

INTRODUCTION TO INSTALMENT 3

This third instalment of the Trent 91 edition presents re-edited versions of the pieces in *Ex Codicis I/II* (which needed updating), plus most of the separate Credo, Sanctus and Agnus settings in the manuscript and also one small group of works which seem self-contained. This latter batch consists of a *Sine nomine* Mass plus a *Salve Regina* setting and a Magnificat which are stylistically close to each other.

The pieces previously given in *Ex Codicis I/II* are mostly antiphon settings, or pieces which resemble them closely, or are similar pieces which are copied adjacently in the manuscript. There are also some Sequence settings here that were not presented in *Ex Codicis I/I*. The majority of these antiphon settings have been published before.¹ However, I have significant reasons for presenting them again. Firstly, giving these particular works as a self-contained assembly helps to reinforce the claim which I made in a previous study that many of them may come from a single school.² Secondly, the pieces already published are definitely worth presenting again with editorial underlay that takes 'greater measures' into consideration for the texting lower voices - a policy not followed in previous editions of this music.³

Most of these pieces occur as batch in Trent 91: nine of the antiphons (nos 52-60) are copied together, no. 61 is only separated by two pieces from the previous group, nos 62 and 63 occur together, nos 64 and 65 are given together before the grouping of 52-60, and nos 67-69 are given together in another part of the manuscript. It is also highly significant that the related source Glogau gives three of the antiphons close together, perhaps implying that both sources derive from exemplars which ordered some of these pieces by type.⁴ As explained in the Introduction to *Ex Codicis I/I* both manuscripts may derive from copies made at the Imperial Chapel in Wiener Neustadt, where it is likely that the majority of the Trent 91 chant settings originated. Some of the Glogau versions of these pieces have been available in a printed edition since the 1930's, but presenting their Trent 91 readings is important because in many cases the latter gives better readings than Glogau. In a sense, the editors of Glogau accidentally did these pieces a disservice by publishing the versions from that manuscript first. The survival of *Nigra sum* in a Polish source and *Regina celi* no. 60 in Munich 3154 perhaps also points to a wider dissemination than surviving manuscripts allow us to realise. Only one setting here is significantly more complex in its Trent 91 version than in Glogau: *Alle Del Filius* no. 71 adds a Contra primus not given in the latter manuscript. In addition, the Munich 3154 concordance for *Regina celi* no. 61 gives the lie to the assumption that all shared pieces between that manuscript and Trent 91 have closely related readings; the two versions seem quite distant from each other.

It is also significant that nos 52-61, 64 and 66 in this selection are Marian items; some of them use well-known plainsongs (such as *Salve Regina* and *Regina celi*) and others have antiphon chants using texts from the Song of Songs. There is a strong preference for duple meter in these settings: only nos 64 and 70 here use triple mensuration, and then only for part of their duration. Relatively unadorned Superius chant presentation also takes priority over other alternatives: the four-part *Regina celi* setting no. 61 is the only setting amongst these works that uses Tenor cantus firmus.

The Trent 91 readings also feature some slightly unusual signatures: *Descendi in ortum* (no. 56) has a Superius flat signature for both B and also the F above it. The flat for top F also reappears in *Alma redemptoris* no. 58 and *Regina celi* no. 60, and the latter also has a single-sharp signature in its Tenor signifying the frequency of B natural throughout. *Anima mea* (no. 57) features conflicting signatures as they are typically found in some fifteenth-century chansons, and *Salve festa dies* (no. 63) features a single-flat signature only in its Tenor (possibly as a result of the imitation which opens the piece). Glogau tends to

¹ See the editions in the EdM series cited in the Commentary.

² Mitchell, R., 'Trent 91; first steps towards a stylistic classification' (Studies in the Trent Codices I, Sudbury, 2003).

³ 'Greater measures' here meaning the tendency of groups of cut-C or C measures to fall into duple or triple groups. Careful consideration of text underlay in these particular pieces seems important since the Glogau readings generally give extensive texting with horizontal extenders - in lower voices as well as Superius parts.

⁴ No. 56 (*Descendi in ortum*) = Glogau no. 105; no. 54 (*O florens rosa*) = Glogau no. 107, and no. 55 (*Salve Regina*) = Glogau no. 108.

omit signatures given in Trent 91, but gives multiple clefs using alphabetical letters - a feature related to types of cleffing in Mu 3232a.

