

A Credible (Mis)Attribution to Josquin in Hans Ott's "Novum et insigne opus musicum":
Contemporary Perceptions, Modern Conceptions, and the Case of Veni sancte Spiritus

Author(s): Stephanie P. Schlagel

Source: *Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis*, Deel 56,
No. 2 (2006), pp. 97-126

Published by: [Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis \(KVNMM\)](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20203941>

Accessed: 22-01-2016 16:26 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis (KVNMM) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Tijdschrift van de Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Stephanie P. Schlagel

A CREDIBLE (MIS)ATTRIBUTION TO JOSQUIN IN HANS OTT'S
NOVUM ET INSIGNE OPUS MUSICUM

Contemporary Perceptions, Modern Conceptions, and the Case of
*Veni sancte Spiritus**

For James Haar

With the publication of the two-volume *Novum et insigne opus musicum* and *Secundus tomus novi operis musici* in 1537 and 1538,¹ Hans Ott launched the German 'Josquin Renaissance'.² By elevating Josquin to the status of hero and devoting twenty-five percent of his massive anthology to his motets, Ott set the stage for Josquin to become the first major composer whose music and reputation would vastly outlive him. Despite what appears to be a sincere effort to preserve and disseminate authentic Josquin motets, Ott muddied the waters when he placed *Veni sancte Spiritus*, prominently bearing Josquin's name, as the inaugural composition of his two-volume anthology. Sixteenth-century audiences and modern scholars unhesitatingly accepted this attribution until 1985, when a unique but credible ascription of the work to 'M. Forestier' was found in UppsU 76b, a French manuscript dated 1510–1520.³

The newly discovered misattribution to Josquin originating with Ott's print pro-

* A version of this essay was presented at the symposium 'New Directions in Josquin Scholarship' organized by Rob Wegman at Princeton University in October 1999. I wish to thank Willem Elders, Patrick Macey, and Grayson Wagstaff for their assistance during the final stages of preparing this article for publication.

1. *Novum et insigne opus musicum, sex, quinque et quatuor vocom, cuius in Germania hactenus nihil simile usquam est editum* (Nürnberg 1537 [1537¹]); and *Secundus tomus novi operis musici, sex, quinque et quatuor vocom, nunc recens in lucem editus* (Nürnberg 1538 [1538³]). Unless otherwise specified, I will use the short title *Novum et insigne opus musicum* to refer collectively to the two-volume set. Manuscript sigla are those found in the *Census Catalogue of Manuscript Sources of Polyphonic Music, 1400–1550*, 5 vols., Renaissance Manuscript Studies, 1 (s.l. 1979–1988). Sigla for print sources are those found in *Répertoire International des Sources Musicales, Recueils imprimés XVIe–XVIIe siècles*, ed. François Lesure, ser. B/1 (München 1960) [RISM BI].

2. H. Osthoff, *Josquin Desprez*, 2 vols. (Tutzing 1965–1968), I: 90.

3. T.G. MacCracken, *The Manuscript Uppsala, Universitetsbiblioteket, Vokalmusik I handskrift 76b* (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago 1985), 441–67; and *Idem*, Introduction to *Uppsala, Universitetsbiblioteket, Vokalmusik i handskrift 76b*, Renaissance Music in Facsimile, vol. 20 (New York 1986), v–vi. See also *Idem*, 'The Sacred Music of Mathurin Forestier', in *The Burgundian-Habsburg Court Complex of Music Manuscripts (1500–1535) and the Workshop of Petrus Alamire* (Leuven 2003), 349–62; here 360–62.

vided additional grist to the mill of long-standing distrust of the Protestant publishers based in Nürnberg, Augsburg, and Wittemberg. For example, Ott's attributions have been described with such strong verbiage as 'thoroughly unreliable',⁴ and the motives for such ascriptions among the German publishers have likewise been called into question as a marketing ploy.⁵ While merited, these appraisals are nevertheless unbalanced, focusing on the errors without taking into consideration the number of attributions they actually got right. Such assessments also arise from an entirely modern perspective: twenty/twenty hindsight brought into sharp focus by a gap of nearly five hundred years, culminating with the explosion of research methods and resources of postwar musicological scholarship. Are we perhaps condemning the mid-sixteenth century publishers based on inappropriate criteria? After all, until 1985 we were no more the wiser than Ott regarding the attribution of *Veni sancte Spiritus*.

Owens summarizes the need to differentiate between contemporary perceptions and modern conceptions of Josquin and his works:⁶

The patterns of dissemination of his music and the records of the actual repertoires performed in a given time and place reveal that the Josquin we know from the modern edition was not the Josquin experienced in various parts of Europe. To understand his place in history requires replacing the composite picture of modern historiography with a series of images specific to particular times and places.

These individual images must necessarily take into consideration not only the repertory we today consider to have been composed by Josquin, but also the compositions audiences in a particular time and place reasonably thought were by Josquin, even if we no longer believe so.⁷ The case of *Veni sancte Spiritus* allows us to do just that. Ott's self-declared motives for his choice of repertory in the *Novum et insigne opus musicum* and his editorial methods affirm his sincere efforts to provide the market with

4 H.M. Brown, 'Hans Ott, Heinrich Finck and Stoltzer. Early Sixteenth-Century German Motets in Formschneider's Anthologies of 1537 and 1538', in *Von Isaac bis Bach. Studien zur älteren deutschen Musikgeschichte. Festschrift Martin Just zum 60. Geburtstag*, edd. F. Heidlberger, W. Osthoff & R. Wiesend (Kassel 1991), 73–84; here 73.

5 'His [Josquin's] name was such that it helped sell books, and it became attached to a number of compositions that are found only in late German sources', J.A. Owens, 'How Josquin Became Josquin. Reflections on Historiography and Reception', in *Music in Renaissance Cities and Courts. Studies in Honor of Lewis Lockwood*, edd. J.A. Owens & A.M. Cummings (Warren, Mich. 1997), 271–79; here 277.

6 *Ibid.*, 275.

7 On the ramifications of the 'authenticity fetish' of modern Josquin scholarship and ways of rescuing ourselves from it, see P. Higgins, 'The Apotheosis of Josquin des Prez and Other Mythologies of Musical Genius', in *JAMS* 57 (2004), 443–510; here 464–80; and R.C. Wegman, 'Who Was Josquin', in *The Josquin Companion*, ed. R. Sherr (Oxford 2000), 21–50.

good redactions of authentic motets by Josquin. Moreover, the subsequent dissemination and reception of *Veni sancte Spiritus* suggest that this work indeed fulfilled contemporary expectations of Josquin's compositional practices.⁸ These expectations would have been based on the available repertory and the criteria by which mid-sixteenth-century audiences appraised a composition.

★ ★ ★

Scholars have recently begun to moderate their criticisms of the (un)reliability of the mid-sixteenth-century German publishers. In considering the preconditions for Josquin's posthumous reputation, Meconi arrives at a more sympathetic, if backhanded, assessment: 'it is striking to see that the practice we typically associate with posthumous German sources has its antecedents in supposedly much more reliable Italian manuscripts compiled during Josquin's lifetime while he was employed nearby'.⁹ Gustavson, taking a comprehensive look at the collaborative output of publisher Hans Ott and printer Hieronymus Formschneider, concludes that only five percent of the 486 composer attributions in the *Novum et insigne opus musicum* and the *Choralis Constantinus* combined are incorrect or dubious; nevertheless, most of these involve Josquin.¹⁰

When compared to the present state of research, Ott's ascriptions to Josquin prove to be reliable more often than not. Of the twenty-six motets in the anthology that have been associated with Josquin at one time or another, Ott properly credited fourteen (Table 1, Group 1), nine are now considered incorrectly attributed (Group 2), and one lacks proper credit (Group 3). Attributions for two additional works involve special circumstances but could nevertheless be considered correct, each in its own way (Group 4).

8 For another assessment of how a single work by Josquin influenced later composers, see G. Wagstaff, 'Mary's Own. Josquin's Five-Part *Salve regina* and Marian Devotion in Spain', in *TVNM* 52 (2002), 3–34. Kenneth Kreitner also discusses contemporary perceptions of Josquin's style based on an erroneous attribution of *Ave festiva ferculis* to him in a Spanish manuscript from the early sixteenth century. See K. Kreitner, '*Ave festiva ferculis* and Josquin's Spanish Reputation', in *JRMA* 128 (2003), 1–29.

9 H. Meconi, 'Josquin and Musical Reputation', in *Essays on Music and Culture in Honor of Herbert Kellman*, ed. B. Haggh (Paris 2001), 280–97; here 283.

10 R.R. Gustavson, *Hans Ott, Hieronymus Formschneider, and the Novum et insigne opus musicum (Nuremberg, 1537–1538)* (Ph.D. diss., University of Melbourne 1998), 56. Gustavson's calculations require further refinement. According to the data he provides pp. 424–87, it appears he considered to be correctly attributed those works with unique attributions to Josquin that are now considered incorrect (e.g., *Benedicite omnia opera* and *In illo tempore stetit Jesus in medio*).

