

## CHAPTER VII

### ANONYMOUS WORKS

The great number of anonymous Mass pieces in the sources of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries makes it impractical for us to discuss and analyze in detail each work, but an attempt will be made to survey the field with a certain degree of thoroughness in the minimum hope that a primary classification into Italian and non-Italian compositions can be determined. In order to cover all of the anonymous works and still stay within reasonable limitations of space we shall confine our remarks about the various compositions to only the most essential items, even if at times this will leave the reader with little or no conception of a piece as a whole. Nevertheless, if a certain work or aspect of a work is sufficiently unusual or interesting to seem to demand more extended treatment, we shall feel free to relax somewhat this general restriction upon detailed discussion.

The scope of the source material is as follows: all manuscripts containing anonymous polyphonic Mass pieces from the fourteenth and first half of the fifteenth centuries which are of Italian origin or which are not Italian but contain any music at all — not necessarily Mass pieces — by Italian composers are taken into consideration. There are five exceptions to this rule: no attempt has been made to deal with the large

number of anonymous Mass pieces in the voluminous later sources Ao, Tr, MBO,<sup>1</sup> Str, and OH, in none of which the Italian contribution appears to be significant. In each case all of the Mass pieces which are anonymous in a particular manuscript will be accounted for except those pieces the composers of which have been identified in the published inventory cited. (Thus, a piece will be listed here even if the composer has been identified elsewhere in the literature but not in the inventory cited.)

The sources fall into five unequal groups. The first contains examples of a class of polyphonic Mass pieces which cannot claim a great deal of interest or importance as artistic achievements but which must be included in our study for the sake of completeness. These pieces are the "primitive" compositions, found mostly — not exclusively — in manuscripts devoted primarily to plainchant. They are in the simplest two-voiced homorhythmic discant style. Some of the compositions are written in chant notation and others are mensural. The manuscripts in which these pieces are found are unified neither chronologically — they probably range throughout the two centuries, although it should be borne in mind that manuscripts of this sort are often peculiarly difficult to date — nor functionally( e.g., Ven II is a codex of extremely small dimensions which is primarily a lauda

---

<sup>1</sup>It is interesting to note that MBO contains a Kyrie (No. 110, ff. 58v-59) which is a contrafactum of Landini's ballata, Questa fanciulla.

collection for private devotion, the only manuscript of this sort under consideration). There are altogether eleven manuscripts in this "dis-cant group" as it now stands, but doubtless several others will be added after a more thorough search has been made.

Two other sources are so unlike all the others that each must be considered as forming a group by itself: Fol, which is stylistically and perhaps chronologically unique, and Fa, which contains instrumental Mass pieces.

The remaining manuscripts contain pieces in the main line of tra-dition, comparable to those we have studied by the various Italian masters. They may be divided chronologically into two groups: those of ca. 1400 or earlier (Pad, RB, RU<sub>1</sub>, Lo, and [probably] Perugia, Bib. Com., Ms III-12-4), and those of ca. 1420 or later (Mod II, EL, BU, Sie A, Sie B, MU L, Ven I, Kras, and St P).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The single remaining manuscript which has any connection with Italian Mass music is O, which leaves only one piece anonymous: the Patrem No. 2 (ff. 2v-4), ascribed to Binchois in EL.

### The Simple Discant Settings

A Credo for two voices in homorhythmic discant in a fifteenth century manuscript now preserved in the Seminario in Pisa was mentioned in the introduction.<sup>1</sup> It is written in black mensural notation. B. Stäblein has reported that a fragment of a fourteenth century gradual from Italy (Bologna, Conservatorio di Musica "G. B. Martini," MS Q11) contains two settings of the Agnus in two parts.<sup>2</sup> Neither this nor the following five sources listed by M. Melnicki<sup>3</sup> have been available for study. According to the information she provides, all five contain two-part settings (identical?) of the same Kyrie melody, and all the manuscripts originated in two localities in Friuli: three from Cividale,

Cividale, Museo Archeol., MS LVIII, fol. 230  
(second half of 14th century)  
Cividale, Museo Archeol., MS LVI, fol. 218  
(14th century)  
Cividale, Museo Archeol., MS LXXIX, fol. 132v  
(15th century)

and two from Aquileia:

---

<sup>1</sup>Above, p. 9. MGG, II, Pl. 59 reproduces fols. 89v-90, which has the sections: "Crucifixus... dexteram patris." The folio numbers for the complete piece are not given.

<sup>2</sup>"Agnus Dei," MGG, I, col. 153.

<sup>3</sup>Op. cit., pp. 78f. and 134ff. See above, p. 5, note 4.

Gorz, Seminario Maggiore, MS J, fol. 232v  
(14th or 15th century)  
Venice, Bib. Naz. Marciana, MS LIII 125, fol. 45v  
(15th century)

Another manuscript, Parma C, has received little attention since it was listed by G. Gasperini and N. Pellicelli in their catalogue of the musical holdings of the Parma libraries.<sup>1</sup> This is a large fifteenth-century choir book, beautifully copied, entitled Libro del Te Deum e Chirie del Tempo Pasquale. The main parts of the collection are Gregorian, written on five four-line staves per page, but at the end of the Kyriale section there are two settings of the Credo in black mensural notation (also written on four-line staves). The first is monophonic, and the second is for two equal voices, one of which has the same melody as the monophonic piece.

<u>Parma C</u>	ff. 136-140	Credo 1 <sup>1</sup>
<u>Parma C</u>	ff. 140v-148	Credo 2 <sup>2</sup>

An example taken from this mensural discant will serve as an illustration

---

<sup>1</sup>Associazione dei Musicologi Italiani, Catalogo generale delle opere musicali; I: Città di Parma. (Parma, 1909-11), pp. 56f. The account of the polyphonic pieces is both incomplete and inaccurate.

of the style in general. (The cantus firmus is in the part written on the higher staff.)<sup>1</sup>

Ex. 123. Beginning of Credo, Parma C, ff. 140v-148

o: d

Cre-do in unum de-um Pa- trem om-ni-po-ten-tem fac-to-

Pa- trem om-ni-po-ten-tem fac-to-

-rem ce-li et ter- re vi-si-bi-li-um

-rem ce-li et ter- re vi-si-bi-li-um

Before the main body of the manuscript are five (unnumbered) folios of which the first is the title page and the last (recto and verso) contains an old index. The remainder have, on six five-line staves in black mensural notation by a different hand from that of the main body of the manuscript:

<sup>1</sup>The accidentals on b are given in the form in which they appear in the original manuscript. This sign is often used as a flat in polyphonic sources (particularly French) of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but it would appear to be used as a natural in the present case — the only example of such a use known to the writer.

Parma C [ff. lv-4 of fascicle at beginning] Patrem 2<sup>2</sup>

One of the voices has the melody of the Credo GR IV — this melody was a favorite for simple discant settings of this type — slightly elaborated with short figurations from time to time. A later hand has added a large number of accidentals and also some tiny extra notes in white notation, apparently as third and fourth parts for a few chords as well as for the entire Amen melisma.

The manuscript ends with a quinterno written by a hand (obviously accustomed to writing only plainchant) which is similar to the one which wrote the main part of the collection. (Not all of the plainchant fascicles are by the same hand.) This time there are four five-line staves per page:

Parma C ff. [165v-174] Credo 2<sup>2</sup>

One of the voices is the same as the one which had the cantus firmus (GR IV) in the Credo at the beginning of the manuscript, except that the breve and long rests between every short phrase there are now lacking, and double bars close off each period (versus). A semicircle with a vertical line through it shows that the piece is to be sung in diminution. All this is explained by a marking at the head of one of the voices: Cantatur per medium et absque pausa usque ad finem cuiuslibet versus. The Amen is changed to sesquialtera proportion ( $\frac{3}{2}$ ) in one voice.

The last page of the manuscript has a piece in white notation by the same hand:

Parma C f. [174v] Deo gratias [5<sup>4</sup>?] (accompanied canon)

It carries the marking: Fuga duorum temporum ex tenore in prolatione minori temporis imperfecti, and is quite different in style from the simple discant settings. Over an obviously instrumental lowest part which consists of nothing but the alternation of the two deep tones F and c in breves, a very short canon unfolds. It is probably a circle canon which can accommodate up to four or more entrances — one cannot be certain because the end of the part is difficult to read.

