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PREFACE

Conflicting attributions in music generally have been treated as problems of authorship: which composer wrote the piece. The main reason for this seems to be that most conflicting attributions have been discussed within one rather narrow context or another, most often in studies that deal with an individual composer. And undoubtedly, such one-composer studies should have the problem of determining authorship as the--or at least a--primary concern. However, as such studies have proliferated, and as an ever-increasing number of newly uncovered conflicting attributions have come to light, the need to examine the conflicting attributions in a different, more "global" context has been growing.

Thus, the present study of conflicting attributions in the Continental motet repertory of the first half of the sixteenth century attempts to both bring together (for the first time) all the conflicting attributions in that body of music and examine them from a number of different points of view. And rather than placing the emphasis on the problem of who wrote what piece, the conflicting attributions are themselves used as a springboard that sheds light on such aspects of sixteenth-century music as patterns of
dissemination, printing techniques, composers’ biographies, and even modern musicological attitudes towards the notion of authorship.

In all, the study accounts for a total of 266 motets (including one Te Deum) that involve conflicting attributions among 122 composers. The search for conflicting attributions is limited to motets written by composers who were active on the Continent during the first half of the sixteenth century (thus disregarding Latin motets by English composers). In some instances composers who were not active during that period have been included if their works conflict with those by composers who worked primarily during the fifty-year span. Finally, all composers who were active primarily between ca. 1500 and ca. 1550 have been included, with no attempt to distinguish between those works written during the period in question and those that might fall a few years on either side.

The 266 motets listed in the Inventory (Appendix A) have been tracked down by three means: (1) previous studies, editions, worklists, inventories, etc., of individual composers and sources, which, as one might expect, yielded the overwhelming majority of conflicts--245; (2) my own thematic catalogue of 1,900 motets which added nine more conflicts not noted in the existing literature (Nos. 84, 97, 143, 173, 191, 204, 206, 233, 235); and (3) unpublished
information kindly given to me by Dr. Bonnie Blackburn which added still another twelve conflicting attributions (Nos. 1, 16, 30, 40, 68, 69, 77, 87, 92, 94, 101, 145). Since my catalogue contains all the motets that I have been able to find in modern editions, no doubt more conflicting attributions will eventually be discovered as more editions become available.

I hope that this project is merely a first step in what will become a series of similarly conceived, future studies on conflicting attributions for other periods and other genres, and that such studies will take us one step closer to a better understanding not only of individual problems of authorship, but also of such aspects of the musical past as compositional process, performance practices, patterns of transmission, copying and printing process, and even biography.
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CHAPTER I
CONFLICTING ATTRIBUTIONS FROM ca. 1350
TO ca. 1600: A SURVEY

In general, our modern notion of authorship in the arts--whether music, literature, or the visual arts--is grounded in the idea of a one-to-one relationship between the author, and the work of art. Thus we speak of Homer's Iliad, Shakespeare's Hamlet, Leonardo's Mona Lisa, Beethoven's Choral Symphony, etc. At times, however, a given work may be attributed to more than one author, a phenomenon that is particularly relevant to English drama of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries and to music of a number of different periods. Yet despite sharing the multi-author phenomenon, the two fields furnish us with distinctly different types of multiple authorship: in English drama of that period, multiple authorship usually comes about as a result of the active collaboration of two or more writers, a type that we may call "shared authorship;"¹ in music, on the other hand, instances in

¹. Needless to say, we find examples of "shared authorship" in music also, especially in Baroque opera. A particularly well known example is Muzio Scevola, composed by Filippo Amadei (Act I), Giovanni Bononcini (Act II), and Handel (Act III). Yet even here there is an important difference as compared with the "shared authorship" of English drama, for in the latter, the question of who wrote which portion of the play cannot be always clearly deter-
which two composers are named for a single piece in the very
sources that transmit that piece have usually been viewed as
representing a disagreement or contradiction between
attributions, a type generally known as a "conflicting
attribute." This idea of a conflicting attribution is
generally unfamiliar to students of literature and to
historians of the visual arts.  

For music historians, however, especially those who
specialize in the music of the Renaissance or the Classical
Era, the problem posed by conflicting attributions is ever-
present. The following discussion surveys the problem of
conflicting attributions as it affects various genres from

mined; see, for example, Ernest Oliphant's discussion of
Beggars' Bush by Beaumont and Fletcher (The Plays of
Beaumont and Fletcher, pp. 256-65).

2. There are, of course, examples of "conflicting" attri-
butions in literature. For instance, the seventeenth-century
drama The Coronation, a Comedy is attributed to John
Fletcher and James Shirley, while The Bondman is ascribed to
Fletcher and Philip Massinger; see Bently, "Authenticity and
Attribution in the Jacobian and Caroline Drama," pp. 183-4,
and for still other examples, Oliphant, The Plays of
Beaumont and Fletcher, pp. 94-9. In addition, a few more
conflicting attributions are to be found in English poetry
of the same period, as in the case of The Passionate Shep-
erd, ascribed to both Christopher Marlowe and Shakespeare;
see Hebel and Hudson eds., Poetry of the English Renais-
sance, p. 946. Conflicting attributions also appear in
fifteenth-century poetry, as, for example, in the Spanish
canción Verra con poco saber attributed to Juan de Mena and
Pere Torroellas; see Pope and Kanazawa, Montecassino 871, p.
572.
ca. 1350 to ca. 1600. In the discussion that follows, the material is organized in the following fashion: (A) a discussion of conflicting attributions from ca. 1350 to ca. 1500; (B) conflicts from ca. 1550 to ca. 1600 (both of these periods are treated in rather general fashion); and (C) conflicts from ca. 1500 to ca. 1550, this period being covered with statistics in a genre-by-genre approach (chansons, frottole, madrigal, Masses, and finally the motet.

(A) CONFLICTING ATTRIBUTIONS FROM CA. 1350 TO CA. 1500

The first unequivocal examples of conflicting attributions appear in the fourteenth century, when music manuscripts begin to name composers on a fairly regular basis. In Apel's monumental edition of the French secular repertory, there are three pieces--out of a total of 118

3. Aside from some authors to whom various Gregorian chants are attributed (if, indeed, they composed the music of the chants ascribed to them), the first extensive group of composers to appear in the history of Western music consists of the troubadours and trouvères of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. And as Van der Werf points out, there are instances in which a chanson is attributed to different composers (The Chansons of the Troubadours and Trouvères, p. 16). However, this view has been challenged by Karp, who maintains that the attributions "refer primarily to the poet and not the composer" ("Troubadours and Trouvères," The New Grove, vol. XIX, p. 197). In the end, though, we probably know too little about the composer-poets and their creative processes to say whether or not those pieces carry conflicting attributions in the sense that we are using the term here.
with attributions (and 293 in all)—that are attributed to more than one composer: No. 28, ascribed to Philippus de Caserta and Johannes Galiot; No. 88, to Galiot and Jacques de Senleches; and No. 115, to Machaut and Jean Vaillant. And if the proportion of conflicting attributions to the total number of attributions is minuscule in the fourteenth-century French repertory, it is almost non-existent in the contemporary Italian repertory. In fact, the entire body of Trecento music seems to offer only a single piece with a conflicting attribution, Mort' à la fe, ascribed to both "Franciscus" [Landini?] and P[aulus] A[bbas de Florentia].

In all, it seems fair to say that while the fourteenth century gave rise to the first instances of clearly conflicting attributions, those that do appear are few in number and present little problem to modern scholars.

The situation changes, and dramatically so, in the fifteenth century, when conflicting attributions become both numerous and troublesome. Among the first composers


5. Günther, Nádas, and Stinson, "Magister Dominus Paulus Abbas de Florentia," p. 207. This conflicting attribution has only recently been brought to light, and we might note that von Fischer's catalogue of the Trecento repertory does not list a single conflicting attribution as carrying a conflict; see his Studien zur italienischen Musik, pp. 18-73.
seriously affected by conflicting attributions is John Dunstable. The Dunstable worklist in *The New Grove* contains sixty-four works under the composer’s name, with as many as thirteen of them also ascribed to someone else. Looking at the kinds of pieces that are affected by the conflicts, we notice that sacred works outnumber secular pieces, eleven to two, something that we would expect given that the total number of secular pieces attributed to Dunstable consists of only five works (as opposed to fifty-nine sacred compositions). What is surprising, though, is that as many as eight of the eleven conflicts that affect Dunstable’s sacred output belong to one specific sub-genre, the non-isorhythmic motet, while the isorhythmic motets are completely free of conflicting attributions (see Table I-1).

An examination of works attributed to Hugo de Lantins yields a total of five conflicts—three of ten sacred compositions, and two of eighteen secular works. For Lantins, however, the genre most heavily affected is that of Mass movements, as all three of the sacred works with conflicting attributions are the Mass movements (see Table I-2). Thus, to change the focus from composers to

---

6. Unless otherwise noted, the data presented in this chapter is based on the worklists included in the individual entries on composers in *The New Grove*. The modern edition of Dunstable’s works lists only seven conflicting attributions; see the critical commentary of Dunstable, *Complete Works*.
Table I-1. Conflicting attributions in Dunstable’s works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Number of Pieces</th>
<th>Number of Conflicts</th>
<th>Composers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masses and Mass movements</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Power (2), Power and Benet (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Isorhythmic Motets</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Power (4), Binchois (2), Dufay (1), Forest (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isorhythmic Motets</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secular Works</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bedyngham (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I-2. Conflicting attributions in H. de Lantins’ works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Number of pieces</th>
<th>Number of Conflicts</th>
<th>Composers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masses and Mass movements</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dufay (2), Forest (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Isorhythmic Motets</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isorhythmic Motets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secular Works</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arnold de Lantins (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
manuscripts, it may not be surprising that in BolC Q15, BolU 2216, and OxfBC 213, each of which transmits a mixed repertory, sacred compositions are transmitted with conflicts rather more frequently than are the secular works—eight out of 414 redactions of sacred pieces and four out of 304 redactions of secular ones. However, to conclude that one particular genre or another is more seriously affected by conflicting attributions than another seems inappropriate, since there are not enough incidents to make comparison meaningful.

One pattern begins to emerge clearly with the Dunstable conflicts: a composer tends to conflict either with another or with a narrow circle of composers with whom there would seem to be some biographical connections. Thus of the thirteen conflicting attributions in which Dunstable is involved, seven are, as one might expect, with his fellow Englishman Leonel Power. In the case of Hugo de Lantins, four of the five conflicts involve either Dufay (2), who might have had a close connection with Hugo, or Arnold de Lantins (2), who probably was Hugo’s relative.

This pattern—the tendency for certain composers to

7. As Alejandro Planchart, "Du Fay’s Benefices," p. 124, points out, Hugo was present at the Malatesta court of Pesaro at precisely the same time that we presume that Dufay was also in Malatesta service.

conflict primarily with certain other composers—is apparent again in the second half of the fifteenth century, though now the concentration of conflicting attributions shifts to the secular repertory, specifically to the French chanson, a repertory that Fallows has estimated to consist of some 1,200 works.\textsuperscript{9} Limiting his search only to those conflicting attributions in which at least one of the composers involved is named in a source that originated in Italy, Atlas turned up seventy-six conflicts.\textsuperscript{10} Though we can do no more than guess, if we extend Atlas’s study to include conflicts in which both composers are named in sources from north of the Alps, the number of conflicts would approximately double. The number of conflicting attributions for the chanson repertory of the second half of the fifteenth century could therefore conceivably approach 12\% of the total repertory.

Unfortunately, no similarly systematic effort has been made to tally up the conflicting attributions in the sacred genres of the same period. However, it seems unlikely that the rate of conflicting attributions in such pieces would

\textsuperscript{9} "Review of Howard Mayer Brown, A Florentine Chansonnier from the Time of Lorenzo the Magnificent," Times Literary Supplement, 27 April 1984, p. 474. Fallows points out that the 268 works in the manuscript FlorBN BR229 constitute approximately one quarter of the total chanson repertory of the second half of the fifteenth century.

\textsuperscript{10} Atlas, "Conflicting Attributions."
match or even come close to that in the French chanson.
Indeed, three strictly liturgical genres of the period for
which there are inventories—Office hymns, Magnificats, and
Te Deums—contain a very small number of conflicts.\textsuperscript{11} This
trend is confirmed by the ratios of conflicting attributions
in the sacred and secular works of four composers—Agricola,
Busnois, Compère, and Ockeghem (Table I-3).\textsuperscript{12}

Though Ockeghem has left us secular and sacred pieces
in almost equal number—there are twenty-four chansons
ascribed to him, alongside seventeen Masses and nine
motets—six of the eight conflicting attributions involving
Ockeghem occur in his secular output. As for Agricola,
there are conflicting attributions in four out of thirty-
eight sacred works (10.5%), but seventeen out of eighty-four
secular works (20.2%). Thus it seems safe to say that
during the second half of the fifteenth century the problem
of conflicting attributions is far more acute in the secular
repertory than it is in the sacred.

As for the phenomenon in which a composer tends to
conflict predominantly with one other composer or with a

\textsuperscript{11} For hymn settings, see Ward, \textit{The Office Hymn}; for
Magnificat and Te Deum settings, see Kirsch, \textit{Te Deum- und
Magnificat}.

\textsuperscript{12} In addition to the worklists in \textit{The New Grove}, I have
used the followings: Agricola, \textit{Opera Omnia}, Finscher,
Compère, and Atlas, "Conflicting Attributions."
Table I-3. Comparison of conflicting attributions in sacred and secular works of Agricola, Busnois, Compère, and Ockeghem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sacred number of pieces</th>
<th>Sacred number of conflicts</th>
<th>Secular number of pieces</th>
<th>Secular number of conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricola</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busnois</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compère</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ockeghem</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
small group of composers with whom he intersects biographically, this will, as Table I-4 makes clear, hold up for all four composers. Indeed, Atlas believes the tendency is so strong, that he actually turns it around and speculates about the biographies of certain composers based upon the composer-concentration of their conflicting attributions.13

(B) CONFLICTING ATTRIBUTIONS FROM ca. 1550 TO ca. 1600

In the second half of the sixteenth century, it seems initially as though conflicting attributions are virtually absent, at least in comparison to both the second half of the fifteenth century and the first half of the sixteenth century. Indeed, a search through the works of some of the most prolific composers of the period—Lasso, Monte, Palestrina, Porta, and Wert—turns up only a meager number of conflicts: one madrigal for Lassus, and three madrigals

13. Atlas, "Conflicting Attributions," pp. 275-6. Thus it would not be surprising if further research turns up some kind of biographical connection between Busnois and Japart, about whom we know very little. (For speculation about the matter, see the forthcoming article by Atlas, "Japart-Busnois/Student-Teacher" to appear in a Festschrift for Luther Dittmer.) And though there is no documentary evidence that links Caron to Busnois, it has been suggested that they knew each other; see The New Grove, vol. III, p. 816.
Table I-4. Composers with whom the four composers conflict.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Composers Conflicting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricola</td>
<td>Compère (4), Isaac (3), Brumel (2), Fresneau (2), Hayne (2), Josquin (2), Obrecht (2), Aulen, Bourdon, Busnois, Felice, La Rue, P., Robert, Verbonet (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busnois</td>
<td>Caron (3), Japart (3), Hayne (2) Ockeghem (2), Agricola, Compère, Felice, Isaac, La Rue, Martini, Mureau (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compère</td>
<td>Agricola (4), Josquin (3), Weerbecke (2), Anchieta, Boris, Busnois, Martini, Mureau, Ninot, Obrecht, Peñalosa, Pietrequin, Pipelare, Ribera, Richafort, Robert, Rubinet, Stockem, Tinctoris, Vaqueras (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ockeghem</td>
<td>Busnois (2), Barbingant, Dufay, Faugues, Hayne, Cornelius Heyns, Malcort, Martini (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for Monte. Still, as a recent example involving Giovanni Gabrieli attests, one cannot be certain that at least a few more conflicts will not turn up in the future. For example, while the inventory of Gabrieli's works compiled by Kenton fails to list a single instance of a conflicting attribution, the addenda made by Charteris includes a hitherto overlooked German organ tabulature--BerlPS 40165--that transmits eight keyboard works generally thought to be Gabrieli's but which are here attributed to Christian Erbach and Andrea Gabrieli. Or, to cite another example, the madrigal Non vi vieto per queste included in Dorico's 1560 collection of Lasso's madrigals, and thus generally regarded as an authentic work of Lasso's, is also attributed to Hoste da Reggio in a Scotto print of 1554. Perhaps, therefore, still further conflicting attributions of this period will be uncovered when a more thorough cross-checking of works is possible. Even so, it is probable that a list

14. Mann, The Madrigals of Monte, pp. 142-57. MacClintock's catalogue lists no conflicting attributions; see her Giaches de Wert: Life and Works, pp. 239-79. Unfortunately, there are still no thorough catalogues of both works and sources for either Palestrina or Porta. All that can be said is that The New Grove worklists for those composers fail to list even a single conflicting attribution.

15. Kenton, Giovanni Gabrieli, passim.


of conflicting attributions from this period would be rather short. For that reason the pattern of conflicting attributions—concentrations within certain groups of composers—mentioned in connection with the conflicts in the second half of the fifteenth century is not found here.

No doubt, the virtual disappearance of conflicting attributions in the second half of the sixteenth century is related to the changes in the means through which most music was transmitted. In general, transmission by manuscript became ever more insignificant during these years, and we would have lost only a small number of pieces from this period even had no manuscripts at all from the late sixteenth century survived. For example, even were we to disregard every manuscript redaction of Philippe de Monte's madrigals, not a single piece would be lost.¹⁸ And just as the manuscript tradition slowed down, so too did the production of printed anthologies, at least as measured against their mid-century peak (see Table I-5). Now, what these two means of transmission have in common, despite

¹⁸. Mann, The Madrigals of Monte, pp. 11-58. This is especially true for the Italian madrigal and related genres. As for the sacred music of the period, though manuscripts were still fairly important, they tended to betray a backward-looking tendency in musical repertories; manuscripts from the late sixteenth century often contain as much music by composers of the first half of the century as they do by composers from the second half.
Table I-5. Anthologies published before 1600.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Number of prints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1501-10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1511-20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521-30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1531-40</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541-50</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551-60</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561-70</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571-80</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581-90</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591-1600</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table is based on RISM B/IV/1.
their obvious differences, is that they represent two types of anthology--assemblages of various composers' works. At the same time, the production of one-composer collections began to increase. Even though the number of such collections published during the period is hard to estimate accurately, an examination of printed collections for some composers chosen at random--Monte, Porta, and Wert--provides us with some basis on which to judge their importance. Admittedly, as Table I-6 shows, the sheer number of anthologies that include music by these three composers is still larger than the number of one-composer collections. However, since each collection devoted to a single composer contains a far greater number of works by that composer than does an anthology, the number of pieces by the composer which is included in the one-composer collections is far greater than that in the anthologies.19

In all, the sharp decrease in the number of conflicting attributions may be related to the increase in the publication of one-composer collections, a type that began to appear regularly in the early 1530's. This new medium became what was perhaps the major means of transmitting music during both the second half of the

19. Moreover, many pieces that appeared in anthologies had already been printed in earlier, one-composer collections. For such instances in connection with Monte, see Mann, The Secular Madrigals of Monte, p. 41.
Table I-6. Number of publications in both anthology and collection types for the works by Monte, Porta, and Wert.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Anthologies</th>
<th>One-Composer Collections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monte</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porta</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wert</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sixteenth century and the first quarter of the seventeenth, when the music printing business as a whole began to fall upon hard times.\textsuperscript{20}

Thus, if the hypothesis relating the rate of conflicting attributions to the means of transmission is correct, we should see a different situation in the seventeenth century, when transmission by means of manuscript once again began to predominate. Looking at the works of Giacomo Carissimi, for example, we are struck by the large number of conflicting attributions in his works and, hence, at least somewhat confirming the hypothesis. In her index of Carissimi’s cantatas, Gloria Rose notes that of the total of 211 such works, thirty-two are transmitted with conflicting attributions, involving fourteen composers.\textsuperscript{21} And as one might expect, the transmission of Carissimi’s vocal works was primarily through manuscripts.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{20} According to Bianconi, music publishing declined sharply after 1600; see, \textit{Music in the Seventeenth Century}, pp. 73-81.

\textsuperscript{21} Rose, \textit{Giacomo Carissimi}, passim.

\textsuperscript{22} For example, of Carissimi’s more than 250 motets, fifty-three survive in prints, while more than two hundred motets are transmitted only in manuscripts; see, Jones, \textit{Motets of Carissimi}, p. 41. Moreover, the figures for the print-to-manuscript ratio of Carissimi’s cantatas are even more striking. Up to 1710 there are but nine prints that contain cantatas by Carissimi, while the number of manuscript redactions that transmit his cantatas runs well into the hundreds; see Rose \textit{op. cit.}, p. vii.
(C) CONFLICTING ATTRIBUTIONS FROM CA. 1500 TO CA. 1550

During the first half of the sixteenth century, almost every genre—whether secular or sacred—was affected by conflicting attributions in fairly substantial numbers. The following discussion of conflicts during the period between 1500 and 1550 is based sometimes on data taken from a selective population, at other times on data drawn from a more comprehensive population. Yet despite this inconsistency in the methods of obtaining the data, it provides some idea as to the degree with which conflicting attributions were transmitted during this period.

(1) Secular Music

The three main secular genres of the time were the chanson, the madrigal, and—early in the century—the frottola. As will be shown, each of the three genres is marked by a rate of conflicting attributions that varies from about 6% to approximately 13% of the total number of pieces in each genre by a select group of composers. Moreover, in each genre, a pair of composers emerges, with the number of conflicts between the members of each pair being so great in comparison to conflicts that they have with other composers that no one could fail to recognize them.

For the so-called "Parisian" chanson, I examined the
works of Certon, Janequin, and Sermisy. According to the worklists in *The New Grove*, these three composers wrote a total of about 731 chansons: 283 by Janequin, 176 by Sermisy, and 285 by Certon (minus 13 for duplications owing to conflicting attributions = 744). As Table I-7 shows, the 731 works include thirty-nine instances of conflicting attributions. Table I-7 further shows that the greatest number of conflicts between any two composers are the eleven between Janequin and Sermisy. Finally, while Sermisy conflicts with Sandrin and Certon five and two times respectively, neither one of the latter two composers ever stands in conflict with Janequin. From the number of composers involved—thirty one—and the number of conflicts, it is clear (1) that conflicting attributions in the Parisian chansons were common, and (2) that the late fifteenth-century trend in which one composer tended to conflict with another continues to hold up.

---

23. In addition to the worklists for the three composers in *The New Grove*, the following sources were used: the Passereau worklist in *The New Grove* (which adds two more Janequin/Passereau conflicts that are not listed in the worklist for Janequin); and *Certon: Chansons polyphoniques*, Agnel and Expert, eds., which, however, includes only 125 pieces. Since the Certon worklist in *The New Grove*, which credits Certon with 285 chansons, does not cite conflicting attributions, the seven conflicts accounted for in Table I-7 were taken from *Certon: Chansons polyphoniques*. Thus there may well be further conflicting attributions involving Certon.
Table I-7. Conflicts in the Parisian chansons involving three composers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Number of pieces ascribed</th>
<th>Composers involved</th>
<th>Number of conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janequin</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>Sermisy(11), Passereau(4), Le Heurteur(3) Clemens (2), Gascongne(2), Bonvosiin(1), Cossin(1), Fevin(1), Gombert(1), Gosse(1), T. Janequin(1), Port(1), Sohier(1), Ysoré(1).</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermisy</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Janequin(11), Sandrin(5), Certon(2), Crecquillon(2), Jacotin(2), Le Heurteur(2), Appenzeller(1), Dulot(1), Gombert(1), Isaac(1), La Rue(1), Mornable(1), Moulu(1), Peletier(1), Vermont(1).</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certon</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Panurge(2), Sermisy(2), P. Clereau(1), Dufour(1), Gardane(1).</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>744</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Subtract duplications -13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>731</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rate of Conflicting Attribution: 7.2%

* Since there are conflicts involving more than two composers, and since conflicts among the three representative composers are listed twice, all the duplications must be subtracted in order to calculate the total number of pieces with conflicting attributions.
In Italy, the two major secular genres of the time were the frottola in the early part of the century and later the madrigal. The works of four frottola composers were examined: Cara, Lurano, Pesenti, and Tromboncino. Of the approximately 349 different compositions ascribed to the four composers, twenty-two involve conflicting attributions (see Table I-8).24 Again, the large number of conflicts between one pair of composers—Cara and Tromboncino—is significant.

It is interesting to note that the varying geographical-chronological breadths with which the Parisian chansons and frottola were disseminated does not affect the degree to which they were affected by conflicting attributions in any significant way. Thus while the Parisian chanson traveled widely all over the Continent, the rate of conflicts in the chanson repertory is not meaningfully higher than the rate of conflicts in the frottola, a genre cultivated and disseminated mainly in northern Italy. Moreover, as we shall see, the rate of conflicts in the chanson is also lower than that in the madrigal, a genre disseminated outside Italy only during the second half of the sixteenth century.

24. The data is based on the catalogue by Jeppeson, La Frottola, vols. I-III, passim.
Table I-8. Conflicts in frottole involving four composers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Number of pieces ascribed</th>
<th>Composers involved</th>
<th>Number of conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tromboncino</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Cara (10), Pesenti (3), Lurano (2), A. de A. (1), F. T. (1), F. V. (1), Iac. Fo. (1)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cara</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Tromboncino (10), Alexandro Mantovano (2), Pesenti (1)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesenti</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Tromboncino (3), Cara (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lurano</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Tromboncino (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtract duplications</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td></td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>349</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rate of Conflicting Attribution: 6%
As with the frottola, our sample of madrigals was taken from the works of four composers: 429 madrigals by Berchem, Festa, Verdelot, and Willaert.\textsuperscript{25} These works yielded fifty-seven instances of conflicting attributions, with the most prominent couplings of composers taking the form of fourteen conflicts between Festa and Fogliano\textsuperscript{26} and of eleven between Festa and Arcadelt (see Table I-9).

In sum, the rates of conflicting attributions in the sample populations of attributed chansons, frottole, and madrigals are 7.2\%, 6\%, and 13.2\%, respectively. Obviously, these figures are, with respect to the genres as a whole, slightly skewed, in that the samples that yielded them consisted only of pieces transmitted with attributions in the first place. And it is just as obvious that the rates would drop if the many anonyini in these genres were added to the total populations.\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{25} For conflicting attributions in Festa's madrigals, see Musch, \textit{Festa als Madrigalkomponist}, pp. 157-69 and Fenlon and Haar, "Fonti e cronologia." The modern edition of Willaert's madrigals adds more conflicting attributions which are not listed in \textit{The New Grove}; see, Willaert, \textit{Opera Omnia}, vol. XIV, pp. viii-ix.

\textsuperscript{26} The fourteen madrigals are ascribed to Fogliano only in RegB 940-1; see Fenlon and Haar, "Fonti e cronologia," p. 215, fn. 8.

\textsuperscript{27} For example, in a letter of 1 December 1988, Prof. Lawrence Bernstein informed me that his estimate of the proportion of chansons with conflicting attributions would be about 5\% of the total repertory.
Table I-9. Conflicts in madrigals involving Berchem, Festa, Verdelot, and Willaert.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Number of pieces ascribed</th>
<th>Composers involved</th>
<th>Number of conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Festa</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Fogliano (14), Arcadelt (11), Verdelot (2), Compère (1), S. Festa (1), Gardane (1), Ghibelli (1), Rampollinus (1), Pesenti (1), Pisano (1), Willaert (1)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdelot</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Arcadelt (4), Willaert (4), M. Jhan (3), Festa (2), De Silva (2)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willaert</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Verdelot (4), Barré (2), Corteccia (1), Donato (1), C. Festa (1)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berchem</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Arcadelt (2), A. Ferrabosco (1), Jacquet (1), Ivo (1), Ivo Barry (1), Naich (1)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>435</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtract duplications</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>429</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rate of Conflicting Attribution: 13.2%
(2) **Sacred Music** (Masses)

Thanks to the catalogues of Kirsch and Ward, there are three sacred genres—straddling the fifteenth and first half of the sixteenth centuries—for which accurate rates of conflicting attributions can be determined: Office hymn, Magnificat, and Te Deum. While Kirsch's catalogue of Te Deum and Magnificat settings lists nine settings with conflicts out of a total of 1,160, Ward's inventory of 755 Office hymns does not include a single item with a conflicting attribution. In both instances, the low proportion of pieces with conflicting attributions would seem to result from (1) the low attribution rate to begin with—only 144 of the 755 hymns listed by Ward bear attributions, and (2) the generally circumscribed dissemination with which the majority of these often "local" pieces are found.

In other sacred genres, however, namely the motet and the Mass, conflicting attributions are as numerous, or almost so, as in the secular genres of the time. Since there is no single inventory for the Mass repertory of the period, our estimate must once again be based on a group of select composers (see Table I-10). What emerges is that, with the Masses of Josquin omitted, a total of 110 ascribed Masses by seven composers includes five with conflicting
Table I-10. Conflicts in Masses involving the eight composers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Number of pieces ascribed</th>
<th>Composers involved</th>
<th>Number of conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Compère (2), La Rue (2), Bauldewyne (1), Martini (1), Moulu (1), Nicolaus Scomtianus (1), Richafort (1)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crecquillon</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Clemens (1), Manchicourt (1), Morales (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fevin (1), Forestier (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemens</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Crecquillon (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fevin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mouton (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchicourt</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Crecquillon (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morales</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Crecquillon (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gombert</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtract duplications</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rate of Conflicting Attribution: 10.1%
less than the 6% that emerges from our select group of frottola settings. When, however, Josquin’s twenty-nine ascribed Masses with their nine conflicts are added, the rate of conflicting attributions more than doubles, reaching 10.1%. Josquin alone, then, accounts for more than half of the conflicting attributions in our sample, and we shall see that he stands out in a similar way in our overall, non-randomly-selected survey of the motet repertory.

(3) The Motet Repertory

Since conflicting attributions in the motet repertory from ca. 1500 to ca. 1550 are the main subject of the present study, we shall deal with them in only the briefest, most introductory fashion here. Out of a total of 6,000 motets,28 I have accounted for 266 conflicting attributions that involve a total of 122 composers. Thus, slightly less than 5% of the motets—both attributed and anonymous—composed in the first half of the sixteenth century are transmitted with conflicting attributions, a proportion that approximates our estimated percentages for conflicting attributions in such genres as the chanson and frottola, while falling rather short of our estimate for the madrigal and Mass.

Finally, as I have already noted in the Preface, this study deals with the Continental motet only, Latin motets by English composers having been excluded. This is not to imply that the English motet repertory and other English genres do not have conflicting attributions and problems of their own. Rather, it is a case of their being sharply distinct repertories. In fact, there is only one instance in which a motet is attributed both to an English and to a Continental composer: the *Ascendo ad Patrem* ascribed to Maillard and Tye. If nothing else, this lack of conflicting attributions between English and Continental composers may show that the lines between the repertories were drawn a good deal harder than they had been a hundred years earlier, when six of the thirteen conflicts involving Dunstable had him bumping up against Continental composers.

There emerge from this brief sketch of conflicting attributions three "themes," so to speak, the last two of which run through the entire span of periods covered: (1) conflicting attributions—that is, situations in which the musical or other documentary sources unequivocally attribute one work to two or more different composers—are an ever-present phenomenon from at least the beginning of the fifteenth century to ca. 1550 (with a much smaller number of conflicts appearing in both the late fourteenth and late
sixteenth centuries);\textsuperscript{29} (2) from the fifteenth century on, there seems to be a correlation between the number of conflicting attributions and the means by which music was generally transmitted; that is, the number of conflicts during the second half of the sixteenth century--small in comparison with the periods before and after--would seem to be related to the predominance of printed, one-composer collections as opposed to either printed or manuscript anthologies; and (3) if one finds a relatively large number of total conflicts for a given composer, the vast majority of those conflicts tends to occur with only one or two other authors with whom the composer has had some biographical intersections, while a larger group of composers will share

\textsuperscript{29} A superficial survey of conflicting attributions in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries shows that these periods, too, transmit a large number of conflicts. For instance, seventeenth-century Italy, is plagued by conflicting attributions, and, as in the late fifteenth century, they seem to be concentrated in certain genres; thus they appear mainly in conjunction with the cantata and motet, as opposed to instrumental music, oratorio or opera; see The Wellesley Edition Cantata Index Series for conflicting attributions in the seventeenth-century cantatas. As for the Classical Era, it would seem to be similar to the first half of the sixteenth century, as conflicting attributions seem to pervade most genres; see, for example, MacIntyre, \textit{The Viennese Mass}, pp. 583-676, and LaRue, \textit{The Eighteenth-Century Symphonies}. 
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the rest, each of whom has a smaller number.\textsuperscript{30}

Finally, while it is one thing to identify certain recurring "themes," it is another to explain their causes. And though the explanations offered in the chapters that follow may seem conjectural and less than precise, they represent at least a beginning for the study of conflicting attributions in the early sixteenth-century motet. At the same time, the present work serves as an invitation for others to explore the problem of conflicting attributions in various periods and genres with the same intensity.

\textsuperscript{30} This pattern also seems to continue into the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. For example, of the thirty-two cantatas of Carissimi that have conflicting attributions, fourteen are also ascribed to Luigi Rossi, who worked in Rome, where Carissimi spent most of his life; see Rose, \textit{Giacomo Carissimi, passim}. Similarly, of the forty-nine conflicts that affect the symphonic works of Johann Stamitz, eleven are also attributed to Filtz who studied with Stamitz at Mannheim; the Stamitz-Filtz conflicts are twice as numerous as those for the next pairing, Stamitz and F. X. Richter, for whom there are five conflicts; see Wolf, \textit{Johann Stamitz}, pp. 377-458.
CHAPTER II
CONFLICTING ATTRIBUTIONS
AND THEIR TRANSMISSION TYPES

Sixteenth-century sources transmit conflicting attributions in various ways: (A) in multiple sources—with four different transmission types—(1) conflicting attributions transmitted in both manuscripts and prints; (2) conflicting attributions in which manuscripts disagree with prints only; (3) conflicting attributions transmitted only through manuscripts; and (4) conflicting attributions transmitted only through prints.¹

There are those conflicting attributions (B) in which the names of the two composers actually appear within a single source. Again, four different types may be distinguished: (1) the two composers are named in a conflict between any combination of indices and the main body of the sources; (2) the two composers are named over the prima and the secunda pars, respectively; (3) the two composers are named using the word "alias;" and (4) the two composers are named in different copies or "states" of the same edition of a printed source.

¹. Throughout this chapter, sources without ascriptions are ignored, since they do not affect the transmission type of the conflicting attribution.
In addition, we should note that a conflicting attribution involving multiple sources may include a source with an internal conflict. Such cases are included in both categories. Throughout this chapter, the emphasis is placed on the presentation of factual-statistical information, and, it must be said, no significant patterns emerged from the following analysis.

(A) **CONFLICTING ATTRIBUTIONS TRANSMITTED IN MULTIPLE SOURCES**

(1) **Conflicts transmitted in both manuscripts and prints.**

By far the greatest number of conflicting attributions belong to the type in which each of the composers involved is named in both manuscripts and prints. One example may suffice as an illustration: *Congratulamini mihi* (No. 45) attributed to Sermisy in four prints—Gardane 1539/13, Attaingnant 1542 Sermisy, Gardane 1549/10, and Scotto 1549/10a—and in two manuscripts—KönSU 1740 and MunBS 16, though it bears Verdelot’s name in the print Kriesstein 1540/7 and the manuscript ErlU 473/1. Of the 266 motets with conflicting attributions, no fewer than 154 motets (58%) are transmitted in this manner.²

---

². Manuscripts are designated using the sigla employed in the Census Catalogue, and prints are designated by publisher followed by RISM (vol. B/IV/1) number. For printed single-composer collections, the siglum consists of the name of the printer, year of publication, and name of the composer to
(2) **Conflicts between manuscripts and prints.**

This subgroup consists of conflicting attributions in which all manuscript sources that transmit the motet with an ascription attribute it to one composer, while all prints transmitting the same motet—again, with an ascription—attribute it to another composer.

Again, one example may serve here, the Morales/Escobedo *Immutemur habitu* (No. 112): this motet is attributed to Escobedo in two manuscripts, ToleBC 17 and VatS 13, whereas Morales is named in three prints, Scotto 1543/5, Gardane 1546/9, and Montanus & Neuber 1556/9. Altogether, there are forty-eight such examples, or 18% of the whole (see Table II-1).

(3) **Conflicts transmitted in manuscripts only**

There are only twenty motets in which conflicting attributions are found exclusively in manuscripts; thus these conflicts comprise only a small part (7%) of the whole. Looking at Table II-2, one notices immediately that Josquin and Mouton dominate the list. This may no doubt be explained by their status as two of the most prolific composers of motets just prior to the period when printed

whom the collection is devoted. See the List of Sources (Appendix C) for a full explanation of each siglum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motet Number</th>
<th>Ascription in manuscripts</th>
<th>Ascription in prints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Richafort</td>
<td>Gombert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bauldeweyn</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Willaert</td>
<td>Simon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M. Jhan</td>
<td>Jacquet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Dalla Viola</td>
<td>Gombert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Conseil/M. Jhan</td>
<td>Jacquet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>Senfl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>Champion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Crecquillon</td>
<td>Hollander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Jacquet</td>
<td>Gombert/Ruffo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Clemens</td>
<td>Tubal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Haugk</td>
<td>Gombert/Mahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Champion/Josquin</td>
<td>Senfl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Carpentras</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Stoltzer</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Moulu</td>
<td>Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Lhérigitier</td>
<td>Jacquet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Clemens</td>
<td>Crecquillon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Reulx</td>
<td>Sermisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Mouton/Richafort</td>
<td>Hesdin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Mahu</td>
<td>Walter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td>Fevin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Phinot</td>
<td>Gombert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>M. Jhan</td>
<td>Jacquet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Lapicida</td>
<td>Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Escobedo</td>
<td>Morales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Moulu</td>
<td>Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Morales</td>
<td>Jacquet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td>Moulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Clemens</td>
<td>Valent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Crecquillon</td>
<td>Clemens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Josquin/M. Jhan</td>
<td>Heugel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Richafort</td>
<td>Gombert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Danblon</td>
<td>Pesenti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Brouck</td>
<td>Sermisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Lupus</td>
<td>Conseil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Anchieta/Peñalosa/Ribera</td>
<td>Compère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Manchicourt</td>
<td>Clemens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Maessens</td>
<td>Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Morales</td>
<td>Clemens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Festa</td>
<td>Senfl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Lupi</td>
<td>Sermisy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table II-2. Conflicting attributions transmitted only in manuscripts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motet number</th>
<th>Composers involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Josquin/Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Anchieta/Peñaalosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Mouton/Willaert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Josquin/Senfl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Mouton/Ninot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Lhéritier/Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Gombert/Mouton/Verdelot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Eckel/Josquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Escobar/Peñaalosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Crecquillon/Lupi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Josquin/Regis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Compère/Richafort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Lupus/Renaldo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Josquin/Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Lhéritier/Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Jacquet/Josquin/Verdelot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Josquin/Peñaalosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Ninot/Obrecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>De Silva/Josquin/Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Jacquet/Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Brunet/Josquin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sources, if not coming to dominate, at least came to stand
on par with manuscripts in disseminating the motet. Indeed,
many of the composers listed in Table II-2 had already
reached maturity by the beginning of the sixteenth century.

On the other hand, such prolific composers as Clemens,
Crecquillon, and Gombert, whose careers blossomed at the
time that coincides with the "explosion" of printed sources,
are barely represented in the list. For example, only one
instance involves Willaert (No. 80).

The twenty motets in Table II-2 are transmitted in
forty-three manuscripts (see Table II-3). The chronological
and regional breakdown of those manuscripts show that (1)
almost half of them were compiled around the middle of the
century, (2) while all the Italian sources (except TrevBC 8)
are distributed equally for the first two thirty-year spans,
the German sources begin to appear only after 1530, and (3)
the number of the Spanish sources decreases gradually.

(4) **Conflicts transmitted in prints only.**

Included in this category are forty-four motets (see
Table II-4); thus approximately 17% of the conflicting
attributions--more than two times as many as were
disseminated only in manuscripts--are transmitted
exclusively in printed sources. Here the Willaert-Gombert
generation comes to the fore. Fourteen motets involve
Gombert, five concern Jacquet, and four each mention Lupi,
Table II-3. Chronological and Regional Breakdown of the forty-three manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Regional Breakdown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>before 1530</td>
<td>7 Italian (BolC Q19, BolC Q20, FlorBN II.I.232, ModD 9, VatS 42, VatS 46, VerBC 760), 5 Spanish (BarcBC 454, SegC s.s., SevC 5-5-20, TarazC 2, TarazC 5), 2 Netherlandish (VatC 234, VienNB Mus. 15941), 1 French (CopKB 1848)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530-1560</td>
<td>8 German (CopKB 1872, DressL 1/D/505, Eiss s.s., KönSU 1740, LeipU 49, RosU 49, RegB 940-1, SGallis 463), 7 Italian (BolC R142, FlorBN Magl. 125bis, RomeV 35-40, VatG XII.4, VatS 24, VatS 38, VerA 218), 3 Spanish (SevBC 1, ToleBC 10, ToleBC 21), 2 Netherlandish (BrusC 27088, LeidGA 1439)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after 1560</td>
<td>6 German (DressL Grimma 49, DressL Grimma 51, MunBS, 1536, RegB 786-837, VienNB Mus. 19189, ZwiR 74/1), 1 Italian (TrevBC 8), 1 Spanish (Vallac 5)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table II-4. Conflicting attributions transmitted in prints only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motet number</th>
<th>Composers involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Caussin/Gombert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gombert/Hesdin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gombert/Verdelot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Stoltzer/Werrecore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Eustachius/Isaac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Gombert/Naich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Crecquillon/Lupi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Gombert/Helloinck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Conseil/Gombert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Fevin/Josquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Gallus/Susato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Arcadelt/Sermisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Gombert/Manchicourt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Gombert/Willaert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Lupi/Lupino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Hesdin/Manchicourt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Manchicourt/Portinaro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Fevin/Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Brumel/Josquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Jacquet/Senfl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Jacquet/Werrecore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Berchem/Jacquet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Courtois/Jacotin/Morales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Gombert/Ruffo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Gombert/Grandsyre/Lupi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Clemens/Morales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Jacquet/Morales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Hellinck/Vinders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Jacquet/Manchicourt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Gascongne/Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Gascongne/Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Gombert/Ruffo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Caussin/Gombert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Hellinck/Lupi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Mahu/Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Gombert/Ruffo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Certon/Josquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Clemens/Crecquillon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Cadéc/Hesdin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Lupino/Willaert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Gombert/Morales/Ruffo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Ferrabosco/Rore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>De Silva/Paminger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Clemens/Crecquillon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Manchicourt, and Mouton (see Table II-5).

Finally, Table II-6 provides the breakdown of the 266 motets that were distributed in each of the four transmission types.

(B) CONFLICTING ATTRIBUTIONS TRANSMITTED IN SINGLE SOURCES

The sources of sixteenth-century vocal music were prepared in one of two formats: choirbook or partbook. In the case of choirbook format, there are two places where the names of composers could appear—in the index and above the beginning of the superius, generally at the top of the verso. However, in the case of partbooks, which were introduced toward the end of the fifteenth century and which gradually became the format favored both by printers and by compilers of manuscripts in the sixteenth century, the attribution can, in theory (assuming a set of five partbooks), appear in ten different places—above the beginning of the music of each voice part, as well as in the index of each partbook. Obviously, not every source gives each attribution ten times. Rather a set of "partial

3. According to The New Grove, Ber1PS 40098 (the so-called Glogauer Liederbuch), compiled in ca. 1480, is the first set of partbooks; see, "Partbooks," vol. XIV, p. 251.

4. There is, however, among later printers—Susato for example—a tendency to give attributions as many times as possible; see Table II-10.
Table II-5. Composers involved in conflicts transmitted in printed sources only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composers</th>
<th>Number of conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gombert</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquet</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupi, Manchicourt, Mouton</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemens, Hellinck, Hesdin, Josquin, Morales, Ruffo</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caussin, Crecquillon, Fevin, Gascongne, Lupino, Werrecore, Willaert</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadelt, Berchem, Brumel, Cadéac, Certon, Conseil, Courtois, De Silva, Eustachius, Ferrabosco, Gallus, Grandsyre, Isaac, Jacotin, Mahu, Paminger, Portinaro, Rore, Senfl, Sermisy, Stoltzer, Susato, Vinders, Verdelot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II-6. Number of motets in each type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number of motets with conflicts</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mss+Prints vs. Mss+Prints</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mss vs. Prints</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mss vs. Mss</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prints vs. Prints</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
attributions"—some in indices and some above the music in the main body of the source—is more common, especially in manuscripts. In any event, the multiple attributions in sets of partbooks soon gave rise to instances in which one ascription in a source names one composer, while another ascription in that same source offers the name of another composer.

As in the case of conflicting attributions transmitted in multiple sources, we can classify four different types of conflicts transmitted in a single source.

1. **Conflicts involving indices and the main body of source.**

   In this first group, which comprises the largest category of single-source conflicting attributions—forty one out of a total of fifty—we may distinguish among five different subgroups: (a) index vs. the main body of the source (nineteen cases); (b) index vs. partbook and partbook vs. partbook (fifteen); (c) partbook vs. partbook (four); (d) index vs. index (two); and (e) index vs. index and partbook vs. partbook (one). Each of those types will be discussed in turn.

   (a) **Index vs. The Main Body of The Source**

   In this subgroup, the ascription in the index disagrees with that in the main body of the source, whether the source is in partbook or choirbook format. For
instance, in Attainant 1535/3, the motet Deus regnorum et christianissimi (No. 60) is ascribed to Sermisy in the index of the source, but to Gascongne above the music in all partbooks. As Table II-8 makes clear, such examples are also found in manuscripts of both formats. However, since indices or tables of contents are not found in manuscripts as frequently as they are in prints,\(^5\) this type of conflicting attribution is more prevalent in printed sources than it is in manuscripts; there are eleven such conflicting attributions in prints, and eight in manuscripts (see Tables II-7 and II-8).

(b) **Index vs. Partbook and Partbook vs. Partbook**

Frequently the name given in the index reappears in some of the partbooks, but disagrees with the attribution given in others. Thus, there can be a conflict between the ascriptions in the index and those in the partbooks, as well as among the ascriptions in the partbooks themselves. Eleven printed sources carry fifteen such conflicts (see Table II-9). An example of such a conflict appears in connection with the Jacquet/Morales Jubilate Deo (No. 138), for which Moderne 1542/5 gives the name "Morales" above the

\(^5\) We should note, however, that not all indices in printed sources list the names of composers. Particularly, the indices of early prints often list incipits and folios only.
Table II-7. Motets with conflicts between index and partbooks in printed sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motet No.</th>
<th>Printer</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Attributions in</th>
<th>partbooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>indices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Attaingnant</td>
<td>1534/5</td>
<td>Verdelot</td>
<td>Sermisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Attaingnant</td>
<td>1534/9</td>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td>Gombert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Attaingnant</td>
<td>1535/3</td>
<td>Sermisy</td>
<td>Gascongne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Formschneider</td>
<td>1537/1</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>Moulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Buglhat</td>
<td>1538/5</td>
<td>Jacquet</td>
<td>Willaert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Petreius</td>
<td>1538/6</td>
<td>Wolff</td>
<td>Josquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Gardane</td>
<td>1539/12</td>
<td>Lhéritier</td>
<td>Pieton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Scotto</td>
<td>1541/3</td>
<td>Gombert*</td>
<td>Jacquet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Petreius</td>
<td>1542/6</td>
<td>Jacquet</td>
<td>Sermisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Phalèse</td>
<td>1554/1</td>
<td>Clemens</td>
<td>Crecquillon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Rampazetto</td>
<td>1564/6</td>
<td>Lhéritier</td>
<td>Pieton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Attribution on the title page.

Table II-8. Motets with conflicts between index and music in manuscript sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motet No.</th>
<th>(Format)Source</th>
<th>Attributions in indices</th>
<th>above music</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>(P) BudOS 23</td>
<td>C. Festa</td>
<td>S. Festa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>(C) CambriP 1760</td>
<td>Fevin</td>
<td>Therache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>(C) LeidGA 1441</td>
<td>Crecquillon</td>
<td>Clemens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>(C) ToleBC 10</td>
<td>Moulu</td>
<td>Verdelot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>(C) VatG XII.4</td>
<td>Jacquet</td>
<td>Jaques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(C) VatS 45</td>
<td>Brumel</td>
<td>Jo. Brumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>(P) VerA 218</td>
<td>Gombert</td>
<td>Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>(P) VerA 218</td>
<td>Lupus</td>
<td>Mouton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P = Partbook,  C = Choirbook
Table II-9. Motets with index-vs.-partbook and partbook-vs.-partbook conflict.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motet No.</th>
<th>Printer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Attributions in Indices</th>
<th>Attributions in Partbooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Rhaw</td>
<td>1538/8</td>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td>Mahu/Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Moderne</td>
<td>1539/5</td>
<td>Gombert</td>
<td>Gombert/Lupi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Moderne</td>
<td>1542/5</td>
<td>Morales</td>
<td>Jacquet/Morales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Susato</td>
<td>1546/6</td>
<td>Manchicourt</td>
<td>Clemens/Manchicourt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Ulhard</td>
<td>1548/2</td>
<td>Crecquillon</td>
<td>Canis/Crecquillon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Ulhard</td>
<td>1548/2</td>
<td>Crecquillon</td>
<td>Canis/Crecquillon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Ulhard</td>
<td>1548/2</td>
<td>Crecquillon</td>
<td>Canis/Crecquillon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Mont &amp; Neuber</td>
<td>1553/4</td>
<td>Wolff</td>
<td>Josquin/Wolff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Mont &amp; Neuber</td>
<td>1553/4</td>
<td>De Silva</td>
<td>De Silva/Paminger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Mont &amp; Neuber</td>
<td>1553/5</td>
<td>Certon</td>
<td>Certon/Josquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Susato</td>
<td>1553/14</td>
<td>Manchicourt</td>
<td>Clemens/Manchicourt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Phalèse</td>
<td>1554/1</td>
<td>Crecquillon</td>
<td>Clemens/Crecquillon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Mont &amp; Neuber</td>
<td>1555/12</td>
<td>Lupi</td>
<td>Lupi/Lupino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Mont &amp; Neuber</td>
<td>1556/8</td>
<td>Portinaro</td>
<td>Manchicourt/Portinaro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Mont &amp; Neuber</td>
<td>1556/8</td>
<td>Maessens</td>
<td>Comes/Maessens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
motet in both the contratenor and the bassus partbooks, as well as in all five indices, while the superius, tenor, and altus partbooks name "Iacquet." This type of conflict is never found in manuscripts of partbook format.

(c) Partbook vs. Partbook

The next group of conflicting attributions consists of those conflicts in which only the partbooks disagree among themselves. For example, the scribe of RegB 786-837 attributes the Clemens/Manchicourt *Vidi speciosam* (No. 260) to Manchicourt in the partbook of discantus I, while he names Clemens as the composer in each of the other six partbooks. There are two other instances of such conflicting attributions: No. 54 to Josquin and Senfl in DresSL 1/D/3; and No. 128 to Gombert and Sermisy in VerA 218. On the other hand, there is only one such instance involving prints: No. 254 to La Fage and Therache in Antico 1521/5. Finally, it is interesting to note that, whereas the conflicting attributions of subgroup (a) were more prevalent in prints than they were in manuscripts (by a margin of 11 to 8), and whereas those in subgroup (b) involved only printed sources, those in subgroup (c) appear mostly in manuscript sources, something perhaps explained by the tendency of manuscripts to have indices far less frequently than do printed sources.
(d) **Index vs. Index**

Still another way that conflicting attributions were transmitted within a single source involves two examples in which two indices of a source list the same motet under the names of two different composers. Thus *Gratia plena ipsa* (No. 106) in *VienNB Mus. 15941* is attributed to Mouton in the tenor index, but to Ninot le Petit in the bassus index. *BoJC R142* attributes *Salve Regina* (No. 216) to Josquin in the first index, but to Jacquet in the second index. We can presume that such index-vs.-index examples are not encountered in prints because the compositor of a printed set of partbooks did not need to reset the type for each index, thus rendering all the indices identical.⁶

(e) **Index vs. Index and Partbook vs. Partbook**

The final type of conflicting attribution is represented by only one example in which two composers are named both in the indices and in the main body of the source, that is, indices disagree with indices and partbooks disagree with partbooks. Table II-10 illustrates how

---

⁶. Sometimes the composers were forced to reset the type, for they had to change the folio or page numbers when the pieces in the collection did not begin on the same folio or page in each partbook. However, even in such circumstances, the names of composers and the text incipits could remain as they were set for the first partbook printed. This procedure, called "standing types," will be explained further in Chapter III.
Table II-10. Attributions in *Dispereant nisi sit* (No. 66) in Susato 1553/15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partbook</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Above the music</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superius</td>
<td>Rore</td>
<td>Lowys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altus</td>
<td>Rore</td>
<td>Lowys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contratenor</td>
<td>Lowys</td>
<td>Rore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenor</td>
<td>Rore</td>
<td>Lowys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassus</td>
<td>Rore</td>
<td>Rore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dispereant nisi sit (No. 66) is attributed to both Rore and Lowys in Susato 1553/15.

