

INTRODUCTION TO INSTALMENT 2

This instalment of the Trent 88 edition presents all of the Magnificat settings in the manuscript, plus all of the Vespers, Matins and processional hymns and the single *Te Deum* setting.

There are sixteen Magnificat settings in Trent 88, giving this manuscript the largest individual concentration of such works in the Trent Codices. Trent 89 comes close with fifteen settings, but two of those are fragmentary. Trent 88 is therefore an excellent source for the study of Magnificat settings in the Dufay and Binchois era, even though no pieces by those composers are present here.

Typically, a Magnificat setting of this period is usually three-voice and sets either the odd- or even-numbered verses. Parent material from one of the eight Magnificat Tones is normally paraphrased or alluded to in the Superius, but references tend to be sketchy and they are frequently punctuated by cadential clichés. Sometimes the pitches of sectional openings and endings are virtually the only clues to what Tone might be present in the so-called paraphrase. Individual verses and sometimes whole settings use fauxbourdon, but otherwise declamatory and homophonic passages are not common in mid-century settings. In many settings there is a variety of successive mensurations and internal scorings, with occasional temporary quotation of parent material by a voice other than the Superius. However all Magnificats in Trent 88 use Superius-based parent material, and the more elaborate paraphrases tend to make scant use of Tone material.

My previous edition of the Trent 89 Magnificats emphasised the two versions of the Magnificat Tones which were current in the fifteenth-century Empire as illustrated in Carl-Heinz Illing's Magnificat study.¹ Amongst the Trent 88 Magnificat settings, only two appear to use Germanic-version Tones (nos 49 and 50). In fifteenth-century music collections Magnificat settings tend to be copied together, but this is not always the case. For example, SP B80 has a self-contained Magnificat collection and so do CS 15, Verona 758, Verona 759 and the earlier section of Mu 3154. The settings in Trent 88 are largely scattered throughout the manuscript apart from nos 49 and 50 (which are copied together) and a group of six settings which are also copied consecutively (nos 52-57).

Setting no. 46a would appear to be fairly typical. It has all even-numbered verses set, simple Superius Tone I paraphrase, a filler Contratenor and some variety in mensurations including a final verse using O3 (which was possibly intended as a sesquialtera signature after the preceding polyphonic verse using cut-C). But it seems that no. 46a is only an adaption of a longer work, since the same piece also occurs in Trent 93 in an incomplete form but with the first four verses set. Three of these Trent 93 verses are not found in the Trent 88 setting. Therefore the original work may have set all twelve verses individually. The migrant setting no. 44 (Tone VIII) is also fairly typical, but includes some imitative interplay using triadic motives on C and major-minor contrasts, and its part-music ends with fermata chords. I would therefore characterise this setting as probably western since the characteristics mentioned otherwise occur in motets and secular pieces by Dufay and others.² Setting no. 45 is also typical and is otherwise found in Strahov, as is Magnificat no. 47.

Alongside these conventional settings there are also Magnificats in Trent 88 which are informative of a less skilled tradition, i.e. pieces put together as unconvincing adaptations or composed by poor amateurs. One such adaption seems to be the four-voice Tone III setting no. 48. As it exists in Trent 88, there are simply too many notes here for the Magnificat text (which is poorly entered) and there are only two polyphonic sections for all even-numbered verses. Considerable emendation also seems to be needed to make this rather homophonic

¹ Illing, C-H., Zur Technik der Magnificat-Komposition des 16. Jahrhunderts (Wolfenbüttel, 1936) p. 22. However, the variant terminations are not given in Illing's examples.

² This setting's Superius also contains dotted figures in triple rhythm which are otherwise typical of Binchois's song style (see measures 49-50).

setting with a real bass work properly. It may not have originated as a Magnificat setting at all, and might have been a psalm setting using Tone III. If this is so, it would be a forerunner of similar psalm settings by Martini and Brebis used in the 1470's at Ferrara. Likewise, the three-voice Tone VI setting no. 55 seems noteworthy because of its shortwindedness and inept partwriting. Although it is similar in sound to the *Advenisti* motet in this edition (no. 12) the two pieces may be by different anonymi whose experience of partwriting was somewhat lacking in both cases.