Rome, Bib. Ap. Vat., MS Barb. lat. 657 contains a Kyriale of the fifteenth or sixteenth century added to a fourteenth century Roman Missal.<sup>1</sup> A two-part setting in black mensural notation of the same cantus firmus that was used in Parma C ff. 140v-148 (Ex. 123) is found. The second voice is quite different from the one in Parma C.

Rome, Bib. Ap. Vat., MS Barb. lat. 657, ff. 419v-423 Credo 2<sup>2</sup>

Following this (ff. 423v-425) is a monophonic version of the Credo GR I, also in black mensural notation.

Ven is a composite fifteenth-century manuscript consisting of two independent parts<sup>2</sup> of which the second is one of the most important

---

<sup>1</sup>See H.H. Bannister, Monumenti vaticani di paleografia musicale latina (Rome, 1913), pp. 185 and 189.

<sup>2</sup>Description of manuscript and inventory of Part II in K. Jeppesen, "Ein venezianisches Laudenmanuskript," Theodor Kroyer-Festschrift, ed. H. Zenck, et al. (Regensburg, 1933), pp. 69ff. Inventory of Part I in Bessler, AMW, VII (1925), 236f.



sources for the lauda. Both the style and the writing of the music of Part II are crude and amateurish, and probably originated in a Franciscan community some place in the Veneto. Near the beginning of Part II there is a homorhythmic setting in plainchant notation of the *Benedicamus*

Ven II f.93 *Benedicamus* 2<sup>2</sup>

with the melody (transposed) of GR II in the upper voice.

### Fol

The fragment which was recently discovered in Foligno by Hans David has not yet been described in print. This unusual and provocative source is a double folio from a manuscript of uncertain origin but which was probably North Italian or South Germanic. The writing of the text, which is quite Gothic and employs many abbreviations, looks unlike other Italian manuscripts. The music is written on eight five-line staves per page.

- |                 |                               |                                    |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| No. 1 (ff.1-1v) | Et in terra 3 <sup>3</sup>    | (two lower voices incomplete)      |
| No. 2 (f. 2)    | Et in terra[3 <sup>3</sup> ?] | (ends of two voices only)          |
| No. 3 (f. 2v)   | Et in terra[2 <sup>2</sup> ?] | (one complete upper voice only)    |
| No. 4 (f. 2v)   | Et in terra[2 <sup>2</sup> ?] | (beginning only of an upper voice) |

All the pieces use the note forms of longs, breves, and semi-breves, as well as several forms of ligatures. In addition, fols. 2 and 2v use the note form of a minima and fol. 2v uses the major semi-breve with downward tail. Points of division are often found, most

consistently on fol. 2v. Nos. 2, 3, and 4 can be understood in one of the other senaria division, but No. 1 does not appear to be mensural. The counterpoint is almost exclusively one-against-one, but there are frequent contradictions in the note forms of the various parts (breve against semibreve, etc.). In two cases, however, semibreves in ligature are used in the usual way against breves. It seems likely that the irregularities are the result of copyist's errors. If the notes do not have mensural significance, what is the purpose of the points of division? The composition is divided by double bar lines (written in the form of two breve rests) into numerous brief sections.

Since the lower part of No. 2 is written above the higher part on fol. 2, a comparison with No. 1 (which has the lowest part second on both pages) results in the conclusion that No. 2 was also for three voices, and that what remains are the ends of the tenor and the contra-tenor (higher in range). There are few points, if any — it is difficult to know from a photograph —, and the style suggests some of the early Mass pieces of Iv. The prevailing near-homorhythmic of the two parts is occasionally broken by rests of a long in one of the parts; these rests become quite numerous in the Amen section.

Fol Nos. 3 and 4 also bring to mind the French style of the first half of the fourteenth century, though the frequent points of

division and major semibreves point in the direction of Italian notation.

Ex. 124. Beginning of Et in terra, Fol No. 3  
(one voice only)



As further evidence for the Italian origin of the manuscript, we may also note the spelling "mondi" for "mundi" twice in No. 3 (although this could point as well to French provenance).

Fol is a most interesting source, one that will be studied carefully by all who are interested in the development of fourteenth century Italian notation. Some of the music, particularly No. 1, may well come from as early as the first quarter of the century, although it should be emphasized that it is hazardous to attempt to date a manuscript fragment which has so many unusual features. Even if it should come from later in the fourteenth century, however, the importance of the manuscript is great in the context of Italian music for the Ordinary of the Mass. The musical styles (as much of them as we are able to glimpse from the fragmentary evidence) are in themselves of no great significance, but the fact that an early fourteenth century Italian manuscript which was obviously designed for practical use contained

what must have been a whole group of polyphonic Ordinary settings — there would probably have been several more settings of the Gloria on the one or more double folios between fols. 1v and 2, and perhaps others before fol. 1 and after fol. 2v — this fact throws a new light on the problem of the history of polyphony for the Ordinary of the Mass in fourteenth-century Italy.

### Fa

The extensive and important collection of keyboard music which forms the older part of the Faenza codex was probably written down about 1420 in North Italy.<sup>1</sup> Five settings of parts of the Ordinary of the Mass have been identified, two Kyrie-Gloria pairs and an unconnected Kyrie.

ff. 2-3 [Kyrie]  
ff. 3v-5 [Et in terra] (incomplete)  
ff. 77-79 [Kyrie]  
ff. 79v-81v [Et in terra]  
ff. 88-88vv Kyrie

Since Flamenac has discussed these compositions in detail and has published two of the Kyrie settings,<sup>2</sup> it is unnecessary for us to duplicate

---

<sup>1</sup>Description and inventory: D. Flamenac, "Keyboard music of the 14th century in Codex Faenza 117," *JAMS*, IV (1951), 179ff.; see also idem, "New light on Faenza Codex 117," Report of the Vth Congress of the International Musicological Society, Utrecht, 1952 (Amsterdam, 1953), pp. 310ff.

<sup>2</sup>The Kyrie on ff. 77-79 is transcribed ibid., pp. 322ff., and the Kyrie on ff. 88-88v in *JAMS*, IV (1951), 193. Photographs of the two pieces are included in the respective articles. A complete facsimile edited by A. Garapetyan is in progress. ("The Codex Faenza, Biblioteca Comunale, 117 [Fa]," *IB*, XIII [1959], 79ff.)

his descriptions. We shall only recall that each piece is based on a cantus firmus: either the Kyrie or Gloria of GR Mass IV, and only alternate verses are included in the two Kyrie-Gloria pairs, leaving the remainder to be sung in plainchant or discant. Later fifteenth century German sources show this alternatim technique to be standard,<sup>1</sup> and we have cited earlier a report by Villani which shows that such a procedure was used in the Cathedral in Florence in the first half of the fourteenth century.<sup>2</sup>

Pad

The late fourteenth century Paduan fragments include sacred works by Italian and foreign composers in about equal number.<sup>3</sup> The composers of eight Mass pieces (not counting No. 7, which is a partial duplication of No. 11) have not been identified.

---

<sup>1</sup>See L. Schrade, "Die Messe in der Orgelmusik des 15. Jahrhunderts," Archiv für Musikforschung, I (1936), 129ff; idem, "The organ in the Mass of the 15th century," AM, XXVIII (1942), 325ff., 457ff.

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 78.

<sup>3</sup>Description and inventory: Bessler, AMM, VII (1925), 228f. and VIII (1926), 233 ff. See the remarks about the manuscript above, pp. 116f.

- No. 2 (MS 1475, f. 2v) Agnus 3<sup>3</sup> (fragmentary)  
No. 3 (MS 1475, f. 2v) Sanctus [2<sup>2</sup>?] (one fragmentary voice only)  
No. 7 (MS 1475, f. 4v) Clementie pax bajula [3<sup>1</sup>] (tenor and contratenor only, fragmentary) = Pad No. 11, RB p. 5, staves 1-4 (fragmentary)  
No. 11 (MS 1475, f. 3v, 5-5v) Et in terra...clementie pax bajula 3<sup>1</sup> = Pad No. 7, RB p. 5, staves 1-4 (both fragmentary)  
No. 13 (MS 1475, f. 1) Et in terra [a ?] (tenor only)  
No. 21 (MS 684, f. 2) Et in terra...qui sonitu melodie [3<sup>1</sup>] (tenor and contratenor only) = Iv No. 50, Ipt No. 7, EF No. 2, Str No. 60  
No. 24 (Oxford MS, f. 53) Sanctus [3<sup>3</sup>?] (one upper voice and second half of tenor only)  
No. 25 (Oxford MS, f. 53v) Benedicamus domino 2<sup>2</sup>  
No. 29 (Oxford MS, f. 55) Et in terra [3<sup>2</sup>?] (one upper voice only)

No.