Table 1. Status of Josquin attributions in Ott's *Novum et insigne opus musicum* and *Secundus tomus novi operis musici*

<i>Group 1. Correctly Attributed to Josquin</i>	<i>vol.</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Benedicta es, caelorum regina	1	
Huc me sydereo	2	
In exitu Israel	1	Earliest printed source for this work
In principio erat verbum	2	Earliest printed source for this work
Inviolata, integra et casta es, Maria	2	
Liber generationis Jesu Christi	2	
Miserere mei, Deus	1	
Misericordias Domini	1	
O admirabile commercium (cycle)	2	
O virgo prudentissima	2	
Pater Noster-Ave Maria	1	Earliest printed source for this work
Praeter rerum seriem	1	
Qui habitat in adjutorio	1	Earliest printed source for this work
Stabat mater dolorosa	2	
<i>Group 2. Incorrectly Attributed to Josquin</i>		
Benedicite omnia opera	1	No earlier source survives; questioned on stylistic grounds: rhythm and word-setting are untypical
Congratulamini mihi	1	Josquin's name appears in the index only; LeBrung in VienNB 18825; Richafort in BolC Q19; probably Le Brung
Deus pacis reduxit	2	No earlier source survives; Stoltzer in ZwiR 81/2; probably Stoltzer
Gloria, laus et honor	2	Brumel in 1505 ¹ ; probably Brumel
In illo tempore stetit Jesus in medio	2	No earlier source survives; contains <i>Satzfehler</i>
Propter peccata	1	Attributed here to Josquin; no earlier source survives; contrafact of <i>La Spagna</i> , the authenticity of which has been questioned on stylistic grounds.
Quam pulchra es	1	Mouton in 1519 ² ; Moulu in BolC Q19; Vinders in LeidGA 1441
Tribulatio et angustia	1	Verdelot in 1526 ⁵ ; anon. in LonBLR 8 G.vii
Veni sancte Spiritus	1	M. Forestier in UppsU 76b

Group 3. *Lacking Attribution to Josquin*

Virgo prudentissima (a4) 1 Attributed here to Isaac

Group 4. *Other*

Haec dicit Dominus 1 contrafact of *Nymphes, nappée*; here it appears under the name Conrad Rupsch, author of the contrafact text

Magnus es tu, Domine 2 Attributed here to Finck; Josquin in *Dodecachordon*; anon in 1504¹; unlikely to be by either

Ott's contemporaries were indeed aware that numerous false attributions lurked amid the available Josquin repertory. Within three years of the 1537–38 publication of the *Novum et insigne opus musicum*, printers such as Petreius, Rhaw, and Kriesstein unleashed a freshet of motets and chansons bearing Josquin's name, prompting Georg Forster to remark, 'I remember a certain eminent man saying that, now that Josquin is dead, he is putting out more works than when he was still alive'.¹¹ Forster stood by his word, refusing to print any works by Josquin in his 1540 collection because he did not know of any authentic ones (i.e., that had not already been printed).¹² Was this an innocent quip? Could he have been expressing disdain for gullible consumers? Or was Forster hurling accusations at Ott, Petreius, and the rest?¹³

Ott himself expressed doubts about some of the attributions he encountered, although he did not enumerate them. In his envoy addressed to the 'Happy Musician' that concludes the first volume of the *Novum et insigne opus musicum*, Ott apologized for any errors that might appear in his publication, explaining that he had to rely on manuscripts, in which 'because of negligence or ignorance, things may have been distorted, omitted, or changed', and he reminded his readers that it is easy to introduce errors into manuscripts.¹⁴ In the dedicatory letter he expressed a similar lack of

11 Memini summum quendam virum dicere, Iosquinum iam vita defunctum, plures cantilenas aedere, quàm dum vita superstes esset (*Selectissimarum mutetarum partim quinque partim quatuor vocum* (Nürnberg 1540 [1540⁶]), Preface, ll. 16–17).

12 Tametsi autem (propter quorundam delictiores aures) Iosquini viri in hac arte citra controversiam principis, lubentius quàm aliorum compositiones hisae libellis inservissem, tamen quia in isto ingenti acerno omnis generis cantilenarum, quae mihi ad manus fuere, exiguus numerus earum reperiebatur, id praestare non potui (1540⁶, Preface, ll. 11–13).

13 It should be noted that Petreius published Forster's 1540 anthology. That Forster would condemn his own publisher seems unlikely, despite the fact that of the sixteen motets Petreius attributed to Josquin in the psalm anthologies of 1538–1539, at least eight are no longer considered authentic.

14 Quam sit difficile in hoc genere laboris, non saepe errare, facile estimabunt mediocriter eruditi, Nam praeterquam quod istorum opera cogimur uti, qui artem non intelligunt, etiam in eo mul-

faith in hand-written sources.¹⁵ Yet with the gap in the transmission of knowledge between Josquin's generation and his own, and the limited number of printed sources available to him, Ott may have had little choice but to rely, within reason, on what he found.

Ott's distrust of manuscripts rises above the status of a marketing ploy. Undoubtedly he was touting the intended benefit of his publication, but at the same time his words project a contemporary preference for the permanence and authority of the printed book. Early in the dedicatory letter Ott states that he has undertaken this massive project, *cuius in Germania hactenus nihil simile usquam est editum*, in order to 'preserve the liberal art of music, which people unworthily and foolishly overlook'.¹⁶ Later in the dedication, and again in the preface to the *Secundus tomus novi operis musici*, he rearticulates this agenda.¹⁷ The need to preserve the repertory was particularly acute in Protestant Nürnberg, where recent liturgical reforms had removed polyphony from the church service.¹⁸

Contemporary praise of the printing press appears in another music-related text, the preface to Sebald Heyden's *De arte canendi* (1540). Here Ott's fellow Nürnberger invokes this German invention to defend the greatness of modern polyphony, which, like the printing press, has no antecedents in ancient Greek civilization:¹⁹

tum periculi est, quod manuscriptis chartis usi sumus, ubi multa studio a quibusdam depravata, multa per negligentiam, aut omissa, aut mutata sunt. Notum enim est, quam facile in hoc genere scripturae peccetur (1537¹, Candido Musico. Salutem, ll. 1-5).

15 Quod ad artifices attinet, quorum cantiones nunc edidi, neque ordo certus servari, nec nomina ubique adscribi potuerunt, quod nonnunquam in hoc genere fraude quadam, Auctorum nomina mutata sint. Quare id sine cuiusquam contumelia factum est (1537¹, Preface, ll. 81-83).

16 Ac sane decet bonos Principes imprimis haec cura conservandarum liberalium artium, quas vulgaris adeo illiberaliter, & stulte negligit (1537¹, Preface, ll. 10-11).

17 Quare hunc quoque laborem meum existimavi eo minus incurrere in reprehensionem posse, quod tam belle cum tuae M. studio ac cura congruit, quam T. M. ponit in conservationem artis suavissimae, & reip: utilissimae (1537¹, Preface, ll. 78-81).

Ego rex invictissimae, quicquid hoc est studii, quod ad conservationem illustrium monumentorum Musices posui... (1538³, Preface, ll. 75-76).

18 B. Butler, *Liturgical Music in Sixteenth-Century Nürnberg. A Socio-Musical Study* (Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign 1970), 431-47.

19 Ut autem nova haec sit, & veteribus illis Graecis planè ignota fuerit, non tamen minus, & admirationis & laudis habebit, quam ullae aliae quamlibet vetustissimae artes. Nisi forte, nostrorum seculorum inventis, per invidiam hoc gloriae dare recusemus, quod illi veteres, si inventores extitissent, vel de coelo sibi revelatum, utique & gloriati fuissent, & venerati. Age, quae nam veterum inventio est, cum qua ars excudendi libros nostris temporibus, & à Germanis excogitata, de gloria contendere non posset? (S. Heyden, *De arte canendi* (Nürnberg 1540; R/New York 1969), fol. A2^v-A3; trans. C.A. Miller, *Sebald Heyden, De arte canendi*. Musicological Studies and Documents, 26 [s.l. 1972], 19).

Although this art [of polyphony] is new and completely unknown to ancient Greek writers, it will be no less admired and praised than any of the oldest arts, unless perhaps through envy we refuse to give it a place of glory among the inventions of our times, while if it had been invented by the ancients they would have honored and revered it as a revelation from heaven. But then, what invention of the ancients is there with which the art of printing books in our times, invented by the Germans, could not contend for glory.

Clearly the Germans took pride in their invention, which surpassed the ancients – the standard against which humanists measured their cultural achievements. With the contemporary conviction that printed books carry a certain prestige lacking in manuscripts, Ott sought to invest the motets he published with permanence, status, and authority.

When Ott organized the anthology he gave *Veni sancte Spiritus* pride of place. With its invitational text suitable for Protestant worship and stunning canonic artifice, *Veni sancte Spiritus* aptly sets the tone for the entire collection as the inaugural work. The placement of the motet immediately follows Ott's unabashed praise of Josquin in the preface to the volume. Here Ott discusses Josquin, Isaac, and Senfl, but names Josquin first, using capital letters to spell his name and offering him the highest praise:²⁰

All will easily recognize JOSQUIN as the most celebrated hero of the art of music, for he possesses something that is truly divine and inimitable. Nor will a grateful and honest posterity begrudge him this praise.

It thus seems more likely that Ott sincerely aspired to open the volume with an authentic work by Josquin than that he was attempting to increase the salability of the volume with a knowingly false attribution. Ott's unabashed praise of Josquin as a hero, his stated distrust of manuscript sources, his desire to invest polyphony with authority and permanence in the wake of Protestant reforms, and contemporary awareness of forgeries all attest to the publisher's integrity.

Because the mid-sixteenth-century German prints contain a number of false attributions to Josquin (in addition to being removed from the composer in both time and place), collectively they have been maligned and the publishers have been accused of using Josquin's name to increase the marketability of their volumes. This may be the case with publishers following Ott's lead. There is scant evidence, however, that the population at large was clamoring for Josquin's motets in the decade preceding the appearance of the 1537 print, for the transmission of these works had all

20 IOSQUINUM celeberrimum huius artis Heroem facile agnoscent omnes, habet enim vere divinum et inimitabile quiddam Neque [sic] hanc laudem grata & candida posteritas ei invidet (1537¹, Preface, ll. 83–85).

but ceased during the fifteen years following his death. While learned and historically-minded individuals such as Ott himself, Glarean, Senfl, Petreius, Forster, and Martin Luther had sustained their interest in Josquin's music, only a few of the extant sources prepared during this era contain more than one or two of his motets.²¹ Although printing this antiquated Catholic music was a risky business venture in Protestant Nürnberg, Ott apparently unleashed his market's voracious appetite for Josquin's sacred settings. From 1539 to 1545 approximately thirty-five additional motets attributed to Josquin were published in Germany and subsequently copied into dozens of derivative sources.²² In Ott's defense, it must be noted that the publishers who came after him, Petreius, Kriesstein, and Rhaw, polluted the Josquin canon with a greater number of erroneous attributions than did he.²³

Our general distrust of the mid-sixteenth-century German prints also eclipses Ott's integrity as an editor, one who frequently lives up to modern critical standards. Where Ott's sources for Josquin's motets can be established or reasonably hypothesized, they prove to be reliable and pedigreed. Senfl's *Liber selectarum cantionum quas vulgo Mutetas appellant* (Augsburg, Grymm & Wyrung 1520 [1520⁴]), Antico's *Motetti libro primo* (Roma 1518; Venezia 1521 [1521³]), and sources very closely related to the Munich Hofkapelle manuscripts are among Ott's exemplars. Moreover, Ott's redactions prove to be very faithful to his exemplars.

