

## INTRODUCTION

This instalment-type edition of the Trent 91 repertory succeeds my previous *Ex Codicis* series, and readers are referred to those booklets and also my article “Trent 91; first steps...” for my work so far on this manuscript. The editorial method and the format of the critical commentary here are much the same as in the *Ex Codicis* series, except that in the present collection plainsong notes (both in manuscript passages and also in editorial additions) are rendered in monorhythmic notation instead of their original notation. Additionally, less critical notes are given than before regarding manuscript text positioning. Since the Trent Codices are now online, readers may easily refer to the online images of the manuscripts rather than plough through paragraphs of textual detail on underlay placement.

The Adobe format in which the edition is presented shows a little screen distortion, but none of this should appear in printed copies. For abbreviations in the critical commentary sections which might be unfamiliar, refer to the following list.

b	flat
br	breve
col	colored
conj	conjecturally
cor	corona
cs	congruent sign
dsf	demisemifusa
dtd	dotted
<u>DTÖ</u>	<u>Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich</u>
ed	editorial
err	in error / erroneously
f	fusa
f./ff.	folio/folios
h-col	half-colored
illeg	illegible
ind	indicated
lig	ligature
ligd	ligated
L	long
m	minim
m sign	mensuration sign
mx	maxima
ns	notes are split to accommodate underlay
om	omitted
p div	punctus divisionis
pp.	pages
p sync	punctus syncopationis
r	rest(s)
rpt(s)	repeats
sbr	semibreve
scr corr	scribally corrected
sf	semifusa
sig	signature
uc	unclear
**	now illegible in manuscript, but legible in previous reproductions / microfilms

Additionally, source sigla which are referred to throughout follow the abbreviations in *Ex Codicis*, and additional primary sources here are referred to in full on their first citation and then subsequently by new sigla throughout.

In repertorial terms the first batch of pieces presented here continue the work of *Ex Codicis* in presenting pieces which are likely to be the work of the ‘Sequence anonymous’ discussed in *Ex Codicis I/I*. The relevant works here (nos 1-7 and the final section of no.8) strongly feature the following elements: barely elaborated chant presentation with a tendency towards monorhythm, rhythmic simplicity, and Contratenor parts which are not always bass-like. A certain starkness results, notably in *Verbum caro* no. 1 which is important since it has a recently-discovered concordance outside the Trent Codices.<sup>1</sup> Kyrie no. 4 and *Salve Regina* no. 2 are only a little less functional than the latter. All three settings have simple Tenor cantus firmus much in the manner of the chant-carrying Tenor verses of the *Ex Codicis I/I* Sequence settings, and also as in the latter Sequences the Superius parts tend to sound synthetic. *Gaudeamus* no. 3 is only a little different, and is unusual amongst Introit settings since the polyphony starts without the customary chant intonation.

There remain a certain number of works in the same or similar styles which might also belong to this composer-group, although inclusion is less certain. *O sapientia* no. 5 is another simple Tenor cantus firmus setting, and *Alle Dei Filius* no. 6 is similar but has a four-voice texture which the composer does not seem to handle with ease. The case for including no. 5 in this group is admittedly weak, but as for no. 6 its texture is related to the conclusion of the *Sedit angelus* setting no. 8 to be discussed below.

The Magnificat Tone I setting no. 7 is migrant, again relating it to the *Ex Codicis I/I* Sequences which – like this setting – give alternate polyphonic verses with Superius- or Tenor-based chant. This piece is otherwise quite unlike most other Magnificats in the later Trent Codices due to its occasionally plain presentation of the tone and the clear use of a German-variant tone formula (with the Superius at 47-48 and the Tenor at 99 giving C as part of the borrowed material whereas a western setting might use B flat here instead). The four-voice writing in this setting is also a little uneasy, as in no.6. My familiarity with the abovementioned Sequences and the simpler chant settings in this selection easily lead me to the view that this Magnificat might be part of the same composer-group. Perhaps that view might eventually come to be shared by frequent users of my editions. Finally regarding the ‘Sequence anonymous’, the chants that he set (if he was a single individual) seem to suggest some eagerness to provide for important occasions in the Church calendar. His Introit setting no. 3 and the Kyrie setting no. 4 could have multiple liturgical uses, as – in a wider sense – could *Salve Regina* no. 2. *Verbum caro* no. 1 provides for another important occasion (the Nativity) and the Sequences in *Ex Codicis I/I* are also for major feasts. I may not be too far from the truth in suggesting that his employer(s) expected him to provide polyphony for important occasions as a first priority. If I was also correct in identifying the Trent 91 *Liber Generationis* and the *Sendliche peim* lied in Trent 89 as his, we begin to form a picture of a man employed at a prestigious musical centre.