The Agnus/2 follows the Sanctus No. 1 by "Sant. omer" and it is

in exactly the same style -- homorhythmic counterpoint in modal rhythm --, so the two give the appearance of constituting a set of paired movements. Perhaps "Sant. omer" is the composer of both pieces; at any rate, there is no reason to consider the Agnus as by an Italian composer. Concordances show that another piece, the troped Gloria No. 21, is a work from the Avignon repertory.

Three compositions must be classified as probably French on the basis of style, although here and with many other compositions to be considered later we must always bear in mind that our analytical tools do not possess the degree of subtlety which would enable us to distinguish between French compositions and those by Italians working well within the French style. We have often had occasion to remark in the course of this

study that certain works by Italian composers were written completely within a French or Netherlandish idiom.<sup>1</sup> Knowing this, we can never be quite certain about the foreign origin of a particular composition which does not show any Italian features at all, but it would be useless to speculate on the question. Perhaps some small assurance can be gained from the thought that the compiler of a manuscript in Italy is less likely to know the names of the composers of the pieces if these composers are French. The first of the three compositions referred to is No. 13, which has the appearance of being the tenor of one of the simple cantilena-style Mass pieces in Iy or Apt. Another is No. 29, the second cantus part of an Et in terra in which the two upper voices alternated the verses of the text, as in the troped Et in terra Pad No. 4 by Egardus<sup>2</sup> (although the present example is not isorhythmic in the extant part and probably was not in the missing tenor). The third is the Et in terra No. 11 (= No. 7) with the trope "Clementie pax bajula" (an addition to "spiritus et alme"). This composition has been published by de Van as an Italian work,<sup>3</sup> although stylistically it belongs with the cantilena-style pieces from Avignon. It is yet another example of beginning the highest voice with a version of the Gloria GR IX, but without continuing

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., the Et in terra by Grazioso da Padova (see above, p.122), or the three Mass pieces by Antonio da Cividale (p. 315).

<sup>2</sup>See above, pp. 146ff.

<sup>3</sup>Les monuments de l'Eglise Nova, pp. 31ff.

to draw upon the chant.<sup>1</sup> The handling of the tropes divide the piece into fairly uniform short sections of eighteen or twenty breves each: sections with the liturgical text plus "Spiritus et alme" alternate with sections with "Clementie pax bajula." No. 7 has the two lower parts of alternate sections only (those which have the "Clementie pax bajula" trope).<sup>2</sup>

Of the eight anonymous Mass pieces in Pad, then, only three appear to be Italian. No. 3 is a single fragmentary voice of a Sanctus which may be the tenor of a two-part composition in the madrigal style of the Mass compositions in P. It is written in duodenaria and octonaria divisions in longa-notation without letters or points. The burst of fast notes at the beginning of the second "Sanctus" signals the Italian provenance of the work. If it is not in two-part madrigal style, it may possibly be in the closely related three- or four-part elaborated discant style such as that seen in the Sanctus Pad No. 27 by "Mediolano."<sup>3</sup>

The fragmentary Sanctus No. 24 is unequivocally Italian with its expansive melismatic style of the older madrigalists. Although the two parts remaining could very well be considered complete, the arrangement

---

<sup>1</sup>Notwithstanding Ficker, "Die frühen Messenkompositionen der Trienter Codices," SZGW, XI (1924), 5.

<sup>2</sup>The fact that the lower voices of No. 7 are on the verso rather than the recto leads to the question whether the vocal part was given at all for No. 7. Perhaps the sectional arrangement was intended for the antiphonal performance of two groups, but it is impossible for Nos. 7 and 11 themselves to be used simultaneously since they were in the same codex -- old folios 44v and 47v-48v.

<sup>3</sup>See above, pp. 136ff.



on the page makes it likely that a third (highest) voice has been lost along with the beginning of the tenor. Letters (.o., s.p., .d., .n.), points of division, and special note forms are used consistently. The high quality of this composition causes one to regret very much that it is incomplete, and if it is true that it was originally in three parts, it is the unique example of a Mass piece in such a three-part madrigal style.

The Bendicamus No. 25 uses the letters .s.i. and points of division. The lower part has the same cantus firmus that Paolo Tenorista da Firenze used, here notated entirely in longs. Thus, the basic procedure of figured discant over a uniformly moving tenor is identical with that used by Paolo,<sup>1</sup> although Pad No. 25 does not have changes of divisions and is in a generally simpler and more regular style, even if we do not consider the obvious fact of the fewer number of voices.

RE

Since this manuscript<sup>2</sup> has been cited in the literature with various page and folio numbers, it will be useful to show how these numbers collate with the present markings. One double folio is cut horizontally into two strips (marked a and b):

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 110ff.

<sup>2</sup>Described in Bessler, AFM, VII (1925), 228.

p. 1a + 1b = fol. 1 or fol. 223 or [Besseler] fol. 2  
p. 2a + 2b = fol. 1v or fol. 223v or [Besseler] fol. 2v  
p. 3a + 3b = fol. 2 or fol. 224  
p. 4a + 4b = fol. 2v or fol. 224v  
p. 5 = fol. 3 or fol. 225 or [Besseler] fol. 1  
p. 6 = fol. 3v or fol. 225v or [Besseler] fol. 1v

Of the four settings of the Et in terra (three troped) which the fragments contain, that on page 5, staves 1-4, consists of the two lower parts of the end of Pad No. 11 (with a different, extended Amen), a piece which we have already classified as probably French. As nearly as one can tell from the fragmentary conditions of the other works -- extreme for the two troped settings on pages 1 and 2 -- the three other pieces do not display any features which would lead one to conclude that they were written by Italian composers. Apparently it is the concordance with Pad No. 11 which has led Besseler<sup>1</sup> and Korte<sup>2</sup> to classify the fragment as a "Paduan" manuscript, but it is more likely that FB preserves a French repertory and should not be included among the sources of Italian music at all. (Incidentally, the piece on page 1 contains what is probably the earliest extant example of duo and chorus markings ["D." and "C."]).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid.

<sup>2</sup> Studie zur Geschichte der Musik in Italien..., pp. 6f.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Bukofzer, Studies in medieval and Renaissance music, p. 178, note 5.

RU<sub>1</sub>

Fischer has conjectured that RU<sub>1</sub> might be of peripheral Tuscan origin, ca. 1400.<sup>1</sup> The only composer's name to be found is for Je porte mielement by "Donatus," but the Kyrie summe clementissime from the French repertory is found in BarcB ascribed to "J. Graneti," and two other pieces are from the Mass cycle in P (Gherardello's Et in terra and Lorenzo's Sanctus).<sup>2</sup> One monophonic and three polyphonic Mass pieces remain.

- No. 1 (ff. 84v-85) Patrem 1<sup>1</sup>
- No. 3 (ff. 87v-88) Sanctus 2<sup>2</sup>
- No. 7 ( f. 90v ) Kyrie ["rondello"] 3<sup>3</sup>
- No. 8 (ff. 91v-92) Et in terra 2<sup>2</sup> (incomplete)

The Patrem is one of the very simple monophonic settings in mensural notation which are sometimes seen in manuscripts of this period.<sup>3</sup> Ludwig has already stated that the marking "rondello" for the Kyrie No. 7 obviously refers to the rondeau-like two-sectioned construction of the piece, and could well indicate a contrafactum of a French song (as yet unidentified).<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Studien zur italienischen Musik..., p. 97.

<sup>2</sup> Description and inventory of RU<sub>1</sub>: Bessler, ADMW, VII (1925), 226f.

<sup>3</sup> See above, pp. 350 and 353.

<sup>4</sup> Guillaume de Machaut, Musikalische Werke, II, 24, note 1.