When Ott planned and compiled his anthology, it appears he turned to the *Liber selectarum cantionum* as a model.²⁴ Edited by Ludwig Senfl and printed soon after the

21 These sources are Dorico's two reprints of Petrucci's *Motetti de la Corona Libro III* (Roma 1526, 1527 [1526³, 1527]), and UlmS 237, the contents of which are mostly derived from Petrucci's early motet anthologies, *Motetti A* (Venezia 1502 [1502¹]), *Motetti De Passione...* (Venezia 1503 [1503¹]), *Motetti C* (Venezia 1504 [1504¹]), and *Motetti Libro Quarto* (Venezia 1505 [1505¹]). Attaignant's fourth and twelfth motet books (1534⁶ and 1535⁴) each contain one work by Josquin.

22 In addition, there are a number of sources for Josquin's motets prepared after 1537 that are independent of the German printed tradition, including Du Chemin & Goudimel's *Liber primus collectorum modulorum* (Paris 1553 [1553²]), and the manuscripts EdinU 64, LeidGA 1439, LeidGA1442, and LeidSM 1440.

23 *Psalmorum selectorum* (Nürnberg: Petreius, 1538-1539 [1538⁶, 1539⁹]), *Modulationes aliquot quatuor vocum selectissimae* (Nürnberg, Petreius 1538 [1538⁷]); Salblinger's *Selectissimae necnon familiarissimae cantiones* (Augsburg, Kriesstein 1540 [1540⁷]), *Concentus octo, sex, quinque & quatuor vocum* (Augsburg, Ulhard 1545 [1545²]), and *Cantiones septem, sex et quinque vocum* (Augsburg: Kriesstein, 1543 [1545³]); *Sacrorum hymnorum liber primus* (Wittenberg, Rhaw 1542 [1542¹²]), and *Bicinia gallica, latina, Germanica* (Wittenberg, Rhaw 1545 [1545⁶]).

24 In his extensive study of the *Novum et insigne opus musicum*, Gustavson argues against the possibility that Ott used the *Liber selectarum cantionum* as a model. However, his faulty translation of the subtitle of Ott's collection seems to have skewed his interpretation of the data, some of which are based on incomplete critical reports (Gustavson, 214-15). See S. Schlagel 'The *Liber selectarum cantionum* and the "German Josquin Renaissance"', in *Journal of Musicology* 19 (2002), 564-615; here 594-97, and details in the present discussion for further elaboration.

death of Maximilian I, this collection contains twenty-five motets, seven of which are by Josquin.²⁵ Senfl organized the selections according to the number of voices: the choirbook begins with works for six, followed by works for five, and then works for four. Dividing leaves separate and announce each new section – the only volume of music printed before 1537 with such a feature. Although Ott's anthology is in partbook format, he nevertheless retained the idea of ordering each of the two volumes according to the number of voices – a rarity in printed anthologies to this point, found previously only in Senfl's print and Petrucci's *Motetti de la corona. Libro III* (Venezia [Fossombrone] 1519 [1519²]). Ott also preserved Senfl's use of dividing leaves to announce each new section based on the number of voices (in instances where the last motet of a section covers only the top part of the page, the indication of the new section appears in the remaining space). Like Senfl, Ott placed heavy emphasis on Josquin's motets, setting a retrospective tone for his anthology.²⁶

In addition to following Senfl's format, Ott appears to have copied several works by Josquin from the earlier collection. Although Gustavson argues that this could not have been the case, he did not himself compare the redactions in the *Liber selectarum cantionum* with those in the *Novum et insigne opus musicum* but instead relied on the critical report to Smijers's *Werken van Josquin des Pres*.²⁷ This is not to discredit Smijers – certainly he was a pioneer and his work represents one of the earliest modern scholarly editions. However, Smijers's critical report is not free from mistakes; furthermore, he seems never to have listed all variants in his critical notes. In fact, there are several inconsistencies in the reports for *Miserere mei*, *Deus* and *Stabat mater dolorosa* (Smijers omitted some variants occurring in Senfl's collection while reporting the same ones in Ott's and *vice versa*). The result is that, judging from only the critical reports, the two sources appear less alike than they actually are.

Establishing derivation of one source from another in the case of Josquin's motets is no easy task. There are very few significant musical variants throughout the entire transmission of Josquin's most widely disseminated motets that could separate or join sources. Nevertheless, there is a host of minor variants that consistently reappear in families of related sources. Variants of these types, which are so common in the transmission of Renaissance music, are insufficient by themselves to prove derivation or independence. Nevertheless an *aggregate* of such similarities or departures can lead to more confident assertions, particularly when they align with patterns within the entire transmission history of a particular composition.

Not only must the quantity of the variants be taken into consideration, but also their nature. The resolution or use of minor color and ligatures can depend on the

25 See Schlagel, 'The *Liber selectarum cantionum*', 597–610, for a discussion of Senfl's exemplars.

26 See *Ibid.*, 589–91 regarding the similarity of aesthetics governing the Senfl's and Ott's anthologies.

27 'As the question at hand is simply whether or not Ott copied directly from the *Liber selectarum cantionum*, Smijers' commentary suffices' (Gustavson, 214, n.10).

manufacture of appropriate pieces of type. The filling in of thirds with passing tones, matters of cadential ornamentation, and the splitting or joining of repeated notes could have easily been initiated by editors or typesetters. Producing a print is also more likely to introduce variants as compared to creating a manuscript copy, as the typesetter must first look at the exemplar, then find the correct pieces of type, and then load them on the stick. The simplification of semiminim under-third cadential ornaments, in addition to suggesting a more modern aesthetic, would certainly ease the type-setting process, as fewer pieces of type are required for an unadorned cadence. Nevertheless, in no single composition does Ott (or his typesetters) globally remove or add such figures. Inconsistencies among such minor variants are not necessarily separative. However, a great degree of consistency between two sources in this arena, which is otherwise highly variable and inconsequential, can provide compelling evidence that one source could have served as an exemplar for another. In fact, throughout the transmission of Josquin's most popular motets, these variable and inconsequential formulae are reproduced in related sources with surprising stability.

Ott's redactions of *Benedicta es, caelorum regina*, *Miserere mei, Deus*, *O Virgo prudentissima*, *Praeter rerum seriem*, and *Stabat mater dolorosa* match Senfl's in almost every detail. Table 2 inventories the differences between the two sources for these pieces according to the nature of the variant: cadential ornamentation, the presence or absence of a semiminim anticipation figure (e.g., dotted minim *d* - semiminim *c* - semibreve *c*, versus semibreve *d* - semibreve *c*), the splitting or joining of note values for repeating pitches, other ornamentation, changes in pitch or rhythm, and variants that correct or introduce an error. Appendix 1 provides precise measure locations.²⁸

Table 2. Summary of variants in Ott's *Novum et insigne opus musicum* compared with Senfl's *Liber selectarum cantionum*

Composition	Total	Cadential ornament	Semiminim anticipation	Rhythmic substitution	Passing Tone	Other ornaments	Pitch	Error
<i>Benedicta es,</i>	29	11	6	5	2	1	3	1 corrected in Ott
<i>Miserere mei, Deus</i>	3			3				
<i>O virgo prud.</i>	25	7	3	12	1		2	
<i>Praeter rerum seriem</i>	10	2	4	2	1			1 introduced in Ott
<i>Stabat mater</i>	1			1				

28 In some instances a cadential passage might include variations in the presence or absence of a semiminim anticipation to the syncopated semibreve (or dotted minim), as well as the presence or absence of the semiminim under-third figure. In such cases the semiminim anticipation figure and the semiminim under-third figure are tallied separately in their respective categories.

Immediately apparent is how few in number and minor the variants are, especially given the length of each piece (*Miserere mei*, *Deus* runs more than 400 measures), the number of voices (all are for five or six voices), and the level of ornamentation and melismatic writing (*Benedicta es, caelorum regina* and *Praeter rerum seriem* are particularly florid). None could be regarded as separative.

More telling are the conjunctive variants in *Benedicta es, caelorum regina*, *Praeter rerum seriem*, and *Stabat mater dolorosa*. The only source for *Benedicta es, caelorum regina* predating the German prints, VatS 16, contains an error in the concluding ‘Amen’ that results in parallel fifths and octaves. The *Liber selectarum cantionum* offers a solution and Ott’s edition is identical to Senfl’s, save for the final pitch in the Bassus and Quintus.²⁹ Similarly, both sources transmit a flawed reading in the Sextus, m. 6 and share a peculiar underlay of the text in the Bassus mm. 41–50. A conjunctive variant in *Praeter rerum seriem* devoid of stylistic consequences nevertheless documents Ott’s reliance on Senfl’s edition. At the *secunda pars* of *Praeter rerum seriem* Senfl inverts the positions, and thus the implied voice labels, of the altus and quintus (tenor secundus in Smijers’s edition) when compared to earlier print and manuscript sources.³⁰ Senfl’s switch is reproduced in the *Novum et insigne opus musicum* and its derivative sources. Perhaps the most definitive evidence of Ott’s reliance on Senfl’s print is a faulty reading in *Stabat mater dolorosa*. The Superius m. 62, notes 2 and 3 are each *c*’s in the *Liber selectarum cantionum*. In all but one other source predating Ott’s print, the pitches are both *a*’s, which is a better reading (the *c* produces an open fifth with the *f*’s, the only other pitch sounding).³¹ The *Novum et insigne opus musicum* reproduces Senfl’s flawed version. In the Munich exemplar, the erroneous pitches have been erased and replaced with *a*’s (the second *c* is still partially visible).