The remainder of the chant settings in this selection are nearly all Superius paraphrases and represent the more sophisticated likely composer-group in Trent 91 as outlined in the introduction to *Ex Codicis I/III*. Nos 10-20 are the easiest to discuss (since some of them occur as pairs of Proper settings for the same feast in Trent 91) and their occasional use of triple meter and duet sections probably indicates an indebtedness to the Trent 88 Propers. Some of the latter were circulating in the German-speaking world from at least the 1460s, so it seems reasonable to suppose that local imitations soon arose. Likely catalysts for the transmission of western Proper settings might include Friedrich III’s journey to Italy for his coronation at Emperor (1453) and the temporary residences of Franco-Flemish musicians in the Imperial musical establishment such as Touront, Boubert and Fleron. Typically, the stylised manner of the more ambitious Trent 88 Propers are reflected in the opening O-mensuration sections of some the Alleluias given here. Likewise, the Trent 91 *Benedicta sit* setting (no. 12) might have been written with some awareness of the earlier setting in Trent 88; like the latter piece the Trent 91 setting is a Superius paraphrase that has polyphony beyond the Introit’s first section. Adelyn Leverett also demonstrated that Isaac’s setting of the same chant is probably related to the

<sup>1</sup> In Bratislava, Univerzita Komenského, Knížnica, Inc. 318-I (*olim* III B 6, hereafter Kosice). For a description and inventory, see Gancarczyk, P.; Musica Scripto. Kodeksy menzurálne II połowy XV wieku na wschodzie Europy Łacińskiej (Warsaw, 2001) pp. 155-167.

Trent 91 setting, so here we seem to have three settings of the same chant that span the work of three consecutive generations of composers.<sup>2</sup>

Several of the Propers given here seem to be compositional pairs, and are mostly probably the work of the ‘chief mind’ of the Trent 91 chant paraphrase assembly. *Benedicta sit* pairs suitably with *Alleluia Benedictus es* (no.13, which is next to it in the manuscript) and nos 10-11 and 14-15 are likewise convincing pairs provided for single feasts. Most of these settings have wide-ranging Contra parts (sometimes spanning an octave plus a fifth) and there is a relatively high incidence of doubled-leadingnote cadences and upper-voice fifths throughout. These Propers are therefore mostly a little less modern-sounding than some of the antiphon settings presented in *Ex Codicis I/II*. *Alleluia Pasca nostrum-Epulemur* (no. 14) is more extensive than the rest here, and gives its Superius chant paraphrase with some inner-section presentation in greater measures (02 against lower-voice C2) probably because of the importance of its intended feast (Easter Sunday).<sup>3</sup> The duet sections also have widely-spaced voices in one passage, which is a feature which does not appear in any of the other settings here. Another important feature of this little collection of Propers (and indeed some of the Trent 88 collection) is that the composer(s) tended to write similar pieces by type. Probably for no particular reason other than uniformity, two of the Communions here (nos 18 and 20) sound similar with their declamatory manner. They also use similar internal imitative gambits. Two of the Alleluias (nos 13 and 14) also end their initial triple sections with imitative drive devices

Three of the pieces presented here definitely do not seem to be the work of the same anonymous as above. *Alleluia Veni sancte Spiritus* (no. 19) gives its parent chant as a Superius paraphrase, but ends each of its sections with a musically rhymed and sequential non-chant-related passage. It also uses sesquialtera in the Tenor voice alone in its second section (a feature which does not appear in any of the abovementioned works). Likewise the Communion *Ecce concipies* (no. 21) is most unlike the pieces discussed above and occurs in the earlier pages of Trent 91 – unlike the Propers discussed above which tend to be grouped together. The third of these ungroupable pieces (the Corpus Christi *Alleluia Caro mea*, no. 17) is lower-pitched than all of the pieces discussed so far, and largely consists of a duet between the Superius and Contra. Its rhythmic turns, little patches of sequential writing and occasional dotted rhythms are rather unlike anything else in Trent 91 so it is best regarded as being truly anonymous. This piece also gives a couple of clues about how parts of the Trent 91 chant paraphrase assembly may have been put together. Measure 28 in both the Superius and Contra contains errors, maybe suggesting that no. 17 was copied from a relatively small manuscript with at least one page-turn.<sup>4</sup> In addition, the rubric above this setting indicates optional destinations as the Alleluia for either the Nativity of the BVM or the feast of St. Vigilius – one of the very few mentions of Trento’s local saint in these manuscripts. It is probable that this rubric relates to local usage rather than a non-Tridentine parent source. *Alleluia Caro mea* is also paired rather unconvincingly in Trent 91 with a Communion for Corpus Christi (no.18) which has totally different voice-ranges. This is therefore likely to be a scribal/liturgical pairing rather than a compositional one.

A further question arises regarding these pieces; how they might combine with the Trent 91 Introit settings to effect partial sets of Propers? Out of the five Introits published in *Ex Codicis I/II*, the St. Peter and Paul *Nunc scio vere* setting is copied next to the Alleluia and Communion for the same feast in Trent 91 (nos 10 and 11 in this selection), and on grounds of style they appear to be a compositional set. The setting of the Sequence for the same feast (*Ex Codicis I/II* no. 18) is also probably part of this set. Likewise, the Corpus Christi Introit *Cibavit eos* is probably by the same composer as the Corpus Christi Communion in this selection (no. 18), and the Sequence setting for the same feast (*Ex Codicis I/II* no. 19) is compositionally

<sup>2</sup> See Leverett, A., A paleographical and repertorial study of the manuscript Trento, Castello del Buonconsiglio, 91 (1378) (Ph. D. dissertation, 2 vols, Princeton University, 1990), I, pp.107-108 & II, p.58.