Both the Sanctus No. 3 and the Et in terra No. 8 are in the madrigal style of the Florentine masters. Letters and points of division are employed, with changes of meter in certain sections, but with quaternaria grouped in perfect mode (diminished, equal to duodenaria) predominating. The mixture of points of division and points of addition — even in a very simply passage — is apt to give a momentary fright to anyone who had been dealing just previously with the subtleties of French syncope:

Ex. 125. Beginning of Sanctus, RU<sub>1</sub> No. 3

The two voices alternate short phrases in the Et in terra No. 8:

"Laudamus te. Benedicimus te. Adoramus te. Glorificamus te." and

again later: "Quoniam tu solus sanctus. Tu solus dominus." The final

(incomplete) section begins with a long melisma in imitation, quite like the ritornello of a caccia.

Ex. 126. End of *Et in terra*, RU<sub>1</sub>, No. 8

The image shows a musical score for two voices, likely soprano and alto, in a two-part setting. The score is written on four staves. The top two staves are vocal lines, and the bottom two staves are likely lute tablature. The lyrics are: "spi-ri-tu." and "spi-ri-tu." The word "Cum" is written above the first two staves. The music features a long melisma in imitation, with a key signature of one flat (B-flat) and a common time signature. The notation includes various rhythmic values and accidentals, such as a sharp sign on the second staff.

This Gloria is for two equal high voices, a disposition we have seen before only in Lorenzo's *Sanctus*. Perhaps it is no coincidence that one follows the other in the manuscript (discounting the brief *Kyrie eleison* on fol. 80v); *Sanctus*, fols. 90v-91; *Et in terra*, fols. 91v-92. Stylistically, the two have a number of points in common -- one may note especially the openings and the unisons at "Gracias agimus tibi" --, so we may tentatively assign also the *Et in terra* to Lorenzo.

Lo

Aside from a monophonic Kyrie in mensural notation, there are three Mass pieces in Lo, all anonymous.<sup>1</sup>

- No. 52 (ff. 36v-38) Cantano gl'angioliati santus — Santus 3<sup>3</sup>  
No. 115 (f. 81v) Kyrie 1<sup>1</sup>  
No. 116 (ff. 82v-83) Et in terra 3<sup>1</sup>  
No. 117 (ff. 83v-85) Patrem 3<sup>1</sup>

Fischer has proposed a date of ca. 1400 or shortly thereafter for the compilation of the manuscript, and the large number of works by Nicoló da Perugia (here called "Nicholo del Proposto") has led him to associate the codex with Perugia. The Gloria-Credo pair is written by a completely different (and much more skillful) hand than the one which wrote the main body of the codex, and is generally within the flowing French cantilena style of the later fourteenth century. This is especially true of the Patrem, which gives no hint that it is not of French origin. The Et in terra, on the other hand, has certain details which seem characteristic of Italian music: quick declamation on one tone repeated several times, and a long melisma with fast figurations on "no[-bis]." Also, in two sections the meter is changed (by means of red notes), but the change is in the vocal part only, leaving the two

---

<sup>1</sup>Description and inventory: G. Reaney, "The manuscript London, British Museum, Additional 29987 (Lo)," MD, XII (1952), 67ff. The Et in terra No. 116 is transcribed pp. 88ff.

instrumental parts to continue in the same breve-semibreve motion as before, so that the result is rather more a change of subdivisions within a constant pulse than a basic change of meter. This is close in effect to the frequent changes of division in Italian music for the sake of variety of figuration.

Even with these Italian features, however, it is clear that the basic source is the French cantilena style. There are several syncopations and small rhythmic irregularities such as one could find in a (modest) manneristic work, to which we could add the prominent use of fermata-chords. The total impression which one receives is that of an Italian working within the French style. The piece is rather similar to several of the Mass pieces in Mod, and of all the composers whom we have studied, the most likely to have written this composition is Matteo da Perugia. However, a carelessness in the handling of the counterpoint — the contratenor would seem to have been added to the tenor with little thought of how it would fit with the cantus — casts doubt on the possibility of Matteo's authorship, for this composer was usually more careful in this matter. Incidentally, the fact that a comparable degree of contrapuntal roughness is not to be seen in the *Patrem* strengthens our belief that the two works were not written by the same composer.

There can, of course, be no doubt whether the composer of the *Sanctus*-motet No. 52 was Italian. This work, written in an extremely

melismatic style which is derived from the madrigal, is one of the most interesting in the entire repertory. The musical style alone would be sufficient to claim our attention, but the composition is even more remarkable when we take the text into consideration, for this is one of the very rare examples of an Italian motet from the fourteenth century. The two upper voices have a trope in Italian, referable to the Preface which introduces the Sanctus in the Mass, while the tenor has the liturgical text (without cantus firmus). Fischer has called attention to the madrigal-like construction of the trope.<sup>1</sup>

Cantano gl'angioliati santus, santus, santus;  
Dominus deus la cui gloria  
In ciel'e'n terra laudandosi storia.

Cantate osanna, benedictus, santus, santus,  
qui venit in nomine domini,  
[Pede, speranza,] Et chari[-tá] degl'omini.

Benedecto sia quel dolce chanto,  
Tu che portast[-i] lo spirito santo.

The constant play of little figurations, with the interest tossed back and forth between all three parts, creates a lively and vivid

---

<sup>1</sup> Studien zur italienischen Musik..., p. 75. See his reference to a similar case of troping in a lauda by Bianco da Siena. The text above follows the spelling of Cantus I (with punctuation added) except for the passages in brackets, which are missing in that voice. This is but one example of the great carelessness with which both the text and the music of this manuscript was copied. A further example is that the page turn of this composition occurs approximately, but not exactly, at the same place in the three voices.



texture. The frequent rests in the various parts almost never coincide, so that there is much overlapping of phrases. It is interesting to note how the imitation which is found in the successive entries of the parts is never literal and is often so free that it could hardly be classified as imitation at all. This motet is quite exceptional in the Italian repertory, and close study does not diminish its fascination.

Perugia, Bib. Com., MS III-12-4

The second set of Perugia fragments are mentioned by Ghisi in his article about the early parody Mass.<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately, they have not been available for study, so we are forced to confine ourselves to reporting Ghisi's brief account. There are fragments of what appear to be three different settings of the Patrem on the two leaves, which Ghisi dates at the end of the fourteenth century.

- f. 1 recto Patrem a ? (beginning of cantus only)
- f. 1 verso Patrem a 3? (ends of tenor and contratenor only)
- f. 2 recto Patrem a ? (part of cantus only)

These fragments may or may not belong to the group of sources which includes Pad, RU<sub>1</sub>, and Lo. In any event, no further works of this group are to be found, and the large number of anonymous Mass pieces remaining all belong to those which are in the group of later sources.

---

<sup>1</sup>Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Musica Sacra, Roma, 1950,  
p. 308.

Mod

All of the anonymous Mass pieces in Mod are in the first gathering, which, together with the last, makes up the more recent part of the codex. This section is closely associated with Matteo da Perugia, and Pirrotta has conjectured that it was assembled under his direction in the third decade of the fifteenth century.<sup>1</sup> Matteo is named as the composer of four of the thirteen compositions in the first gathering; all of the remainder are anonymous. These include a Latin motet, two French secular pieces, and two contratenors to secular pieces, but the main body of the gathering is devoted to the liturgical works:

- No. 3 (ff. 2v-3) Et in terra... spiritus et alme 4<sup>2</sup>
- No. 4 (ff. 3v-4) Et in terra 4<sup>2</sup>(4?) or 3<sup>2</sup>
- No. 7 (ff. 5v-6v) Patrem 3<sup>1</sup>
- No. 9 (ff. 7v-9) Patrem 3<sup>1</sup>

Pirrotta has stated that these anonymous works are probably Italian,<sup>2</sup> but Fano goes further: he ascribed all of them to

---

<sup>1</sup>"Il codice estense lat. 568 e la musica francese in Italia al principio del '400," Atti della Reale Accademia di Scienze, Lettere e Arti di Palermo, Ser. IV, Vol. V, parte II (1940), p. 154. This article (pp. 101ff.) is a description, inventory, and analysis of Mod. A more detailed inventory may be found in F. Fano, Le origini e il primo maestro di cappella: Matteo da Perugia, Part I of La cappella musicale del Duomo di Milano, edited by G. Cesari ("Istituzioni e momenti dell'arte musicale italiana," Nuova serie, Vol. I; Milan, 1956), pp. 112ff.