With whom or what, exactly, do we attribute agency for the variants? Ott himself? Workers in Formschneider’s shop? The exemplars Ott received? It is, of course, impossible to reconstruct precisely what Ott did or what went through his mind as he prepared his anthology. Certainly manuscript sources have been destroyed over the years and Ott could have relied on intermediary exemplars that were nearly identical to Senfl’s print.³² Nevertheless, Ott’s occupation as a bookseller from 1525 until his death,³³ and thus the high probability that he would have been cognizant of Senfl’s print; the similarity of an otherwise unique format; the fact that the proposed exemplar is a print and could thus exist in an identical state in multiple locations (as

29 *New Josquin Edition*, vol. 23: Motets on Non-Biblical Texts, 3: De beata virgine 1, Critical Commentary, ed. W. Elders (Utrecht 2006), 186–89, 193, 208.

30 LonRC 1070, SGallS 464, VatS 16, and 1519² (Smijers’s source).

31 The exception is FlorBN II.I.232, which also has two *C*’s.

32 Gustavson postulates some type of indirect connection between Senfl and Ott, and also Senfl and Formschneider (Gustavson, 18, 38–40, 153–54).

33 *Ibid.*, 4.

opposed to a manuscript, which is unique); and the closeness of the redactions suggest that it is unnecessary to propose an hypothetical intervening source.³⁴

Although the rule of Ockham's razor and the theory of wholesale copying would point to Senfl's collection as Ott's source for *Inviolata, integra et casta es, Maria*, this proves not to be the case. It is difficult to document the dissemination of this work after its initial appearance in the Medici codex (FlorL 666), for there are no major variants to speak of and only a few minor ones among the twenty-two extant sources. Yet when comparing lesser details such as the use of ligatures and cadential ornamentation, Ott's redaction consistently matches the one in Antico's *Motetti libro primo*.³⁵ Ott's edition, however, stands as the earliest extant source of *Inviolata* with its Protestant contrafact text.³⁶ Ott's version of *O admirabile commercium*, like that of *Inviolata*, matches Antico's *Motetti libro primo* with an overwhelming accuracy of detail including ligation, use of coloration, and cadential ornamentation.³⁷

A different group of motets points to sources closely related to the Munich Hofkappelle manuscripts and VienNB 15941, a set of decorated partbooks prepared in Brussels and sent to Augsburg as a gift to Raimund Fugger the Elder (d. 1535), as

34 Admittedly, the case for *Benedicta es, caelorum regina* is not as strong as the others because of the relatively large number of minor variants compared to the other concordant works. Also, Elders asserts that Ott's version of *O virgo prudentissima* is independent of Senfl's and is, in fact, a better version. Nevertheless, in both cases the larger point stands: Ott had access to very good sources for the works that remain securely attributed to Josquin. I wish to thank Professor Elders for sharing his evaluation of the sources for *O virgo prudentissima* with me prior to its publication.

35 In fact, Ott's print matches Antico's in all but one instance: for the Superius, m. 135, notes 5–8, Ott has semiminims *f-g-a-f* Antico has a single semibreve *f* Ott's readings match Senfl's, possibly suggesting that both sources were consulted, or that whoever made the emendation in the printer's copy was already familiar with the reading via Senfl's collection. Also noteworthy is an inferior reading in Antico's print that is reproduced in Ott's (Bassus, m. 76 note 2: Antico and Ott have semiminim *e*; Senfl has semiminim *f*).

I also compared the readings in FlorL 666 and Petrucci's *Motetti de la corona Libro IV* (Venezia [Fossombrone] 1519 [1519³]). FlorL 666 is all but identical with Antico's print (as would be expected). Petrucci's version introduces enough minor variants to be eliminated as a possible source, particularly in light of the high degree of consistency between Antico's and Ott's editions.

36 Gustavson believes that Ott was responsible for the Protestantizations of the original Marian texts, but there is no concrete evidence to support this claim (Gustavson, 227–62, esp. 253–62). The revisions to *Inviolata, integra et casta es, Maria* are fairly extensive.

37 Ott's reading departs from Antico's in 'Ecce Maria genuit', Superius m. 42, where Ott supplies a dot to a semibreve; the dot is erroneously missing in Antico's edition. Also, 1538³ presents a Protestantization of the text at the end of 'Rubum quem viderat'. The original words 'intercede pro nobis' are replaced with 'ora pro nobis'. Here pairs of repeated minims in 1521³ are combined into semibreves in 1538³ to accommodate the reduction by two syllables.

Ott's likely exemplars. The *Novum et insigne opus musicum* shares repertory with MunBS 10 (*Qui habitat in adjutorio*, *Liber generationis Jesu Christi*, and *In principio erat verbum*) and MunBS 12 (*Pater noster-Ave Maria*).³⁸ Variants that emerge in a three-way comparison of *In principio erat verbum* and *Qui habitat in adjutorio* in VienNB 15941, MunBS 10, and Ott's edition are very few in number.³⁹ The redactions of *Pater noster-Ave Maria* in MunBS 12 and the print are also overwhelmingly close, although Ott's anthology bears a Protestant contrafact in the *secunda pars*.⁴⁰ Similarly, the readings for *In exitu Israel* in the *Novum et insigne opus musicum* and VienNB 15941, the only extant source for this work pre-dating Ott's print, are all but identical.⁴¹

The readings for *Liber generationis Jesu Christi* in MunBS 10 are remarkably similar to those in both the *Novum et insigne opus musicum* and Petrucci's *Motetti C*. Two major variants, one at mm. 277-79 and one at the final cadence, nevertheless separate Petrucci's *Motetti C* and Ott's collection from MunBS 10. Just believes Ott's edition to be derived from Petrucci's, and considers MunBS 10 to be a contaminated source belonging essentially to the Petrucci branch of his stemma (which also includes Ott's collection and the *Dodecachordon*) but matching the other branch at the passages in question.⁴² Just's conclusions and my above preference to a theory of derivation from a known printed source over a putative lost manuscript notwithstanding, I am reluctant to accept that Ott's version of *Liber generationis Jesu Christi* was copied directly from *Motetti C*. This is because Petrucci's motet anthologies appear to have had a limited impact on the posthumous reputation of Josquin and the subsequent dissemination of his music. Similarly, while Judd observes a high degree of congruence between *Motetti C* and Ott's anthology in the readings for *Magnus es tu, Domine*, she nevertheless posits an intervening source between the two printed editions.⁴³ Even *Motetti de la corona. Libro tertio*, which is replete with Josquin's music and was reprint-

38 In fact ten of the fourteen works in MunBS 10 and six of the ten in MunBS 12 are concordant with Ott's anthology. Gustavson, 98-99.

39 Some readings in Ott's print align with MunBS 10 while others with VienNB 15941.

40 For a detailed discussion of the source traditions of *Pater noster-Ave Maria* see D. Freeman, 'On the Origins of the *Pater noster-Ave Maria* of Josquin des Prez', in *MD* 45 (1991), 169-219; here 170-85.

41 It should be noted that in VienNB 15941 the voice designations for the contratenor and tenor parts for *In exitu Israel* and *In principio erat verbum* are switched.

42 *New Josquin Edition*, vol. 19: Motets on Texts from the New Testament 1, Critical Commentary, ed. M. Just (Utrecht 1998), 133, 135. VatS 42, LonRC 1070, and FlorBN II.I.232 exhibit the same variant as MunBS 10.

43 C.C. Judd, 'Exempli Gratia. A Reception History of *Magnus es tu domine/Tu pauper refugium*', in *Reading Renaissance Music Theory. Hearing with the Eyes* (Cambridge 2000), 265-320; here 265-67 and 276, esp. the diagram on 266.

ed in 1526 and again in 1527, can claim few derivative sources.⁴⁴ To sum up: although Ott could not have derived his editions of *Qui habitat in adjutorio*, *Liber generationis Jesu Christi*, *In principio erat verbum* and *Pater noster-Ave Maria* directly from the Munich Hofkappelle manuscripts or VienNB 15941, the closeness of his readings to these sources indicate that he had access to equally reliable exemplars.⁴⁵

For most motets in Group 1, those securely attributed to Josquin, Ott's sources can be identified or hypothesized. Unfortunately, Ott's sources for the motets erroneously ascribed to Josquin (Group 2) cannot be identified. The *Novum et insigne opus musicum* is the earliest extant source for *Benedicite omnia opera*; its authenticity has recently been questioned on stylistic grounds, although there are no alternate attributions.⁴⁶ *Congratulamini mihi*, *Deus pacis reduxit*, *Gloria, laus et honor*, *In illo tempore stetit Jesus in medio*, *Quam pulchra es*, *Tribulatio et angustia*, and *Veni sancte Spiritus* survive in earlier sources with credible ascriptions to other composers but appear under Josquin's name for the first time in Ott's collection. If Ott were the agent of change, there would likely be a great degree of similarity in the musical texts between these earlier sources and his anthology (as is the case with the Group 1 motets discussed above), with the only major variant being the composers' names. This proves not to be the case, however, for divergent readings in addition to the conflicting attributions argue against a close relationship between these earlier extant sources and Ott's putative exemplar.