(2) Two composers named in the prima and the secunda pars.

In general, the motets of the early sixteenth century—especially those of the Gombert generation—consist of two sections called "prima pars" and "secunda pars." The usual place for the composer's name is above the prima pars, that is, at the top of the verso folio. The name is sometimes repeated above the secunda pars, as when the composer's name functions as a running head. In some cases, though, the attribution over the secunda pars names a composer other than the one given on the previous page or folio.

An example of such a conflicting attribution occurs in connection with the Clemens/Crecquillon Dum aurora (prima pars)/Discite a me (secunda pars) (No. 65). All but one of the partbooks of Phalèse 1554/1—the exception being the bassus, where no attribution is given—transmit Discite as a separate motet and ascribe it to Clemens. However, the bassus partbook designates Discite as the secunda pars of Dum aurora which is ascribed to Crecquillon (see Table II-11).

Although it seems probable at first that Phalèse regarded the two sections as two different pieces (except
Table II-11. Attributions in Phalèse 1554/1 for *Dum aurora* and *Discite*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>Dum aurora</em></th>
<th><em>Discite</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Crecquillon</td>
<td>[not listed]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superius</td>
<td>[no ascription]</td>
<td>Clemens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contratenor</td>
<td>[no ascription]</td>
<td>Clemens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenor</td>
<td>[no ascription]</td>
<td>Clemens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassus</td>
<td>Crecquillon</td>
<td>&quot;Secunda pars&quot; [no ascription]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qnt.</td>
<td>[no ascription]</td>
<td>Clemens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for the bassus), and thus attributed each to different composers, that only one of the two sections is listed in the index—*Dum aurora*—speaks against such a possibility. The reasons for the error are therefore not immediately apparent. Three more examples—Nos. 22, 96, and 135—can be included among this type; in each instance, the second composer is named above the *secunda pars*, and stands against the ascription that appears both above the *prima pars* and/or in the indices.

(3) "Alias" attributions.

A third type of conflicting attribution may be called the "alias" type. Here, the printer or scribe seems actually to acknowledge (1) that the conflicting attribution had already entered the tradition in which the motet was transmitted, (2) that their exemplar(s) already contained the conflicting attributions, and (3) that they could or would not decide which ascription was correct, and chose to pass on both names. Thus, the scribe of RegB B211-5 attributes *Magnus es tu Domine* (No. 153) to "Josquin alii HF[Heinrich Finck]." Likewise, Petreius 1542/6 ascribes *In te Domine*

---

7. Sometimes the two partes of a motet are split into two separate motets and ascribed to two composers (see No. 246, for example). However, since the conflicting attributions for No. 150 do not occur within a single source, they are not included in this type. See Chapter V, where some of these motets are discussed.
speravi (No. 122) to "Lerithier, alias Verdeloth." Finally, the conflicting attribution for Sancta Trinitas (No. 224) may actually combine the "alias" type of conflict with simple confusion owing to the perpetual Doppelmeister problem (see Chapter III), as when the scribe of RegB 786-837 attributed the motet to "Jachet alias Jacotin." Here the scribe may well have been using the "alias" in its literal sense, but at the same time thought that "Jachet" and "Jacotin" were simply two different forms of the same composer's name.

(4) Attributions in different "states" of the same edition

Modern scholars have identified some "concealed editions" in the music books of the sixteenth century, that is, editions that are not specified as such on their title page, but that contain differences in such matters as text underlay, minor musical changes, etc.⁸ The final type of conflicting attribution occurs when different states of the same edition attribute a motet to two different composers.⁹

---

⁸. For example, Pogue has identified different states of the first edition of Moderne's Motteti del fiore I (1532/10); see Moderne, pp. 122-3.

⁹. In technical terms, 50% or more of the type should be reset in order for a copy to be identified as a different edition. When two copies exist with slight differences, they are referred to as different "states;" see Gaskell, A New Introduction to Bibliography, pp. 313-6.
According to Suzanne Cusick, there are three extant states of Dorico's reprint of Petrucci's *Motetti della corona I*.\(^{10}\) The index of the Jena, Universitätsbibliothek, exemplar attributes the Mouton/Fevin *Gaude francorum regia* (No. 99) to Fevin and the Mouton/Longueval *Benedicta es caelorum* (No. 33) to Mouton.\(^{11}\) However, the first piece is attributed to Mouton in the index of the exemplar at Regensburg, Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek, while the second piece is ascribed to Longueval in the index of the copy at Barcelona, Biblioteca Central (now the Biblioteca de Catalunya). Thus each of the three extant states transmits a different set of attributions for the two motets.

One final observation may be made in connection with those conflicting attributions that appear within a single source: in four instances—Nos. 54, 122, 224, and 260—both of the composers named within that source are also named in others, whereas on nine occasions—Nos. 47, 118, 133, 153, 202, 216, 235, 255, and 266—the two composers involved in an internal conflict within a single source conflict with still a third composer named in yet another collection. Thus there is an overlap of thirteen motets between the conflicting attributions that are transmitted in multiple sources.

---


11. These agree with the attributions in Petrucci 1514/1, the source that Dorico was reprinting.
sources and those that appear within a single source.
CHAPTER III
CAUSES FOR CONFLICTING ATTRIBUTIONS

In their discussions of the problems raised by conflicting attributions, scholars not only have sought to unravel the question of which of two or more composers named in a conflicting attribution actually wrote the composition in dispute, but also have offered theories explaining how conflicting attributions came about in music of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in the first place. Two of these theories can by now be regarded as "traditional," and account for the conflicts by imputing them either to "honest" confusion on the part of scribes and printers, on the one hand, or to intentional misattribution, on the other. In addition to these traditional interpretations for the appearance of conflicting attributions, recent years have seen three new theories about how conflicting attributions came about: Spitzer's "anonymous transmission/re-attribution" theory, Boorman's interpretation based on the examination of certain aspects of the printing process, and Atlas's "revision" hypothesis.

(A) THE TRADITIONAL EXPLANATIONS FOR CAUSES OF CONFLICTING ATTRIBUTIONS

(1) CONFUSION

Until recently, perhaps the single most often-cited
explanation for the presence of conflicting attributions is that they arose because of confusion on the part of scribes or printers. Further, this hypothesis generally accounts for three possible causes of such confusion: (1) similar names among composers of the period; (2) settings of the same or similar text by more than one composer; and (3) musical similarities between those settings.

(a) **Composers with Similar Names.**

The most obvious examples of confusion owing to similar names occur when a single composition is ascribed to two composers who shared the same surname. Two examples suffice to illustrate the point, one involving Costanzo and Sebastiano Festa,\(^1\) the other Antoine and Robert Fevin. The scribe of BudOS 23 ascribes *In illo tempore* (No. 118) to both of the Festas—-to Sebastiano in the bassus partbook, and to Costanzo in the index. Similarly, the compiler of CambriP 1760 attributes a *Lamentation* to Antoine Fevin above the music, while he names Robert Fevin in the index of the manuscript. The presence of these examples within single sources seems to suggest all the more strongly that both conflicts came about simply through a scribe's confusion over the two composers who shared the same name.

---

1. It has been presumed that the two Festas were related, even though a conclusive document to support the assertion is still lacking; see, *The New Grove*, vol. VI, p. 504.
The most frequently cited examples of such confusion arising from the similar names of composers are those involving: (1) "Lupus" for Johannes Lupi, Lupus Hellinck, Francesco Lupino, \textit{et al.}; (2) "Jacquet" for Jacquet of Mantua, Jacquet Berchem, Jaques du Pont, \textit{et al.}; and (3) "Benedictus" for Benedictus Appenzeller, Benedictus Ducis, \textit{et al.}.\(^2\) Here, though, not all instances of confusion necessarily resulted in a true conflicting attribution. It is possible that when sixteenth-century scribes or printers saw the name "Lupus" in their exemplars, they could--assuming that they recognized the multi-composer ambiguity and decided to take a stand on the issue--resolve the ambiguous ascription with a more specific attribution of their own, one that named either Lupi, Hellinck, or Lupino. It is also possible that a compiler of a source was actually unaware of the ambiguity inherent in an ascription to "Lupus," and simply expanded it with the single so-named composer with whom he was familiar. Thus an ascription to "Lupus" could just as well refer to the same man as one that named "Johannes Lupi." What we have, therefore, is not so much a conflicting attribution as an instance of the somewhat "loose" uses of an ambiguous name.

\(^2\) For the three "packs" of composers, see Blackburn, "The Lupus Problem," Nugent, "The Jacquet Motets," and Thompson, "Benedictus Appenzeller."
Two examples may illustrate both situations. A case in which the names "Lupus" and "Lupi" gave rise to a true conflicting attribution that was no doubt a result of honest confusion occurs in connection with the motet *Pontificum sublime decus* (No. 195), which Moderne 1538/2 ascribes to "Io. Lupi," whereas Susato 1546/7 gives it to "Lupus Hellinc." On the other hand, it is difficult to say whether the ascriptions to "Lupi" and "Lupino" of *Dum fabricator mundi* (No. 82) in Montanus & Neuber 1555/12--"Lupi" in the index, but "Lupino" in the discantus and bassus partbooks--should be interpreted as true conflicts or not. They can be viewed in two ways: (1) since "Lupino" is a diminutive of "Lupi," the two names could in fact indicate one and the same person; or (2) the two names could refer respectively to Johannes Lupi and Francesco Lupino, and do, in that case, constitute a true conflicting attribution. In any event, there is no way of knowing just what information the printers intended to pass on to their customers.

If composers with the same name were a source of confusion, so too were composers whose names were merely similar, whether with respect to the actual sound of the names or to orthographic similarities. Certainly, it could have been the similarity in the pronunciation of the two composers' names that caused *Nisi Dominus edificaverit* (No. 168) to be attributed to Le Heurteur in Attaingnant 1535/1
and to Lhéritier in Moderne 1532/10. On the other hand, orthographical similarities may have caused the ascription of *Ave Maria gratia plena* (No. 14) to Brumel in the index of VatS 45 to become transformed to "Jo. Brumes" in the main body of that source; and that we are not dealing with a simple misspelling but with a true case of the scribe’s having confused two composers is evident from his having included the Christian name "Johannes" (Brumel’s first name, of course, being Antoine). Similarly, it is easy enough to understand the process by which *In illo tempore accesserunt* (No. 115) was attributed both to Mouton (in VienNB Mus. 15941) and to Moulu (in BolC Q19); at some point, the "t" and "l" became confused, as did the final "n" and "u," letters whose forms were identical. Thus, unstandardized spellings combined with occasional slovenly penmanship could easily lead to the transformation of an attribution from one composer to another.

(b) Similar Texts.

In addition to the confusion that resulted from the similarities among composers’ names, there was also the problem caused by composers often writing motets that set the identical text, or at least motets with the same text incipit. Thus it is easy enough to understand the process wherein a scribe or printer confused the composer of, say,
one setting of *Ave regina caelorum* with another composer who set the same text. At other times, however, confusion and a subsequent conflicting attribution might have come about even when two texts began with the same words but then continued differently. 3 Thus as Nugent explains, the attribution to Jacquet of the *Aspice Domine de sede* (No. 7) in Scotto 1539a *Jacquet* (also ascribed to La Fage and Sermisy) came about through Scotto’s having confused that setting with Jacquet’s authentic setting of *Aspice Domine quia facta* in another collection of Jacquet’s motets published by Scotto during the same year. 4 During a period in which a short text incipit was used in a manner analogous to a title, such a mistake was easy to make. When one considers that certain texts were set over and over again, it is not surprising that motets based on certain texts gave rise to large clusters of conflicting attributions. Table III-1 lists all such motets that are involved in three or more different sets of conflicting attributions.

3. For example, each of four settings of *Inclina Domine* (Nos. 125-8) employs a quite different text; the whole of Ps. 85 for the Gombert/Sermisy setting (No. 128), a part of Ps. 85 for the Courtois/Jacotin setting (No. 126), parts of Ps. 85, Ps. 90, and Ps. 141 for the Berchem/Gombert setting (No. 127), and parts of Ps. 85, Ps. 5, and Ps. 69 for the Clemens/Valent setting (No. 125).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Composers involved</th>
<th>Number of Settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beati omnes qui timent</td>
<td>Josquin/Senfl</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nos. 25-29)</td>
<td>Gombert/Hellinck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lhéritier/Pieton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stoltzer/Werrecore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Champion/Josquin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Regina caelorum</td>
<td>Conseil/Jacquet/M.Jhan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nos. 15-18)</td>
<td>Conseil/Jacquet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dalla Viola/Gombert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Festa/Jacquet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclina Domine</td>
<td>Clemens/Valent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nos. 125-128)</td>
<td>Courtois/Jacotin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berchem/Gombert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gombert/Sermisy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congratulamini mihi</td>
<td>Josquin/Le Brung/Richafort</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nos. 44-46)</td>
<td>Crecquillon/Hollander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sermisy/Verdelot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In te Domine speravi</td>
<td>Lhéritier/Verdelot</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nos. 122-124)</td>
<td>Hellinck/Senfl/Verdelot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berchem/Jacquet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigra sum sed formosa</td>
<td>Conseil/Lupus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nos. 166-168)</td>
<td>Clemens/Crecquillon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crecquillon/Jacquet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pater peccavi</td>
<td>Clemens/Manchicourt</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nos. 189-191)</td>
<td>Clemens/Manchicourt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clemens/Crecquillon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quam pulchra es</td>
<td>Lupi/Verdelot</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nos. 260-202)</td>
<td>Jacquet/Lupi/Mouton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Josquin/Moulu/Mouton/Verdelot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usquequou Domine</td>
<td>Hellinck/Verdelot</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nos. 246-248)</td>
<td>Lhéritier/Mouton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Ferabosco/Rore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) **Similarity of Text and Music.**

In some instances, composers not only set the same—or almost the same—text, but they also carried the textual similarity over into the music. This, of course, only added to the confusion. For example, the conflicting attribution of the motet *In te Domine speravi* (No. 122) to Lhéritier and Verdelot may well have come about, as Perkins suggests, because the printer Petreius (in 1542/6) confused the work with a motet by Verdelot that not only sets the identical text, but begins with a similar musical motive (see Ex. III-1). 5

In all, "honest confusion," whether caused by the similarity in the names of composers, in the text used, or in the music when one finds different settings of the same text, no doubt generated more than a few of the conflicting attributions that we find in the sixteenth-century motet.

(2) **INTENTIONAL MISATTRIBUTIONS**

The second "traditional" explanation of conflicting attributions concerns what might be called "intentional misattribution," that is, instances in which sixteenth-century printers, seeking to capitalize on the reputation of a "big-name" composer, intentionally ascribed to him pieces that were written by someone else.

5. Lhéritier, *Opera omnia*, p. xxii.
Ex. III-1. Beginnings of *In te Domine speravi* by (a) Lhéritier and (b) Verdelot
The title page of Arcadelt’s first book of madrigals, published in 1539 by Gardane, reads as follows: Il primo libro di madrigali d’Archadelt a quatro con nuova giunta impressi. However, in examining the actual contents of the book, one finds that there are ten pieces that carry ascriptions to someone other than Arcadelt. Thus, in this case we are fortunate, since in spite of his misleading title page, Gardane identified the pieces that he knew were not by Arcadelt, and the "intentional misattributions" do not go beyond the rather misleading title page. Seven years later, in 1546, the printer would mislead the public once again, but this time with a different twist. In Gardane 1546/9, the title page reads: Moralis Hispani et multorum eximiae artis virorum musica... Here, however, the honest admission on the title page, to the effect that the collection contains motets by composers other than Morales, is undermined in the body of the collection, where Gardane failed to enter even a single attribution, thus leaving us to wonder both about which motets are not by Morales and about the identity of the other composers represented.\(^6\)

In both of the instances just cited, Gardane’s

---

6. Nugent points out that one of the motets in the collection, *In illo tempore dixit Jesus* (No. 116), was later attributed to Morales in CoimU 48 because the scribe of that manuscript copied the piece from Gardane’s print, where only the name Morales appears.
"dishonesty" is tempered: in the case of the misleading title page of the Arcadelt print, by subsequent attributions, and in the case of the lacking attributions in the Morales collection, by the admission on the title page that not all the motets contained in the publication were by that composer. In other instances, however, publishers were indeed unscrupulous with respect to their ascriptions, and, as the evidence to be presented will make clear, the underlying motive for the use—or misuse—of a famous composer's name was the hope for the commercial success of the publications.  

A number of contemporary documents support such an assumption. In the dedication to Arcadelt's second book of madrigals for four voices, Gardane says, "The malevolence of printers, from pure avarice, does not always recoil from publishing under the name of worthy authors the inferior products of others." Or, as Formschneider points out in his preface to a motet collection (Formschneider 1537/1), he had experienced difficulty in ascribing some of the motets in the book, because "sometimes authors' names were

7. For other examples of prints with misleading titles, see Haar, *Italian Poetry and Music*, p. 101 and fn. 6.

fraudulently changed.\textsuperscript{9}

Nor was it only the publishers who knew about the deliberate falsification of authorship; composers were also aware of the practice. In the dedication of his first book of madrigals, published by Scotto in 1544, Corteccia writes:

For the principal reason which moved me to do this [publishing the collections of his madrigals] is that some of these madrigals of mine had been printed by others . . . under the names of other authors, who in turn are more excellent and more famous than I. . . . On the other hand, printed under my name were some other [madrigals] which I freely confess to never having seen, let alone written, and thus I did not want anyone, being misled by such an ascription, to hold me in higher esteem than I actually merit.\textsuperscript{10}

Similar testimony can also be found in the dedication of Berchem’s madrigal book that Gardane published in 1546, where Berchem accuses some printers of outright plagiarism.\textsuperscript{11} Obviously, one should ask whether such assertions as those by Corteccia and Berchem were simply a fashion of the time, and thus of little significance, or were indeed a true assessment of the practices of sixteenth-century publishers. On the one hand, D’Accone has pointed out that seven madrigals in the Corteccia collection had

\textsuperscript{9} Quoted from Thompson, "Benedictus Appenzeller," pp. 115-6.

\textsuperscript{10} See Corteccia, \textit{Opera omnia}, vol. VIII, p. xxvii.

indeed been printed under Arcadelt’s name in the first four books of Arcadelt’s madrigals published by Gardane and Scotto in 1539.12 Thus, one tends to believe, as does D’Accone, that Corteccia is telling the truth. On the other hand, when Gardane published the second book of Corteccia’s madrigals in 1547, the composer repeated the same claim that he had made in the first book, even though the second book contains only two pieces printed elsewhere under someone else’s name. This leads D’Accone to conclude that the claim in the second book is "formal" and "stylized."13

In any event, these contemporary documents seem to indicate, at the very least, that intentional misattributions were an integral part of the music publishing business in the sixteenth century. And finally, if printers were guilty of fabricating intentional misattributions, we may at least speculate that compilers of manuscripts—especially of presentation manuscripts—did the same. Indeed, we can infer precisely this from Martin Luther’s casual statement that he ascribed a piece which he


13. Corteccia, Opera omnia, vol. IX, p. xi. However, Prof. Ruth DeFord has informed me that an examination of some 200 publications of Italian secular music of the latter part of the sixteenth century yielded a single case in which a composer reported misattributions of his works to other composers. I should like to thank Prof. DeFord for this information.
himself had arranged to a well-known composer, because the
person to whom Luther was sending the piece liked music only
by famous composers.\textsuperscript{14}

(B) \textbf{THREE NEWLY-PROPOSED EXPLANATIONS}

Recently, three new explanations for the causes of
conflicting attributions in the fifteenth and the sixteenth
century have been advanced by Spitzer, Boorman, and Atlas.
While Spitzer's hypothesis is, to some extent, little more
than an elaboration and expansion of the conventional
"confusion" theory, the ideas proposed by Boorman and Atlas
use various aspects of musical sources in completely new and
original ways.

(1) \textbf{ANONYMOUS TRANSMISSION/RE-ATTRIBUTION}

Even though they do not express it explicitly,
proponents of the "confusion theory" presuppose the
partially anonymous transmission of the pieces whose
attributions came to be confused. It is with this
presumption that Spitzer formulates his "anonymous
transmission/re-attribution" theory. Spitzer surmises:

\textsuperscript{14} For the discussion of the letter, see Nettl, Luther
and Music, p. 62, Bornkamm, Luther in Mid-Career, p. 674,
Preuss, Luther der Künstler, pp. 117-8, and Mattfeld, Rhow's
Instead of name and notes being transmitted together in writing, only the notes would have been written. When the notes were eventually provided with a name in writing, that name would have been acquired from another source—written or oral—than the notes.\textsuperscript{15}

What Spitzer tries to establish is the two-step process in which music and ascriptions were transmitted: anonymous transmission of the music, and then the addition of an ascription. According to Spitzer, the second step might have been open to any kind of confusion, including the "revision" theory, which will be discussed below.

To illustrate his hypothesis, Spitzer cites three chansons—\textit{Adieu mes amours}, \textit{Cela sans plus}, and \textit{Si dedero}—which are transmitted with conflicting attributions in the Wolffheim Chansonnier, a manuscript where no attributions were originally entered, but to which some ascriptions were added by a later hand.\textsuperscript{16} The most important aspect of Spitzer's theory is that he views the music and the attributions as having been transmitted separately.

If we link Spitzer's hypothesis to the Jacquet/La Fage/Sermisy \textit{Aspice Domine de sede} (No. 7), the attribution to Jacquet in Scotto 1539a \textit{Jacquet} could be explained in the following two-step sequence: (1) the source from which

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{15} Spitzer, "Authorship and Attributions," p. 147.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Spitzer, "Authorship and Attribution," pp. 149-50.
\end{itemize}
Scotto worked contained the motet, but without an attribution; (2) Scotto was able to ascribe it to Jacquet, for he knew from another written source—Scotto’s other collection of Jacquet’s motets published in the same year—that had Jacquet composed a motet with a similar text.

It seems, however, that Spitzer’s theory would work better if the ascription had been obtained from an oral source, since he introduces a term, the "regional attribution-grapevine," which, as he defines it, "transmitted chanson authorship independent of the transmission of musical texts."17 With the concept of the "regional grapevine" in mind, Spitzer argues that conflicting attributions of *Mais que ce fust* to Petrequin and Compère show two clearly divided traditions of attribution: in Florentine sources, the song is ascribed to the local composer, Petrequin, whereas in the Venetian *Odhecaton*, the piece is attributed to Compère.18 This leads Spitzer to suggest that even if a scribe worked from a source with an attribution, he might well have changed the attribution in his exemplar to one known from a local, oral tradition.19

In all, Spitzer argues that conflicting attributions came about as a result of scribal-printer confusion. This confusion was caused by a specific mode of transmission, which almost invited compilers of sources to create their own attributions based on local oral (or written) traditions.

(2) CONFLICTS INDUCED BY THE PRINTING PROCESS

The hypotheses about the causes of conflicting attributions set forth by Boorman and Atlas break completely with the more traditional theories concerning their causes. Of the two, Boorman’s hypothesis is the more demonstrable, Atlas’s the more speculative in nature. On the other hand, Atlas’s is potentially more far-reaching in its applicability to a wider body of sources and repertory.

Boorman sees the causes of at least some conflicting attributions as lying in certain aspects of the printing process itself, more specifically in the practices employed by such Italian printers of the 1530s and early 1540s as Gardane and Scotto.20 In the printing process of the period, Boorman sees three features that led to the creation of conflicting attributions: (1) the practice wherein an opening sometimes contained three pieces spread across verso

and recto, but only two ascriptions, one at the head of each page; (2) the practice of using running headlines that consisted of a composer's name which served not as an attribution, but as an identification of the volume as a whole; (3) the process whereby, generally in an anthology, the headline-attribution that appears on one page was mistakenly carried over to a new piece on another page simply as an oversight, not because the printer thought of it as the correct attribution. In what is perhaps the most conceptually original aspect of his hypothesis, Boorman shows that at least some supposed instances of conflicting attributions are thus more apparent than real. The following examples illustrate Boorman's three points.

The first feature of Boorman's theory concerns the layout of the printed page. The ambiguity as to ascriptions arises when three pieces are distributed on one opening, but are accompanied by only two attributions (see Figure 1). When three pieces were layed out as in Figure 1, the name of the composer of the second piece could not be fitted between the end of the first piece and the beginning of the second piece because of the presence of the text. Thus, just which work belongs to which composer becomes unclear, especially for the second and third ones.

Obviously, so ambiguous a practice of ascribing works could easily enough lead to the creation of conflicting
Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verso</th>
<th>Recto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name A</td>
<td>Name B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piece 1</td>
<td>Piece 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piece 2</td>
<td>Piece 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
attributions when someone other than the printer himself—for instance, another printer or a scribe using the print as the exemplar for a manuscript—based an attribution on such an opening. Further confusion would have been caused by some printers altering the position of compositions in subsequent editions. Figure 2 shows how the ascription of E morta la speranza changed from Arcadelt to Festa owing to such alterations. The piece appears in all four surviving editions of Arcadelt’s third book of madrigals, published for the first time in 1539 by Scotto, and then reissued three times by Gardane in 1541, 1543, and 1556. Boorman argues that the crucial change occurred in the edition of 1543, where the layout of the three pieces implies Festa’s authorship of E morta la speranza. Gardane himself was confused when he published the fourth edition, where the piece is unquestionably ascribed to Festa.

Though Boorman’s discussion is concerned mainly with madrigal prints of the 1530s and 1540s, we can already see that certain practices utilized by such earlier printers as Petrucci and Antico, ca. 1520, already had the potential to give rise to conflicting attributions.

In Petrucci 1519/3, O pulcherrima mulierum (No. 182) appears on f. 14v above the motet Quam pulchra es, with the headline "XIII. Noel baulduin XV." (see Figure 3). Traditionally, O pulcherrima came to be considered one of
Figure 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verso</th>
<th>Recto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scotto 1539/23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archadelt</td>
<td>next piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E morta ---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardane 1541/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archadelt</td>
<td>Con. festa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedetto--</td>
<td>next piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E morta --&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Se morte--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardane 1543/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con. festa</td>
<td>Archadelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So che ---</td>
<td>next piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E morta --&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lasso che--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardane 1556/22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con. festa</td>
<td>next piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E morta --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Figure 3.

Sup. XIII. Noel baulduin XV.

O pulcherrima ---

-------------||

Quam pulchra es -------------

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Baudeweyn's works until Sparks examined various surviving states of that print. He points out that the ascription of the motet to Baudeweyn by some modern scholars resulted from the misunderstanding of the headline: they thought that the Baudeweyn attribution referred to piece No. 14 and that No. 15 was anonymous. However, Sparks concludes that the headline should be read as "anonymous XIII, Baudeweyn XV," since throughout that volume Petrucci placed the composer's name before the piece number. Therefore, the ascription to Baudeweyn applies to the second piece on that page, No. XV Quam pulchra es, not to No. XIII O pulcherrima mulierum. 21

The next feature that Boorman discusses is the standard running headline, a headline that is repeated throughout the volume. Boorman believes that this type of headline in some collections represents nothing more than an identification tag of sorts, as in Gardane 1539/24, where the name, "Archadelt," appears in all but seven captions. Thus the appearance of the name "Archadelt" in a caption does not imply that "the printer originally thought the piece to be by that composer." 22 Therefore, Boorman does

---

21. Sparks, The Music of Noel Baudeweyn, pp.? Also, Sparks points out that in some other states of the book he examined, an additional attribution, "Noel bauduin. XV," is carefully printed vertically in the left margin of the beginning of Quam pulchra es.

not regard attributions in standard running headlines as necessarily being an indication of authorship. Obviously, if a sixteenth-century scribe or printer regarded it otherwise, a conflicting attribution could have come about.

An example from Gardane will suffice to illustrate the point. In 1539, 1541, and 1545, Gardane published three separate editions of Arcadelt's fourth book of madrigals. According to Boorman's interpretation of the running headlines, the seemingly apparent conflicting attributions for two of the madrigals in those editions (see Table III-2), *Io son tal volta* and *Tengan dunque*, are not conflicts at all. For example, the appearance of the name Arcadelt in 1541/12 over *Io son tal volta* does not mean that Gardane changed and corrected his earlier attribution of the same piece to Verdelot. Rather, it is a running headline, and what appears to be an ascription to Arcadelt in the second edition should not be understood as such. *Io son tal volta* should be regarded as a work of Verdelot, a fact borne out by Gardane's "re-ascription" in the 1545 edition. (The same interpretation can be applied to the attribution to Arcadelt for *Tengan dunque* in the first and second editions.)

Finally, Boorman argues that some of the conflicting attributions can be resolved by examining details of printing process. This part of his theory requires some preliminary knowledge of the music printing. It has been
Table III-2. Changes in ascriptions for the two madrigals in three editions of the fourth book of Arcadelt's madrigals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>1539/24</th>
<th>Ascription 1541/12</th>
<th>1545/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Io son tal volta</td>
<td>Verdelot</td>
<td>Archadelt</td>
<td>Verdelot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tengan dunque</td>
<td>Archadelt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leonardus Barre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
said that printers of the sixteenth century generally needed two formes to print a sheet of paper—the outer and the inner formes—with each forme holding types for music, text, and border materials such as the headline and signature line. (This last part of the forme is sometimes called a skeleton forme; see Figure 4).

Boorman argues that many printers of the sixteenth century retained types to the fullest extent possible from one sheet to the next in order to speed up production. Such types are called "standing types." The standing types varied according to how the printers proceeded: (1) if partbooks were printed one at a time—for example, a whole superius partbook, and then the tenor partbook, and so on—at least the voice designation could stay, as could the composer’s name when the edition was devoted to one composer; (2) if partbooks were printed one gathering at a time—for example, the first gathering of all partbooks, then the second gathering, and so on—most of the border materials including page numbers, when each piece appears on the same page in each partbook, could remain. The first procedure has been called "horizontal" printing, the second,

Figure 4. A portion of a hypothetical forme for one sheet.

a headline ---> CANTVS. Archadelt. XII.

the skeleton forme

Music and Text

a signature line-->

Ciiss
"vertical" printing.\textsuperscript{24}

The most efficient procedure was vertical printing, because in many prints of the second generation printers, all pieces were arranged so that the same piece appears on the same page in all partbooks. Therefore it was possible that the name of a composer, which appeared as part of the headline, was carried over from the place where it legitimately belonged to where it did not. Obviously, such a mistake is even more disastrous in anthologies, where many different composers are represented, for more often than not, the retention of the names from one sheet to the next resulted in an ascription to the wrong composer.

As an example of this process, Boorman discusses a madrigal from Gardane 1541/16, which is largely devoted to Verdelot. The madrigal in question is \textit{Deh perche non è in voi} which appears on f. C3v (p. 22) of each partbook. It is anonymous in all partbooks except for the cantus where it is attributed to Arcadelt. Boorman, however, argues that the madrigal should be considered anonymous, since the name Arcadelt was simply carried over from f. B3v of the cantus to f. C3v of the same book where \textit{Deh perche} is printed. Boorman's argument is enhanced by the typographical evidence

\textsuperscript{24} These terms were introduced for the first time by Lewis. She discusses the printing process of Gardane in detail; see Chapter III of her study.
offered by the physical condition of the letter "1" in the name Arcadelt as well as by the spacing of letters, both of which are identical on f. B3v and C3v, something that would have occurred only if the skeleton forme for B3v was reused for C3v.25 Thus Boorman believes that some conflicting attributions came about simply by means of the typesetter’s having inadvertently retained an ascription in a skeleton forme when he should have removed or changed it.

Boorman’s brilliant demonstration of printing-house techniques shows that more than a few of what seem to be conflicting attributions came about neither because printers honestly believed that two different composers wrote the same piece nor because a printer was intentionally foisting an incorrect name upon the public, but as a result of imperfections, shortcuts, and oversights in the printing process itself.

(3) REVISION HYPOTHESIS

Atlas’s "revision" hypothesis takes up the problem of conflicting attributions in the Franco-Netherlandish chanson in the second half of the fifteenth century.26 He begins with the observation that the pattern of conflicting


attributions was not haphazard or, as he puts it, "accidental," but that composers who conflict with one another most often tend to share chronological-geographical intersections in their careers. Atlas notices that many of the chansons involved in conflicting attributions were also disseminated with variants that could be classified as "compositional" variants, that is, variants that were unlikely to have been added in the course of the normal copying process, but are of a nature that seems to betray the work of a real composer. Putting the two observations together, he concludes that many of the apparent conflicts in the chanson repertory were not conflicts at all— at least not in the sense of one being correct, the other wrong—but instances in which one composer had revised the work of the other, so that both composers named in such a conflicting attribution had some rightful claim on the piece in question.

Two examples may suffice to illustrate Atlas's theory. First, the chanson Des bien, attributed to both Isaac and Martini, was transmitted, as Ex. III-2 shows, with extensive variants. As Atlas points out, the variants are too significant to be regarded as nothing more than the product of a wayward or even inventive copying process. Rather, he argues that one of the composers must have revised the work of the other, and this is perfectly understandable given
that the careers of Isaac and Martini intersected on more than a few occasions. On the other hand, even though the next example, La saison en est, attributed to Agricola and Compère, shows less extensive variants than the first one, Atlas believes that they may still be classified as "compositional" variants (see Ex. III-3). Since Agricola and Compère were together both at Milan and later at the French royal court, one of the two composers reworked the piece of the other. After examining seventy-six chansons with conflicting attributions, Atlas concludes that fifty-three of them may contain "compositional" variants, supporting his hypothesis that many conflicting attributions really indicate that one composer revised the work of the other.

As Spitzer points out, the "revision theory" marks a completely new approach to the problem of conflicting attributions:

it approaches the music of another era without prejudice and without anachronism. . . Atlas implicitly questions modern notions of what constitutes the "same" piece of music as well as the idea that there must be a one-to-one correspondence between composer and work. 27

To sum up: each of the last three hypotheses about the causes of conflicting attributions suggests possible causes

Ex. III-2. Martini/Isaac, Des biens, m. 22f, (a) FlorBN Magl. 178 and FlorBN BR229; (b) CapePL 3. b. 12, FlorBN Panc. 27, and BerLS 40021
(continued)

(a)

(b)
Ex. III-3. Agricola/Compère, La saison en est, mm. 15-18: (a) CopKB 1848, FlorBN Magl. 178, ParisBNF 2245, RomeC 2856; (b) LonBL 31922
which had not been considered before. It is interesting that, while each of the three hypotheses is different from the others, each shares a fundamentally new insight with one of the others. Boorman and Atlas share the notion that some of the so-called conflicting attributions may not be conflicts at all. On the other hand, Atlas and Spitzer share the idea that conflicting attributions in the chanson repertory of the late fifteenth century are not unconscious errors—as Boorman claims they are in his repertory and sources—but conscious acts by scribes and printers who could in some way justify the attributions that they entered.
CHAPTER IV
TRADITIONAL APPROACHES TO THE PROBLEM

Faced with the problem of conflicting attributions in the motet repertory of the sixteenth century, scholars have traditionally used three different approaches in their efforts to determine authorship. The three approaches employ evidence gleaned from (1) stylistic analysis of the music, (2) the sources that transmit the composition, or (3) other external evidence, such as biographical data, the verbal texts of the music, the testimony of theorists, etc. What follows is a discussion of these traditional approaches as they have been employed in an effort to determine the authorship of various sixteenth-century motets. And in reading it, one must bear in mind (1) that we are concerned not with the conflicting attributions or the composers themselves, but with the various methodological approaches of modern-day scholars, and (2) the constant assumption on the part of most scholars that conflicting attributions, if they can be resolved at all, can be resolved in favor of one composer or another.

(A) STYLE ANALYSIS

Problematical though it may be, style analysis has been the main approach not only in the attempts to resolve conflicting attributions, but also in matters pertaining to
authorship-anonymity in general. Though the application of style analysis in order to determine the authorship of anonymous works is particularly risky, its use as the chief criterion in the solution of conflicting attributions is at least somewhat less daunting, since the field of possible composers is limited to those named in the sources. In other words, unless one wants to complicate the matter even further, one need only choose a composer from the two—generally—composers involved, rather than search out a possible candidate from an exponentially larger group of composers, as in the case of ascribing anonymous pieces. For example, Blackburn need only decide whether Paradisi portas (No. 186) was composed by Renaldo or Lupus, the two composers to whom the motet is ascribed: if the motet is stylistically different from Lupus’s other motets, it is ascribed to Renaldo, and vice-versa.

Some scholars are skeptical about the reliability of style analysis as it pertains to the question of conflicting

---

1. For a detailed account of the problems raised by the use of style analysis, see Spitzer, "Authorship and Attribution," pp. 370-413. Spitzer’s discussion deals with the problem as it pertains to eighteenth-century music. On the use of style analysis in the field of literature, see D. Erdman and E. Fogel, eds., Evidence for Authorship, especially the article by Fogel, pp. 69-101. And for the visual arts, see two classic studies, Giovanni Morelli, Italian Painters, and Bernard Berenson, The Study and Criticism of Italian Art; for a recent discussion, see Edgar Wind, "Critique of Connoisseurship."
attributions in general. Atlas, for instance, finds
difficulty in reaching firm conclusions when composers wrote
"in fairly similar and impersonal styles," or when the
output of some composers is too small to formulate easily
identified personal styles. Thus one must ask if the nine
motets credited to Lupus in The New Grove work list and the
eleven motets—including Paradisi portas—by Renaldo in Bo1C
Q19 provide enough of a stylistic profile on which to posit
a personal style for the two composers. And if the
questions can be raised in connection with authors who have
left us as many motets as we have just mentioned, what are
we to do when a composer named in a conflicting attribution
has left no more than two or three such works, or, to
confound the problem even further, if all—or many—of the
other works by the composer are also involved in conflicting
attributions?

Sometimes even a large number of compositions by one

2. Atlas, "Conflicting Attributions," p. 251. See also

3. Apparently it is a sufficient body of works for
Blackburn, who assigns the piece to Renaldo on stylistic

4. The following composers with at least one motet in-
volved in a conflicting attribution left no more than four
motets: Craen (4), Danglon (2?), Elimot (1), Forestier (2),
Grandsyre (2), Le Bouteiller (2), Longueval (3), Naich (2),
Pesenti (2), and Ribera (4).
or more of the composers involved is not necessarily sufficient to determine the authorship of the piece. Thus Maas reports his inability to assign the well-known Passion attributed to Obrecht/Longueval/La Venture/La Rue to any one of the composers on the basis of style analysis, while Kirsch finds it difficult to assign the Josquin/De Silva/Mouton Te Deum (No. 239) on stylistic grounds, even though all of the composers named left a large enough body of motets to permit some conclusions based on stylistic comparison. It seems, then, that the failure to distinguish between one composer's style and that of another with any real degree of certainty results from the "fairly similar and impersonal styles"--to quote Atlas again--in which they composed.

And even if one succeeds in formulating a clear picture of a given composer's style, uncertainties may remain, since another scholar may well have a different view about that composer's style. A case in point is the Josquin/Mouton Missus est Gabriel angelus (No. 163), which Smijers credited to Josquin on stylistic grounds, whereas


6. See Kirsch, Die Motetten des Andreas de Silva, pp. 306-8. Kirsch does not discuss the attribution to Mouton, and though he does not offer a conclusive answer, he is inclined to accept the attribution to Josquin.
Lowinsky, using a similar methodology, assigned the work to Mouton.\textsuperscript{7} Consequently, there is always an air of subjectivity that seems to surround the use of style analysis. Using it to determine the most likely composer in cases of conflicting attributions yields answers that never quite have a sense of certainty about them.

Reacting to such doubts, several scholars have attempted to refine the style-analytical method so that the results drawn from it are beyond reproach with respect to their objectivity. In order to obtain such objectivity, they generally follow a three-step procedure: (1) they decide on a number of the stylistic features on which to focus in order to establish a profile of the composer's style; (2) they set up quantitative values in order to evaluate stylistic characteristics in terms of numeric values; and finally (3) they identify the composer of the work in question based on a comparison of test results. The type of style analysis that follows this three-step

\textsuperscript{7} Lowinsky, \textit{The Medici Codex}, pp. 222-4. Josquin, \textit{Werken}, vol. XXIV, p. v. For other examples of such disagreement, see the comments concerning the Caen/Hellinck/Richafort \textit{Hierusalem luge} (No. 107) and the Brunet/Josquin \textit{Victimae paschali laudes} (No. 258) in the inventory.
procedure may be referred to as "statistical analysis."\textsuperscript{8} Here, we shall look at one example of many studies which use statistical analysis: John Reid's study of the music of Dufay. The reason for choosing Reid's study is two-fold: (1) in dealing with a fifteenth-century composer, he faces a problem that does not occur with later composers, namely the problem of determining the extent to which the completely non-autograph dissemination of the works actually reflects Dufay's intentions; and (2) the study employs a concept called "minor encoding habits," which was developed by analysts in the fields of literature and painting, and first applied to music by Paisley.\textsuperscript{9} In the paragraphs that follow, I shall try to show that despite the claims made by those who practice statistical analysis, its usefulness in

\textsuperscript{8} In the field of literary criticism, statistical analysis has a long history with, for example, the practice of tallying the frequency of certain words as a means for determining an author's stylistic profile having already begun as early as the mid-nineteenth century. For an excellent introduction to the history of statistical analysis in literature, see Williams, \textit{Style and Vocabulary}, pp. 1-10.

\textsuperscript{9} Paisley, "Identifying the Unknown Communicators," \textit{passim}. Another musical study which uses the same concept is Fruehwald, "Authenticity Problems in Haydn's Early Instrumental Works." There are many other statistical analysis studies of music that do not use the "minor encoding habits." To discuss other approaches, however, goes beyond my own interests in the matter. For a recent bibliography on this subject, see Davis, \textit{Computer Application in Music}, which includes a section devoted to style analysis. See also Fruehwald who adds to Davis's list ("Authenticity Problems in Haydn's Early Instrumental Works," pp.?).
relationship to the present repertory is still limited.

Reid's study, which takes Paisley's as a starting point, is based on a comparison of dissonance treatment in Dufay's works with that in the works of other composers. Before dealing with what is probably the main problem in Reid's work--can the music of the period even be analysed statistically?--two basic mistakes in his study must be noted. First, although the number of sample pieces used to establish Dufay's style may be sufficient, the number of sample pieces for other composers is too small to be meaningful. Obviously, when the sample pieces by other composers are too few in number, the stylistic traits supposedly characteristic of Dufay's works cannot necessarily be considered as Dufay's alone. Second, the choice of dissonance treatment does not fit well with the criteria for identifying "minor encoding habits" on which Reid's study is supposedly based. For example, the test which Reid calls the "very unusual occurrence rate"--that is, the rate of dissonance types that occur very rarely in

10. Reid, "The Treatment of Dissonance in the works of Dufay." Chapter V of this study was published as an article entitled "Testing for Authenticity."

11. The samples consist of just five pieces: one chanson by Binchois, one chanson by Grenon, one motet by Carmen, the Kyrie of the Missa Mimi by Ockeghem, and the Ave Maria (for four voices?) by Josquin.
Dufay's authentic works--violates the criterion that the frequency of occurrence should be high relative to the sampling error. 12 In any event, the following discussion leaves these objections aside.

Reid conducts four tests to solve problems of Dufay authenticity: (1) type-component evaluation, (2) rhythmic evaluation, (3) the "very unusual occurrence" rate, and (4) the dissonance type-distribution test. The most crucial mistake made by Reid lies not in what kind of tests he carried out, but in the assumption that Besseler's edition--once it decided which pieces were and were not authentic--necessarily presents a text (reading) for each piece that represents Dufay's intentions. As we all know in connection with music of this period, the multiple redactions of a given work are more often than not transmitted with variant--small or large--readings. Obviously, the problem is that we simply do not know which version is the "authentic" one (if, in fact, there is such a thing). Why is it necessary to know which one is authentic? Because Reid's four tests are bound to be greatly affected even by very small alterations such as certain all-too-common cadential variants, rhythmic changes (a minim for two semiminims or vice versa), etc. In all, I regard the authentic Dufay

12. For the criteria, see Paisely, "Identifying the Unknown Communicators," p. 227.
style as profiled by Reid as being little more than fiction.

Finally, one should remember that our knowledge of a
given composer's style is almost entirely dependent upon
attributions in the sources in which the composer's works
appear. In this sense, Boorman's concern with the risk of
style analysis is not overstated, "...it has seemed
dangerous to attempt to analyse any one work, and thereby
eliminate any one composer, when our perception of that
composer's style is built up from pieces that may not be
his..."13

Despite these weaknesses, style analysis is, as we
have noted, still a widely practiced method for coming to
terms with conflicting attributions.

(B) MUSICAL SOURCES

(1) Raw Tabulation

The most simplistic use of the musical sources has
consisted of scholars' tallying up the ascriptions to the
composers involved, and then assigning the work to the
composer with the greater number of ascriptions. Atlas's
criticism of this method is well founded:

155-6.
... its wrong-headedness is evident in that it forgets that all the ascriptions to one composer may be dependent upon a common parent or, once we reach the era of printed music, even on one another. 14

In spite of its "wrong-headedness," this method has been applied rather widely, even by scholars with more than a little experience in dealing with both conflicting attributions and Renaissance sources. Thus Perkins attributes Beata Dei Genetrix (No. 21)—also ascribed to Conseil and Willaert—to Lhéritier because of "a preponderance of attributions" to him. 15 Likewise, Picker assigns the Gascongne/La Fage/Lupus Rex autem David (No. 211) to Gascongne because he is "named by three sources." 16 Or, to offer a final example: on the authorship of the Josquin/Mouton/Willaert Salva nos, Domine (No. 214), Lowinsky says that Mouton’s authorship of the motet "is guaranteed [my emphasis] by the Medici Codex and by eight additional concordances." 17 In all, while the correct composer may well be the one named in the greater number of sources, the method is not a method at all.


15. See the introduction to Lhéritier, Opera Omnia, p. xxii.

16. Picker, Motet Books of Antico, p. 64.

(2) **Analysis of the Reliability of the Sources**

Among the advances in our knowledge of Renaissance music in recent years is the increased accuracy with which the provenance of an ever growing number of manuscripts has been determined. And this, when taken in conjunction with our biographical data about composers, has led to the next method of resolving conflicting attributions. This method centers around the task of determining which among the sources that transmits a composition stands closest—chronologically and geographically—to either of the composers involved, and which, then, is the "most reliable" and thus most likely to transmit the correct attribution.

An example of the method working in its most convincing fashion appears in connection with the motet *In illo tempore* (No. 118), which is attributed to the two Festas—Costanzo and Sebastiano—and to Mouton, and which survives in two prints and two manuscripts. The motet was published by the German printers Montanus & Neuber under Mouton’s name in 1554—thirty-two years after Mouton’s death. The source, then, is far removed from Mouton both chronologically and geographically.\(^{18}\) As for Costanzo Festa, he is named in BudOS 23, compiled around 1550—or

---

\(^{18}\) As far as we know, Mouton was not active in Germany.
possibly later--at Wittenberg. Here there is no geographical connection with the composer. Against these two sources, Antico 1521/5 and the northern Italian manuscript BolC Q19, which bears the date 1518, name Sebastiano Festa as the composer of the motet.\footnote{The bassus partbook of BudOS 23 ascribes the motet to Sebastiano.} Tying the provenance and date of the two Italian sources to the known facts of Sebastiano's life,\footnote{Very little is known about Sebastiano's life. However, his association with Leo X is documented; see, Main, "Sebastiano Festa," in The New Grove, vol. V, p. 504.} Picker concludes that the motet rightly belongs to Sebastiano.\footnote{Picker, Motet Books of Antico, p. 62.}

Though certainly more methodologically rigorous than the "raw tabulation" method, and possibly--perhaps even probably--more objective than style analysis, this method, too, is not without its problems. It can function only with as much accuracy as the manuscript-biography data on which it is based.

Perhaps the best-known example concerns the conflicting attributions in FlorL 666 (the so-called "Medici Codex"). Lowinsky, of course, believed that the manuscript originated at the French royal court, where Jean Mouton was a prominent figure at the time of the manuscript's
compilation in 1518.\textsuperscript{22} Assuming its authoritative nature (Lowinsky even states that Mouton might have been the editor or supervisor of the manuscript), Lowinsky takes the ascriptions of FlorL 666 at face value,\textsuperscript{23} even to the extent of ignoring the internal evidence when it does not support the ascription in the manuscript.\textsuperscript{24} 

The problem here seems clear. If, as most scholars now agree, Lowinsky’s conclusion about the Royal French provenance of FlorL 666 can be successfully challenged,\textsuperscript{25} then his resolutions reached by the "best source" method are open to question. Indeed, Picker notes the reliability of both readings and attributions in the motet collections of Andrea Antico, and thus accepts Antico’s ascription to Barra of \textit{Nuptiae factae sunt} (No. 174), a composition which had been ascribed to Elimot in FlorL 666 and accepted by

\textsuperscript{22} See Lowinsky, \textit{The Medici Codex}, vol. I, p. 28-36.

\textsuperscript{23} Eight motets (see Appendix C) in FlorL 666 are attributed to someone else in other sources. Not one attribution was rejected by Lowinsky.

\textsuperscript{24} For instance, Lowinsky argues that Mouton is the author of \textit{In omni tribulatione} (No. 121), even though it "is an unusual work among Mouton’s motets"; see \textit{The Medici Codex}, vol. I, p. 170.

\textsuperscript{25} The controversy concerning the provenance of FlorL 666 has spawned an extensive literature, including notices by Lockwood, Perkins, Finscher, Crawford, and Rifkin, all of whom agree that the manuscript was written in Italy, not France. For a summary of the matter, see Picker, \textit{Motet Books of Antico}, p. 10, fn. 6.
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The task of deciding which source stands as the "most reliable" is not always clear cut. Indeed, problems may even arise in what would appear to be fairly simple situations, as when printed sources are devoted to a single composer. In these cases their attributions are generally considered to take precedence over any that may challenge them in an anthology. What, however, should we conclude about Domine non secundum peccata nostra (No. 75), which is included not only in two Gombert collections published by Scotto and Gardane in 1541 and 1542 respectively, 27 but also in a collection of Manchicourt's motets issued by Attaingnant in 1539?

Though we might assume that the Parisian Attaingnant stands more closely to Manchicourt than does the Venice-based Scotto to Gombert, nevertheless we are left with the question of how the Venetian printer could have blundered so badly as to include in an all-Gombert collection a work that was not by Gombert. Yet even our initial impression of Attaingnant 1539 as the more reliable source must be tempered, since that all-Manchicourt collection is

26. For another instance in which there is disagreement about which source stands as the most reliable, see the comments in the inventory about the Anchieta/Compère/Peñalosa/Ribera O bone Jesu (No. 177).

challenged in three other instances. Similarly, the Scotto collection, presumably devoted exclusively to Gombert, is challenged on two other occasions. The fact that a collection is devoted to the works of a single composer is not a guarantee that its attributions are correct.

The example just cited leads us to the next problem in connection with this method: how can we decide which source is the more reliable when the sources that contain the attributions are equally close (or far removed) from the composers involved? Confronted with the fact that Salvator mundi (No. 215) is ascribed to Lhéritier in VatG XII.4, a Roman source copied in 1536 (Lhéritier was active there in 1521-2), but is assigned to Mouton in SGallS 463, copied in ca. 1540 by Aegidius Tschudi, a member of Glarean’s circle,28 Perkins concludes that the two sources are equally reliable for their respective composers, and that the motet, therefore, "could be by either man."29

Thus, to single out the "most reliable" source is not always easy, and the seemingly attractive logic of the method is constantly limited by the accuracy with which we

28. Tschudi studied with Glarean who was in Paris between 1517 and 1522, and who claimed to converse with Mouton through an interpreter.

29. See the introduction to Lhéritier, Opera Omnia, p. xxiii.
can both determine the provenance of the sources and tie
that information to our still sometimes sketchy knowledge of
biographical data.

(C) OTHER METHODS

Another question that arises in connection with the
conflicting attributions in the motet repertory concerns the
testimony of theorists. How much weight should be accorded
to their ascriptions? The most crucial theorist in this
respect is Glarean, who offers many attributions in his
Dodecachordon.

In his study of Petrucci's Motetti della corona
series, Gehrenbeck states that Glarean's attribution of the
Josquin/Richafort/Mouton Miseremini mei (No. 161) to Mouton
in the Dodecachordon may indicate that "Mouton himself had
verified his authorship" of the motet.\textsuperscript{30} However, Loach, in
his study of SGallS 463, characterizes Glarean's
acquaintance with the French composer as "tenuous" and
"aloof,"\textsuperscript{31} and he shows convincingly that Glarean collected
music not from Parisian sources, but mainly from such
Italian sources as Petrucci's Motetti C (1504/1) and

\begin{footnotes}
\begin{itemize}
\item[31.] Loach, "Aegidius Tschudi's Songbook," p. 213.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotes}
Antico's four motet books. Thus the statements that theorists offer about authorship are in general no more reliable than the ascriptions in musical sources. In the end, sixteenth-century theorists seem to have relied on the same sources that we use today.

In a few instances—when a motet with a conflicting attribution survives either with different verbal texts or with a single text with variants—the text itself has been used as evidence for resolving the problem of authorship. Two examples may suffice.