<sup>2</sup>"Il codice estense...", loc. cit., pp. 140ff. Cf. Ludwig, "Die mehrstimmige Messe des 14. Jahrhunderts," AMW, VII (1925), 424.

Matteo.<sup>1</sup> From the point of view of style, Matteo is, indeed, the most likely composer. Still, a disturbing factor is the question why Matteo was not named as the composer of these pieces if that is the case. Mod carefully gives Matteo's name (or "idem") for thirty-one pieces and even assigns a contratenor to him. In the first gathering his name is found for Nos. 1-2 (fols. 1-2) and Nos. 11-12 (fols. 9v-10), but nowhere else. In a manuscript so closely associated with Matteo, the fact that Nos. 3-10 (fols. 2v-9) are left anonymous would seem to be an argument against Fano's proposal that these pieces be attributed to that composer. The stylistic evidence, nevertheless, is impressive, and the present writer declares himself to be as convinced as he can ever be by purely stylistic arguments — which is none too much — that Fano is correct.

The troped Gloria No. 3 has two freely-flowing upper voices, often with little imitations at the beginnings of phrases, over instrumental lower parts in canon ("Tenor faciens contratenorem"). The place where the contratenor enters is marked with a small numeral "8" above the appropriate tenor note, indicating a rest of eight breves. Similarly, the Amen tenor is marked with the numeral "3." Handschin has tried to show that there are references to a cantus firmus in this composition,<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Op. cit., ff. 17ff. The four anonymous Mass pieces are transcribed in this publication.

<sup>2</sup>"zur Frage der melodischen Paraphrasierung im Mittelalter," EMW, X (1928), 552ff.

but it cannot be affirmed that his demonstration is very convincing.

The Et in terra No. 4 is isorhythmic, and is provided with an alternate (non-isorhythmic) solus tenor. The upper parts have five periods of eighteen breves each, and the beginnings of the periods are numbered in the manuscript — the only example of such a procedure known to the present writer. The tenor has the melody of the (first) Agnus Dei Gr XVII arranged in three isorhythmic periods (the last incomplete), and then both the tenor and the contratenor (not isorhythmic) are repeated in diminution. The contratenor is in imperfect mode and the tenor in perfect mode, indicated by the numerals "2" and "3" respectively at the beginnings of the parts.<sup>1</sup>

We have remarked in connection with Matteo's motet Ave sanctus mundi salus that the presence of an Agnus Dei cantus firmus could well

---

<sup>1</sup>Fano (op. cit., pp. 428f.) mentions this possibility, but declares that the tenor is not consistently in perfect mode, and that the rules of alteration, imperfection, and syncopation cannot explain the numeral or the red notes and points. It is true that the notation of the tenor displays that love of academic skill which we have already observed in one of Matteo's works — see above, p. 186 — and can hardly be called obvious to the interpreter, but Fano is in error when he states that the notation is faulty. A copy of this tenor and an interpretation of the notation was published by de Van ("La pédagogie musicale du moyen-âge," ibid., II [1948], 86; although the latter's ingenious explanation of why the first rest of a long is not red like the others may be disregarded; as a matter of fact, the rest is red in the manuscript). Probably the clearest understanding of the notation of the tenor may be had by considering the red notes and rests of a long (there are six altogether) as one level of syncopation, and the displacements caused by the points as another. (This might have been the reason the numeral "3" was placed over the first breve rather than before the rest as in the contratenor.)

have been due to the lack of an Agnus in the Ambrosian Mass, so that the question of liturgical conflict would not arise.<sup>1</sup> This explanation is even more necessary in the present case, for it is most unlikely that the mixture of two different parts of the Ordinary of the Mass would have been tolerated by Church authorities. Indeed, we may count this as one more bit of evidence that this anonymous Mass piece, if not written by Matteo himself, was at least written for the Milanese service and was not taken from some other Italian or foreign collection. As in Matteo's motet, the words of the Agnus Dei are written out under the notes, but it is probable that the text is there merely for the purpose of identification and that the tenor and contratenor (the latter also marked "Agnus dei," although only the first few notes are taken from the chant) were intended for instruments.

This Et in terra No. 4 is one of the most intricate formal constructions in the repertory of medieval music. At no point from the beginning of the piece until its end do the divisions between the isorhythmic periods in the upper voices coincide with those of the tenor. Added to the isorhythm is the usual free variation in the upper voices when the lower parts repeat in diminution. All this does not obstruct an almost constant play of light and easy imitation between the upper voices throughout the course of the piece. The whole represents a technical

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 191f.

achievement of high order, rather in a class with Matteo's Ave sancta mundi salus, although the latter has a simplicity and musical directness about it which makes the solution of technical difficulties seem effortless, and must be judged a more significant work of art.

The Patrem No. 7 and the Patrem No. 9 are both in the same cantilena style, one that is not dissimilar to that of Matteo's Et in terra, Mod No. 2.<sup>1</sup> Both works feature changes of mensuration in the large sections, and No. 7 has a typically Italian brief passage in diminished imperfect time with minor prolation (2 x 2/8) while the accompanying parts continue in the preceding 6/8 time.

HL

It is surprising how few works are left anonymous in a manuscript as large as HL.<sup>2</sup> Of a total of one hundred and forty-six polyphonic pieces for the Ordinary of the Mass, only twenty-three are not assigned to a composer in the codex. The proportion of works

---

<sup>1</sup> See above, pp. 165ff.

<sup>2</sup> Inventory: G. de Van, "Inventory of manuscript Bologna Liceo musicale, Q15 (olim 37)," MD, II (1948), 231ff. It is regrettable that there are so many printing errors in this catalogue. The most important correction for our purposes is to point out that old fols. 176 and 177 are bound at the beginning of the manuscript before fol. 1, and that the anonymous Et in terra on fols. 176v-177 should be de Van's (and old) No. 1. Bessler (Bourdon und Fauxbourdon [Leipzig, 1950], p. 11) identified the work as a duplication of No. 80 by Jean Legerant. Note that the first column in the inventory carries the old numbering of pieces which is found in the manuscript, and the second carries the new (de Van's) numbering.

assigned to Italian composers in comparison with Northerners is small: nineteen Italian to one hundred and four foreign (including seven by Ciconia). It is also instructive to note how many of the twenty-three anonymous Mass pieces have been identified by concordances with other manuscripts as works of Northerners: sixteen, if we count No. 83 as a work of Bosquet instead of Nicolò da Capua.<sup>1</sup> Aside from this doubtful No. 83, none of the anonymous works is assigned to an Italian composer in another manuscript.

- No. 1 (old No. 1, ff. 176v-177) Et in terra 3<sup>1</sup>  
= BL No. 80; Ae ff. 36v-37 and 74v-76; Jo. Le Grant  
No. 3 (old No. 3, ff. 1v-2) Kyrie 3<sup>3</sup>  
No. 79 (old No. 102, ff. 100v-101) Et in terra 3<sup>1</sup>  
No. 81 (old No. 105, ff. 103v-104) Et in terra 3<sup>1</sup>  
No. 82 (old Nos. 106-107, ff. 104v-106) Patrem 3<sup>1</sup>  
No. 146 (old No. 181, ff. 158v-159) Et in terra 3<sup>2</sup>  
No. 159 (ff. 178v-180) Kyrie O sacra virgo beata 3<sup>1</sup>  
No. 165 (old No. 200, ff. 187v-189) Et in terra 3<sup>2</sup>

The Kyrie No. 3 is grouped with a Gloria and Credo by Ciconia and a Sanctus and Agnus by Arnold de Lantins to form a Mass for the Virgin. The Gloria and Sanctus are troped, and the Kyrie, Sanctus, and Agnus employ cantus firmi in the tenors which are taken from GR Mass IX. The tenor of the Kyrie has the melody either as a succession of breves or alternating semibreves and breves, above which the upper voices weave in constant figuration, rather like the simple style of elaborated discant

---

<sup>1</sup> See above, pp.

which may be seen in the Kyrie Apt No. 1.<sup>1</sup> French mensuration signs (including a half-circle with a point in the center and with a vertical line through it) are used, and the last chord of each section is marked with a fermata sign. The composition is probably by a Northerner.