One feature of several fifteenth-century settings is the use of repeats for sets of verses. The 'Jo. Gayus' Magnificat does this by making all of its three polyphonic verses repeat twice for the sake of musical economy. This setting is also significant for two other reasons. It survives - in a barely legible state - on badly faded pages of Trent 88, and secondly some small values in the Superius (at 38, 62, 71-72, 98 and 103) look as though they might be ornamental accretions in a part that originally may have been simpler. Otherwise Jehan Gay (if that was his proper name) seems untraceable but since his only other piece (the brief *Dyana lux serena*) uses the word 'Dyana' (an image for the daystar found in Italian literature) we might suppose that his music circulated in Italy. The well-known Dufay Tone III / IV setting uses a similar repeat scheme, as do other two other settings to be discussed below (nos 43 and 47).

Most of the works discussed so far were probably written in the years around 1450 and some of them may be older. To take a more complex piece than any discussed so far, the Tone II setting no. 54 is lower-pitched than most of Trent 88 Magnificats. Although it only uses O mensuration throughout it has a degree of complexity owing to the amount of harmonic minim movement and unison imitation that occurs. No doubt influenced by English style features, this setting also has a degree of unity in its use of motives shared between different verses. The way that this piece treats its text is also noteworthy. The final syllable '-cto' (in verse 11) is treated as a long melisma, and likewise the final syllable of 'mea' at measures 2-5 is treated melismatically. Clearly, not all features of Superius chant paraphrases match modern conventions concerning text underlay.

My work on the Trent 89 Magnificats isolated five small groups of Magnificat settings that were either similar to each other or similar to other works in the later Trent Codices - largely on the grounds of stylistic idiosyncrasy or similarity to the extensive Tone VI setting by Touront. Magnificats no 71 and 72 in the Trent 89 edition (which are copied next to each other in the Trent 89) may also be the product of a teacher and pupil collaboration. In Trent 88 such resemblances are harder to find. It seems certain that the six settings gathered together (nos 52-57) are not the work of a single man, but nos 52 and 53 are likely to be a composer pair. Both are three-voice Tone I settings, with the second setting's parent material being the shortened Tone I with an ending on G. For details of their close similarities see the commentary. Otherwise the resemblances involve similar paired duet passages and similar writing at identical textual points, similar use of drives at section endings, shared use of mid-verse pause points and similarly opening half-verses. The dissonance technique of these pieces seems a little old-fashioned as well as their rather muscular rhythmic movement. If they are not English settings, then they may belong to the first generation of continental works that convincingly imitated English music. I also suspect that they are only imitations for one significant reason: the first half of verse 5 in no. 52 is written so that a fauxbourdon Contra can be added if desired, and fauxbourdon does not normally occur in insular works.

Likewise nos 49 and 56 are likely to be the work of a single man. The former seems to call for Germanic-variant chant verses, so this pair of settings may be central European. Again, for details I refer readers to the commentary but the important points here are that both settings have identically scored second sections and the third polyphonic verse in each setting is written in an imitative manner using triple mensurations rather like sesquialtera. The partwriting in both settings also has some archaisms and oddities, and the first verse of the Tone VIII setting no. 56 particularly gives the impression that this is rather slipshod polyphony.

The final pair of similar settings (nos 43 and 47) seem to be representative of something more ambitious, since they are four-voice and make use of varied repeat schemes as are found in works by Busnois and others. The

Tone I setting no. 43 also has a florid conclusion to its first duet verse as one might find in one of the surviving Busnois motets. The repeated four-part verse uses imitation and its final cadence (with small values in the Superius and a suspended A in the higher Contra) is sophisticated. There are also clear paraphrase elements in the Superius of all verses, part of verse 11 uses sesquialtera, even the four-part verse has a little variation in texture. I strongly suspect that these settings may be the work of a Franco-Flemish minor master. The Tone VIII setting no. 47 is shorter than no. 43 but some of the same traits are present. I refer readers to the commentary for further similarities. No. 43 also has a concordance in a Spanish source.

The Magnificat settings not mentioned here so far are nos 50, 51 and 57. Setting no. 51 is a four-voice setting of Tone 5 with some declamatory writing (see verse 2 and 'et sanctum nomen eius') and some undistinguished partwriting. It may well be Germanic as might no. 50, which is a shortwinded Tone I featuring what seems to be an unavoidable flat / natural conflict at its first subsection ending (measures 5-9). The second polyphonic verse also features some anacrusic imitation as found in some [Trent 89](#) Magnificats (see 54-56) and irregular cadential tactus, which tends to be another feature of central European settings. That leaves us the Tone IV setting no. 57, which is more asymmetrical and again typical of some of the writing found in the probably Germanic Magnificat settings in [Trent 89](#). In no. 57 we find rhythmically irregular cadences to the first two polyphonic verses and verse 8, a seven-minim pre-cadential measure in the middle of verse 6 (see measure 76) and also a half-close on weak beat in the same verse (see 72). The Tone IV material is mostly elaborated, but verse 8 gives a particularly distinct and clear rendering of its parent material. It has become normal to dismiss such pieces as provincial oddities, but this is (in my view) a fascinating setting in spite of its sometimes awkward writing.