Four years after the death of Anne of Brittany in 1514, the motet *Quis dabit oculis* (No. 207), composed to commemorate her death, was copied into Bo1C Q19 under Costanzo Festa's name. The same composition was printed twenty years later in Formschneider 1538/3, but now with textual-musical changes that associate the work with the death of Maximilian I (d. 1519) and with an attribution to Ludwig Senfl. As Main has argued, since Festa might have enjoyed a relationship with the French court and Senfl had no such connection, it is more likely that Festa was the


33. Perhaps the best known example is the case of Pietro Aaron, who simply took attributions from Petrucci's publications.
composer of the original version.\textsuperscript{34} 

The second example concerns a contrafactum. Montanus & Neuber 1564/1 opens with a setting of \textit{Vidi speciosam} (No. 260) attributed to Manchicourt. However, as Lowinsky has pointed out, the twelfth composition in the very same collection, a setting of \textit{Salva nos Christe salvator} attributed to Clemens non Papa, is musically identical to the Manchicourt motet that opens the collection. Using the music-word criterion as the basis for his argument, Lowinsky concludes that it was \textit{Vidi speciosam} which was the original text and that it was Manchicourt, therefore, who wrote the piece.\textsuperscript{35}

Two aspects of this method call for comment. First, there are obviously few conflicting attributions that can be resolved this way. And second--and more important--both Main and Lowinsky acknowledge that the two conflicting attributions which involve contrafacta point to one composer's having revised the work of the other.\textsuperscript{36}

At present, most scholars seeking to resolve a conflicting attribution employ both style analysis and one

\textsuperscript{34} Main, "Maximilian's Second-Hand Funeral Motet," pp. 173-89.

\textsuperscript{35} Lowinsky, "Two Motets Wrongly-ascribed to Clemens," pp. 21-30.

\textsuperscript{36} For the "revision hypothesis," see Chapter III.
or more methods involving "external evidence." Though this seems to be the most sensible approach, it can sometimes lead to still another problem, as when the two types of evidence are in conflict. And while most scholars nowadays would probably give preference to the evidence gleaned from the sources or from other contemporary witnesses, there are instances in which the two types of evidence seem to reach a standoff. As Sparks points out in connection with the Bauldeweyn/Josquin Ave caro Christi cara (No. 11—see the comments in the Inventory): "I have no explanation for the contradiction [of the evidence] and do not see at the moment how to weigh the evidence accurately enough to resolve it." 37

In the end, it is apparent that no single method—or even any combination of methods—is foolproof. In fact, the literature is full of statements that express the frustrations of scholars trying to come to terms with conflicting attributions of this period: "...unfortunately...a preponderance of evidence does not always exist" (Reese); 38 "...research on questions of personal style around 1500 has not advanced to the point where one could pronounce judgement on so difficult a question with definiteness"

37. Sparks, The Music of Noel Bauldeweyn, p. 103.
38. Reese, Music in the Renaissance, p. 42.
(Lowinsky);\textsuperscript{39} "there are puzzling exceptions that are difficult to account for [with respect to the reliability of sources]" (Nugent);\textsuperscript{40} and as if in summation, "Hindering the development of a secure stylistic profile is the large number of conflicting attributions. . ." (Blackburn).\textsuperscript{41} Thus in order to overcome this difficult matter, as I have mentioned in Chapter III, Atlas and Boorman have recently advanced new ways of looking at the problem.

\textsuperscript{39} Lowinsky, \textit{The Medici Codex}, vol. I, p. 222.
\textsuperscript{40} Nugent, "The Jacquet Motets," p. 200.
CHAPTER V
AN EXAMINATION OF SELECTED MOTETS
WITH CONFLICTING ATTRIBUTIONS

The first half of the sixteenth century has left us at least 266 motets with conflicting attributions. To "solve," "explain," or "account for" all of these, whether with traditional or new methods, would be unrealistic. Rather, I have examined the conflicting attributions for fifty-eight motets, with the choice of works having been determined by the likelihood that the conflicts might possibly be solved or explained using the methods developed by Atlas and Boorman for the fifteenth-century chanson and the sixteenth-century madrigal, respectively (see Chapter III). In the discussion that follows, I examine first those conflicting attributions that seem to yield most readily to Boorman's ideas about the problem and then those for which Atlas's hypothesis seems to provide an answer. As we shall see, more than a few of the conflicting attributions will not be easily explained by means of either method.¹

¹ I have not used Spitzer's anonymous transmission-reattribution hypothesis, since its completely speculative nature makes the hypothesis rather impractical for the problem at hand.
(A) **Conflicting Attributions Explained by Means of Boorman’s Methods**

As noted in Chapter III, Boorman’s explanation of conflicting attributions in sixteenth-century madrigal prints consists of three components: (1) the features of layout, (2) attributions in the running headline, and (3) carried-over attributions. Though virtuoso-like in its treatment of printed sources, Boorman’s method is somewhat limited in its applicability, not only because it is confined to printed sources, but also because it deals exclusively with collections issued by two Venetian printers, Gardane and Scotto. As we shall see, at least some of the conditions that apply in madrigal collections of both publishers find no parallel in the printed motet collections of the period.

(1) **The Problematic Lay-out**

In general, the layout of motet books is less problematic than that of contemporary madrigal books. Unlike the printed madrigal collections, which, with their shorter pieces, often place three pieces—but only two attributions—across an opening, the printed motet collections are rarely affected by the "problematic layout," since a single opening of a motet book usually contains no more than one or two motets (depending on whether the motets are in one or two partes). Even when a motet print does
contain three pieces on a single opening, as sometimes occurs in the collections of such German printers as Petreius, Kriesstein, or Montanus & Neuber (all of whom were perfectly willing to begin a new piece wherever the preceding one ended), the complications caused by the Gardane- or Scotto-type of "problematic layout" are avoided since the German printers usually placed the ascription for new pieces either directly above or just to the left of the beginning of the work.

Moreover, the question of which attribution belongs to which motet is further clarified in most motet collections by the presence of indices with attributions, a feature that is rarely present in the early madrigal prints with which Boorman is concerned (especially in the one-composer collections). In all, examples of conflicting attributions caused by the problematic layout are rare in the motet repertory. Only three conflicts in three prints--with none dating from after 1520--seem to have been caused by such a problem in layout: No. 63, Dilectus Deo, in Petrucci 1514/1; No. 161, Miseremini mei saltem vos, in Antico 1520/2; and No. 183, O pulcherrima mulierum, in Petrucci 1519/3.²

² For Nos. 63 and 161, see the comments in the Inventory; for No. 183, see Chapter III. It should be pointed out that none of the prints involved has an index that contains attributions.
(2) Running Headlines

There are not many instances in the printed motet repertory in which we can clearly show that an attribution in a running headline of a one-composer collection is not a true attribution, but merely an identification tag of sorts for the volume as a whole. Indeed, the conflicting attributions for only four motets that appear in two one-composer collections can be explained by Boorman's interpretation of running headlines.

When Gardane published the first book of Gombert's four-voice motets in 1541 (Gardane 1541 Gombert), he used Scotto 1539 Gombert as the basis for his edition. Though the content of the two collections is slightly different, all of the motets are ascribed to "Gomberth" in the running headline of both editions. However, when Gardane issued a new edition of the collection in 1551 (Gardane 1551 Gombert), he changed the attributions for two motets: No. 263, Virgo prudentissima, and No. 16, Ave regina cælorum, to Payen and "Incerto autore," respectively. There seems to be no doubt, then, that Gardane's intention was to correct his (and Scotto's) earlier attributions, and that the


4. My own examination of Scotto 1539 Gombert shows that the name "Gomberth" appears in the headline of every page of all partbooks.
scription of these motets to "Gomberth" in the earlier
collections had come about only through the use of the name
as a running headline.

A similar instance can be found in connection with
Gardane’s two collections of Jacquet’s motets. In Gardane
1553 Jacquet, the printer changed the attributions of No.
117, In illo tempore dixit Jesus, and No. 124, In te Domine
speravi, from Jacquet (to whom they had been ascribed in
Gardane 1540 Jacquet) to Berchem. While Boorman’s
interpretation of the attributions in the running headline
is certainly applicable to the four conflicts in these
particular Gardane and Scotto collections, I have not yet
encountered such instances in the books of other printers.
Perhaps the practice of using headline attributions in this
way is unique to the two Venetians, Gardane and Scotto.

(3) Carried-Over Attributions

Finally, a number of conflicting attributions that
appear within a single printed collection (see Tables II-8
and II-10) can be explained away by means of Boorman’s idea
concerning the so-called carried-over attribution, for in
these instances, there can be no doubt that the compositors
made some kind of mistake. Moreover, since the prints with
which this study is concerned usually include an index in at
least one of the partbooks, we may assume that the
attributions in the index are those that the printer
intended. For example, No. 19, *Ave sanctissima Maria*, is attributed in Attainant 1534/5 to Verdelot in the indices and the superius partbook, but to "Claudin" in the contratenor. In this case, we may suppose that Attainant's intention was to attribute the motet to Verdelot, but that the name "Claudin" was carried over from someplace else in the print owing to a compositor's error. Nevertheless, my own examination of the prints (mostly from microfilms) reveals that many conflicting attributions appearing within a single print cannot be explained in terms of Boorman's theory. And sometimes, it is difficult to determine the precise place from which the carried-over ascription was drawn.

The conflicting attributions discussed below are arranged in the following order: (a) conflicts definitely caused by carried-over attributions; (b) conflicts that might have been caused by carried-over attributions, but for

5. one may argue that, when index and partbook disagree, it is the partbook that should be considered correct, because the compositor corrected the ascription when he set type for the music. Yet, it seems unlikely that composers would have made such corrections. Probably we have to distinguish between the working habits of composers, on the one hand, and scribes on the other. While a scribe could act as copyist, editor, and corrector at the same time, composers probably acted merely as typesetters, putting the presumably correct type in the right place, and adhering slavishly to the manuscript exemplar in front of them. In other words, setting type is a much more mechanical process than is the copying of music.
which the origin of the error cannot be easily determined, and, (c) conflicts that could not have been caused by a carried-over attribution.

(a) Conflicting Attributions Caused by Carried-Over Attributions

(i) No. 227, *Servus tuus ego sum*, Canis/Crecquillon
No. 235, *Surge illuminare Jerusalem*, Canis/(Clemens)/Crecquillon
No. 262, *Virgo gloriosa*, Canis/Crecquillon

In Ulhard 1548/2, three consecutive motets (Nos. 6-8 of the collection) are ascribed to both Canis and Crecquillon; the attribution to Canis appears only in the altus partbook, whereas the other books and all the indices ascribe the three motets to Crecquillon. According to the indices, this anthology contains seventeen motets by four composers—five each by Canis, Crecquillon, and Payen, and two by Lestainnier. The three motets with conflicting attributions are the first of the five that are attributed to Crecquillon in the indices. Since the first gathering contains four Canis motets, his name appears in four headlines of that gathering. But when the composer set the second gathering, which includes one motet by Canis and three by Crecquillon, instead of changing the attributions from Canis to Crecquillon for the last three pieces, he

6. The motet No. 235 is also ascribed to Clemens in another source, see the Inventory.
apparently kept all the headline materials intact except for the piece numbers. There seems little doubt, then, that the attributions to Canis in the headlines of the altus book were carried over from the first gathering of the same book. This implies that Ulhard employed what is known as horizontal printing, which was the obvious choice for this kind of collection where pieces by the same composer are grouped together. Thus, that the compositor could easily have forgotten to change the attributions in the headlines is readily understood.

(ii) No. 190, *Pater peccavi* (I), Clemens/Manchicourt

This is a particularly interesting example, for it shows that a carried-over attribution need not necessarily have been carried over from someplace within the same volume, but could even have been carried over from another volume of a multi-volume series issued by the same printer. Susato 1553/14 ascribes this motet to Manchicourt in the indices and in all partbooks except the contratenor, where the name "Iaco. Clemens non Papa" appears in the headline of fol. 2r. To explain this conflicting attribution, we must consider the whole series of collections to which this print belongs. During the period 1553-1555, Susato published twelve volumes of motet anthologies entitled *Ecclesiasticarum cantionum*. There is good evidence that
Susato prepared all twelve volumes at the same time, since the first gathering of each of the twelve contratenor partbooks was evidently set first by a single compositor whose work appears nowhere else in the collections, something that becomes evident from the fact that the fonts used for the first gathering of each contratenor book are found exclusively in those parts of the collections. Thus, if the attribution to Clemens in the contratenor book of Susato 1553/14 was carried over from another place, it must have been from a first gathering of another volume in the series.

Comparison of the first pages, in fact, yields unequivocal evidence that the attribution to Clemens in 1553/14 was indeed carried over from the first page of Susato 1553/12 (see Plates I and II). Not only does the spacing of the composer's name match perfectly, but so too does the placement and the spacing of the folio numbers.  

7. This process is sometimes called "concurrent" or "parallel" printing. It was used as a time-saving method, since the compositor does not have to wait until the other parts of the job are finished. For further information on this technique, see Gaskell, A New Introduction to Bibliography, pp. 164-8.

8. Perhaps this implies that the compositor worked on 1553/14 immediately after having completed 1553/12.
Plate II. The Contratenor Partbook of Susato 1553/12, f. 2r.
(b) **Conflicting Attributions that might have been caused by Carried-Over Attributions**

(i) No. 61, *Deus regnorum*, Gascongne/Sermisy

Whereas all four partbooks of Attaingnant 1535/3 attribute this motet to Gascongne, the indices ascribe it to Sermisy. Altogether there are six motets attributed to Gascongne in this collection (two before and three after *Deus regnorum*), and it seems possible that the attribution could have been carried over from another place in the collection. However, the headlines containing the name Gascongne are too similar to one another to permit us to pinpoint the one that was carried over, and we are faced with the problems of uncertainty that constantly plague scholars who work with early prints. Theoretically, in dealing with a carried-over attribution, we should be able to identify precisely the spot from which the ascription was carried over. Yet, in order to do this, we must know many of the details about how a specific print was executed. For example, did the printers use only one forme, or was more than one forme used? Did the compositors employ the technique called "work-and-turn"? Did they work in sequence from the beginning of the collection to end? (In theory, they could have begun anywhere in the print.) In other

---

words, the precise spot from which an attribution could have been carried over will vary with the compositors’ working methods. And to tell the truth, we cannot always determine the minute details of the printing process. Even when we find the kind of printers’ errors that occurred in connection with the Clemens/ Manchicourt Pater peccavi or the three motets attributed to Canis and Crecquillon (see above), we can reconstruct only part—never the whole—of the printing process.10 Without such evidence, it is virtually impossible to say how Gascongne’s name came to be printed on every page that was intended to carry an attribution to Sermisy.

(ii) No. 100, Gaude virgo Catherina, Gombert/Mouton

In Attaingnant 1534/9, this piece is attributed to Mouton in the indices, but to Gombert in the bassus partbook. (No ascription is given in the other three partbooks.) Significantly, the bassus headline contains information that goes beyond the customary material; it

10. In Gaskell’s words, 
   . . . real (as opposed to theoretical) printing was a complex craft carried out by fallible and inconsistent human beings of widely different capabilities. . . . For every generalization that is made about the history of printing technology, for every rule supposedly observed by hand printers, there may have been an exception; or—for there was no rule about this either—there may not (A New Introduction to Bibliography, p. 47).
reads: "De Sancta Katherina Gombert Bassus," and thus yields a clue as to the probable place from which the headline was taken. Although there is no other "Catherine motet" ascribed to Gombert in that collection, another Attaingnant print, Attaingnant 1534/6, contains Gombert's *Virgo sancta Katherina*, and does so with precisely the same inscription: "De Sancta Katherina." Thus it is possible—even probable, given the two collections were published in the same year and were part of the multi-volume series—that Attaingnant used a forme in 1534/9 which he had already used in the production of 1534/6. Though there is no evidence to indicate that Attaingnant's composers worked on more than one collection at a time (as there was in connection with the Susato prints discussed above), one cannot eliminate the possibility that the attribution to Gombert in Attaingnant 1534/9 was carried over from another Attaingnant collection.

(c) Conflicting Attributions that were not caused by Carried-Over Attributions

(i) No. 266, *Visita quaesumus*, Jacquet/(Lhéririer)/Willaert

This motet is attributed to Jacquet in the indices of Buglhat 1538/5, but to Willaert in all the partbooks (the ascription to Lhéririer appears in other sources--see the Inventory). The headlines of the pages on which the piece appears read as follows:
Cantus Prima pars Adrian Vvillart
Tenor Prima pars Adrian Vvillart
Altus Adrian Vvillart
[Bassus] Adrian Vvillart

An examination of all the headlines that attribute other motets to Willaert fails to confirm that the attribution of Visita quaesumus to Willaert was carried over from any other place in this collection. For example, in the tenor partbook, the headline on fol. 6v reads "Tenor Adrian Vvillart Prima pars," and thus has a different word order, while the headline on fol. 18v of the cantus partbook reads "Cantus Prima Pars Adrian Vvillart," and therefore differs in having a capital P for the word "Pars."

With the failure to explain this conflicting attribution by means of the carried-over technique, the attribution to Willaert becomes even more difficult to comprehend. As the four headlines show, the composers did not even use the same forme for the piece throughout all the partbooks. Rather, they altered the forme when they set the piece in the altus and bassus partbooks, omitting the "Prima Pars" designation in the altus book and both that and the voice designation in the bassus. Yet through it all, the attribution to Willaert was maintained, and the conflicting attributions admits of no easy explanation.
(ii) No. 19, *Ave sanctissima Maria*, Sermisy/Verdelot

Though this motet is ascribed to Verdelot in both the indices and the superius partbook of Attaingnant 1534/5, the contratenor book of that collection gives the name "Claudin" over the piece. In addition, the headline of the contratenor book contains the word "Canon" right next to the composer's name. Thus if the Claudin headline over the motet was carried over, the headline of the page from which it came must have had the matching phrase: "Canon. Claudin." However, that phrase appears nowhere else in Attaingnant 1534/5. The evidence therefore suggests that the conflicting attribution of *Ave sanctissima Maria* was not caused by a carried-over attribution.

(iii) No. 197, *Puer natus est nobis*, Mouton/Mahu

While the index and altus partbook of Rheau 1538/8 ascribes the motet to Mouton, the bassus partbook gives it to Mahu, where the name appears as "STE. MAHV." Again, though, the possibility of a carried-over ascription must be rejected, since all other references to Mahu in this collection give his name as "STEPHANVS MAHV."

(iv) No. 47, *Conserva me Domine*, (Finck)/Josquin/Wolff

In Petreius 1538/6, this motet is ascribed to "Martianus Vuolff" in the index, but to "Iosquin" in the Discantus partbook (it is anonymous in the other
partbooks). Here, we can be sure that the attribution to "Iosquin" was not carried over from any other place in the print, since the name "Iosquin" appears not in the headline of the page, but directly above the beginning of the motet, which begins on the last staff of the page. When Montanus & Neuber published this work in 1553/4, they must have used the Petreius print as their exemplar, because Montanus & Neuber 1553/4 duplicated the conflicting ascription precisely as it appears in the Petreius print naming Wolff in the index and Josquin in the Discantus partbook.  

(v) No. 253, *Verba mea auribus* De Silva/Paminger

Montanus & Neuber 1553/4 contains another motet for which an attribution appears not in a headline but in the middle of a page--this time in the altus partbook. The motet *Verba mea auribus* is ascribed to De Silva in both the indices and the bassus partbook, but to "Leon. Paminger" in the altus. Thus once again, the conflicting attribution, though appearing in the single collection, could not have come about through a carried-over attribution.

In conclusion, Table V-1 summarizes the conflicting

---

11. This motet is also ascribed to Finck in KasL 24.

12. In addition, Montanus and Neuber 1553/4 gives the name Wolff in the altus and bassus partbooks.
Table V-1. Motets examined in relation to Boorman’s methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motet Number</th>
<th>Composers involved</th>
<th>Component tested*</th>
<th>Conflicts explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. 16</td>
<td>Dalla Viola/Gombert</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 19</td>
<td>Sermisy/Verdelot</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 47</td>
<td>Finck/Josquin/Wolff</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 61</td>
<td>Gascongne/Sermisy</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 63</td>
<td>Fevin/Josquin</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 100</td>
<td>Gombert/Mouton</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 117</td>
<td>Berchem/Gombert/Jacquet</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 124</td>
<td>Berchem/Jacquet</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 161</td>
<td>Josquin/Mouton/Richafort</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 183</td>
<td>Baudeweyn/Festa/Fevin/Mouton</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 190</td>
<td>Clemens/Manchicourt</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 197</td>
<td>Mahu/Mouton</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 227</td>
<td>Canis/Crecquillon</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 235</td>
<td>Canis/Clemens/Crecquillon</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 253</td>
<td>De Silva/Painger</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 262</td>
<td>Canis/Crecquillon</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 263</td>
<td>Gombert/Payen</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 266</td>
<td>Jacquet/Lhérétier/Willaert</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(1) = The problematic lay-out, (2) = Running headlines, (3) = Carried-over attributions
attributions discussed so far. Ten of eighteen conflicts can be explained using Boorman's method, while the remaining seven cannot be so resolved.

(B) **Conflicting Attributions Explained by Means of Atlas's Method**

Altogether, the conflicting attributions of forty motets have been examined with a view to explaining the conflicts by means of the revision hypothesis developed by Atlas. Many of the motets display at least one of the following six "variant types" that, according to Atlas, could account for the conflicting attributions: (1) instrumental arrangements of vocal works, (2) added or alternate voice part(s), (3) an added large-scale section of music, (4) "local" variants in music, (5) "local" variants in the text, and (6) contrafacta. The ensuing discussion takes up each type of compositional variant as it appears in the sample motets.

(1) **Instrumental Arrangements of Vocal Works**

This category includes those conflicting attributions that might have been caused by one musician's having intabulated the work of another. Thus when a composer's name appears in connection with an instrumental version of a motet, the attribution might refer only to the arranger, not to the composer of the original motet.
(a) No. 52, *Date siceram maerentibus*, Gombert/Josquin/
Mikołaj/Sermisy

This motet is ascribed to "Nicolaus Cracoviensis" (Mikołaj z Krakowa) in the tabulature KrakPAN 1716, compiled by the Polish organist Jan of Lublin, and to Gombert, Josquin, and Sermisy in other sources. Though the whole of KrakPAN 1716 was copied by Jan, the intabulations included in the manuscript were probably done by others, and Jan of Lublin simply copied his pieces from tabulatures now lost.\(^{13}\) In this case, then, the attribution to Mikołaj was entered because Jan of Lublin worked from a source containing a work intabulated by Mikołaj and ascribed to him.\(^{14}\)

In general, the intabulation of vocal works did not generate many conflicting attributions, and they certainly do not furnish the most interesting or perplexing examples.

(2) **Added or Alternate Voice Part(s)**

The conflicting attributions included here pertain to those in which the conflict can be associated either with a difference in the number of voice parts among the various redactions of the piece, or to the presence of an entire

\(^{13}\) White, "The Tabulature of Lublin," p. 142.

\(^{14}\) Blackburn also believes that Mikołaj was only responsible for the intabulation; see, "Josquin's Chansons," p. 34.
alternate voice part.

(a) No. 80, Dulces exuvie, Mouton/Willaert

This work is ascribed to Willaert in Sgallery 463 as a three-voice work (the same version appears without an ascription in both Antico 1520/6 and Rhaw 1542/8), while a four-voice version is credited to Mouton in RegB 940-1 (this version also appears anonymously in Rhaw 1538/8). Though Mouton is thought to have been Willaert’s teacher, it would appear that Mouton added the fourth voice to Willaert’s three-voice version. (On the other hand, one may argue that Mouton’s version is original, and that it was Willaert who was responsible for reducing the number of voice parts to three, since the fourth voice blends very well with the others, and contains no stylistic traces of being an added voice, though some might say that it overly thickens the texture.)

(b) No. 257, Verbum iniquum et dolosum, Clemens/Crecquillon

Kempers includes two versions of this motet in his edition of Clemens’s motets on the grounds that the work

15. Where modern editions of a piece—with accurate lists of variants—were available, I have used them (these are listed in the Inventory); otherwise, the transcription and/or collation are my own.

survives with two different contratenors. 17 One version of
the motet is ascribed to Clemens in Scotto 1554/14 and
Montanus & Neuber 1564/5, while the other bears an
ascription to Crecquillon in Susato 1553/10 and Montanus &
Neuber 1559/2, but to Clemens in Phalèse 1559c Clemens.
There can be little doubt that the conflicting attributions
came about when one composer replaced the contratenor with
his own. 18

As a whole, the motet repertory contains only a few


18. This is one of those instances in which the distribution
of the compositional variants (here the two contratenor
parts) does not coincide precisely with the attributions,
since one of the versions is attributed to both Clemens and
Crecquillon. Atlas explains this seeming contradiction as
resulting from confusion on the part of the compilers of the
manuscripts and prints ("Conflicting Attributions," p. 273)
but he then goes on to say,

There is, however, an important difference [from the
conventional "confusion theory"], for now the names
are not being "made up," so to speak. Rather, each of
the composers who disputes the authorship of a chanson
has, according to the hypothesis, a legitimate place
in the transmission of the work. What has become
confused is now simply a matter of which version
should be credited to which composer.

Thus, the attribution of the second version to Clemens
resulted, according to Atlas's explanation, from Phalèse's
confusion about which composer wrote what. (This assumes, of
course, that Phalèse himself knew both composers had some
claim to the piece.) Another possible explanation might
derive from the notion of contamination in the transmission
of the work. We may imagine the following situation:
Phalèse, having access to both the Susato and Scotto ver-
sions, adopted the music of the Susato version, while he
took the Clemens attribution from Scotto.
conflicting attributions that appear in conjunction with
added or alternate voices,19 and as such differs
significantly from the fifteenth-century chanson.20

(3) **Added Sections of Music**

It is not unusual to find a motet from the first half
of the sixteenth century sometimes transmitted with one
pars, sometimes with two partes. At the same time, one pars
of a multi-section motet could have been disseminated as a
separate independent piece. And as often happens, a motet
so transmitted will be ascribed to more than one composer,
in which event we may be dealing with instances in which one
composer either added to or deleted from a motet composed by
another.

(a) No. 176, *O admirabile commercium*, Josquin/Regis

The motet *O admirabile commercium* appears in two
manuscripts: LeidGA 1439, with an attribution to Josquin,

19. See also Motet Nos. 39, 223, and 228.

20. As one can see from the inventory in Atlas, "Conflict-
ing Attributions", pp. 278-84, Nos. 5, 9, 15, 16, 19,
20, 21, 27, and 31, this kind of coupling of conflicting
attribution and "added-voice revision" was quite common
among the fifteenth-century chanson. No doubt, the smaller
number of such conflicts-revisions in the motet repertory
has to do with the general change in style ca. 1500, that
is, from successive to simultaneous composition. Obviously,
with the establishment of a truly simultaneous process of
composition, one based more and more on successive points of
imitation, the temptation or the possibility of adding a new
voice became all the less inviting.
and VatC 234, which names Regis as the composer. In LeidGA 1439, the *tertia pars*, "Puer natus est nobis," is missing. While one might assume that the last part was somehow dropped inadvertently in the copying process, a closer look at the music suggests that even if it was LeidGA 1439 that deleted the final *pars* (as opposed to its having been added in VatC 234), we are dealing with a completely calculated act of composition. The evidence lies in the final "chord" of the *secunda pars* of the two versions. In VatC 234, this sonority is a full C-major triad that is then followed by the *tertia pars*, while that in LeidGA 1439 omits the third, E, and thus gives us a more typical final sonority as the whole piece comes to a close. This seemingly minute piece of evidence is perhaps supported by the text of the tenor part, which after having sung the words "Verbum caro est" in cantus-firmus fashion through the first two *partes*, has no further reference to the text in the *tertia pars*. Obviously, one can argue both ways: that Regis changed the final sonority at the end of the *secunda pars* and added a differentiated *tertia pars* to Josquin's two-part original, or that Josquin, noting the lack of coherence between the first two *partes* and the third, decided to drop the final section and then changed the final sonority of the *secunda pars* to the customary open fifth.
(b) No. 182, *O pulcherrima mulierum*, (Baudeweyn)/(Festa)/Fevin/Mouton

While BarcBC 454 ascribes this motet to Mouton, two other sources, Kriesstein 1540/7 and VienNB Mus. 15941, attribute it to Fevin. Kriesstein 1540/7, however, has only the section that sets "Descendi in hortum meum", which is the *secunda pars* of *O pulcherrima* in BarcBC 454. The version in Kriesstein 1540/7, however, extends the ending of that *pars* with nineteen additional measures of music which repeat the last three words of the *Descendi* ("veni, et coronaberis"). Remarkably, the additional music is nothing other than the beginning of *O pulcherrima*. Thus the beginning music of *O pulcherrima* as ascribed to Mouton in BarcBC 454 becomes the ending of the independent *Descendi* as attributed to Fevin in Kriesstein 1540/7.

In terms of tonal coherence, Mouton's version is consistent: it begins with a tonal center of E, and reaches a cadence on A at the end of the *prima pars*; the *secunda pars* then continues to be centered on A, and eventually returns to a Phrygian cadence on E at its conclusion. The version attributed to Fevin, on the other hand, ends with a full C-major triad.

To decide in favor of one version or the other as being the original on the grounds of the tonal structure seems inappropriate. Rather, a comparison of the two beginnings may yield some evidence. In general, multi-part
motets begin each section in a different manner. The
opening of the prima pars is usually "slow" (with long
notes) and imitative, while the secunda pars usually begins
with a full texture (very often chordal), or, if it is
contrapuntal, with a rather fast rhythm. Given this
"standard" procedure, Descendi better fits the model when it
functions as a secunda pars of the motet than it does as the
beginning of a piece, and in all, we can probably conclude
that Fevin reworked Mouton's motet.21

(4) Local Variants in Music

Certainly, the most frequently encountered type of
revision is the one that consists of what might be called
"local variants," that is, variants that alter short
stretches of music either in one voice or throughout the
polyphonic fabric and which seem to be more significant than
simple scribal alterations. In the latter group—variants
which could easily have been introduced in the copying
process by non-composer scribes—we may include the
following: (1) minor rhythmic changes caused by alterations
in text underlay (for example one breve for two semibreves,

21. Although it is ascribed to Fevin, the version in
VienNB Mus. 15941 is the same as the version attributed to
Mouton in that it also contains two partes. However, the
Vienna version has many "local" variants which might point
to further revision by Fevin.
or vice versa), (2) light embellishment of a passage, such as filling in passing tones between two notes, and (3) standard cadential variants. As for the "local-compositional" variants, there is obviously some subjectivity in defining them, though one criterion might be that they could hardly have been made without access to a "score."

(a) No. 45, *Congratulamini mihi omnes*, Sermisy/Verdelot

A compositional variant between the version attributed to Verdelot in Kriesstein 1540/7 and Er1U 473/1 and that ascribed to Sermisy in Scotto 1549/10a appears in the altus at mm. 44-6 (Ex. V-1).

(b) No. 60, *Dirige gressus meos*, Clemens/Crecquillon

The version of this motet in DresSL Löbau 12, where it is attributed to Clemens, differs from the reading found in each of the sources that ascribes the work to Crecquillon: while the superius of the Clemens version fills mm. 17-19 of the superius with a dotted longa and equivalent rest, the Crecquillon version fills the space with the same thematic material that had appeared at mm. 15-6 (Ex. V-2).

---

22. Brown, in an interesting study on this matter, points out that a comparison of five manuscripts into which the Netherlandish court scribe Alamire copied the same Mass by La Rue shows that each reading contains "remarkably few changes in pitches and rhythms;" see, "In Alamire's Workshop," p. 16.
Ex. V-1. Sermisy/Verdelot, No. 45, *Congratulamini mihi omnes*, mm. 44-6: (a) Krieststein 1540/7 (Verdelot) and Erl U 473/1 (Verdelot); (b) Scotto 1549/10a (Sermisy)
Ex. V-2. Clemens/Crecquillon, No. 64, Dirige gressus meos, mm. 17-19: (a) DresSL Löbau 12 (Clemens); (b) all other sources (Crecquillon)
(c) No. 74 Domine ne in furore Josquin/Verdelot

In general, the variants show that two sources KasL 24, with an attribution to Josquin, and LeipU 49, where the piece appears anonymously, are closely related. Significantly, the manuscript that ascribes the motet to Verdelot, BolC Q20, disagrees with the two German sources at mm. 43-4 of the tenor (Ex. V-3).

(d) No. 78, Domini est terra, Appenzeller/Josquin/Vinders

Of the five sources that I have collated, CambraiBM 125-8, with an attribution to Vinders, contains many small variants that distinguish it from the others: GreifU 640-1 (ascription to Appenzeller), KasL 24 (attribution to Josquin), LeidGA 1442 (anon.), and UlmS 237 (anon.). Moreover, of the last four sources, all but GreifU 640-1 are very closely related, so that as Ex. V-4 shows the manuscripts that ascribe the motet to either Appenzeller or Vinders stand aside from both KasL 24 and LeidGA 1442. In the end, one may argue that the version attributed to each composer contains variants that distinguish it from the version ascribed to any other composer: thus three composers and three sets of variant readings.

(e) No. 110, Hodie salvator mundi, Lhéritier/Mouton

The manuscript that attributes this motet to Mouton, TrevBC 8, contains numerous compositional variants which
Ex. V-3. Josquin/Verdelot, No. 73, *Domine ne in furore*, mm. 43-44: (a) BolC Q20 (Verdelot); (b) KasL 24 (Josquin) and LeipU 49 (anon.)
Ex. V-4. Appenzeller/Josquin/Vinders, No. 78, Domini est terra, mm. 163-4: (a) CambraiBM 125-6 (Vinders), GreifU 640-1 (Appenzeller), and UlmS 237 (anon.); (b) KasL 24 (Josquin) and LeidGA 1442 (anon.)
place it against all other sources, including VatG XII.4, which has an ascription to Lhéritier. Ex. V-5 shows the compositional variant that affects tenor and bassus at mm. 86-8.

(f) No. 143, Laqueus contritus est, Clemens/Gombert

This work is attributed to Gombert in both Montanus & Neuber 1554/11 and CambraiBM 125-8, but to Clemens in Phalèse 1559e Clemens. In addition to the variant readings found at the end of the prima pars, there are significant differences in the superius and tenor at m. 120 (Ex. V-6).

(g) No. 150, Lectio actuum apostolorum, Josquin/Viardot

The attribution to Viardot appears in VatS 42, which begins the motet with the words "Dum completerunt." As for the Josquin attribution, it appears in both Petrucci 1519/3 and MunU 401, both of which add thirteen measures to the beginning of the Viardot version in order to incorporate the words "Lectio actuum apostolorum. In diebus illis." It seems apparent that Josquin added the opening phrase to Viardot's motet.23

Ex. V-5. Lhérîtîer/Mouton, No. 110, *Hodie salvator mundi*, mm. 86-88: (a) BolC Q19 (anon.), CasAC D(F) (anon.), and VatG XII.4 (Lhétitier); (b) TrevBC 8 (Mouton)
Ex. V-6. Clemens/Gombert, No. 143, Laqueus contritus est, mm. 119-121: (a) Phalèse 1559e Clemens (Clemens); (b) Montanus & Neuber 1554/11 (Gombert)
(h) No. 225, Sancti Dei omnes, Josquin/Mouton

This motet consists of three parts in the version attributed to Josquin in ToleBC 13, while all other sources, including the one that names Mouton, VatS 42, combine the second and third parts into one by altering the final chord of the second part from a major triad on F to one on C. Obviously, this change helps the passage bridge the gap from one section to the next. Similarly, there is a varied cadence at mm. 211-2, where the version ascribed to Mouton pauses on a full cadence, while that attributed to Josquin avoids the cadence.

(5) Local Changes in Text

As with the musical variants, textual variants can be divided into two groups, those fashioned by the scribes, printers, or compilers of the collections and those that may properly be attributed to the composer.24 As we have noted in the previous chapter, the two versions of Quis dabit oculis (No. 207) are thought to result from Senfl’s having revised—or altered—some of the words in Festa’s original composition. Thus, when there are textual variants that substantially change the content of the text, we may risk

24. Most modern editions do not report minor textual variants. Surprisingly, perhaps, one of the best editions in terms of listing such variants is still the "old" Josquin edition edited by Smijers.
regarding them as compositional variants. Such changes occur especially frequently in the so-called "state motets," as in the Gascongne/Mouton Non nobis Domine.

(a) No. 171, Non nobis Domine, Gascongne/Mouton

The version of this motet in Petrucci 1519/1, where the motet is attributed to Mouton, celebrates the birth of Princess Renée in 1510, daughter of Louis XII and Anne of Brittany. In Attainniant 1535/3, on the other hand, the same motet appears with an ascription to Gascongne and with a text that pays tribute to Louis's successor, Francis I:

Petrucci 1519/1

Non nobis Domine, non nobis
sed nomini tuo da gloriam
qui Reginam fecundasti
et in partu praeservasti
tante prolix gratia
ergo clamemus in caelum
vivat Rex in aeternum
vivat Rex vivat Rex
et Regina.

Attainniant 1535/3

-->qui Franciscum sublimasti
-->et in regem coronasti
-->plebis cum laetitia

-->vivat Rex vivat Rex
per saecula.

O Francia quantum potes
tantum gaude
nam fillia datur
Annae Regique
[missing here]
<ergo ...

secunda pars

Lauda Deum, O Renata
per Renati precesnata
Et nos pari foedere
[missing here]
<ergo ...

-->Jesu bone, rex virtutum
-->qui das salutem regibus
-->conserva regem Franciscum
-->dans pacem suis diebus
O Renata parens regni audi praeces Ludovici da filium nobilem da rubor fer auxilium ergo . . .

-->O Maria, mater Dei
-->exaudi praeces populi
-->serva semper lilium

It seems apparent that it was Mouton who composed the original motet, and that Gascongne was responsible only for the new text and the necessary rhythmic changes.25

(b) No. 90, *Egregie Christi martyr Christophe*, Fevin/Mouton

This motet belongs to a type that can be used for a number of different occasions simply by changing a proper name. Thus the versions in Petrucci 1514/1 (attributed to Fevin) and VienNB Mus. 15491 (attributed to Mouton) have the name of St. Christopher, while the versions in BolSP 38 (anon.), CasAC P(E) (anon.), and LonBLR 8G.VII (anon.) use St. Petronius, St. Evasius, and St. Martin, respectively. Here it would be difficult to conclude that these differences came about through the intervention of either Mouton or Fevin, not because they are both named in connection with the St. Christopher version, but because the local textual changes would seem to be the work of scribes adjusting the text in order to meet the requirements of a

25. Both Gehrenbeck, "Motetti della corona," vol. III, pp. 1061-5, and Dunning, *Staatsmotetten*, pp. 78-82, express the same view. Aside from the textual variants just cited, the music of the two versions is almost identical.
local tradition. Moreover, the two sources with attributions are virtually identical musically. (Of course, it is possible that a source unknown to us, or one of the sources that I was not able to collate, contains compositional variants.)

(c) No. 180, O Christe redemptor, Maessens/Mouton

As Picker points out, there is no question that the conflicting attribution came about through a textual revision, as the source which attributes the motet to Maessens transmits a number of substantial alterations of the text. 26 For example, the version ascribed to Maessens deliberately obscures the French connection in the original text by substituting the word "coetum" for "lilium."

(d) No. 233, Super montem excelsum, Clemens/Crecquillon/Manchicourt

There are three versions of the text of this responsorial motet, just as there are three composers to whom it is attributed. The three versions appear in AachS 2 (attributed to Crecquillon), Phalèse 1559 Clemens VI, and Attaingnant 1539 Manchicourt. The differences in the texts of the three sources are:

---

AachS 2  
Phalèse  
Attaingnant

Et dic civitatis Jude  
Et dic civitatis  
as AachS 2
...
ecce Dominus Deus vester  
ecce Dominus Deus noster  
as AachS 2
...
Alleluia, Alleluia, ...  
Noe, noe, ...  
as Phalèse

secunda pars

...
Et regnabit super vos  
Et regnabit super nos  
as Phalèse
...
Alleluia, Alleluia, ...  
Noe, noe, ...  
as Phalèse

To be sure, the textual variants are minor  
("noster"/"vester" or "nos"/"vos"), and one hesitates to  
classify them as compositional variants. Even the lack of  
the word "Jude" in the version that names Clemens seems  
insignificant. In all, it is unlikely that these textual  
variants have anything to do with the conflicting  
attributions.27

However, the situation changes somewhat when we  
consider one of the musical variants, for while the Clemens  
and Manchicourt versions are virtually identical, the

27. Whenever a source alters either the text itself or  
even the text underlay, rhythmic changes are inevitable. It  
is tempting to speculate that even minor rhythmic changes  
which most of us believe are scribal variants may in some  
cases be true compositional variants. A case in point is  
the Crecquillon/Lupi Nos autem gloriari oportet where the  
two sources that name the two composers disagree with each  
other rhythmically in almost every measure throughout the  
motet. After all, it was during the first half of the  
sixteenth century that close attention to text underlay  
became prominent.

version ascribed to Crecquillon adds four measures at the end of the secunda pars.

(6) Contrafacta

At least some conflicting attributions might have been produced by one composer supplying a completely new text for a motet written by another composer, yielding a contrafactum.

(a) No. 242, Tua est potentia, Danckerts/Phinot

An interesting manuscript in connection with contrafacta is TrevBC 29. In her recent study of the manuscript, Blackburn has pointed out that no fewer than sixty of the 175 motets in TrevBC 29 involve contrafacta. 28 Naturally, she suggests that all the new texts were provided by the owner and scribe(?) of the manuscript, Pietro Varisco. 29 Thus she does not consider the possibility that at least in some instances it might have been the composer who was responsible for the new text.

However, at least one motet in the manuscript raises doubts about Varisco's one-man job: Tu es vas electionis is ascribed to Danckerts in TrevBC 29, while the same music, but with a different text--Tua est potentia--is included in

29. Blackburn, Treviso Cathedral, p. 4.
Gardane 1552 Phinot. As Blackburn indicates, the differences between the two versions pertain to more than just the words, since at one point in the secunda pars, the scribe of TrevBC 29 deleted eleven and a half breves worth of music in order to accommodate the new text.\(^{30}\) Moreover, she shows convincingly that the scribe used the Gardane print (with its ascription to Phinot) for this motet.\(^{31}\) What is difficult to understand, then, is why Varisco, assuming that he was the scribe of TrevBC 29, changed the ascription from Phinot to Danckerts.

Is it possible, therefore, that it was Danckerts who supplied the new text and made the musical alterations? There is nothing that argues against this. Danckerts was dismissed from the Sistine Chapel in 1565 when he was about fifty-five years old. After that, we know nothing about his whereabouts. Significantly, though, Danckerts is named as the composer of another motet that survives in TrevBC 30, a companion volume to TrevBC 29, which Blackburn dates from no earlier than 1575.\(^{32}\) Perhaps, all of this suggests that

\(^{30}\) Though this manuscript was destroyed, the portion of the manuscript that contains our motet survives in photographic reproductions; see Blackburn, *Treviso Cathedral*, p. vi.


\(^{32}\) Only four motets are known to be composed by Danckerts; see Blackburn, *Treviso Cathedral*, pp. 39-40.
Danckerts, after leaving the Sistine Chapel in 1565, was active at Treviso, where he arranged Phinot’s motet, which then became accessible to Varisco and TrevBC 29.

To sum up, a fairly good number (twenty-four out of forty) of our sample conflicting attributions can, it seems, be explained—or perhaps we should say understood—by examining them with Atlas’s revision hypothesis in mind (see Table V-2). To be sure, the theory is just that. But what cannot be denied is the frequent coupling of conflicting attributions, on the one hand, and a variety of different kinds of "compositional" variants, on the other. Moreover, it is Atlas’s explanation, more than any other, that seems to illuminate the subject of our next chapter, the pattern of "clubiness" among the composers involved in conflicting attributions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motet Number</th>
<th>Composers involved</th>
<th>Type of variant</th>
<th>Explained by variants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. 6</td>
<td>Berchem/Lupi</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 10</td>
<td>Brumel/Mouton</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 17</td>
<td>Conseil/Jacquet/ M. Jhan</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 36</td>
<td>Fevin/Mouton</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 38</td>
<td>Baston/Mouton/ Richafort</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 45</td>
<td>Sermisy/Verdelot</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 52</td>
<td>Gombert/Josquin/ Sermisy/ Mikolaj</td>
<td>(1),(6)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 60</td>
<td>Clemens/Crecquillon</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 63</td>
<td>Fevin/Josquin</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 68</td>
<td>Conseil/Festa</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 74</td>
<td>Josquin/Verdelot</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 78</td>
<td>Appenzeller/Josquin/ Vinders</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 80</td>
<td>Mouton/Willaert</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 90</td>
<td>Fevin/Mouton</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 106</td>
<td>Mouton/Ninot</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 110</td>
<td>Lhéritier/Mouton</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 114</td>
<td>Josquin/Mouton</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 134</td>
<td>Gombert/Grandsyre/ Lupi</td>
<td>(3),(6)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 142</td>
<td>De Silva/Josquin</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 143</td>
<td>Clemens/Gombert</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 150</td>
<td>Josquin/Viardot</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 154</td>
<td>Finck/Hellinck/ Josquin</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 169</td>
<td>Le Heurteur/ Lhéritier/Lupus/ Sermisy</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 171</td>
<td>Gascongne/Mouton</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 176</td>
<td>Josquin/Regis</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 178</td>
<td>Anchieta/Compré/ Peñalosa/Ribera</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 180</td>
<td>Maessens/Mouton</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 182</td>
<td>Compré/Richafort</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 183</td>
<td>Fevin/Mouton</td>
<td>(3),(4)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 194</td>
<td>Josquin/Ninot</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 200</td>
<td>Lupi/Verdelot</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 205</td>
<td>Isaac/Rener</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 225</td>
<td>Josquin/Mouton</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 233</td>
<td>Clemens/Crecquillon/ Manchicourt</td>
<td>(4),(5)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Composer(s)</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>De Silva/Werrecore</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Danckerts/Phinot</td>
<td>(4), (6)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Josquin/Pesenti</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Josquin/Gombert</td>
<td>(3), (4), (6)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Clemens/Crecquillon</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Brunet/Josquin</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER VI
CONFLICTING ATTRIBUTIONS AND
THE BIOGRAPHICAL INTERSECTIONS OF COMPOSERS

One of the observations that has emerged from the present survey of conflicting attributions is that there is a tendency for certain composers to conflict mainly with either one other composer or with a small, seemingly "closed" group of composers, who often seem to have shared rather marked biographical intersections. Many of the composers seem to have worked at the same place at approximately the same time (see Chapter I). This tendency is quite prominent among composers of motets written during the first half of the sixteenth century.

Table VI-1 lists the pairs of composers who conflict with one another more than three times, and comments briefly on the intersections of their careers.

Obviously, the career intersections between composers are clearer for some pairs than for others. At one end of the spectrum is the relationship between Mouton and Fevin, which can be substantiated on the basis of solid documentary evidence. In other instances, though, the connections are either more tenuous or simply cannot be proven to have

1. This Chapter is based on the Index of Composers which appears as Appendix B in this study.
Table VI-1. Pairs of Composers with Three or More Conflicts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs of Composers</th>
<th>Comments on the intersections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemens/Crecquillon (16)</td>
<td>both at the chapel of Charles V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josquin/Mouton (11)</td>
<td>both at the court of Louis XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemens/Manchicourt (6)</td>
<td>not enough information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gombert/Ruffo (6)</td>
<td>not enough information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josquin/Verdelot (5)</td>
<td>not enough information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berchem/Jacquet (4)</td>
<td>both in Northern Italy; but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>probably names simply confused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fevin/Mouton (4)</td>
<td>both at the court of Louis XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gombert/Verdelot (4)</td>
<td>not enough information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquet/Gombert (4)</td>
<td>indirect connection (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josquin/Senfl (4)</td>
<td>not enough information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulu/Mouton (4)</td>
<td>both at the court of Louis XII or Francis I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdelot/Williart (4)</td>
<td>not enough information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berchem/Gombert (3)</td>
<td>not enough information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canis/Crecquillon (3)</td>
<td>both at the chapel of Charles V; but printer’s error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gascongne/Mouton (3)</td>
<td>both at the French court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gombert/Lupi (3)</td>
<td>indirect connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellinck/Lupi (3)</td>
<td>both in Netherlands; but probably names simply confused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquet/Maitre Jhan (3)</td>
<td>both at Ferrara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquet/Morales (3)</td>
<td>indirect connection (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llérêtier/Mouton (3)</td>
<td>indirect connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llérêtier/Williart (3)</td>
<td>not enough information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouton/Richafort (3)</td>
<td>both at the court of Louis XII and Francis I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouton/Verdelot (3)</td>
<td>indirect connection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
existed (which is not the same as saying that they were non-existent). This, of course, results from the scanty biographical information about certain composers. A case in point is Verdelot, about whom we know only that he was in Florence during the period 1522-1527. Thus, while the sources have him in conflict with four different composers more than three times each--Josquin (5), Gombert (4), Willaert (4), and Mouton (3)--there is no proof that Verdelot came into direct contact with any of these men.

At times the evidence is simply circumstantial. For instance, although we know surprisingly little about Clemens's life, Kemper, relying on the texts of some of his "state" motets, suggests that the composer might have had some ties with Charles V. And, not surprisingly, there are no fewer than sixteen occasions on which the other composer named in a conflict with Clemens is Crecquillon, chapel master to Charles V. In fact, the sixteen conflicting attributions between Clemens and Crecquillon is the single largest number of conflicts between any two composers. This brings us to another point, one first posited by Atlas: the correlation between the frequency of conflicting attributions and the amount of biographical intersection of these composers seems so pronounced that I feel comfortable

in following Atlas in turning the observation around and using the patterns of conflicting attributions themselves as evidence on which to speculate about the biographies of certain composers.³

In the discussion that follows, the composers involved in the conflicting attributions are organized into six broad, geographically distinct groups according to where they spent a--if not the--major part of their careers: (A) France, especially the royal court; (B) Rome, especially the Papal chapel; (C) Northern Italy, particularly Venice and the courts at Ferrara and Mantua; (D) the Netherlands, especially the Habsburg courts; (E) the cities and courts in the German-speaking lands; and (F) Spain. For some composers, of course, assignment to one center or another is difficult, since not all of them confined their activities to one place. Josquin, to take but one example, was active at Milan (1459-79), Rome (1486-1501), Paris (1501-03),

³. See Atlas, "Conflicting Attributions," pp. 275-6, and fn. 39. Though Atlas uses the pattern of conflicts and the idea of biographical intersections as support for his variant-based revision hypothesis, there is no reason that the pattern-and-biography part of his hypothesis cannot stand on its own. Indeed, Atlas himself permits it to do just that in connection with the careers of Hayne van Ghizeghem-Jean Fresneau and Isaac-Martini. As Atlas also points out, it was the observation about the correlation between the pattern of conflicts and the biographical intersections that served as the starting point for his hypothesis.
Ferrara (1503-04), and the northern French city of Condé (1504-21). In contrast to his reasonably well-documented career, some composers cannot be placed in any of the six centers because we know nothing or next-to-nothing about them. Yet despite these problems, there is a pattern for most of the composers considered. Finally, since we are dealing with as many as 126 composers, the biographical information that appears in the following tables is given in a concise, even sketchy form.

(A) France

The leading resident composer at the French royal court during the first quarter of the century was undoubtedly Jean Mouton (c. 1459-1522), who is documented at the court from 1509(?) through 1522, and whose forty-three motets with conflicting attributions stand second only to the forty-eight that involve Josquin. Among the composers

4. For some of these composers, I shall argue for a connection with one center or another based on the pattern of their conflicting attributions.

5. Unless noted otherwise, all biographical information is taken from the entries for each composer in The New Grove.

6. The composers who are involved in conflicting attributions for more than ten motets are the following (I list both the number of motets and the somewhat higher number of total conflicts, the discrepancy in number being a result of some motets having attributions to three or even four composers): Josquin (48/76), Mouton (43/56), Gombert (42/54), Jacquet (35/43), Clemens (28/30), Verdelot (27/36),
with whom Mouton conflicts, those who most frequently challenge his claims to a piece are Josquin (11 times), Fevin, and Moulu (4 times each). The Mouton-Fevin relationship is perfectly clear, since Fevin was active at the same court from 1507 to 1512 (see Table VI-2), and there is no question, then, about the intersection of their careers. Things are less clear in connection with the Mouton-Josquin relationship, since Josquin can be definitely associated with the court only in 1501-03, that is, prior to Mouton's first known appearance there. However, there has been speculation that Mouton may already have been attached to the retinue of Anne of Brittany as early as 1501.7 Thus the careers of Mouton and Josquin may well have intersected, and indeed, the hypothesis that the careers of composers who share a large number of conflicting attributions must have been intertwined would in this case support Ronsard's statement that Josquin was Mouton's teacher, even though Ronsard's report has generally been disregarded as

Crecquillon (25/27), Willaert (17/20), Lupi (15/17), Sermisy (13/18), Richafort (13/19), Manchicourt (12/13), Hellinck (11/14), Lhéritier (11/15), and Morales (10/18).