The Et in terra No. 79 and the interrelated Gloria-Credo pair Nos. 81-82, together with the Et in terra No. 80 by Jean Legrant, form a group of works on fols. 100v-106 which are written by a different hand than the one which wrote the main body of the codex. This hand is seen in several other places, notably in the three gatherings (XI, XII, and XX) which are later interpolations and the last two (XXVIII and XXIX), which contain hymns, sequences, and settings of the Magnificat. This hand is associated with Dufay and other Northern composers, especially with Johannes de Lymburgia, who figures so prominently in BL that we may assume a personal connection with the manuscript (somewhat analogous to Paolo Tenorista in respect to F or Matteo da Perugia in respect to Mod). The French cantilena style and the use of many fermata chords point toward French or Netherlandish composers.

The Et in terra No. 146 is in the most modest functional style of the Northern composers. It is set for two high voices which alternate

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 39f. The troped Kyrie Apt No. 11 by De Fronciaco uses the same tenor melody as BL No. 3 in a slightly less regular fashion, but the style is otherwise not the same.



phrases in the manner of a dialogue over instrumental tenor, and is marked by an extreme economy, with the syllables set to almost constant minims.

The Kyrie O sacra virgo beata No. 159 is on the lower halves of the same pages as Salve sancta parens by Lymburgia. The latter is an Introit of Masses for the Virgin,<sup>1</sup> and since the following Kyrie and Gloria are also for Marian Masses by Lymburgia and the general style corresponds, it is likely that Lymburgia also wrote No. 159. There is likewise no reason to assume on the basis of style that the Et in terra No. 165 is by an Italian. The presence of a text in the tenor as well as the cantus (with instrumental contratenor) does not in itself indicate Italian authorship, as may be seen in the Sanctus and Agnus Nos. 130-131 by Lymburgia.

The result of our survey of the seven anonymous Mass pieces in BL, then, is to conclude that all of them are probably the work of non-Italian composers.

---

<sup>1</sup>See Gr, p.[98]. The liturgical melody is in the tenor.

BU

Probably compiled for the use of a local chapel in Brescia, BU<sup>1</sup> contains a higher proportion of anonymous works than does the comparable collection HL. Of thirty-three polyphonic Mass Ordinary pieces, eleven are ascribed in the manuscript to composers who are probably foreign, and only three to Italians. But even these three include the doubtful No. 11 by Nicoló da Capua and the composer Do. Vala, who may not be Italian.<sup>2</sup> Five of the anonymous Mass pieces are assigned to foreign composers in other sources, and only one (the Et in terra "Micinella" by Zacharia) to an Italian. Thirteen pieces remain:

- No. 4 (pp. 6-7) Et in terra 3<sup>2</sup>
- No. 5 (p. 7) Kyrie cunctipotens genitor 3<sup>2</sup>
- No. 9 (p. 11) Sanctus 2<sup>2</sup>
- No. 10 (pp. 12-13) Et in terra 3<sup>2</sup>
- No. 12 plus No. 15 (pp. 15 and 17) Kyrie laudes nostras 3<sup>1</sup>
- No. 18 (pp. 20-21) Patrem 3<sup>2</sup>
- No. 29 (pp. 38-41) Patrem 3<sup>2</sup>
- No. 31 (pp. 42-43) Sanctus deus pater 3<sup>2</sup>
- No. 33 (pp. 44-45) Agnus...alme pater 3<sup>2</sup>
- No. 49 (p. 67) Agnus 2<sup>2</sup>
- No. 58 (pp. 78-79) Sanctus admirabilis splendor 2<sup>2</sup>
- No. 82 (p. 109) Benedicamus 3<sup>1</sup>
- No. 91 (p. 114) Benedicamus cum trine vocis jubio 3<sup>1</sup>

The Et in terra No. 4 is a simple, functional piece in the conservative style of many pieces in Apt. There is almost constant semi-breve motion, varied by semibreve plus minim. One should not attach

---

<sup>1</sup>Description and inventory: H. Bessler, "The manuscript Bologna Biblioteca Universitaria 2216," MD, VI (1952), 39ff.

<sup>2</sup>See above, pp. 328ff. and 341ff.

importance to the fact that the tenor is provided with words here (and in several other pieces) for this is a feature of the manuscript. Several compositions in BU which have texts in both the cantus and tenor but not in the contratenor are provided with texts in only the cantus in BL and Q.

The troped Kyrie No. 5 is constructed of three variations of the same musical period. The style is the simple cantilena of the Dufay period, a style which is even more evident in the troped Kyrie No. 12.<sup>1</sup>

The Patrem No. 18 forms its tenor from the cantus by reading the latter at the lower fifth with doubled note values (until the Amen), and a "triplum" with text is added above. A canon in the left margin of page 20 explains the procedure. The style is not Italian.

The Et in terra No. 10 and the group of pieces on pages 38-45 (Patrem No. 29, troped Sanctus No. 31, and troped Agnus No. 33) are musically interrelated movements which obviously belonged together at one time in a Mass cycle which has now been partly dismembered. These movements, moreover, are also related to the Kyrie No. 8 (p. 10) by Reson, so we may attribute the entire cycle to that composer. Note that BU has also broken up a cycle by Dufay (Nos. 7 and 26) and one by Arnold de

---

<sup>1</sup> That Nos. 12 and 15 belong together as one composition can be seen from the marking "volve" after the contratenor at the bottom of page 15, and also from the trope, which consists of three verses (Christe III, Christe I, and Kyrie III — although here they are given as Kyrie, Christe, Kyrie) of Kyrie "Rex virginum" (AH, XLVII, No. 8).

Lantins (Nos. 2, 3, and 27). Even if the style did not clearly indicate a Northerner, the presence of a Mass cycle would make it difficult to accept an Italian as a possible composer.

The two Benedicamus settings (Nos. 82 — a later addition — and 91), although written predominantly within a very simple French style, display a certain awkwardness in the counterpoint here and there, leading one to suspect that they were composed by local musicians with little technical skill. Since there is nothing "Italian" about the two pieces, however, we would be going too far to classify them as such. (After all, they could have been written by unskilled Northerners who happened to be in Italy as well as by unskilled Italians.)

The three compositions in only two parts remain. Two, although separated in the manuscript, appear to be musically interrelated: the Sanctus No. 9 and the Agnus No. 49. The style is identical, with two vocal parts, highly melismatic, quick figurations, and varied rhythms (including some special note forms), and quite a bit of imitation. Both pieces have places near the ends where each voice rests in turn while the other carries on alone for a short passage. Both pieces have cantus firmi in the tenors taken from GR Mass XVII, slightly decorated. These two chants are highly unified in themselves, and the figuration of the

two polyphonic pieces makes the correspondences even closer.

Ex. 127. Beginnings of a) Sanctus, BU No. 9;  
b) Agnus, BU No. 49

The image shows a musical score for two pieces, labeled a) and b). Both pieces are in 6/8 time, indicated by the '♩. ♪.' time signature. Piece a) consists of two staves. The upper staff begins with a treble clef and a common time signature, followed by a key signature change to two flats. The lower staff begins with an alto clef and a common time signature, followed by a key signature change to two flats. The lyrics 'San-ctus' are written below the notes. Piece b) also consists of two staves. The upper staff begins with a treble clef and a common time signature, followed by a key signature change to two flats. The lower staff begins with an alto clef and a common time signature, followed by a key signature change to two flats. The lyrics 'Agnus de-i' are written below the notes. The score shows a clear correspondence in the rhythmic patterns between the two pieces, particularly in the first few measures.

It is quite likely that this pair is by an Italian composer. The troped Sanctus No. 58 is more difficult to judge. Much simpler than the pair above — there are nothing but breves and semibreves in the tenor —, the slight figurations do not conceal the clear homorhythmic discant which is the basis of the counterpoint. A fondness for sequential patterns and the (instrumental ?) sudden rush of fast notes at the cadence at "sabaoth" are suggestive of Italian origin, and we may tentatively assign the work to an Italian composer.

