

INTRODUCTION TO INSTALMENT 5

This instalment consists of all of the music for the Mass Proper in Trent 88 plus miscellaneous liturgical works therein which have not yet been presented in this series. The contents are as follows.

103a-g.	Mass Propers ‘de Spiritu Sancto’, 113v-121r
104a-f.	Mass Propers for the Trinity, 121v-128r
105a-f.	Mass Propers for St. Andrew, 128v-134v
106a-f.	Mass Propers for the Holy Cross, 135v-140v
107a-e.	Mass Propers for St. John the Baptist, 141v-147r
108a-f.	Mass Propers ‘de Angelis’, 147v-154r
109a-h.	Mass Propers for St. George / for birthdays of single martyrs not Pontiffs, 154v-161v & 169r
110a-e.	Mass Propers for the Nativity, 162v-167v
111a-f.	Mass Propers for St. Maurice and his companions, 169v-176r
112a-e.	Mass Propers for St. Anthony Abbot, 176v-182r
113a-e.	Dufay / anon: Mass Propers for St. Anthony of Padua, 182v-189r
114a-d.	Mass Propers for St. Francis, 190v-194r
115a-e.	Mass Propers for St. Stephen, 194v-200r
116a-e.	Mass Propers for St. Sebastian, 210v-215v
117a-d.	Mass Propers for Easter Sunday, 217v-220r
118a-e.	Marian Mass Propers, 351v-356v
119.	Dufay; Mass Ordinaries for St. Anthony of Padua (from <u>Trent 90</u>)
120a-b.	<i>Os iusti</i> , 13v-14r
121.	<i>Gaudeamus</i> , 189v-190r
122.	<i>Puer natus</i> , 266v-267r
123.	<i>Salve sancta parens</i> , 357v-358r
124.	<i>Resurrexi</i> , 358v-359r
125.	<i>Alleluia Ora pro nobis</i> , 64v-65r
126a-b.	<i>Alleluia Dulcis mater</i> , 339r
127.	<i>Grates nunc omnes</i> , 216v
128.	<i>Verbum bonum et suave</i> , 339v-340r
129.	<i>Mittit ad virginem</i> , 340v-341r
130.	<i>Audi filia</i> , 203v-204r
131.	<i>Discubuit Jhesus</i> , 335v-336r
132.	<i>Vidi aquam</i> , 223v-224r
133.	<i>Ego dormio</i> , 22v-24r
134.	<i>Felix namque</i> , 251v-252r
135.	<i>Beata viscera</i> , 252v

The modern history of Trent 88’s Proper cycles began with publication of the DTÖ VII thematic catalogue in 1900, from which it could be seen that Trent 88 contained many Proper settings. Some of these were grouped into cycles indicated by titles. The first scholar to devote serious effort to these Propers was probably Laurence Feininger, who published the first edition of the cyclic Propers in 1947 with editorial attributions to Dufay for eleven of the sixteen cycles.¹ The items in this edition which Feininger thought not to be Dufay’s are cycles 110, 112, 115, 117 and 118 (respectively for the Nativity, St. Anthony Abbot, St. Stephen, Easter Day and the Virgin Mary).

David Fallows’s article ‘Dufay and the Mass Proper Cycles of Trent 88’ summarises subsequent study history of the Propers in more space than I can allow here. Initially Feininger’s attributions of over 60 pieces to Dufay was taken with some scepticism for three reasons. Only one of these works had a composer attribution in a repertorial source (*Alleluia Veni Sancte Spiritus* no.103d) and Feininger also considered other anonymous

¹ Feininger, L. (ed), MPLSER series 2 vol. 1 (Rome, 1947). My initial interest in Laurence Feininger’s work was due in no small part to Danilo Curti (his adopted son) sending me a free copy of this book, for which I record my gratitude here.

works to be by Dufay which later research tended to disprove. Like most other scholars of his era he was misled by faulty attributions into believing that the famous *Missa Caput* was the work of Dufay (that Mass turned out to be insular) and secondly he attributed the anonymous Mass *La mort de Saint Gothard* to Dufay in the 1940's but by 1963 considered this Mass to be a likely Martini work. It does not help matters here that the most recent authorities to write about this Mass consider it to be neither by Dufay nor Martini.² The third reason for general reluctance to accept Feininger's Dufay attributions was because he intended to publish his reasons for attributing many of the Trent 88 Propers but this study never appeared in print. Therefore despite the large amount of work that Feininger devoted to his Trent 88 project (including a cataloguing of Introit paraphrase settings in the Trent manuscripts) his work on the Propers remained on the periphery of fifteenth century studies for some years.³

Things changed in the 1970's. Craig Wright's illuminating 1975 study of Dufay highlighted the fact that the composer had spent virtually all of the 1440's in Cambrai and he is presumed to have spent time working on polyphonic Proper settings.⁴ In 1972 Alejandro Planchart published information on Spataro's citations of settings 103e and 114b in connection with Dufay, and by 1982 David Fallows had likewise used Spataro to confirm that 113b was Dufay's work in addition to correctly renaming the published Dufay 'Sancti Anthonii Viennensis' Mass as a Mass for St. Anthony of Padua.⁵ Further discoveries of sections from this Mass in the theory source Perugia 1013 also attracted new interest, chiefly for their use of proportions. Lastly Craig Wright's 1975 study uncovered a reference to a *Desiderium* Tract setting but since this reference dates from the 1470's it need not refer to the Trent 88 setting 109d.⁶

Assuming that at least some of the St. Anthony of Padua and Holy Spirit Propers might be the work of a single composer, it then began to look as if Feininger might have been at least partially right about attributions to these pieces. Since the 1980's too there has been further input on the authorship of the Proper settings. Barbara Haagh and Rebecca Gerber have disputed the authenticity of some of the Communion settings and argue that these are slightly later accretions.⁷ The 2007 Trent 88 edition has enabled study of this music on a scale not possible before since Feininger's critical notes were minimal and his edition text was partly in Latin.⁸ Rebecca Gerber has further examined the St. Stephen cycle and found it to be unlikely that this is Dufay's, and Reinhard Strohm has similarly questioned the authenticity of the St. Stephen cycle and parts of the cycle for St. George.⁹ Some of the music which Strohm discusses seems to be connected to the chapel of Friedrich III rather than western centres. Most importantly, Alejandro Planchart established that cycles 103-106 and 108 are votive since they each have two Alleluias, and also that these votive Masses were probably written for the Sainte Chappelle in Dijon rather than for Cambrai Cathedral.

Our picture of the Trent 88 Proper settings has therefore become more complex, and questions arise about recent scholarship as well as the basic material. First amongst these is the remaining issue of authorship. How many of these Propers might convincingly be accepted as Dufay's, and what methods and criteria are there to help establish who their composers were? Secondly how many of these cycles look like singly composed units

² See Moohan, E. and Steib, M. (eds), Johannes Martini: Masses Part 1. Masses without Known Polyphonic Models (A-R Editions, Madison, Wisconsin, 1999) p. xv.

³ See Fallows, D., 'Dufay and the Mass Proper cycles of Trent 88' in I Codici Musicali Trentini I (1986) pp. 46-59. Both this article and work cited below by Gerber state that Feininger changed his mind about some Trent 88 Proper attributions.

⁴ See Fallows, *ibid.* p. 48 for mention of a copying payment at Cambrai for 168 folios of Propers in the year 1449-1450 which are described as 'new'. These could conceivably be polyphonic Proper settings.

⁵ Respectively see Planchart, A., 'Guillaume Dufay's Masses: Notes and Revisions' in MQ 58 (1972) pp. 1-23 and Fallows, Dufay (London, Dent, 1982) pp. 182-192.

⁶ Wright, C., 'Dufay at Cambrai: Discoveries and Revisions' in JAMS 28 (1975), pp. 175-229.

⁷ See Haagh, B., 'The Archives of the Order of the Golden Fleece and Music' in JRMA 120 (1995), pp. 1-43 and Gerber, R., 'Dufay's style and the question of cyclic unity in the Trent 88 Mass Proper cycles' in I Codici Musicali Trentini II (1996), pp. 107-119. I am persuaded that some Communion settings might not be authentic because the plenary cycle for St. Anthony Abbot by Piret in Trent 89 has no Communion and seems to have a number scheme based on 31 (the number of members in the mid-century roster of the Golden Fleece order). That scheme is perfectly satisfactory without a Communion setting. Further, see pp. 701-702 in the DIAMM Trent 89 edition.

⁸ Gerber, R. (ed), Sacred Music from the Cathedral at Trent (Monuments of Renaissance Music vol. XII, Chicago and London, 2007).

⁹ Strohm, R., 'The Medieval Mass Proper, and the Arrival of Polyphonic Proper Settings in Central Europe' in Burn, D. & Gasch, S. (eds), Heinrich Isaac and Polyphony for the Proper of the Mass in the Late Middle Ages and the Renaissance (Brepols, 2011) pp. 31-60.

and how many might be multi-composer assemblies? Thirdly, to what extent do similarities to Dufay's music outside this Proper assembly influence any decisions about attribution? Lastly, how reliable does Trent 88 seem as a source for transmission of this music?

I begin to look for answers here with an initial caution from Rebecca Gerber, namely that "...it is difficult to identify compositional mannerisms and isolated passages of a piece with the assurance that the notes are not the result of scribal initiative rather than compositional style".¹⁰ We are not that well equipped to make decisions about what is, might be or might not be Dufay's work and we tend to rely on imperfect tools such as stylistic and textural comparison, analogies with distant pieces by the same composer, and sometimes little more than hunches about similarities between nests of anonymous works or adjacent works. Spataro's mentions of Dufay's Propers provide us with attributions for an Introit (114b) a Gradual (113b) an Offertory (103e) and Trent 90 gives us the attribution for Alleluia 103d. Taking the two latter settings, I regard it as something of a gift that chance has left us two Proper settings in their liturgical sequence although of course these would never have followed each another directly in liturgical performance. Alleluia 103d has a short first section which is importantly comparable with Offertory 103e in the following ways. Both are in very similar rhythmic style in duple meter, and in each the filler Contratenor part is the widest-ranging voice. The Superius parts within each of these sections move in similar ranges and the texture of these sections is virtually non-imitative. Both sections are also cleanly written and it would be easy to think of both as being the work of a single anonymous had their attributions to Dufay not survived. If I extend the search for similarities to Alleluia 103c we also find that much the same style and many of the same features are present.

Spataro also left us information enabling a Dufay attribution to be made to the St. Anthony of Padua Gradual no. 113b. Comparing this with the Gradual in cycle 103 I find the following points in common for both first sections. Both use the same mensuration and in both pieces the voice ranges and triple rhythmic movement are similar. Both first sections also have internal Superius-Contra duets, and both are relatively long (Gradual 103b has 42 measures and 113b has 56). Both first sections are followed by lengthy second sections. The Superius conclusions to both first sections are vaguely similar and the same voice also contains identical cadential clichés (see 103b at 12-13 and 113b at 15-16). As with nos 103d and e, if no composer attribution to 113b had survived there might be grounds for considering 103b and 113b as pieces by the same composer.

That makes the start of a case for seeing Dufay as the likely composer of most of the Holy Spirit cycle no. 103, to which of course can be added the subsidiary evidence of Introit 103a having material that is re-used in subsequent Trent 88 Proper cycles. Such re-use may imply a greater design than the composition of just a set of Propers for a single feast. The Holy Spirit Introit 103a is neither that much like the St. Anthony of Padua Introit 113a nor the Dufay-attributed Introit 114b, but this might not matter for present purposes because it is stylistically akin to the Introit for cycle 104 (with which it shares music). Therefore even in these short initial descriptions above I begin to find similarities which I hope will arouse interest.

Another practical way to start answering questions is to look at the five votive Masses which commence the collection of Propers (nos 103-106 and 108) and to note their common features. I divide the points made below into a set of structural traits (points 1-5) and stylistic features (nos 6-15). The presence or absence of these features in Propers that follow the votive sets helps to act as a test for whether the non-votive cycles (or parts of them) are part of a core repertory that might be by Dufay.