One aspect of these settings hardly covered at all in this introduction is the varied way in which individual works use chant paraphrase technique. For a good survey of this (also covering the Magnificats in the other Trent Codices) I recommend Carla Rutschman's very thorough 1979 dissertation as cited in the commentary section. I do not agree with all of her conclusions, but her work will provide readers with a good insight into how some of these works are put together. To readers familiar with the comparatively greater variety of Magnificat settings in [Trent 89](#), the relatively conservative works in [Trent 88](#) may seem largely pedestrian but one of their values is that such conventional pieces lead on to some magnificent examples from the 1460's and 1470's such as the Busnois Magnificat, the two other anonymous settings which are likely to be his, and also the Martini Tone III and IV settings in [Mu 3154](#).

The *Te Deum* setting which ends this instalment is unusual because of its slightly awkward partwriting (there are B - F progressions in the Contra) and its double occurrence within [Trent 88](#). Wisser evidently saw that his incomplete first copy could not fit onto a single opening, so he abandoned this and rewrote the piece into a different gathering. This setting is another Superius paraphrase, and again there are a few rhythmically irregular cadences. Finally, the way that I have discussed these Magnificat settings (and indeed the hymns that follow) is a little different from my previous procedure for the [Trent 89](#) and [91](#) editions. Previously I passed over the ageing editions and descriptions of these pieces in Masakata Kanazawa's dissertation. For the [Trent 88](#) Magnificats and hymns I include these references, since they are probably useful to those whose familiarity with this music is not great. To conclude, [Trent 88](#) presents quite a variety of Magnificat settings and there is a wealth of attractive music in the following pages for which introductory words cannot really do justice.

.....

Out of the twenty-three Vespers, Matins and processional hymns in this instalment sixteen are given at [Trent 88](#) ff. 222r-240v with no other types of music intervening. The remaining seven settings are mostly isolated.³

³ Of the other seven settings, nos 58, 78, 79 and 80 are copied amongst differing types of music, nos 59 and 60 are copied together, & no. 77 is copied between two works of possible English origin. Gerber's numbering of hymns differs from mine because she includes items like *Christ ist erstanden* as hymns while I classify these as *leisen*.

Most of the settings were either copied by Wisser, or by him with minor additions from subsidiary scribes, or by hands which closely resemble that of Wisser. Nos 59, 70, 72, 73 and 80 all show evidence of scribal collaboration or of correction marks which betray some sort of checking procedure. It seems to have been intentional to copy sixteen of the settings together, but these are a mixture of pieces for the temporal and sanctoral cycles and Marian feasts as Gerber has demonstrated.⁴ If these settings were in liturgical order most of them would be rearranged as follows, and note that the list of temporal feasts listed does not cover the whole liturgical year.

Temporal cycle:

Advent	63 Veni redemptor gentium
Easter	67 Vita sanctorum
Ascension	61 Jhesu nostra redemptio & 66 Festum nunc celebre
Trinity	62 O lux beata trinitas
Corpus Christi	65 Pange lingua
Pentecost	64 Veni creator

Marian feasts:

Assumption	69 & 71 both Gaude visceribus
(Common)	68 Quem terra pontus & 70 Ave maris stella

Sanctoral cycle:

Apostles	74 Exultet celum laudibus
Confessors	75 & 76 both Iste confessor
All Saints	73 Omnes superni ordines