Sie A-B

All of the Mass pieces in the two Sieneſe fragments have been identified as works of Zacharia da Teramo.<sup>1</sup>

Sie A recto Patrem [3<sup>1</sup>+2<sup>2</sup>+1<sup>1</sup>] (end of contratenor only)  
= Kras ff. 193v-195: Opus Zacharie  
St P No. 2 (ff. 2v-4): Slowye szacharie mneysche

Sie A verso Patrem [3<sup>3</sup>] (part of cantus and tenor only)  
= BL No. 57 (old Nos. 70-72, ff. 68v-71): Zacar Scabroso

Sie B f. lv Et in terra [— Gloria laus 3<sup>3</sup>] (part of cantus and tenor only)  
= BL No. 69 (old Nos. 88-89, ff. 86v-88): Zacar  
MNO No. 72 (ff. 37v-38v): Zacharie...  
St P No. 10 (ff. 18-19): —  
OH No. 30 (f. 28v): — (fragmentary)

Sie B ff. 2-2v Et in terra 3<sup>3</sup> (all three parts fragmentary)  
= BL No. 58 (old Nos. 73-74, ff. 71v-73): Zacar Fior gentil

MU L

Of the four compositions for the Ordinary of the Mass in the MU L fragments,<sup>2</sup> one is attributed to Cristoforo da Faltre in the manuscript; concordances show that another is by Antonio da Cividade, and a third by Arnold de Lantins. The remaining piece is only the end of a contratenor:

No. 1 (f.1) Patrem [a 3<sup>3</sup>]

---

<sup>1</sup>Descriptions and inventories: F. Ghisi, "Italian Ars Nova music," Journal of Renaissance and Baroque Music, I (1946), 282; idem, "A second Sieneſe fragment of Italian Ars Nova," MD, II (1948), 173ff. See the end of note 1, p. 245 above.

<sup>2</sup>Description and inventory: Wolf, Geschichte der Mensural-Notation, I, 189f.; see also Reeseler, ATM, VII (1925), 235f.

The frequent changes of mensuration -- it alternates between diminished imperfect time and diminished perfect time -- could have been written by a Northerner as well as by an Italian in the second quarter of the fifteenth century, and any other meager clues about the style do not help us very much.

### Ven I

The only composers named in Part I of Ven<sup>1</sup> are Binchois and Benoit, and from other sources some of the pieces have been identified as the work of Dufay and Hubert de Salinis. Five Mass pieces are as yet unidentified.

- No. 4 (ff. 5v-9) Patrem 2<sup>1</sup>
- No. 4a (f. 9) Benedicamus 2<sup>1</sup>
- No. 7 (ff. 12v-15) Et in terra... Jesu audi nos gementes 2<sup>2</sup>
- No. 9 (ff. 19v-22) Patrem 2<sup>1</sup>
- No. 23 (ff. 35v-36) Benedicamus 2<sup>2</sup>

Since no Italian composer is known to have contributed to the collection and the styles of the anonymous pieces are quite like those by Dufay and Hubert de Salinis, we may assume that the entire section of the manuscript is devoted to Northern composers.

---

<sup>1</sup>Inventory: Besseler, AMM, VII (1925), 236f. The Benedicamus No. "4a" is not listed.

Kras

The last two manuscripts we shall consider come from a remote outpost: Poland. Aside from the local composer Nicholas of Radom, the collections draw largely from a group of musicians who were active in an Italian environment (Padua?) in the early fifteenth century. The published inventory of Kras<sup>1</sup> is so defective that we shall list all of the Mass pieces.

- ff. 177v-178 Et in terra 3<sup>1</sup>: -----  
= BL No. 85 (old No. 110, ff. 108v-109): Grosin (fifth lower)  
= MBO No. 98 (ff. 52v-53): Grossin  
= Ao ff. 59v-60: -----
- ff. 178v-180 Patrem 3<sup>1</sup>: -----
- f. 181v Kyrie 2<sup>1</sup>: -----  
= MBO No. 142 (f. 73): -----
- ff. 187v-189 Et in terra 3<sup>3</sup>: O N de Radom
- ff. 189v-191v Patrem 3<sup>3</sup>: O Nicolai de Radom
- ff. 191v-192v Et in terra 3<sup>1</sup>: -----
- ff. 192v-193 Et in terra 3<sup>1</sup>: -----  
= EL No. 149 (old No. 184, ff. 161v-162): Jo ciconie  
= O No. 242 (ff. 103v-104): M. Johannes ciconia  
= St P No. 15 (f. 25): -----
- f. 193v-195 Patrem 3<sup>2(1)+2<sup>2</sup>+1<sup>1</sup></sup>, Opus Zacharie  
= St P No. 2 (ff. 2v-4) 3<sup>1+2<sup>2</sup>+1<sup>1</sup></sup>: Slowye szacharie wneysche  
= Sie A recto: ----- (fragmentary)

---

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 144, note 1.



- ff. 196 and 198-199v Patrem  $4^4$ : O Zacharis magri, Anthonij  
= HL No. 143 (old Nos. 177-178, ff. 154v-156) $4^3$ : Sacar ad  
ongni vento  
St P No. 6 (ff. 12v-14): ----
- ff. 196v-197 Et in terra  $4^2$ : O Ciconie  
= HL No. 74 (old No. 97, ff. 95v-96): Jo ciconie  
St P No. 8 (ff. 15v-16): ----
- f. 197v Et in terra  $4^2$ : ----
- ff. 199v-200 Sanctus...Gustati necis pocula  $1^1+2^2+3^2$ : ----  
= MUD No. 135 (ff. 70v-71): ---- ["Sanctus Sweitzl" in  
old index]
- ff. 200v-201 Et in terra  $3^1$ : Opus Nicolai de Radom  
= St P No. 14 (ff. 23v-24)  $3^0$ : ----
- ff. 201v-202 Patrem  $3^1$ : ----
- ff. 202v-204 Patrem  $4^2$  ( $2^2$  intro.): O. M. Ciconie  
= St P No. 5 (ff. 9v-11): ----
- ff. 204v-205 Et in terra  $3^3$ : Opus Egardi  
= Mod No. 33 (ff. 21v-22): Egardus
- f. 205v Et in terra[a 3?]: O. N. Frag...[?]  
(cantus and beginning of tenor only)

Of seventeen Mass pieces, three are assigned in the manuscript to Nicholas of Radom, two to Ciconia, two to Zacharia (or Zacaris), one to Egardus, and one to a name ("N. Frag...") which is partly illegible. Of the other eight compositions left anonymous, one is by Ciconia, one by Grossin, and one by the "Sweitzl" who is known only from HL.

The Patrem on ff. 201v-202 may be disposed of easily: it forms a pair with the preceding Gloria by Nicholas of Radom because of the similar beginning motives (a feature which is seen also in the other pair by Nicholas on ff. 187v-191v). There is no such connection between the

openings of the Gloria by Grossin and the following Patrem on ff. 178v-180, but the style and mode correspond. Perhaps the Patrem is also by Grossin; at any rate, there is no reason to suppose Italian authorship. Remembering the absence of Kyrie settings by Italian composers,<sup>1</sup> we may also put aside the composition on f. 181v.

The Et in terra on ff. 191v-192v precedes one by Ciconia (BL No. 149) which is very distinctive. Interestingly, the anonymous work is in the same style and employs exactly the same formal procedure as Ciconia's piece: the song-like repetition of an entire section to new words, with short introduction and Amen-coda.<sup>2</sup> (Here, however, there is no internal repetition within the large section and it is not divided by bar lines into two sub-sections.) Did Ciconia write both works? The characteristic concise motivic elaboration of Ciconia is lacking in the anonymous composition, and the general level of quality does not seem to be up to that master's standard, so it is doubtful that it is actually one of Ciconia's works.

It is most interesting to observe that a similar situation exists with the Et in terra on f. 197v, which follows the style and formal plan of the Et in terra by Ciconia which just precedes it (= BL No. 74).<sup>3</sup> It, too, is based on the repetition for Section II of the instrumental tenor

---

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 134.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 234.

<sup>3</sup> See above, pp. 225ff.

and contratenor. Whereas Ciconia's example has two sections in 2/4 time followed by an Amen in 6/8 time in which the lower parts are in diminished values, the anonymous work has only one major section followed by the section in 6/8 time in diminution (of which the Amen is only a part). Another interesting feature is not shared by Ciconia's *Et in terra*: the two vocal parts simultaneously sing different phrases of the text throughout the composition after "voluntatis," without any attempt at alternation or shift of emphasis from one part to the other. This extreme example of telescoping results in a very short Gloria (hence, a total of only two sections instead of Ciconia's three).