1. Elaborative Superius paraphrase is the main method of chant presentation, occasionally varied by a few Gradual settings which briefly use migrant presentation. To take an example of a setting that quotes chant plainly, see Communion no. 103f's Superius at 40-45. This setting - as previous authors have suggested - is unlikely to be the work of Dufay.
2. All movements of the votive cycles have chant intonations. One Gradual (no. 103b) also has a chant intonation to begin its second section. All Introits also have intonations preceding their verse and doxology sections.
3. Apart from chant-carrying Contra passages in a few migrant settings the lower voices are generally subordinate. In this music it is the topmost part which nearly always carries most musical interest.

¹⁰ See Gerber, 'Dufay's style and the question of cyclic unity...' p. 108.

4. Most settings feature internal duet passages (or successions of them) in which the Superius combines with either lower voice. See Offertory 103e at 53-81 for a typical succession of duets.
5. There is a noticeable lack of imitation. In cycle 103 I only count seven small instances of imitative work.¹¹ In cycle 104 there are only five instances and two of these movements (the second Alleluia and the Communion) have none.¹² Likewise in the St. Andrew cycle no. 105 there are only seven small instances of imitation and its Introit is another completely non-imitative setting. In the Holy Cross cycle no. 106 there are only half a dozen uses of imitation and in the Missa de Angelis no. 108 there are thirteen instances of imitative writing. Most imitative work consists of very brief unison exchanges or equally short imitation at the fourth or fifth. Almost uniquely in this repertory the Offertory to the St. Andrew cycle begins with Tenor-Superius imitation and motivic exchanges lasting until measure 10.
6. The votive Masses have four examples of shared music. Firstly the four-part Superius paraphrase Tone 8 doxology in Introit 103a is also used in Introits 104a and 116a.¹³ Additional re-use of the same material in Introit 109a is possibly evidence of this section being borrowed by composers beyond Dufay, since other elements of 109a seem to be stylistically untypical of him. Secondly the verse-section endings of Introits 103a and 104a also share material.

Thirdly Gradual no. 104b is re-used as the Gradual of cycle 105, in such a way that perhaps only the composer of no. 104b could have been involved. The chants of the two settings are closely related, and the additional passages in the slightly longer Gradual 105b seem to be added with reference to the parent chant for that setting. The Holy Cross Gradual no. 106b also concludes with a considerable stretch of material taken from the ending of no. 104b.

Lastly Alleluia 103c has an identical first-section ending with Alleluia 108d, and Introits 103g and 108a share the same music for their doxology sections. Some of this re-use was doubtless determined by parent chants which share melodic formulas.¹⁴
7. There are similarities in frequent cadential clichés such as the G F E D D C D Superius cadence in the Superius of Alleluia 103c at 45-49. For similar examples see no. 103g at 75-77, 104d at 32-33, and 104e at 26-27. While such figures are of course common their reappearances might be suggestive of a single composer.
8. In sesquialtera passages the Superius or Contra frequently has chains of semibreve-breve syncopations (see 103g at 38-45, 104d at 51-52, 104e at 40-43 and 105c at 110-114). Again, repeated use of such figures may suggest a single composer.
9. In duple settings and duple sections, longs sometimes tend to be used as a pre-cadential value instead of a breve in the familiar suspended pattern semibreve-breve-semibreve. For examples see 103e at 124, 104c at 17-19, and 104e at 115-117. This feature is certainly not unique to the Trent 88 Propers and can also be found in works by Martini (for example, in the Trent 91 Missa *Cucu*). But again its repeated use here highlights Proper settings which are stylistically similar.
10. In duple settings there is a tendency for Superius phrase endings near cadences to use syncopated semibreve-semibreve-breve patterns. For examples see 103b at 173-179, 104c at 139-141, 106a at 86-90, 106b at 74-79 and 108b at 30-36.
11. In rhythmically accelerated passages the most active voice sometimes rests for a single minim rest amongst a group of minims or minims combined with semibreves. This feature is found in Dufay's Tone III-IV Magnificat setting (a late work), and also occurs in no. 104b at Superius 198 and the same voice in 105c at 135. It is also found in the Gradual of Dufay's St. Anthony of Padua Mass at Superius, 109.

¹¹ 103a measures 34-35, 103b at 92-94, 103c at 101-104, 103d at 137-141, 103e at 73-75, 103f at 46-49 and 68-71.

¹² 104a at 36-37, 104b at 35-36, 104c at 125-128 and 141-143 and 104e at 31-33.

¹³ Setting 116a also uses the end of the borrowed doxology to create a musically rhymed verse ending.

¹⁴ Similar repeated material occurs in some of the Introit settings by Brassart.

12. One particular Superius cadential pattern in O mensuration is re-used continually: two sets of minim - dotted minim - crotchet and then the cadential breve - or the same values doubled duple meter. For examples see 103b at 70-72, 103d at 4-6, 103e at 142-144, 103g at 143-145, 104b at 36-37 and 104c at 65-67.
13. Upper pairs of consecutive fifths are quite common at cadential figures, usually where inverted doubled leadingnote cadences occur (see 103b at 18, 104b at 85-86 and 106a at 29-30).
14. Superius phrases in duple rhythm which end dotted-semibreve minim and then follow the minim with a breve at the same pitch do not always call for a text syllable on the breve. For examples see 103b at 132-133, 103c at 39-40 and 105a at 18-19.
15. Occasionally in duple rhythm there are short accelerative passages in doubled harmonic pace or using motion in minims rather than semibreves (see 104b at 193-203, 105c at 131-147, and 106d at 65-75).

Other considerations influence decisions made about music to be subsequently discussed. Firstly, most of the votive movements mentioned here fall into groups determined by basic form. Introits have three sections. Graduals are bipartite. Alleluias mostly have verse sections which are far longer in terms of measures than their first sections. Offertories sometimes have mid-point caesuras (see nos 104e, 106e and 108e). Three quite similar Introit settings (nos 105a, 106a and 108a) all have similar first-section lengths which are respectively 94, 93 and 96 tempora in duple meter. Most first sections of movements tend to use short duet passages for internal scoring contrasts.

Also as regards the votive sets, Superius-Tenor fourths are extremely rare in Dufay's three-part writing with conventional Superius-Contra-Tenor vertical structure. Amongst the votive Masses I only find one brief instance of a Superius-Tenor fourth, in Introit 106a at 81 where the interval is caused by a held G above a Tenor D. They are also extremely rare amongst music confidently attributed to Dufay. One duet passage in the St. Anthony of Padua Gloria at 183 has a Superius A under which the Tenor has E F. Possibly this is admissible as an ornamental dissonance. A few measures later in the same movement the Tenor has an E against A in the Superius in a three-voice section at 223. Here the E has a passing function despite its appearance on a strong beat. In the St. Anthony of Padua Alleluia 113c at 204 the Superius and Tenor converge onto D with the Tenor taking the route B C under a Superius E. Again, this might be taken as a legitimate retardation rather than a structural infringement. Therefore where I find Superius-Tenor fourths in music discussed below I will highlight their appearance similarly: sometimes they might indicate a composer of lesser standing than Dufay.

Much of the music to be discussed in the following pages is not dissimilar from the votive cycles, and it is also worthy of mention here that cycles 105, 106 and 108 contain a heavy concentration of duple-meter sections which are stylistically alike. Cycle 108 also contains an Offertory using O2 which is rhythmically more elaborate than preceding movements and is not dissimilar in style to the Trinity Alleluia no. 104d. Communion 108f (*Benedicite omnes*) starts by using C3 but even this is comparable to the same signature at the start of another Dufay piece (*Magi videntes stellam* in ModB). To summarise this initial exploration, I take it that nearly all of the movements in the Trent 88 votive cycles have a good probability of being Dufay's work. The outsiders in order of certainty seem to be Communion 103f (whose paraphrase is transposed and is not typical of Dufay) and Introit 103g. Despite this Introit providing the doxology for Introit 108a (or vice versa) it is otherwise untypical of the probably authentic movements 103a-e and my suggestion that it might be Dufay's is tentative. It should be noted that it shares syncopated semibreve-breve movement in its internal duet passage with 103f. Should my general argument concerning Dufay not be the case, we would be faced with the likelihood of imitators of Dufay whose style is more or less undistinguishable from his. That I think is unlikely in view of the described shared detail amongst the votive movements.

Before proceeding to the non-votive Propers, the matter of Trent 88 as a reliable source needs to be raised. Gerber has indicated that many of the copies of Propers may be faithful, and the usual signs of careless copying in the later Trent manuscripts (inaccurate blocks of rests, bungled intonations and poorly given signatures) tend to be absent.¹⁵ It is therefore likely that the scribes had good exemplars and much of the Proper assembly was copied across successive fascicles. However in one respect Trent 88's Proper section is remarkably

¹⁵ Some of the intonations and part-intonations given in Trent 93 concordances for these settings (for example in nos 105a and 113a) seem to represent either casually copied material or possibly even a locally decaying chant tradition.

inconsistent. Its duple mensuration signs are given in a variety of types. C mensuration seems to be the initially preferred sign for duple meter, but in places cut-C and C2 are also present. The following list of problems summarises a situation which begins with cycle 103 and continues throughout the manuscript.

1. Alleluia 103c begins with cut-C in the Superius but C in the lower voices, and cut-C appears later on in the Contra.
2. The second section of Gradual 104b has cut-C in the Superius, C in the Tenor, and no mensuration sign in the Contra.
3. Alleluia 104d uses O2, but its Superius and Contra both give C2 and there is no mensuration sign in the Tenor. Only the presence of color in the Tenor at measures 2-3 demonstrates that O2 is correct.
4. Introit 105a initially has C in the Superius followed later by C2, but both lower voices have C2 from their start.

I do not particularly object to either cut-C or C2 being used for an entirely duple-mensuration setting instead of C, but as is usual in mid-fifteenth century works problems occur in multisectional works where either C or cut-C follows O. There are accepted equivalents for the semibreve or breve beats between these signs. Mostly in these pieces my edition follows Planchart in suggesting that one measure of O is probably the equivalent to two measures of C. I have also generally replaced cut-C signs in this edition where they follow O sections, but have left them unaltered in entirely duple settings.

We now come to the question of how homogenous these cycles are. The votive Masses display some unity in style and I think it would be hard to argue for joint composition in any of them apart from cycle 103. But the very fact that Communion 103f is close in style to preceding pieces and is also close to Introit 103g brings home the point that the age which we study here saw a considerable amount of stylistic imitation in polyphony. It is very likely that Dufay had fellow-composers who added to the Proper repertory, and also that some of these may have been known to him and others not. This is because some of the music to be discussed below may have originated in Austria or western centres rather than Cambrai. It should also be borne in mind that there are some very clever imitations of fifteenth-century pieces written only a short while after their models. Egidius Cervelli penned a splendidly complex Kyrie to go with the Domarto *Sine nomine* Mass in SP B80, and there is also a low pitched *Vidi aquam* setting in the same manuscript which is akin to the low-pitched and liturgically related Binchois *Asperges* setting.¹⁶ There are imitations of the English Missa *Caput*, and also some probably central European and very convincing imitations of English Song of Songs motets.¹⁷ These examples aptly illustrate the need to tread carefully. Since Dufay was resident in Cambrai for the 1440's and returned to his Savoyard interests in the following decade, I present the following hypothesis here in the hope that it might make my subsequent decisions about works in Trent 88 seem sensible. While Dufay was resident in Cambrai his work on the votive Masses and also other Propers was something over which he probably had a degree of control. After 1452 (when he left Cambrai for Savoy) material that he left behind may have been adapted in his absence, which might account for the odd appearance of some of the cycles to be discussed in due course.

Harmonic and melodic oddities in this music are rare. The votive Masses are largely diatonic and only a few duple-mensuration pieces justify description as anything more musically ambitious than average paraphrase settings. For more ambitious pieces see the triple-mensuration Introits, Graduals 103b and 104b, Alleluia 104d, and Offertories 104e and 108e). But most settings here have conventional textures. The four-part Gloria Patri which ends several Introits has consecutive octaves as its final cadence as do many examples of early four-part textures, and Offertory 104e has an unusual doubled leadingnote cadence at 109-111 where the Contra's middle-degree note is suspended to create a fifth with the Superius G above. Otherwise I look hard in the votive Masses for outstanding or unconventional instances of partwriting. Passages in fauxbourdon (as in the verse to Introit 105a) are less common than fully written out textures which emulate fauxbourdon, and

¹⁶ For the former see no. 17 in the DIAMM Trent 89 edition. For the latter see SP B80 ff. 240v-242r.