7. There is a consensus that Mouton arrived at Paris in 1501-02. In addition to The New Grove, see Bernstein, La Couronne et Fleur, part II, p. 20 and Sherr, "The Membership of the Chapels," p. 71.
fictitious. 8

Finally, there is the problem of the Mouton-Moulu relationship. This connection is problematical for two reasons: (1) we have few, if any, hard facts about Moulu's career, and (2) as mentioned in Chapter III, the Mouton-Moulu conflicts are prime candidates for those that may simply have come about through "honest confusion," owing to the orthographical similarities of their names. However, not only has it been assumed--on the basis of his two motets, Fiere attropos and Mater floreat--that Moulu was in some way associated with the court during the first quarter of the century, but Richard Sherr has recently uncovered documents which indicate that a Petrus Moulu was a cleric in the diocese of Meaux (twenty-four miles east of Paris) in 1505 and in 1513. 9 And though the cleric Moulu is not specifically referred to as a musician, his presence just outside Paris adds strength to the Mouton-Moulu connection that we would posit simply on the basis of the

---


Table VI-2. Composers in France.

(A) Composers who worked at the court or Paris

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barra</td>
<td>1510-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brumel</td>
<td>1498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentras</td>
<td>1512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certon</td>
<td>1532-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conseil</td>
<td>1509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fevin</td>
<td>1507-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestier</td>
<td>1505-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacotin</td>
<td>1532-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>1501-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Brung</td>
<td>1498-1513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longueval</td>
<td>1507-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td>1509-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richafort</td>
<td>1512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermisy</td>
<td>1532-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1509-28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) Composers who worked at other cities in France

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arcadelt</td>
<td>1554-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brouck</td>
<td>1527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadéac</td>
<td>1538-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesdin</td>
<td>1536-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasson</td>
<td>1528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Bouteillier</td>
<td>(Bourges and Chartres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Heurteur</td>
<td>1545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lhéritier</td>
<td>1540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchicourt</td>
<td>1539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therache</td>
<td>1492-1527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C) Composers whose relation to the French region have been suggested

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relation to the French region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Silva</td>
<td>studied at the court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festa</td>
<td>studied at the court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gascongne</td>
<td>at the court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosse</td>
<td>at the court in 1547-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquet</td>
<td>studied at the court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Fag</td>
<td>at Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lhéritier</td>
<td>at the court ca. 1501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulu</td>
<td>at the court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdelot</td>
<td>in northern France before 1527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willaert</td>
<td>studied at the court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note to Table VI-2: in addition to the articles in *The New Grove*, for Jacotin, see Lockwood, "Jean Mouton and Jean Michel," pp. 222-3.
conflicting attributions.\textsuperscript{10}

Finally, an examination of the twenty-five composers with whom Mouton conflicts shows that only nine of them--Baston, S. Festa, Gombert, Lapicida, Lupi, Lupus, Maessens, Mahu, and Ninot--have no known association either with the royal court in particular or with France in general. In addition, the number of conflicts involving these nine composers comes to only eleven, or less than one quarter of the forty-five conflicts with the related composers (see Table VI-3). Among the sixteen composers who share a geographical relationship with Mouton, only two--Hesdin and Lhéritier--belong with the composers listed in Group (B), which consists mainly of composers of the post-Mouton generation.

Now, what does all this add up to? It seems clear that Mouton shares the overwhelming majority of his conflicting attributions with composers who worked either at the very same court, and with whom he therefore had direct contact, or at least at what we may possibly presume were cultural satellites of the court, and that most of those composers were Mouton's direct contemporaries. The number of conflicts with composers from other geographical areas or

\textsuperscript{10} Obviously, the intersection of the careers of Mouton and Moulu and the possible confusion owing to the orthographic similarities of the names are in no way mutually exclusive of one another.
Table VI-3. Breakdown of conflicting attributions involving Mouton.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group of Composers</th>
<th>Number of Conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (A)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group (B)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group (C)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-related</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with those of a later generation comprise a clear minority of the conflicting attributions with him.

In some cases, even a single conflict may help to support an otherwise tenuous piece of biographical speculation. For example, if, as Lowinsky conjectures,\textsuperscript{11} Mathurin Forestier (fl. c. 1500) can be identified with the Mathurin Dubuisson who is not only recorded in the court documents in 1489, 1505-7 and in 1512-3 (documents from 1499 through 1503 are missing),\textsuperscript{12} but also appears among the composers with French-court connections in Moulu’s motet \textit{Mater floreat}, it could possibly mean that Forestier and Josquin were active at the court together (although Josquin left the court in 1503). Such an identification and relationship between the two composers may well gain support from the Forestier/Josquin conflict, No. 252, \textit{Veni sancte Spiritus}.\textsuperscript{13}

(B) Rome

Among the composers who worked at Rome for a prolonged period are Josquin and Ninot in the late fifteenth and early

\textsuperscript{11} Lowinsky, \textit{The Medici Codex}, vol. I, p. 74, fn. 34.

\textsuperscript{12} Brenet, \textit{Les Musiciens de la Sainte-Chapelle}, pp. 41-64.

\textsuperscript{13} According to the worklist of \textit{The New Grove} for Mouton, one Mass is ascribed to both Mouton and Forestier; perhaps this is another indication of Forestier’s connection to France.
sixteenth centuries, as well as Arcadelt, Carpentras, Conseil, Danckerts, Festa, and Morales during the first half of the sixteenth century (see Table VI-4). Since Josquin and Ninot form a distinct chronological pair, perhaps their conflicting claim to Planxit autem David (No. 194) is not just an accident.

Aside from Josquin, only Morales, among the Rome-based composers, is involved in enough conflicts to catch our attention: there are three with Jacquet, two each with Clemens and Gombert, and one with each of twelve other composers. As can be seen from Table VI-4, though, none of the three composers seems to have had a direct connection with Morales, at least not in Rome. Yet each of them may well have come into direct contact with him. Morales often accompanied his papal employer (Paul III) to the cities and courts of northern Italy, for example, Loreto in 1539 and Bologna, Modena, Parma, and Ferrara in 1543. Of course, it was in this northern Italian milieu, and at precisely this time, that Jacquet was active.

There is at least a fair amount of circumstantial evidence that suggests Morales's acquaintance with another well-traveled ruler of the time, Charles V, and hence with his leading composer, Gombert. The first contact between Morales and the emperor's chapel could have occurred when the composer was still at Seville. Perhaps Morales and
Table VI-4. Composers in Rome.

(A) Composers who worked at the Papal Chapels or at churches in Rome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animuccia</td>
<td>1550-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadelt</td>
<td>1540-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentras</td>
<td>1508-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conseil</td>
<td>1513-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danckerts</td>
<td>1538-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Silva</td>
<td>1519-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustachius</td>
<td>1514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrabosco</td>
<td>1546-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festa</td>
<td>1517-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacotin</td>
<td>1516-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>1486-1501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lhéritier</td>
<td>1521-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morales</td>
<td>1535-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninot</td>
<td>1488-1502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribera</td>
<td>1520-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdelot</td>
<td>1523-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1528-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willaert</td>
<td>1515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Gombert met at Seville in March 1526, during the celebrations of the marriage of Charles V and Isabella of Portugal. We certainly know that Morales performed for the emperor during the latter's visit to Rome in 1536. Finally, during the above-mentioned trip to northern Italy in 1543, Morales obtained a permit, dated 15 May, to visit Genoa for a month, so that his stay in that city would have overlapped nicely with the presence there of Charles V from 25 May to 2 June. Indeed, Stevenson believes that the very purpose of Morales's visit was to meet the emperor and to explore the opportunity of landing a position with him.14 And if Clemens was also associated with Charles at that time (see above), the Morales/Gombert and Morales/Clemens conflicts could be explained by the hypothesis about biographical intersections. In the end, of course, we can do no more than speculate, but there is a tantalizing link between the Morales/Gombert and Morales/Clemens conflicts and the travels of the composers and their patrons.

(C) The Cities and Courts of Northern Italy

The two leading motet composers in northern Italy were certainly Jacquet of Mantua (1483-1559) and Willaert (c. 1490-1562), both of whom apparently had connections in France during the early years of their careers (see Table 14. Stevenson, "Morales," The New Grove.
VI-5). And as one might expect, given the somewhat broad picture that we are drawing, the composers who conflict with Jacquet and Willaert are overwhelmingly those with French and northern Italian orientations. Thus of the forty-four conflicts in which Jacquet is involved, only seven are with composers who have no strong, direct connections with either France or northern Italy: Gombert (4--but see below), Crecquillon (1), Lupi (1), and Senfl (1). Willaert’s conflicts present a similar picture. Out of a total of twenty conflicting attributions, only two are with composers who are not associated primarily with France or northern Italy: one each with Obrecht (who belongs, of course, to an earlier generation) and Gombert.

What is especially interesting in connection with the conflicts involving the Italy-based Jacquet, Willaert, and Morales is the constant recurrence of conflicting attributions that all three composers have with Gombert. Although there is no documentary evidence that places Gombert on the peninsula, there is strong circumstantial evidence that points to a sojourn in northern Italy. First, there is the sudden appearance of his works in the Venetian

15. I have omitted Jaques du Pont, about whom we know nothing.
Table VI-5. Composers Who Worked in Northern Italy

(A) Composers Who Worked at Northern Italian Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>City/Region</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>City/Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berchem 1530-50 (Venice, Verona)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lhéritier 1506-08 (Ferrara)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brumel 1506-10 (Ferrara)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lupino 1532-55 (Loreto, Fano, Urbino)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caussin 1529-48 (Parma)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lupus 1518-19 (Ferrara)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consell 1532 (Florence)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maistre Jhan 1512-43 (Ferrara)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contino 1541-65 (Trent, Brescia, Mantua)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Obrecht 1504-5 (Ferrara)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtois 1553-54 (Verona)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pesenti 1506-14 (Ferrara)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalla Viola 1528-72 (Ferrara)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phinot 1545-55 (Urbino)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Silva 1522 (Mantua)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Portinaro 1520-78 (Padua)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustachius 1520-24 (Modena)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rore 1547-63 (Ferrara, Parma, Venice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrabosco 1540-48 (Bologna)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ruffo 1520-72 (Verona, Milan, Ferrara)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festa 1514 (Ferrara)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Verdelot 1522-27 (Florence)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac 1502-1517 (Florence Ferrara)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Werrecore 1522 Milan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquet 1516-59 (Ferrara, Milan)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Willaert 1517-62 (Ferrara,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josquin 1459-1479, 1503-04 (Milan, Ferrara)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) Composers who probably worked in Northern Italy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>City/Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arcadelt</td>
<td>(Venice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comes</td>
<td>(Venice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupus (if = Lupato, Venice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maffoni (Brescia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaldo (Modena)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon (Ferrara)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

northern Italian orientations. Thus of the forty-four conflicts in which Jacquet is involved, only seven are with composers who have no strong, direct connections with either France or northern Italy: Gombert (4—but see below), Crecquillon (1), Lupi (1), and Senfl (1).\textsuperscript{16} Willaert's conflicts present a similar picture. Out of a total of twenty conflicting attributions, only two are with composers who are not associated primarily with France or northern Italy: one each with Obrecht (who belongs, of course, to an earlier generation) and Gombert.

What is especially interesting in connection with the conflicts involving the Italy-based Jacquet, Willaert, and Morales is the constant recurrence of conflicting attributions that all three composers have with Gombert. Although there is no documentary evidence that places him in Italy, there is strong circumstantial evidence that points to a sojourn in northern Italy. First, there is the sudden appearance of his works in the Venetian prints of Gardane and Scotto—both in one-composer collections and anthologies—from 1539 on. Second, we know that Gombert left the Imperial chapel before 1540; and the next document about him does not come until 1547, when his presence is recorded at Tournai. Finally, there is a letter of 1547 (it

\textsuperscript{16} I have omitted Jaques du Pont, about whom we know nothing.
is not dated more precisely) from Gombert to Ferrante Gonzaga (brother of the Duke of Mantua and the "gran capitano" of Charles V). Thus, it may not be coincidental to find that (1) thirteen of the twenty-eight composers who conflict with Gombert, worked in Italy; and (2) five of the thirteen composers who have multiple conflicting attributions with him—Ruffo (6), Jacquet (4), Berchem (3), Caussin (2), and Phinot (2)—were themselves active at various courts and cities of northern Italy between 1539 and 1547, precisely the years during which Gombert’s own whereabouts are unknown. If one combines what documentation there is (including the period of silence about Gombert’s career) with our hypothesis about conflicting attributions at the intersections of careers, the likelihood that Gombert spent some time in northern Italy between cs. 1540 and ca. 1546 becomes a very compelling idea.

(D) The Netherlands

During his long reign (1519-56), Charles V maintained two separate chapels, the Spanish chapel at Madrid and the Flemish chapel at Brussels. Even though Madrid was

17. On the letter, see Miller, "Jerome Cardan on Gombert, Phinot, and Carpentras," pp. 413-5.

18. Composers who worked for two other members of the Habsburg family, Maximilian I (1493-1519) and Ferdinand I (1558-64), are listed in Table VI-7.
Charles's main residence, it was the Flemish chapel that was the musically more important one. Two of the most prolific composers in that chapel were Crecquillon and Clemens. 19 With their sixteen conflicts, it is these two composers that stand as the single most-often conflicting pair in the entire motet repertory. In addition, a further examination of the other composers involved in conflicting attributions with Clemens and Crecquillon, shows, once again, that most of them are "local" composers, that is, fellow Netherlands (Table VI-6).

Of the eleven non-Clemens conflicts in which Crecquillon is involved, only three--one each with Arcadelt, Jacquet, and Maistre Jhan--are with non-Netherlandish composers. A similar situation emerges in connection with the Clemens conflicts that do not involve Crecquillon. Aside from two conflicts with Morales (who as we have seen, may well have come into contact with Charles V and his musicians) and one with Adrian Tubal, the remaining ten conflicts in which Clemens is involved are all with composers connected to the Habsburgs. 20

Josquin, too, clashes often with the Netherlands.

19. See above and fn. 2.

20. One conflict with Valent is not included, since we know nothing about him.
Table VI-6. Composers in the Netherlands

(A) Composers who worked for Habsburg Families

Appenzeller 1537-51 (Mary of Hungary)  
Bruck 1519 (Charles V)  
Canis 1542-55 (Charles V)  
Champion 1518-28 (Charles V)  
Crecquillon 1540-55 (Charles V)  
Gombert 1526-40 (Charles V)  
La Rue 1514-16 (Marguerite of Austria)  
Maessens 1530-40 (Marguerite of Austria and Charles V)  
Manchicourt 1559-64 (Philip II)  
Payen 1525-58 (Charles V)  
Vaet 1543-54 (Charles V)

(B) Non-Habsburg Composers who Worked in the Netherlands

Appenzeller 1517 (Bruges)  
Baston ca. 1542-63 (?)  
Bauldeweyn 1509-17 (Mechelen, Antwerp?)  
Caussin 1520 (Cambrai)  
Champion 1513-18 (Mechelen)  
Clemens 1544-50 (Bruges)  
Craen 1504 (Bruges)  
De Latre 1538-65 (Liège, Utrecht)  
Grandsyre 1558 (Liège?)  
Guyot 1546-63 (Liège)  
Hellinck 1506-23 (Bruges)  
Hollander 1549-57 (Oudenaarde)  
Josquin 1504-21 (Condé)  
Louys ? (Antwerp)  
Lupi 1514-26 (Cambrai, Louvain)  
Moreau 1553-8 (Antwerp?)  
Naich 1529 (Liège)  
Obrecht 1476-1504 (Utrecht, Bergen op Zoom, Cambrai)  
Regis 1460-81 (Cambrai, Antwerp)  
Richafort 1507-09, 1542-47 (Mechelen, Bruges)  
Tubal ca. 1553-6 (Antwerp?)  
Vinders ca. 1510-50 (?)

Note to Table: For Bauldeweyn, in addition to The New Grove, see Forney, "Music, Ritual and Patronage," pp. 44-5, and for Grandsyre, see below.
There are conflicts with Appenzeller (2), Bauldeweyn (1), Craen (2), Champion (2), Gombert (3), Hellinck (1), Richafort (2), and Vinders (1). Moreover, three of the composers—Appenzeller, Gombert, and Vinders—wrote elegies on Josquin’s death. When we consider that Josquin spent his final years at Condé, the many conflicting attributions with Habsburg-employed composers fall neatly into place.21

Finally, we may take up the case of a very minor figure, Ioan. Grandsyre, about whom we know nothing except for two motets that are attributed to him. His name appears in Baethen 1556/3 over the motet *Isti sunt viri* (No. 134), which is also ascribed to Gombert and Lupi.22 Since both Gombert and Lupi spent part of their careers in the southern Netherlands—Gombert in 1534 and 1547 at Tournai and Lupi from 1514 to 1521 and from 1526 to 1539 at Cambrai—the possibility that Grandsyre was also active there looms large.

As it happens, I was able to find that a musician called Zacharis Grandsyre was a *maître de chant* at St.

---

21. In his *Practica musica* (1556), Hermann Finck states that Gombert was a pupil of Josquin. Nugent surmises that Gombert knew Josquin at Condé. Finally there is a motet ascribed to Appenzeller, Josquin, and Vinders, No. 78, *Domini est terra*; see Chapter V for a discussion of the work.

22. Grandsyre’s other motet appears in the same print, this time without a conflicting attribution.
Lambert Cathedral at Liège from 1535 to 1557. There are, of course, two problems in identifying Ioan. Grandsyre with Zacharis Grandsyre: (1) their Christian names are not the same, and (2) Baethen 1556/3 was published in Düsseldorf when Zacharis was at Liège, and for so minor a figure to be in a remote collection is at least somewhat unusual. But perhaps the objection to the identification can be at least partially removed, for while the difference in Christian name is not easily dismissed, we may note that although Baethen published this print at Düsseldorf, he had moved there only one year earlier, in 1555, from Maastricht, which is only 12 miles north of Liège. Thus, if we are willing to allow for a slip on someone's part with respect to the Ioan.-Zacharis problem, it may well be that the Grandsyre who conflicts with Gombert and Lupi is the musician who was active at Liège.

(E) **The German-Speaking Lands**

For composers working in what is now Germany, Austria, and Eastern Europe, both the number of composers involved and the number of conflicting attributions is small (see Table VI-7). Except for some conflicts such as those

---


24. Baethen's residency prior to Maastricht was Louvain, where he worked from 1545 to 1551; see, *The New Grove*, vol. II, p. 15.
Table VI-7. Composers who worked in Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruck</td>
<td>1527-48</td>
<td>Vienna, Linz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleve</td>
<td>1533-82</td>
<td>Vienna, Augsburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducis</td>
<td>1535-44</td>
<td>Schalckstetten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckel</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>Dresden, Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finck</td>
<td>1510-27</td>
<td>Stuttgart, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyot</td>
<td>1563-64</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haugk</td>
<td>1538-44</td>
<td>Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heugel</td>
<td>1536-85</td>
<td>Kassel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>1497-1501</td>
<td>Innsbruck, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapicida</td>
<td>1510-47</td>
<td>Heidelberg, Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauh</td>
<td>1528-39</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paiminger</td>
<td>1505-67</td>
<td>Vienna, Passau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renner</td>
<td>1498-17</td>
<td>Vienna, Torgau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senfl</td>
<td>1518-43</td>
<td>Augsburg, Munich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoltzer</td>
<td>1519-26</td>
<td>Breslau, Ofen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>1521-54</td>
<td>Torgau, Dresden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolff</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>(Stuttgart?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between Isaac and Rener (*Qui paracletus diceris*, No. 204)—both composers were in the employ of Maximilian I—or Johannes de Cleve and Jean Guyot for *Expurgate vetus fermentum* (No. 94)—both men were associated with the court of Ferdinand I—our notions about the "club"-like nature of the conflicts seem not to apply in anything approaching a convincing fashion.

(F) **Spain**

There are only five motets that have conflicting attributions involving composers active in Spain: Nos. 73 (Anchieta/Peña losa), 112 (Escobedo/Morales), 158 (Escobar/Peña losa), 177 (Anchieta/Compère/Peña losa/Ribera), and 222 (Josquin/Peña losa). 25 Thus, as one can see, the Spaniards tend to conflict among themselves (see Table VI-8).

In conclusion, it seems rather apparent that there is a strong connection between conflicting attributions and the intersections of composers’ careers, as witness the conflicts for such pairs of composers as Clemens/Crecquillon, Josquin/Mouton, and Fevin/Mouton. What is significant in all this, of course, is that the "non-accidental" nature of the patterns, as Atlas refers to it in

25. This list includes only one of the conflicts involving Morales, who was, obviously, as much associated with Italy as with Spain.
Table VI-8. Composers in Spain.

Anchieta 1489-1516 (Seville)
Escobar 1489-1521 (Seville)
Escobedo ? (Salamanca)
Morales ca.1500-26, 1545-53 (Seville, Toledo, Málaga)
Peñalosa 1498-1511 (Seville)
Ribera (no documents)
connection with the fifteenth-century chanson,\textsuperscript{26} is strong enough to permit us to turn the patterns around and use them as a basis on which to speculate about the biographies of composers either for whom there is little or no information at all, as in the case of Grandsyre, or for whom there are lacunae in an otherwise fairly well-documented career, as in the case of Gombert. In the end, conflicting attributions may well have to be accorded a new position in our thinking: from one that see the conflicts primarily as nothing more than the result of confusion and sloppiness on the part of scribes and printers to one that functions as a potentially powerful tool for reconstructing the otherwise obscure biographies of more than a few Renaissance composers.

\textsuperscript{26} Atlas, "Conflicting Attributions," pp. 253-5.
CONCLUSION

The preceding chapters have dealt with various aspects of conflicting attributions as they affect 266 motets that date from the first half of the sixteenth century and that are attributed to 122 composers. And though we now understand a good deal more about many aspects of the conflicts, we are still left with a number of problems that need further investigation.

As for what we know: (1) conflicting attributions are an ever-present phenomenon from the late fourteenth century through the late eighteenth; (2) in the first half of the sixteenth century, conflicting attributions appear in the motet repertory with approximately the same rate of frequency as they do in the other major genres; (3) a substantial number of the conflicts may be explained by one or another of the new methods developed by Atlas and Boorman (see below); and (4) as Atlas pointed out in connection with the fifteenth-century chanson, there seems to be a definite connection in the motet repertory between the most frequently conflicting pairs of composers and their biographical intersections, enough so that we may turn things around and use the conflicting attributions as a hinge on which to speculate about biography.

On the other hand, there are some questions that
resist easy answers: (1) what is the nature of the relationship between the major mode of transmission—anthologies vs. one-composer collections—and the number of conflicts (see Chapter I); (2) Do the types of conflicting attributions—and the preponderance of one type or another—tell us anything about patterns of music transmission (see Chapter II); (3) can we, in the end, truly "solve" the conflicts at all? I shall conclude this study with some speculations about these questions, less with the hope of answering them than with the hope that further study—whether by myself or others—will eventually provide answers that are more concrete in their substance.

As we saw in Chapter I, the general shift in the mode of music transmission from printed and manuscript anthologies to printed one-composer collections seems to be the key in explaining the sudden decrease in the number of conflicting attributions in the second half of the sixteenth century. Yet it is hard to explain their precise role in bringing about this reduction, since one-composer collections had already been plentiful in the first half of the century, when conflicting attributions were still a major problem. One possible explanation is that there was a growing effort by composers to protect their music. Many of the one-composer collections from the first half of the century fail to include a dedication by the featured
composer. Perhaps, then, we may think of these collections as "unauthorized" collections. It appears that the music in such collections was obtained through various secondary sources, such as publication by other printers or manuscript copies that circulated "freely." The opposite situation would be one in which printers acquired music directly from the composers. In such cases we might expect to find the composer's own dedication included. Usually, we see more and more such dedications in the second half of the sixteenth century. Consequently—and with the generally decreasing importance of manuscript sources—chances for printers to publish unauthentic works in one-composer collections were reduced. However, until there are further studies on the precise nature of the relationships that existed between composer and printer on the one hand, and composer-printer and one-composer collections, on the other, we shall continue to grope in the dark.¹

¹ For example, although I have assumed that it is so, it is not readily apparent whether the presence of an author's dedication in a one-composer collection is an important indication that such a collection was "authorized." Among Dorico's one-composer collections, some contain a composer's dedication (see a dedication transcribed in Cusick, Dorico, p. 183), while others include a dedication by the printer (see a dedication in Cusick, Dorico, p. 181). In the collections published by Gardane and Scotto, many of the dedications are those of the printers themselves, even in the publications of such local composers as Willaert. On the other hand, many of Attaingnant's collections include a dedication by the composer.
Perhaps the single most disappointing aspect of my research was the inability to find clear geographical distribution of conflicting attributions. The patterns that did emerge seem too haphazard to permit a general statement. There are, of course, some instances in which the conflicting attributions are split according to geographical boundaries. For instance, Deus in nomine tuo (No. 56) is attributed to Lhéritier in the Italian sources Gardane 1539/6, RomeV 35-40, but to Willaert in the non-Italian sources (Moderne 1532/9 and Petreius 1538/6). On the other hand, there seem to be even more instances in which the geographical boundaries are irrelevant, as with the Alleluia noli flère Maria (No. 3), which is ascribed to Gascongne in the German sources Ulhard 1545/2 (Augsburg), Montanus & Neuber 1554/10 (Nuremberg), BudOS 23 (Wittenberg), RegB 849-52 (Regensburg), and Wroclaw 2 (Wroclaw), as well as in the Italian manuscript BolC Q20 (northern Italy), while it is credited to Mouton in both the Netherlandish Susato 1547/6 (Antwerp) and the German Montanus & Neuber 1559/2 (Nuremberg). Again, my study failed to disclose any significant dissemination of conflicting attributions along purely geographical lines.

Finally, there is perhaps the ultimate question: given our still fragmentary knowledge about such matters as the way music circulated, the composer-printer-scribe
relationship, the idea of "ownership," and "composers' rights,"\textsuperscript{2} and the always ephemeral yardstick of style, not to mention the lack of composers' autographs,\textsuperscript{3} can we truly "solve" conflicting attributions? Certainly, the methods and ideas of Atlas and Boorman do not so much "solve" the conflicts, but rather "explain" why they are there in the first place. And pushed to their logical ends, the ideas of Atlas and Boorman may even lead to the conclusion that there are, in fact, no conflicting attributions at all, that the conflicts came about not because two different people really thought that two different composers wrote the same piece, but because in one case one composer revised another's work and in the other there was a slip-up in the printing process. From these points of view, the traditional theory of confusion may cover a small minority of the conflicts, and

\textsuperscript{2} Underlying attitude of the confusion theory is to view the musical community before the nineteenth century as less conscious about authorship than that of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; for example Spitzer says, "Authorship, thus, does not seem to have been an integral aspect of musical works in the 15th and 16th centuries in anything like the sense it is today ("Authorship and Attribution," p. 110");" or La Rue states, "... in considering the whole question [of conflicting attributions], we must constantly remind ourselves that authorship was a more casual matter two hundred years ago ("Major and Minor Mysteries," p. 181)."

\textsuperscript{3} There are several instances where the existence of autograph caused conflicting attributions, rather than settled the issue; see Rose, "Pasqualini as Copyist," MeJlamed, "The Authorship of the Motet Ich Lasse Dich Nicht (BWV Anh. 159)," and Brown, \textit{Schubert}, p. 25.
in these cases true "solutions" might be forestalled by the obstacle mentioned above.

Perhaps, we have to learn to accept a contradiction that is in the end insolvable, rather than forcing it to conform to our concept of authorship. In this respect, as Spitzer correctly observes, Atlas's revision theory, regardless of how effective it is as an explanation of conflicting attributions, shows a new attitude toward authorship in music. His hypothesis questions whether "authorship" is one and the same as "ownership" in music and whether it existed during the late fifteenth--or, for our purpose, early sixteenth--century. Unlike the situation in the other arts, the ownership of a musical work is difficult to define, since the identity of musical works is transcendental. Perhaps, Dahlhaus's statement about

4. According to Fritz Reckow, in an unpublished paper read at the meeting of the American Musicological Society, 1988, "The Concept of Opus," the notion of a musical work as work of art (that is, creation) did not exist in the Middle Ages at all: however, he argues that such a notion of a musical work began to emerge during the latter part of the fifteenth century, the same period with which Atlas's study is concerned. I should like to thank Prof. Tomasello for bringing this paper to my attention.

5. In other words, musical works do not exist in a concrete and definite form (notation), but rather exist only when we perform them. And performance includes such mental and physical activities as acoustical realization, the act of listening to that acoustical realization, and even copying. Sometimes the distinction between such activities and composing is blurred, to cite an extreme case, as in improv-
Rossini’s operas has some bearing on our subject: "there is no 'authentic,' 'firsthand,' or 'final' version of a Rossini opera...Instead, all we have is a series of instances standing side by side as equivalent realizations of a mutable conception, like a set of variations without a theme." This intrinsic aspect of music has too often been ignored by traditional musicological studies. Yet, with this notion of the identity of a musical work, we are able to see conflicting attributions as a trace left by the vitality of the process of transmission, transmission in its literal sense—the process of transferring from one person to another.

---

isation. I am planning to pursue this in relation to the final movement of Beethoven’s Eighth Symphony. For an extensive treatment of the subject, see Ingarden, The Works of Music and the Problem of Its Identity, and also, Levinson, "What a Musical Work Is."

APPENDIX A. INVENTORY
Prefatory Notes to the Inventory

The Inventory accounts for 266 motets for which there are conflicting attributions during the first half of the sixteenth century. It provides the following information:

Main Entry: the motets have been arranged in alphabetical order and assigned a serial number. For each motet, the text incipit, number of voices (in parenthesis), and composers to whom the motet is ascribed are listed. When a motet was transmitted with more than one text, the alternative text(s) is (are) entered in parenthesis below the main text incipit and preceded by an equal-sign (=). In some instances—as when many sources transmit only the secunda pars or other partes without the prima pars—the text incipit of the secunda pars or other partes are also listed below the main text incipit.

Sources: Under "Attributions and Sources," concordant sources are grouped according to their attributions, while within the list of sources for each composer, prints precede manuscripts, as they do for sources that transmit the work anonymously. After the main list of sources, such additional information as instrumental arrangements, transpositions, alternative text incipits, etc., is provided. An asterisk before a source indicates that I have
not examined it myself, and that information about its attribution has been taken from a secondary source, usually from an inventory of the source or from the "Complete Works" edition of the composer in question.

**Sigla:** Sigla for manuscripts are those used in the *Census Catalogue*, while RISM designations (Vol. B/IV/1) are used for printed anthologies. As for printed single-composer collections, the siglum consists of the name of the printer, year of publication, and name of the composer to whom the collection is devoted. All sigla are fully explained in Appendix C.

**Modern Editions:** No attempt has been made to list all available modern editions. Instead, only "standard" editions such as "Complete Works" are given. However, when there is no such edition available for a motet, any available modern edition is listed.

**Comments:** Only those comments related to the question of authorship are included. When the comments are made by scholars other than myself, bibliographic information is given at the end of each comment.
No. 1. Ad te levavi oculos meos (à 4) Gombert/Richafort

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Petreius 1539/9

RICHAFORT

KasL 24

Modern Editions


No. 2. Adversum me susurrabant (à 4) Caussin/Gombert

Attributions and Sources

CAUSSIN

Moderne [1539]/11

GOMBERT

Scotto 1541c Gombert

*Gardane 1542 Gombert

Modern Editions

Gombert, Opera omnia, vol. VI, p. 37.

No. 3. Alleluia noli flere Maria (à 4) Gascongne/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

GASCONGNE

Ulhard 1545/2

Montanus & Neuber 1554/10

Bo1C Q20

BudOS 23

*RegB 849-52

*WrocS 2 (intabulation)

*WrocS 5
MOUTON

*Susato 1547/6
Montanus & Neuber 1559/2

ANON.

PadBC A17
*VatM 571

Modern Editions


No. 4. Alleluia spiritus Domini (à 5) Gombert/Hesdin

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Scotto 1539b Gombert

HESDIN

Buglhat 1539/7

ANON.

*BolSP 39
*HradKM 29
*ZwiR 33/34

Modern Editions


---Angelus Domini Gombert/Mouton/Verdelot

See Surge Petre
No. 5. *Angelus Domini ad pastores ait* (à 4) Gombert/Verdelot

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Attaignant 1529/1

VERDELOT

Montanus & Neuber 1554/10

Modern Editions


Comments

Böker-Heil attributes the work to Gombert on the grounds that it is not in Verdelot's style (*Die Motetten von Verdelot*, pp. 208-9).

No. 6. *Angelus Domini apparuit* (à 5) Berchem/Lupi

Attributions and Sources

BERCHEM

*TrevBC 5

LUPI

Attaignant 1542 Lupi
Castiglione 1543/3
*Merulo 1569/2

BrusC 27088

Modern Editions

Lupi, *Opera omnia*, vol. I, p. 100.

Comments

Nugent attributes the work to Lupi, because the four earlier sources name Lupi as the composer of the work (*"The Jacquet Motets,"* p. 207).
No. 7. *Aspice Domine de sede* (à 4) Jacquet/La Fage/Sermisy

Attributions and Sources

JACQUET

Scotto 1539b *Jacquet*

*MilC 186
StuttL 35

LA FAGE

Attaingnant 1535/3

SERMISY

*Giunta [c1526]/5
Attaingnant 1542 *Sermisy*
Kohlen 1558/20 (intabulation)

KönSU 1740
ModD 9
VatG XII.4
*VerBC 760

ANON.

*Attaingnant 1531/5 (intabulation)

CasAC D(F)
ChiN M91
*ModE N.1.2
PadBC A17

Modern Editions

*Smijers, Treize livres*, vol. XI, p. 127.

Comments

Nugent suggests that Scotto confused this motet with another setting of a similar text that is definitely by Jacquet, one that also begins with the words "Aspice Domine;" he thus attributes the motet to Sermisy ("The Jacquet Motets," pp. 167-71).

However, after the first two words, the two texts are quite different. Finally, Nugent does not consider the attribution to La Fage.
No. 8. **Aspice Domine quia facta** (I) (à 4) Festa/Gombert

**Attributions and Sources**

**C. FESTA**

*KönSU 1740

**GOMBERT**

Moderne 1532/10  
Attaingnant 1534/4  
Scotto 1539a *Gombert*  
Gardane 1541 *Gombert*  
Gardane 1551/2

*MadM 6832

**ANON.**

UlmS 237

**Modern Editions**

Gombert, *Opera omnia*, vol. V, p. 86.

No. 9. **Aspice Domine quia facta** (II) (à 5) Jacquet/Lupus

**Attributions and Sources**

**JACQUET**

Moderne 1532/9  
Scotto 1539a *Jacquet*  
Gardane 1540 *Jacquet*  
Petreius 1540/6  
*Gardane 1547/22*  
Modern 1552/30  
*Gardane 1553 *Gombert*  
*Gardane 1553/17*  
*Montesdoca 1554/32 (intabulation)*  
Montanus & Neuber 1559/1  
*Scotto 1565a *Jacquet*  
*Jobin 1574/13*
BolC Q27(I)
*MilC 186
*ModE C.313
*MunU 401
*RomeM 23-4
*RomeV 35-40
*StuttL 35
*ToleBC 10
*TrevBC 36
*TurBN IV.45
*VallaC 15
*VallaC 16
*VallaC 17
*VatS 38
*WrocS 1 (intabulation)

LUPUS

CambriU Peter. 471-4

ANON.

*Brocar 1557 (intabulation)
Phalèse 1571/16

*BolSP 39
*LucBS 775
*PiacD (4)

Modern Editions

De Monte, Opera omnia vol. XXVI, appendix (as a Mass model).

No. 10. Ave ancilla trinitatis (à 3) Brumel/Mouton
(= Ave Maria gratia plena)

Attributions and Sources

BRUMEL

Petrucci 1502/2
SegC s.s.

MOUTON

Petreius 1541/2 ("Ave Maria gratia plena")
ANON.

*Egenolph [c1535]/14

Modern Editions

Hewitt, Canti B, p. 201.

Comments

Atlas includes this motet within the category of "Pieces in which variants may possibly support the revision hypothesis" ("Conflicting Attributions," p. 280).

No. 11. Ave caro Christi cara (à 4) Bauldeweyn/Josquin (= Ave Christe immolate)

Attributions and Sources

BAULDEWEYN

*ToleF 23
VienNB Mus. 15941

JOSQUIN

Montanus & Neuber 1564/5

ANON.

VatP 1976-9 ("Ave Christe immolate")

Modern Editions


Comments

Sparks claims that Josquin seems to be the composer of the motet on stylistic grounds. However, since he also believes that Montanus & Neuber 1564/5 is an unreliable source, he fails to reach a firm conclusion (The Music of Bauldeweyn, pp. 98-103).
---Ave Christe immolate Bauldeweyn/Josquin

See Ave caro Christi cara (No. 11)

No. 12. Ave et gaude (à 5) Simon Ferrariensis/Willaert

Attributions and Sources

SIMON

*Schöffer 1539/8

WILLAERT

*BolC Q27 (I)
*TrevBC 29

ANON.

*PiacD (5)

Modern Editions

None.

---Ave Jesu Christe Josquin/Verdelot

See Sancta Maria virgin (No. 221)

No. 13. Ave Maria alta stirps (à 5) Jacquet/Maistre Jhan

Attributions and Sources

JACQUET

Gardane 1540 Jacquet

MAISTRE JHAN

*TrevBC 29

Modern Editions

None.
Comments

Nugent concludes that the ascription to Jhan in TrevBC 29 is unreliable ("The Jacquet Motets," p. 201).

---Ave Maria gratia plena Brumel/Mouton

See Ave ancilla trinitatis (No. 10)

No. 14. Ave Maria gratia plena (à 4) Brumel/Jo. Brumes

Attributions and Sources

BRUMEL

VatS 45 (attribution in index)

JO. BRUMES

VatS 45 (attribution over music)

Modern Editions


Comments

Hudson attributes the motet to Jo. Brumes, since he considers it not to be in the style of Brumel (Brumel, Opera omnia, p. xliii).

---Ave Maria virgo, Josquin/Verdelot

See Sancta Maria virgo (No. 221)

No. 15. Ave regina caelorum (I) (à 3) Festa/Jacquet

Attributions and Sources

C. FESTA

*Gardane 1551/3
*Phalèse 1569/6
JACQUET

*Gardane 1569/3

ANON.

*Gardane 1543/6

Modern Editions

None.

No. 16. Ave regina caelorum (II) (à 4) Dalla Viola/Gombert

Attributions and Sources

DALLA VIOLA

LonRC 2037

GOMBERT

Scotto 1539a Gombert
Gardane 1541 Gombert
Scotto 1541/4

ANON.

Gardane 1551/2

Modern Editions


No. 17. Ave regina caelorum (III) (à 5) Conseil/Jacquet/Maistre Jhan

Attributions and Sources

CONSEIL

RomeV 35-40
VallaC 15
JACQUET

*Scotto 1539a Jacquet
*Gardane 1553 Jacquet
*Scotto 1565b Jacquet

MAISTRE JHAN

RomeM 23-4
VatG XII.4
VatS 17

ANON.

*PiacD (2)

Modern Editions

None.

Comments

Nugent ascribes the piece to Jacquet, and writes that the attribution to Conseil in RomeV 35-40 came about through the scribe's confusion of this piece with another setting of this popular text by Conseil ("The Jacquet Motets," p. 200).

Nugent does not discuss the attributions to Maistre Jhan. See also Table V-2.

No. 18. Ave regina caelorum (IV) (à 6) Conseil/Jacquet

Attributions and Sources

CONSEIL

RomeV 35-40

JACQUET

Scotto 1549/3

BrusC 27088
ModE C.314
VallaC 15
ANON.

*PiacD (4)
Vats 17

Modern Editions

None.

No. 19. *Ave sanctissima Maria* (à 6) Sermisy/Verdelot

Attributions and Sources

SERMISY

Attaingnant 1534/5 (attribution in CT.)

VERDELOT

Attaingnant 1534/5 (attribution in index)

ANON.

BrusBR 228

Modern Editions


Comments

Though Davison believes that Verdelot is the composer, some scholars suggest that it was written by Pierre de La Rue (to whom it is not even attributed), since (1) La Rue composed a Mass modeled on this motet, and (2) it is unlikely that La Rue would have used as a model a composition by a composer younger than himself ("The Motets of La Rue," p. 34).

See also Chapter V for a discussion of the piece.
No. 20. *Ave virgo gratiosa* (à 6) Jacquet/Vermont primus

Attributions and Sources

JACQUET

Gardane 1542/10

RomeV 35-40

*TrevBC 29

VERMONT

Attaingnant 1534/5

ANON.

*EdinU 64

Modern Editions


No. 21. *Beata Dei genetrix* (à 4) Conseil/Lhériritier/Willaert

Attributions and Sources

CONSEIL

Moderne 1539/10

LHÉRITIER

Buglhat 1538/5

Petreius 1540/6

Scotto 1555/15

RegB 940-1

WILLAERT

Scotto 1539a *Willaert*
ANON.

*BolSP 38
CasAC D(F)
LeipU 51
ModD 3
PadBC A17
*RegB 1018

Modern Editions

Lhérîtier, *Opera omnia*, p. 91.

Comments

Perkins attributes the work to Lhérîtier, seemingly for no other reason than that he is the most frequently-named composer (Lhérîtier, *Opera omnia*, p. xxii).

Scotto deleted the motet when he reissued the Scotto 1539 Willaert in 1545.

No. 22. *Beata es Maria* (à 5) Hellinck/Lupi

Attributions and Sources

HELLINCK

Susato 1546/7 (attribution over the 2.p. of S. and T.)

LUPI

Susato 1546/7 (attribution in indices and all other places)

ANON.

*FlorD 11

Modern Editions

No. 23. **Beata es virgo Maria** (à 4) Lhérinier/Verdelot

Attributions and Sources

LÉHRITIER

Attaingnant 1534/3
Moderne 1539/10
Gardane 1539/13
Gardane 1549/10
Scotto 1549/10a
Du Chemin 1553/2
Scotto 1555/15
Scotto 1562/2

*VerBC 760

VERDELOT

Montanus & Neuber 1559/2

ANON.

*BolSP 45

Modern Editions

Lhérinier, *Opera omnia*, p. 235.
Verdelot, *Opera omnia*, vol II, p. 118.

Comments

Perkins ascribes the work to Lhérinier because of the preponderance of attributions to him (Lhérinier, *Opera omnia* p. xxi).

No. 24. **Beata visceza** (à 6) Verdelot/Willaert

Attributions and Sources

VERDELOT

RomeV 35-40
WILLAERT

Attaingnant 1534/10
Gardane 1542/10

ModE C.314
*RegB 853-4
RomeM 23-4
*TrevBC 29

Modern Editions

Verdelot, Opera omnia, vol. II, p. 72.
Willaert, Opera omnia, vol. IV, p. 105.
Smijers, Treize livres, vol. VIII, p. 126.

No. 25. Beati omnes qui timent (I) (à 4) Josquin/Senfl

Attributions and Sources

JOSQUIN

LeipU 49

SENFL

Grimm & Wyrsung 1520/4

ANON.

NurGN 83795

Modern Editions


No. 26. Beati omnes qui timent (II) (à 4) Gombert/Hellinck

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

KönSU 1740
HELLINCK

Moderne 1532/10
Petreius 1539/9
Gardane 1539/12
Gardane 1545/4
Rampazetto 1564/6
Montanus & Neuber 1569/1

RegB 940-1
TrevBC 7

Modern Editions


No. 27. Beati omnes qui timent (III) (à 4) LHéritier/Pieton

Attributions and Sources

LHÉRITIER

Gardane 1539/12 (attribution in index)
Rampazetto 1564/6 (attribution in index)

PIETON

Moderne 1532/10
Gardane 1539/12 (attribution in partbooks)
Petreius 1542/6
Gardane 1545/4
Rampazetto 1564/6 (attribution in partbooks)
Montanus & Neuber 1569/1

Modern Editions

None.
No. 28. Beati omnes qui timent (IV) (à 5) Stoltzer/Werrecore

Attributions and Sources

STOLTZER

Montanus & Neuber 1569/1

WERRECORE

*Rhaw 1542/8

ANON.

Kasl 24

*StuttL 43

Modern Editions


No. 29. Beati omnes qui timent (V) (à 6) Champion/Josquin

Attributions and Sources

CHAMPION

Petreius 1542/6

Montanus & Neuber 1569/1

JOSQUIN

Kasl 24

Modern Editions

Champion, Opera omnia, p. 106.

Comments

Osthooff attributes the motet to Champion on the grounds that he considers the ascription in KasL 24 to Josquin unreliable (Josquin, vol. II, pp. 19-20).
No. 30. _Benedic anima mea_ (à 4) Eustachius Gallus/Isaac

Attributions and Sources

**EUSTACHIUS**

Petrucci 1519/1

**ISAAC**

Petreius 1539/9

**Modern Editions**


No. 31. _Benedicam Dominum_ (à 5) Bauldeweyn/Stoltzer

Attributions and Sources

**BAULDEWEYN**

MunU 401

**STOLTZER**

Petreius 1538/6

*Rhaw 1545/6

DressL 1/D/3

**ANON.**

*DressL Grimma 58 (1.p. only)

**Modern Editions**


**Comments**

Sparks is unable to decide the question of authorship for this motet; he states that two kinds of evidences—reliability of sources and musical style—disagree: while the motet is in Bauldeweyn’s style, reliable German prints ascribe it to Stoltzer (Music of Bauldeweyn, p. 110, fn. 26).
No. 32. *Benedicta es caelorum* (I) (à 4) Le Bouteillier/Willaert

Attributions and Sources

LE BOUTEILLIER

Attaignant 1534/4

WILLAERT

Scotto 1539a Willaert
*Gardane 1545b Willaert

KönSU 1740
*LonRC 1740
*MunBS 19

Modern Editions

Willaert, *Opera omnia*, vol. I, p. 78.

No. 33. *Benedicta es caelorum* (II) (à 4) Longueval/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

LONGUEVAL

*Dorico 1526/1 (attribution in the copy at Barcelona, Biblioteca Centrale)

MOUTON

Petrucci 1514/1
*Dorico 1526/1 (attribution in the copy at Jena Universitätsbibliothek)
*Le Roy & Ballard 1555 *Mouton

*MadM 6832

Modern Editions

No. 34. *Benedictus Dominus Deus* (à 4) Conseil/Lupi

Attributions and Sources

CONSEIL

KönsU 1740

LUPI

Gardane 1539/13
Attainnant 1542 Lupi
Gardane 1549/10
Scotto 1549/10a
Montanus & Neuber 1555/11
Scotto 1562/2

CambraiBM 125-8
*LeuvU 163
MunBS 16
*RegB 883-6

ANON.

*Gardane 1547/22 (intabulation)
*Phalèse 1552/29 (intabulation)

*S HerAB 73
MunU 401
*PadBC D27 (2.p. only)

Modern Editions

Lupi, *Opera omnia*, vol. 1, p. 144.

---Bonitatem et disciplinam* Carpentras/Josquin

See *Bonitatem fecesti* (No. 35).
No. 35. *Bonitatem fecesti* (à 4) Carpentras/Josquin
(= *Bonitatem et disciplinam*)

Attributions and Sources

**CARPENTRAS**

- Petrucci 1514/1
- Petreius 1539/9

- FlorBN II.I.232
- *GreifU 640-1*

**JOSQUIN**

- KasL 24 ("Bonitatem et disciplinam")
- SGalls 463

**ANON.**

- LeipU 49 ("Bonitatem et disciplinam")

Modern Editions

- Genet, *Opera omnia*, vol. V, p. 57.

Comments

In connection with Josquin, Osthoff considers both KasL 24 and SGalls 463 unreliable sources (*Josquin*, vol. II, p. 19).

Antonowytsch ascribes the piece to Carpentras on the grounds that its style is not that of Josquin ("The Present State," p. 61).

Glarean, in his famous anecdote, says that Josquin composed this motet (Glarean, *Dodecachordon*, vol. II, p. 272).

No. 36. *Caeleste beneficium introivit* (à 4) Fevin/Mouton
(2.p. *Adiutorium nostrum*)

Attributions and Sources

**FEVIN**

- CambriP 1760 (2.p. only)
MOUTON

Petrucci 1514/1
Dorico 1526/1

VienNB Mus. 15941 (2.p. only)

ANON.

LonBLR 8G.vii (2.p. only)
*LonRC 1070 (2.p. only)
VatP 1976-9 (2.p. only)

Modern Editions


No. 37. Cantantibus organicis (à 4) Gombert/Naich

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Susato 1554/8
*Andreae 1565/22 (intabulation)
*Laet 1569/36 (intabulation)

NAICH

Moderne [1539]/11

Modern Editions

Gombert, Opera omnia, vol. X, p. 50.
Naich, Opera omnia, p. 187.

No. 38. Christus factus est (à 5) Crecquillon/Lupi

Attributions and Sources

CRECQUILLON

*Waelrant & Laet 1554/6
Montanus & Neuber 1559/1
*Phalèse 1576 Crecquillon
LUPI

Montanus & Neuber 1555/12 ("Incertus authoris" in S.)

ANON.

Susato 1553/12
*Müller 1562/24 (intabulation)

Modern Editions


Comments

Blackburn ignores the ascription to Lupi in Montanus & Neuber as a printer’s error ("The Lupus Problem," p. 313).

---Christus resurgens--- Josquin/Verdelot

See Sancta Maria virgo virginitum (No. 221)

No. 39. Christus resurgens ex mortuis (à 4/5) Baston/Mouton/Richafort

Attributions and Sources

BASTON

Ulhard 1545/2

MOUTON

*VienNB Mus. 18825

RICHAFORT

Antico 1520/2
Petrus 1547/1 Dodecachordon
Du Chemin 1553/2
Montanus & Neuber 1554/10
Susato 1555/9 (à 5)
*Le Roy & Ballard 1556 Richafort

*Wrocs 2 (intabulation)
*Wrocs 5
ANON.

*Rhaw 1539/14
*BarcBC 681
BudOS 23
CambraiBM 125–8
CasAC D(F)
*FlorD 11
MunU 401
TrevBC 7
*UppsU 76c
VallaC 15
VatP 1976–9

Modern Editions

Picker, Motet Books of Antico, p. 259.

Comments

Reese says that the motet is "undoubtedly by Richafort" without giving any reason (Music in the Renaissance, p. 337).
Picker ascribes it to Richafort, since he believes that Antico 1520/2 is a reliable source (Motet Books of Antico, p. 43).

No. 40. Clama ne cesses (à 4) Appenzeller/Canis

Attributions and Sources

APPENZELLER

Susato 1547/6

CANIS

Ulhard 1548/2
*Scotto 1554/15
*StuttL 36

Modern Editions

None.
No. 41. *Clamabat autem mulier chananea* (à 5) Jacquet/Morales/Rore

(= *Orabat Jesum mulier*)

**Attributions and Sources**

**JACQUET**

RegB 940-1 ("Orabat Jesum mulier")

**MORALES**

*ToleBC 17*

**RORE**

*Phalèse 1573 Rore*
*Gardane 1595 Rore*

DressL Grimma 54

**ANON.**

*Gardane 1549/8*

**Modern Editions**

Morales, *Opera omnia*, vol. II, p. 96.

**Comments**

Owens explains that Gardane included this work in Gardane 1595 *Rore* because "it appears anonymously between two Rore motets in [Gardane] 1549/8" ("Illuminated Manuscript," p. 64).
No. 42. *Coenantibus illis* (à 4) Jacquet/Jaques du Pont

Attributions and Sources

**JACQUET**

VatG XII.4 (ascription in index)

**JAQUES DU PONT**

Gardane 1539/13
Vissenaken 1542/7
Gardane 1549/10
Scotto 1549/10a
Montanus & Neuber 1555/11

TrevBC 7
VatG XII.4 (ascription above music)

Modern Editions

None.

Comments

Nugent ascribes the motet to du Pont, writing that the ascription to Jacquet in the index of VatG XII.4 was the result of the scribe's having confused Jacquet with the similarly named Jaques du Pont ("The Jacquet Motets," p. 168).

No. 43. *Confitamini Domine* (à 6) Josquin/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

**JOSQUIN**

RomeV 35-40

**MOUTON**

*VatS 38*

Modern Editions

None.
Comments

Osthoff was not able to decide the authorship of this motet. However, he suggests that the scribe of VatS 38 confused the work with the four-voice setting of the same text by Mouton (Josquin, vol. II, p. 127).

No. 44. **Congratulamini mihi omnes** (I) (à 4) Josquin/Le Brung /Richafort

Attributions and Sources

**JOSQUIN**

Formschneider 1537/1

DresSL Grimma 54  
*RegB 849-52  
*WrocS 2 (intabulation)  
*WrocS 5

**LE BRUNG**

*VienNB Mus. 18825

**RICHAFORT**

BoIC Q19

**ANON.**

Gardane 1549/12  
*BerlPS 40043  
CambraiBM 125-8  
CasAC D(F)  
DresSL Glashütte 5  
PadBC A17  
*RegB 940-1  
*RegB 1018  
SionA 87-4  
StuttL 34  
*VatVM 571  
*WrocS 8  
*ZwiR 94/1

Modern Editions

Comments

Osthoff dismisses the ascription to Josquin in Forms Schneider 1537/1 as being unreliable (Josquin vol. II, pp. 10-1).

No. 45. Congratulamini mihi omnes (II) (à 4) Sermisy/ Verdelot

Attributions and Sources

SERMISY

Gardane 1539/13
Attaingnant 1542 Sermisy
Gardane 1549/10
Scotto 1549/10a

KönSU 1740
MunBS 16

VERDELOT

Kriesstein 1540/7
ErlU 473/1

Modern Editions

None.