In the case of this *Et in terra* on f. 197v as well as the other on f. 191v-192v, it is more than likely that we have the preservation of two well-known works by the greatest master of the day, Ciconia, together with two works which are modelled upon them written by a probably local, lesser artist. Given the nature and provenance of the manuscript, the most likely such composer is Nicholas of Radon, whose name is found attached to the Mass pair which just precedes the *Et in terra* on ff. 191v-192v.

The *Et in terra* on f. 205v which carries the illegible name "O. N. Frag..."<sup>1</sup> consists of a cantus and part of an instrumental tenor.

---

<sup>1</sup>According to Jachimecki's inventory. It is invisible on the film which was available to me.

The general melodic style is rather close to the two pieces we have just considered, but the fragmentary nature of the copy does not permit one to make a more significant observation.

### St P

Closely related to Kras in repertory and extent, St P names only Nicholas of Radom (twice) and Zacharia ("Słowye zacharie zneysche") as composers.<sup>1</sup> There are altogether sixteen settings of the Gloria or the Credo, and besides the three whose composers are identified in the manuscript, eight others have been identified as works by Zacharia (four) Ciconia (three), and Nicholas of Radom (one). Thus, with a total of five pieces, Zacharia has the largest share of the collection. The composers of five pieces remain unknown.<sup>2</sup>

- No. 1 (ff. 1-2) Patres 3<sup>1</sup><sub>2</sub>  
No. 4 (ff. 6v-7) Patres 3<sup>1</sup> (1<sup>1</sup> Intro.)  
= St No. 70 (old nos. 7-91, ff. 21v-90): Zachar  
    Mod No. 4 (ff. 22v-25): Zacharias  
No. 7 (ff. 14v-15v) Et in terra 2<sup>2</sup>+3<sup>2</sup>  
No. 11 (ff. 17v-21) Et in terra 3<sup>2</sup> (2<sup>2</sup> intro.)  
No. 12 (ff. 21v-24) Et in terra... bene ihesu 3<sup>2</sup>+1<sup>1</sup>  
No. 16 (ff. 25v-27) Et in terra... suscipe trinitas 3<sup>2</sup>+2<sup>2</sup>

The Patres No. 1 is in the loosely-flowing, functional style of many of the cantilena-type pieces of Iv and Apt. The entire middle section is written in red notes in order to effect a change from 6/8 time to

---

<sup>1</sup>Description and inventory: M. Szczepańska, "Nowe źródło do historii muzyki średniowiecznej w Polsce," Księga pamiątkowa ku czci Profesora Dr. Adolfa Chybińskiego (Kraków, 1930), pp. 55ff.

<sup>2</sup>The incipits only of two voices of another Et in terra are found on f. 15v (before No. 8).

3/4 time. (The end of the tenor has the marking slowye cum rubeis.)

The Et in terra No. 7 is in exactly the same style — even the same motives are used — as Zacharia's Patrem No. 2,<sup>1</sup> but there is only one section for divided cantus other than the introduction. A most remarkable connection between the two pieces may be observed in the ritornello of No. 7, which may be compared with the ritornello of No. 2.<sup>2</sup>

Ex. 128. From Et in terra, St P No. 7

The musical score consists of three staves. The top staff is a vocal line in G major, 3/4 time, with lyrics 'ti-' and '-bi'. The middle staff is another vocal line, also in G major, 3/4 time, with lyrics 'ti-' and '-bi'. The bottom staff is a keyboard accompaniment in G major, 3/4 time. The music is in G major and 3/4 time. The tempo marking is '♩ = ♩'. The score is enclosed in a rectangular box.

The most interesting change, of course, is the shifting of the passage down one step from a D-mode to a C-mode. Knowing the composer's penchant for parody, we may conjecture that one of the pieces was derived from the other by Zacharia himself.

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 286ff.

<sup>2</sup>Ex. 101, p. 288 above.

The Et in terra No. 11 sets each of eight periods as a canon in the upper voices above an instrumental tenor. The style is simple and straightforward, and there is nothing about the piece which would suggest Italian origin.

The troped Et in terra No. 12 is unusual in that it alternates passages for cantus and two instrumental accompanying parts with passages for cantus alone (undivided). Otherwise, the style is rather like that of the Patrem No. 1, and the piece does not seem to be Italian.

The last composition we are to consider, the troped Et in terra No. 16, is interesting for the close stylistic and motivic relationship it has to Ciconia's Patrem BL No. 5. This Patrem, it will be remembered, was part of a closely related group of works by Ciconia which included the two Gloria settings Pad No. 5 and O No. 240.<sup>1</sup> The present Gloria is perhaps the most closely related of the three to the Patrem -- it even uses the little hocket-like imitations in the soloist sections with far more consistency than do the other Gloria settings --, but in view of the caution which seemed advisable before,<sup>2</sup> we would be unwise to declare that Et F No. 16 makes a "pair" with BL No. 5. This still leaves us free to attribute the work tentatively to Ciconia, just as the preceding

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 209ff.

<sup>2</sup>See pp. 215ff.

Et in terra No. 15 is also a work by Ciconia which is anonymous in St P. Of course, we may also be dealing here with a situation similar to that which we have conjectured above in regard to two works in Kras:<sup>1</sup> St P No. 16 may be a composition by a lesser artist in imitation of one by Ciconia. This possibility cannot be ruled out, but the stylistic evidence favors the proposal that the work is by the master himself.

#### Summary of the Anonymous Works

We may assume that all of the Mass pieces in the sources of the "simple discant group," in Pol, and in Fa are of Italian origin. The table below lists all the Mass pieces which are not assigned to a composer in any of the remaining sources<sup>2</sup> and which may be of Italian origin. The works which show decided Italian traits have been separated from those which are more difficult to classify.

---

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 387f.

<sup>2</sup> Except the three settings of the Patrem in Perugia, Bib. Com., MS III-12-4, which has been unavailable for study.

	total anon. Mass pieces	almost certainly Italian	probably Italian
<u>Pad</u>	8 <sup>note 1</sup>	Sanctus No. 3 Sanctus No. 24 Benedicamus No. 25	none
<u>RB</u>	4	none	none
<u>RU<sub>1</sub></u>	3	Sanctus No. 3 Et in terra No. 8 (Lorenzo?)	none
<u>Lo</u>	3	Sanctus=notet No. 52	Et in terra No. 116 (Matteo??)
<u>Mod</u>	4	none	Et in terra No. 3 (Matteo?) Et in terra No. 4 ( " ) Patrem No. 7 ( " ) Patrem No. 9 ( " )
<u>BL</u>	7	none	none
<u>BU</u>	13	Sanctus No. 9 Agnus No. 49	Sanctus No. 58
<u>MGL</u>	1	none	none
<u>Ven I</u>	5	none	none
<u>Kras</u>	6 <sup>note 2</sup>	none	none
<u>St P</u>	5	none	Et in terra No. 7 (Zacharia?)
<b>totals</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>

<sup>1</sup> Does not include one duplication.

<sup>2</sup> Includes one illegible name.



The number of fifteen anonymous Mass pieces which are probably Italian — this does not count the Et in terra St P No. 7 which we have attributed to Ciconia — is not very large, and the addition of these works to the total repertory of Italian Mass pieces from about 1300 to 1450 does not greatly alter the total picture, either in quantity or character. The most significant supplement is that formed by the madrigalesque pieces in Pad. RU<sub>1</sub> and Lo, which reinforce the small group of pieces of this nature which are assigned to specific composers in the sources, thereby leading one to suspect that there was at one time an appreciable number of Mass pieces written in this very Italian style.

The anonymous works in later manuscripts yield very little which adds to our knowledge of Italian music for the Mass. Again, very probably there are works by Italian composers in these manuscripts which we have been unable to recognize because they are written completely within the French style. The large number of anonymous works in the manuscripts which through concordances are found to be of foreign origin should reassure us somewhat. Even if the composer of every anonymous piece were suddenly made known to us, it is quite likely that the number of such pieces by Italians would not be very much greater than the number we have indicated above.