Superius paraphrase predominates in the Trent 88 hymns and only three settings differ. No. 78 (Touront's *Pange lingua*) is unique in its double-discantus texture and imitative use of the chant in all of its voices. *Ave maris stella* no. 70 has elaborated chant cantus firmus in the second down out of four voices (a Contra part), and *Gaude visceribus* no. 71 mostly uses Superius chant paraphrase but begins with a free opening consisting of two ascending fourths in the Superius. Duple rhythm also predominates. Only nos 58, 59, 64, 78 and 80 differ. Several of the chants used in these settings help to identify some of them as geographically German or central European in origin, as the chant traditions of these regions often specify chants or texts for certain feasts that are not present in Italian or western sources. The texts or chants concerned here are with nos 66 (*Festum nunc celebre*), 67 (*Veni redemptor gentium*), 71 (*Vita sanctorum*), 72 (*Quem terra pontus*), 73 (*Omnes superni*) and 73 and 75 (*Gaude visceribus*). Several of these settings and also others amongst the Trent 88 hymns may similarly be German or central European due to them having concordances in Strahov and Mu 3225.⁵ Some of the readings shared between Trent 88 and Strahov are also close (see the commentaries to nos 66, 67, 68 and 70). Generally Trent 88 present better readings than the notoriously error-prone Strahov copies, but occasionally these present better or simpler variants so Trent 88 clearly has no overall authority in this area.⁶ Similarly, one finds simpler readings than those of Trent 88 in some passages of the Mu 3225 concordances.

Gerber suggested that many of these settings may be Germanic in origin, and this view is supported by the way in which I have provided editorial chant verses for some of the settings. For ten of them, the same German or central European chant versions seem to suffice as I have previously provided for settings of the same texts

⁴ Gerber, *op. cit.* p. 13.

⁵ Nos 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 70, 75, 77 and 78 also occur in Strahov, and nos 65, 71 and 74 are also in Mu 3225.

⁶ Likewise, both Trent 88 and Strahov give inferior readings for some passages in *Ave maris stella* no. 70, which I have corrected using Florence 112bis.

in my edition of the Trent 89 hymn settings.⁷ In previous work, too, I have argued for many of the hymn settings in these manuscripts being geographically non-western so what appears to be the case in Trent 89 is possibly similar for the origins of many of the Trent 88 hymns.⁸ But here I urge a note of caution, because we cannot be sure how widespread some chant variants were. For example, *Urbs beata* no. 61 has a Superius which paraphrases a version of the well-known chant which is quite different to that used in other settings in the Trent Codices. Furthermore, this probably earlier version of the *Urbs beata* chant was current in both French and German chant sources. Therefore the provenance of at least some items amongst the Trent 88 hymns is a matter best left for future discussion.

In style terms, no. 80 is possibly the oldest setting since this is the fauxbourdon version of Dufay's *Deus tuorum militum*. No. 58 (*Christe redemptor*) may be of the same vintage since this is also a triple-time fauxbourdon setting, but possibly this piece is presented in an adulterated form since the last line of music will not work in fauxbourdon. *Salve festa dies* no. 60 is another fauxbourdon setting in triple meter. *Jhesu nostra redemptio* no. 61 is a rather asymmetric duple-time fauxbourdon setting, which looks similar to the *O lux beata trinitas* setting following it since the two share some syncopated writing and uncouth progressions. The latter appears to use a German version of its chant so these two hymn settings may be geographically Germanic.⁹ But here I alight on a particular problem with the Trent 88 hymns since many of them are stylistically quite similar but may be the work of different men. Gerber thought that nos 75 and 76 (two *Iste confessor* settings copied consecutively) might be the work of a single man, but the second might equally well be the imitation of the first by an arguably less skilled composer. She also considered that nos 71 and 73 (respectively *Vita sanctorum* and *Gaude visceribus*) might be the work of a single man - a suggestion which I am inclined to favour. I also consider that nos 63 and 72 (*Veni redemptor* and *Deus tuorum militum*) might be a composer pair.¹⁰ But the difficulties of grouping pieces here are compounded not only by their generally common style, but also because four settings (nos 64, 67, 72 and 77) are presented in optional three- or four-voice versions. In all of these the three-voice version seems to be a better piece of work than its four-voice counterpart, so there is some justification in assuming that the three-voice versions generally came first.¹¹ But who wrote the four-voice versions, and were these the work of their original composers or adapted in a single batch by one or more people? Strahov is not much help in this respect, since like Trent 88 it gives the three- and four-voice versions for each setting concerned.

Some four-voice settings (including those that are exclusively for four voices) seem to have better partwriting than others. Apart from the Touront *Pange lingua* setting the most advanced is probably *Veni redemptor gentium* no. 63, whose higher Contra is rhythmically quite active and which has a bass-like lowest part. *A solis ortus cardine* no. 77 is also a cleanly-written four-voice piece. Others are not: nos 64, 71 and 72 are all four-part pieces where inferior partwriting is highlighted in my critical notes. No. 72 (*Deus tuorum militum*) provides an interesting insight into how some of these four-part versions might have been obtained. The two Contras for the four-part version are in a darker ink shade than the rest of the copying, so Wisser may have returned to this copy and added these at a later date than the rest of the copying - which is not all his anyway. Minor additions on this double page have also been made by a subsidiary scribe.¹²

Typically, the four-part settings in the main hymn section of Trent 88 have filler Contra parts and their texture

⁷ Nos 58, 62, 64, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 78 and 79.