¹⁷ For Simon de Insula's Missa *O admirabile* (which is closely modelled on the *Caput* Mass) see no. 98 in this edition. For a piece from Strahov which emulates English Song of Songs motets see no. 181 (ff. 206v-208r). This setting uses a chant found in the Neumarkt Canticale and is - unusually for Strahov - immaculately copied with precise texting.

as in later Proper settings by Isaac and others there is a sense of musical subdual in the sometimes plain way that these settings sometimes proceed.

Separating some of the Trent 88 Propers out for distinctive traits is sometimes difficult. While working on this repertory David Fallows wrote "...It should be added here that my approach was relatively unmethodical, with a lot of time spent just playing the music and listening to it with a view to grasping familiar or unfamiliar features of its style. That was partly because it is generally my instinct to do so, and partly because I felt - I now believe wrongly - that Feininger would have worked in a similarly unmethodical manner..."¹⁸. The same article continues to suggest directions for further analysis and pigeonholing of the Trent 88 Propers, but two factors make our task easier than for anybody writing about Trent 88 in the 1980's as Fallows was. Firstly some complete Proper cycles were isolated by Feininger as probably inauthentic and this judgement has been repeated by later authors like Gerber, Planchart and Strohm. My subsequent arguments are not going to repeat that material in its entirety. Secondly, if my suggestions that the votive Masses represent some sort of start point for the Proper assembly project are taken as valid, then departures from the norms that these pieces set will be taken as significant reasons for isolating other Proper movements as inauthentic, probably not by Dufay, or otherwise spurious or accretional.¹⁹ My plan for discussion of the remaining cycles will be as follows.

1. The St. John cycle no. 107.
2. The Nativity cycle no. 110.
3. The Easter Day cycle no. 117.
4. The St. Stephen cycle no. 115.
5. The St. Anthony Abbot cycle no. 112.
6. The St. Anthony of Padua cycle no. 113.
7. The St. Francis cycle no. 114.
8. The Marian cycle no. 118.
9. The St. George / single martyr cycle no. 109.
10. The St. Maurice cycle no. 111.
11. The St. Sebastian cycle no. 116
12. Isolated Propers within Trent 88.

.....

1. The St. John cycle no. 107.

There seems to be no reason why the non-votive Mass for St. John the Baptist is copied before the last of the votive Masses in Trent 88. Feininger considered the St. John cycle to be attributable to Dufay, and Planchart listed it in his 2017 article as a work of Dufay but previously had not accepted it as attributable.²⁰ Perhaps it is easy to see why there might be doubts about authenticity since the Gradual is in duple rhythm with a continuous-texture first section and the Alleluia has no chant intonation. Also the first section of the Introit has a rhythmically irregular final cadence. This movement also raises suspicions about authenticity since in one place its Superius paraphrase technique differs strongly from Gerber's accurate description of Dufay

¹⁸ Fallows, 'Dufay and the Mass Proper Cycles of Trent 88' p. 55.

¹⁹ Gradual 103b is the only Gradual setting in this manuscript to have a second intonation halfway through. Therefore it may have been the first of the Trent 88 Gradual settings to be written.

²⁰ Planchart, A., 'Guillaume Dufay's Second Style' in Owens, J. and Cummings, A. (eds), Music in Renaissance Cities and Courts: Studies in Honor of Lewis Lockwood (Harmonie Park Press, 1997) pp. 307-340 and Planchart, 'The case of a unique Alleluia for Cambrai' in TVNM 67 (2017) pp. 31-49.

spacing his paraphrased chant notes between ornamental values.²¹ At ‘sub tegumento’ (33-34) five chant notes seem to be used successively with only one ornamental tone (the E). The Offertory also has a single Superius-Tenor fourth (at 62) but this occurs in a passage with extended Superius values and it might justify description as merely an ornamental dissonance on a strong accent.

However the St. John Propers still have more in common with other Trent 88 Propers than has perhaps been realised. For example the Superius sesquialtera section of the Gradual at 128-155 moves in ‘greater measures’ of two tempora - a feature also found in the Trinity Alleluia 104c at 102-116. A rhythmically similar Superius passage (using O3 and greater measures of three tempora) is also found in Dufay’s St. Anthony of Padua Credo at 297-341. Secondly, parts of the Introit reflect the style of music previously discussed and also the style of a further Trent 88 work which I will associate with Dufay in due course (Introit 121). The St. John Introit has a passage of Superius sesquialtera in O in a duet (at 41-44) as does the Trinity Offertory 104e at 39-48. Also the St. John Introit’s doxology uses practically the same music as the isolated *Gaudeamus* setting no. 121, and the short verse sections of both Introits are not dissimilar either. The doxology music here also makes a reappearance in the St. Maurice Introit 111b, albeit with note values doubled. Texturally and melodically the St. John Introit is not dissimilar either to the St. Anthony of Padua Introit 113a and both settings have identical voice ranges. The St. John Introit and Gradual also have brief passages of triadic lower-voice unison imitation which is likewise a feature of the Trinity Alleluia 104c at 93-96. Like the St. John Introit the texture of 104c is more or less non-imitative.

The latter movements of the St. John cycle also suggest closeness to Dufay, firstly on account of the Alleluia verse’s length and secondly because of similarities between the Offertory and Communion and other Trent 88 Propers. The extended values in the Offertory Superius at 55-62 are also a feature of the Trinity Alleluia 104c at 94-101, and the St. John Offertory’s first-section ending is similar to that of second section ending of Offertory 105e. Both of these Offertory settings begin with imitative devices in which only the Superius and Tenor participate despite the texture being three-voice. Communion 107e also has similarities with the St. Andrew Communion setting 105f.²²

I have therefore listed ten features of the St. John Propers which relate to works associable with Dufay. It would be very improbable for an anonymous Dufay emulator to gather together all of the music where all of these similar features occur and to compose a set of Propers which imitates Dufay’s chant-setting style in so many small ways. Therefore I consider it to be highly likely that Dufay is the composer of the St. John Propers and one important further feature tends to suggest that these Propers are the work of a single man. This is their probable preoccupation with number as illustrated below - a feature which so far as I am aware is only so prominent in two of the other Trent 88 Proper cycles: Dufay’s St. Anthony of Padua cycle no. 113 and the Marian Proper cycle no. 118.

The Alleluia consists of 150 tempora without its final longs, and its first section consists of exactly 150 notes. The Offertory has almost exactly the same number of notes in each section (respectively 291 and 292) and these totals may have been identical in the original. The Communion consists of 334 notes, which likewise may originally have been 333. The Introit and Gradual may also share a numerical peculiarity since the Contra note total in the former and the Contra’s first section in the latter have a third of all the notes involved in each case. The note totals for the Introit are as follows.

Table 1. Note totals in Introit 107a.

Voices	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Section totals	Section totals as percentages of 672
Superius	187	30	47	264	39.28%
Contra	155	25	42	222	33.03%
Tenor	117	27	42	186	27.67%
Totals	459	82	131	672	

²¹ See Gerber, ‘Dufay’s style and the question of cyclic unity...’ p. 110.

²² Communion 107e’s doubled harmonic pace Superius-Contra duet at 23-29 is rhythmically similar to the same duetting voices in the St. Andrew Communion 105f at 23-28, and the syncopated sesquialtera in 107e’s Superius at 58-63 resembles the same device as used in Gradual 105b at 152-160. The first cadence in Communion 107e at 10-14 is also not dissimilar to the first cadence in Dufay’s well-known *Adieu m’amour*.

Calculations for the first section of the Gradual are similar, but these only work if a single note is subtracted from the note total of the Tenor, as below.

Table 2. Note totals in the first section of Gradual 107b.

Voices	Section 1	Section totals as percentages of 318
Superius	120	37.73%
Contra	106	33.33%
Tenor	92	28.93%
Totals	318	

I make no claim that such features carry particular weight, and their occurrences (or some of them) might be only be coincidental. However, having carried out note-counts for all other Trent 88 Proper settings I only find significant numerical resemblances in the previously mentioned *Gaudeamus* setting no. 121 and in the first two movements of cycle 118. The latter cycle will be examined in due course.²³

Table 3. Note totals in Introit 121, with final longs removed from the first-section totals.

Voices	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Section totals	Section totals as percentages of 669
Superius	190	20	45	255	37.94%
Contra	163	19	42	224	33.33%
Tenor	128	20	42	190	28.27%
Totals	481	59	129	669	

The resemblances between the totals in the Introits illustrated makes it likely that the *Gaudeamus* setting 121 might be another Dufay setting, and evidence for that is presented later in this discussion. See also p. 2006 for a similar numerical feature in the central section of the Credo of Dufay's St. Anthony of Padua Mass.

.....

2. The Nativity cycle no. 110

So far, readers have been presented with arguments suggesting some uniformity in the votive Masses and a case for regarding the St. John Propers as the work of Dufay like most of the votive movements. From here I move to what I hope is an equally obvious opposite in description of Proper cycles which seem to have little or nothing to do with Dufay. The clearest case amongst these is that of the Nativity cycle, which no previous specialists have attributed to Dufay. Perhaps it is easy to see why in view of the partwriting problems in these movements, and there is no clear indication that all five movements even make up a singly composed cycle since the Gradual is higher-pitched than the other movements and is not that similar to the others in style.

²³ I do not mean to assert here that use of number implies either superior intellect or superior musical technique, and indeed some of the less skilled Trent 88 Proper settings display convincing use of number. For example, *Felix namque* no. 134 has 443 notes (possibly originally 444) *Beata viscera* no. 135 has a third of all its notes in its Tenor, and *Os iusti* no. 120a has exactly 400 notes. Number symmetry does not seem to be an important factor in the votive Masses, but I note that some Graduals might display numerical features. Gradual 103b has 880 notes, and 104b has near-identical Superius and Contra totals in both of its sections. Outside the votive sets, Gradual 110b has 801 notes, 115b has 552 notes (nearly 555) and its first section without the final longs has 55 tempora. Gradual 117b has 299 notes (nearly 300) and Gradual 118b's Superius has 334 notes. For Alleluias in the votive Masses with numerical features see 104c (which has exactly 150 tempora) 104d (whose sections without final longs respectively total 20 and 40 tempora) and 106c (which has 330 notes in total). Other numerical features in the non-votive Propers will be highlighted in due course.

The following partwriting and dissonance problems occur. A Superius-Contra seventh (110a, 34-35) a seventh in a duet (110b at 59), contrary-motion duet cadences involving fourths (110c, 104-105 and 109-110), exposed sixths in fully-scored passages (110b, 26,3 and 34,3), rhythmically irregular cadences (110d, 64-66) and asymmetrical imitation involving only the lower voices (110d, 101-105). Other oddities include poor partwriting (110a, 19 and 39) and an arguably weak melodic line in the Superius (110b, 52-55). Plus the repetition of rhythm and melody in a paraphrase passage (110c, 56-59) a subsection beginning with a cadential cliché (110c, 75-76) and the second section of the Offertory abandoning the flat signatures that are given for its first section. The music is rhythmically competent but the Introit in particular uses far more small values than are found in the votive cycles' Introits and at one point there is rhythmic imitation in semiminim runs in a fully scored passage (110a, 15-17). Otherwise I find another nine instances of imitation throughout these movements apart from the Communion, which is non-imitative. This is a slightly higher incidence of imitation than in each of the votive cycles.

The music seems to be written in imitation of other Trent 88 Propers but the characteristics outlined make it a fairly rough piece of work. The Offertory and the short Communion setting sound like a stylistic pair and the Introit and Alleluia possibly also have common musical ground. The Gradual is texturally in imitation of other Gradual settings with duet verse sections such as those in cycles 111, 113 and 115 and its partial reliance on duet texture in the otherwise full first section also seems to be derivative. The size of the Offertory with its relatively brief first section and triple-then-duple mensuration pattern likewise looks derivative, and the Introit is quite elaborately written compared with other Trent 88 settings. This is the only movement in the Nativity set which gives its paraphrase at chant pitch (all other movements present their paraphrased material an octave up). All movements exclusively use Superius chant paraphrase and I would prefer not to make any decisions regarding provenance because the set of Nativity Proper chants and texts for both the Paris and Passau rites are usually the same. Therefore we would have no way of knowing whether this cycle is geographically western or whether it was perhaps produced at an Austrian centre by western musicians - as is probably the case for some movements of the St. Stephen cycle discussed below. But I suspect that it is close to the cycles which I attribute to Dufay: the previously mentioned Superius-Tenor fourth in the St. John Offertory 107d at 62 also occurs in the same guise in the Nativity Offertory 110d at 92. The degree of textural and stylistic mimicry in these movements perhaps also seems to indicate the hand of a Dufay pupil or emulator.