Comments

See Chapter V for a discussion of the motet.

No. 46. Congratulamini mihi omnes (III) (à 5) Crecquillon/ Hollander

Attributions and Sources

CRECQUILLON

RegB 940-1

HOLLANDER

Susato 1555/9
Modern Editions

None.

No. 47. *Conserva me, Domine* (à 4) Finck/Josquin/Wolff

Attributions and Sources

FINCK

KasL 24

JosQUIN

Petreius 1538/6 (attribution in D.)
Montanus & Neuber 1553/4 (attribution in D.)

LeipU 49

WOLFF

Petreius 1538/6 (attribution in index)
Montanus & Neuber 1553/4 (attribution in index, A.,
and B.)

Modern Editions

None.

Comments

See Chapter V for a discussion of the piece.

No. 48. *Convertimini ad me* (à 5) Gombert/Jacquet/Ruffo

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Scotto 1541/3
Montanus & Neuber 1556/8

JACQUET

StuttL 34
RUCCO

*Castiglione 1542 Ruffo

Modern Editions

None.

Comments

Nugent ignores the attribution to Jacquet in StuttL 34 as having no firm basis ("The Jacquet Motets," pp. 208-9).

No. 49. Cum esset Anna (à 5) Clemens/Tubal

Attributions and Sources

CLEMENS NON PAPA
LeidGA 1442

TUBAL
Waelrent & Laet 1555/6

Modern Editions
Clemens, Opera omnia, vol. XXI, p. 109.

No. 50. Cur quisquam corrdat (à 4) Gombert/Haugk/Mahu

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Scotto 1541c Gombert
*Gardane 1542 Gombert

HAUGK
KönSU 1740

MAHU

Petreius 1538/7
Modern Editions

Gombert, *Opera omnia*, vol. VI, p. 104.

No. 51. *Cursu festa redit* (à 5) Gombert/Hellinck

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Scotto 1541b *Gombert*

HELLINCK

Kriesstein 1545/3

ANON.

*LucBS 775 (5.p. only, a fourth higher)*

Modern Editions

None.

No. 52. *Date siceram maerentibus* (à 5) Gombert/Josquin/
Mikołaj/Sermisy

(=*Je ne me puis* =*Respice in me* =*Lauda Syon)*

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

*Juan 1546/14 (intabulation, "Respice in me")*
*Montesdoca 1554/32 (intabulation, "Lauda Syon")*

JOSQUIN

*Attaingnant 1549 *Josquin* ("Je ne me puis")
*Le Roy & Ballard 1560 ("Je ne me puis")*
*Le Roy & Ballard 1572/2 ("Je ne me puis")*

BudOS 23
*MunBS 1508 ("Je ne me puis")*

MIKOŁAJ

*KrakPAN 1716 (intabulation)*
SERMISY

Kohlen 1558/20 (intabulation)

ANON.

*Müller 1562/24 (intabulation)

MunU 326
*RegB 1018
RegB B211-5
*WrocS 12

Modern Editions

Josquin, Wereldlijke Werken, Bundel III, p. 78.
Blackburn, "Josquin's Chanson," p. 68.

Comments

Blackburn ascribes the work to Josquin on stylistic grounds, though she concedes that the bibliographical evidence supports Gombert's authorship ("Josquin's Chanson," p. 31).
See Chapter V for a discussion of the work.

No. 53. De profundis clamavi (I) (à 4) Champion/Josquin

Attributions and Sources

CHAMPION

VienNB Mus. 15941

Josquin

Grimm & Wyrsung 1520/4
Antico 1521/3
Petreius 1539/9
Petrus 1547/1 Dodecachordon

KasL 24
SGalls 463
ANON.

[Antico?] [c1521]/7

DressL 1/D/6
ErlU 473/4
RegB C120

Modern Editions


Comments

Picker attributes the motet to Josquin on stylistic and bibliographic grounds (*Motet Books of Antico*, pp. 24-5).

No. 54. *De profundis clamavi* (II) (à 5) Josquin/Senfl

Attributions and Sources

JOSQUIN

Petreius 1539/9

DressL 1/D/3 (attribution in C. V.)

SENFL

Formschneider 1537/1

BerlPS 40013
DressL 1/D/3 (attribution in T. 4ta.)
DressL 1/D/6
*Eiss s.s.
GothaF A98
KasL 24
*MunBS 10
MunU 327
NurGN 83795
RegB 891-2
ANON.

*CopKB 1873
LeipU 49
MunU 326

Modern Editions


No. 55. *Deus in adjutorium* (à 3) Champion/Josquin/Senfl

Attributions and Sources

CHAMPION

VienNB Mus. 15941

JOSQUIN

KasL 24

SENFL

Petreius 1538/6

ANON.

Grimm & Wyrsung 1520/4

Modern Editions

Champion, *Opera omnia*, p. 112.

No. 56. *Deus in nomine tuo* (à 5) Lhéritier/Willaert

(2.p. *Ecce enim*)

Attributions and Sources

LHERITIER

Gardane 1539/6

RomeV 35-40
WILLAERT

Moderne 1532/9
Petreius 1538/6

ANON.

*StuttL 43

Modern Editions

Lhéritier, Opera omnia, p. 149.

Comments

Perkins ascribes the motet to Lhéritier, stating that RomeV 35-40 is a reliable source (Lhéritier, Opera Omnia, p. xxii).

No. 57. Deus in nomine tuo (à 4) Carpentras/Josquin
(2.p. Voluntarie)

Attributions and Sources

CARPENTRAS

VatS 46

JOSQUIN

Montanus & Neuber 1553/5

ANON.

Petrucci 1519/3
Dorico 1526/4

Modern Editions

Genet, Opera omnia, vol. V, p. 32.
Comments

Osthoff considers VatS 46 to be more reliable than Montanus & Neuber 1553/5, and thus ascribes the work to Carreras (Josquin, vol. II, p. 117).


No. 58. Deus pacis reduxit (à 4) Josquin/Stoltzer

Attributions and Sources

JOSQUIN

Formschneider 1538/3

STOLTZER

*ZwiR 81/2

Anon.

*BudOS P6

Modern Editions


No. 59. Deus qui sedes super thronum (à 4/6) Verdelot/Walter

Attributions and Sources

VERDELOT

*DresSL Pirna VII (à 6)

WALTER

*[no printer named] 1524 Walter

*Schöffer 1525 Walter

*Schöffer 1534 Walter

*Rhaw 1544 Walter

*Rhaw 1551 Walter
RegB 940-1  
StuttL 35  
*WeimB B  
*WrocS 1 (intabulation)  
*WrocS 12  
*ZwIR 34/35

ANON.

*Formschneider 1533/1 (intabulation)

BerlPS 40013  
GothaF A98  
*KrakPAN 1716 (intabulation)  
LeipU 51  
NurGN 83795  
*RegB 1018  
SionA 87-4  
*UlmS 236

Modern Editions


No. 60. Deus regnorum et christianissimi (à 4) Gascongne/ 
Sermisy

Attributions and Sources

GASCONGNE

Attaingnant 1535/3 (attribution over music)

SERMISY

Attaingnant 1535/3 (attribution in index)

Modern Editions


Comments

See Chapter V for a discussion of the conflicting 
attributions.
No. 61. *Deus ultionem Dominus* (à 4) Conseil/Gombert

Attributions and Sources

CONSEIL

* Gardane 1549/9
* Scotto 1549/9a

GOMBERT

Petreius 1539/9

ANON.

* Attaingnant [1528]/2
  KasL 24
  RomeM 23-4

Modern Editions


--- *Diem festum sacratissime* Arcadelt/Crecquillon

See *Signum salutis pone Domine* (No. 230)

No. 62. *Dilectus Deo* (à 4) Fevin/Josquin

Attributions and Sources

FEVIN

Rhaw 1538/8

JOSQUIN

Petreius 1538/7

ANON.

Petrucci 1514/1 (1.p. only)
Dorico 1526/1 (1.p. only)
PadBC A17 (1.p. only)
Modern Editions

Albrecht, Symphoniae jucundae 1538, p. 77.

Comments

Antonowytc ascribes the motet to Fevin on
Although Clinckscale was not aware of the
attribution to Josquin in Petreius 1538/7, he points out
that the two partes are different in style ("Fevin," pp.
136-7).
Gehrenbeck discusses the possibility of a misreading
of the headline in the altus book of Petrucci 1514/1,
where "Ant. feuin" appears. He believes that the
attribution belongs to the motet, Egregie (see No. 90),
which appears just before Dilectus, and which Petrucci
ascribes to Fevin in the index ("Motetti della corona,"
vol. II, p. 649, fn. 1).

No. 63. Dilexi quoniam exaudiet (à 4) Ducis/Maffoni

Attributions and Sources

DUCIS

Petreius 1539/9
RegB 940-1
*WrocS 10

MAFFONI

*BergBC 1209

ANON.

*Günther 1544/25 (intabulation)
*Eichorn 1556/32 (intabulation)

CasAC N(H)
FlorBN II.I.350
*GreifU 640-1
*KönSU 1740
SGalls 463
SionA 87-4
*VerBC 760
*WrocU 42
Modern Editions


No. 64. *Dirige gressus meos* (à 5) Clemens/Crecquillon

Attributions and Sources

**CLEMENS**

DresSL Lëbau 12

**CRECQUILLON**

Scotto 1549/7
*Gardane 1549/8
Montanus & Neuber 1554/11
*Phalèse 1555/4
*Phalèse 1558/6
*Phalèse 1576 *Crecquillon*

AachS 2

Modern Editions

Clemens, *Opera omnia*, vol. XXI, p. 120.

Comments

See Chapter V for a discussion of the work.

No. 65. *Discite a me* (à 5) Clemens/Crecquillon

(2.p. *Dum aurora*)

Attributions and Sources

**CLEMENS**

Susato 1553/12
Phalèse 1554/1 (attribution in S. A. T. CT.)
Beyer 1563/24 (intabulation)

MunBS 13
*Whalley*S 23
CRECQUILLON

Phalèse 1554/1 (attribution in index, B.)

*StuttL 9

Modern Editions

Clemens, *Opera omnia*, vol. XIII, p. 2.

Comments

In the bassus partbook of Phalèse 1554/1, this motet is printed as the *secunda pars* of *Dum aurora*, which is ascribed to Crecquillon in the index of the print, while *Discite a me* is not listed in the index (see Chapter II, Table II-10).

No. 66. *Disperant nisi sit* (à 5) Louwys/Rore

Attributions and Sources

LOUWYS

Susato 1553/15 (see Comments)

RORE

Gardane 1549/8
Susato 1553/15 (see Comments)
*Phalèse 1573 *Rore

MunBS 16

Modern Editions

Rore, *Opera omnia*, vol. I, p. 140.

Comments

See Chapter II, Table II-11.
No. 67. *Dominator caelorum* (à 5) Conseil/C. Festa

**Attributions and Sources**

**CONSEIL**

Schöffer 1539/8

Bo1C Q27(I)

**C. FESTA**

RomeV 35-40

**ANON.**

*PadBC D27*

**Modern Editions**

Festa, *Opera omnia*, vol. V, p. 20.

**Comments**

Main ascribes the motet to Festa on stylistic grounds ("Costanzo Festa," p. 63).

No. 68. *Domine da nobis* (à 4) Gallus/Susato

**Attributions and Sources**

**GALLUS**

Vissenaeken 1542/7

**SUSATO**

Ulhard 1545/2

**Modern Editions**

None.
No. 69. *Domine Deus omnipotens* (à 4) Arcadelt/Sermisy

Attributions and Sources

ARCADELT

Buglhat 1538/5

SERMISY

Attaingnant 1542 *Sermisy*

Modern Editions

None.

No. 70. *Domine Dominus noster* (à 4) Moulu/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

MOULU

KasL 24

MOUTON

Antico 1520/1
Petreius 1538/6

ANON.

*HeilbS XCIII/3*

Modern Editions


Comments

Picker considers KasL 24 as a peripheral source, and thus ascribes the work to Mouton (*Motet Books of Antico*, p. 35).
No. 71. *Domine exaudi me* (à 5) Jacquet/Lhéritier

Attributions and Sources

**JACQUET**

Moderne 1539/5
Gardane 1540 Jacquet
Petreius 1542/6

**LHÉRITIER**

RomeM 23-4

Modern Editions

None.

Comments

Lewis ascribes the motet to Lhéritier on the strength of the ascription in RomeM 23-4, which, she believes, is authoritative ("Antonio Gardane," p. 212).

No. 72. *Domine Jusu Christe* (à 4) Anchieta/Peñalosa

Attributions and Sources

**ANCHIETA**

*SegC s.s.*
*SevBC 5-5-20

**PEñALOSA**

*TaraZC 5

**ANON.**

*CoimU 12*
*CoimU 32*
*VallaC 5*

Modern Editions

None.
No. 73. **Domine ne in furore** (à 4) Josquin/Stoltzer/Verdelot

Attributions and Sources

**JOSQUIN**

KasL 24

**STOLTZER**

*UtreH s.s.

**VERDELOT**

*Rhaw 1544/4

Bo1C Q20

**ANON.**

LeipU 49

Modern Editions

None.

Comments

See Chapter V for a discussion of the piece.

No. 74. **Domine non est exaltum** (à 5) Clemens/Crecquillon

Attributions and Sources

**CLEMENS**

Susato 1546/7

*Montanus & Neuber 1553/6

Susato 1553/14

*Sylvius [1559]/4

DressSL Löbau 12

LeidGA 1441 (attribution over music)

**CRECQUILLON**

LeidGA 1441 (attribution in index)
Modern Editions

Clemens, Opera omnia, vol. IX, p. 4.

No. 75. Domine non secundum peccata nostra (à 4) Gombert/Manchicourt

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Scotto 1541c Gombert
*Gardane 1542 Gombert
Montanus & Neuber 1556/9

MANCHICOURT

Attaignant 1539 Manchicourt
Attaignant 1545 Manchicourt

Modern Editions

Gombert, Opera omnia, vol. VI, p. 6.

No. 76. Domine Pater et Deus (à 4) Clemens/Crecquillon

Attributions and Sources

CLEMENS

LeidSM 1440

CRECQUILLON

Ulhard 1548/2
*Waelrant [1556]/4
Phalèse 1559 Crecquillon
*Phalèse 1576 Crecquillon

Modern Editions

Clemens, Opera omnia, vol. XXI, p. 128.
No. 77. Domine quis habitabit (à 4) Reulx/Sermisy

Attributions and Sources

REULX
CambraiBM 125-8

SERMISY
Attaingnant 1529/1
Petreius 1538/6

Modern Editions
None.

No. 78. Domini est terra (à 4) Appenzeller/Josquin/Vinders

Attributions and Sources

APPENZELLER
*GreifU 640-1

JOSQUIN
KasL 24

VINDERS
Vissenaecken 1542/7
CambraiBM 125-8

ANON.
Formschneider 1537/1
LeidGA 1442
UlmS 237

Modern Editions
None.
Comments

As though Osthoff disregards the ascription to Josquin in Kasl 24 unreliable, he does not ascribe the motet to anyone (Josquin, vol. II, pp. 19-20).

See Chapter V for a discussion of the conflicting attribution.

No. 79. Dulce lignum (à 5) Gombert/Willaert

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Scotto 1541b Gombert

WILLAERT

Scotto 1539c Willaert

Modern Editions

None.

No. 80. Dulces exuvie dum fata deus (à 3/4) Mouton/Willaert

Attributions and Sources

MOUTON

RegB 940-1 (à 4)

WILLAERT

SGallS 463 (à 3)

ANON.

*Antico 1520/6 (à 3)
Rhay 1538/8 (à 4, "altus ad placitum")
Rhay 1542/8 (à 3)

Modern Editions

Albrecht, Symphoniae jucundae 1538, p. 26 (à 4 version).
Comments

Loach suggests that the scribe of RegB 940-1 confused this motet with Mouton’s different setting of the same text ("Tschudi’s Songbook," pp. 197-8). See Chapter V for a discussion of the piece.

---Dum complerentur Josquin/Viardot

See Lectio actuum apostolorum (No. 150)

No. 81. Dum complerentur (à 5) Arcadelt/Verdelot

Attributions and Sources

ARCADELT

Moderne 1538/2
Moderne 1539/4
Gardane 1539/6
Schöffer 1539/8
Petreius 1540/6
*Moderne 1542/4
Montanus & Neuber 1550/2
Montanus & Neuber 1555/10

*LeuvU 163
MunU 327
RegB 875-7
RegB 940-1
RomeV 35-40
*VatS 19
*WrocS 3 (intabulation)
*WrocS 5
*ZwiR 74/1

VERDELOT

*WrocS 10
*WrocS 12

ANON.

*Eichorn 1556/32 (intabulation)
*Gerlach 1575/17 (intabulation)
Modern Editions

Arcadelt, *Opera omnia*, vol. X, p. 5.

No. 82. *Dum fabricator mundi* (à 5) Lupi/Lupino

Attributions and Sources

LUPI

Kriesstein 1545/3
Montanus & Neuber 1555/12 (attribution in index, A., T., CT.)

LUPINO

Montanus & Neuber 1555/12 (attribution in D. B.)

Modern Editions


Comments

Blackburn notices that some stylistic features of Lupi's music are absent in this work (*Opera omnia*, vol. II, p. xxx).

No. 83. *Ecce Dominus veniet* (à 5) Josquin/Senfl

Attributions and Sources

JOSQUIN

*ZwiR 74/1

SENFL

*Eiss s.s.
ANON.

Formschneider 1537/1

Modern Editions

None.

---Ecce video Craen/La Rue

See Sancta Maria virgo (No. 220)

No. 84. Ecce nos reliquimus omnia (à 4) Crecquillon/
      Maistre Jhan

Attributions and Sources

CRECQUILLON

LeidSM 1440

MAISTRE JHAN

Attaingnant 1534/10
*Scotto 1543/4

LonRC 2037

ANON.

CasAC N(H)
MunU 401

Modern Editions

Smijers, Treize livres, vol. VIII, p. 175.

No. 85. Ecce odor filii mei (à 4) Hesdin/Manchicourt

Attributions and Sources

HESDIN

Susato 1547/5
MANCHICOURT

Attaingnant 1539 Manchicourt
Attaingnant 1545 Manchicourt

Modern Editions


No. 86. Ego Dominus (à 4) Maessens/Vaet

Attributions and Sources

MAESSENS

Montanus & Neuber 1556/9

VAET

Montanus & Neuber 1564/5

*DresSL Pirna III
RegB 891-2
*StuttL 8

ANON.

Susato 1554/8

Modern Editions


No. 87. Ego dormio et cor meum Canis/Clemens

Attributions and Sources

CANIS

Waelrant 1556/6

CLEMENS

*Phalèse 1555/4
*Montanus & Neuber 1559/1
No. 88. **Ego sum qui sum** (à 5) Hesdin/Mouton/Richafort

Attributions and Sources

**HESDIN**

Buglhat 1539/7

**MOUTON**

Bo1C Q27(I)

**RICHAFORT**

*ToleBC 22
LeidGA 1439

**ANON.**

*HradKM 29

Modern Editions


No. 89. **Ego sum resurrectio** (à 4) Mahu/Walter

Attributions and Sources

**MAHU**

RegB B211-5

**WALTER**

Rhaw 1538/8
ANON.

BerlPS 40013
DresSL 1/D/501
GothaF A98
LeipU 51
NurGN 83795
*WeimB B

Modern Editions

Albrecht, *Symphoniae jucundae* 1538, p. 115.

No. 90. *Egregie Christi martyr Christophore* (à 4) Fevin/
Mouton

Attributions and Sources

FEVIN

Petrucci 1514/1
Dorico 1526/1

MOUTON

*VienNB Mus. 15941

ANON.

*BolSP 38 (St. Petronius instead of St. Christopher)*
CasAC P(E) (St. Evasius instead of St. Christopher)
LonBLR 8G.vii (St. Martin instead of
St. Christopher)

Modern Editions

Gehrenbeck, "Motetti della corona," vol. IV,
p. 1584.

Comments

Clinckscale attributes the motet to Fevin on
No. 91. **Elisabeth Zachariae magnum** (à 4) La Fage/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

**LA FAGE**

Petrucci 1519/1  
Antico 1520/1  
Dorico 1526/2  
Rhow 1538/8

FlorL 666  
ModD 9

**MOUTON**

Montanus & Neuber 1559/2

RegB 861-2  
RegB 940-1

**ANON.**

*[no printer named] 1546/4 (intabulation)*

DressSL 1/D/501  
LeipU 51  
PadBC A17  
RegB C120

Modern Editions

Albrecht, *Symphoniae jucundae* 1538, p. 93.  

Comments

Lowinsky ascribes the work to La Fage on both stylistic and bibliographic grounds (*The Medici Codex*, vol. I, p. 148).
No. 92. *Emendemus in melius* (à 4) Manchicourt/Portinaro

Attributions and Sources

**MANCHICOURT**

Montanus & Neuber 1556/8 (attribution in T. B.)

**PORTINARO**

Montanus & Neuber 1556/8 (attribution in A.)

Modern Editions

None.

No. 93. *Expurgate vetus fermentum* (I) (à 5) Berchem/Gombert/ Lupi

Attributions and Sources

**BERCHEM**

*Gardane 1552b Gombert

**GOMBERT**

Scotto 1541b Gombert

*Scotto 1550 Gombert

**LUPI**

Susato 1555/8

LeidGA 1441

Modern Editions

Gombert, *Opera omnia*, vol. VIII, p. 1.


Comments

Blackburn considers the attributions to Berchem and Gombert as an error (Lupi, *Opera omnia*, p. xvii). However, she does not explain what kind of error Gardane and Scotto committed.
No. 94. *Expurgate vetus fermentum* (II) (à 4) Cleve/Guyot

Attributions and Sources

CLEVE

RegB 849-52

GUYOT

Susato 1547/6

*WrocS 10

Modern Editions

None.

No. 95. *Factum est verbum Domini* (à 6) Berchem/Willaert

Attributions and Sources

BERCHEM

*Gardane 1542 Willaert* (attrition over 1.p.)

*Montanus & Neuber 1558/4

*TrevBC 8

WILLAERT

*Gardane 1542 Willaert* (attrition over 2.p.)

Modern Editions

None.

No. 96. *Felix namque es* (à 5) Gombert/Lupi

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Moderne 1539/5 (attrition in all partes and voices except for those that ascribe it to Lupi—see below)
LUPI

Moderne 1539/5 (attribution in 1.p and 2.p. of S. and 2.p. of B.)
Attaignant 1542 Lupi
MunBS 274a

Modern Editions


No. 97. Gabriel angelus (à 4) Clemens/Crecquillon

Attributions and Sources

CLEMENS

Phalèse 1559e Clemens
LeuvK 4

CRECQUILLON

Susato 1553/8
Montanus & Neuber 1559/2

LeidGA 1441
RegB 861-2

Modern Editions

Clemens, Opera omnia, vol. XX, p. 12.

No. 98. Gabriel nunciatvit Mariae (à 5) Gombert/Phinot

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

*Moderne 1538/2

PHINOT

*TrevBC 29
Modern Editions

Gombert, *Opera omnia*, vol. X, p. 91.

No. 99. *Gaude francorum regia* (à 4) Fevin/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

FEVIN

Petrucci 1514/1
Dorico 1526/1 (attribution in the exemplar at Jena, Universitätsbibliothek)
Attaingnant 1535/3

MOUTON

Dorico 1526/1 (attribution in the exemplar at Barcelona, Biblioteca Central)

Modern Editions


Comments

He is not aware of the attribution to Mouton. For the attributions in Dorico 1526/1, see Chapter II.

No. 100. *Gaude virgo Catherina* (à 4) Gombert/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Attaingnant 1534/9 (attribution in B.)

MOUTON

Attaingnant 1529/1
Attaingnant 1534/9 (attribution in index)
Modern Editions


Comments

See Chapter V for a discussion of the conflicting attribution.

No. 101. Gaudent in caelis (à 4) Clemens/Maessens

Attributions and Sources

Clemens

Ulhard 1549/11
*Scotto 1554/15
*Phalèse 1559e Clemens

LeidGA 1441
*LeuvK 4

Maessens

Montanus & Neuber 1546/8

Modern Editions

Clemens, Opera omnia, vol. IX, p. 116.

No. 102. Gaudent in caelis (à 8) (II) Phinot/Richafort/Verdelot

Attributions and Sources

Phinot

*MunBS 1536

Richafort

Montanus & Neuber 1564/1

RegB 786-837
VERDELOT
VerA 218
ANON.
CopKB 1872
Modern Editions
Verdelot, Opera omnia, vol. III, p. 55.

No. 103. Genuit puerpera (à 4) Jacquet/Maistre Jhan
Attributions and Sources
JACQUET
Gardane 1545 Jacquet
MAISTRE JHAN
*TrevBC 8
Modern Editions
None.
Comments
Nugent ascribes the motet to Jacquet on the grounds that TrevBC 8 is unreliable ("The Jacquet Motets," p. 169).

No. 104. Gloria laus et honor (à 4) Brumel/Josquin
Attributions and Sources
BRUMEL
Petrucci 1505/2
JOSQUIN
Formschneider 1538/3
Modern Editions

Brumel, *Opera omnia*, vol. V, p. 29.

Comments

Antonowytch ascribes the motet to Brumel on stylistic grounds ("The Present States," p. 62). Hudson favors Brumel for stylistic and bibliographical reasons (Brumel, *Opera omnia*, p. xxx.) Osthoff dismisses the attribution to Josquin by Formscheider as unreliable (*Josquin* vol. II, p. 12).

No. 105. *Gloriosi principes terrae* (à 5) Lapicida/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

LAPICIDA

FlorL 666

MOUTON

Attaingnant 1534/10
Le Roy & Ballard 1555 *Mouton*

Modern Editions


Comments

Lowinsky attributes the work to Lapicida, writing that the work is stylistically unlike those by Mouton (*The Medici Codex*, vol. I, p. 230).

No. 106. *Gratia plena ipsa* (à 4) Mouton/Ninot le petit

Attributions and Sources

MOUTON

VienNB Mus. 15941 (without 3.p., attribution in T. index)
NINOT LE PETIT

VienNB Mus. 15941 (without 3.p., attribution in B. index)

ANON.

VatP 1976-9

Modern Editions

Ninot le Petit, Opera omnia, p. 130.

Comments

Hudson argues that the style of the piece is unlike that of either composer (Ninot le Petit, Opera omnia, p. xxviii).

No. 107. Hierusalem luge (à 5) Caen/Lupus/Richafort

Attributions and Sources

CAEN

Montanus & Neuber 1559/1

RegB 891-2
*WrocS 1 (intabulation)
*WrocS 12

LUPUS

Attaingnant 1534/10

RomeV 35-40
VatG XII.4

RICHAFORT

Moderne 1532/9
Gardane 1539/6
Petreius 1540/8
Du Chemin 1553/2
*Du Chemin 1557/12
*Sanchez 1578/24 (intabulation)
*Beyer 1583/24 (intabulation)
*DresSL Löbau 8/70
*DresSL Pirna VII
ErlU 473/1
MunU 401
RegB 940-1
*ZwiR 74/1

ANON.

CopKB 1872
LeipU 49
MunU '326
MunU 327
NurGN 83795
*PiacD (5)
SionA 87-4
UlmS 237
ZwiR 46/120
*ZwiR 75/1

Modern Editions


Comments

Blackburn ascribes the motet to Richafort, stating that its style is unrelated to that of either Lupus or Hellinck ("The Lupus Problem," pp. 304-8).
Kabis ascribes the work to Richafort on stylistic grounds ("The Works of Richafort," p. 25).
Reese favors Lupus (Music in the Renaissance, p. 337, fn. 7).

No. 108. *Hodie Christus natus est* (I) (à 5) Gombert/Ruffo

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Scotto 1541/3
Montanus & Neuber 1554/10

*WroCS 6 (intabulation)*
RUFFO

*Castiglione 1542 Ruffo
*Montanus & Neuber 1564/4

Modern Editions

None.

No. 109. Hodie Christus natus est (II) (à 5) Conseil/Lupi

Atributions and Sources

CONSEIL

Montanus & Neuber 1554/10
MunBS 274a

LUPI

Castiglione 1543/3
Montanus & Neuber 1559/1

*WrocS 6 (intabulation)

ANON.

DresSL Glashütte 5
*PiacD (5)

Modern Editions

Lupi, Opera omnia, vol. II, p. 76

Comments

Blackburn writes that the work is by Lupi on stylistic grounds, and that the readings in the sources differ according to their attribution (Lupi, Opera omnia, pp. xx-xxi).
No. 110. *Hodie salvator mundi* (à 4) Lhéritier/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

LHÉRITIER

VatG XII.4

MOUTON

*TrevBC 8

ANON.

BohC Q19
CasAC D(F)

Modern Editions

Lhéritier, *Opera omnia*, p. 60.

Comments

Perkins accepts the ascription in VatG XII.4 as being reliable. He also explains that the attribution to Mouton in TrevBC 8 is an error on the part of the scribe, who confused this motet with Mouton’s *Salvator mundi* because of the musical and textual similarities of the two motets (Lhéritier, *Opera omnia*, p. xxii).

See Chapter V for a different explanation of the conflicting attribution.

No. 111. *Homo quidam fecit* (à 5) Gombert/Phinot

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Scotto 1541/3

PHINOT

*Caesano 1554* Phinot
*Gardane 1555* Phinot

RegB 891–2
Modern Editions

Phinot, *Opera omnia*, vol. IV, p. 146.

No. 112. *Immutemur habitu* (à 4) Escobedo/Morales

Attributions and Sources

ESCOBEDO

*ToleBC 17
*VatS 13

MORALES

*Scotto 1543/5
Gardane 1546/9
Montanus & Neuber 1556/9

Modern Editions

*Monumentos de la Música Española*, vol. XIII, p. 28.

No. 113. *In Domino confido quomodo dicitis* (à 4) Jacquet/Senfl

Attributions and Sources

JACQUET

Scotto 1539b *Jacquet*
Scotto 1544 *Jacquet*
Gardane 1545 *Jacquet*
*Du Bosc & Gueroult 1554/13

SENFL

Petreius 1542/6

ANON.

CivMA 59

Modern Editions

Jacquet, *Opera omnia*, vol. IV, p. 63.
No. 114. *In illo tempore Maria Magdalena* (à 4/6) Josquin/Mouton

**Attributions and Sources**

**JOSQUIN**

*VerBC 760 (1.p. only)

**MOUTON**

Antico 1521/5
Attaingnant 1529/1

*BergBC 1209
Bo1C Q19
LonRC 2037
ModD 9
*VienNB Mus. 18825

**ANON.**

*[Antico?] [1521]/4
*[Antico?] [c1521]/7

CambraiBM 125-8
*LonRC 1070
*MunBS 41 (à 6)
PadBC A17

**Modern Editions**


No. 115. *In illo tempore accesserunt* (à 4) Moulu/Mouton

**Attributions and Sources**

**MOULU**

Bo1C Q19
SGallS 463
MOUTON

Formschneider 1537/1
Le Roy & Ballard 1555 Mouton
Montanus & Neuber 1559/2

ANON.

*[Antico?] [1521]/4
*LonRC 1070
RegB 940-1

Modern Editions


Comments

Loach concludes that this motet is not in Mouton's style ("Tchudi’s Songbook," p. 206).
The conflicting opinions of Chapman and Loach underscore the difficulty of using style as a conclusive criterion.

No. 116. In illo tempore dixit Jesus (à 4) Jacquet/Morales
(2.p. Dicebant ergo)

Attributions and Sources

JACQUET

Scotto 1539b Jacquet
Gardane 1539/13
Scotto 1544 Jacquet
Gardane 1545 Jacquet
Gardane 1549/10
Scotto 1549/10a
Scotto 1562/2

MORALE S

*CoimU 48
ANON.

*Scotto 1543/5
Gardane 1546/9

CasAC N(H)
StuttL 35
*TrevBC 5

Modern Editions


Comments

Nugent accepts the motet as Jacquet’s, explaining that the compiler of CoimU 48 simply copied the Morales attribution in Scotto 1543/5 or Gardane 1546/9, where the Morales’s name appears on the title page of each source ("The Jacquet Motets," pp. 170-1).
For more detail, see Chapter III.

No. 117. In illo tempore dixit Jesus (à 5) Berchem/Gombert/
(2.p. Domine ostende) Jacquet

Attributions and Sources

BERCHEM

*Gardane 1553 Jacquet
*TrevBC 29

GOMBERT

Moderne 1539/5
Kriesstein 1545/3
*Kriesstein 1545/6

JACQUET

Gardane 1540 Jacquet
Moderne 1542/5
Montanus & Neuber 1555/10
*Scotto 1565a Jacquet
Modern Editions

None.

Comments

Nugent favors Jacquet, since he believes that the attribution to Berchem in Gardane 1553 Jacquet was caused by that printer's competition with Scotto ("The Jacquet Motets," p. 205).

No. 118. In illo tempore dixit Jesus (à 4) C. Festa/S. Festa/ (2.p. Postguam) Mouton

Attributions and Sources

C. FESTA

BudOS 23 (attribution in index)

S. FESTA

Antico 1521/5

BolC Q19

BudOS 23 (attribution in B.)

MOUTON

Montanus & Neuber 1554/10

Modern Editions

Picker, Motet Books of Antico, p. 412.

Comments

Picker assigns the work to Sebastiano Festa, claiming that BolC Q19 and Antico 1521/5 are authoritative sources (Motet Books of Antico, p. 62).
No. 119. *In nomine Jesu* (I) (à 5) Jacquet/Werrecore

**Attributions and Sources**

**JACQUET**

Kriesstein 1545/3  
*Kriesstein 1546/5  

**WERRECORE**

Castiglione 1543/3  
Montanus & Neuber 1564/4  
*Merulo 1569/2  

**ANON.**

*LucBS 775  

**Modern Editions**

None.

**Comments**

Since "Incerto Authore" appears in the indices and the bassus partbooks of both Kriesstein prints, Nugent attributes the piece to Werrecore, even though the other four partbooks of both prints name Jacquet ("The Jacquet Motets," p. 208).

No. 120. *In nomine Jesu* (II) (à 6) Josquin/Mouton

**Attributions and Sources**

**JOSQUIN**

*Montanus & Neuber 1558/4  
Montanus & Neuber 1564/3  
MunBS 1536  

**MOUTON**

BoIC R142

**Modern Editions**

None.
No. 121. *In omni tribulatione* (à 4) Moulu/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

**MOULU**

Antico 1521/5
[Antico?] [1521]/6

**MOUTON**

FlorL 666

**ANON.**

*VatP 1980-1
*VerBC 760

Modern Editions


Comments

Chapman ascribes the motet to Mouton on stylistic grounds ("The Works of Moulu," p. ?)
Lowinsky accepts the attribution to Mouton in FlorL 666 (*The Medici Codex*, vol. I, p. 169).

No. 122. *In te Domine speravi* (I) (à 4) Lhéritier/Verdelot

Attributions and Sources

**LHÉRITIER**

*Giunta [c1526]/5
Gardane 1539/12
Petreius 1542/6 (attribution in partbooks)
Gardane 1545/4
Rampazetto 1564/6

**VERDELLOT**

*Moderne 1532/11
Gardane 1539/13
LHERITIER alias VERDELOT

Petreius 1542/6 (attributed as "Lerithier, alias Verdeloth" in index)

Modern Editions

Lhérîtier, Opera omnia, p. 209.

Comments

Perkins offers two possible reasons for confusion on the part of Petreius: (1) "a knowledge of the conflicting ascription given by [Moderne 1532/11 and Gardane 1539/13]; and (2) "a striking similarity with the beginning of another setting of the same text that appears only under Verdelot's name." Perkins concludes that the latter is the more likely reason for the conflict (Lhérîtier, Opera omnia, p. xxii).

For the beginning of each piece, see Chapter III, Ex. III-1.

No. 123. In te Domine speravi (II) (à 5) Hellinck/Senfl/Verdelot

Attributions and Sources

HELLINCK

Moderne 1532/9
Attaingnant 1535/1
Formschneider 1537/1
Gardane 1539/6
Du Chemin 1553/2
Montanus & Neiber 1559/1

Bo1C Q27(I)
BrusC 27088
ErlU 473/3
*LeuvU 163
*RegB 772
RegB 891-2
RegB C99
RomeV 35-40
StuttL 34
*TolBC 17
SENFL

MunU 401
*WeimB B

VERDELOT

DressL 1/D/3
KasL 24
*ZwiR 73

ANON.

Phalèse 1571/16
BerlPS 40013
DressL 1/D/501
GothaF A98
MunU 326
MunU 327
NurGN 83795
*PiacD (5)
UlmS 237
*VatVM 571

Modern Editions


No. 124. In te Domine speravi (III) (à 5) Berchem/Jacquet

Attributions and Sources

BERCHEM

Gardane 1540 Jacquet
*Gardane 1553/17

JACQUET

Scotto 1539a Jacquet
Schöffer 1539/8
Petreius 1542/6
*Gardane 1553 Jacquet
*Scotto 1565a Jacquet

Modern Editions

None.
No. 125. *Inclina Domine* (I) (à 4) Clemens/Valent

Attributions and Sources

**Clemens**

*VienNB Mus. 19189

**Valent**

*Rampazetto 1563/3

Modern Editions

Clemens, *Opéra omnia*, vol. XXI, p. 140.

---

No. 126. *Inclina Domine* (II) (à 4) Courtois/Jacotin/Morales

(2.p. *Deduce me Domine*)

Attributions and Sources

**Courtois**

*Gardane 1543/21 (2.p. only)*

*Gardane 1559/21 (2.p. only)*

*Scotto 1587/8 (2.p. only)*

**Jacotin**

*Attaingnant 1535/1*

*Scotto 1549/14 (2.p. only)*

*Montanus & Neuber 1560/2 (2.p. only)*

**Morales**

*Gardane 1546/9 (attribution on the title page)*

**Anon.**

*Gardane 1542/18 (2.p. only)*

*Scotto 1543/5*

*Coimu 48*

*UlmS 237*

Modern Editions

Comments

Gardane 1546/9 carries the inscription "Morales and others" on its title page, without further attributions in the main body of the print (see Chapter III).

No. 127. **Inclina Domine** (III) (à 5) Berchem/Gombert

Attributions and Sources

BERCHEM

*Gardane 1552b **Gombert**

GOMBERT

Scotto 1541b **Gombert**

*Scotto 1550 **Gombert**

Montanus & Neuber 1554/11

StuttL 34

Modern Editions

None.

No. 128. **Inclina Domine** (IV) (à 8) Gombert/Sermisy

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

VerA 218 (attribution in A2.)

SERMISY

Montanus & Neuber 1564/1

*MunBS 25

VerA 218 (attribution in B1.)

ANON.

MunBS 1536
Modern Editions


No. 129. **Inclita strips Jesse** (à 4) Clemens/Crecquillon

**Attributions and Sources**

**CLEMENS**

*Ulhard 1549/11
Phalèse 1559c Clemens

**CRECQUILLON**

LeidGA 1441

**ANON.**

Baethen 1556/3

Modern Editions

Clemens, *Opera omnia*, vol. IX, p. 138.

No. 130. **Infirmitatem nostram** (à 5) Verdelot/Willaert

**Attributions and Sources**

**VERDELOT**

Attaingnant 1534/6
Formschneider 1538/3
*Valderrábano 1547/25 (intabulation)
*Fezandat 1558/18 (intabulation)
Montanus & Neuber 1559/1

BoiC Q27(I)
*KlagL 4/3 (intabulation)
*LeuvU 163
ModD 4
RomeV 35-40

**WILLAERT**

LeidGA 1441
ANON.

*Phalèse 1552/29 (intabulation)
*S HerAB 72C
*PadBC D27
*PiacD (5)

Modern Editions

Verdelot, *Opera omnia*, vol. II, p. 6.

No. 131. *Ingresso Zacharia* (à 5) Gombert/Jacquet

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Scotto 1541/3 (attribution on the title page only)

JACQUET

Scotto 1541/3 (attribution in A. T. B.)

Modern Editions

None.

No. 132. *Inter vestibulum* (à 5) Gombert/Ruffo

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Scotto 1541/3

RUFFO

*Castiglione 1542 Ruffo*

Modern Editions

None.
No. 133. *Inviolata integra et casta* (à 8) Gombert/Mouton/Verdelot

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

VerA 218 (attribution in index)

MOUTON

VerA 218 (attribution in B.)

VERDELLOT

MunBS 1536
RegB 786-837

ANON.

Montanus & Neuber 1564/1

Modern Editions

None.

No. 134. *Isti sunt viri* (à 5) Gombert/Grandsyre/Lupi

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Scotto 1541/3
*Gardane 1552a Gombert

GRANDSYRE

*Baethen 1556/3

LUPI

Attaingnant 1542 Lupi

Modern Editions

Lupi, *Opera omnia*, vol. I, p. 111.
Comments

On Grandsyre, see Chapter VI.

No. 135. *Ite in orbem* (à 5) Clemens/Manchicourt

Attributions and Sources

**CLEMENS**

Susato 1546/6 (attribution over 1.p. of S. and 1.p. and 2.p. of CT. T. B. Q.)
Susato 1553/12
Montanus & Neuber 1555/10

*CoimU 48
NurLA 28
*ZwiR 74/1

**MANCHICOURT**

Susato 1546/6 (attribution in index and over 2.p. of S.)

**ANON.**

DressL Pirna VIII

Modern Editions

Clemens, *Opera omnia*, vol. IX, p. 7.
Manchicourt, *Opera omnia*, vol. VI, p. 93.

No. 136. *Jam non dicam vos servos* (à 5) Hellinck/Richafort

Attributions and Sources

**HELLINCK**

*TrevBC 30

**RICHAFORT**

Moderne 1532/9
Petreius 1540/6
Du Chemin 1553/2
Montanus & Neuber 1555/10
*Le Roy & Ballard 1556 Richafort
ModD 3
*MunBS 1503b
MunU 401
RegB 940-1
*RegB B223-33
RegB C99
*UppsU 76c
*VienNB Mus. 9814

ANON.

LeidGA 1438
LeipU 49
PadBC A17

Modern Editions

Monumenta Musica Neerlandica, vol. IX, p. 60.

--- Je prens congé Gombert/Josquin

See Tulerunt Dominum meum (No. 245)

No. 137. Job tonso capite (à 5) Clemens/Morales

Attributions and Sources

CLEMENS

*Cardane 1549/8
*Waelrant & Laet 1554/6
Susato 1554/9
Montanus & Neuber 1559/1

MORALES

Scotto 1549/7

Modern Editions

Clemens, Opera omnia, vol. IX, p. 70.
No. 138. **Jubilate Deo** (à 6) Jacquet/Morales  
  
**Attributions and Sources**  
  
**JACQUET**  
  Moderne 1542/5 (attribution in S. T.)  
  
**MORALES**  
  Moderne 1542/5 (attribution in index and A. CT. B.)  
  *Valderarábano 1547/25 (intabulation)*  
  Scotto 1549/3  
  Montesdoca 1554/32 (intabulation)  
  
**Modern Editions**  
  
No. 139. **Judea et Jerusalem** (à 4) Isaac/Obrecht  
  
**Attributions and Sources**  
  
**ISAAC**  
  Petreius 1538/7  
  *RegB 838-43*  
  
**OBRECHT**  
  DressSL 1/D/505  
  
**ANON.**  
  *DressSL Grimma 59*  
  LeipU 51  
  *ZwiR 94/1*  
  
**Modern Editions**  
  None.
No. 140. **Judica me, Deus** (à 4) Caen/Josquin

**Attributions and Sources**

**CAEN**

Petrucci 1519/1  
Dorico 1526/2  
KasL 24

**JOSQUIN**

Petreius 1538/6  
Montanus & Neuber 1553/4

**ANON.**

DressL 1/D/6

**Modern Editions**


**Comments**

Osthoff concludes that this motet is stylistically unlike those by Josquin (*Josquin*, vol. II, p. 129).

---

No. 141. **Justum deduxit Dominus** (à 4) Crecquillon/De Latre

**Attributions and Sources**

**CRECUILLON**

Ulhard 1548/2  
Phalèse 1559 **Crecquillon**  
*Phalèse 1576 **Crecquillon**

LeidGA 1438

**DE LATRE**

Susato 1553/9
Modern Editions

Monumenta Musica Neerlandica, vol. IX, p. 29.

Comments

Marshall attributes the motet to Crecquillon on the grounds that four sources ascribe it to him (*Four-voice Motets*, p. 19).

No. 142. *Laetare nova Syon* (à 4) De Silva/Josquin

Attributions and Sources

DE SILVA

Moderne 1532/10

*BergBC 1209
*TrevBC 8

Josquin

*Gardane 1546/25 (intabulation)
*Gardane 1546/26 (intabulation)

Modern Editions

De Silva, *Opera omnia*, vol. I, p. 36.

Comments

Kirsch suggests that, since Josquin’s motet *Adiutus nobis* is inserted between two parts of our motet in *BergBC 1209*, the editor of the Gardane prints could have thought that *Laetare nova Syon*, too, was by Josquin. He also points out that three sources, *BergBC 1209* and the two Gardane intabulations, are stemmatically close (*Die Motetten des De Silva*, p. 65).
No. 143. Laqueus contributus est (à 4) Clemens/Gombert

Attributions and Sources

CLEMENS

Phalèse 1559e Clemens

GOMBERT

Montanus & Neuber 1554/11

CambraiBM 125-8

Modern Editions

Clemens, Opera omnia, vol. XIX, p. 64.

Comments

See Chapter V for a discussion of the piece.

No. 144. Lauda Jerusalem (à 4) Heugel/Josquin/Maistre Jhan

Attributions and Sources

HEUGEL

Formschneider 1537/1

JOSQUIN

KasL 24

MAISTRE JHAN

FlorL 666

ANON.

*VatP 1980-1

Modern Editions

Comments

Lowinsky accepts the ascription to Maistre Jhan in FlorL 666, claiming that the manuscript is authoritative. He also suggests that the reason for the attribution to Heugel in Formschneider 1537/1 could have been the result of confusion with Heugel's five-voice setting of the same text (The Medici Codex, vol. I, p. 126).

No. 145. Laudate Dominum omnes gentes (I) (à 5) Berchem/
Jacquet/Sermisy

Attributions and Sources

BERCHEM

Montanus & Neuber 1559/1

JACQUET

Gardane 1540 Jacquet
Petreius 1542/6 (attribution in index)
RegB B211-5

SERMISY

Petreius 1542/6 (attribution in D.)

Modern Editions

None.

No. 146. Laudate Dominum omnes gentes (II) (à 16) Eckel/
Josquin

Attributions and Sources

ECKEL

CopKB 1872
DresSL Grimma 49

JOSQUIN

LeipU 49
Modern Editions
   None.

No. 147. *Laudate pueri Dominum* (à 5) Hellinck/Vinders

Attributions and Sources

   **HELLINCK**

   Kriesstein 1545/3
   *Formschneider 1544/20

   **VINDERS**

   *Susato 1557/3

Modern Editions
   None.

Comments

   Blackburn concludes that this motet is stylistically unlike those of Hellinck ("The Lupus Problem," p. 304).

No. 148. *Laudem dicite Deo nostro* (I) (à 5) Jacquet/
   Manchicourt

Attributions and Sources

   **JACQUET**

   Gardane 1540  *Jacquet*

   **MANCHICOURT**

   Attaignant 1539  *Manchicourt*
   Attaignant 1545  *Manchicourt*

   **ANON.**

   RegB B211-5

Modern Editions

   Manchicourt, *Opera omnia*, vol. I, p. 69.
Comments

Nugent accepts the attribution to Manchicourt, since the motet is included in two Parisian collections of Attainant ("The Jacquet Motets," p. 207).

No. 149. **Laudem dicite Deo nostro** (II) (à 5) P. Animuccia/ Rore

Attributions and Sources

ANIMUCCIA

ParisBNC 851

RORE

*Gardane 1595 Rore

ModE C.313

*MunBS B

*TrevBC 4

Modern Editions

Rore, *Opera omnia*, vol. VI, p. 64.

--- **Laudemus Dominum** Contino/Jacquet

See *Surge Petre* (II) (No. 237)

No. 150. **Lectio actuum apostolorum** (à 5) Josquin/Viardot

(= *Dum completerunt*)

Attributions and Sources

JOSQUIN

Petrucci 1519/3

Dorico 1526/4

MunU 401

VIARDOT

VatS 42 ("Dum completerunt")
ANON.

Grimm & Wyrsung 1520/4

Modern Editions


Comments

Noting that the version in VatS 42 does not have the opening phrase of Lectio..., Sherr suggests that only that opening phrase was composed by Josquin ("The Papal Chapel," p. 236).

For further details, see Chapter V.

No. 151. Levavi oculos meos (à 4) Gombert/Richafort

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Scotto 1539a Gombert
Gardane 1541 Gombert
Scotto 1541/4

RICHAFORT

KönSU 1740

Modern Editions

Gombert, Opera omnia, vol. V, p. 47.

No. 152. Locutus est Dominus (à 5) Jacquet/Lupus

Attributions and Sources

JACQUET

Gardane 1538/4
*Scotto 1549/4
*Gardane 1549/5
Montanus & Neuber 1559/1
*Scotto 1565b Jacquet

Bo1C Q27(I)
ModE C.313
LUPUS

RegB B211-5

ANON.

Formschneider 1538/3

*LucBS 775
MunBS 16
*PiacD (5)
*TrevBC 6

Modern Editions

None.

---Lugebat David Absalon Gombert/Josquin

See Tulerunt Dominum meum (II) (No. 245)

No. 153. Magnus es tu Domine (à 4) Finck/Josquin

Attributions and Sources

FINCK

Formschneider 1538/3

JOSQUIN

Petrus 1547/1 Dodecachordon

MunU 322-5
SGals 463
*VienNB Mus. 15500

JOSQUIN alias FINCK

RegB B211-5

ANON.

Petrucci 1504/1
Modern Editions


No. 154. *Mane nobiscum Domine* (à 5) Clemens/Crecquillon

Attributions and Sources

**CLEMENS**

Phalèse 1554/1  
Montanus & Neuber 1554/10

BrusC 27088  
KasL 91  
LeidGA 1438

**CRECQUILLON**

Scotto 1554/16

**ANON.**

*ClnU 57*

Modern Editions


No. 155. *Manus tue Domini fecerunt* (à 4) Danglon/Pesenti

Attributions and Sources

**DANGLON**

*VerBC 760*

**PESENTI**

[Antico?] [1521]/6 ("Manus Domini fecerunt me")

**ANON.**

CasAC D(F)  
*CorBC 95-6/ParisBNN 1817*
Modern Editions


No. 156. **Maria Magdalenæ** (à 5) Gombert/Manchicourt

**Attributions and Sources**

**GOMBERT**

Montanus & Neuber 1554/10

*WrocS 2 (intabulation)*

**MANCHICOURT**

Moderne 1539/5

Gardane 1539/6

**Modern Editions**


Manchicourt, *Opera omnia*, vol. VI, p. 122.

No. 157. **Maria virgo semper laetare** (à 4) Gascongne/Mouton

**Attributions and Sources**

**GASCONGNE**

Attaingnant 1534/3

**MOUTON**

Petrucci 1519/1

**ANON.**

*LonRC 1070 (without text)*

**Modern Editions**

Smijers, *Treize livres*, vol. I, p. 82.
No. 158. *Memorare piissima* (à 4) Escobar/Peña1osa

Attributions and Sources

**ESCOBAR**

*SevBC 1
*SevC 5-5-20
*TarazC 2

**PEÑALOSA**

BarcBC 454
*ToleBC 21

**ANON.**

*CoimU 12
*CoimU 32

Modern Editions

None.

Comments

Although Hardie does not discuss the conflicting attribution, she points out that there are four different version of this motet ("Motets of Peña1osa," vol. I, pp. 137-43).

No. 159. *Mirabile mysterium* (à 5) Berchem/Jacquet/Le Brung

Attributions and Sources

**BERCHEM**

Montanus & Neuber 1559/1

*RegB 853-4

**JACQUET**

Scotto 1539a [Jacquet]
Buglhat 1539/7
Gardane 1540 [Jacquet]
*Gardane 1553 [Jacquet]
*Gardane 1553/17
*Scotto 1565b [Jacquet]
*LucBS 775
ModE C.313

LE BRUNG

Schöffer 1539/8

ANON.

CasAC (C)
*WrocS 6 (intabulation)

Modern Editions

None.

No. 160. *Miseremini mei saltem vos* (à 4) Josquin/Mouton/Richafort

Attributions and Sources

JOSQUIN

Antico 1520/2

MOUTON

Petrus 1547/1 *Dodecachordon*

MunBS 16
SGallS 463

RICHAFORT

Petrucci 1519/1

VienNB Mus. 15941

ANON.

Attaingnant 1534/3

VatP 1976-9
*VatP 1980-1
Modern Editions


Comments

Antonowytch points out that, stylistically this
Gehrenbeck believes that the motet "undoubtedly
belongs to Mouton," since Glarean attributes it to him
Kabis attributes the work to Richafort on stylistic
Loach also assigns the piece to Richafort on
Picker accepts the ascription the motet to Richafort
on the grounds that he is named two independent sources:
Petrucci 1519/1 and ViennNB Mus. 15941 (*Motet Books of
Antico*, pp. 39-40).
Reese ascribes the piece to Mouton without giving
any reason (*Music in Renaissance*, p. 282, fn. 558).