Another Josquin motet that Ott appears to have derived from a source no longer extant is *Virgo prudentissima*. This work carries Isaac's name in Ott's print, an error commonly blamed on confusion with Isaac's six-voice ceremonial motet *O virgo prudentissima*;⁴⁷ Ott is unlikely to have made this mistake himself, however, because he also published the six-voice work in the *Novum et insigne opus musicum*, albeit with the contrafact text *Christus filius Dei*. The attribution of *Virgo prudentissima* to Josquin, found in Petrucci's *Motetti A*, still stands. As with the Group 2 motets, numerous variants eliminate Petrucci's print as Ott's exemplar. Ott's redaction transmits several errors and inferior readings, pointing instead to a source of dubious quality in several respects.

44 UlmS 237 and the sources associated with Glarean and his circle, including the *Dodecachordon*, are the exceptions. See S. Schlagel *Josquin des Prez and His Motets. A Case Study in Sixteenth-Century Reception History* (Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill 1996), 152-57, 332.

45 Just concludes that Ott's redaction of *In principio erat verbum* belongs to the same branch as that in VienNB 15941, but that in MunBS 10 belongs to a separate branch. Nevertheless, the three sources are very closely related: if Just's stemma were a family tree, then Ott's print and VienNB 15941 could be considered siblings and MunBS 10 a first cousin. Just, 96.

46 P. Macey, 'Josquin des Prez', in *NGD*², works list.

47 In their re-edition of Ott's collection, Berg & Neuber reproduced the misattribution of Josquin's *Virgo prudentissima* to Isaac.

A similar situation occurs with *Magnus es tu, Domine*, which Ott attributes to Heinrich Finck. Petrucci printed the work anonymously in *Motetti C*, while in sources emanating from Glarean and his circle it carries Josquin's name.⁴⁸ In RegB 211–215 it confusingly appears under Josquin's name with Heinrich Finck's initials.⁴⁹ When Noble compiled the Josquin works list he put the motet in the 'authentic' column but warned that it may not be the work of either composer.⁵⁰ More recently Brown argued that the composition is likely not by either composer because the motet is atypical of both composers' style and, moreover, *Motetti C* is an unlikely source for a motet by Finck.⁵¹ As mentioned above, Judd posits an intervening source between *Motetti C* and Ott's print.

Ott's redactions and errors strongly imply that, knowingly or not, he worked from sources no longer extant that now prove to be unreliable. At the same time, his mistakes emphasize the gap in the transmission of knowledge from Josquin's generation to his own, reinforcing Osthoff's declaration of the period in question as a true Renaissance – a renewed interest in a subject that was all but forgotten for a period of time.⁵² These lapses also suggest that Ott probably took the attributions he found at face value unless he had reason to doubt them. Furthermore, if *Virgo prudentissima* and *Magnus es tu, Domine* are any indication, Ott seems not to have indiscriminately slapped Josquin's name on anonymous works or works credited to others.

Although Ott apparently relied on a certain number of untrustworthy sources that are no longer extant, he appears to have had access to some good sources that also have not survived. *Huc me sydereo*, the authenticity of which is unequivocal, is among the works for which we cannot posit Ott's exemplar. Although quite a few surviving sources for this work predate Ott's print, it is unlikely these (or derivative sources no longer extant) could have served as Ott's model. BrusBR 9126 and LonRC 1070 lack the added sixth voice found in VatS 45, FlorBN II.I.232, *Motetti de la corona. Libro tertio*, and in the *Secundus tomus novi operis musici*.⁵³ At the same time, numerous minor variants, and several major ones, separate Ott's redaction from the three Italian sources. Ott's departures from VatS 45, FlorBN II.I.232, and *Motetti de la corona. Libro tertio* are summarized in Table 3. Details are provided as Appendix 2.

48 MunU 322–325, SGallS 463, *Dodecachordon*. The alternate version of the *prima pars* in the Glarean sources separates them from *Motetti C*, the *Novum et insigne opus musicum*, and RegB 211–215.

49 This manuscript, of south German or Austrian origin, was prepared between 1538 and 1543; redactions of *Magnus es tu, Domine* and *Haec dicit Dominus* point to Ott's collection as the parent source.

50 G. Reese and J. Noble, 'Josquin des Prez', in NGD¹.

51 Brown, 75.

52 See P. Burke, *The Renaissance Sense of the Past* (London 1969), 1, 6, 7, 13, 23, 39, *passim*, for further elaboration on the cultural and intellectual conditions that signify a renaissance.

53 SGallS 464 also antedates Ott's print, but because of its fragmentary state I have not included it in the comparison.

Table 3. Summary of variants in Ott's *Novum et insigne opus musicum* compared with VatS 45, FlorBN II.I.232, and *Motetti de la corona Libro tertio*⁵⁴

Total	38
Cadential ornamentation	2
Splitting/Joining of repeated notes	12
Pitch	11
Rhythm	5
Other ornamentation	2
Major variants	5
Resolution of the tenor augmentation and diminution	

Some of the changes, notably the resolution of the isorhythmic tenor and the transposition of the Bassus mm. 30–32 down a fifth to avoid an extremely high range, ease the singability of the work, rendering it more ‘user friendly’ to potential buyers of the volume. Nevertheless, if Ott initiated all of the changes, such a high degree of editorial intervention would be wholly out of character with his treatment of the Josquin motets for which we *can* establish a parent source or putative exemplar, as is the case with the other Group 1 works. Similarly, Ott's source for *Misericordias Domini* appears to be unrelated to any extant copies. Undoubtedly Ott had the benefit of access to sources with reliable attributions that we now lack.

★ ★ ★

To date, Ott's source for *Veni sancte Spiritus* has not been recovered, nor can it be reconstructed hypothetically. Only one extant source for *Veni sancte Spiritus* predates Ott's print, UppsU 76b, in which the work is attributed to M[athurin] Forestier. MacCracken convincingly demonstrated that UppsU 76b is of French provenance, a good source for French music from the 1510s and 1520s, reliable in its attributions,⁵⁵ and unquestioningly independent of the German tradition.⁵⁶ Although no other comparable motets by Forestier survive, making it difficult to verify the attribution on stylistic grounds, his *Missa L'homme armé* demonstrates that he is indeed capable of writing complex canonic works. Lacking any further data, MacCracken invokes the philological precept of *difficilior lectio potior* (the more difficult reading is the stronger

54 So as to make this tally comparable to those in Table 2, these data do not include readings unique to 1519² (see Appendix 2 for details) or to FlorBN II.I.232 (there are 5; they are not reported in Appendix 2).

55 MacCracken, Introduction to *Uppsala, Universitetsbiblioteket, Vokalmusik i handskrift 76b*, v–vi.

56 See MacCracken, *The Manuscript Uppsala, Universitetsbiblioteket, Vokalmusik i handskrift 76b*, 445–48, for a discussion of variants in 1537¹, J678, StuttL 36, MunBS 1536, RegB 878–882, and BolC R142.

one); that is, the less obvious choice is more likely to be correct. In this case Forestier is the less obvious choice because the ascriptions to Josquin far outnumber the one to Forestier. MacCracken concludes that it is more likely Josquin's name got attached to a very good work, than that a motet composed by a major figure was erroneously attributed to a lesser contemporary.⁵⁷

Despite MacCracken's arguments and conclusions, Milsom nevertheless favors the attribution of *Veni sancte Spiritus* to Josquin on stylistic grounds. While he admits that some features of the work are atypical of Josquin's large-scale sacred settings, he observes that the work's 'technical polish, its purposeful melodic lines, and its assured sense of forward drive' bear strong similarity with Josquin's six-voice motets, especially *Praeter rerum seriem*.⁵⁸ Milsom also finds *Veni sancte Spiritus* to be a stronger composition than Forestier's *Missa L'homme armé*. In this work there is a greater tolerance of dissonance and the use of consecutive fifths, the melodic lines are sometimes inelegant, and the canon is 'the focus of attention rather than an underlying and barely audible process.'⁵⁹ In other words, if the *Missa L'homme armé* is any indication, it is unlikely that Forestier wrote a work as good as *Veni sancte Spiritus*. Many scholars have objected to this type of reasoning.⁶⁰

No source attributing *Veni sancte Spiritus* to Josquin can claim to be as close in time and place as UppsU 76b is to Forestier. As Meconi affirms: 'When we have a source with a clear temporal and geographical connection to the composer concerned, we virtually must accept the ascriptions as genuine, and revise or restructure our assessment of a composer's style accordingly. Conversely, compositions in sources lacking firm connections to the targeted composer require the closest scrutiny to see if they match what we know of someone's style.'⁶¹ This argument favors the ascription to Forestier over Josquin. Moreover, the inverse argument can be made: that the work is *not* attributed to Josquin in UppsU 76b, despite *his* geographical and temporal proximity to it and the overwhelming number of other sources that do credit him with the work, adds further credence to the ascription of the work to Forestier.

Although *Veni sancte Spiritus* is now generally regarded as inauthentic (it remains in the list of doubtful and misattributed works in *New Grove*), a number of factors indicate that Ott's attribution of the work to Josquin did not result simply from carelessness or salesmanship. As discussed above, Ott was fond of Josquin's music and

57 *Ibid.*, 464-65.

58 J. Milsom, 'Motets for Five or More Voices', in *The Josquin Companion*, ed R. Sherr (Oxford 2000), 281-320; here 319.

59 *Ibid.*

60 See for example, J. Rifkin, 'Problems of Authorship in Josquin. Some Impolitic Observations, With a Postscript on *Absalon, fili mi*', in *Proceedings of the International Josquin Symposium, Utrecht 1986*, ed. W. Elders (Utrecht 1991), 45-52; here 45-46 and 48-49; Higgins, 467-470; and Wegman, 43.