⁸ Mitchell, R., 'Regional Styles and works in Tr 89 and related sources: a short survey' in Gozzi, M. (ed), Manoscritti di polifonia nel Quattrocento Europeo (Trento, 2004), pp. 153-178.

⁹ However, *Jhesu nostra redemptio* is originally an Italian-tradition chant.

¹⁰ Gerber (*op. cit.* p. 13) also considers that nos 67 and 72 might be the work of a single man, and suggested that nos 68, 69 and 73 also look similar. However, I am reluctant to suggest 'nests' of pieces where there is probably not enough evidence for their creation.

¹¹ In *Vita sanctorum* no. 71, one of the Contras in the four-part version seems to draw on the Contra for the three-part version.

¹² See the critical commentary to no. 72.

is either continuous or includes very short episodes of three-voice scoring for the lower parts. Text is usually only indicated by an incipit unless special attention has been given to successive verses on otherwise blank parts of the page. Rhythmic sophistications like animated passages are usually not present (except in nos 63 and 72). The liberty with which chant paraphrase is applied to Superius parts of course varies. In the solitary Dufay setting and in nos 61 and 62 the parent chants are not much modified, but oppositely in *Ave maris stella* no. 70 the chant in the second voice down is subjected to considerable alteration. Likewise in *Deus tuorum* no. 72 the chant is treated quite liberally, and elaborate paraphrase also occurs in *Urbs beata* no. 60. Once more Touront's solitary hymn setting rises above the others in the extent to which the *Pange lingua* chant pervades the whole texture, but even this setting was revised by the time that it was copied into Strahov and Spec since both of these sources have a version which replaces the second Discantus with a more Contra-like part. The anonymous *Pange lingua* no. 65 is fairly typical of the four-part settings here. It begins with sustained values (a frequent feature amongst these hymns), it has a continuous texture and makes minimal use of imitation, its Contra voices occasionally cross and there is one progression that looks dubious - a virtual dominant seventh at 21-22. Also all four parts here seem to be essential, although frequently the higher Contras in four-part works seem to have been worked out last of all. Most (but not all) four-part settings call the higher Contra a 'primus' and the lower one a 'secundus', but a few reverse this order.

In my editions of these hymn settings I take alternatim performance for granted, but the appearance of unusual sequences of verses for some pieces in Strahov might suggest that other customs sometimes prevailed.¹³ Likewise, the texting of *Pange lingua* no. 78 in Spec with its fifth verse (*Tantum ergo*) is representative of local practices in the Czech lands. Most of my transcriptions also feature full editorial text, but in some cases wordless vocalisation for lower voices has been suggested as an equally viable alternative and in two instances (nos 75 and 76) I have left the lower voices without text as vocalisation for these voices seems more commonsense than trying to text them. In other words, on these pages of Trent 88 performance might have been possible from the music as it is presented - perhaps with more text provided by the Superius singer(s) from memory. Meanwhile, for those who believe in something more improvisational than my editorial hymn underlay I mention here the fragmentary setting of *Urbs beata* in the late fifteenth century Linz fragments, f. 11r.¹⁴ Here, a Superius part is visible with multiple verses underlaid plus a partly-preserved Tenor part which seems to have extensive partial texting. This - to my knowledge - is one of the few examples of an extensively texted Vespers hymn setting outside formal and pristinely copied collections such as ModB and CS 15.

Finally regarding the Magnificats, some of the Trent 89 examples give 'eius' as 'ei-us', so Germanic Latin pronunciation is probably also in order for at least a few of the Trent 88 settings. As with the Trent 88 Magnificats, most of the hymns presented here are little known and at least deserve exploration. I particularly recommend the low-pitched *Ave maris stella* no. 70 and *Veni redemptor* no. 63 as an introduction to this repertory, as representative of a richly creative hymn-setting tradition that the world of modern performance largely ignores, and which probably flourished as much in monastic surroundings as in courtly and civic environments.

.....

¹³ See the critical notes to no. 77a, where the Strahov reading underlays verses 2, 4, 5 and part of 6 to the Superius.

¹⁴ Linz, Oberösterreichische Landesbibliothek, ms 529.