No. 161. *Miserere mei Deus* (à 4) Carpentras/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

CARPENTRAS

Petrucci 1519/3
Dorico 1526/4

FlorBN II.I.232

MOUTON

Petreius 1538/6

ANON.

FlorBN Magl. 164-7

Modern Editions

Genet, *Opera omnia*, vol. V, p. 42.
No. 162. **Miserere mei Domine** (à 4) Bruck/Sermisy  

**Attributions and Sources**  

**ARUCK**  
RegB B211-5  

**SERMISY**  
Boglhat 1538/0  
Attaingnant 1542 Sermisy  
Petreius 1542/6  

**Modern Editions**  
None.  

No. 163. **Missus est Gabriel angelus** (à 5) Josquin/Mouton  

**Attributions and Sources**  

**JOSQUIN**  
Petrucci 1519/3  
Dorico 1526/3  

MunU 401 ("MVTON" was crossed out, then "IOSQVIN" was added by a contemporary hand)  
VatG XII.4  
*Vats 19  

**MOUTON**  
Grimm & Wyrsung 1520/4  
Montanus & Neuber 1559/1  
FlorL 666  

**Modern Editions**  
Comments


No. 164. *Ne reminiscaris Domine* (à 5) Comes/Maessens

Attributions and Sources

**COMES**

Montanus & Neuber 1556/8 (attribution in D. A.)

**MAESSENS**

Montanus & Neuber 1556/8 (attribution in index and B. V.)

Modern Editions

None.

Comments

According to *The New Grove*, Montanus & Neuber 1556/8 attributes this work to Gombert (vol. XI, p. 486). However, in the exemplar that I examined, the motet is not ascribed to him. We should note that the same print attributes another setting of the same text (for five voices) to Gombert, and that it appears just before the motet that we are considering here.

No. 165. *Nigra sum sed formosa* (I) (à 4) Conseil/Lupus

Attributions and Sources

**CONSEIL**

Attaingnant 1534/4
Moderne 1539/10

**LUPUS**

Bo1C Q19
ANON.

MunU 401

Modern Editions


Comments

Blackburn ascribes the motet to Conseil on stylistic grounds ("The Lupus Problem," p. 251).

No. 166. Nigra sum sed formosa (II) (à 5) Clemens/
Crecquillon

Attributions and Sources

CLEMENS

Phalèse 1554/1 (attribution in index)

CRECQUILLON

Phalèse 1554/1 (attribution in partbooks)
*Du Chemin 1551/1
Susato 1555/8
*Sylvius [1559]/5
*Phalèse 1576 Crecquillon

LeidGA 1438

Modern Editions

Monumenta musicae neerlandicae, vol. IX, p. 120.

No. 167. Nigra sum sed formosa (III) (à 5) Crecquillon/
Jacquet

Attributions and Sources

CRECQUILLON

*Susato 1553/16
*Susato 1557/4
Susato 1558/3
JACQUET

Gardane 1540 Jacquet
ModE C.313

Modern Editions


Comments

Nugent regards the attributions in the Italian sources more reliable than those in Susato’s prints ("The Jacquet Motets," pp. 201-2).

No. 168. Nisi Dominus edificaverit (à 4) Hellinck/
Le Heurteur/Lhéritier/Sermisy

Attributions and Sources

HELLINCK

Kholen 1558/20 (intabulation)

LE HEURTEUR

Attaingnant 1535/1
Scotto 1555/15

LHÉRITIER

Moderne 1532/10
Petreius 1539/9
Gardane 1539/12
Gardane 1545/4
Rampazetto 1564/6

*CoimU 48

SERMISY

CambraiBM 125-8

ANON.

KasL 24
LeidGA 1442
Modern Editions

Lhéritier, *Opera omnia*, p. 198.

Comments

Perkins accepts the attribution to Lhéritier simply because of their numerical preponderance (Lhéritier, *Opera omnia*, p. xxii).

No. 169. *Noe, noe, noe, hodie salvator mundi* (à 4) Jacquet/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

JACQUET

*BergBC 1209
BolC Q19

MOUTON

Montanus & Neuber 1554/10

*RegB 838-43
*WrocS 6 (intabulation)
*WrocS 15

ANON.

*PadBC D27

Modern Editions

No. 170. Non nobis Domine (à 4) Gascongne/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

GASCONGNE

Attaingnant 1535/3

MOUTON

Petrucci 1519/1
Dorico 1526/2

ANON.

VatP 1976-9

Modern Editions


Comments

See Chapter V for a discussion of the motet.

No. 171. Non turbetur cor vestrum (I) (à 4) Gosse/Manchicourt

Attributions and Sources

GOSSE

Gardane 1539/13
Gardane 1549/10
Scotto 1549/10a
Scotto 1562/2

BudOS 23
RegB 875-7

MANCHICOURT

LeidGA 1441

Modern Editions

None
No. 172. *Non turbetur cor vestrum* (II) (à 5) Le Roy/Verdelot

**Attributions and Sources**

**LE ROY**

Susato 1553/13

**VERDELOT**

Petreius 1540/6
Montanus & Neuber 1555/10

RegB 875-7
*WrocS 2 (intabulation)*
*WrocS 5*

**ANON.**

*Dressl 2/D/22*
*SionA 87-4*

**Modern Editions**

Verdelot, *Opera omnia*, vol. III, p. 66.

**Comments**

Böker-Heil concludes that the motet is not by Verdelot on stylistic grounds. He also points out that the sources with the Verdelot attributions are of German origin, and thus unreliable (*Die Motteten von Verdelot* p. 211).

No. 173. *Nos autem gloriari oportet* (à 5) Crecquillon/Lupi

**Attributions and Sources**

**CRECQUILLON**

*VienNB Mus. 19189*

**LUPI**

*BrusC 27088*
Modern Editions

Lupi, Opera omnia, vol. II, p. 86.

Comments

See Chapter V for a comment on the motet.

No. 174. Nuptiae factae sunt (à 4) Barra/Elimot

Attributions and Sources

BARRA

Antico 1521/3
SGallS 463

ELIMOT

FlorL 666

ANON.

[Antico] [c1521]/7

CasAC D(F)
CivMA 59
DresSSL 1/D/6
LeipU 51
PadBC A17
RegB 940-1
RegB B211-5
RegB C120
*WrocS 12

Modern Editions


Comments

Rifkin concludes that no approach--whether stylistic or bibliographical--provides enough evidence to resolve the conflicting attribution (The New Grove, vol. II, p. 178).
No. 175. *O admirabile commercium* (à 5) Josquin/Regis

Attributions and Sources

JOSQUIN

LeidGA 1439 (without 3.p)

REGIS

*VatC 234

Modern Editions

Regis, *Opera omnia*, vol. II, p. 49.

Comments

See Chapter V for a discussion of the motet.

No. 176. *O beata infantia* (à 6) Richafort/Willaert

Attributions and Sources

RICHAFORT

*Le Roy & Ballard 1556 Richafort

ModD 9

WILLAERT

RomeV 35-40

Modern Editions


Comments

Kabis assigns the motet to Richafort on stylistic grounds ("The Works of Richafort," pp. 23-5).
No. 177. O bone Jesu (I) (à 4) Anchieta/Compère/Penálosa/Ribera

Attributions and Sources

ANCHIETA
SegC s.s.

COMPÈRE
Petrucci 1519/2
Dorico 1526/3

PEÑALOSA
BarcBC 454

RIBERA
*TarazC 2

ANON.
*CoiMU 12
*BarcOC 5

Modern Editions

Compère, Opera omnia, vol.IV, p. 27.

Comments

Baker attributes the motet to Anchieta, since she believes that SegC s.s. is a reliable source ("An Unnumbered Manuscript," pp. 50-1).

Finscher, on the other hand, regards Petrucci 1519/1 to be a more reliable source (Loyset Compère, p. 180).

Ros points out that the three different endings with which the work is transmitted came about through successive revisions that play upon the last two words of the piece, "finem meum (my ending)" ("Barcelona Manuscript").

No. 178. O bone Jesu (II) (à 4) Clemens/Manchicourt

Attributions and Sources

CLEMENS
Montanus & Neuber 1556/8

MANCHICOURT

*MontsM 772

ANON.

Susato 1554/8

Modern Editions

Manchicourt, *Opera omnia*, vol. VI, p. 160.

Comments

According to Kempers, this motet is attributed to Clemens in the index of Montanus & Neuber 1556/8, but to Maessens in the partbooks of that print. He concludes that Maessens is the more likely composer ("Bibliography of the Sacred Works," p. 150).

However, the exemplar that I looked at attributes the motet only to Clemens, in both the indices and all partbooks.

No. 179. *O Christe redemptor* (à 4) Maessens/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

MAESSENS

LeipU 49

MOUTON

Petrucci 1519/1
Antico 1521/5
Dorico 1526/2

ANON.

*ZwiR 73

Modern Editions

Comments

Even though Picker accepts the work as Mouton's—he dismisses the attribution to Maessens as unreliable—he proposes that Maessens might have been responsible for rhythmic changes that improve the text-music relationship (Motet Books of Antico, p. 59).

For more detail, see Chapter V.

No. 180. O doctor optime (à 5) Gombert/Ruffo

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Scotto 1541/3

RUFFO

*Castiglione 1542 Ruffo

Modern Editions

None.

---O fili Dei Gombert/Verdelot

See Sancta Maria succurre (No. 219)

No. 181. O genetrix gloriosa (à 4) Compère/Richafort
(2.p. Ave virgo gloriosa)

Attributions and Sources

COMPERE

VatS 46

RICHAFORT

CopKB 1848
ANON.

Petrucci 1502/1

M6ID 1 (2.p. only)
M6ID 2 (2.p. only)
M6ID 3 (1.p. only)
*SienBC K.I.2

Modern Editions

Compère, Opera omnia, vol. IV, p. 29.

Comments

Finscher suggests that CopK 1848 ascribes the piece to Richafort because of his parody Mass based on the motet (Lovset Compère, p. 187, fn. 16).

No. 182. O pulcherrima mulierum (à 4) Baudeweyn/Festa/Fevin /Mouton

(2.p. Descendi in hortum meum)

Attributions and Sources

BAULDEWEYN

Petrucci 1519/3 (see Comments)
Dorico 1526/4 (see Comments)

C. FESTA

Bo1C R142

FEVIN

Kriesstein 1540/7 (2.p. only)
VienNB Mus. 15941

MOUTON

BarcBC 454
SGallS 530 (intabulation, 1.p. only)
ANON.

Bo1C Q27 (I)
PadBC A17
VerBC 760

Modern Editions

None.

Comments


Sparks shows that the attribution to Bauldewyne in the main body of Petrucci 1519/3 is not an attribution, but simply misreading of the headline by present-day scholars. He thus claims that this motet cannot be regarded as Bauldeweyn's. He further points out that the attribution to Bauldeweyn in the index of Dorico 1526/4 is simply a printing mistake (Music of Bauldeweyn, pp. 17-22 and fn. 11).

According to Sparks again, the motet is ascribed to Josquin in the index of Petrucci 1519/3. However, in the index of the exemplar at London British Library, the motet is anonymous.

In connection with the attributions to Fevin and Mouton, see Chapter V.

NO. 183. O sacrum convivium (à 5) Arcadelt/Jacquet

Attributions and Sources

ARCADELT

Buglhat 1539/7
Montanus & Neuber 1555/11
RomeV 35-40

JACQUET

*Scotto 1565b Jacquet

Modern Editions

Comments

Nugent explains that the inclusion of this work in the Jacquet collection was a result of Scotto's borrowing some works from Buglhat 1539/7 ("The Jacquet Motets," p. 207).

However, Nugent does not explain how the attribution was changed from Arcadelt to Jacquet.

No. 184. *O salutaris hostia* (à 6) Verdelot/Willaert

Attributions and Sources

VERDELOT

*ToleBC 10

WILLAERT

Gardane 1542/10
RomeV 35-40
VatG XII.4

ANON.

CasAC (C)

Modern Editions

Willaert, *Opera omnia*, vol. IV, p. 55.

---*Orabat Jesum mulier* Jacquet/Morales/Rore

See *Clamabat autem mulier chananea* (No. 41)

No. 185. *Os loquentium iniqua* (à 4) Clemens/Crecquillon

Attributions and Sources

CLEMENS

Phalèse 1559e *Clemens*

CRECQUILLON

Susato 1553/9
LeidGA 1441

Modern Editions

Clemens, *Opera omnia*, vol. XX, p. 8.

---Osculetur me Craen/La Rue

See *Sancta maria virgo* (No. 220)

No. 186. *Paradisi portas aperuit nobis* (à 4) Lupus/Renaldo

Attributions and Sources

LUPUS

*VerBC 760

RENALDO

Bo1C Q19

Modern Editions

None.

Comments


No. 187. *Pastores loquebantur* (à 5) Clemens/Crecquillon

Attributions and Sources

CLEMENS

Susato 1555/9
Montanus & Neuber 1559/1

*RegB 853-4

CRECQUILLON

LeidGA 1441

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
ANON.

*DressL Grimma 53
DressL Pirna II

Modern Editions

Clemens, Opera omnia, vol. XVII, p. 33.

No. 188. Pater noster (à 4) Obrecht/Willaert
(Z.p. Ave Maria)

Attributions and Sources

OBRECHT

LeipU 49 (1.p only)

WILLAERT

Moderne 1532/10
Attaingnant 1534/4 (1.p. only)
Petreius 1538/7 (1.p. only)
Gardane 1539/12
*Gardane 1545c Willaert
Gardane 1545/4
*Juan 1546/14 (intabulation)
*Cordova 1547/25 (intabulation)
*Scotto 1548/12 (intabulation)
*Pisador 1552/35 (intabulation)
Du Chemin 1553/2 (1.p. only)
Rampazetto 1564/6

LeidGA 1442 (1.p. only)
LondRC 2037
MunU 326
ParisBNC 851 (1.p. only)
RegB 875-7
RegB 940-1
RegB C99
*RomeSC 792-5
*ToleBC 21
*Vallap s.s. (1.p. only)
*VerBC 760 (1.p. only)
*VienNB Mus. 15500
ANON.

CasAC N(H)
ChiN M91 (1.p. only)
*FlorD 27
LeipU 51
TrevBC 34
VatP 1976-9 (1.p. only)
*VatVM 571

Modern Editions

Willaert, Opera omnia, vol. II, p. 11.

Comments

Although Long does not doubt Willaert's authorship of the motet, she points out that the secunda pars, "Ave Maria" should be considered as a separate motet, because two partes are stylistically different ("The Motets of Willaert," pp. 81 and 91-3).

No. 189. Pater peccavi (I) (à 4) Clemens/Manchicourt

Attributions and Sources

Clemens

*Moderne 1547/2
Susato 1547/5
*Phalèse 1555/5
Phalèse 1559d Clemens
*Phalèse 1568/23

AnsbachS 16
LeidGA 1441
*ToleBC 13

Manchicourt

*Montanus & Neuber 1546/8
Montanus & Neuber 1556/9

*BerIPS 40043
DresSL Glasshütte 5
RegB 940-1
ANON.

*ColnU 57  
*CopKB 1873  
*LüneR 144  
*RegB 1018  
SionA 87-4  
*WrccS 1 (intabulation)

Modern Editions

Clemens, *Opera omnia*, vol. IX, p. 1.  
Manchicourt, *Opera omnia*, vol. VI, p. 163.

No. 190. *Pater peccavi* (II) (à 5) Clemens/Manchicourt

Attributions and Sources

CLEMENS

Susato 1553/14 (attribution in CT.)

MANCHICOURT

Susato 1546/7  
Susato 1553/14 (attribution in all places but CT.)  
Montanus & Neuber 1556/8

MontsM 772  
RegB 940-1

Modern Editions

Manchicourt, *Opera omnia*, vol. VI, p. 169.

Comments

On the attribution to Clemens, see Chapter V.

No. 191. *Pater peccavi* (III) (à 8) Clemens/Crecquillon

Attributions and Sources

CLEMENS

Phalèse 1555/5
CRECQUILLON

Montanus & Neuber 1564/1
*Wyriot 1578/1

MunBS 41
StuttL 13

Modern Editions

Clemens, Opera Omnia, vol. XVI, p. 96

No. 192. Peto Domine (à 5) Caussin/Gombert

Attributions and Sources

CAUSSIN

Moderne 1542/5
*Gardane 1548 Caussin
Montanus & Neuber 1556/8

GOMBERT

Scotto 1541b Gombert
*Gardane 1552b Gombert

Modern Editions

Gombert, Opera omnia, vol. VIII, p. 115.

No. 193. Philomena praevia (à 4) Richafort/Sermisy

Attributions and Sources

RICHAFORT

Antico 1520/1
*[Antico?] [1521/4]
*Le Roy & Ballard 1556 Richafort

CambraiBM 125-8
RegB C99

SERMISTRY

*CoimU 48
ANON.

*Attaingnant [1528]/2

Modern Editions


No. 194. Planxit autem David (à 4) Josquin/Ninot le petit

Attributions and Sources

JOSQUIN

Le Roy & Ballard 1555 Josquin
Petrus 1547/1 Dodecachordon

SGalls 463
*VatS 38

NINOT

FlorBN II.I.232

ANON.

Petrucci 1504/1
DresSL 1/D/505

Modern Editions

No. 195. *Pontificum sublime decus* (à 5) Hellinck/Lupi

Attributions and Sources

**HELLINCK**

* Susato 1546/7

**LUPI**

Moderne 1538/2
Moderne 1539/4
Gardane 1539/6
* Moderne 1542/4

Modern Editions

Lupi, *Opera omnia*, vol. II, p. 98.

Comments

Blackburn ascribes the motet to Lupi on both bibliographic and stylistic grounds (Lupi, *Opera omnia*, vol. II, p. xxiii).

No. 196. *Puer natus est nobis* (I) (à 4) Josquin/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

**JOSQUIN**

Dressl Grimma 51

**MOUTON**

Bo1C Q19
FlorBN II.1.232
ModD 9
VatS 46
VienNB Mus. 15941

**ANON.**

*[Antico] [c1521]/7

*BolSP 29
PadBC A17
Modern Editions

None.

No. 197. **Puer natus est nobis (II) (à 4)** Mahu/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

**MAHU**

Rhaw 1538/8 (attribution in B.)

**MOUTON**

Rhaw 1538/8 (attributions in index and A.)

**ANON.**

*Welack 1591/25*

ErlU 473/4
LeipU 51
MunU 326
RegB 940-1

Modern Editions

Albrecht, *Symphoniae jucundae 1538*, p. 15.

Comments

Noblitt suggests that the attribution to Mouton in Rhaw 1538/8 was the result of confusion with a setting of the same text by that composer ("Reconstruction of Thomaskirche 51," p. 70, fn. 54).

In the worklist for Josquin, Noble erroneously states that this motet and the previous one (No. 196) are identical (*The New Grove*, vol. IX, p. 735).
No. 198. **Puer qui natus est** (à 5) Gombert/Ruffo

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Scotto 1541/3

RUFFO

*Castiglione 1542 Ruffo

Modern Editions

None.

No. 199. **Quam dilecta tabernacula** (à 5) Certon/Josquin

Attributions and Sources

CERTON

Montanus & Neuber 1553/5 (attribution in index and B.)

JOSQUIN

Montanus & Neuber 1553/5 (attribution in A.)

Modern Editions

None.

No. 200. **Quam pulchra es** (I) (à 4) Lupi/Verdelot

Attributions and Sources

LUPI

*Moderne 1532/11
Gardane 1539/12
Attaingnant 1542 Lupi
Gardane 1545/4
Rampazetto 1564/6
CambraiBM 125-8
LeipU 51
*LeuVU 163
RomeM 23-4

VERDELOT

Rhaw 1538/8
RegB 940-1

ANON.

LeipU 49

Modern Editions

Lupi, Opera omnia, vol. I, p. 130.
Albrecht, Symphoniae jucundae 1538, p. 29.

No. 201. Quam pulchra es (II) (à 4) Jacquet/Lupi/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

JACQUET

*Scotto 1565 Jacquet

LUPI

Buglhat 1538/5
Petreius 1540/6
RegB 940-1

MOUTON

CambraiBM 125-8

ANON.

DressL 1/D/501
LeipU 51
*PadBC D27
*WrocS 8
Modern Editions

Clemens, Opera omnia, vol. VII, p. 77 (as a model for Clemens's mass).

Comments

Blackburn points out that the motet is stylistically unlike those of Lupi. She suggests that Buglhat confused our motet with Lupi's authentic setting of the same text ("The Lupus Problem," pp. 358-9).

No. 202. **Quam pulchra es** (III) (à 4) Josquin/Moulu/Mouton/Verdelot

Attributions and Sources

**JOSQUIN**

Montanus & Neuber 1559/2
Formschneider 1537/1 (attribution in index)

**MOULU**

Formschneider 1537/1 (attribution in partbooks)

Bo1C Q19
RegB B220-2
SGalls 463
*ToleBC 10 (attribution in index)
*ZwiR 81/2

**MOUTON**

Petrucci 1519/2
Dorico 1526/3

Bo1C R142

**VERDELOT**

*ToleBC 10 (attribution over music)

**ANON.**

*[Antico?] [1521]/4
Modern Editions


Comments

Chapman attributes the work to Moulu on stylistic
Loach also uses style as his criterion, but decides
that the work is not by Moulu ("Tschudi's Songbook," p.
206).
Antonowytch claims that the motet is not by Josquin

No. 203. Queramus cum pastoribus (à 4) Josquin/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

JOSQUIN

*Gardane 1546/25 (intabulation)
*Gardane 1546/26 (intabulation)

MOUTON

Antico 1521/3
Attaingnant 1529/1
Du Chemin 1553/2
Le Roy & Ballard 1555 Mouton
Montanus & Neuber 1559/2

DresSL Grimma 51
*MadM 6832
*RegB 786-837
*RegB 838-43
*RegB 878-82
SGal1S 463
VatS 46

ANON.

*[Antico?] [1521]/4
*[Antico?] [1521]/7
No. 204. **Qui consolabatur me** (à 5) Clemens/Morales

Attributions and Sources

**Clemens**

- Phalèse 1554/1
- Phalèse 1555/2
- Montanus & Neuber 1556/8
- Susato 1557/4

**Morales**

- ParisBNC 851

Modern Editions

- Clemens, *Opera omnia*, vol. XIV, p. 22.
- Morales, *Opera omnia*, vol. VIII, p. 68.

No. 205. **Qui paracletus diceris** (à 6) Isaac/Rener

Attributions and Sources

**Isaac**

- Montanus & Neuber 1564/3
- *RegB* 878-82
RENER

Rhaw 1542/12

ANON.

*BudOS P6
*StuttL 24

Modern Editions


No. 206. Quis dabit mihi pennas (à 4) Clemens/Crecquillon

Attributions and Sources

CLEMENS

Phalèse 1559f Clemens

CRECQUILLON

Scotto 1554/14

Modern editions

Clemens, Opera omnia, vol. XX, p. 71.

No. 207. Quis dabit oculis (à 4) Festa/Senfl

Attributions and Sources

C. FESTA

BoLC Q19

SENFL

Formschneider 1538/3

Modern Editions

C. Festa, Opera omnia, vol. V, p. 25.
Comments

Main concludes that the motet was originally written by Festa for the death of Anne of Brittany and that Senfl was responsible for adapting it to a revised text to commemorate the death of Maxmilian I ("Funeral Motet," pp. 173-89).

No. 208. *Quis est iste qui prograditur* (à 5) Luperi/Sermisy

Attributions and Sources

LUPI

LeidGA 1439

SERMISY

Attaingnant 1542 Sermisy
Kriesstein 1545/3

Modern Editions

None.

Comments

Blackburn assigns the work to Sermisy, arguing that LeidGA 1439 is late and thus not reliable ("The Lupus Problem," p. 313).

No. 209. *Repleatur os meum* (à 5) Berchem/Jacquet

Attributions and Sources

BERCHEM

Montanus & Neuber 1559/1

JACQUET

Gardane 1538/4
Scotto 1539a *Jacquet*
Kriesstein 1540/7
Moderne 1542/5
*Scotto 1549/4
*Gardane 1549/5
*Scotto 1565a *Jacquet*
BolC Q27(I)
ModE C.313
VatG Xi 4

ANON.
BudOS 23
*PadBC D27
*PiacD (3)
RomeV 35-40

Modern Editions
None.

No. 210. Retribuere dignare Domine (à 4) Jacquet/Verdelot

Attributions and Sources

JACQUET
Scotto 1539b Jacquet
Scotto 1544 Jacquet
Gardane 1545 Jacquet
BolC Q20

VERDELOT
*BergBC 1209

ANON.
*PadBC D27

Modern Editions
Jacquet, Opera omnia, vol. IV, p. 87.

Comments

Nugent favors Jacquet on the grounds that the work is included in three different Jacquet collections ("Jacquet Motets," p. 170).
No. 211. *Rex autem David* (à 4) Gascongne/La Fage/Lupus

Attributions and Sources

GASCONGNE

Antico 1521/5
Attaingnant 1535/3
KônSU 1740

LA FAGE

[Antico?] [1521]/6

LUPUS

Moderne [1539]/11

ANON.

PadBC A17
RegB 940-1

Modern Editions


Comments

Picker attributes the motet to Gascongne because he is named in more sources than any of the other composers (*Motet Books of Antico*, p. 64).

No. 212. *Salus populi ego sum* (à 5) Cadéac/Hesdin

Attributions and Sources

CADÉAC

Attaingnant 1535/5
Schöffer 1539/8
Le Roy & Ballard 1555 Cadéac

HESDIN

Buglhat 1539/7
ANON.

*Zwir 46/120

Modern Editions


--- **Salva nos Christe salvator** Clemens/Manchicourt

See *Vidi speciosam* (No. 260)

No. 213. **Salva nos Domine** (I) (à 4) Isaac/La Rue

(*Agnus Dei III* of Missa Salva nos = Christe eleison)

Attributions and Sources

ISAAC

*Formschneider 1539/2* ("Agnus Dei" as a part of the Mass)

*BasU F.IX.55* ("Agnus Dei" as a part of the Mass)

LA RUE

Rhaw 1538/8

ANON.

*KasL 53/2
MunU 326
RegB 940-1* ("Christe eleison")

*VerBC 756* ("Agnus Dei" as a part of the Mass)

Modern Editions

None.
No. 214. Salva nos Domine (II) (à 6) Josquin/Mouton/Willaert

Attributions and Sources

JOSQUIN

BoIC R142

MOUTON

Antico [1521]/6
Kriesstein 1540/7
*Montanus & Neuber 1558/4

BoIC Q19
FlorL 666
*’S HerAB 72C
ModD 9
*StuttL 3
*VatS 38

WILLAERT

Gardane 1542/10

ANON.

*VatP 1980-1

Modern Editions

Willaert, Opera omnia, vol. IV, p. 65.

Comments

Lowinsky ascribes the work to Mouton, because FlorL 666 and eight other sources name him as the composer (The Medici Codex, vol. I, p. 179).
No. 215. *Salvator mundi, Salva nos* (à 4) Lhéritier/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

LHÉRITIER

VatG XII.4

MOUTON

SGallS 463
VallaC 5 (1p)

ANON.

Antico 1520/2
[Antico?] [c1521]/7

CasAC D(F)
*SGallS 464
*VatP 1980-1

Modern Editions

Lhéritier, *Opera omnia*, p. 72.

Comments

Perkins is unable to decide who composed the motet, since he believes that VatG XII.4 and SGallS 463 are equally authoritative for their respective composers (Lhéritier, *Opera omnia*, p. xxiii).

Picker favors Lhéritier, pointing to both the reliability of VatG XII.4, and the stylistic features of the motet (*Motet Books of Antico*, p. 42).

No. 216. *Salve regina* (à 6) Jacquet/Josquin/Verdelot

Attributions and Sources

JACQUET

BoLC R142 (attribution in the first index)
*VatS 24

JOSQUIN

BoLC R142 (attribution in the second index)
VERDELOT

RomeV 35-40

Modern Editions

Verdelot, *Opera omnia*, vol. II, p. 58.

Comments

Böker-Heil ascribes the motet to Verdelot on stylistic grounds (*Motetten von Verdelot*, pp. 211-4).

No. 217. *Sana me Domine* (à 4) Lupino/Willaert

Attributions and Sources

**LUPINO**

*Gardane 1549 Lupino

**WILLAERT**

*Gerlach 1567/1

Modern Editions

None.

No. 218. *Sancta et immaculata* (à 4) Gombert/Hesdin

Attributions and Sources

**GOMBERT**

VatG XII.4

**HESDIN**

*Attaingnant 1534/6
*Buglhat 1538/5
*Petreius 1540/6

ANON.
CambraiBM 125-8
LeipU 51
MunU 401

Modern Editions

Smijers, Treize livres, vol. IV, p. 182.

No. 219. Sancta maria succurre (à 4) Gombert/Verdelot
(= O fili dei)

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Kohlen 1558/20 (intabulation)

VERDELOT

Attaingnant 1529/1
Attaingnant 1534/4
Formschneider 1538/3 ("O fili dei")
Gardane 1539/13
Gardane 1549/10
Scotto 1549/10a
Scotto 1549/15
Du Chemin 1553/2
Montanus & Neuber 1559/2 ("O fili dei")
Scotto 1562/2

MunBS 16
RegB 891-2 ("O fili dei")
RegB B225
*WrocS 1 ("O fili dei," intabulation)

ANON.

PadBC A17
RegB 940-1 ("O fili dei")

Modern Editions


Comments

Gombert wrote a parody mass modeled on this motet.
No. 220. *Sancta maria virgo* (à 3) Craen/La Rue
(2.p. O *Maria virgo* = *Ecce video* = *Osculetur me*)

Attributions and Sources

**CRAEN**

Petrucci 1502/1 ("Ecce video")
*Egenolff [c1535/14] ("Ecce video")
*Petreius 1536/13 ("Ecce video," intabulation)
Petrus 1547/1 *Dodecachordon* ("Ecce video")

CambraiBM 125-8 ("Osculetur me")
MunU 322-5 ("Ecce video")
SGallS 463 ("Ecce video")
*SGallS 530 ("Ecce video," intabulation)

**LA RUE**

FlorBN 2439

**ANON.**

*Egenolff [c1535/14] ("Ecce video")
Formschneider 1538/9 (without text, 1.p. only)

**Modern Editions**


No. 221. *Sancta maria virgo virginum* (à 6) Josquin/Verdelot
(=*Ave Jesu Christe* = *Christus resurgens*)

Attributions and Sources

**JOSQUIN**

*WrocS 1 ("Ave Jesu Christe" intabulation)*
*WrocS 2 ("Christus resurgens" intabulation)*
*WrocS 5 ("Christus resurgens")

**VERDELOT**

Moderne 1538/2
Moderne 1539/4
*Moderne 1542/4
*Eichorn 1573/27 ("Ave Jesu Christe" intabulation)
*Sanchez 1578/24 (intabulation)
ModD 9
*MunBS 59
*MunBS 266 (intabulation)
*MunU 401 (without text)
*RegB 393 ("Ave Jesu Christe")
*RegB 1018
*RomeV 35-40
*SchmalT s.s. ("Ave Jesu Christe")
*ToleBC 10
*VallaC 15
*VienNB Mus. 16195 ("Ave Jesu Christe")

ANON.

*Attaingnant [1528]/2
*Gardane 1547/22 (intabulation)

ChiN M91
FlorBN Magl. 125bis
LeidGA 1439
LonBLR A49-54
*PiacD (5)
*VatS 38
*WrocS 6 ("Sancta Maria vel Christus resurgens" intabulation)
*ZwiR 96/1 ("Ave Jesu Christe")

Modern Editions

Verdelot, Opera omnia, vol. II, p. 42.

No. 222. Sancta mater, istud agas (à 4) Josquin/Peñalosa

Attributions and Sources

JOSQUIN

BarcBC 454

PEÑALOSA

*SevC 5-5-20
*TarazC 2
*ToleBC 21
Modern Editions

Josquin, Motetten, vol. supplement, p. 41.

Comments

Ros assigns the work to Peñalosa, since the attribution in BarcBC 454 was added by a later hand ("Barcelona 454").

No. 223. Sancta trinitas unus Deus (I) (à 4/6) Craen/Festa /Fevin/Josquin/Morales

Attributions and Sources

CRAEN
KönsU 1740

C. FESTA
*TrevBC 5

FEVIN

Petrucci 1514/1
Dorico 1526/1
Montanus & Neuber 1555/11 (à 6, "Fevin. Arnoldus de Bruck addidit duas voces")
*Montanus & Neuber 1558/4 (à 6)
Kholen 1558/20 (intabulation)

BarcBC 454
CambriP 1760
DressS Glashütte 5 (à 6)
*LübBH 203
*ModD 9
*RegB 883-6 (à 6)
RegB 940-1 (à 6)
*StuttL 25
*TolBC 13
*UppsU 76c
*VatC 234
*VerBC 760
*WrocS 3 (intabulation, à 6, "Fevin. Arn. de Bruck addidit duas voces")
*WrocS 5 (à 6, "Fevin. Arn. de Bruck addidit duas voces")
JOSQUIN

*EisS s.s. (à 6)

MORALES

*SaraP 34

ANON.

*Attaingnant 1531/5 (intabulation)
Formschneider 1537/1

BolC Q27 (I)
CambraiBM 125-8
*ChiN 107510 (intabulation)
CivMA 59
CopKB 1872
*CopKB 1873
DresSL Grimma 55
ErlU 473/4
LondBLR 8G.vii
*LondRC 1070
PadBC A17
SGalS 462
*TourC M

Modern Editions

Rokseth, Treize motets, p. 28.
Bruck, Sämtliche Motetten, p. 99 (the six-voice version).

Comments

Montanus & Neuber 1555/11 attributes the original version à 4 to Fevin and notes that Brouck added two voices, thus turning the motet into a six-part composition.

No. 224. Sancta trinitas unus Deus (II) (à 8) Jacotin/
Jacquet

Attributions and Sources

JACOTIN

Ulhard 1545/2
JACQUET

Montanus & Neuber 1555/11
Montanus & Neuber 1564/1

MunBS 1536
RomeV 35-40
VerA 218

JACQUET alias JACOTIN

RegB 786-837

ANON.

*VatS 57
*WrocS 3 (intabulation)

Modern Editions

None.

No. 225. Sancti Dei omnes (à 4) Josquin/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

JOSQUIN

*ToleBC 13

MOUTON

Le Roy & Ballard 1555 Mouton

VatS 42
*VatS 76
*VerBC 760

ANON.

Petrucci 1504/1

*LonRC 1070
Mild 3
*VerBC 758
Modern Editions

Josquin, Motetten, vol. V, p. 27.
Das Chorwerk, vol. LXXVI, p. 15.

No. 226. Saule, Saule, quid me (à 5) Le Brung/Moulu

Attributions and Sources

LE BRUNG

*Giunta [c1526]/5
Attaingnant 1534/10

MunU 401
*ToleBC 10

MOULU

ModD 9

ANON.

*[Antico?] [1521]/4

*BergBC 1209
CasAC D(F)
PadBC A17
*PiacD (3)
*PiacD (4)
VatS 46

Modern Editions

Smijers, Treize livres, vol. VIII, p. 54.

Comments

No. 227. *Servus tuus ego sum* (à 4) Canis/Crecquillon

Attributions and Sources

**CANIS**

*Ulhard 1548/2 (attribution in A.)*

**CRECQUILLON**

Ulhard 1548/2 (attribution in index and S. T. B.)
Phalèse 1559 *Crecquillon*
*Phalèse 1576 *Crecquillon*
LeidGA 1441

Modern Editions


Comments

On the attribution in Ulhard 1548/2, see Chapter V.

No. 228. *Si bona suscepmus* (à 5) Richafort/Verdelot

Attributions and Sources

**RICHAFORT**

MunU 327

**VERDELOT**

Moderne 1532/9
Formschneider 1537/1
Gardane 1539/6
Schöffer 1539/8
Du Chemin 1553/2
*Montesdoca 1554/32 (intabulation)*
*Brocar 1557 (intabulation)*
Kohlen 1558/20 (intabulation)
Montanus & Neuber 1559/1
*Jobin 1574/13 (intabulation)*
*Beyer 1583/24 (intabulation)*
*Jobin 1589/17 (intabulation)*
Bo1c Q27(I)
Er1U 473/3
*MadM 6832
ModD 9
ModE C.313
ParisBNC 851
RegB 891-2
RegB 940-1
RomeV 35-40
*ToleBC 17
VatG XII.4
*VatS 38
*WrocS 10
*WrocS 12
*ZwiR 74/1
*ZwiR 79/2

ANON.

ChiN M91
CopKB 1872
*FlorD 11
GothaF A98
*LüneR 150
NurGN 83795
*OxfBT 1018
*RegB 1018
*RomeSC 389
*StuttL 43

Modern Editions


No. 229. **Si oblitus fuero** (à 4) Ninot le Petit/Obrecht

Attributions and Sources

**NINOT LE PETIT**

FlorBN II.I.232
VatS 42

**OBRECHT**

DresSL 1/D/505
ANON.

Petrucci 1504/1
CambraiBM 125-8
*CorBC 95-6/ParisBNN 1817
*MunBS 3154
*SienBC K.I.2

Modern Editions

Ninot le Petit, Opera omnia, p. 96.

Comments

For a stemma of the motet, see Noblitt, "Textual Criticism," p. 242. The stemma, however, does not indicate who the composer might be.

Shine includes this motet as Mouton's work ("The Motets of Mouton," vol. II, p. 798). In addition, the Mouton Worklist in The New Grove lists the work as Mouton's. However, CambraiBM 125-8, which both Shine and The New Grove cite as bearing Mouton's name, transmit the work without an ascription.

No. 230. Signum salutis pone Domine (à 5) Arcadelt/
 (= Diem festum sacratissime) Crecquillon

Attributions and Sources

ARCADELT

*TrevBC 29 ("Diem festum sacratissime")
*TrevBC 30

CRECQUILLON

*Kriesstein 1545/3
*Montanus & Neuber 1555/11

Modern Editions

None.
No. 231. Spem in alium (à 5) Gombert/Morales/Ruffo

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Scotto 1541/3
Montanus & Neuber 1556/8

MORALES

Moderne 1542/5

RUFFO

*Castiglione 1542 Ruffo

Modern Editions

Monumentos Música Española, vol. XXXIV, p. 79.

No. 232. Spes salutis (à 4) Hellinck/Lupi

Attributions and Sources

HELLINCK

Buglhat 1538/5

LUPI

Attaingnant 1542 Lupi

CambraiBM 125-8

*LeuvU 163

ANON.

*Formschneider 1546/31

Modern Editions

Clemens, Opera omnia, vol. V, p. iii (as a Mass model).
Comments

Blackburn assigns the motet to Lupi on stylistic grounds. She says that the attribution to "Lupus" in the Buglhat print should be understood as referring to Hellinck ("The Lupus Problem," p. 359).

No. 233. Super montem excelsum (à 4) Clemens/Crecquillon/ Manchicourt

Attributions and Sources

CLEMENS

Phalèse 1559f Clemens

CRECQUILLON

Aachs 2

MANCHICOURT

Attaingnant 1539 Manchicourt
Attaingnant 1545 Manchicourt

ANON.

Ansbachs 12

Modern Editions

Clemens, Opera omnia, vol. XX, p. 96.
Manchicourt, Opera omnia, vol. I, p. 150.

Comments

See Chapter V for a discussion of the piece.
No. 234. **Super ripam Jordanis** (à 5) Clemens/Crecquillon

**Attributions and Sources**

**CLEMENTS**

Phalèse 1554/2  
Susato 1555/8  
Montanus & Neuber 1555/12  
*Du Bosc & Gueroult 1556 Clemens*  
AachS 2  
BrusC 27088  
DressL 1/D/6  
DressL Grimma 54  
MunBS 13  
RegB 861-2  
*StuttL 9*

Crecquillon

*LübBH 203*

**Modern Editions**


No. 235. **Surge illuminare Jerusalem** (à 4) Canis/Clemens/Crecquillon

**Attributions and Sources**

**CANIS**

Ulhard 1548/2 (attribution in A.)

**CLEMENS**

Phalèse 1559e Clemens

**CRECQUILLON**

Ulhard 1548/2 (attribution in index, S. CT. T. and B.)  
Susato 1553/9

LeidGA 1441  
StuttL 36
ANON.

AnsbachS 12

Modern Editions

Clemens, Opera omnia, vol. XX, p. 1.
Monumenta Musicæ Neerlandicae, vol. IX, p. 46.

Comments

See Chapter V for a discussion of the attributions in Ulhard 1548/2.

No. 236. Surge petre (I) (à 4) Gombert/Mouton/Verdelot
(2.p. Angelus Domini)

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Scotto 1541c Gombert
*Gardane 1542 Gombert
Montanus & Neuber 1550/2
Du Chemin 1554/7

StuttL 34

MOUTON

KönSU 1740

VERDELOT

*Zwir 81/2

ANON.

CambraiBM 125-8
LeipU 49 (1.p. and 2.p. are reversed)
StuttL 36 (1.p. and 2.p. are reversed)
*TorunK 29-32 (1.p. and 2.p. are reversed)
Ulms 237

Modern Editions

Comments

Böker-Heil argues against the ascription to Verdelot on stylistic grounds (Die Motetten von Verdelot, pp. 208-9).

No. 237. *Surge petre* (II) (à 5) Contino/Jacquet (= Laudemus Dominum)

Attributions and Sources

CONTINO

*Scotto 1560 Contino
*TrevBC 29 ("Laudemus Dominum")

JACQUET

*ModE C. 313

Modern Editions

None.

Comments

Blackburn suggests that the scribe of ModE C. 313 confused this motet with the six-voice setting of the same text by Jacquet (Music for Treviso, p. 91).

No. 238. *Surrexit pastor bonus* (à 5) De Silva/Werrecore

Attributions and Sources

DE SILVA

Bolc Q27(I)
*VatS 9

WERRECORE

Formschneider 1538/3

*WrocS 2 (intabulation)
*WrocS 5
ANON.

*BudOS 6
*FlorD 45
PadBC A17
*PiacD (5)
*StuttL 43

Modern Editions

De Silva, *Opera omnia*, vol. II, p. 55.

--- Sustinuimus pacem Gombert/Josquin

See Tulerunt *Dominium meum* (No. 245)

No. 239. **Te Deum laudamus** (à 4) De Silva/Josquin/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

DE SILVA

BolC Q20

JOSQUIN

*RcsU 49

MOUTON

KönSU 1740

ANON.

Formschneider 1537/1

AugsS 7
DresSL 1/D/6
ErlU 473/1
RegB 940-1
*RegB 1018
RegB C120

Modern Editions

Comments

Kirsch is not able to come to a conclusive decision; he states that while the piece is stylistically unlike those of De Silva, the manuscript, RosU 49, which names Josquin, is not reliable (Die Motetten des de Silva, pp. 306-8).

Kirsch does not take the ascription to Mouton in KónSU 1740 seriously.

Osthoff believes that the motet is by De Silva, since BoiC Q20 is the earliest source for the work (Josquin, vol. II, p. 70).

No. 240. *Tribulatio et angustia* (à 4) Josquin/Verdelot

Attributions and Sources

**JOSQUIN**

Formschneider 1537/1
Montanus & Neuber 1559/2

DresSL 1/D/6
LeipU 49

**VERDELOT**

*Giunta [c1526]/5

**ANON.**

* [Antico?] [1521]/4

BerlPS 40031
GothaF A98
LonBLR 8G.vii

Modern Editions


Comments

Böker-Heil assigns the work to Verdelot on the grounds that since Giunta [c1526/5] is the earliest source (Die Motetten von Verselot, pp. 214-5).
No. 241. *Tu es petrus* (à 5) Danckerts/Gombert/Morales/Moreau

Attributions and Sources

DANCKERTS

* Kriesstein 1545/3 (attribution in B)

GOMBERT

*TrevBC 29

MORALES

*Scotto 1541/3
*Kriesstein 1545/3 (attribution in other places)
*Susato 1546/7
*ToleBC 17

MOREAU

*Phalèse 1553/11

ANON.

*Susato 1557/3
*FlorD 11

Modern Editions

*Monumentos Música Española*, vol. II, p. 149.

---*Tu es vas* Danckerts/Phinot

See *Tu est potentia* (No. 242)
No. 242. *Tu est potentia* (I) (à 5) Danckerts/Phinot
 (= *Tu es vas*)

Attributions and Sources

DANCKERTS

* TrevBC 29 ("Tu es vas")

PHINOT

*Beringi 1547 Phinot
* Gardane 1552 Phinot
* ZwiR 74/1

ANON.

* WrocS 12

Modern Editions

Phinot, *Opera omnia*, vol. I, p. 5.

Comments

Blackburn ascribes the motet to Phinot, and considers the revised version ("Te es vas") to be the work of Varisco, the scribe of TrevBC 29 (*Music for Treviso*, pp. 46-51).

For a different explanation of the conflicting attribution, see Chapter V.

No. 243. *Tu est potentia* (II) (à 6) Dnackerts/Maistre Jhan

Attributions and Sources

DANCKERTS

*Kriesstein 1540/7

MAISTRE JHAN

*TrevBC 30

Modern Editions

None.
No. 244. *Tulerunt Dominium meum* (I) (à 4) Josquin/Pesenti

**Attributions and Sources**

**JOSQUIN**

Petrus 1547/1 *Dodecachordon*

MunU 322-5  
SGallS 463

**PESENTI**

Petrucci 1519/2

**ANON.**

Petrucci 1503/1

**Modern Editions**


**Comments**

Antonowytsch disregards the attributions to Josquin on stylistic grounds ("The Present State," p. 63).  
In the *Dodecachordon*, Glarean says that he does not know who composed the motet. But according to Miller, Glarean states in a letter to his friend that some people ascribe it to Isaac (Miller, *Dodecachordon*, vol. II, p. 259, and fn. 1).

---

No. 245. *Tulerunt Dominium meum* (II) (à 8) Gombert/Josquin

(*Je prens congie = Lugebat David Absalon*  
*Sustinuimus pacem*)  
(*Porro rex operuit = Tu sola es*)

**Attributions and Sources**

**GOMBERT**

*Pisador 1552/35* ("Tulerunt" only, intabulation)

LonBLR A49-54 ("Je prens congie" only)  
VerA 218 ("Sustinuimus" only)
JOSQUIN

Montanus & Neuber 1554/10 ("Tulerunt" only)
Montanus & Neuber 1564/1 ("Lugebat" with "Porro")

DressL Löbau 50 ("Tulerunt" only)
MunBS 1536 ("Tulerunt" only)
RegB 786-837 ("Lugebat" with "Porro")
*WrocS 1 (intabulation)
*WrocS 2 ("Tulerunt" only, intabulation)
*WrocS 5 ("Tulerunt" only)

ANON.

DressL Glashütte 5 ("Tulerunt" only)
DressL Grimma 7 ("Tulerunt" only)
DressL Grimma 55 ("Tulerunt" Only)
VerA 218 ("Tu sola" only)

Modern Editions

Gombert, Opera omnia, vol. XI, p. 230 ("Je prens").
Das Chorwerk, vol. XXIII, p. 22 ("Tulerunt" only).

No. 246. Usquequo Domine obliviscerisme (I) (à4) Hellinck/Verdelot
(2.p. Illumina oculos)

Attributions and Sources

HELLINCK

Attaingnant 1535/1
Gardane 1549/12 (attribution above 1.p.)

Bo1C Q20

VERDELOT

Gardane 1549/12 (attribution above 2.p.)

Modern Editions

Smijers, Treize livres, vol. IX, p. 93.
No. 247. *Usquequo Domine obliviscerisme* (II) (à 4)  
Lhéritier/Mouton

Attributions and Sources

LHÉRITIER

*Giunta [c1526]/5

MOUTON

Bo1C Q20

Modern Editions

Lhéritier, *Opera omnia*, p. 123.

Comments

Perkins regards the motet as Lhéritier’s, since he considers Giunta [c1526]/5 a reliable source (Lhéritier, *Opera omnia*, p. xxiii).

---

No. 248. *Usquequo Domine obliviscerisme* (III) (à 5)  
Ferrabosco/Rore

Attributions and Sources

FERRABOSCO

*Gardane 1544/6

RORE

*Gardane 1595 Rore

ANON.

*WolfA 293

Modern Editions

*Das Chorwerk*, vol. DXXI, p. 28.
Comments

Johnson favors Ferrabosco, stating that the editor of Gardane 1595 Rore confused the motet with Rore’s different setting of the same text (Johnson, "Motets of Rore," p. 95).

No. 249. *Vado ad eum* (à 5) Rore/Willaert

Attributions and Sources

RORE

*Gardane 1544/6
*Scotto 1545 Rore
*Gardane 1545 Rore
Montanus & Neuber 1555/10
*Phalèse 1573 Rore
*Gardane 1595 Rore

ModE C.313
RegB 875-7
*WolfA 293

WILLAERT

Castiglione 1543/3

ANON.

*BolSP 39
*LucBS 775
*TurBN IV.45

Modern Editions

None.

No. 250. *Veni electa mea* (à 5) Gombert/Jacquet

Attributions and Sources

GOMBERT

Schöffer 1539/8
*Gardane 1552b Gombert

*TrevBC 29
JACQUET
BoL C Q27(I)
ANON.
*LucBS 775
Modern Editions
Gombert, Opera omnia, vol. VIII, p. 137.
Comments
Nugent ascribes the motet to Gombert, arguing that the ascription to Jacquet in BoL C Q27(I) is a scribal error ("The Jacquet Motets," p. 207).

No. 251. Veni sancte Spiritus (II) (à 4) Jacquet/Mouton

Attributions and Sources
JACQUET
BoL C Q19
MOUTON
BoL C Q20
ANON.
PadBC A17
Modern Editions
None.
Comments
Nugent ascribes the motet to Jacquet on the grounds that BoL C Q19 is an important source for Jacquet’s music ("The Jacquet Motets," p. 169).
No. 252. *Veni sancte Spiritus* (I) (à 6) Forestier/Josquin

Attributions and Sources

**FORESTIER**

*UppS U 76b*

**JOSQUIN**

Formschneider 1537/1
Le Roy & Ballard 1555 *Josquin*
Montanus & Neuber 1558/4

BoI C R142
*HradKM 22
*RegB 878-82
StuttL 36

**ANON.**

BerlPS 40013
DresSl Glashütte 5
DresSl Grimma 55
DresSl Pirna VIII
GothaF A98
NurGN 83795

Modern Editions


No. 253. *Verba mea auribus* (à 4) De Silva/Paminger

Attributions and Sources

**DE SILVA**

Gardane 1549/12
*Scotto 1549/15
Montanus & Neuber 1553/4 (attribution in index and B.)*

**PAMINGER**

Montanus & Neuber 1553/4 (attribution in A.)
Modern Editions


Comments

See Chapter V on the attributions in Montanus & Neuber 1553/4.

No. 254. *Verbum bonum et suave* (I) (à 4) Fevin/La Fage/Therache

Attributions and Sources

FEVIN

CambrP 1760 (attribution in Index)

LA FAGE

Antico 1521/5 (attribution in T.)

THERACHE

Petrucci 1519/1
Antico 1521/5 (attribution in other partbooks)
Dorico 1526/2

CambrP 1760 (attribution above music)
FlorL 666

ANON.

LonBLR 8 G.vii
*LonRC 1070

Modern Editions

No. 255. *Verbum bonum et suave* (II) (à 8) Lupus/Mouton

**Attributions and Sources**

**LUPUS**

VerA 218 (attribution in Index)

**MOUTON**

Montanus & Neuber 1564/1

*MunBS 1536
VerA 218 (attribution in B.)*

*Wrocs 6 (intabulation)*

**Modern Editions**

None.

No. 256. *Verbum caro factum est* (à 5) Appenzeller/Josquin

**Attributions and Sources**

**APPENZELLER**

Susato 1546/7

**JOSQUIN**

*ZwiR 73

**Modern Editions**


No. 257. *Verbum iniquum et dolosum* (à 4) Clemens/Crecquillon

**Attributions and Sources**

**CLEMENS**

Scotto 1554/14

Phalèse 1559c *Clemens*

Montanus & Neuber 1564/5
CRECQUILLON

Susato 1553/10
Montanus & Neuber 1559/2

Modern Editions

Clemens, Opera omnia, vol. XV, p. 43 (the Scotto version) and p. 46 (the Phalèse version).

Comments

See Chapter V for a discussion of the motet.

No. 258. Victimaæ paschali laudes (à 6) Brunet/Josquin

Attributions and Sources

BRUNET

*VatS 24

JOSQUIN

FlorBN Magl. 125bis
*RomeV 35-40
*ToleBC 10

Modern Editions


Comments

Osthoff assigns the motet to Josquin on stylistic grounds (Josquin, vol. II, pp. 27-8)
Sparks, however, favors Brunet, also on stylistic grounds ("Problems of Authenticity," pp. 345-59).
No. 259. *Videns Dominus flentes* (à 4) Jacquet/Verdelot/ Willaert

Attributions and Sources

JACQUET

TrevBC 7 ("Jachet" is crossed out, and then Willaert's name was added)

VERDELOT

Rhaw 1538/8

WILLAERT

Attaingnant 1535/3
Scotto 1539a Willaert
*Gardane 1545b Willaert

LonRC 2037
RomeM 23-4
TrevBC 7 ("Jachet" is crossed out, and then Willaert's name was added)

ANON.