61 H. Meconi, 'Another Look at *Absalon*', in *TVNM* 48 (1998), 3-29; here 5.

wished to invest his motets with permanence and authority by printing them. While he apparently worked from some unreliable sources that remain unidentified, he frequently consulted reliable exemplars, some lost and some still available to us, and was extremely faithful to them. It thus follows that whatever the source for *Veni sancte Spiritus*, Ott would have reproduced it with a minimum of editorial intervention and was more likely to have received the motet already ascribed to Josquin than to have added the attribution himself.

The widespread dissemination of *Veni sancte Spiritus* following its debut in print suggests that mid-sixteenth century audiences appreciated the musical substance of the work and unhesitatingly accepted the attribution to Josquin. The perceived authenticity of *Veni sancte Spiritus* and the authoritativeness of Ott's publication are reflected in the large number of sources for the motet derived from the 1537 print; fifteen of them contain an explicit or implicit attribution to Josquin. Le Roy & Ballard undoubtedly turned to Ott's publication as the source for a substantial number of works in their 1555 Josquin motet *Einzeldruck* (J678), as did the scribe of StuttL 36. When Berg & Neuber revised the *Novum et insigne opus musicum*, their publication spawned another spate of copying; derivative sources for *Veni sancte Spiritus* include MunBS 1536, RegB 878-882, DresSL Glashütte 5, DresSL Grimma 55, DresSL Pirna VIII, HradKM 29, and HradKM 22.⁶²

Circumstantial evidence suggests that the copies of *Veni sancte Spiritus* in manuscripts prepared under Johann Walther's direction (BerlPS 40013, GothaF A98, and NurGN 83795) may also be derived from Ott's anthology. First, Walther was closely associated with the Protestant educator and reformer Philipp Melanchthon, who had a strong influence on Protestant Nürnberg's musical life and thus may have helped, indirectly, to shape the contents of Ott's collection. Second, the Walther manuscripts were prepared for use in Torgau, not far from Nürnberg, and were copied within a few years of Ott's publication. Finally, the Walther manuscripts and Ott's print share many concordant works in addition to *Veni sancte Spiritus*, including *Pater noster*, *Praeter rerum seriem*, *Haec dicit Dominus*, and *Qui habitat in adjutorio*, as well as motets by other composers. In GothaF A98 *Veni sancte Spiritus* is nested between *Pater noster-Ave Maria* and *Praeter rerum seriem*, a slight reordering of Ott's print that nevertheless suggests the three works were strongly associated with each other, presumably because of their authorship.

62 The Dresden sources are incomplete or damaged and could not be examined. Surviving parts are as follows: DresSL Glashütte 5-SA extant; DresSL Grimma 55-SBQ available, AT6 un-filmable due to damage; DresSL Pirna VIII-choirbook, but beginning folios are missing. Variants in the parts available for examination, as well as the dating and provenance of the manuscripts, all point to 1558⁴ as their source. All lack attributions, but it is not unusual for attributions to appear only on the initial folio (as might have been the case with the Pirna choir-book), or only in the tenor partbook (as might have been the case with the incomplete or damaged partbooks).

Inconsistencies between Ott's redaction of *Veni sancte Spiritus* and those found in the Walther manuscripts may weaken the conjectural relationship of these sources. Most of the compositions in the Torgau manuscripts are anonymous but this is probably because Walther *did* know their authorship and had no need to record the attributions. Yet numerous minor cadential and rhythmic alterations – mostly the splitting or joining of note values to create a more natural text declamation – emerge when comparing concordant works in Ott's prints and Walther's manuscripts. On one hand, it is easy to imagine Walther, a keen musician, introducing rhythmic adjustments to create a more natural text declamation and standardizing the cadential formulae to render the works more uniform. On the other hand, these variants could also reflect a different parent source, albeit one not distantly related to Ott's.

In contrast to the popularity and widespread dissemination of *Veni sancte Spiritus*, few other works dubiously ascribed to Josquin in the Nürnberg prints of 1537 to 1540 survive in more than two or three later sources, be they derivative or independent. For example, *Levavi oculos meos*, now proven to be incorrectly attributed to Josquin in Petreius's 1538 psalm print, is an unicum; Berg & Neuber omitted it in their revised edition of Petreius's anthology. Similarly, of the so-called *Satzfehler* pieces ascribed to Josquin, *Ave verum corpus*, *In illo tempore stetit Jesus in medio*, *Nesciens mater*, and *Responsum acceperat Simeon*, only *In illo tempore* survives in a later source, StuttL 25. The infamous *Absalon fili, mi*, anonymous in LonBLR 8 G.vii and attributed to Josquin in Salblinger's 1540 publication, can be found in only one other source: Berg & Neuber's revised and expanded *Novum et insigne opus musicum* (Nürnberg 1558–59 [1558⁴, 1559¹, 1559²]). *Gloria, laus et honor* and *Quam pulchra es* appear in no other extant source postdating Ott's print. Popular taste, awareness of compositional weaknesses, and inconsistencies with contemporary understanding of Josquin's style may have all contributed to the lukewarm reception of these works despite the attributions to him in mid-century German prints. Indeed, Ott affirms that each composer has his own notable music that learned musicians could recognize.⁶³ Perhaps we are thus witnessing a certain selectivity on the part of users of the anthologies, for the fate of *Veni sancte Spiritus*, which parallels Josquin's most popular and monumental works such as *Benedicta es, caelorum regina*; *Huc me sydereo*; *Inviolata, integra et casta es, maria*; *Miserere mei, Deus*; *Pater noster-Ave Maria*; *Praeter rerum seriem* and *Stabat mater dolorosa* both in its stylistic features and in its widespread pattern of dissemination subsequent to Ott's print, stands in sharp contrast to its kindred forgeries.

What was the state of knowledge of Josquin's motet output in mid-sixteenth-century Nürnberg? Consumers might have owned both of Ott's anthologies and the Petreius collections, and some other German prints in which Josquin's music is less prominent. A truly avid collector might also have owned a Petrucci volume or two.

63 Neque de Autorum nominibus valde fuimus solliciti, quod singuli suas insignes notas habeant. Quibus ab eruditissimis Musicis facile possint agnosci. H. Ott, 'Candidis musicis salutem', in *Trium vocum carmina* (Nürnberg 1538 [1538⁹]), ll. 17–19.

It is more conceivable, however, that he would have owned parts of the *Corona* series rather than the earlier ‘alphabet’ series of 1502–1505, as the *Corona* volumes were reprinted by Giunta in 1526 and 1527. Moreover, as mentioned above, few of Josquin’s motets found in the ‘alphabet’ series achieved the widespread dissemination of those in the *Corona* volumes.

The music was available only in parts, not scores, making it difficult for consumers to scrutinize individual details of counterpoint and harmony.⁶⁴ There is contemporary evidence of musicians scoring individual works for study; they could also mentally pair two or three parts and could sing pairs of voices with a colleague. Still, one would have had to expend great effort to isolate details of counterpoint, harmony, and texture in order to reach any type of methodical conclusions. It seems, moreover, that sixteenth-century audiences did not think first and foremost in these terms.

More immediately discernible to, and valued by, sixteenth-century audiences were large-scale features. These include the opening gestures and also the openings of internal *partes*; constructivist devices such as canons, cantus firmi, and ostinati, all of which are more apparent to the eye in partbook format than in our modern scores; patterns of repetition; choice of text and overall mood; proportions of scale; and the shapes of individual melodic lines and their relationships to the meaning and structure of the text.⁶⁵ Ludovico Zacconi would later formulate these ideas as *arte* (the skillful manipulation of musical materials), *modulatione* (the melodic writing in a broad sense), *diletto* (the ability of the music to give pleasure), *tessitura* (the interweaving of materials), *inventione* (the product of imaginative creation in general or some single idea), and *buona dispositione* (the well-ordered succession of ideas).⁶⁶ Ott himself draws attention to some of these very features in his commentaries on Josquin’s *Huc me sydereo* and *Miserere mei, Deus* in the preface to the *Secundus tomus novi operis musici*:⁶⁷

64 Theorists occasionally chastise composers for certain infelicities of counterpoint, but it seems that they did not question authorship on these grounds. See J. Haar, ‘A Sixteenth-Century Attempt at Music Criticism’, in *JAMS* 36 (1983), 191–209; here 192.

65 Similarly, Wagstaff observes that Spanish composers changed their approach to setting the *Salve regina* to incorporate these very types of features after learning of Josquin’s *Salve regina* (Wagstaff, 19–25).

66 Haar, 201–06. These terms are found in Lodovico Zacconi’s *Prattica musica* (Venezia 1622). The definitions are my simplifications of Haar’s extensive discussions of the terms’ connotations according to their usage in classical treatises on oration and in sixteenth-century music treatises, notably Zarlino’s *Istiutioni harmoniche* (Venezia 1558). Zacconi’s discussion is a bit late for the repertory in question: it first appeared in 1622 and reflects concerns and tastes expressed thirty years earlier when he began the two-volume work. Nevertheless, it is helpful for its nearly contemporary concepts and terminology.

67 In prioribus libellis edidimus Psalmum quinquagesimum primum, eum quaeso, an quisquam tam negligenter audire potest, ut non simul toto animo, et mente tota feratur, ad sententiam

In the earlier of the books, we put forth Psalm 51 [i.e., 50]. I beg whether anyone can listen so carelessly as not to be moved in his whole spirit and whole intellect towards contemplating the message of the Prophet more carefully, since the melodies conform to the feelings of one who is burdened by the magnitude of his sins and [since] the very deliberate repetition by which [the sinner] begs for mercy, does not permit the soul either to reflect idly or to fail to be moved toward hope of assurance. Thus in this book we place first a song in commemoration of the kindness exhibited by Christ. If something more should be desired in verse, nevertheless what painter could depict so graphically the visage of Christ subjected to the punishment of death as JOSQUIN portrayed when he so appropriately repeated this part of the little line, ‘verbera tanta pati’.