Most of the three-voice works also feature the same type of Contratenor; these are generally wide-ranging and tend to avoid doubled-leadingnote progressions except in pieces such as nos 53 and 54 where there are Phrygian progressions. In general, Contratenors in three-part pieces are quite bass-like and cross the Tenor less often than typical mid-century filler Contratenors. Rhythmically, the antiphon settings which have the most in common are nos 53-57. These settings proceed in a steady rhythmic manner and chant presentation tends towards monorhythm except at cadences. Perhaps the starkest of them is *O florens rosa* no. 54. The presence of Tenor-generated imitation (which occurs in nos 52-54, 57 and 59) is also persuasive towards giving all voices text underlay. Setting no. 59 (*Nigra sum*) slightly varies the general format with its final sesquialtera passage (which is largely independent of the parent chant) but apart from this it should be easy to see that there is a certain uniformity of style amongst the antiphon settings cited. Lower voices are frequently more active than Superius parts, too - a feature best illustrated by the lengthy and non-imitative *Salve Regina* setting no. 55 and the Communion setting *Ave Regina* no. 64.

The *Alma redemptoris* setting no. 58 initially presents a problem in that it is rhythmically more sophisticated than most pieces cited so far, and its active duple meter and imitative manner might seem to set it apart from the settings preceding it. Indeed, this piece would not look out of place in a music collection from ca. 1490 or 1500. Nevertheless I suggest that it is a product of the same school as the other antiphon settings for two significant reasons. Firstly, its accelerative devices are by no means unique; active rhythms are also found at the start of the second section of *Hec dies* (no. 62) and they also occur in the Trent 91 *Lectio* settings.⁵ Secondly, this *Alma redemptoris* must have been a fellow-traveller with the other antiphon settings since it is also found in Glogau.

Not all of the differences between readings are so easily explained as some of those above. The lengthy Sequence setting *Lauda Syon* no. 70 is quite unlike the Sequences given in *Ex Codicis II*, and also different from Sequences nos 67 and 69 here in view of its partial use of triple meter and high-pitched Superius. Poorly copied in Trent 91, it lacks an internal stretch of its Contra and the lower voices at the openings of its penultimate and final verses are omitted. Glogau gives this setting a duple-meter first verse instead of a triple-meter verse, and also fills in the lower-voice passages mentioned. But possibly neither version is really satisfactory; the Trent 91 first verse may have been taken from another *Lauda Syon* setting, and Glogau's first verse is copied as an addition. The fact that the Glogau compiler also added another such verse in the same fashion to yet another Sequence setting (*Congaudent angelorum chori*) makes these first verses look suspicious. Are they authentic, or do they modify previous versions of these pieces?

The other Sequences and the Communion setting given between them in Trent 91 (nos 67-69) are more like the simpler antiphon settings presented here in their use of Superius-based chant. No. 69 is another setting with conflicting signatures, it also features restatement of a section of chant melody with rhythmic acceleration and imitation (at 96-103) and even the chant motives and acceleration here are similar to a passage in the Sequence setting *Sancti Spiritus assit* presented in *Ex Codicis II* - for which reason I suspect that the composer of this setting might have known the presumably slightly older piece mentioned. Restatement of repeated chant material with acceleration is also a feature of *Salve Regina* no. 55 and *Alle Dei Filius* no. 71. In the latter, the repetitive Easter trope melody is given in approximately halved values at its second statement (47-64); a Tenor cantus firmus Sanctus in Trent 91 also has a related scheme in that its sections proceed in what seem to be successively faster mensurations.⁶ Such a technique seems to be just one of many ways in which composers sought to vary settings of repetitive chants. Another method is evident in the *Ave Regina* setting no. 64 with its highly active lower voices. Neither is this the only such work that seems to be part of the Trent / Glogau chant setting complex: an *Ave maris stella* setting in Trent

⁵ See 'Trent 91; first steps...', pp. 35-36.

⁶ See Instalment 2 no. 32.

89 (DTÖ no. 625) is fairly similar to the latter piece and therefore also conceivably part of the same collection of settings.

Studying the idiosyncrasies of these pieces is fascinating. A recent article by Martin Just has outlined how the Glogau antiphon settings seem to be put together, and my own cited study of the contents of Trent 91 suggests that a 'chief mind' may have been responsible for many of its chant settings.⁷ For further exploration of the possibility that most of the music presented here might be by that single anonymous, I offer the following points of resemblance. Three of these settings have similar openings even though all three use different chants (measures 1-7 in nos 52, 56 and 58). Some settings also feature Superius cadence formulas using dotted rhythms (no. 58, 10-13 and no. 62, 118-121). Others feature syncopated dotted Contratenor movement following internal cadences (no. 52, 101-103, no. 57, 101-103, no. 59, 49-51 and no. 62, 164-167). Another favoured device is an internal duet interlude prior to re-entry of the Superius, and some of these interludes are similar (no. 53, 54-57 and no. 56, 71-75). Other preferred features include a liking for interrupted cadences, hung-over cadences (as at the end of no. 62) and occasional long-note treatment of the chant-carrying Superius in settings which otherwise have a degree of rhythmic equality between their voices (no. 66, 87-96). Monorhythm is also a favoured method of presenting chant Tenors (as in *Regina celi* no. 61) and it is not inconceivable that this piece (with its frequent imitative runs and dotted rhythms in the outer voices) represents the 'Tenor cantus firmus' manner of the same composer who seems to be responsible for most of the Superius paraphrase settings.⁸