LeipU 49

Modern Editions


No. 260. *Vidi speciosam* (à 8) Clemens/Manchicourt (= *Salva nos Christe salvator*)

Attributions and Sources

CLEMENS

Montanus & Neuber 1564/1 ("Salva nos")

RegB 786-837 (attribution in all partbooks except for D1)
MANCHICOURT

Attaingnant 1545 Manchicourt
Montanus & Neuber 1564/1

MunBS 1536
RegB 786-837 (attribution in D1)

Modern Editions

Manchicourt, Opera omnia, vol. I, p. 163.

Comments

After examining the music-word relationship, Lowinsky considers Manchicourt's version to be the original. ("Two Motets Wrongly Ascribed," p. 27).

No. 261. Virgo carens criminibus (à 4) De Silva/Moulu

Attributions and Sources

DE SILVA

*Antico [1521]/4
Attaingnant 1534/6

*BergBC 1209

MOULU

RegB B220-2

ANON.

PadBC A17

Modern Editions

No. 262. **Virgo gloriosa** (à4) Canis/Crecquillon

Attributions and Sources

**CANIS**

Ulhard 1548/2 (attribution in A.)

**CRECQUILLON**

Ulhard 1548/2 (attribution in all other places)

Modern Editions


Comments

See Chapter V for the attributions in Ulhard 1548/2.

No. 263. **Virgo prudentissima** (I) (à 4) Gombert/Payen

Attributions and Sources

**GOMBERT**

Scotto 1539a  *Gombert*

Gardane 1541  *Gombert*

Scotto 1541/4

**PAYEN**

Ulhard 1548/2

Gardane 1551/2

LeidGA 1441

**ANON.**

Vissenaeken 1542/7

Modern Editions

Gombert, *Opera omnia*, vol. V, p. 33.
No. 264. *Virgo prudentissima* (II) (à 4) Isaac/Josquin

Attributions and Sources

**ISAAC**

Formschneider 1537/1  
Montanus & Neuber 1559/2  

Dressl 1/D/6

**JOSQUIN**

Petrucci 1502/1

*HradKM 7  
MunU 322-5  
SGallS 463  
*SGallS 530 (intabulation)

Modern Editions


No. 265. *Virtute magna* (à 4) De Silva/Lasson/Verdelot

Attributions and Sources

**DE SILVA**

*BerIPS 321

**LASSON**

Attaingnant 1535/5  
Gardane 1539/12  
Gardane 1545/4  
Montanus & Neuber 1555/10  
Rampazetto 1564/6

RegB 875-7  
*WrocS 1 (intabulation)  
*WrocS 3 (intabulation)  
*WrocS 5

**VERDELOT**

Rhw 1538/8  
Valderrábano 1547/25 (intabulation)
RegB 940-1
*WrocS 12

ANON.

Moderne 1532/10
LeipU 51
*PadBC D27
TrevBC 7
UlmS 237

Modern Editions


No. 266. *Visita quaesumus* (à 4) Jacquet/Lhéritier/Willaert

Attributions and Sources

JACQUET

Buglhat 1538/5 (attribution in index)
Scotto 1539b *Jacquet*
Scotto 1544 *Jacquet*
Gardane 1545 *Jacquet*

Bo1C Q20
LonRC 2037
StuttL 35

LHÉRITIER

*ToleBC 17

WILLAERT

Buglhat 1538/5 (attribution above music)

Modern Editions

Jacquet, *Opera omnia*, vol. IV, p. 31.

Comments

Perkins favors Jacquet, since most of the sources name him (Lhéritier, *Opera omnia*, p. xxiii).
See Chapter V for the ascriptions in Buglhat 1538/5.
APPENDIX B. INDEX OF COMPOSERS

Anchieta, Juan de: 2 motets with 3 composers

Compère (1) 72 177
Peñalosa (2) 177
Rivera (1) 177

Animuccia, Paolo: 1 motet with 1 composer

Rore (1) 149

Appenzeller, Benedictus: 3 motets with 3 composers

Canis (1) 40
Josquin (2) 78 256
Vinders (1) 78

Arcadelt, Jacques: 4 motets with 4 composers

Crecquillon (1) 230
Jacquet (1) 183
Sermisy (1) 69
Verdelot (1) 81

Barra, Hotinet: 1 motet with 1 composer

Elimot (1) 174

Baston, Josquin: 1 motet with 2 composers

Mouton (1) 39
Richafort (1) 39

Baudeweyn, Noel: 3 motets with 5 composers

Festa (1) 182
Fevin (1) 182
Josquin (1) 11
Mouton (1) 182
Stoltzer (1) 31
Berchem, Jacquet de: 8 motets with 5 composers

Gombert (3) 93 117 127
Jacquet (4) 117 124 145 209
Lupi (2) 6 93
Sermisy (1) 145
Willaert (1) 95

Bruck, Arnold von: 1 motet with 1 composer

Sermisy (1) 162

Brumel, Antoine: 3 motets with 3 composers

Brumes (1) 14
Josquin (1) 104
Mouton (1) 10

Brumes, Jo.: 1 motet with 1 composer

Brumel (1) 14

Brunet: 1 motet with 1 composer

Josquin (1) 258

Cadéac, Pierre: 1 motet with 1 composer

Hesdin (1) 212

Caen, Arnold: 2 motets with 3 composers

Hellinck (1) 107
Josquin (1) 140
Richafort (1) 107

Canis, Cornelius: 5 motets with 3 composers

Appenzeller (1) 40
Clemens (2) 87 235
Crecquillon (3) 227 235 262

Carpentras: 3 motets with 2 composers

Josquin (2) 35 57
Mouton (1) 161

Caussin, Ernold: 2 motets with 1 composer

Gombert (2) 2 192
Certon, Pierre: 1 motet with 1 composer
   Josquin (1) 199

Champion, Jacques: 3 motets with 2 composers
   Josquin (3) 29 53 55
   Senfl (1) 55

Clemens non Papa, Jacob: 28 motets with 8 composers
   Canis (2) 87
   Crecquillon (16) 64 65 74 76 97 129 154
   Gombert (1) 143
   Maessens (1) 101
   Manchicourt (6) 135
   Morales (2) 137
   Tubal (1) 49
   Valent (1) 125
(continued)

   Canis
   Crecquillon 166 185 187 191 206 233 234 235
   Manchicourt 178 189 190 233
   Morales 204
(continued)

   Crecquillon 257
   Manchicourt 260

Cleve, Johannes de: 1 motet with 1 composer
   Guyot (1) 94

Comes, Bartholomaeus: 1 motet with 1 composer
   Maessens (1) 164

Compère, Loyset: 2 motets with 4 composers
   Anchieta (1) 177
   Peñalosa (1) 177
   Ribera (1) 177
   Richafort (1) 181
Conseil, Jean: 8 motets with 7 composers

Festa (1) 67
Gombert (1) 61
Jacquet (2) 17 18
Lhermitier (1) 21
Lupi (2) 34 109
Lupus (1) 165
Maistre Jhan (1) 17

Contino, Giovanni: 1 motet with 1 composer

Jacquet (1) 237

Courtois, Jean or Lambert: 1 motet with 2 composers

Jacotin (2) 126
Morales (1) 126

Craen, Nicolas: 2 motets with 5 composers

Festa (1) 223
Fevrin (1) 223
Josquin (1) 223
La Rue (1) 220
Morales (1) 223

Crecquillon, Thomas: 25 motets with 9 composers

Arcadelt (1) 64 65 74 76 97 129 154 166 185
Canis (3) 141
Clemens (16) 46
De Latre (1) 167
Hollander (1) 173
Jacquet (1) 38
Lupi (2) 84
Maistre Jhan (1)
Manchicourt (1)

(continued)

Arcadelt 230
Canis 227 235 262
Clemens 187 191 206 233 234 235 257 233
Manchicourt

Dalla Viola, Alfonso: 1 motet with 1 composer

Gombert (1) 16
**Danckerts, Ghiselin:** 3 motets with 5 composers

- Gombert (1) 241
- Maistre Jhan (1) 243
- Morales (1) 241
- Moreau (1) 241
- Phinot (1) 242

**Danglon, Alexandre:** 1 motet with 1 composer

- Pesenti (1) 155

**De Latre, Petit Jean:** 1 motet with 1 composer

- Crecquillon (1) 141

**De Silva, Andreas:** 6 motets with 7 composers

- Josquin (2) 142 239
- Lasson (1) 265
- Moulu (1) 261
- Mouton (1) 239
- Paminger (1) 253
- Verdelot (1) 265
- Werrecore (1) 238

**Ducis, Benedictus:** 1 motet with 1 composer

- Maffoni (1) 63

**Eckel, Matthias:** 1 motet with 1 composer

- Josquin (1) 146

**Elimot:** 1 motet with 1 composer

- Barra (1) 174

**Escobar, Pedro de:** 1 motet with 1 composer

- Peñalosa (1) 158

**Escobedo, Bartolomé de:** 1 motet with 1 composer

- Morales (1) 112

**Eustachius Gallus:** 1 motet with 1 composer

- Isaac (1) 30
Ferrabosco, Domenico: 1 motet with 1 composer

Rore (1) 248

Festa, Costanzo: 7 motets with 11 composers

Bauldewyn (1) 182
Conseil (1) 67
Craen (1) 223
S. Festa (1) 118
Fevin (2) 182 223
Gombert (1) 8
Jacquet (1) 15
Josquin (1) 223
Morales (1) 223
Mouton (2) 118 182
Senfl (1) 207

Festa, Sebastiano: 1 motet with 2 composers

Festa (1) 118
Mouton (1) 118

Fevin, Antoine de: 6 motets with 6 composers

Bauldewyn (1) 182
Craen (1) 223
Festa (2) 182 223
Josquin (2) 62 223
Morales (1) 223
Mouton (4) 36 90 99 182

Finck, Heinrich: 2 motets with 2 composers

Josquin (2) 47 153
Wolf (1) 47

Forestier, Mathurin: 1 motet with 1 composer

Josquin (1) 252

Gallus, Joannes: 1 motet with 1 composer

Susato (1) 68
**Gascongne, Mathieu:** 5 motets with 4 composers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La Fage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermisy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gombert, Nicolas:** 42 motets with 28 composers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berchem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caussin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conseil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalla Viola</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danckerts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandsyre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haugk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellinck</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesdin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchicourt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikołaj</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morales</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naich</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phinot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richafort</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruffo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermisy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdelot</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willaert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berchem</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caussin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemens</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandsyre</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesdin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquet</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupi</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchicourt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richafort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruffo</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermisy</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdelot</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dankerts</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquet</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morales</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreau</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payen</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruffo</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdelot</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gosse, Maistre:** 1 motet with 1 composer

Manchicourt (1) 171

**Grandsyre, Ioan.:** 1 motet with 2 composers

Gombert (1) 134
Lupi (1) 134

**Guyot, Jean:** 1 motet with 1 composer

Cleve (1) 94

**Haugk, Virgilius:** 1 motet with 2 composers

Gombert (1) 50
Mahu (1) 50
**Hellinck, Lupus:** 10 motets with 7 composers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Number of Motets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gombert (2)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupi (3)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richafort (2)</td>
<td>107, 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senfl (1)</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdelot (2)</td>
<td>123, 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinders (1)</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hesdin, Nicolle des:** 5 motets with 5 composers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Number of Motets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cadéac (1)</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gombert (2)</td>
<td>4, 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchicourt</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouton (1)</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richafort (1)</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Heugel, Johannes:** 1 motet with 2 composers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Number of Motets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Josquin (1)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maistre Jhan (1)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hollander, Christian:** 1 motet with 1 composer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Number of Motets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crecquillon (1)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Isaac, Heinrich:** 5 motets with 5 composers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Number of Motets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eustachius (1)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josquin (1)</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue (1)</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obrecht (1)</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rener (1)</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jacotin Frontin or Le Bel:** 2 motets with 3 composers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Number of Motets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courtois (1)</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquet (1)</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morales (1)</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Jacquet, of Mantua:** 35 motets with 27 composers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arcadelt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berchem</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conseil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crecquillon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gombert</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacotin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaques</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Fage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le brung</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lhéritier</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maistre Jhan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchicourt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morales</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruffo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senfl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermisy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdelot</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werrecore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willaert</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arcadelt</td>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berchem</td>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crecquillon</td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gombert</td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacotin</td>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josquin</td>
<td></td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le brung</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupi</td>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupus</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchicourt</td>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morales</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermisy</td>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdelot</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
(continued)

Contino  237
Gombert  250
Lhéritier  266
Mouton  251
Verdelot  259
Willaert  259 266

**Jaques du Pont:** 1 motet with 1 composer

Jacquet (1) 42
**Josquin Des Prez:** 48 motets with 38 composers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Motets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appenzeller</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baudewyn</td>
<td>(1) 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brumel</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunet</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caen</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentras</td>
<td>(2) 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certon</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champion</td>
<td>(3) 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craen</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Silva</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckel</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festa</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fevin</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finck</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestier</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gombert</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heugel</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquet</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Brung</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maistre Jhan</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikošaj</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morales</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulu</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td>(11) 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninot</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peñalosa</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesenti</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richafort</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senfl</td>
<td>(4) 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermisy</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoltzer</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdelot</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viardot</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinders</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willaert</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolff</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motets</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(continued)

Caen 140
Certon 199
De Silva 142
Eckel 146
Finck 153
Heugel 144
Maistre Jhan 144
Mouton 120
Ninot 160 163
Regis 194
Richafort 175
Viardot 160

(continued)

Craen 223
De Silva 239
Festa 223
Fevin 223
Forestier 252
Gombert 245
Jacquet 216
Morales 223
Moulu 202
Mouton 202 203 214
Peñalosa 222
Pessenti 244
Verdelot 202
Willaert 214 221

(continued)

Appenzeller 256
Brunet 258
Isaac 264

La Fage, Jean de: 4 motets with 6 composers

Gascongne (1) 211
Jacquet (1) 7
Lupus (1) 211
Mouton (1) 91
Sermisy (1) 7
Therache (1) 254
La Rue, Pierre de: 2 motets with 2 composers

  Craen (1)  220
  Isaac (1)  213

Lapicida, Erasmus: 1 motet with 1 composer

  Mouton (1)  105

Lasson, Mathieu: 1 motet with 2 composers

  De Silva (1)  265
  Verdelot (1)  265

Le Bouteillier, Jean: 1 motet with 1 composer

  Willaert (1)  32

Le Brung, Jean: 3 motets with 4 composers

  Jacquet (1)  159
  Josquin (1)  44
  Moulu (1)  226
  Richafort (1)  44

Le Heurteur, Guillaume: 1 motet with 3 composers

  Lhéririer (1)  168
  Lupus (1)  168
  Sermisy (1)  168

Le Roy, Guille: 1 motet with 1 composer

  Verdelot (1)  172

Lhéririer, Jean: 11 motets 9 composers

  Conseil (1)  21
  Jacquet (2)  71
  Le Heurteur (1)  168
  Lupus (1)  168
  Mouton (3)  110
  Pieton (1)  27
  Sermisy (1)  168
  Verdeolt (2)  23
  Willaert (3)  21

Longueval, Antoine de: 1 motet with 1 composer

  Mouton (1)  33
Louwys, Ioannes: 1 motet with 1 composer
Rore (1) 66

Lupi, Johannes: 15 motets with 11 composers
Berchem (1) 6 93
Conseil (2) 34 109
Crecquillon (2) 38 173
Gombert (3) 93 96 134
Grandsyre (1) 134
Hellinck (3) 22 195 232
Jacquet (1) 82 201
Lupino (1) 201
Mouton (1) 208
Sermisy (1) 200
Verdelot (1)

Lupino, Francesco: 2 motets with 2 composers
Lupi (1) 82
Willaert (1) 217

Lupus: 7 motets with 9 composers
Conseil (1) 165
Gascongne (1) 211
Jacquet (2) 9 152
La Fage (1) 211
Le Heurteur (1) 168
Lhéritier (1) 168
Mouton (1) 255
Renaldo (1) 186
Sermisy (1) 168

Maessens, Pieter: 4 motets with 4 composers
Clemens (1) 101
Comes (1) 164
Mouton (1) 179
Vaet (1) 86

Maffoni, Hieronimo: 1 motet with 1 composer
Ducis (1) 63
Mahu, Stephan: 3 motets with 4 composers

Haugk (1)  50
Gombert (1)  50
Mouton (1)  197
Walter (1)  89

Maistre Jhan: 6 motets with 6 composers

Conseil (1)  17
Crecquillon (1)  84
Danckerts (1)  243
Heugel (1)  144
Jacquet (3)  13 17 103
Josquin (1)  144

Manchicourt, Pierre de: 12 motets with 7 composers

Clemens (6)  135 178 189 190 233 260 233
Crecquillon (1)  
Gombert (2)  75 156
Gosse (1)  171
Headin (1)  85
Jacquet (1)  148
Portinari (1)  92

Mikołaj z Krakow: 1 motet with 3 composers

Gombert (1)  52
Josquin (1)  52
Sermisy (1)  52

Morales, Critóbal de: 10 motets with 14 composers

Clemens (2)  137 204
Courtois (1)  126
Craen (1)  223
Danckerts (1)  
Escobedo (1)  112 241
Festa (1)  223
Fevin (1)  223
Gombert (2)  231 241
Jacotin (1)  
Jacquet (3)  41 116 138
Josquin (1)  223
Moreau (1)  241
Rore (1)  41
Ruffo (1)  231
Moreau, Simon: 1 motet with 3 composers

Danckerts (1) 241
Gombert (1) 241
Morales (1) 241

Moulu, Pierre: 6 motets with 5 composers

De Silva (1) 261
Josquin (1) 202
Le Brung (1) 226
Mouton (4) 70 115 121 202
Verdelot (1) 202

Mouton, Jean: 43 motets with 26 composers

Baston (1) 39
Baudeweyn (1)
Brumel (1) 10
Carpentras (1)
De Silva (1)
Festa (2)
S. Festa (1)
Fevin (4) 36 90 99
Gasconge (3) 3
Gombert (3) 100
Hesdin (1) 88
Jacquet (3)
Josquin (11) 43 114
La Pape (1) 91
Lapicida (1) 105
Lhéritier (3) 110
Longueval (1) 33
Lupi (1)
Lupus (1)
Maeusens (1)
Mahu (1)
Moulu (4) 70 115
Ninot (1) 106
Richafort (3) 39 88
Verdelot (3)
Willaert (2) 80
(continued)

Bauldeweyn 182
Carpentras 161
Festa 118
S. Festa 118
Fevin 182
Gascongne 157 170
Gombert 133
Jacquet 169
Josquin 120 160 163 196
Maessens 179 197
Mahu
Moulu 121
Richafort 160
Verdelot 133

(continued)

De Silva 239
Gombert 236 251
Jacquet 201
Josquin 202 203 214 225 239
Lhéritier 215 247
Lupi 201
Lupus 255
Moulu 202
Verdelot 202 236
Willaert 214

Naich, Hubert: 1 motet with 1 composer

Gombert (1) 37

Ninot le petit: 3 motets with 3 composers

Josquin (1) 194
Mouton (1) 106
Obrecht (1) 229

Obrecht, Jacob: 3 motets with 3 composers

Isaac (1) 139
Ninot (1) 229
Willaert (1) 188

Faminger, Leonhard: 1 motet with 1 composer

De Silva (1) 253
Payen, Nicolas: 1 motet with 1 composer
  Gombert (1) 263

Peñalosa, Francisco de: 4 motets 5 composers
  Anchieta (2) 72 177
  Compère (1) 177
  Escobar (1) 158
  Josquin (1) 222
  Ribera (1) 177

Pesenti, Michele: 2 motets with 2 composers
  Danglon (1) 155
  Josquin (1) 244

Phinot, Dominique: 4 motets with 4 composers
  Danckerts (1) 242
  Gombert (2) 98 111
  Richafort (1) 102
  Verdelot (1) 102

Pieton, Loyset: 1 motet with 1 composer
  Lhérëtiger (1) 27

Portinaro, Francesco: 1 motet with 1 composer
  Manchicourt (1) 92

Regis, Johannes: 1 motet with 1 composer
  Josquin (1) 175

Renaldo: 1 motet with 1 composer
  Lupus (1) 186

Rener, Adam: 1 motet with 1 composer
  Isaac (1) 205

Reulx, Jacques de: 1 motet with 1 composer
  Sermisy (1) 77
Ribera, Antonio de: 1 motet with 3 composers

Anchieta (1) 177
Compère (1) 177
Peñalosa (1) 177

Richafort, Jean: 13 motets with 13 composers

Baston (1) 39 Caen (1) 107 Compère (1) 181
Gombert (2) 1 151
Hellinck (2) 107 136
Hesdin (1) 88
Josquin (2) 44 160
Le Brung (1) 44
Mouton (3) 39 88 160
Phinot (1) 102
Sermisy (1) 193
Verdelot (2) 102 228
Willaert (1) 176

Rore, Cipriano de: 5 motets with 6 composers

Anumuccia (1) 149
Ferrabosco (1) 248
Jacquet (1) 41
Louwys (1) 66
Morales (1) 41
Willaert (1) 249

Ruffo, Vincenzo: 6 motets with 3 composers

Gombert (6) 48 108 132 180 198 231
Jacquet (1) 48
Morales (1) 231

Senfl, Ludwig: 7 motets with 6 composers

Champion (1) 55
Festa (1) 207
Hellinck (1) 123
Jacquet (1) 113
Josquin (4) 25 54 55 83
Verdelot (1) 123
Sermisy, Claudin de: 13 motets with 16 composers

Arcadelt (1) 69
Berchem (1) 145
Bruck (1) 162
Gascongne (1) 60
Gombert (2) 52 128
Jacquet (2) 7 145
Josquin (1) 52
La Fage (1) 7
Le Heurteur (1) 168
Lhéritier (1) 168
Lupi (1) 208
Lupus (1) 168
Mikołaj (1) 52
Reux (1) 77
Richafort (1) 193
Verdelot (2) 19 45

Simon Ferrariensis: 1 motet with 1 composer

Willaert (1) 12

Stoltzer, Thomas: 4 motets with 4 composers

Bauldeweyn (1) 31
Josquin (2) 58 73
Verdelot (1) 73
Werrecore (1) 28

Susato, Tylman: 1 motet with 1 composer

Gallus (1) 68

Theracche, Pierrequin de: 1 motet with 1 composer

La Fage (1) 254

Tubal, Adrian: 1 motet with 1 composer

Clemens (1) 49

Vaet, Jacobus: 1 motet with 1 composer

Maessens (1) 86

Valent: 1 motet with 1 composer

Clemens (1) 125
Verdelot, Philippe: 27 motets with 19 composers

Arcadelt (1) 81
De Silva (1) 133
Gombert (4) 5
Hellinck (2) 123
Jacquet (3) 74
Josquin (5) 202
Lasson (1) 172
Le Roy (1) 122
Lhéritier (2) 23
Lupl (1) 200
Moulu (1) 202
Mouton (3) 133
Phinot (1) 102
Richafort (2) 102
Senfl (1) 123
Sermisy (2) 19 45
Stoltzer (1) 74
Walter (1) 59
Willaert (4) 24 130

(continued)

De Silva 265
Gombert 219 236
Hellinck 246
Jacquet 210 216 259
Josquin 216 221 240
Lasson 265
Mouton 123
Richafort 228
Willaert 259

Vermont Primus: 1 motet with 1 composer

Jacquet (1) 20

Viardot: 1 motet with 1 composer

Josquin (1) 150

Vinders, Jheronimus: 2 motets with 3 composers

Appenzeller (1) 78
Hellinck (1) 147
Josquin (1) 78
Walter, Johann: 2 motets with 2 composers

Mahu (1) 89
Verdelot (1) 59

Werrecore, Matthias Hermann: 3 motets with 3 composers

De Silva (1) 238
Jacquet (1) 119
Stoltzer (1) 28

Willaert, Adrian: 17 motets with 14 composers

Berchem (1) 95
Conseil (1) 21
Gombert (1) 79
Jacquet (2) 214
Josquin (1) 259
Le Bouteillier (1) 32
Lhéritier (3) 21 56
Lupino (1) 217
Mouton (2) 80 214
Obrecht (1) 188
Richafort (1) 176
Rore (1) 249
Simon (1) 12
Verdelot (4) 24 130 184 259

(continued)

Jacquet 266
Lhéritier 266

Wolff, Martin: 1 motet with 2 composers

Finck (1) 47
Josquin (1) 47
APPENDIX C. LIST OF SOURCES

The sources cited in the Inventory (Appendix A) are listed here in two sections--(A) printed sources and (B) manuscript sources. Printed sources are grouped according to printers, and then for each printer anthologies are listed first chronologically followed by one-composer collections. Under each source, the motet serial number and an attribution as given in that source are also listed.

The arrangement of manuscript sources strictly conforms to that of the Census Catalogue, that is, cities in alphabetic order. Also taken from the Census Catalogue is information on date and provenance of sources. As in printed sources, the motet number with an attribution in that source is listed under each entry. In both sections, for sources that are not found in RISM IV/B/I or the Census Catalogue, additional information on the literature about the sources is given.
(A) PRINTED SOURCES

**ANDREA** in Kraków

1565/22  Valentini Greffi Bakfarci pannonii, harmoniarum musicarum . . .
        Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
        No. 37 Gombert

**ANTICO** in Rome and Venice

1520/1  Motetti novi libro secondo.
        Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
        La Fage 91, Mouton 70, Richafort 193

1520/2  Motetti novi libro tertio.
        Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
        Josquin 160, Richafort 39, anon. 215

1520/6  Chansons à troys.
        Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
        anon. 80

1521/3  Motetti libro primo.
        Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
        Barra 174, Josquin 53, Mouton 203

[1521]/4  [Motetti libro secondo]
        Contains 8 conflicting attributions:
        De Silva 261, Richafort 193, anon. 114, 115, 202, 203, 226, 240

1521/5  Motetti libro quarto.
        Contains 6 conflicting attributions:
        S. Festa 118, Gascongne 211, Moulu 121, Mouton 114, 179, La Fage/Therache 254

[1521]/6  Motetti e canzone libro primo.
        Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
        La Fage 211, Moulu 121, Mouton 214, Pesenti 155

[c.1521]/7  [Motetti et carmina gallica]
        Contains 7 conflicting attributions:
        anon. 53, 114, 174, 196, 203, 215, 212
ATTAINNANT in Paris

[1528]/2  Motetz nouvellement composez.
Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
anon. 61, 193, 221

1529/1  XII. Motetz musicaux a quatre et cinq
voix composez par les auteurs cy
dessoubz escriptz . . .
Contains 6 conflicting attributions:
Gombert 5, Mouton 100, 114, 203, Sermisy
77, Verdelot 219

1531/5  Treze motetz musicaux avec ung prelude
le tout reduict en la tabulature . . .
Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
anon. 7, 223

1534/3  Liber primus quinque et viginti musicales
quatuor vocum motetos complectitur . . .
Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
Gascongne 157, Lhéritier 23, anon. 160

1534/4  Liber secundus: quatuor et viginti
musicales quatuor vocum motetos
habet . . .
Contains 5 conflicting attributions:
Boutillier 32, Conseil 165, Gombert 8,
Verdelot 219, Willaert 188

1534/5  Liber tertius: viginti musicales quinque
sex vel octo vocum motetos habet . . .
Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
Verdelot/Sermisy 19, Vermont primus 20

1534/6  Liber quartus XXIX. musicales quatuor
vel quinque parium vocum modulos
habet . . .
Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
De Silva 261, Hesdin 218, Verdelot 130

1534/9  Liber septimus XXIII. trium, quatuor,
quinque, sexve vocum modulos . . .
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Mouton/Gombert 100
Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
(Attaignant continued)

1549 Josquin  Trente sixiesme livre contenant XXX.
chansons ... 
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: 
Josquin 52

BAETHEN in Düsseldorf

1556/3 Liber tertius sacrarum cantionum
diversorum autorum ... 
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: 
Grandsyre 134, anon. 129

BERINGEN in Lyons

1547 Phinot  Liber primus mutetarum quinque vocum. 
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: 
Phinot 242

BEYER in Leipzig

1583/24 Tabulaturbuch auff Orgeln und Instrument
darinne auff alle Sontage ... 
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: 
Clemens 65, Richafort 107, Verdelot 228

BROCAR in Alcalá

1557  Libro de Cifra Nueva para Tecla, Harpa, Y 
Vihuela, ... 
Literature: Brown, Instrumental Music 
Printed, pp. 174-7 
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: 
Verdelot 228, anon. 9

BUGLHAT in Ferrara

1538/5 Liber cantus (vocum quatuor) triginta 
novem motetos habet ... 
Contains 7 conflicting attributions: 
Arcadelt 69, Hesdin 218, Jacquet/Willaert 
266, Lhéritier 21, Lupi 201, Lupus 232, 
Sermisy 162
(Buglhat continued)

1539/7 Moteti de la Simia (Liber primus vocum quinque).
   Contains 5 conflicting attributions:
   Arcadelt 183, Hesdin 4, 88, 212, Jacquet 159

CAESANO in Pesaro

1554 Phinot Liber secundus mutetarum quinque vocum.
   Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
   Phinot 111

CASTIGLIONE in Milan

1543/3 Mutetarum divinitatis liber primus quae quinqueae absolutae vocibus . . .
   Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
   Lupi 6, 109, Werrecore 119, Willaert 249

1542 Ruffo Il primo libro de motetti a cinque voci.
   Contains 6 conflicting attributions:
   Ruffo 48, 108, 132, 180, 198, 231

CORDOVA, DE FERNANDEZ in Valladolid

1547/25 Libro de musica de vihuela intitulado Silva de sirenas.
   Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
   Morales 138, Verdelot 130, 265, Willaert 188

DORICO in Rome

1526/1 Motetti de la Corona libro primo.
   Contains 5 conflicting attributions:
   Fevin 90, 223, Fevin/Mouton 99, Mouton 36,
   Mouton/Longueval 33, anon. 62

1526/2 Motetti de la Corona libro secondo.
   Contains 5 conflicting attributions:
   Caen 140, La Fage 91, Mouton 170, 179,
   Therache 254
(Dorico continued)

1526/3  Motetti de la Corona libro tertio.
        Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
        Josquin 163, Mouton 202

1526/4  Motetti de la Corona libro quarto.
        Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
        Baudeweyn 182, Carpentras 161, Josquin
        150, anon. 57

DU BOSC & GUEROUlt in Geneva and Lyons

1554/13 Secundus liber modulorum, quatuor,
               quinque et sex vocum . . .
               Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
               Jacquet 113

1556 Clemens Quintus liber modulorum quinque vocum
               (quos vulgus moteta vocat).
               Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
               Clemens 234

DU CHEMIN in Paris

1551/1  Primus liber septem decim continet
               quatuor, & quinque vocum modulos . . .
               Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
               Crecquillon 166

1553/2  Liber primus collectorum modulorum (qui
               moteta vulgo dicuntur) . . .
               Contains 8 conflicting attributions:
               Lhérétier 23, Mouton 203, Richafort 39,
               107, 136, Verdelot 228, Willaert 188,
               Lupus 123

1554/7  Moduli undecim festorum solemnium totius
               anni, cum quatuor & quinque vocibus . . .
               Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
               Gombert 236

1557/12 Tresiesme livre, contenant XXIII.
               chansons nouvelles à quatre parties . . .
               Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
               Richafort 107
EGENOLFF in Frankfurt

[c.1535]/14  [Lieder zu 3 & 4 Stimmen]
Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
anon. 10, 220

EICHORN in Frankfurt

1556/32  Tabulatura continens insignes et
selectissimas quasdam fantasias . . .
Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
anon. 63, 81

1573/27  Tabulatura continens insignes et
selectissimas quasque cantiones . . .
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Verdelot 221

FERNANDEZ DE CORDOVA in Valladolid

1558/18  Second livre de tabulature de leut,
contenant plusieurs chansons . . .
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Verdelot 130

FORMSCHNEIDER in Nuremberg

1533/1  Tabulatur auff die Laudten etlicher
Preambel, Teutscher, Welscher . . .
Literature: Brown, Instrumental Music
Printed, pp. 42-3
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
anon. 59

1537/1  Novum et insigne opus musicum, sex,
quique, et quatuor vocum . . .
Contains 14 conflicting attributions:
Heugel 144, Isaac 264, Josquin 44, 240,
252, Josquin/Moulu 202, Lupus 123, Mouton
115, Senfl 54, Verdelot 228, anon. 78, 83,
223, 239

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
(Formschneider continued)

1538/3
Secundus tomus novi operis musici, sex, quinque et quatuor vocum . . .
Contains 7 conflicting attributions:
Finck/Hellinck 153, Josquin 58, 104, Senfl 207, Verdelot 130, Werrecore 238, anon. 152

1538/9
Trium vocum carmina a diversis musicis composita.
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
anon. 220

1539/2
Missae tredecim quatuor vocum a praestantiss. artificib. compositae.
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Isaac 213

1544/20
Hundert und fünfftzehn guter newer Liedlein, mit vier, fünff, sechz Stimmen . . .
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Hellinck 147

1546/31
Musica und Tabulatur, auff die Instrument der kleinen und grossen Geygen . . .
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
anon. 232

**GARDANE in Venice**

1538/4
Primus liber cum quinque vocibus. Motetti del frutto.
Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
Jacquet 152, 209

1539/6
Secundus liber cum quinque vocibus. Fior de mottetti tratti dalli Mottetti del fiore.
Contains 7 conflicting attributions:
Arcadelt 81, Lhéritier 56, Lupi 195, Lupus 123, Manchicouxt 156, Richafort 107, Verdelot 228
(Gardane continued)

1539/12 Primus liber cum quatuor vocibus. Fior de mottetti tratti dalli mottetti del fiore. Primus liber cum quatuor vocibus.
Contains 7 conflicting attributions: Lasson 265, Lhéritier 122, 168, Lhéritier/ Pieten 27, Lupi 200, Lupus 26, Willaert 188

1539/13 Primus liber cum quatuor vocibus. Mottetti del frutto a quatro.
Contains 8 conflicting attributions: Gosse 171, Jacquet 116, Jaques du Pont 42, Lhéritier 23, Lupi 34, Sermisy 45, Verdelot 122, 219

1542/10 Adriani Willaert musicorum omnium qui hactenus et nostro . . .
Contains 4 conflicting attributions: Jacquet 20, Willaert 24, 184, 214

1542/18 Primo libro di madrigali d'Archadelt a tre voci, insieme alcuni di Const. Festa.
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 126

1543/6 Motetta trium vocum ab pluribus authoribus composita . . .
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 15

1543/21 Primo libro di madrigali d'Archadelt a tre voci . . .
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Courtois 126

1544/6 Cipriani musici eccelentissimi cum quibusdam aliiis doctis authoribus motectorum . . .
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Ferrabosco 248, Rore 249

1545/4 Flos florum primus liber cum quatuor vocibus. Motteti del fior.
Contains 7 conflicting attributions: Lasson 265, Lhéritier 122, 168, Lupi 200, Lupus 26, Pieten 27, Willaert 188
(Gardane continued)

1546/9 Moralis hispani et multorum eximiae artis virorum musica . . .
   Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
   Morales 112, 116, 126,

1546/25 Intabolatura de lauto di recercari canzon francose motetti madrigali . . .
   Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
   Josquin 142, 203

1546/26 Intabolatura di lauto di recerchari, canzon francese, motetti, madrigali . . .
   Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
   Josquin 142, 203

1547/22 Intabolatura de lauto di Simon Gintzler musico del reverendissimo cardinale di Trento . . .
   Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
   Jacquet 9, anon. 34, 221

1549/2 = 1539/3

1549/5 = 1538/4

1549/8 Il terzo libro di motetti a cinque voci di Cipriano de Rore, et de altri . . .
   Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
   Clemens 137, Crecquillon 64, Rore 66, anon. 41

1549/9 Musica quatuor vocum, que materna lingua moteta vocantur . . .
   Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
   Conseil 61

1549/10 = 1539/13

1549/12 Electiones diversorum motetorum distincte quatuor vocibus . . .
   Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
   De Silva 253, Lupus/Verdolot 246, anon. 44

1551/2 Nicolai Gomberti musici imperatorii motectorum . . .
   Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
   Gombert 8, Payen 263, anon. 16
(Gardane continued)

1551/3 = 1543/6

1553/17 Iachet musici suavissimi celeberrimique musices reverendissimi cardinalis . . .
Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
Berchem 124, Jacquet 9, 159

1557/6 = 1550/1

1559/21 Il primo libro di madrigali d'Archadelt a tre voci, con la gionta di dodese canzon
francese & sei motetti novissimi . . .
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Courtois 126

1569/3 = 1543/6

1540 Jacquet Primo libro di mottetti di Iachet a cinque voci con la gionta . . .
Contains 9 conflicting attributions:
Jacquet Berchem 124, Jacquet 9, 13, 71,
117, 145, 148, 159, 167

1541 Gombert Gomberti excellentissimi, . . . Liber
Primus, cum quatuor vocibus.
Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
Gombert 8, 16, 151, 263

1542 Gombert N. Gombert, Musici imperatorii,
motectorum... Liber Secundus. Quatuor vocum.
Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
Gombert 2, 50, 75, 236

1542 Willaert Adriani Willaert musicorum omnium . . .
Musicorum Sex vocum . . . Liber Primus.
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Berchem/Willaert 95

1545 Jacquet Iachet Musici suavissimi celeberrimique musices . . . Motecta quatuor vocum . . .
Liber Primus.
Contains 5 conflicting attributions:
Jacquet 103, 113, 116, 210, 266
(Gardane continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Attribution Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1545</td>
<td>Rore</td>
<td>Cypriani Rore musici excellentissimi Motetta nunc primum summa . . . Quinque vocum.</td>
<td>Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Rore 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545c</td>
<td>Willaert</td>
<td>Adriani Willaert musici celeberrimi . . . Musica quatuor vocum . . . Liber Secundus.</td>
<td>Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Willaert 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>Caussin</td>
<td>Arnoldi Causini musici celeberrimi Motecto . . . Liber Primus cum quinque vocum.</td>
<td>Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Caussin 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549</td>
<td>Lupino</td>
<td>Di Francesco Lupino anconitano maestro di Capella del Domo di Urbino Il Primo Libro di Motetti a Quatro voci . . .</td>
<td>Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Lupino 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552a</td>
<td>Gombert</td>
<td>Nicolai Gomberti musici excellentissimi cum quinque vocibus Liber Primus . . .</td>
<td>Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Gombert 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552b</td>
<td>Gombert</td>
<td>Nicolai Gomberti Musici excellentissimi cum quinque vocibus Liber Secundus . . .</td>
<td>Contains 4 conflicting attributions: Berchem 93, 127, Gombert 192, 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>Phinot</td>
<td>Liber Primus Mutetarum Quinque Vocum Dominico Phinot Autore.</td>
<td>Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Phinot 242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Gardane continued)

1553 **Jacquet**

Iachet Musici suavissimi celeberrimique . . . Motecta Quinque vocum . . .

Contains 6 conflicting attributions:
Berchem 117, Jacquet 9, 17, 117, 124, 159

1555 **Phinot**

Liber Secundus Mutetarum Quinque Vocab
Dominico Phinot Autore . . .

Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Phinot 111

1595 **Rore**

Sacrae cantiones quae dicuntur motecta, cum quinque, sex, & septem vocibus . . .

Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
Rore 41, 149, 248, 249

**GERLACH** in Nuremberg

1567/1

Suavissimae et iucundissimae harmoniae: octo, quinque et quatuor vocum . . .

Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Willaert 217

1575/17

Ein neuer kunstlich Tabulaturbuch, darin sehr gute Moteten.

Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
anon. 81

**GIUNTA** in Rome

[c.1526]/5

Fior de motetti e Canzoni novi composti da diversi eccellentissimi musici.

Contains 5 conflicting attributions:
Le Brung 226, Lhéritier 122, 247, Sermisy 7, Verdelot 240

**GRIMM & WYRSUNG** in Augsburg

1520/4

Liber selectarum cantionum quas vulgo Mutetas appellant sex quinque et quatuor vocum.

Contains 5 conflicting attributions:
Josquin 53, Mouton 163, Senfl 25, anon. 55, 150
GÜNTER in Nuremberg

1544/25  Das dritt Buch. Ein new künstlich Lauten Buch
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
anon. 63

JOBIN in Strasbourg

1574/13  Teütsch Lautenbuch, darinnenn künstliche
Muteten, liebliche italianische
Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
Jacquet 9, Verdelot 228

1589/17  Thesaurus motetarum. Newerlessner zwey
und zweintzig herrlicher Moteten
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Verdelot 228

JUAN de LAON in Seville

1546/14  Alonso Mudarra Tres Libros de Musica en
cifras para vihuela. En el Primero.
Literature: Brown, Instrumental Music
Printed, pp. 87-9
Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
Gombert 52, Willaert 188

KOHLEN in Heidelberg

1558/20  Tabulaturbuch auff die Lauten von Moteten
frantzösischen-welschen
Contains 6 conflicting attributions:
Fevin 223, Hellinck 168, Gombert 219,
Sermisy 7, 52, Verdelot 228

KRIESSTEIN in Augsburg

1540/7  Selectissimae necnon familiarissimae
cantiones
Contains 5 conflicting attributions:
Danckerts 243, Fevin 182, Jacquet 209,
Mouton 214, Verdelot 45
(Kriesstein continued)

1545/3  Cantiones septem, sex et quinque vocum. 
Longe gravissimae . . .  
Contains 8 conflicting attributions: 
Crecquillon 230, Gombert 117, Jacquet 119, 
Lupi 82, Lupus 51, Hellinck 147, 
Morales/Danckert 241, Sermisy 208

1545/6  Bicinia gallica, latina, germanica, ex 
praestantissimis musicorum . . .  
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: 
Gombert 117

1546/5 = 1545/3

LAET in Antwerp

1569/36  Valentini Greffi Bakfarcii pannonii, 
harmoniarum musicarum . . .  
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: 
Gombert 37

LE ROY & BALLARD in Paris

1572/2  Mellange de chansons tant des vieux 
auteurs que des modernes . . .  
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: 
Josquin 52

1555 Cadéac  Motet, quatuor, quinque et sex vocum, 
liber primus.  
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: 
Cadéac 212

1555 Josquin  Moduli, ex sacris litteris diletci et in 
4, 5, et 6 voces distincti, liber primus.  
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: 
Josquin 194, 252

1555 Mouton  Selecti aliquot moduli, & in 4, 5, 6, & 8 
vocum harmoniam distincti, liber primus.  
Contains 5 conflicting attributions: 
Mouton 33, 105, 115, 203, 225
(Le Roy & Ballard continued)

1560 Josquin Livre des meslanges, contenant six vingtz chansons.
   Literature: Blackburn, "Josquin's Chansons," p. 31
   Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
   Josquin 52

1556 Richafort Modulorum quatuor, quinque & sex vocum, liber primus.
   Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
   Richafort 39, 136, 176, 193

MERULO in Venice

1569/2 Motectarum divinitatis liber primus que quinque absolute vocibus . . .
   Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
   Lupi 6, Werrecore 119

MODERNE in Lyons

1532/9 Secundus liber cum quinque vocibus.
   Contains 6 conflicting attributions:
   Jacquet 9, Lupus 123, Richafort 107, 136, Verdelot 228, Willaert 56

1532/10 Primus liber cum quatuor vocibus. Motteti del fiore.
   Contains 7 conflicting attributions:
   De Silva 142, Gombert 8, Lhéririer 168, Lupus 26, Pieton 27, Willaert 188, anon.
   265

1532/11 Secundus liber cum quatuor vocibus.
   Motteti del fiore.
   Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
   Lupi 200, Verdelot 122

1538/2 Tertius liber mottetorum ad quinque et sex voces . . .
   Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
   Arcadelt 81, Gombert 98, Lupi 195, Verdelot 221

1539/4 = 1538/2
(Moderne continued)

1539/5  Quartus liber mottetorum ad quinque et sex voces . . .
        Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
        Gombert 117, Gombert/Lupi 96, Jacquet 71,
        Manchicourt 156

1539/10 Tertius liber cum quatuor vocibus.
       Motteti del fio-re.
       Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
       Conseil 21, 165, L'hérifier 23

[1539]/11 Quartus liber cum quatuor vocibus.
       Motteti del fiore.
       Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
       Caussin 2, Lupus 211, Naich 37

1542/4 = 1538/2

1542/5  Quintus liber mottetorum ad quinque, et
       sex, et septem vocum.
       Contains 5 conflicting attributions:
       Caussin 192, Jacquet 117, 209, Jacquet/
       Morales 138, Morales 231,

1547/2  Harmonidos Ariston. Tricdon ogdaomeron.
        In quo habentur liturgiae . . .
        Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
        Clemens 189

1552/30 Intabulatura Valentinii Bacforc
       translivani coronensis liber primus.
       Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
       Jacquet 9

MONTANUS & NEUBER in Nuremberg

1546/8  Selectissimae symphoniae compositae ab
       excellentiibus musicis, ante hac non
       aeditae.
       Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
       Maessens 101, Manchicourt 189

1550/2  Carmina vere divina, a praetantissimis
       artificibus . . .
       Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
       Arcadelt 81, Gombert 236
(Montanus & Neuber continued)

1553/4 Psalmorum selectorum a praestantissimis
huius nostri temporis . . .
Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
De Silva/Paminger 253, Josquin 140,
Josquin/Wolff 47

1553/5 Tomus secundus Psalmorum selectorum,
quatuor et plurium vocum.
Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
Certon /Josquin 199, Josquin 57

1553/6 Tomus tertius Psalmorum selectorum,
quatuor et plurium vocum.
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Clemens 74

1554/10 Evangelia dominicorum et festorum dierum
musicis numeris . . .
Contains 10 conflicting attributions:
Clemens 154, Conseil 109, Gascongne 3,
Gombert 108, 156, Josquin 245, Mouton 118,
169, Richafort 39, Verdelot 5

1554/11 Tomus quartus Psalmorum selectorum,
quatuor et plurium vocum . . .
Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
Crecquillon 64, Gombert 127, 143

1555/10 Secundus tomus Evangeliorum, quatuor,
quinque, sex, et plurium vocum . . .
Contains 7 conflicting attributions:
Arcadelt 81, Clemens 135, Jacquet 117,
Lasson 265, Richafort 136, Rore 249,
Verdelot 172

1555/11 Tertius tomus Evangeliorum, quatuor,
quinque, sex, et plurium vocum . . .
Contains 6 conflicting attributions:
Crecquillon 230, Fevin 223, Jacquet 224,
Jaques du Pont 42, Lupi 34, anon. 183

1555/12 Quartus tomus Evangeliorum, quatuor,
quinque, sex, et plurium vocum . . .
Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
Clemens 234, Lupi 38, Lupi/Lupino 82
(Montanus & Neuber continued)

1556/8
Quintus tomus Evangeliorum, et piarum sententiarum: quinque vocum . . .
Contains 8 conflicting attributions:
Caussin 192, Clemens 178, 204,
Comes/Maessens 164, Gombert 48, 231,
Manchicourt 190, Manchicourt/Portinaro 92

[1556]/9
Sextus tomus Evangeliorum, et piarum sententiarum. Quatuor, sex, et octo vocum . . .
Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
Gombert 75, Maessens 86, Manchicourt 189,
Morales 112

1558/4
Novum et insigne opus musicum, sex, quinque, et quattuor vocum . . .
Contains 5 conflicting attributions:
Berchem 95, Fevin 223, Josquin 120, 252,
Mouton 214

1559/1
Secunda pars magni operis musici, continens clarissimorum symphonistarum . . .
Contains 15 conflicting attributions:
Berchem 159, 209, Caen 107, Clemens 87,
137, 187, Crecquillon 38, Jacquet 9, 152,
Jacquet/Berchem 145, Lupus 109, 123,
Mouton 163, Verdelot 130, 228

1559/2
Tertia pars magni operis musici, continens clarissimorum symphonistarum . . .
Contains 10 conflicting attributions:
Crecquillon 97, 257, Isaac 264, Josquin
202, 240, Mouton 3, 91, 115, 203, Verdelot
23

1560/2
Variarum linquarum tricinia, a praestantissimis musicis . . .
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Jacotin 126
(Montanus & Neuber continued)

1564/1 Thesaurus musicus continens selectissimas octo, septem, sex, quinque et quatuor vocum Harmonias . . .
   Contains 10 conflicting attributions: Clemens 260, Crecquillon 191, Jacquet 224, Josquin 245, Manchicourt 260, Mouton 249, 255, Richafort 102, Sermisy 128, anon. 133

1564/3 Thesauri musici tomus tertius continens cantiones sacras . . .
   Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Isaac 205, Josquin 120

1564/4 Thesauri musici tomus quartus continens selectissimas quinque vocum . . .
   Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Ruffo 108, Werrecore 119

1564/5 Thesauri musici tomus quintus, et ultimus, continens sacras harmonias . . .
   Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Clemens 257, Josquin 11, Vaet 86

1569/1 Beati omnes. Psalmus CXXVIII. Davidis: sex, quinque et quatuor vocum . . .
   Contains 5 conflicting attributions: Champion 29, Lupus 26, Pieton 27, Stoltzer 28, 174

**MONTESDOCA** in Seville

1554/32 Libro de musica para vihuela, intitulado Orphenica lyra . . .
   Contains 4 conflicting attributions: Gombert 52, Jacquet 9, Morales 138, Verdelot 228

**MÜLLER** in Strasbourg

1562/24 Lautten Buch, von mancherley schönen und lieblichen Stucken . . .
   Contains 2 conflicting attributions: anon. 38, 52
PETREIUS in Nuremberg

1536/13  Der ander Theil des Lautenbuchs. . . .
         durch mich Hansen Newsidler . . .
         Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
         Craen 220

1538/6  Tomus primus psalmorum selectorum à
         praestantissimis musicis . . .
         Contains 8 conflicting attributions:
         Josquin 140, Josquin/Wolff 47, Mouton 70,
         161, Senfl 55, Sermisy 77, Stoltzer 31,
         Willaert 56

1538/7  Modulationes aliquot quatuor vocum
         selectissimae . . .
         Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
         Isaac 139, Josquin 62, Mahu 50, Willaert 188

1539/9  Tomus secundus psalmorum selectorum
         quatuor et quinque vocum.
         Contains 9 conflicting attributions:
         Carpentras 35, Ducis 63, Gombert 1, 61,
         Isaac 30, Josquin 53, 54, Lhérétier 168,
         Lupus 26

1540/6  Selectissimarum mutetarum partim quinque
         partim quatuor vocum tomus primus.
         Contains 7 conflicting attributions:
         Arcadelt 81, Hesdin 218, Jacquet 9,
         Lhérétier 21, Lupi 201, Richafort 136,
         Verdelot 172

[1540]/8  Concentus novi, trium vocum, ecclesiarum
         usui in Prussia praecipue
         accomodati . . .
         Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
         Richafort 107

1541/2  Trium vocum cantiones centum, à
         praestantissimis diversarum
         nationum . . .
         Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
         Mouton 10
(Petreius continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1542/6</td>
<td>Tomus tertius psalmorum selectorum quatuor et quinque . . . Contains 8 conflicting attributions: Champion 29, Jacquet 71, 124, Jacquet/ Sermisy 145, Lhéritier/Verdelot 122, Pieton 27, Senfl 113, Sermisy 162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PETRUCCI in Venice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1502/1</td>
<td>Motetti A. numero trentatre. A Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Craen 220, Josquin 264, anon. 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1502/2</td>
<td>Canti B. numero cinquanta B Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Brumel 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1503/1</td>
<td>Motetti De passione De cruce De sacramento de Beata virgine et huius modi. Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504/1</td>
<td>Motetti C. Contains 4 conflicting attributions: anon. 153, 194, 225, 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1505/2</td>
<td>Motetti libro quarto. Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Brumel 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1514/1</td>
<td>Motetti de la corona. Libro primo. Contains 7 conflicting attributions: Carpentras 35, Fevin 90, 99, 223, Mouton 33, 36, anon. 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519/1</td>
<td>Motetti de la corona libro secondo. Contains 8 conflicting attributions: Caen 140, Eustachius 30, La Page 91, Mouton 157, 170, 179, Richafort 160, Therache 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519/2</td>
<td>Motetti de la corona. Libro tertio. Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Compère 177, Mouton 202, Pesenti 244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Petrucci continued)

1519/3  Motetti de la corona. Libro quarto.
        Contains 5 conflicting attributions:
        Bauldeweyn 182, Carpentras 161, Josquin
        150, 163, anon. 57

PETRUS in Basel

1547/1  Glareani Dodecachordon.
        Contains 7 conflicting attributions:
        Craen 220, Josquin 53, 153, 194, 244,
        Mouton 160, Richafort 39

PHEALESE in Louvain

1552/29 Hortus Musarum in quo tanquam flosculi
        quidam selectissimorum carminum collecti
        sunt . . .
        Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
        anon. 34, 130

1553/11 Liber quartus cantionum sacrarum, (vulgo
        moteta vocant) quinque et sex vocum . . .
        Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
        Moreau 241

1554/1  Liber primus cantionum sacrarum, (Vulgo
        moteta vocant) quinque vocum . . .
        Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
        Clemens 154, 204, Clemens/Crecquillon 166,
        Crecquillon 65

1554/2  Liber secundus cantionum sacrarum, (vulgo
        moteta vocant) quinque et sex vocum . . .
        Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
        Clemens 234