.....

3. The Easter Day cycle no. 117.

This cycle appears to be assembly and in Trent 88 it is the last of the main group of cycles. The Easter Day Propers are an incomplete set and combine merely an Introit, a Gradual, an Alleluia and a Sequence. The second and third of these movements paraphrase their chant a fourth up, the Introit has its chant an octave up, and the Sequence is a migrant Superius-Tenor setting. Apart from the very brief first Alleluia section all of the music is duple with no use of sesquialtera, and the single-section Gradual lacks a polyphonic verse. These settings tend towards plainness and functionality and part of the Introit Superius paraphrase (at 54-57) simplifies the melodic line of its parent material. Also the Gradual does not paraphrase the chant melisma on 'ea' which should occur at the end of its single section.

I suspect that this so-called cycle consists of the work of three anonymi. The Introit is quite like some of the duple-meter Introits in the votive cycles but has an exposed sixth in a full passage at 128 which could easily have been avoided. The Gradual and Alleluia share melodic moves in their approaches to sonorities on B flat and the Alleluia has the 'Pasca nostrum' verse without the additional 'Epulemur' verse which usually follows. The verse duet in this Alleluia looks inept and features a brief second at 25, an odd syncopated phrase ending at 46-47, and a fourth at 49. Some unusual accidentals are also needed in the flatward passage at 52-59. After the flats the verse ends at 65-67 with a cadence that seems to call for ficta sharps. Like the Alleluia the Gradual has similar flatward movement in a single passage but this movement is more conventionally written. It

consists of 299 notes; possibly there were originally 300. No other numerical traits seem to be detectable in these movements.

The Sequence setting is alternatim and has a more bass-like Contra than any preceding movements. Apart from differing from preceding music by using migrant chant presentation it is also more imitative. There are four instances of Superius-Tenor and Tenor-Superius imitation throughout whereas the preceding movements only have a total of two imitative passages (each of which involves the Superius and Contra). As with cycle 110 I would not care to decide provenances for these movements.

.....

4. The St. Stephen cycle no. 115.

This five-movement set of Propers was not included in Feininger's group of cycles attributable to Dufay, and Rebecca Gerber has highlighted partwriting difficulties in most of the movements.²⁴ She also considers this set to be unattributable. All movements use Superius paraphrase and all except the Communion paraphrase their chants an octave up. The Communion transposes its chant a fourth up and Gerber argues that it might not be part of the original cycle on grounds of style as well as pitch.

Most of the movements have general elements in common with the Nativity cycle in their occasional use of small values and slightly rough partwriting. The Introit has a very odd cadence involving a seventh at 26-27 where a clean octave would be more normally expected. Also there is a Superius cadence involving very small values at 42-43. The Introit has musical rhyme for its second and third section endings instead of closely adhering to the chant passages for these cadences.

The Gradual has a dissonant Contra at 21, there is an irregular cadential measure at 23, the lower-voice motion of the pedal passage at 36-39 is awkward and there are outer-voice consecutive octaves at 49. The Superius of this movement has a range of an octave and a fifth and ascends to high G. In the Alleluia there are also clumsinesses. The lower voices are dissonant at 15, there is a diminished fifth at 24, a brief seventh at 51, an irregular cadence at 73-75, a fourth at 84 and there is a cadential figure on D just before a cadence on G (128-134).

The Offertory is fairly full of small values and has three instances of imitation throughout whereas preceding and following movements only manage one or two short imitative exercises each. It might have been written with a polyphonic antecedent in mind and possibly this was the Trinity Offertory 104e since the first sections of both pieces briefly use sesquialtera in O. Partwriting problems in this movement include an accented dissonance at 3, odd Superius and Tenor movement at 8, the behaviour of the Superius and Contra at 14, a brief fourth at 19 and virtual consecutive octaves between the Superius and Contra at 107-108. The Communion lacks contrapuntal problems and this too may have been written in imitation of another Proper setting - possibly the St. Anthony of Padua Communion 113e or the St. Francis Communion 114d. The St. Stephen Communion has more equal-voice writing than preceding movements and it begins with a full triad. These are further reasons for considering this movement as a later addition to the preceding four.

Reinhard Strohm (in 'The Medieval Mass Proper') has suggested that chant paraphrase in the Introit and Offertory are closer to the Passau versions of those chants than to typical versions in western chant sources. This would suggest that those movements were composed in Austria and possibly at the Imperial court, albeit possibly by a westerner since there were several Franco-Flemish musicians who worked there. Such a connection (in addition to ideas of Strohm's concerning the St. George cycle) perhaps help to explain how the Trent 88 Propers originally reached central Europe. I agree with Gerber's assessment that the Introit, Offertory and Alleluia are likely to be the work of a single anonymous. However the Gradual is unlike the other movements. It is an inept piece of work and in addition to partwriting problems it also features a weak-looking Superius line at 74-77 and unusually also features declamatory rhythms in the same voice at 119-123.²⁵

²⁴ See Gerber, 'Dufay's style and the question of cyclic unity...' p. 115.

²⁵ In addition to the Gradual's numerical features cited in footnote 22, the Alleluia of this cycle has close first-section Superius and Contra totals (59 and 58 notes respectively) and its overall note total is 597 (nearly 600). The 59 notes of

Outside Introit psalm verses and doxologies this feature is rare amongst the Trent 88 Propers. The St. Stephen Propers are therefore likely to be an assembly and since that assembly may have been made in Austria they probably have little to do with Dufay. No movements of the St. Stephen cycle resemble any of those in the Nativity cycle 110 either. Gerber's analysis of the St. Stephen movements also cites parallelisms and rests at cadences as reasons why these pieces are unlike the style of the votive Mass group. Nevertheless the sectional layout of the St. Stephen Propers suggests a stylistic indebtedness to other Propers in Trent 88.

.....

5. The St. Anthony Abbot cycle no. 112.

This set of five Propers was not attributed to Dufay by any previous writers, and study of the latter two movements is impeded by the fact that their parent chants have not yet been located. The Offertory may be a migrant setting with a little Contratenor chant presentation since it has a lower-voice duet at 20-27. Its chant may be related to the similar-looking Superius line of the Trent 89 St. Anthony Offertory. Otherwise apart from the migrant Gradual all movements seem to be Superius chant paraphrases. In all movements except the Alleluia paraphrase is an octave up. The Alleluia gives its parent material at chant pitch. The plainsongs which are traceable for this cycle betray the lack of consistency in fifteenth-century Antonine Propers, which tended to vary in different regions. Sometimes St. Anthony Abbot's feast was celebrated as a Common for a confessor and in other places he had his own chants. But the Trent 88 cycle shows that at least some of these were borrowed. The Introit *Scitote quoniam* appears to use most of the chant of the *Cibavit eos* Introit, and likewise the Gradual's parent chant seems to be a contrafactum of the Gradual *Exsurge Deus*. The Alleluia paraphrases a rare Antonine Alleluia chant whose text is part of a rhymed office. The texts used in the Trent 88 St. Anthony Abbot cycle also partly differ from those in the Trent 89 Missa *Beati Anthonii*.²⁶

The Trent 88 Introit is quite unlike succeeding movements and both this and the Alleluia are at a lower pitch than the other movements. This Introit uses only duple rhythm, it has a largely bass-like Contra, and occasional awkwardnesses like an exposed sixth (at 11) and a fourth (at 22) seem to exclude the likelihood of Dufay's authorship. Both the verse and the doxology sections end with musical rhyme as in the St. Stephen Introit. There are no other Introit settings quite like this one amongst the Trent 88 Propers.

The Gradual and Offertory display clear signs of being in technical advance of the votive cycles which are attributable to Dufay. The Introit only has three short instances of imitation and so does the first section of the Gradual, but its second section has seven such instances and the Alleluia verse duet has eight. The Offertory and Communion only have two or three instances of imitation each. The Gradual in particular is an energetic piece which involves more doubled harmonic pace work than the votive Propers plus also sesquialtera, patches of long-note chant treatment and some unusual accidentals. Elements in the Gradual otherwise generally not found in the votive Masses include an imitative passage where the Superius runs up a seventh (at 16) active Contratenor parts against sustained Tenor values (18-19 and 29-31) and anacrusic hocket-like figures in the Superius at 44-48. The Alleluia verse likewise features some rapid lower-voice movement against held Superius values and the Offertory's final duple passage is rhythmically energetic and includes some small values. The Communion is a quieter piece of work but is still sufficiently similar to the Offertory to justify inclusion in a set of four movements that are probably the work of a single anonymous. Stylistic indebtedness to likely Dufay works is definitely present. For example, the Alleluia is not unlike the Alleluia setting in the St. Francis cycle (see section 7 for reasons why I consider this to be a Dufay work) and the Offertory briefly uses dotted-C mensuration in the Superius against O in the lower voices as does the Gloria of Dufay's St. Anthony of Padua Mass. Planchart and Gerber both examined rubrics in many chant sources to see how these particular Propers might fit into Antonine ritual. The otherwise lost Communion chant *Orabat Dei famulus*

the Superius constitute exactly a third of all notes in that section. The Offertory has a first-section note total of 499 (nearly 500) and the Communion consists of exactly 90 tempora. However some of these totals may be mere coincidence.

²⁶ The Trent 89 Introit, Gradual, Alleluia verse and Offertory texts are respectively *Scitote quoniam* (with a different chant from Trent 88), *Tronus eius sicut sol*, *Vox de celo* and *Inclito Anthonio*. The chant for the Alleluia in Trent 89 is the same as for Dufay's Alleluia 113c. The chant for the Gradual is *Sciant gentes* (LU 1997 p.506) and apart from its similarities to the Superius of setting Trent 88 112d the Offertory chant is lost.

has at least two mentions in rubrics and liturgical books on western chant sources, so I suspect that this set of Propers may be of western origin rather than a probable Austrian compilation like the St. Stephen set.²⁷

As a final note to the music studied in sections 2-5, my highlighting of dissonance problems and musical weak points should not dissuade performers from using much of this music - which is of some quality. Only some of the settings discussed in section 3 seem to be almost beneath notice.

.....

6. The St. Anthony of Padua cycle no. 113.

Dufay's Propers for St. Anthony of Padua are discussed at this point because it seems to be pivotal in this discussion. Beyond this point all Proper cycles discussed seem to contain a percentage of movements that might be Dufay's, maybe suggesting that after he left Cambrai for Savoy in the 1450's he might have had less control over use of settings previously written. I might remind readers here that the case for Gradual 113b being Dufay's looks convincing, not only because of Spataro's comments on the Gradual but also because he mentions the St. Anthony of Padua Ordinary movements as being by Dufay as do Tinctoris and Gafforio. In this edition I deal with the Ordinary movements in an essay following the critical notes to no. 119. It is the Propers that concern us here. Gerber identified the Communion as likely to be spurious, which is a separation that I accept. Otherwise the Propers 113a-d tend to differ from the votive sets in the following ways. The Offertory is for four voices throughout, and the four voices are written without the consecutive octaves at the four-part doubled leadingnote cadences in votive Introits 103a and 104a. The Gradual is more economical than any of the votive-set Graduals since its second section is a duet. But oppositely the Alleluia 113c is very extended, it has two verses, and consists of 239 tempora.

I have also already mentioned that the St. John Introit 107a and Introit 113a have identical voice ranges. Their use of O mensuration and the near-absence of imitation in each setting makes them look similar as do their verse and doxology settings which are quite close despite each setting using a different chant formula in the Superius. Like its counterpart in the St. John cycle, the St. Anthony Gradual 113b is non-imitative apart from a single instance in each second section. But 113b's second section uses O2 as does the verse duet to the Trinity Alleluia 104d. Like the latter 113b is quite complex and both settings feature sesquialtera. Additionally 113b features slight technical advances over the votive sets such as an extended passage of doubled harmonic pace (at 81-84) and sustained Superius values against a faster-moving lower voice at 85-87. Such features suggest that cycle 113 may have been written a while after the votive cycles.

