturals (typically, on B and F respectively) and have been rendered thus with appropriate mention in the critical commentary. Editorial flat signatures have also been provided where considered necessary (i.e.; in works where the disposition of flat signatures seems inconsistent either in itself or by reference to a concordant source). Editorial accidentals indicating recta and ficta are placed above the stave which they affect, and have the validity of a single measure unless otherwise indicated (i.e.: by a following and cancelling accidental in the same measure). Where a manuscript accidental is suspected to be vertically out of place (ie: a sharpened C in a construct on F) its use is relegated to the critical commentary.

(iv) Where sesquialtera occurs, the original ciphers and suitable equivalents have been given. However, at the end of sesquialtera passages it has been taken for granted that performers will

¹¹ This tentative identification is of course guesswork, and the identification of fifteenth-century musicians named ‘de Clibano’ begins to approach the scale of the ‘Lupi’ problem in sixteenth-century sources. There seems to have been at least two composers named ‘J. de Clibano’, one of whom was a contemporary of Binchois (see Strohm, R., Music in Late Medieval Bruges (Clarendon, Oxford, 1985, pp. 117 and 142). Possibly a second person with a similar name was responsible for the Missa Et super nivem in CS 51.
return to the tactus preceding the sesquialtera, and not treat the given equivalents cumulatively. In multisectonal works and other works involving mensuration change, equivalents are suggested above the stave(s).

(v) Other notational features are indicated as follows; ligatures by horizontal square-end braces above the voice(s) concerned, coloration by two square brace-ends above the note(s) concerned, half-coloration by two dotted ends of a square brace likewise. Congruent signs are indicated by an “S” with dots on either side; these too are given above the stave. Where editorial additions have been made to the basic musical texture (due to lacunae or partly legible or missing notes, rests, etc.) these are enclosed in square brackets. For the sake of compression some editorial accidentals are given in positions which split ligature braces.

(vi) Manuscript clef changes are indicated by miniature clefs and guide-lines with the line-number of the clef concerned (i.e. miniscule C-clef followed by “3” means ‘in the main source this part changes to the C-clef on the third line up at this point’). These small clefs otherwise have no performing validity in the score, and they merely serve to shorten the critical commentary needed for each item. However, where a manuscript clef change is patently incorrect, it is referred to as such in the critical commentary. Small omissions (such as a fermata missing in a single voice out of three) are merely bracketed and are not normally referred to in the commentary.

(vii) ‘Duo’ markings for duets are retained, and are automatically taken to mean that all voices except the duetting pair concerned are silent from the duo point until the duet terminates. ‘Tacet’ directions are only used where given in an individual work.

(viii) All voices are usually texted, but where I consider vocalisation to be a better alternative this is stated in the score. Where a note has to be split to accommodate editorial underlay, this is indicated above the stave concerned by minuscule note-values and dotted guides.

(ix) Latin text largely follows the orthography and punctuation of modern liturgical books, but a few features of the original sources have been retained - i.e. “Jhesu” for “Jesu”. However, spellings which are regarded as particularly strange (and also probable misspellings) are relegated to the critical commentary.

(x) As far as is possible, chant insertions given in the source(s) are notated as in the manuscript(s) used except where they use hufnagelschrift. Where editorial chant additions are necessary, these are in modern chant notation but with a few features of fifteenth-century chant notation retained - i.e.: the modern two-note podatus ligature (with the second immediately above the first) is sometimes replaced by two separate small diamond-shaped values. This is merely for ease of musicsetting.

CRITICAL POLICY

(i) Entries regarding voices are given in descending order, and works with more than one source are given separate source entries in descending order of preference. With each work that is not a unicum, a list of the decided order of sources is given before the critical apparatus commences. Where a well-known, well-distributed or previously published piece has numerous concordances, much of the critical apparatus will be shortened.

(ii) A description of the text follows the source listing. The text itself is not repeated unless all or a significant part of it is thought to be unique - as is frequently the case with ceremonial motets, occasional pieces and contrafact items.

(iii) Bibliographical information on the music and text then follow, and if further performance, transmission or parent-chant questions arise from the source(s) and their texting, these are
referred to at the end of the critical apparatus for each work.

(iv) Manuscript positioning of individual text syllables and editorial underlay involving ligature breaks are normally not recorded, even though I have experimented considerably with syllable placement in most works presented (and often relied on parent chants as underlay guides rather than their polyphonic settings). Arguably, since the Trent Codices are published in facsimile these volumes should satisfy the requirements of those wishing to enquire after precise text placement in individual works. Omitting long lists of syllable placements, too, saves us space and time. Where the preferred source's textual intentions seem dramatically different from the underlay given in the edition, the matter is usually referred to as in (iii) above.

(v) Note-numbering in the critical commentary takes the first note of each measure to be "1" even if it is tied over from a preceding measure. The following abbreviations are used;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>br</td>
<td>breve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>col</td>
<td>colored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conj</td>
<td>conjecturally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cor</td>
<td>corona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cs</td>
<td>congruent sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dsf</td>
<td>demisemifusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dtd</td>
<td>dotted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed</td>
<td>editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>err</td>
<td>in error / erroneously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>fusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. / ff.</td>
<td>folio / folios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h-col</td>
<td>half-colored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illeg</td>
<td>illegible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ind</td>
<td>indicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lig</td>
<td>ligature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ligd</td>
<td>ligated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>minim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m sign</td>
<td>mensuration sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mx</td>
<td>maxima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ns</td>
<td>note split (to accommodate underlay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>om</td>
<td>omitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p div</td>
<td>punctus divisionis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp</td>
<td>pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p sync</td>
<td>punctus syncopationis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>rest(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rpt(s)</td>
<td>repeat(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sbr</td>
<td>semibreve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scr corr</td>
<td>scribbally corrected / scribal correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sf</td>
<td>semifusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sig</td>
<td>signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uc</td>
<td>unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>now illegible in manuscript, but legible in previous reproductions or microfilms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Rorate celi
Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto.

Si e rat in principio, et nunc, et semp.

per, et in saecula saeculorum.

Repeat intonation & 1-88
2. Salve sancta parens

Salve sancta Parens, e

Contra sancta Parens, e

Tenor sancta Parens,

11

nisaxapusperm

23

Regem, qui cepulum

35

Regem, qui

47

git in se
Et Spiritui Sancto. Sicut erat

in principio, et nunc, et sem

per, et in secula secula

lorum. Amen.

3. Viri Galilei

Viri Galilei,

quid admirare

Tenor quid admirare

Contra quid admirare
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mi - ni a - spi - ci -

en - tes in ce -

la - b - l - u -
lum? al - le -

ia: quem - ad - mo -

ia: quem - ad - mo -

ia: quem - ad - mo -

dum vi - di - stis c -

vi - vi - di - stis e -
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Gen - tes plau - di - te ma - ni - bus: in - bi - la - te De -

De - o in vo - ce e - xul - ta -

et Fi - li - o, et Spi - ri - tu - i San - cto. Si - cut c - rat in prin - ci - pi -