The appreciation for these features is also reflected in the choice of characteristics that composers generally borrow when modeling new compositions on existing ones.⁶⁸

Additionally, the sixteenth-century musician would likely formulate a general impression of a composer’s style based on the works contained within the volume at hand. For example, from Ott’s collection one gets the impression that Josquin writes on a large scale and frequently employs constructivist devices. He often begins pieces with paired-voice imitation. He also varies the texture by inserting imitative duos. At other times he begins with sparse textures that gradually build up to the cadences. He enjoys setting sequences and psalms. The rhythmic and melodic shape of individual lines often parallels the spoken declamation of the text, while the entire musical fabric mirrors the mood and dramatic content of the text. At the same time, Ott’s anthology itself contains inauthentic works under Josquin’s name that would obfuscate the overall picture of his style.

Veni sancte Spiritus shares many features with Josquin’s other mature sequence settings appearing in Ott’s two-volume collection: *Praeter rerum seriem*; *Benedicta es, caelorum regina*; *Inviolata, integra et casta es, Maria*; and *Stabat mater dolorosa*. These four works portray analogous stylistic profiles: all call for large forces – five or six voices; all contain a structural cantus firmus usually presented in strict imitation between two

Prophetae diligentius intuendam, cum et modi, ad affectus illius, qui peccatorum magnitudine premitur, conformati sint, et ista gravissima repetitio qua misericordiam implorat, non sinat animum, aut ociose ista cogitare, aut non excitari ad spem fiducia. Sic etiam in his libellis quam primam posuimus cantionem, commemoratio est beneficii per Christum exhibiti. Et si autem inversibus [in versibus] possit desyderari aliquid, tamen, quis pictor eam Christi faciem, suppliciiis mortis subiecti, exprimere tam graphice potuit, quam, modis eam expressit IOSQUINUS cum tam apte repetit, hanc partem versiculi, verbera tanta pati (1538³).

68 See P. Macey, ‘Josquin as Classic. *Qui Habitat, Memor esto*, and Two Imitations Unmasked’, in *JRMA* 118 (1993), 1–43; here 22–27 and 41–43; and E.H. Sparks, ‘Problems of Authenticity in Josquin’s Motets’, in *Josquin des Prez. Proceedings of the International Josquin Festival-Conference held at The Julliard School at Lincoln Center in New York City, 21–25 June 1971*, edd. E.E. Lowinsky and B.J. Blackburn (London 1976), 345–59; here 350–53.

voices or in true canon;⁶⁹ all but *Inviolata* include a shift to triple meter in the final *pars*; and in all cases imitative motives are woven throughout the entire texture. *Veni sancte Spiritus* also calls for six voices; its borrowed chant melody sounds in canon at the fifth (as it does in *Inviolata, integra et casta es, Maria*); the penultimate couplet is set in triple meter; and melodic motives are woven into its entire polyphonic fabric, including the canonic voices bearing the ornamented chant. *Benedicta es, caelorum regina* presents a similar treatment of the chant melody; at the outset it appears to be in canon between the tenor and the superius, but eventually this facade crumbles as the two voices engage in freer ornamental imitation and share contrapuntal motives with the surrounding voices. The exordium of *Veni sancte Spiritus*, with its imitative gesture and the use of *tempus perfectum*, creates a stately, processional quality that abstractly depicts the general sense of the text, much the way the low scoring and dense imitation at the opening of *Praeter rerum seriem* suggest the birth of Christ as ‘beyond the natural order’.

The spurious motet does contain some exceptional features when compared to the other authenticated sequences by Josquin within Ott’s prints. It is unlikely that any single one taken in isolation would cause a user of the volume to question the attribution. The use of perfect time (O) is unique to *Veni sancte Spiritus*, but so is the use of perfect minor mode (O2) in *Praeter rerum seriem* (these meters can, of course, be found in other compositions within Josquin’s oeuvre, but not in the works appearing under his name in Ott’s collection). Although in different meters, the two *partes* of *Veni* lack the textural and rhythmic contrast between sections that is so prominent in *Praeter rerum seriem* and *Benedicta es*, but this feature is likewise absent in *Stabat mater dolorosa* and *Inviolata*. In *Veni sancte Spiritus*, each half of each double versicle is set to nearly identical music. This contrasts with Josquin’s customary procedure of writing ‘variation chains’, a phrase coined by Gustave Reese.⁷⁰ The absence of extended *duos* or *fauxbourdon* passages in *Veni sancte Spiritus* but found in *Benedicta es, caelorum regina* and *Praeter rerum seriem*, respectively, may result from the double canon, which hinders textural variation (although one could imagine Josquin strategically placing rests within the canonic voices to achieve a reduced texture). Double canons, the hallmark of *Veni sancte Spiritus*, do not occur in any other motets attributed to Josquin in Ott’s anthology but are nevertheless consistent with his tendency to use constructivist devices and canons, as exemplified by other works appearing under his name

69 I am using ‘canon’ in the strict sense of a compositional device in which additional voices can be derived from a single notated one.

70 G. Reese, *Music in the Renaissance* (rev. ed. New York 1959), 251. Ironically, Reese cites the last versicle of *Veni sancte Spiritus* as a typical example; in fact, it exhibits only a slight variation created by the addition of a new countermelody in the canonic Bassus and Tenor parts (mm. 155–160). In his other sequences, Josquin usually provides a quite different setting for each half of each double versicle.

within the collection. The double canon would further magnify a mid-sixteenth-century musician's impression of Josquin's compositional prowess.⁷¹

Some features of *Veni sancte Spiritus* are inconsistent with Josquin's general style, even as it would have been known through Ott's collection. For instance, the work lacks Josquin's control of texture, which he usually harnesses to create a dramatic build-up articulating the largest subdivisions (e.g., the end of the *prima pars* of *Benedicta es, caelorum regina*). Additionally, each half of each couplet is set to essentially the same music; thus there is no hierarchy of cadences to differentiate between ends of versicles and ends of couplets. Finally, because of the double canon, new imitative ideas overlap with the cadences of previous phrases by as many as four breves; Josquin usually articulates cadences with greater clarity.

Despite these differences sixteenth-century audiences had little reason to doubt the attribution of *Veni sancte Spiritus*. Its high overall quality, contrapuntal genius, constructivism, large dimensions, articulation of the text structure, and general expressiveness resonate with Josquin's compositional habits and techniques evident within Ott's anthology. To the mid-sixteenth-century user of the collection *Veni* would surely enhance Josquin's reputation as a composer who deftly blends constructivist procedures with sensitivity to the text. These features, and the resemblances to his other sequence settings, would have pointed toward Josquin more strongly than the inconsistencies would have pointed away from him. Although Ott and his contemporaries were aware of the presence of forgeries and could distinguish, for example, an eleventh-century counterfeit of a verbal document from a fourth-century authentic one,⁷² identifying a contemporaneous musical forgery that is so similar to Josquin's other sequences would have been an entirely different matter.

Until recently, modern scholars have also had little reason to doubt the attribution of *Veni sancte Spiritus*. Just as Osthoff took the *Satzfehler* itself as evidence of Josquin's authorship, when he compared *Veni sancte Spiritus* with Josquin's overall output he was willing to overlook the stylistic inconsistencies, ultimately dubbing the work 'das kunstvollste Stück der Gruppe'.⁷³ During the 1971 International Josquin Festival-Conference, Sparks refuted Osthoff's *Satzfehler* argument by closely comparing a great deal of music containing the simultaneity; some of this repertory had not yet been composed by the time the works in question had been published, and had only recently become available in modern editions.⁷⁴ Similarly, had UppsU 76b, with its French provenance and reliable attributions, not materialized, we would no more

71 Numerous examples of Josquin's canonic artifice, including double-cans, appear in his masses, chansons, and in the 'little' *Salve regina* (a4), a motet that achieved only a limited circulation in manuscript and was never printed until modern times.

72 Burke, 50-69.

73 Osthoff, II: 37.

74 Sparks, 345-59

question the authorship of *Veni sancte Spiritus* than did our sixteenth-century counterparts.

In our ongoing effort to separate the authentic from the inauthentic, it is important to distinguish misattributions resulting from blatant mistakes or deliberate attempts at deception from those that are truly credible. Moreover, serious consideration of credible misattributions yields invaluable information regarding the reception of Josquin's motets and his audience's understanding of his style, which can indeed deviate from our own. The combination of historical distance, the development of new methodologies, and the increasing availability of comparative materials – the result of, and obligation to, modern research – holds the promise of ever-expanding directions in Josquin scholarship.

APPENDIX 1

Variants between the *Liber selectarum cantionum* and the *Novum et insigne opus musicum* (excludes ligatures, resolution of minor color, and representation of final note value). Voice designations and measure numbers refer to Smijers's edition, with the exception of *Benedicta es, caelorum regina*, which refers to the *New Josquin Edition*.

A. *Benedicta es, caelorum regina*

Cadential ornamentation (11)	Superius: m. 30, m. 116, m. 134 Altus: m. 14, m. 36, m. 110, m. 112, m. 121 Tenor 1: m. 33 Tenor 2: m. 18 Bassus 2: m. 84
Semiminin anticipation (6)	Superius: m. 72 Altus: m. 74 Tenor 1: m. 60, m. 67 Tenor 2: m. 49 Bassus 2: m. 13
Rhythmic substitution (5)	Altus: m. 115 Tenor 2: m. 21 note 4–m. 22 note 1, m. 25 note 4–m. 26 note 1, m. 66 note 3–m. 67 note 1 Bassus 2 : m. 85
Passing tone added in 1537 (2)	Superius: m. 114 after note 4; m. 121 after note 1
Other ornaments (1)	Tenor 1: m. 66: 1520 ⁴ has dotted min G,–smin F; 1537 ¹ has smins G–F–G–E
Pitch (3)	Tenor 2: final note 1520 ⁴ has D; 1537 ¹ has B Bassus 2: m. 41 notes 3–4 1520 ⁴ has mins E–C; 1537 ¹ has dotted min E–smin F, m. 80 note 2 1520 ⁴ has smin F; 1537 ¹ has smin G; final note 1520 ⁴ has D; 1537 ¹ has G
Error (1)	Superius: m. 111 note 5–112 note 1: 1520 ⁴ has dotted min D–smin C–min B; corrected in 1537 ¹ to dotted min D–fusae C–B–min A
Conjunctive Variants (2)	Bassus 1: m. 6: VatS16 min B–C–G; 1520 ⁴ and 1537 ¹ have min B–sbr G, an inferior reading. Tenor 2 and Bassus 2: m. 170–end: VatS16, the only other source predating 1520 ⁴ , contains errors. 1520 ⁴ provides a correction that is reproduced in 1537 ¹ . See <i>New Josquin Edition, Critical Commentary</i> vol. 23, 186–89.