The size of Alleluia 113c and its well-worked texture make it an outstanding movement. The first section only has a single instance of imitation but the second has six imitative passages. It features Superius sesquialtera in a duet passage and also sustained upper-voice values against active lower parts (at 193-204) as well as doubled harmonic pace passages. One penalty for writing in this manner is a single Superius-Tenor fourth at 204. Doubts have been raised regarding the authenticity of Offertory 113d, but the unusual texture of this setting with its three crossing lower voices that are nearly equal in range calls for some comment. Similar voice names and crossing vertical functions for lower parts with ranges that are similar occur in Dufay's *O proles Hispanie / O sidus Hispanie* (no. 10 in this edition) which is another piece for St. Anthony of Padua. Both works also have final cadences in which the Contra secundus has a divisi third, and the Superius parts of both have some similar melodic moves (compare the feminine cadence at 17-18 with the rhythmically similar cadence in *O proles Hispanie* at 10-11). The rhythmically animated passage in the latter at 111-116 is also not dissimilar to the drive passage which ends the first section of 113d. On these grounds (and also because both works are for the same saint) a Dufay attribution for 113d seems to be justified. Another reason for suggesting this as an authentic part of Dufay's St. Anthony cycle is that the Communion is probably not authentic. Therefore the original sequence of polyphonic St. Anthony Propers might have ended with this grander than usual Offertory setting. Finally, the nearest next comparable piece in Trent 88 (the four-voice Offertory setting *Mirabilis Deus* no. 111e) does not have matching or near-matching lower voice ranges and has some harmonic progressions which the other two pieces here do not share. *Mirabilis Deus* may therefore

²⁷ See Gerber, 'Sacred Music from the Cathedral at Trent' p. 72 and Planchart, 'Guillaume Dufay's Benefices...' p. 146.

be an imitation of Dufay's style rather than an authentic work, and it seems to have an unusual numerical feature which is explored in Section 10 below.

Gerber separates out the Communion 113e for the following reasons. The text is set with more words per musical phrase than seems to be typical of Dufay. The chant is set at pitch (all preceding movements paraphrase their parent material an octave up), chant elaboration is mainly at cadences, the setting is lower-pitched than other three-part movements in this cycle, its partwriting is undistinguished and there is a relatively low overall percentage of full triads for a three-voice piece. Those are plenty of reasons for regarding 113e as a later addition by an anonymous composer.²⁸

Like the St. John cycle the St. Anthony of Padua Propers seem to demonstrate considerable use of number. Excluding all sectional final longs, the Introit's first section has 444 notes. The short verse section which follows has exactly 60 notes and the doxology section has 42 notes in each voice. Excluding all sectional final longs, the Gradual has 999 notes. The first section of the Alleluia has 299 notes (nearly 300) and the Contra and Tenor of this section each have 102 notes. Finally the total of Superius notes in the entire Alleluia is 445 (nearly 444). The Ordinary movements likewise display some signs of number symmetry and these are listed in the essay following no. 119's critical notes. Finally (as suggested by Christoffersen) there is likely to be a melodic link between the start of the Introit Superius and the Kyrie from the St. Anthony Ordinaries. For details see the critical notes to Introit 113a.

.....

7. The St. Francis cycle no. 114.

In Trent 88 the St. Anthony of Padua cycle is followed by an isolated Introit setting (*Gaudeamus* no. 121) and then by the incomplete set of Propers for St. Francis. This cycle has two Introit settings (114a and 114b) the second of which seems to be Dufay's owing to Fallows identifying some of its ligatures as quoted by Spataro. There then follows an Alleluia and Communion, but no Gradual or Offertory. The use of the same Gradual as in cycle 113 is specified by a manuscript instruction, and since St. Francis was a confessor like the Franciscan St. Anthony of Padua the same Offertory as in cycle 113 could also be used for St. Francis.

The succession of Introits at this point in Trent 88 is not so easily explained. Planchart thought that the first Introit (no. 121) might be present with its second and third sections since the second Introit lacks these - therefore showing the singers of Introit 114a how the verse and doxology should be sung. Planchart also showed that the incipits and order of movements as musically or verbally given in Trent 88 corresponds well with those in one particular late thirteenth century Franciscan missal which gives *Os iusti* (the text of no. 114b) as its Introit.²⁹ But maybe the two preceding *Gaudeamus* settings were present in this continuously copied section of Trent 88 for a different purpose - namely that *Gaudeamus* could be used with interchangeable texts and verses for different temporal feasts and other Marian and confessors' feasts. This may be why no. 121 gives alternate texts for the Assumption and All Saints.

I shall leave my reasons for considering no. 121 as a piece attributable to Dufay until later. For now, the single-section *Gaudeamus* 114a is also probably Dufay's since it is very similar to *Os iusti* 114b. The two pieces have near-identical ranges and the same type of Contra, neither is imitative apart from one small instance at 37-39 in 114b, both use C mensuration, and their first sections both make use of simple semibreve syncopation in the Superius to help move the texture along. Both first sections also have short internal passages of Superius-Contra duet and both also share similar Superius cadences (see 114a at 67-70 and 114b at 17-21). There is no particular reason why this should be so other than probable common authorship since each piece paraphrases a different chant. One significant difference between them is that 114a uses sesquialtera both internally and also to end its sole section. But since Dufay-attributable Propers like the St. Andrew Communion also end with sesquialtera in C mensuration this should not be an obstacle to attribution. Therefore I regard Introit 114a as a probable Dufay work in addition to 114b.

²⁸ Gerber, 'Dufay's Style and the Question of Cyclic Unity...' p. 114.

²⁹ Planchart, 'Guillaume Dufay's Benefices...' p. 144.

Alleluia 114c also turns out to have Dufay associations. Unlike the previous St. Francis movements it paraphrases its chant at pitch and is low-pitched, with both the Contra and Tenor reaching low E. An appropriate parallel here can be drawn with Dufay's canonic chanson *Les douleurs* whose lower voices are similarly pitched. The very extended Alleluia verse with internal sesquialtera is quite like other Alleluia settings in Trent 88 that are attributable to Dufay. The Superius also contains minim rests in animated passages (see 104b, 105c and 111c for similar occurrences) and the notation is reasonably well supplied with dots of division (another characteristic of pieces in Trent 88 that may be Dufay's work).³⁰ Like the St. Anthony of Padua Alleluia its first section only has a single instance of imitation but the duet verse which follows has nine instances of imitative writing. Another reason for considering this Alleluia setting as somehow special is because it seems to display use of number. There are 660 notes in all of its Superius and Contra and 44 in its Tenor. Like 114a and 114b I regard this as a likely Dufay work, but I hesitate to draw numerical parallels with cycle 113 because symmetries shared between cycles may only be coincidental.

As with cycle 113 the Communion appears to be inauthentic here. It resembles the probably anonymous Communion 113e. Both settings have similar voice ranges and similar final cadences involving close false relations. The partwriting in 114d features a Superius-Tenor seventh at 10 just as 113e also has partwriting problems. The ends of the internal sesquialtera passages in both settings have similar Superius movement (see 101-103 in no. 113e and 59-61 in 114d) and the sesquialtera passages in both pieces feature Superius-Contra duet work plus some movement in dotted breves. The way in which the chant is paraphrased in 114d also has some affinity with the paraphrase method in 113e. Finally regarding the St. Francis Propers, the presence of a scribal comment to indicate a double-duty Gradual is similar to the situation regarding duplicated Gradual movements in some of the votive cycles. It seems reasonable to suggest that the composer of these pieces would have initiated such duplications rather than an imitator. The Alleluia of this cycle also appears in contrafact guise as Alleluia 116c in the St. Sebastian cycle. Since that cycle contains another example of borrowed music (the four-part doxology shared by Introits 103a, 104a and 109a) I take the St. Francis version of this Alleluia as having priority over the St. Sebastian version. Planchart published the St. Francis Propers along with the St. Anthony of Padua movements in his online Dufay edition, and I mostly concur with his judgement that the St. Francis movements have a strong case for being Dufay's work. I say 'mostly' here because of the suspect status of the Communion.

.....

8. The Marian cycle no. 118.

These Assumption movements are widely separated from the main corpus of Propers and are in the later fascicles of Trent 88. All movements paraphrase their chants an octave up apart from the Communion, which gives its chant a fourth up. Most sections are in duple mensuration, but the Introit's verse and doxology and the first section of the Offertory use O. There is also some sesquialtera in the Gradual's verse section. Neither Planchart nor Feininger considered that these movements are attributable to Dufay. The *Gaudeamus* Introit 118a is simple in terms of style and the copyist in Trent 88 has provided options which make it suitable for feasts other than the Assumption. Alternative text is given to make this an Introit for St. Bernardino of Siena (canonised in 1444) although I doubt that the setting was originally composed with that option. Stylistically this Introit is similar to the Holy Cross Introit 106a with which it shares similar ranges and texture. All movement of this Marian cycle are cleanly written apart from the Alleluia, and I have previously mentioned use of number in the St. John Introit and Introit 121 as possibly being suggestive of common authorship. Introit 118a shares their feature of allotting a third of its notes to the Contratenor.

³⁰ For minim rests used thus see the eleventh style feature previously listed for the votive Masses, and regarding frequent dots of division in likely Dufay works see 'Dufay's Style and the Question of Cyclic Unity...' p. 112.

Table 4. Note totals in Introit 118a.

Voices	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Section totals	Section totals as percentages of 594
Superius	172	27	48	247	41.58%
Contra	135	20	43	198	33.33%
Tenor	90	20	39	149	25.08%
Totals	397	67	130	594	

Discovery of this shared feature then prompted me to look for Dufay-like aspects of the music, and in common with the votive Masses I find Superius longs used in syncopated fashion (118a, 23-25 and 30-32), an internal duet for the two upper voices (82-98) and a virtually non-imitative texture. These points in addition to the numerical feature described make at least the start of a case for Dufay being the composer of this Introit.

Gradual 118b also furthers the attribution process since like the St. Anthony of Padua and St. Francis cycles it has imitative work in its duet verse (in this case four instances) most of which are of some length. The sesquialtera passage which ends the verse (223-231) is a small exercise in pseudo-canon. The Gradual verse is shorter than in some previous examples. Could it be that these Propers are a Dufay set written at some time after the votive Masses and cycles 113 and 114? Further suggestion that these Marian Propers are linked to cycles already described is provided by the totals below. In the St. John Gradual 107b the Contra has 33% of all notes. In Gradual 118b there also seems to be an apparent interest in thirds - this time resulting in the first-section total of all notes being almost 333.

Table 5. Note totals in Gradual 118b.

Voices	Section 1	Section 2	Section totals	Section totals as percentages of 768
Superius	140	230	370	48.17%
Contra	103	204	307	39.97%
Tenor	91		91	11.84%
Totals	334	434	768	

Gradual 118b also has other parallels with the votive Masses such as two passages of internal duets in the first section with different voice combinations, clichéd Superius cadences featuring pre-cadential downward runs of a fourth, and an interesting passage of rhythmic fluidity in the Superius at 84-86. It would be wrong to dismiss all of these aspects as coincidental common ground with previously discussed music. Likewise, the two-section Offertory is very similar to other examples thought to be the work of Dufay. The lower-voice imitation under sustained Superius values at 37-41 should be compared with the same feature in the Trinity Alleluia no. 104c at 94-101. Also the two-measure caesura between the sections likewise occurs in Offertory 104e and Offertory 109f (which is to be discussed in a subsequent section). Nos 104e and 118d have rhythmically similar triple sections although the former is more complex, and both of these sections also have similarly arranged reduced scoring panels within those triple sections. Offertory 118d also seems to have numerical features. Its first-section note total is 399 notes (nearly 400) and its overall note total is 601. Possibly once these were rounded totals. The short Communion setting 118e is texturally like the Gradual, and while it offers no particular stylistic points worthy of comment this movement too seems to have a numerical feature. Both of its lower voices have exactly the same number of notes (84 each). Imitation is not an important feature of either the Offertory or Communion. Each of the three sections of music concerned here only have two instances of imitation in each section.