<sup>3</sup> This method of highlighting chant-carrying Superius with mensurations different from the lower voices also occurs in the Kyrie setting Trent 91 ff. 96v-97r, and elsewhere in Trent 91 chant-carrying voices with implied triple-rhythm ‘greater measures’ are also found: see *Ex Codicis I/II* p. 40 (*Mittit ad virginem*) and *I/II* p. 62 (*Lauda Syon salvatorem*).

<sup>4</sup> Few such other instances are detectable in Trent 91 and Trent 89, but the Trent 89 copy of Touront’s *O generosa* (which has the text *Compangant omnes*) displays similar closely-spaced errors.

similar but this may be another piece that reaches us in a revised condition.<sup>5</sup> That - of course - leaves aside the Easter pieces mentioned above (which may in any case be a part of compositional set larger than the subject of this discussion allows). Otherwise Trent 91 only contains one complete set of Propers copied consecutively in their liturgical order; these are the Dedication Propers to be published later in this series.

Nos 8 and 9 in this selection (the Easter Sunday processional antiphon settings *Sedit angelus* and *Christus resurgens*) call for some comment due to their length and the former's state of survival. No. 8 only uses four voices for its short final section, and is otherwise a three-voice and migrant chant setting much like the antiphons published in *Ex Codicis I/II*. The three-voice section is probably by the same anonymous composer as these antiphons. The Superius is particularly high-pitched, and would constitute a particularly exhausting sing for even the most energetic of solo voices due to its sheer length. This is just one amongst many arguments for 'more than one voice per part' in such three-voice settings. Another argument might be that two of the Sequence settings in *Ex Codicis I/I* (*Victime pascali* and *Sancti Spiritus assit*) have repeated first strains of chant material – just as in several well-researched liturgies where the initial verset of an important chant is repeated once before the continuation. Could such repeated first strains indicate antiphonal performances of these Sequences by six instead of three singers? This suggestion of course begins to take apart the idea of three solo voices as the preferred performance medium for mid-fifteenth century sacred music. There are, too, other indications from central Europe in the same period that three-voice polyphony sometimes might have involved more than three individual performers.<sup>6</sup>

Leaving aside these considerations, the final four-voice section of *Sedit angelus* is nothing like the rest of the piece and has Tenor cantus firmus plus a synthetic-looking Superius above it. The scribe appears to have added this final section in Trent 91 as something of an afterthought since it is rather compressed on the page. It is of great interest here that the style of this cantus firmus section is strongly reminiscent of *Alle Dei filius* no. 6, which I have already suggested might be the work of the 'Sequence anonymous'. Therefore, the possibility arises that he added this section to an already existing setting by the paraphrase composer. The question also arises as to whether the 'Sequence anonymous' and the composer of the Superius paraphrase settings either worked at the same centre or collaborated in some other way. The main section of *Sedit angelus* has some variety of texture throughout: there are patches of widely-spaced voices where the Contra is bass-like, there is a solitary example of a doubled-leadingnote cadence (295-297), and there is also a duet passage where the Tenor briefly carries the chant. The Superius part is also very nearly identical at 162-236 and 316-392 (which is partly the result of the chant's nature) but the supporting voices differ in these passages. The Superius and Tenor imitate and anticipate one another at approximately ten entries throughout, but the Contra does not take part in such activity despite moments of lower-voice rhythmic imitation (such as at 223-225 and 271-275) and frequent Contra crossings of the Tenor.

*Christus resurgens* (which is also a lengthy setting) serves as a more functional example of the same type of Superius setting as the first section of no.8. The paraphrase throughout is very simple, the texture is non-imitative apart from a few Tenor anticipations of the Superius, and it is rather like the *Salve festa dies* setting published in *Ex Codicis I/II*. Such pieces seem to represent the 'default manner' of a composer who – at his best – was capable of imitating western developments in his Proper and antiphon settings. We are at a considerable loss since this man (the 'chief mind' of the Trent 91 chant-setting collection and its counterpart in Glogau) still remains unidentified.

Finally it remains for me to thank the following people for help with this instalment of the edition: Pawel Gancarczyk, Lenka Hlavkova, Margaret Bent and Leofranc Holford-Strevens. Their assistance on various musical and textual items is very much appreciated.

<sup>5</sup> See *Ex Codicis I/II*, Introduction, p. ii.

<sup>6</sup> Notably the large page-size of the earlier fifteenth-century Zwettl fragment, whose scribe (Johannes Wolf) was also one of the main scribes of the earlier Trent Codices. Further, see Wright, P., 'The Compilation of Trent87<sub>1</sub> and Trent 92<sub>2</sub>' in EMH II (1982), pp. 237-271.