B. Miserere mei, Deus

Rhythmic substitution (3)	Altus: m. 383, notes 2–3 Tenor primus: m. 421: 1520 ⁴ has dotted sb–min with text to the end ‘Mi-se-re-re mei’; 1537 ¹ has dotted min-smin-min-min with text to the end ‘Miserere mei Deus’ Bassus: m. 384 note 3–395 note 1
Conjunctive Variants	There are readings shared by 1520 ⁴ and 1537 ¹ that are not found in FlorL 666, 1519 ² (Petrucci), 1521 ³ (Antico), or MunBS 10.

C. O virgo prudentissima

Cadential ornamentation (7)	Superius: m. 28, m. 140, m. 178, m. 186 Quinta vox: m. 121, m. 127 note 4–128 Sexta vox: m. 136
Semiminim anticipation (3)	Superius: m. 28 Quinta vox: m. 51 Sexta vox: m. 31
Rhythmic substitution (12)	Superius: m. 35 note 2–m. 36 note 1, m. 36 note 5–note 6, m. 42 note 2–m. 43 note 1, m. 185 note 5–m. 186 Altus: m. 105, m. 185 Quinta vox: m. 99 notes 2–3, m. 137 notes 2–3 Bassus: m. 24, notes 3–4 Altus/Tenor: mm. 94/96 notes 2–3, mm. 99/101 notes 2–3, mm. 178/180 notes 2–4
Passing tone (1)	Bassus: 1537 ¹ m. 159 has min <i>D</i> in place of fusae <i>E–D</i>
Pitch (2)	Quinta vox: m. 40 note 1: 1520 ⁴ has high <i>D</i> , 1538 ³ has low <i>D</i> ; m. 59, note 3: 1520 ⁴ has <i>C</i> , 1537 ¹ has <i>A</i>

D. *Praeter rerum seriem*

Cadential ornamentation (2)	Superius: m. 28, m. 67
Semiminim anticipation (4)	Altus: m. 75 Bassus: m. 25 (<i>D–C</i>) Tenor secundus (tenor primus in Smijers): m. 73 Bassus secundus: m. 25 (<i>E–D</i>)
Rhythmic substitution (2)	Tenor primus: m. 14, note 1: 1520 ⁴ has min–smin, 1537 ¹ has dotted min Tenor secundus: m. 14, note 10–m. 15: has sbr–sbr–br, 1537 ¹ has lo
Passing tone added (1)	Tenor secundus: m. 11, note 7: 1537 ¹ has smins <i>C–B</i> in place of min B
Errors (1)	Superius 1537 ¹ : m. 61 note 3, <i>C</i> should be <i>D</i>
Conjunctive Variant	Switching of voice parts at the <i>secunda pars</i> separates 1520 ⁴ from earlier sources; 1537 ¹ follows 1520 ⁴

E. *Stabat mater dolorosa*

Rhythmic substitution (1)	Superius Secunda vox: m. 30 note 2–m. 31 note 1
Conjunctive Variant (1)	Superius Prima vox: m. 62 notes 2–3: in 1520 ⁴ (and FlorBC 232) both pitches are <i>C</i> , in all other sources predating Ott's print, the pitches are <i>A</i> , which is a better reading (the <i>C</i> produces open fifths/octaves; the <i>A</i> produces an octave and a third). Ott's print reproduces the erroneous reading in 1520 ⁴ . In the Munich exemplar, the erroneous pitches have been erased and replaced with <i>A</i> 's (the second <i>C</i> is still partially visible)

APPENDIX 2

Variants for *Huc me sydereo* found in VatS 45, the *Novum et insigne opus musicum*, and Petrucci's *Motetti de la corona. Libro tertio* (1519²) excluding ligatures, resolution of minor color, and representation of final note value. Voice designations and measure numbers refer to Smijers's edition. The first number under each category of variant refers to the total number of variants; the number in parentheses refers to the number of variants between VatS 45 and 1538³ only.

		VatS 45	1538 ³	1519 ²
Cadential	Altus 2 m. 138	smin under-3 rd	Simple	=Vat
Ornament 2 (2)	Bassus 1 m. 138	smin under 3 rd	smin F fusae G-F-E-F	=Vat
Rhythmic	Sup m. 49–50	br-sbr	=Vat	dotted sbr
Substitution	Sup m. 57	br	2 sbr	=Vat
18 (12)	Sup m. 130 notes 2–3	sbr	2 mins	=Vat
	Sup m. 135	br	=Vat	2 sbr
	Sup m. 187 note 4–188 note 1	2 min	sbr	=Vat
	Altus 2 m. 11 note 2–m. 12 note 1	dotted sbr	sbr-min	=Vat
	Altus 2 m. 16–19	duplex lo	=Vat	2 lo
	Altus 2 m. 51	2 sbr	br	=Vat
	Altus 2 m. 74 note 3–m. 75 note 1	dotted sbr	sbr-min	=Vat
	Altus 2 m. 76 note 3–m. 77 note 1	dotted br	=Vat	br-sbr
–	Altus 2 m. 127 note 2–m. 128 note 1	br	=Vat	2 sbr
	Altus 2 m. 162 note 2–note 3	dotted sbr	sbr-min	=1538
	Altus 2 m. 165–m. 168	br-br-sbr-sbr-sbr	sbr-br-sbr-br-sbr	=1538
	Bassus 2 m. 63 note 1–m. 64 note 1	s sbr	br	=1538
	Altus 1 m. 75 note 2–m. 76 note 1	sbr-min	dotted sbr	=Vat
	Altus 1 m. 168 note 4–m. 169 note 2	sbr-min	dotted sbr	=Vat
	Bassus 1 m. 76 note 2–m. 77 note 1	sbr-min	=Vat	dotted sbr
	Bassus 1 m. 99 note 2–m. 100 note 1	2 sbr (page turn)	br	=138
Pitch	Sup m. 6, note 5	F smin	=Vat	E smin
13 (11)	Sup m. 180 note 2	D smin	C smin	=Vat
	Sup m. 183 note 3 (A and C sound)	E min	F min	=Vat
	Sup final note	D lo	=Vat	D br-F lo
	Altus 2 m. 163 note 2	A smin	G smin	=Vat
	Bassus 2 final note	low and high D	Low D	High D
	Altus 1 m. 2 note 2	E smin	D smin	=Vat
	Altus 1 m. 41 note 3	B smin	A smin	=Vat
	Altus 1 m. 99 note 2	A min	G min	=Vat
	Altus 1 m. 125 note 1	Low C sbr	High C sbr	=Vat

		VatS 45	1538 ³	1519 ²
	Altus 1 m. 139 note 2	<i>C</i> min	<i>B</i> min	=Vat
	Altus 1 m. 178 note 2	<i>F</i> smin	<i>G</i> smin	=Vat
	Bassus 1 m. 186 note 1	<i>G</i> min	<i>B-flat</i> min	=Vat
Rhythm	Sup m. 63 notes 1–2	2 min	min–smin	=Vat
6 (5)	Sup m. 79 notes 3–5	min–2 smins	dotted min–2 fusae	=Vat
	Sup m. 176 notes 1–2	dotted min–smin	2 min	=Vat
	Altus 2 m. 73 note 1	dotted sbr	sbr–min rest	=Vat
	Altus 2 m. 81 notes 3–5	min–2 smin	dotted min–2 fusae	=Vat
	Altus 2 m. 144 note 2–m. 145 note 2	sbr–min	=Vat	Min–sbr
Ornamentation	Sup m. 81 notes 3–5	Min–2 smins	Min–2 fusae	=Vat
2 (2)	Bassus 1 m. 137 note 3–4	<i>A–B</i> fusae	<i>A–G</i> fusae	=Vat
Mensuration	Notation of Tenor	O ♢ ♢2	♢ ♢ ♢	O2 ♢ ♢
Voice designation	Altus 2	Contratenor primus	Altus [1]	Altus 2
	Bassus 2	Contratenor tertius	Bassus	Bassus 2
	Altus 1	Contratenor secundus	Quinta vox	Altus 1
	Bassus 1	Tenor secundus	Sexta vox	Bassus 1
Major variants	Altus 2 m. 39–42	See Ex. 1	See Ex. 1	See Ex. 1
	Bassus 2 m. 30–32 note 3	<i>D–D–C–B–A–G</i>	<i>G–G–F–E–D–G</i>	=Vat
	Altus 1 m. 55–56	See Ex. 1	See Ex. 1	See Ex. 1
	Altus 1 m. 72–74 note 1	See Ex. 1	See Ex. 1	See Ex. 1
	Altus 1 m. 115–117	See Ex. 1	See Ex. 1	See Ex. 1

Example 1. Josquin des Prez, *Huc me sydereo*, major variants in the earliest sources for the six-voice version (VatS 45, FlorC II.I.232, 1519², 1538³).

Altus 2, mm. 39–42

1538³

1519²

VatS 45

FlorC 232

Altus, 1 m. 55–56

1538³

Vat, 1519², Flor

Altus 1, mm. 72–74

1538³

Vat

1519², Flor

Altus 1, mm. 115–118

1538³

Vat, 1519²

Flor