The Alleluia seems to be the misfit in this cycle, suggesting that cycle 118 is another assembly. This movement has an irregular pre-cadential measure in its verse duet plus some partwriting which is not entirely satisfactory (see 4-5 and 15-16). While it is otherwise texturally like the Gradual and Communion I suspect that it might be the work of a Dufay follower, and it is unusual amongst these Propers in that two successive phrases of its first section begin with imitation between the outermost voices (see 20-22 and 32-33). How close such an imitator might have been to the workings of the other movements is open to question. I suspect that he might

have had more than a casual familiarity with how the other movements were constructed because the overall note total of this movement is 404 and the totals of the voice for the first section look suspiciously close. In the order Superius-Contra-Tenor these are respectively 59, 56 and 57. Despite parallels with the numerical features of the St. John cycle and other attributable works, there seems to be a little distance in terms of style and substance between cycle 118 and other attributable works previously discussed. Therefore I freely admit that my case for considering most of these movements as Dufay's is weaker than in previous sections. However, highlighting of shared musical features is an important process in helping to decide where these Propers belong.

.....

9. The St. George / single martyr cycle no. 109.

This is a confused-looking collection of settings respectively consisting of two Introits, and Alleluia, a Tract, two Offertories and two Communions. The Alleluia exists in another version (no. 125) and it is uncertain which preceded the other although the version here may have come first. The Tract may also be slightly incomplete.

Planchart considered that the duplication of categories here might have been occasioned by the feast-day of St. George falling before, during or after Easter (which can vary between the dates March 22nd and April 25th). If St. George's day occurred during Holy Week it would have been celebrated after Easter or Pentecost, in which case the Tract would not be used since Tracts are not sung in Lent unless they are for Requiems or feasts of Holy Innocents. Planchart also argued that the only movement here which is specific to St. George is Introit 109a. Liturgically these Propers could otherwise have been intended for use on feasts of single martyrs either during or outside Easter. The second Introit in this assembly is lower pitched than 109a and very different from it in style. This is another reason why cycle 109 is unlikely to be a single compositional unit.

Reinhard Strohm has provided a plausible context for this assembly beginning with Introit 109a, since he associates 109a with Frederick III adding a new chapel of St. George to Wiener Neustadt castle in the 1440's and '50's - later making the chapel available to the newly founded Order of St. George. The 'cycle' transmitted to Trent 88 may therefore be Austrian in make-up but not necessarily in all of its contents. Some movements may have been written by Franco-Flemish musicians from the Imperial chapel and others may have been western imports. Introit 109a may be a newly added piece for three more reasons other than Strohm's hypothesis. Firstly its Tone 8 doxology section is borrowed from cycle 103. In some Germanic and western chant sources including Winterburger's Passau Gradual print Tone 7 verse and doxology formulas are used with this parent chant. But at least two other Passau Rite chant sources give the Introit with Tone 8 second and third sections as in this setting.³¹ Secondly the verse section of this Introit closely resembles the same section in the St. Sebastian Introit (no. 116a). Thirdly, 109a may be an imitation of Dufay's style since the Superius cadence at 23 seems untypical of Dufay as do the syllabic passages at 16, 29 and 31. Its first section is rather short (39 tempora in O mensuration) whereas the comparable sections in the votive Introits 103a and 104a respectively total 41 and 51 tempora. The St. John Introit 107a has 52 tempora here and the St. Anthony of Padua Introit has 51. Amongst attributable Introits only the St. Sebastian Introit 116a has a shorter first section in O (34 tempora). For these reasons I regard Introit 109a as anonymous.

I shall deal with the other movements here with the attributable ones discussed first. The *Desiderium* Tract 109d could easily be a Dufay work. Its triple sections are in unambitious style and resemble parts of the St. Anthony of Padua Ordinaries. One of the duple sections also contains a series of syncopated breves in sesquialtera as are also found in some of the votive Propers. Most of the setting seems to be for two voices and the parent chant is transposed an octave up for paraphrase. This could easily be the *Desiderium* setting reported as being copied at Cambrai in 1473-4. But I am not entirely convinced that we have the complete piece. Trent 88 gives a two-voice first section in the slow-moving Tenor at 19 and 43 has little or no Superius part above it. I therefore suspect that for at least the opening triple section there might be a missing Contratenor, in spite of the other Tract setting in Trent 88 (*Audi filia* no. 130) being completely for two voices.

³¹ Graz, Universitätsbibliothek ms 807 f. 37v and Klosterneuberg, Augustiner Chorherrenstift Bibliothek ms 588, f. 31r.

Alleluia 109c is another Superius paraphrase with the chant an octave up, and I have already mentioned that the same piece is also present in Trent 88 in a shortened version. This is possibly because there are two versions of the chant, and the second (shorter) version seems to have been penned with knowledge of the shorter chant verse. Here we have a similar situation with that which exists between the Dufay-attributable Graduals 104b and 105b, where the St. Andrew setting 105b is lengthened because the chant version for St. Andrew is longer than the chant used in setting 104b. It is persuasive to regard Dufay as the composer of Alleluia 109c in view of the modification due to chant and also because the Superius opening is rhythmically similar to that of Offertory 104e. The conclusion of the duet verse sesquialtera passage in 109c at 106-115 is also not unlike that in Alleluia 104d at its sesquialtera cessation (measures 50-53 in 104d). Lastly the duet verse opening is similar to that of Alleluia 105c.

The two short Offertory settings 109e and 109f show signs of being a compositional pair. Both paraphrase their chants at pitch and both have the triple-duple mensuration pattern familiar from other Offertories that are attributable to Dufay. The following features make it suggestible that 109e might be a Dufay setting. Like Offertory 104e the first section has an internal reduced-scoring panel and the section ending is followed by a two-measure caesura. This caesura is also found in setting 109f. The Superius start of 109e's second section is also rhythmically similar to the same point in Offertory 104e. Additionally the Superius conclusion to the first section (29-33) is rhythmically not unlike the first-section Superius conclusion to Introit 104a (at 46-51 in the latter). The following reasons suggest compositional pairing of 109e and f: both have 33-measure first sections, both have similar rhythmic movement in their duple sections, and these duple sections both conclude with syncopated semibreve-semibreve-breve patterns in their Superius parts like some movements in the votive Masses. Setting 109e also seems to have some numerical organisation. Its second section has exactly 200 notes and the Superius and Contra totals for that section are close (72 and 71 notes respectively).

Of the two Communion settings given here, *Posuisti Domine* no. 109g is short and transposes its parent chant a fifth up. It is similar in duple style and ranges to the latter sections of the Offertories previously discussed and may therefore be a companion piece to 109e and f. While Dufay authorship for these three settings seems likely, Communion 109h is separated from the rest of this cycle in Trent 88 and looks similar to the probably spurious Communion setting 113e which ends the St. Anthony of Padua Propers. Both works have similar sesquialtera passages before their final C-mensuration subsections, although in the St. Anthony Communion the sesquialtera passage is for three voices rather than two. Additionally I find the use of a cadential formula and suspension in mid-phrase to be untypical of Dufay (see 7-8) as may be the duet Superius written over a single Tenor pitch for five measures at the start of the final subsection (see 63-67).

That leaves us with Introit 109b, which paraphrases its chant at pitch, has frequent tonic-dominant chording, and is in duple meter with a diminished signature from the verse onwards (which is most unusual amongst the Trent 88 Propers). There are also a number of upper-voice consecutive fifths or barely disguised fifths throughout: in the first section these are found at 18-19, 79-80 and 84. It shares verse and doxology material with the St. Maurice Introit *Venite benedicti* no. 111a despite these sections in both settings having differing mensurations. The Superius paraphrase in 109b also contains a relatively high quantity of breves, giving the topmost line in this setting a rather plain sound. In view of these features it is most unlikely to be a Dufay work. It is also completely non-imitative, as is the Tract setting in this cycle. Otherwise in this set of Propers imitation does not feature frequently. There is only one imitative passage in Introit 109a, there are two in the verse duet of Alleluia 109c, and between the two Offertories there are only three short imitative passages in their second sections. Both Communion settings are also virtually non-imitative. Most of these Propers are therefore collectively quite like the votive movements previously described.

.....

10. The St. Maurice cycle no. 111.

This seems to be another assembly, and like the St. George cycle only the first of the two Introits seems to be specific to the dedicatee. The other movements (Introit 111b, Gradual 111c, Alleluia 111d, Offertory 111e and Communion 111f) are suitable for Nativity feasts of plural martyrs. As with the St. George cycle the movements have pitch and scoring differences. Introit 111a is low-pitched and has its paraphrase at chant

pitch. All remaining movements have their chant transposed an octave up for paraphrase. 111b is a migrant setting, and Offertory 111e is four-part.

Both Introits may be spurious and are unlike the settings probably by Dufay for a variety of important reasons. Setting 111a has a Superius-Tenor fourth in a cadential cliché which could easily have been avoided (see measure 12) and it has a few two-semiminim and minim groups which also seem to be untypical of Dufay (at 16 and 18). It shares doxology material with Introit 111a (another setting which is possibly not Dufay's). Also it begins with construct on G which has D doubled an octave apart (which is unusual in this repertory) and its first phrase ends with rhythmic imitation between the Superius and Contra (see 4-6). For these reasons I doubt that it is by Dufay. Similarly Introit 111b is unique in that it is the only migrant Introit setting in Trent 88 (the Contra has the chant at 19-38) and also because it is the only Introit setting in Trent 88 whose first section largely consists of duet subsections. While it is rhythmically quite like the St. Francis Introit 114b (which is Dufay's) it has a passage of imitation at 33-38 in which one voice is decorated. That too seems untypical of Dufay. This is another setting which duplicates doxology material, which in this case is taken from Introits 107a and 121. But here the borrowed material is in C rather than O mensuration and it has a cadence on D like the Introit's first section. Some chant sources give a formula ending on A for this doxology. For all of these reasons I consider 111b as anonymous.

Gradual 111c is an extended setting similar in size to the St. Anthony of Padua Gradual, with a first section in O2 and a duple duet verse. The writing in O2 mensuration is sophisticated with asymmetrical cadence-points at 22 and 31, and the first of these is imitative. The duet section contains rhythmic sophistications in sesquialtera at 148-157. At 119 the Superius has a brief cadential halt of minim's rest in an animated passage (as found in other settings likely to be Dufay's) and also the O2 mensuration style is generally similar to that of the Offertory *Stetit angelus* no. 108e. While there is only one imitative passage in both Introits cited above and likewise only one in the Gradual's first section, its duet verse has nine imitative passages and therefore it closely resembles the St. Francis Alleluia 114c in this respect (which also has nine instances in its verse). I am quite confident that this could be a Dufay setting. Likewise the Alleluia setting 111d strongly resembles other Alleluias that are attributable to Dufay such as 105c and 113c, and like these it has a long and elaborate duet verse. This too may be a Dufay work.

The Offertory *Mirabilis Deus* (111e) has a general similarity with Dufay's Offertory setting no. 113d and also his *O proles Hispanie* / *O sidus Hispanie* (no. 10 in this edition). But I doubt that 111e is Dufay's work. This is for several reasons. Firstly it uses a four-part hybrid cadence of a type that is either rare or non-existent in other middle or late-period Dufay works (see 4-5 and 17-18). Also - despite the lower-voice trio passages in all three works cited - the Contra secundus in *O proles Hispanie* is more often a middle and filler part than the slightly more bass-like part in *Mirabilis Deus*. Thirdly the construction of this piece seems to have an odd numerical feature because - with a very small adjustment - the two Contras add up to exactly half the number of notes used in the whole setting as illustrated below. One digit has been taken off each voice's sectional total to represent removal of sectional longs, and then a further single note has been subtracted from the Contra primus in section 1.

Table 6. Slightly adjusted note totals in Offertory 111e.

Voices	Section 1	Section 2	Section totals	Section totals as percentages of 768	Sums of voice pairs
Superius	73	148	221	29.9458%	Superius plus Tenor: 50% of 738
Contra 1	62	138	200	27.10027%	Contra 1 plus Contra 2: 50% of 738
Tenor	58	90	148	20.0542%	
Contra 2	75	94	169	22.89973%	
Totals	268	470	738		

Calculations like these or similar to these when applied to Offertory 113d do not produce significant results. The succession of scoring panels and the size of the triple section in relation to the following duple panels are very similar to those in Offertory 113d, but for the reasons above I consider this setting to be a careful imitation of the Dufay's four-part style rather than a work which is attributable to him. Communion 111f resembles Communion 113e and 109h and I doubt that this short setting is the work of Dufay. It is non-imitative and like the two latter it uses internal sesquialtera. My chief reason for suspecting it to be by an imitator of Dufay is that the Contra in a temporary duet at 're-' (34-37) has an abrupt termination on an exposed third-to-fifth progression which is not really cadential. This abrupt termination is then followed by a short section of Superius-Tenor duet. That type of scoring seems to be untypical of Dufay.