An additional point regarding the antiphons is that there seems to be some degree of characterisation amongst the Song of Songs settings. Their probable composer(s) may have been intent on the settings reflecting aspects of their texts in choices of musical gestures and cadence-pitches. I suggest this not so much as evidence of wordpainting but rather as a way of understanding that some settings might be intended as little tableaux of narrative material in their texts. This is possibly why *Nigra sum* no. 59 features Phrygian cadences (which it need not do, since the parent chant is in F mode) and also may be the reason why *Anima mea* no. 57 makes use of conflicting signatures to make a setting that sounds (at least, in our terms) quite plangent. Of course it is impossible to say whether such criteria operated for judging the sound of a piece of polyphony in the times concerned; I merely raise the point here to illustrate that there may be a degree of textual awareness in these pieces.

I have faced a persistent problem in these pieces regarding Superius underlay; when a conventional cadential figure appears, should the editor underlay text according to the typical rhythmic stresses of the formula, or should he follow the chant's underlay as strictly as possible? I suggest that the former alternative is often preferable in settings where any degree of figurative style appears in the chant-derived voice concerned. Thus in setting no. 52 (*Ecce concipies*) I have underlaid the cadence at 7-12 with disregard for both Trent 91's ligatures and also the chant's underlay at this point. This might be seen as taking a little too much musical licence, but I would prefer these pieces to be seen as the art settings that they are rather than as merely taxidermised versions of their parent material. But perhaps where a parent chant is not particularly well-known this does not really matter. Either the chant-biased or the cliché-biased alternative might apply at cadences.

The Sanctus and Agnus settings which make up the second part of this instalment (nos 72-77) largely follow trends already explored in this series. No. 72 (a Sanctus-Agnus pair) features mensuration change for part of its chant-carrying Superius (see 31-42) and has fairly active lower voices. No. 73 features a prominent interrupted cadence at the end of its first section and is quite succinct. By contrast, the troped Sanctus setting no. 74 is extensive and serves as something as a showcase for various ways of treating a parent chant. This setting also features temporary mensuration change (at 45-53), active lower voices, sections of

⁷ See Just, M., 'Polyphony based on chant in a late fifteenth-century German manuscript' in Kmetz, I (ed), *Music in the German Renaissance; Sources, Styles and Contexts* (Cambridge University Press, 1994) pp. 129-151, and Mitchell, 'Trent 91;...', p. 29.

⁸ For further shared devices which seem to unite much of this repertory, see Mitchell, 'Trent 91;...' pp. 31-32.

unembellished chant presentation, and lower-voice imitative devices under a long-note Superius. It is one of several noteworthy pieces in this instalment that I would particularly like to hear recorded well.

The short and similar group of pieces nos 74-76 (a Kyrie, Sanctus and Agnus) come from a section of Trent 91 which otherwise features some chant-carrying voices in Lorraine neumes (like the Kyrie) and pieces with simple textures in Superius-Tenor-Bass scoring. The partwriting in these settings is slightly rough, but their modernity in texture and style (as well as their tendency to use Germanic parent chants) perhaps points to them being written together at a single centre. They therefore seem to be slight ‘outsiders’ in the Trent 91 chant-setting repertory, as are the final pieces in this instalment. No. 78 (the Credo attributed to ‘Attamasch’ in Glogau), *Salve Regina* no. 79, Magnificat no. 80 and the *Sine nomine* Mass no. 81 may all be the work of a single man.

The Mass has been extensively described by Adelyn Leverett, who identified the Ordinary chants that it uses and even the style of the majuscules in the manuscript as likely to indicate Bohemian provenance. That it is indeed a central European composition is also likely since - in addition to its parent Ordinary chants - each movement features an additional short cantus firmus in the Superius in ‘quodlibet’ fashion which cannot yet be identified. Like the previous set of pieces discussed, there is a tendency for the Contras in these pieces to be bass-like. The Mass, the Credo and *Salve Regina* all feature short patches of mensuration change, and the Magnificat and *Salve Regina* are copied next to each other in Trent 91. *Salve Regina* no. 79 has portions of its chant-carrying material in Lorraine neumes, and is rather like *Salve Regina* no. 55 in size and texture even though it is a migrant piece and no. 55 has Superius-based chant. But perhaps it is a less accomplished piece than the latter. As for ‘Attamasch’, I hesitate to assume that this is a composer’s name until further documentation is uncovered. The important fact is that these pieces (which were possibly written at some distance from the main Trent 91 chant-setting repertory) still display a commonality of style with it. Evidently the people that produced and copied the main part of this repertory had their imitators.

My particular thanks for help with this instalment go to Marco Gozzi, Jan Vecere and Peter Wright.

.....