.....

11. The St. Sebastian cycle no. 116.

I have already indicated that the Alleluia of this five-movement cycle is a slightly shortened and probably contrafact version of the St. Francis Alleluia 114c, with the shortening possibly being due to the composer understanding that the parent chant for Alleluia Sebastiani gratia was shorter than the St. Francis version. This makes it likely that both versions came from the pen of Dufay, or at least somebody who understood the setting thoroughly. While the Alleluia gives its paraphrase at chant pitch, all other movements of this cycle paraphrase their chants an octave up. Introit 116a is another setting that uses borrowed music, with the four-part doxology being shared by Introits 103a, 104a and 109a. The verse section is also close to that of 109a. This setting has noticeable melodic resemblances with the Trinity Introit *Benedicta sit* no. 104a. Its Superius at 2-4 is like the *Benedicta sit* Superius at 7-10, and its Superius at 18-19,3 is like the *Benedicta sit* Superius at 6-7,3. All parts at 27-29 have a cadence on A not dissimilar to that in *Benedicta sit* at 28-30. The two settings also have identical ranges in each voice, similar types of first Contra and very similar movement in O mensuration. Taken into consideration with the shared music between the settings in the verse and doxology sections, these resemblances make it likely that no. 116a is the work of Dufay.

Gradual 116b is slightly miscopied in Trent 88 and there is nothing to tell whether its verse duet is for the Tenor or Contra. But with its second section Superius-Contra duet scoring restored (as seems normal for several Graduals in this collection) it is quite close to Dufay's St. Anthony of Padua Gradual 113b. Both have first sections which are in O mensuration, which are rhythmically similar and which have brief duet interludes for lower voices. Both also have internal sesquialtera passages in their second sections which are similar, although 113b is generally the more complex of the two duet sections. Comparison with the St. Maurice Gradual 111c (which is also attributable to Dufay) also shows some traits similar to those above, and 111c and the present piece share animated writing of a similar type at the end of their duet sections. At measure 167 in the Superius there is a minim rest in an animated phrase – a previously mentioned feature which is a Dufay hallmark. No. 116b is therefore demonstrably close to both other Gradual settings cited here. Its use of three-voice imitation at 27-30 (with the voice entry order Contra-Tenor-Superius) is also matched by an imitative entry with the same three-voice order in the St. Anthony of Padua Alleluia no. 113c (at 88-95). For these reasons I am willing to accept 116b as a likely Dufay piece.

Offertory 116d is a relatively short setting but it compares reasonably well with the longer and more complex Offertory in the Trinity Propers (no. 104e). Both pieces have a two-measure caesura separating their two halves, and the opening of both pieces is in noticeably simple O mensuration style. Offertory 109f also has the two-measure caesura in the same position as 104e. The Superius first-section cadence in 116d and the first-section cadence in the Gradual setting no. 104b are very similar (see measures 47-48 in the latter) and some of the sustained values in the duple section are matched by similar occurrences in other Trent 88 Offertory settings which are attributable to Dufay (see measures 55-62 in no. 107d). On these grounds it seems likely that 116d might also be the work of Dufay. The note totals of this piece are as follows.

Table 7. Note totals in Offertory 116d.

Voices	Section 1	Section 2	Section totals
Superius	73	149	222
Contra	59	108	167
Tenor	43	66	109
Totals	175	323	498

The near-symmetry of the overall total (which is nearly 500) persuaded me that a little experimentation might reveal further sophistication. Accordingly the totals below are slightly adjusted and - if they are thought appropriate - suggest that this movement might have been created with a view to reflecting the proportions 44-33-22.

Table 8. Slightly adjusted note totals in Offertory 116d.

Voices	Section 1	Section 2	Section totals	Totals as a percentage of 500
Superius	75	148	223	44.6%
Contra	59	107	166	33.2%
Tenor	46	65	111	22.2%
Totals	180	320	500	

I am also encouraged to attribute the brief (51-measure) Communion setting 116e to Dufay because of its continuous three-part texture and use of C mensuration (features shared by the Trinity Communion setting no. 104f and Communion no. 106e) and because its style in duple mensuration is not dissimilar to Offertory 116d preceding it. Which would also mean that all movements in the St. Sebastian Proper cycle originated as works by Dufay even if the Alleluia is a contrafactum. Those familiar with Dufay's secular works will also note more than a passing resemblance between the opening of 116e and that of his *Dona I ardenti ray*.

.....

12. Isolated Propers within Trent 88.

For this final group of pieces I make a change to previous discussion since the only works that concern us here are isolated Propers in Trent 88 which might be stylistically or directly connected to the main body of Proper cycles. Other items (some of which may not be western) have their individual characteristics dealt with in their critical commentaries. Only five settings therefore really concern us, the first of which is *Gaudeamus* no. 121. Previously cited on account of its using similar verse and doxology material to Introit 107a and also because exactly a third of its notes are all in the Contra, this setting uses O mensuration and has internal Superius-Contra and Superius-Tenor duet passages like 107a. Like 107a it also features cadences on weak beats (see 47-48 in setting 121 and 2-3 in 107a). The O mensuration style is similar to that of 107a and both settings also have identical ranges in their lower voices. It therefore seems highly likely that this is a Dufay setting.

The alternim Tract setting *Audi filia* (no. 130) is a duple-meter setting with Superius chant paraphrase. While it is similar to the duple sections of the *Desiderium* Tract setting 109d, it does not contain enough distinguishing features for me to highlight anything that might suggest Dufay's authorship. For the present it is probably satisfactory to associate it with the main corpus of Propers on account of its entirely two-voice texture since much of *Desiderium* is written in the same way.

Alleluia 125 has alternative verses (*Posuisti* for feasts of single martyrs, and *Ora pro nobis* for Marian feasts) and is a shortened contrafact version of Alleluia 109c. I consider the latter to be attributable to Dufay but it is not clear whether the shortened version is his or an anonymous adaption. The *Ora pro nobis* verse is rarer in chant sources than the *Posuisti* verse, but the former is also used in Liebert's plenary Mass. It is therefore

suggestible that this adapted setting might have originated in western circles. Furthermore this setting is transmitted in Trent 88 between works which are unlikely to be Germanic in origin.

Finally, Planchart suggested that the *Felix namque* setting no. 134 and the *Beata viscera* setting 135 might be part of a lost Dufay set of Marian Propers. I consider this to be unlikely since the partwriting in setting 134 is undistinguished. The piece begins with what are virtually outer-voice consecutive fifths and there are exposed sixths at 18 and 129. I would not care to suggest where these simple and duple-meter paraphrase settings come from, but they seem to be a compositional pair on account of their shared style and the numerical features therein previously mentioned in footnote 23.

.....

Conclusions

The most important conclusion is that Feininger seems to have been correct in identifying Dufay-like settings in the majority of the Trent 88 Proper cycles. But his investigations show that at least until 1947 (when the MPLSER edition was published) he seems to have thought in terms of cyclic composition or maybe lacked the publishing space to explain why some cycles seemed to be stylistically inconsistent.

Secondly, a common effort of scholarship has separated the Nativity, St. Stephen and Easter Propers from the main corpus of the Trent 88 cycles and these three cycles are likely to be by imitators of Dufay. The same is likely to apply to the St. Anthony Abbot Propers. My own investigations suggest that single movements or more in cycles 103, 109, 111, 113, 114 and 118 are likewise additions to a large body of settings which is probably the work of Dufay. Beyond what seem to be deliberately added Communion settings (nos 103f, 109h, 110e, 111f, 113e and 114d) there is no great degree of sameness or identity in the musical additions and not even all of these Communion settings need be the work of a single musician.

Third, my conclusions suggest an industrious period for Dufay in the 1440's possibly resulting in many chant settings and three separate settings of the *Gaudeamus* Introit. But since he also left three works beginning with *Ave Regina celorum* texts, two *Alma redemptoris* settings and several hymns with optional versions there need not necessarily be an issue with the three ascribed Introits. In addition to Dufay's likely output it is likely that at least some of the Trent 88 Propers reach us in third-hand condition. Some cycles may have passed through the Imperial chapel before reaching Trento, and one or two may have been assembled there from imported movements.

Fourth, in its nature this short study is a fairly quick dash through one of the most impressive musical creations of the fifteenth century, chiefly because its function is that of a sorting process. I am hoping that readers will have time to appreciate the finer points of magnificently extended paraphrase settings like Gradual 104b and the rich sonorities of Offertories 113d and 111e. Plus also the energetic writing in the St. Anthony Abbot Gradual 112b. Regarding the probably large contribution probably made to this repertory by Dufay, I make the following assertion in the hope that it will be considered as important. In general the musicianship and attention to detail in most of his settings have qualities which are at least the equal of those in the Choralis Constantinus and Jena Proper collections. But that is of course a personal preference based on my usual biases of technical accomplishment and rhythmic detail.

Fifth, it is beyond the scope of this study to document western and central European imitations of the Trent 88 Propers, some of which seem to be particularly close to models provided in this collection (for example, the Alleluia *Ascendit Deus* and *Caro mea* settings in Trent 91).³² Similarly some movements of Ockeghem's Requiem are not that different in style from the Trent 88 Propers. Likewise it is beyond the scope of my work here to describe the wide dispersal of polyphonic Mass Propers in Europe by 1450. The well-used phrase 'from Portugal to Poland' fits the known distribution quite well.³³

³² Nos 16 and 17 and in the DIAMM Trent 91 edition.

³³ The probably Bohemian or Moravian source Strahov has concordances for the following items in this instalment: 103a, 105a, 109h, 111b, 114b, 122, 123 and 126. Most of which are in inferior readings or are incomplete, or slightly adapted.

Lastly there is one very good reason why a claim for Dufay's authorship of much of this music should now be credible. This is because the past 30-40 years in fifteenth century studies have started to see a recognition that there was such a being as a composer-compiler. In other words a man employed on a medium- to long-term project for the supply of chant settings, chansons, psalm settings or other sorts of polyphony in some quantity and with a certain degree of sameness in the resulting output. Daniel Leech-Wilkinson has suggested that many of the songs in the manuscript Turin J.II.9 have a degree of sameness which suggests a solitary composer or maybe the work of two men. Peter Wright has likewise suggested that several similar Mass Ordinary settings in the earlier Trent Codices may be the work of Bloym. My own work on Trent 91 also detects a sameness in several groups of chant settings therein which may equally lead to recognition that much of this collection of pieces was formed by a single mind.³⁴ The idea of the composer-compiler has been with us in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century studies for some time. It is entirely reasonable that sets of similar-sounding clausulae, organa and Petronian-notation motets in single manuscripts might emanate from the same hand in each case. I therefore regard it as equally believable that Dufay was employed to produce quantities of Proper settings to order, and the instances cited here are by no means the only ones suggesting mass production of part-music. Others might be the Martini and Brebis psalm setting collection from Ferrara, some of the Easter music in the Egerton manuscript, similar-looking and liturgically related sets of pieces in the Glogau partbooks, and also at least some of the similar keyboard intabulations in the Buxheim collection.

The following table summarises my attribution decisions in previous sections, and divides those pieces which I consider to be attributable to Dufay into four categories. These are 1: pieces with fifteenth century attributions. 2: pieces with a strong likelihood of Dufay's authorship, and 3: settings where I am less sure about Dufay being the composer. The fourth category consists of shaded entries which indicate that I had little to go on in deciding where such pieces belong - in some cases only the presence of substandard or unfamiliar musical features. Lastly, pieces which seem to have little or nothing to do with Dufay have entries in italic text. Some of these latter decisions may eventually be proved wrong or misleading but under present circumstances there is little more information that I can provide.

.....

For an Iberian source containing polyphonic Propers, see Nelson, B., 'The Lieria Fragments: Vestiges of Fifteenth-Century Northern Polyphony in Portugal' in Revista Portuguesa de Musicologia 14-15 (2004-2005), pp. 79-100. For a similarly isolated source from Slovenia, see Snoj, J., 'Two 15th-century sheets of Binchois's and anonymous music in Ljubljana National University Library' in Muzikoloski Zbornik XXIV (1988) pp. 5-20.

³⁴ Further, see Leech-Wilkinson, D., 'The Cyprus Songs' in Günther, U. and Finscher, L. (eds), The Cypriot-French Repertory of the Manuscript Torino J.II.9... (1995), pp. 395-431. Wright, P., 'Early 15th-Century Pairings of the Sanctus and Agnus Dei, and the case of the composer "Bloym"' in Journal of Musicology XXII (2005), pp. 604-643, plus also my own monograph 'Trent 91: first steps towards a stylistic classification' on the DIAMM website.

Table 9. Attributions in the Trent 88 Propers.

Edition no.	Type	Title	Feast(s)	Parts	Attrib. to Dufay	Strong case for editorial attribution	Weaker case for editorial attribution
103a	I	Spiritus Domini	De Sancto Spiritu	4		✓	
103b	G	Beata gens	De Sancto Spiritu	3		✓	
103c	A	Alleluia Emitte Spiritum	De Sancto Spiritu	3		✓	
103d	A	Alleluia Veni Sancte Spiritus	De Sancto Spiritu	3	✓		
103e	O	Confirma hoc Deus	De Sancto Spiritu	3	✓		
103f	C	<i>Factus est repente</i>	<i>De Sancto Spiritu</i>	3			
103g	I	Dum sanctificatus	De Sancto Spiritu	3			✓
104a	I	Benedicta sit	Trinity	4		✓	
104b	G	Benedictus es	Trinity	3		✓	
104c	A	Alleluia Benedictus es	Trinity	3		✓	
104d	A	Alleluia Verbo Domini	Trinity	3		✓	
104e	O	Benedictus sit	Trinity	3		✓	
104f	C	Benedicite Deum	Trinity	3		✓	
105a	I	Mihi autem	St. Andrew	3		✓	
105b	G	Constitues eos	St. Andrew	3		✓	
105c	A	Alleluia Ego vos	St. Andrew	3		✓	
105d	A	Alleluia Dilexit Andream	St. Andrew	3		✓	
105e	O	Mihi autem	St. Andrew	3		✓	
105f	C	Venite post me	Holy Cross	3		✓	
106a	I	Nos autem gloriari	Holy Cross	3		✓	
106b	G	Christus factus est	Holy Cross	3		✓	
106c	A	Alleluia Dicite in gentibus	Holy Cross	3		✓	
106d	A	Alleluia dulce lignum	Holy Cross	3		✓	
106e	O	Protege Domine	Holy Cross	3		✓	
106f	C	Per signum crucis	Holy Cross	3		✓	
107a	I	De ventre matris	St. John, Nativity	3		✓	
107b	G	Priusquam te	St. John, Nativity	3		✓	
107c	A	Alleluia Tu puer propheta	St. John, Nativity	3		✓	
107d	O	Iustus ut palma	St. John, Nativity	3		✓	
107e	C	Tu puer propheta	St. John, Nativity	3		✓	
108a	I	Benedicite Dominum	De Angelis	3		✓	
108b	G	Benedicite Dominum	De Angelis	3		✓	
108c	A	Alleluia In conspectu	De Angelis	3		✓	
108d	A	Alleluia Laudate Deum	De Angelis	3		✓	
108e	O	Stetit Angelus	De Angelis	3		✓	
108f	C	Benedicite omnes Angeli	De Angelis	3		✓	
109a	I	<i>In virtute tua</i>	<i>St. George</i>	4			
109b	I	<i>Protexisti me Deus</i>	<i>St. George</i>	3			
109c	A	Alleluia Posuisti Domine	St. George	3		✓	
109d	T	Desiderium anime	St. George	3		✓	
109e	O	In virtute tua	St. George	3		✓	
109f	O	Confitebuntur celi	St. George	3		✓	
109g	C	Posuisti Domine	St. George	3		✓	
109h	C	<i>Letabitur iustus</i>	<i>St. George</i>	3			
110a	I	<i>Puer natus</i>	<i>Nativity</i>	3			
110b	G	<i>Viderunt omnes</i>	<i>Nativity</i>	3			
110c	A	<i>Alleluia Dies sanctificatus</i>	<i>Nativity</i>	3			
110d	O	<i>Tui sunt celi</i>	<i>Nativity</i>	3			
110e	C	<i>Viderunt omnes</i>	<i>Nativity</i>	3			
111a	I	<i>Venite benedicti</i>	<i>St. Maurice</i>	3			
111b	I	<i>Sapientiam sanctorum</i>	<i>St. Maurice</i>	3			
111c	G	Gloriosus Deus	St. Maurice	3		✓	
111d	A	Alleluia Iudicabunt sancti	St. Maurice	3		✓	
111e	O	<i>Mirabilis Deus</i>	<i>St. Maurice</i>	4			
111f	C	<i>Gaudete iusti</i>	<i>St. Maurice</i>	3			
112a	I	<i>Scitote quoniam</i>	<i>St. Anthony Abbot</i>	3			
112b	G	<i>Deus qui das vindictas</i>	<i>St. Anthony Abbot</i>	3			
112c	A	<i>Alleluia Felix corpus</i>	<i>St. Anthony Abbot</i>	3			
112d	O	<i>Quis similis ei</i>	<i>St. Anthony Abbot</i>	3			
112e	C	<i>Orabat Dei famulus</i>	<i>St. Anthony Abbot</i>	3			
113a	I	In medio Ecclesie	St. Anthony of Padua	3		✓	

(Table 9, contd.)

Edition no.	Type	Title	Feast(s)	Parts	Attrib. to Dufay	Strong case for editorial attribution	Weaker case for editorial attribution
113b	G	Os iusti	St. Anthony of Padua	3	✓		
113c	A	Alleluia Anthoni compar	St. Anthony of Padua	3		✓	
113d	O	Veritas mea	St. Anthony of Padua	4		✓	
113e	C	<i>Domine quinque talenta</i>	<i>St. Anthony of Padua</i>	3			
114a	I	Gaudeamus...Francisci	St. Francis	3		✓	
114b	I	Os iusti	St. Francis	3	✓		
114c	A	Alleluia O patriarcha	St. Francis	3		✓	
114d	C	<i>Fidelis servus</i>	<i>St. Francis</i>	3			
115a	I	<i>Etenim sederunt</i>	<i>St. Stephen</i>	3			
115b	G	<i>Sederunt principes</i>	<i>St. Stephen</i>	3			
115c	A	<i>Alleluia Video celos</i>	<i>St. Stephen</i>	3			
115d	O	<i>Elegerunt Apostoli</i>	<i>St. Stephen</i>	3			
115e	C	<i>Video celos</i>	<i>St. Stephen</i>	3			
116a	I	Letabitur iustus	St. Sebastian	4		✓	
116b	G	Posuisti Domine	St. Sebastian	3		✓	
116c	A	Alleluia Sebastiani gratia	St. Sebastian	3		✓	
116d	O	Gloria et honore	St. Sebastian	3		✓	
116e	C	Magna est gloria	St. Sebastian	3			✓
117a	I	<i>Resurrexi</i>	<i>Easter Day</i>	3			
117b	G	<i>Hec dies</i>	<i>Easter Day</i>	3			
117c	A	<i>Alleluia Pasca nostrum</i>	<i>Easter Day</i>	3			
117d	S	<i>Victime pascali laudes</i>	<i>Easter Day</i>	3			
118a	I	Gaudeamus	BMV	3			✓
118b	G	Propter veritatem	BMV	3			✓
118c	A	<i>Alleluia Assumpta est</i>	<i>BMV</i>	3			
118d	O	Diffusa est gratia	BMV	3			✓
118e	C	Dilexisti iustitiam	BMV	3			✓
120	I	<i>Os iusti</i>	<i>Confessors</i>	3			
121	I	Gaudeamus	BMV	3		✓	
122	I	<i>Puer natus</i>	<i>Nativity</i>	4			
123	I	<i>Salve sancta parens</i>	<i>BMV</i>	4			
124	I	<i>Resurrexi</i>	<i>Easter Day</i>	4			
125	A	Alleluia Ora pro nobis	BMV	3		✓	
126	A	<i>Alleluia Dulcis mater</i>	<i>BMV</i>	3			
127	S	<i>Grates nunc omnes</i>	<i>Nativity</i>	3			
128	S	<i>Verbum bonum</i>	<i>Octave of Assumption</i>	3			
129	S	<i>Mittit ad virginem</i>	<i>Annunciation</i>	3			
130	T	<i>Audi filia</i>	<i>Virgins</i>	2			
131	R	<i>Discubuit Jhesus</i>	<i>Corpus Christi</i>	3			
132	Ant	<i>Vidi aquam</i>	<i>Aspersio at Easter</i>	3			
133	?	<i>Ego dormio</i>	<i>BMV?</i>	3			
134	O	<i>Felix namque</i>	<i>BMV</i>	3			
135	C	<i>Beata viscera</i>	<i>BMV</i>	3			

A note on chant sources and editions, comments on editorial texting, and acknowledgements.

For the purposes of this edition ‘chant model’ refers to a manuscript version of the parent melody concerned which has been examined in preference to Solesmes chant editions for reference to creating editorial text underlay. This does not mean that the texting in the transcriptions slavishly follows either that of the model or that of [Trent 88](#). Preferential chant sources consulted for this edition are largely thirteenth or fourteenth century. There is a good reason for using these rather than their fifteenth century equivalents: the earlier sources show that many of the chants concerned here have a long pedigree in the Gallican chant tradition. Where more recent chants and texts are used (i.e. probably fifteenth-century ones) this policy also tends to put the newer chant material used in its proper context - that is, as relatively ‘new’ Gregorian material so far as we can determine. Also, for Alleluia chants I have tended to rely on the older version of Karlheinz Schlager’s

Alleluia catalogue (1965) rather than the newer and more comprehensive 1968 version. This is simply because the older version was more readily available.

Performers need not use all of the editorial text for lower voices which I have provided in this edition. I have usually texted lower voices but in the Padua Mass Ordinaries (no. 119) there is some allowance for wordless vocalisation of lower voices. Occasionally in setting text to the lower voices of Introits, Graduals and the like I have felt that the effort of editorial texting is a little contrived since much of this music is non-imitative. Some settings are completely non-imitative, such as Dufay's Introit 113a and the Easter Gradual 117b. It would certainly ease matters for those sceptical about fifteenth-century *a cappella* polyphony if singers of lower parts were not overly familiar (or not expected to be familiar) with the tracts of Biblical and patristic writing which comprise many of the movemental texts. Accordingly, the lower voices of some first sections in pieces here can be wordlessly vocalised - allowing maybe for one or two text incipits where the supporting voices have bridging duet passages (as is very often in the case with this music) or where imitation occurs. This would of course also mean that much of the Trent 88 Proper repertory could be sung from sight using the manuscript. There are of course other elements which would have to be considered in advance of vocalising lower voices. For example, in Alleluia and Gradual duet sections I would expect both voices to be texted, and in an imitative duet such as that in Alleluia 114c I would expect imitatively worked-out underlay as I have accordingly provided. Settings which have no significant duet episodes with lower voices and no imitative work are of course the easiest ones to select for experiments in lower-voice vocalising. The following list gives all such settings in this instalment.

Communion 104f

Communion 106f

Offertory 107d

Communion 108f

Communion 112e

Communion 116e

Gradual 117b

Communion 118e

Offertory 134

Communion 135

The next step would be to experiment with Introits which need sung lower voice text in syllabic verse and doxology sections, but which otherwise might suffice with vocalised lower voices in a non-imitative first section such as in Introit 112a (where the three-voice texture in this section largely remains unvaried throughout). But already in speculating on such matters I go beyond the immediate purpose of this edition, which is simply to make the music available in an easily usable format.

My thanks for help in putting together this instalment go to the following friends and scholars. Firstly, the late Peter Wright, David Fallows, Warwick Edwards, Jeffrey Dean, Danilo Curti, Margaret Bent, Bonnie Blackburn, Solomon Guhl-Miller, Pawel Gancarczyk and Reinhard Strohm. I also wish to remember here Alejandro Planchart (who I met, and whose work on this music was very considerable) and the work of Laurence Feininger before him whose research was the stimulus for this project.

.....