1554/4 = 1553/11

1555/2 = 1554/1

1555/4  Liber septimus cantionum sacrarum vulgo
        moteta vocant, quinque & sex vocum . . .
        Contains 2 conflicting attribution:
        Clemens 87, Crecquillon 64
1555/5 Liber octavus cantionum sacrarum vulgo moteta vocant quinque sex septem & octo vocum...
    Contains 2 conflicting attribution: Clemens 189, 191

1558/6 = 1555/4

1568/23 Luculentum theatrum musicum, in quo (demptis vetustate tritis cantionibus) selectissima optimorum...
    Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Clemens 189

1569/6 Selectissimarum sacrarum cantionum (quas vulgo Moteta vocant) flores, trium vocum...
    Contains 1 conflicting attribution: C. Festa 15

1571/16 Theatrum musicum, longe amplissimum cui (demptis quae vetustate viluerant)...
    Contains 2 conflicting attributions: anon. 9, 123

1559c **Clemens** Liber tertius cantionum sacrarum vulgo moteta vocant, quatuor vocum.
    Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Clemens 129, 257

1559d **Clemens** Liber quartus cantionum sacrarum vulgo moteta vocant, quatuor vocum.
    Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Clemens 143, 189

1559e **Clemens** Liber quintus cantionum sacrarum vulgo moteta vocant, quatuor vocum.
    Contains 4 conflicting attributions: Clemens 97, 101, 185, 235

1559f **Clemens** Liber sextus cantionum sacrarum vulgo moteta vocant, quatuor vocum.
    Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Clemens 233
(Phalèse continued)

1559 **Crecquillon** Liber septimus cantionum sacrarum vulgo moteta vocant, quatuor vocum.
Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
Crecquillon 76, 141, 227

1573 **Rore** Sacrae cantiones seu moteta (ut vocant) non minus instrumentis quam vocibus aptae, liber unus.
Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
Rore 41, 66, 249

1576 **Crecquillon** Opus sacrarum cantionum (quas vulgo moteta vocant)... quatuor, quinque, sex et octo vocum...
Contains 6 conflicting attributions:
Crecquillon 38, 64, 76, 141, 166, 227

**PISADOR** in Salamanca

1552/35 Libro de musica de vihuela, agora nuevamente compuesto por Diego Pisador. . .
Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
Gombert 245, Willaert 188

**RAMPAZZETTO** in Venice

1563/3 Liber primus Musarum cum quatuor vocibus sacrarum cantionum que vulgo mottetta vocantur ab Orlando di Lassus, . . .
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Valent 125

1564/6 Motteti del Fiore a quattro voci, novamente ristampati . . .
Contains 7 conflicting attributions:
Lasson 265, Lhéritier 122, 168, Lhéritier/Pieton 27, Lupi 200, Lupus 26, Willaert 188
**RHAW in Wittenberg**

1538/8  Symphoniae iucundae atque adeo breves quatuor vocum . . .
   Contains 9 conflicting attributions:
   Fevin 62, La Fage 91, La Rue 213,
   Mahu/Mouton 197, Verdelot 200, 259, 265,
   Walter 89, anon. 80

1539/14 Officia Paschalia. De Resurrectione et Ascensione Domini.
   Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
   anon. 39

1542/8  Tricinia. Tum veterum tum recentiorum in arte musica symphonistarum . . .
   Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
   Werrecore 28, anon. 80

1542/12 Sacrorum hymnorum liber primus. Centum & triginta quatuor hymnos contines . . .
   Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
   Rener 205

1544/4  Postremum Vespertini Officii opus, cuius priores partes . . .
   Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
   Verdelot 73

1545/6  Bicinia gallica, latina, germanica, ex praestantissimis musicorum . . .
   Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
   Stoltzer 31

1544 **Walter**
   Wittembergisch deudsch Geistlich Gesangbüchlein.
   Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
   Walter 59

1551 **Wlater** = 1544 Walter

**SANCHEZ in Madrid**

1578/24  Obras de musica para tecla arpa y vihuela, de Antonio de Cabeçon . . .
   Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
   Richafort 107, Verdelot 221
SCHÖFFER in Strasbourg

1539/8 Cantiones quinque vocum selectissimae, a primarijs (Germaniae inferioris, Galliae, & Italiae) . . .
Contains 8 conflicting attributions:
Arcadelt 81, Cadéac 212, Conseil 67, Gombert 250, Jacquet 124, Le Brung 159, Simom 12, Verdelot 228

1525 Walter Geystliche Gsangbüchlin.
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Walter 59

1534 Walter Witterembergische Gsangbüchli . . . uff ein neues corrigeriet, . . .
Contains conflicting attributions:
Walter 59

SCOTTO in Venice

1541/3 Nicolai Gomberti musici excellentissimi
Pentaphthongos harmonia . . .
Contains 10 conflicting attributions:

1541/4 Gomberti excellentissimi, et inventione in hac arte facile principis, . . . musica quatuor vocum . . .
Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
Gombert 16, 151, 263

1543/4 Symphonia quatuor modulata vocibus excellentissimi musici Joannis Galli
alias chori Ferrariae magistri . . .
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Maistre Jhan 84

1543/5 Moralis hispani, et multorum eximiae
artis virorum musica . . .
Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
Morales 112, anon. 116, 126

1548/12 Intabolatura di lautto libro secondo.
Madrigali a cinque & a quattro . . .
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Willaert 188
1549/3  Il primo libro de motetti a sei voce, da diversi eccellentissimi musici . . .
Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
Jacquet 10, Morales 138

1549/4  Excellentiss. autorum diverse modulationes
que sub titulo Fructus vagantur . . .
Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
Jacquet 152, 209

1549/7  Primo libro de motetti a cinque voci da
diversi eccellentissimi musici . . .
Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
Crecquillon 64, Morales 137

1549/9a Musica quatuor vocum, que materna lingua
moteta vocantur . . .
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Conseil 61

1549/10 Excelentiss. autorum diverse modulationes
que sub titulo Fructus vagantur . . .
Contains 6 conflicting attributions:
Gose 171, Jacquet 116, Jaques du Pont 42,
Lhérityier 23, Lupi 34, Sermisy 45

1549/14 Libro secondo de li motetti a tre voce,
da diversi eccellentissimi musici . . .
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Jacotin 126

1549/15 Elletione de motetti non piu stampati a
quattro voci di Verdelotto et di altri . . .
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
De Silva 253

1554/14 Motetti del Laberinto, a quattro voci
libro secondo.
Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
Clemens 257, Crecquillon 206

1554/15 Motetti del Laberinto. A quatuor voci
libro terzo.
Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
Canis 40, Clemens 101
(Scotto continued)

1554/16  Motetti del Laberinto, a cinque voci libro quatro
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Crecquillon 154

1555/15  Moteti de la fama Libro primo a quatro voci, composti da Ioanne Lheritier . . .
Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
Le Heurteur 168, Lheritier 21,
Lhéritier/Verdelot 23

1562/2  Motetti del frutto a quattro voci. Libro primo . . .
Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
Gose 171, Jacquet 116, Lheritier 23, Lupi 34

1587/8 = Gardane 1543/21

1539a  Gombert  Gomberti Excellentissimi et inventione in hac arte . . . Musica Quatuor Vocum . . .
Liber Primus.
Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
Gombert 8, 16, 151, 263

1539b  Gombert  Musica Excellentissimo Nicolai Gomberti
(vulgo Motecta Quinque Vocum
nuncupata) . . . Liber Primus
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Gombert 4

1539a  Jacquet  Motecta quinque vocum . . . liber primus.
Contains 5 conflicting attributions:
Jacquet 9, 17, 124, 159, 209

1539b  Jacquet  Motecta quatuor vocum . . . liber primus.
Contains 5 conflicting attributions:
Jacquet 7, 113, 116, 210, 266

1539a  Willaert  Musica quatuor vocum (quae vulgo motecta
nuncupatur) . . . liber primus, quatuor vocum.
Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
Willaert 21, 32, 259
(Scotto continued)

1539c Willaert Musica quinque vocum (quae vulgo motecta nuncupatur) . . . liber primus.
   Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
   Willaert 79

1544 Jacquet = 1539b Jacquet
   Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
   Jacquet 113, 116, 210, 266

1541b Gombert Motectorum quinque vocum. . . liber secundus.
   Contains 5 conflicting attributions:
   Gombert 51, 79, 93, 127, 192

1541c Gombert Motectorum . . . liber secundus quatuor vocum.
   Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
   Gombert 2, 50, 75, 236

1545 Rore = Gardane 1545 Rore
   Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
   Rore 249

1560 Contino Modulationum, quinque vocum, liber secundus.
   Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
   Contino 237

1565a Jacquet = Scotto 1539a Jacquet
   = Gardane 1545 Jacquet
   Contains 3 conflicting attributions:
   Jacquet 9, 117, 209

1565b Jacquet Motetti di Jachet da Mantoa a cinque voci.
   Libro secondo, di novo ristampati.
   Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
   Jacquet 17, 124, 159, 183
**SUSATO in Antwerp**

1546/6  
Liber primus sacrarum cantionum, quinque vocum, vulgo moteta vocant . . .  
Contains 2 conflicting attributions:  
Clemens 135, Manchicourt 135

1546/7  
Liber secundus sacrarum cantionum, quinque vocum vulgo moteta vocant . . .  
Contains 6 conflicting attributions:  
Appenzeller 256, Clemens 74, Hellinck 195, Lupi/Lupus 22, Manchicourt 190, Morales 241

1547/5  
Liber tertius sacrarum cantionum, quattuor vocum, vulgo Moteta vocant . . .  
Contains 2 conflicting attributions:  
Clemens 189, Hesdin 85

1547/6  
Liber quartus sacrarum cantionum, quattuor vocum vulgo moteta vocant . . .  
Contains 3 conflicting attributions:  
Appenzeller 40, Guyot 94, Mouton 3

1553/8  
Liber primus ecclesiasticarum cantionum quattuor vocum vulgo moteta vocant . . .  
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:  
Crecquillon 97

1553/9  
Liber secundus ecclesiasticarum cantionum quattuor vocum vulgo moteta vocant . . .  
Contains 3 conflicting attributions:  
Crecquillon 185, 235, De Latre 141

1553/10  
Liber tertius ecclesiasticarum cantionum quattuor vocum vulgo moteta vocant . . .  
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:  
Crecquillon 257

1553/12  
Liber quintus ecclesiasticarum cantionum quinque vocum vulgo moteta vocant . . .  
Contains 3 conflicting attributions:  
Clemens 65, 135, anon. 38

1553/13  
Liber sextus ecclesiasticarum cantionum quinque vocum vulgo moteta vocant . . .  
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:  
Le Roy 172
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(Susato continued)

1558/3 = 1553/16

Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Crecquillon 167

**SYLVIUS** in Geneva

[1559]/4 Tertius liber modulorum, quatuor ey quinque vocum . . .
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Clemens 74

[1559]/5 Quartus liber modulorum, quatuor et quinque vocum . . .
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Crecquillon 166

**ULHARD** in Augsburg

1545/2 Concentus octo, sex, quinque & quatuor vocum . . .
Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
Baston 39, Gascongne 3, Jacotin 224, Susato 68

1548/2 Cantiones selectissimae. Quatuor vocum.
Ab eximiiis et praestantibus . . .
Contains 7 conflicting attributions:
Canis 40, Canis/Crecquillon 227, 235, 262,
Crecquillon 76, 141, Payen 263

1549/11 Cantiones selectissimae. Quatuor vocum.
Liber secundus . . .
Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
Clemens 101, 129

**VISSENAECKEN** in Antwerp

1542/7 Quatuor vocum musicae modulationes numero XXVI ex optimis autoribus . . .
Contains 4 conflicting attributions:
Gallus 68, Jaques duPont 42, Vinders 78,
anon. 263
WAEILRANT et LAET in Antwerp

1554/6 Sacrarum cantionum (vulgo hodie moteta vocant) quinque et sex vocum . . .
Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
Clemens 137, Crecquillon 38

1555/6 Sacrarum cantionum (vulgo hodie moteta vocant) quinque et sex vocum . . .
Contains 2 conflicting attributions:
Canis 87, Tubal 49

[1556]/4 Sacrarum cantionum (vulgo hodie Moteta vocant) quatuor vocum . . .
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Crecquillon 76

WELACK in Wittenberg

1591/25 Cantilenae latinae et germanicae III. et V. vocum . . .
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
anon. 197

WYRIOT in Strasbourg

1578/1 Selectae cantiones octo et septem vocum,
in usum Academiae Reipublicae argentoratensis.
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Crecquillon 191

Prints without the name of the printer

1524 Walter Geystliche gesangk Buchleyn.
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
Walter 59

1546/22 Intabulatura di lutto, libro quarto, de
la messa di A. Fevino . . .
Contains 1 conflicting attribution:
anon. 91
(B) MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

**AachS 2** Aachen. Stiftsarchiv. MS II

Date: 1574-9  
Provenance: Aachen  
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Clemens 234, Crecquillon 64, 233

**AnsbachS 12** Ansbach. Staatliche Bibliothek. MS VI.g.12

Date: 1564  
Provenance: Dresden  
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: anon. 233, 235

**AnsbachS 16** Ansbach. Staatliche Bibliothek. MS VI.g.16

Date: 1565-6  
Provenance: Ansbach  
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Clemens 189

**AugsS 7** Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek. MS Tonkunst Schletterer 7

Date: 1576  
Provenance: Augsburg  
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 239

**BarcBC 454** Barcelona. Biblioteca Central. MS 454

Date: before 1525  
Provenance: Barcelona  
Contains 5 conflicting attributions: Fevin 223, Josquin 222, Mouton 182, Peñalosa 158, 177

**BarcBC 681** Barcelona. Biblioteca Central. MS 681

Date: first half of 16th c.  
Provenance: Vich  
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 39
BarcOC 5 Barcelona. Biblioteca de L’Orfeó Català. MS 5
Date: late 15th c. - early 16th c.
Provenance: partly Spanish
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 177

BasU F.IX.55 Basel. Öffentliche Bibliothek der Universität. MS F.IX.55
Date: early 16th c.
Provenance: Basel?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Isaac 213

BergBC 1209 Bergamo. Biblioteca Civica. MS 1209 D
Date: second quarter of 16th c.
Provenance: Bergamo
Contains 7 conflicting attributions: De Silva 142, 261, Jacquet 169, Maffoni 63, Mouton 114, Verdelot 210, anon. 226

BerLPS 321 Berlin. Former Preussische Staatsbibliothek. MS Landesberg 321
Date: after 16th c.
Provenance: ?
Literature: Kirsch Motetten des De Silva, p. 52.
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: De Silva 265

BerLPS 40013 Berlin. Former Preussische Staatsbibliothek. MS mus. 40013
Date: ca. 1540
Provenance: Torgau
Contains 5 conflicting attributions: Senfl 54, anon. 59, 89, 123, 252

BerLPS 40031 Berlin. Former Preussische Staatsbibliothek. MS mus. 40031
Date: second quarter of 16th c.
Provenance: Germany?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 240
BerlPS 40043 Berlin. Former Preussische Staatsbibliothek. MS mus. 40043

Date: ca. 1542-4
Provenance: Torgau
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Manchicourt 189, anon. 44

BloomL 4 Bloomington. Indiana University, Lilly Library. Latin American Manuscripts, Guatemala, Music MS 4

Date: late 16th c.
Provenance: Santa Eulalia, Guatemala
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Mouton 203

BloomL 8 Bloomington. Indiana University, Lilly Library. Latin American Manuscripts, Guatemala, Music MS 8

Date: late 16th c.
Provenance: San Juan Ixcoi, Guatemala
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Mouton 203

BloomL 9 Bloomington. Indiana University, Lilly Library. Latin American Manuscripts, Guatemala, Music MS 9

Date: late 16th c.
Provenance: San Mateo Ixtatán, Guatemala
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Mouton 203

BolC Q19 Bologna. Civico Museo bibliografico musicale. MS Q19

Date: ca. 1518
Provenance: northern Italy (Ferrara?)
Contains 13 conflicting attributions: C. Festa 207, S. Festa 118, Jacquet 169, 251, Lupus 165, Moulu 115, 202, Mouton 114, 196, 214, Renaldo 186, Richafort 44, anon. 110
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Bo1C Q20 Bologna. Civico Museo bibliografico musicale. MS Q20

Date: ca 1530
Provenance: northern Italy
Contains 8 conflicting attributions: De Silva 239, Gascongne 3, Jacquet 210, 266, Lupus 246, Mouton 247, 251, Verdelot 73

Bo1C Q27(I) Bologna. Civico Museo bibliografico musicale. MS Q27(I)

Date: the second quarter of the 16th c.
Provenance: northern Italy
Contains 13 conflicting attributions: Conseil 67, De Silva 238, Jacquet 9, 152, 209, 250, Lupus 123, Mouton 88, Verdelot 130, 228, Willaert 12, anon. 182, 223

Bo1C R142 Bologna. Civico Museo bibliografico musicale. MS R142

Date: ca. 1515-30, or 1530-50
Provenance: northern Italy
Contains 6 conflicting attributions: C. Festa 182, Jacquet/Josquin 216, Josquin 214, 252, Mouton 120, 202

Bo1SP 29 Bologna. Archivio Musicale della Fabbriceria di San Petronio. MS A.XXIX

Date: 1512-27
Provenance: Bologna
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 196

Bo1SP 38 Bologna. Archivio Musicale della Fabbriceria di San Petronio. MS A.XXXVIII

Date: 1512-27
Provenance: Bologna
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: anon. 21, 90, 203
BolSP 39  Bologna. Archivio Musicale della Fabbriceria di San Petronio. MS A.XXXIX

Date: 1552
Provenance: Bologna
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: anon. 4, 9, 249

BolSP 45  Bologna. Archivio Musicale della Fabbriceria di San Petronio. MS A.XXXV

Date: 1527-41
Provenance: Bologna
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 23

BrusBR 228 Brussels. Bibliothèque Royale. MS 228

Date: 1516-23
Provenance: Brussels/Mechlin
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 19

BrusC 27088 Brussels. Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal de Musique. MS 27088

Date: before 1549
Provenance: Beaumont
Contains 6 conflicting attributions: Berchem 18, Clemens 154, 234, Lupi 6, 173, Hellinck 123

BudOS 6  Budapest. Országos Széchényi Könyvtár. MS Bárta 6

Date: early 17th c.
Provenance: Bárta
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 238

BudOS 23 Budapest. Országos Széchényi Könyvtár. MS Bárta 23

Date: ca. 1550, and after 1555
Provenance: Wittenberg
Contains 7 conflicting attributions: Clemens 87, C.Festa/S.Festa 118, Gascongne 3, Gosse 171, Josquin 52, anon. 39, 209
BudOS P6  Budapest. Országos Széchényi Könyvtár. MS Bártfa Mus. Pr. 6 (a-d)

Date: after 1558
Provenance: Bártfa
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: anon. 58, 205

CambraiBM 125-8  Cambrai. Bibliothèque municipale. MSS 125-128

Date: 1542
Provenance: Bruges?
Contains 17 conflicting attributions: Reulx 77, Craen 220, Gombert 143, Lupi 34, 200, 232, Mouton 201, Richafort 193, Sermisy 168, Vinders 78, anon. 39, 44, 114, 218, 223, 229, 236

CambriP 1760  Cambridge. Magdalene College, Pepys Library. MS 1760

Date: ca. 1500-16
Provenance: France
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Fevin 36, 223, Fevin/Therache 254

CambriU Peter. 471-4  Cambridge. University Library. MSS Peterhouse 471-474

Date: 1539-41
Provenance: Canterbury, or Durham
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Lupus 9

CasAC C  Casale Monferrato. Archivio e Biblioteca Capitolare, Duomo. MS C

Date: 1538-ca. 1545
Provenance: Casale Monferrato
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: anon. 159, 184
CasAC D(F) Casale Monferrato. Archivio e Biblioteca Capitolare, Duomo. MS D(F)

Date: 1521-ca. 1526, and 1538-ca. 1545
Provenance: Casale Monferrato
Contains 10 conflicting attributions: anon. 7, 21, 39, 44, 110, 155, 174, 203, 215, 226

CasAC N(H) Casale Monferrato. Archivio e Biblioteca Capitolare, Duomo. MS N(H)

Date: 1538-ca. 1545
Provenance: Casale Monferrato
Contains 4 conflicting attributions: anon. 63, 84, 116, 188

CasAC P(E) Casale Monferrato. Archivio e Biblioteca Capitolare, Duomo. MS P(E)

Date: 1521-ca. 1526
Provenance: Casale Monferrato
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 90


Date: 1527-9
Provenance: Florence
Contains 4 conflicting attributions: anon. 7, 188, 221, 228

ChiN 107510 Chicago. Newberry Library, Special Collections. Ms. Lute Codex Vincenzo Capirola, Acquisition Number 107501

Date: ca. 1515-20
Provenance: Venice
Literature: Gombosi, Composizione di Meser Vincenzo Capirola, pp. ix-xiv
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 223
CivMA 59 Cividale del Friuli. Museo Archeologico Nazionale. MS LIX

Date: ca. 1535-40
Provenance: ?
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: anon. 113, 174, 223

CoimU 12 Coimbra. Biblioteca Geral da Universidade. MS M.12

Date: late 15th c.-early 16th c.
Provenance: Coimbra
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: anon. 72, 158, 177

CoimU 32 Coimbra. Biblioteca Geral da Universidade. MS M.32

Date: late 16th c.
Provenance: Coimbra
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: anon. 72, 158

CoimU 48 Coimbra. Biblioteca Geral da Universidade. MS M.48

Date: after 1559
Provenance: Coimbra
Literature: Kastner, "Los manuscritos musicales," pp. 80-6
Contains 5 conflicting attributions: Clemens 135, Lhéritier 168, Morales 116, Sermisy 193, anon. 126

ColnU 57 Cologne. Universitäts- und Stadtbibliothek. MS GB III 57

Date: 2nd half of 16th c.
Provenance: of German origin?
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: anon. 87, 154, 190

CopKB 1848 Copenhagen. Det Kongelige Bibliotek. MS Ny Kongelige Samling 1848, 2°

Date: ca. 1525
Provenance: Lyons?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Richafort 181
CopKB 1872  Copenhagen. Det Kongelige Bibliotek. MS Ny Kongelige Samling 1872, 4°

Date: 1541-3
Provenance: Copenhagen, or Königsberg
Contains 5 conflicting attributions: Eckel 146, anon. 102, 107, 223, 228

CopKB 1873  Copenhagen. Det Kongelige Bibliotek. MS Ny Kongelige Samling 1873, 4°

Date: after 1556
Provenance: Copenhagen
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: anon. 54, 189, 223

CorBC 95-6  Cortona. Biblioteca Comunale. MSS 95-96 (see ParisBNN 1817)

Date: ca. 1492-4, and 1515-6
Provenance: Florence
Contains conflicting attributions: anon. 155, 229

DressL 1/D/3  Dresden. Sächsische Landesbibliothek. MS Mus. 1/D/3

Date: ca. 1550-60
Provenance: Wittenberg
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Josquin/Senfl 54, Stoltzer 31, Verdelot 123

DressL 1/D/6  Dresden. Sächsische Landesbibliothek. MS Mus. 1/D/6

Date: ca. 1560-80
Provenance: Silesia
Contains 8 conflicting attributions: Clemens 234, Isaac 264, Josquin 240, Senfl 54, anon. 53, 140, 174, 239


Date: ca. 1560
Provenance: central Germany
Contains 4 conflicting attributions: anon. 89, 91, 123, 201
DresSL 1/D/505  Dresden. Sächsische Landesbibliothek. MS Mus. 1/D/505

Date: ca. 1530
Provenance: Annaberg
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Obrecht 139, 229, anon. 194


Date: ca. 1590-1600
Provenance: central Germany?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 172

DresSL Glashütte 5  Dresden. Sächsische Landesbibliothek. MS Glashütte 5 (1-2)

Date: 1583-8, and ca. 1600
Provenance: ?
Contains 7 conflicting attributions: Fevin 223, Manchicourt 189, anon. 44, 81, 109, 245, 252

DresSL Grimma 7  Dresden. Sächsische Landesbibliothek. MS Grimma 7 (1-4)

Date: ca. 1590-1621, and ca. 1650
Provenance: Meissen
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 245

DresSL Grimma 49  Dresden. Sächsische Landesbibliothek. MS Grimma 49 (1-7)

Date: 1593-6
Provenance: Meissen
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Eckel 146

DresSL Grimma 51  Dresden. Sächsische Landesbibliothek. MS Grimma 51 (1-4)

Date: ca. 1570-80
Provenance: Meissen
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Josquin 196, Mouton 202
DresSL Grimma 53  Dresden. Sächsische Landesbibliothek. MS
Grimma 53 (1-5)

Date: ca. 1560-75
Provenance: Meissen
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 187

DresSL Grimma 54  Dresden. Sächsische Landesbibliothek. MS
Grimma 54 (1-5)

Date: ca. 1590
Provenance: Meissen
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Clemens 234,
Josquin 44, Rore 41

DresSL Grimma 55  Dresden. Sächsische Landesbibliothek. MS
Grimma 55 (1-7)

Date: ca. 1560-80
Provenance: Meissen
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: anon. 223, 245, 252

DresSL Grimma 56  Dresden. Sächsische Landesbibliothek. MS
Grimma 56 (1-5)

Date: ca. 1560-86
Provenance: Meissen
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 81

DresSL Grimma 58  Dresden. Sächsische Landesbibliothek. MS
Grimma 58 (1-3)

Date: ca. 1555-60
Provenance: Meissen
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 31

DresSL Grimma 59  Dresden. Sächsische Landesbibliothek. MS
Grimma 59a

Date: ca. 1560
Provenance: Meissen
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 139
DresSL Löbau 12  Dresden. Sächsische Landesbibliothek. MS
Löbau 12

Date: 1565
Provenance: Löbau
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Clemens 64, 74, 87

DresSL Löbau 50  Dresden. Sächsische Landesbibliothek. MS
Löbau 50

Date: ca. 1610-60
Provenance: Löbau
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Josquin 245

DresSL Löbau 8/70  Dresden. Sächsische Landesbibliothek.
MSS Löbau 8 and Löbau 70

Date: 1592
Provenance: Löbau
Contains conflicting attributions: Richafort 107

DresSL Pirna II  Dresden. Sächsische Landesbibliothek. MS
Pirna II

Date: ca. 1550-65, or 1575
Provenance: Pirna
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 187

DresSL Pirna III  Dresden. Sächsische Landesbibliothek. MS
Pirna III

Date: ca. 1550-65, or ca. 1570-80
Provenance: Pirna
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Vaet 86

DresSL Pirna VII  Dresden. Sächsische Landesbibliothek. MS
Pirna VII

Date: ca. 1556
Provenance: Pirna
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Richafort 107, Verdelot 59
DresSL Pirna VIII  Dresden. Sächsische Landesbibliothek. MS Pirna VIII
Date: ca. 1560-70
Provenance: Pirna
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: anon. 135, 252

EdinU 64  Edinburgh. University Library. MS 64
Date: ca. 1557
Provenance: Scotland
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 20

EisS s.s.  Eisenach. Stadtarchiv. MS s.s.
Date: mid 16th c.
Provenance: Eisenach
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Josquin 223, Senfl 54, 83

ErlU 473/1  Erlangen. Universitätsbibliothek. MS 473/1
Date: 1541
Provenance: Heilsbronn
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Richafort 107, Verdelot 45, anon. 239

ErlU 473/3  Erlangen. Universitätsbibliothek. MS 473/3
Date: 1545
Provenance: Heilsbronn
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Hellinck 123, Verdelot 228

ErlU 473/4  Erlangen. Universitätsbibliothek. MS 473/4
Date: 1540-1
Provenance: Heilsbronn
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: anon. 53, 197, 223
**FlorBN II.I.232** Florence. Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale. MS II.I.232

Date: 1516-21  
Provenance: Florence  
Contains 5 conflicting attributions: Carpentras 35, 161, Mouton 196, Ninot 194, 229

**FlorBN II.I.350** Florence. Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale. MS II.I.350

Date: ca. 1520  
Provenance: Florence  
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 63

**FlorBN Magl. 125bis** Florence. Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale. MS Magliabechi XIX, 125bis

Date: 1530-4  
Provenance: Florence  
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Josquin 258, anon. 221

**FlorBN Magl. 164-7** Florence. Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale. MS Magliabechi XIX. 164-167

Date: 1530-40  
Provenance: Florence  
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 161

**FlorC 2439** Florence. Biblioteca del Conservatorio di Musica Luigi Cherubini. MS Basevi 2439

Date: 1506-14  
Provenance: Brussels/Mechlin  
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: La Rue 220

**FlorD 11** Florence. Duomo, Archivio Muaicale dell’Opera di Santa Maria del Fiore. MS 11

Date: 1557  
Provenance: Florence  
Contains 6 conflicting attributions: anon. 22, 39, 81, 203, 228, 241
FlorD 27 Florence. Duomo, Archivio Muaciale dell’Opera di Santa Maria del Fiore. MS 27

Date: 1564-8
Provenance: Florence
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 188

FlorD 45 Florence. Duomo, Archivio Muaciale dell’Opera di Santa Maria del Fiore. MS 45

Date: ca. 1559
Provenance: Florence
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 238

FlorL 666 Florence. Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana. MS Acquisti e doni 666

Date: 1518
Provenance: Rome
Contains 8 conflicting attributions: Elimot 174, Lapicida 105, La Fage 91, Maistre Jhan 144, Mouton 121, 163, 214, Therache 254

GothaF A98 Gotha. Forschungsbibliothek Gotha, Schloss Friedenstein. MS Chart. A. 98

Date: 1545
Provenance: Torgau
Contains 7 conflicting attributions: Senfl 54, anon. 59, 89, 123, 228, 240, 252

GreifU 640-1 Greifswald. Universitätsbibliothek. MSS BW 640-641

Date: 1539-58
Provenance: Barth?
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Appenzeller 78, Carpentras 35, anon. 63

HeilbS XCVII/3 Heilbronn. Stadtarchiv, Musiksammlung. MSS XCI-IV/3

Date: after 1566
Provenance: ?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 70
'S Hertogenbosch. Archief van de Illustre Lieve Vrouwe Broederschap. MS 72C

Date: 1530-1
Provenance: Brussel/Mechlin
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Mouton 214, anon. 130

'S Hertogenbosch. Archief van de Illustre Lieve Vrouwe Broederschap. MS 73

Date: 1544
Provenance: 'S Hertogenbosch
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 34

HradKM 7 Hradec Králové. Krajske Muzeum, Knihovna. MS II A 7

Date: late 15th c., or early 16th c.
Provenance: Prague
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Josquin 264

HradKM 22 Hradec Králové. Krajske Muzeum, Knihovna. MS II A 22 (a-b)

Date: 1574-5
Provenance: ?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Josquin 252

HradKM 29 Hradec Králové. Krajske Muzeum, Knihovna. MS II A 29

Date: ca. 1556-62
Provenance: ?
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: anon. 4, 88

KasL 24 Kassel. Murhard’sche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel und Landesbibliothek. MSS 4° Mus. 24/1-4

Date: 16th C.
Provenance: Kassel
Contains 17 conflicting attributions: Caen 140, Finck 47, Josquin 29, 35, 53, 55, 73, 78, 144, Moulu 70, Richafort 1, Senfl 54, Verdier 123, anon. 28, 61, 168, 174
KasL 53/2 Kassel. Murhard'sche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel und Landesbibliothek. MS 8° Mus. 53/2

Date: 16th C.
Provenance: Kassel
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 213

KasL 91 Kassel. Murhard'sche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel und Landesbibliothek. MSS 4° Mus. 91/1-5

Date: 16th c.
Provenance: Kassel
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Clemens 154

KlagL 4/3 Klagenfurt. Landesregierungsarchiv. MS 4-3

Date: ca. 1560-70
Provenance: ?
Literature: Federhofer, "Eine Kärntner Orgeltabulatur,"
p. 330.
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Verdelot 130

KönSU 1740 Königsberg. Former Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek. MS 1740

Date: ca. 1537-44
Provenance: Königsberg
Contains 13 conflicting attributions: Conseil 34, Craen 223, C. Festa 8, Gascongne 211, Gombert 26, Haugk 50, Mouton 236, 239, Richafort 151, Sermisy 7, 45, Willaert 32, anon. 63

KrakPAN 1716 Kraków. Biblioteka Polskiej Akademii Nauk. MS 1716

Date: ca. 1537-48
Provenance: ?
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Mikołaj 52, anon 59
LeidGA 1438  Leiden. Gemeentearchief, Archieven van de Kerken. MS 1438

Date: 1549
Provenience: Leiden
Contains 4 conflicting attributions: Clemens 154, Crecquillon 141, 166, anon. 136

LeidGA 1439  Leiden. Gemeentearchief, Archieven van de Kerken. MS 1439

Date: 1559
Provenience: Leiden
Contains 4 conflicting attributions: Josquin 175, Lupi 208, Richafort 88, anon. 221

LeidGA 1441  Leiden. Gemeentearchief, Archieven van de Kerken. MS 1441

Date: mid 16th c.
Provenience: Brussels?
Contains 13 conflicting attributions: Clemens 101, 189, Clemens/Crecquillon 74, Crecquillon 97, 129, 185, 187, 227, 235, Lupi 93, Manchicourt 171, Payen 263, Willaert 130

LeidGA 1442  Leiden. Gemeentearchief, Archieven van de Kerken. MS 1442

Date: mid 16th c.
Provenience: Brussels?
Contains 4 conflicting attributions: Clemens 49, Willaert 188, anon. 78, 168

LeidSM 1440  Leiden. Stedelijk Museum in de Lakenhal. MS 1440

Date: 1559
Provenience: Leiden
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Clemens 76, Crecquillon 84, anon. 81
LeipU 49 Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek. MS Thomaskirche 49 (1-4) and MS Thomaskirche 50

Date: ca. 1558
Provenance: Leipzig
Contains 15 conflicting attributions: Josquin 25, 47, 145, 240, Maessens 179, Obrecht 188, anon. 35, 54, 73, 81, 107, 136, 200, 236, 259

LeipU 51 Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek. MS Thomaskirche 51 (1-2)

Date: ca. 1555
Provenance: Leipzig
Contains 12 conflicting attributions: Lupi 200, anon. 21, 59, 89, 91, 139, 174, 188, 197, 201, 218, 265

LeuvK 4 Leuven, Bibliotheek der Katholieke Universiteit te Leuven. MS M4

Date: 1556
Provenance: from Low countries
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Clemens 97, 101

LeuvU 163 Leuven, Former Bibliothèque de l’université. MS 163

Date: 1546
Provenance: ?
Contains 6 conflicting attributions: Arcadelt 81, Lupi 34, 200, 232, Lupus 123, Verdelot 130

LonBL 29246-7 London. British Library, Reference Division. Department of Manuscripts. MS Additional 29246, 29247

Date: ca. 1620
Provenance: ?
Literature: Hughes-Hughes, pp. 59-63
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Josquin 52
LonBLR 8 G.vii London. British Library, Reference Division. Department of Manuscript. MS Royal 8 G.vii

Date: 1513-25
Provenance: Brussels/Mechlin
Contains 5 conflicting attributions: anon. 36, 90, 223, 240, 254

LonBLR A49-54 London. British Library. MS Royal A49-54

Date: ca. 1565-80
Provenance: from Nonesuch palace
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Gombert 245, anon. 221

LondRC 1070 London. Royal College of Music. MS 1070

Date: ca. 1510-5, or 1533-6
Provenance: London, or France
Contains 8 conflicting attributions: anon. 36, 114, 115, 157, 203, 223, 225, 254

LonRC 2037 London. Royal College of Music. MS 2037

Date: 1527-34
Provenance: Ferrara
Contains 6 conflicting attributions: Jacquet 266, Maistre Jhan 84, Mouton 114, Willaert 188, 259, Dalla Viola 16

LübhH 203 Lübeck. Bibliothek der Hansestadt Lübeck. MS Mus. A 203 (a-d)

Date: ca. 1586-1613
Provenance: Lübeck?
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Crecquillon 234, Fevin 223

LucBS 775 Lucca. Biblioteca Statale. MS 775

Date: mid 16th c.
Provenance: from Low Countries
Contains 8 conflicting attributions: Jacquet 159, anon. 9, 51, 81, 119, 152, 249, 250
Lüner 144  Lüneburg. Ratsbächerei. MS Mus. ant. pract. K.N. 144

Date: ca. 1590
Provenance: Lüneburg
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 189

Lüner 150  Lüneburg. Ratsbächerei. MS Mus. ant. pract. K.N. 150

Date: ca. 1575-1620
Provenance: Lüneburg
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 228

MadM 6832  Madrid. Private Library of Don Bartolomé March Servera. MS R. 6832

Date: late 16th c.
Provenance: Spain
Contains 4 conflicting attributions: Gombert 8, Mouton 33, 203, Verdelot 228

MilC 186  Milan. Biblioteca del Conservatorio di Musica Giuseppe Verdi. MS Santa Barbara 186[IV.10]

Date: ca. 1540?
Provenance: ?
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Jacquet 7, 9

Mild 1  Milan. Archivio della Veneranda Fabbrica del Duomo, Sezione Musicale. Librone 1

Date: ca. 1484-90
Provenance: Milan
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 181

Mild 2  Milan. Archivio della Veneranda Fabbrica del Duomo, Sezione Musicale. Librone 2

Date: ca. 1490-1500
Provenance: Milan
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 181
**Mild 3** Milan. Archivio della Veneranda Fabbrica del Duomo, Sezione Musicale. Librone 3

Date: ca. 1500  
Provenance: Milan  
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: anon. 181, 225

**ModD 3** Modena. Duomo, Biblioteca e Archivio Capitolare. MS Mus. III

Date: 1520-4  
Provenance: Modena  
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Richafort 136, anon. 21, 203

**ModD 4** Modena. Duomo, Biblioteca e Archivio Capitolare. MS Mus IV

Date: ca. 1520-30  
Provenance: Modena?  
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Verdelot 130

**ModD 9** Modena. Duomo, Biblioteca e Archivio Capitolare. MS Mus. IX

Date: ca. 1520-30  
Provenance: Modena  
Contains 12 conflicting attributions: De Silva 238, Fevin 223, La Page 91, Moulu 226, Mouton 114, 196, 214, Richafort 176, Sermisy 7, Verdelot 221, 228, anon. 203

**ModE C.313** Modena. Biblioteca Estense e Universitaria. MS C.313 (1-4)

Date: ca. 1560  
Provenance: Ferrara  
Contains 9 conflicting attributions: Jacquet 9, 152, 159, 167, 209, 237, Rore 149, 249, Verdelot 228
ModE C.314  Modena. Biblioteca Estense e Universitaria. MS C.314 (1-7)

Date: ca. 1560
Provenance: Ferrara
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Jacquet 18, Willaert 24

ModE N.1.2  Modena. Biblioteca Estense e Universitaria. MS a.N.1.2 (Lat. 452)

Date: 1534-5
Provenance: Ferrara
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 7

MontsM 772  Montserrat. Biblioteca del Monestir. MS 772

Date: ca. 1560
Provenance: Madrid
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Manchicourt 178, 190

MunBS 10 Munich. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Musiksammlung. Musica MS 10

Date: 1525-30
Provenance: Munich
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Senfl 54

MunBS 13 Munich. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Musiksammlung. Musica MS 13

Date: after 1552
Provenance: Munich
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Clemens 65, 234

MunBS 16 Munich. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Musiksammlung. Musica MS 16

Date: ca. 1552-6
Provenance: Munich
Contains 5 conflicting attributions: Lupi 34, Mouton 160, Rore 66, Sermisy 45, anon. 152
MunBS 19 Munich. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Musiksammlung.
Musica MS 19

Date: before 1531, and ca. 1531-40
Provenance: Munich
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Willaert 32

MunBS 25 Munich. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Musiksammlung.
Musica MS 25

Date: ca. 1520-4
Provenance: Munich
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Sermisy 128

MunBS 41 Munich. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Musiksammlung.
Musica MS 41

Date: ca. 1552-60
Provenance: Munich
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Crecquillon 191,
anon. 114

MunBS 59 Munich. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Musiksammlung.
Musica MS 59

Date: ca. 1556-63
Provenance: Borna or Wittenberg?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Verdelot 221

MunBS 266 Munich. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Musiksammlung.
Musica MS 266

Date: ca. 1555-1575
Provenance: Augsburg
Literature: RISM B/VII, pp. 214-5
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Verdelot 221

MunBS 274a Munich. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek
Musiksammlung. Musica MS 274a

Date: mid 16th c.
Provenance: Augsburg?
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Conseil 109, Lupi
96
MunBS 1503b Munich. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Musiksammlung. Musica MS 1503b

Date: ca. 1535-50
Provenance: Augsburg?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Richafort 136

MunBS 1508 Munich. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Musiksammlung. Musica MS 1508

Date: mid 16th c.
Provenance: from Netherlands
Contains 1 conflicting attributions: Josquin 52

MunBS 1536 Munich. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Musiksammlung. Musica MS 1536

Date: 1583
Provenance: ?
Contains 8 conflicting attributions: Jacquet 224, Josquin 120, 245, Manchicourt 260, Mouton 255, Phinot 102, Verdelot 133, anon. 128

MunBS 3154 Munich. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Musiksammlung. Musica MS 3154

Date: ca. 1466-1511
Provenance: Innsbruck or Augsburg?
Contains conflicting attributions: anon. 229

MunBS B Munich. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Musiksammlung. Musica MS B

Date: 1557-9
Provenance: Munich
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Rore 149

MunU 322-5 Munich. Universitätsbibliothek der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität. MSS 8° 322-325

Date: 1527
Provenance: Basel
Contains 4 conflicting attributions: Craen 220, Josquin 153, 244, 264
MunU 326 Munich. Universitätsbibliothek der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität. MS 8° 326

Date: 1543
Provenance: Augsburg?
Contains 7 conflicting attributions: Willaert 188, anon. 52, 54, 107, 123, 197, 213

MunU 327 Munich. Universitätsbibliothek der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität. MS 8° 327

Date: ca. 1543
Provenance: Augsburg?
Contains 5 conflicting attributions: Arcadelt 81, Richafort 228, Senfl 54, anon. 107, 123

MunU 401 Munich. Universitätsbibliothek der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität. MS 4° Art. 401 (1-4)

Date: 1536-40
Provenance: Austria (or Augsburg?)
Contains 14 conflicting attributions: Bauldeweyn 31, Jacquet 9, Josquin 150, 163, Le Brung 226, Richafort 107, 136, Senfl 123, Verdelot 221, anon. 34, 39, 84, 165, 218

NurGN 83795 Nuremberg. Bibliothek des Germanischen Nationalmuseums. MS 83795

Date: ca. 1539-48
Provenance: Torgau
Contains 8 conflicting attributions: Senfl 54, anon. 25, 59, 89, 107, 123, 228, 252

NurLA 28 Nuremberg. Landeskirchliches Archiv. MS St. Egidien 28

Date: 1574
Provenance: Nuremberg
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Clemens 135
Oxford. Bodleian Library. MS Tenbury 1018

Date: late 16th or early 17th c.
Provenance: England
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 228

Padua. Biblioteca Capitolare. MS A 17

Date: 1522
Provenance: Padua

Padua. Biblioteca Capitolare. MS D 27

Date: ca. 1541-50
Provenance: Padua
Contains 9 conflicting attributions: anon. 34, 67, 130, 169, 201, 203, 209, 210, 265


Date: late 16th c.
Provenance: Parma or Ravenna?
Contains 4 conflicting attributions: Animuccia 149, Morales 204, Verdelot 228, Willaert 188

Paris. Bibliothèque Nationale, Département des Manuscrits. Nouvelles Acquisitions Françaises. MS 1817 (see CorBC 95-6)

Date: 1515-6
Provenance: Florence
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: anon. 155, 229

Piacenza. Archivio del Duomo, Fondo Musicale. MSS s.s. (2)

Date: mid 16th c.
Provenance: Piacenza?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 17
PiacD (3) Piacenza. Archivio del Duomo, Fondo Musicale. MSS s.s. (3)

Date: mid 16th c.
Provenance: Piacenza?
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: anon. 209, 226

PiacD (4) Piacenza. Archivio del Duomo, Fondo Musicale. MSS s.s. (4)

Date: mid 16th c.
Provenance: Piacenza?
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: anon. 9, 18, 226

PiacD (5) Piacenza. Archivio del Duomo, Fondo Musicale. MSS s.s. (5)

Date: mid 16th c.
Provenance: Piacenza
Contains 7 conflicting attributions: anon. 12, 107, 109, 123, 130, 152, 221, 238

RegB 786-837 Regensburg. Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek. MS A.R. 786-837

Date: 1569-78
Provenance: Regensburg
Contains 6 conflicting attributions: Clemens/Manchicourt 260, Jacquet/Jacotin 224, Josquin 245, Mouton 203, Richafort 102, Verdelot 133


Date: 1571-3
Provenance: Regensburg
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Isaac 139, Mouton 169, 203
Date: 1569-75
Provenance: Regensburg
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Cleve 94, Gascongne 3, Josquin 44

RegB 853-4 Regensburg. Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek. MS A.R. 853-854
Date: the second half of the 16th c.
Provenance: Regensburg
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Berchem 159, Clemens 187, Willaert 24

RegB 861-2 Regensburg. Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek. MS A.R. 861-862
Date: 1577
Provenance: Regensburg
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Clemens 234, Crecquillon 97, Mouton 91

RegB 875-7 Regensburg. Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek. MS A.R. 875-877
Date: 1568-79
Provenance: Regensburg
Contains 6 conflicting attributions: Arcadelt 81, Gosse 171, Lasson 265, Rore 249, Verdelot 172, Willaert 188

RegB 878-82 Regensburg. Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek. MS A.R. 878-882
Date: 1569-72
Provenance: Regensburg
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Josquin 252, Isaac 205, Mouton 203
RegB 883-6 Regensburg. Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek. MS
A.R. 883-886

Date: 1573-9
Provenance: Regensburg
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Fevin 223, Lupi 34

RegB 891-2 Regensburg. Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek. MS
A.R. 891-892

Date: ca. 1570-80
Provenance: Regensburg
Contains 6 conflicting attributions: Caen 107, Lupus 123, Phinot 111, Senfl 54, Vaet 86, Verdelot 228

RegB 893 Regensburg. Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek. MS
A.R. 893

Date: ca. 1570-80
Provenance: Regensburg
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Clemens 87, Verdelot 221

RegB 940-1 Regensburg. Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek. MS
A.R. 940-941

Date: 1557-9
Provenance: Wittenberg and Regensburg
Contains 26 conflicting attributions: Arcadelt 81, Crecquillon 46, Ducis 63, Fevin 223, Jacquet 41, Lhéritier 21, Lupi 201, Lupus 26, Manchicourt 189, 190, Mouton 80, 91, Richafort 107, 136, Verdelot 200, 228, 265, Walter 59, Willaert 188, anon. 44, 115, 174, 197, 211, 213, 239

RegB 1018 Regensburg. Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek. MS
A.R. 1018

Date: the second half of the 16th c.
Provenance: south or central Germany?
Contains 8 conflicting attributions: Verdelot 221, anon. 21, 44, 52, 59, 189, 228, 239
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RegB B211-5 Regensburg. Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek. MS B. 211-215

Date: ca. 1538-43
Provenance: south Germany or Austria?
Contains 8 conflicting attributions: anon 145, Bruck 162, Josquin ali H.F.[Finck] 153, Lupus 152, Mahu 89, Werrecore 28, anon. 52, 148

RegB B220-2 Regensburg. Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek. MS B. 220-222

Date: mid 16th c.
Provenance: Salzburg?
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Moulu 202, 261

RegB B223-233 Regensburg. Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek. MS B. 223-233

Date: second half of 16th c.
Provenance: Augsburg?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Richafort 136

RegB C99 Regensburg. Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek. MS C. 99

Date: 1548
Provenance: Regensburg
Contains 4 conflicting attributions: Lupus 123, Richafort 136, 193, Willaert 188

RegB C120 Regensburg. Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek. MS C. 120

Date: early 1520’s
Provenance: south Germany?
Contains 4 conflicting attributions: anon. 53, 91, 174, 239

Date: ca. 1532-4
Provenance: Rome
Contains 7 conflicting attributions: Jacquet 9, Lhéritier 71, Lupi 200, Maistre Jhan 17, Willaert 24, 259, anon. 61


Date: 1617
Provenance: Rome
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 228

RomeSC 792-5 Rome.  Biblioteca Musicale Governativa del Conservatorio di Musica Santa Cecilia.  MS G.792-795

Date: ca. 1590-1620
Provenance: Rome
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Willaert 188


Date: 1530-1
Provenance: Florence
Contains 21 conflicting attributions: Arcadelt 81, 183, Conseil 17, 18, C. Festa 67, Jacquet 9, 20, 224, Josquin 43, 258, Lhéritier 56, Lúpus 107, 123, Verdelot 24, 130, 216, 221, 228, Willaert 176, 184, anon. 209

RosU 49 Rostock.  Bibliothek der Wilhelm-Pieck-Universität.  MS Mus. Saec. XVI-49 (1-6)

Date: 1566
Provenance: Hamburg
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Josquin 239

SarAP 34 Saragossa.  Iglesia Metropolitana de la Virgen del Pilar, Archivio Musical.  Armario C-3, MS 34

Date: last third of 16th c.
Provenance: Saragossa?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Morales 223
Schmalt s.s. Schmalkalden. Turmbibliothek der St. Georg Kirche. MS s.s.

Date: mid 16th c.
Provenance: Germany?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Verdelot 221

SegC s.s. Segovia. Archivo Capitular de la Catedral. MS s.s.

Date: 1500-03
Provenance: Toledo?
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Anchieta 72, 177, Brumel 10

SevBC 1 Seville. Catedral Metropolitana, Biblioteca del Coro. MS 1

Date: ca. 1550-4
Provenance: Seville
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Escobar 158

SevBC 5-5-20 Seville. Catedral Metropolitana, Biblioteca del Coro. MS 5-5-20

Date: early 16th c., or before 1507
Provenance: Seville?
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Anchieta 72, Escobar 158, Peñalosa 222


Date: ca. 1500
Provenance: Siena
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: anon. 181, 229

SionA 87-4 Sion (Sitten). Archives du Chapitre. MS 87-4

Date: ca. 1555-60
Provenance: Wroclaw or vicinity?
Contains 6 conflicting attributions: anon. 44, 59, 63, 107, 172, 189
SGalls 462 Saint Gall. Stiftsbibliothek. MS 462

Date: 1510 and 1530
Provenance: Paris
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 223

SGalls 463 Saint Gall. Stiftsbibliothek. MS 463

Date: ca. 1517-20, or ca. 1540
Provenance: ?

SGalls 464 Saint Gall. Stiftsbibliothek. MS 464.

Date: ca. 1510-20
Provenance: Basel?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 215

SGalls 530 Saint Gall. Stiftsbibliothek. MS 530

Date: 1512-31
Provenance: St. Gall
Literature: Nef, "Der St. Galler Organist," pp. 46-132
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Craen 220, Mouton 182, anon. 223

StuttL 3 Stuttgart. Württembergische Landesbibliothek. MS Musica folio I 3

Date: 1562
Provenance: Stuttgart
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Mouton 214

StuttL 8 Stuttgart. Württembergische Landesbibliothek. MS Musica folio I 8

Date: ca. 1570
Provenance: Stuttgart
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Vaet 86
StuttL 9 Stuttgart. Württembergische Landesbibliothek. MS Musica folio I 9

Date: 1571-2
Provenance: Stuttgart
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Clemens 234, Crecquillon 65

StuttL 13 Stuttgart. Württembergische Landesbibliothek. MS Musica folio I 13

Date: ca. 1577
Provenance: Stuttgart
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Crecquillon 191

StuttL 24 Stuttgart. Württembergische Landesbibliothek. MS Musica folio I 24

Date: 1542-61
Provenance: Stuttgart
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 205

StuttL 25 Stuttgart. Württembergische Landesbibliothek. MS Musica folio I 25

Date: ca. 1542
Provenance: Stuttgart
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Fevin 223

StuttL 34 Stuttgart. Württembergische Landesbibliothek. MS Musica folio I 34

Date: ca. 1545
Provenance: Stuttgart
Contains 5 conflicting attributions: Gombert 127, 236, Jacquet 48, Lupo 123, anon. 44

StuttL 35 Stuttgart. Württembergische Landesbibliothek. MS Musica folio I 35

Date: ca. 1540
Provenance: Stuttgart
Contains 5 conflicting attributions: Jacquet 7, 9, 266, Walter 59, anon. 116
StuttL 36 Stuttgart. Württembergische Landesbibliothek. MS Musica folio I 36

Date: ca. 1548-50
Provenance: Stuttgart
Contains 4 conflicting attributions: Canis 40, Crecquillon 235, Josquin 252, anon. 236

StuttL 43 Stuttgart. Württembergische Landesbibliothek. MS Musica folio I 43

Date: ca. 1540
Provenance: Stuttgart
Contains 4 conflicting attributions: anon. 28, 56, 228, 238

TarazC 2 Tarazona. Archivo Capitular de la Catedral. MS 2.

Date: early 16th c.
Provenance: Seville?
Contains 3 conflicting

Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Escobar 158, Peñalosa 222, Ribera 177

TarazC 5 Tarazona. Archivo Capitular de la Catedral. MS 5

Date: first half of 16th c. (Part II and III), second half of 16th c. (Part I)
Provenance: Saragossa (Part I), Tarazona (Part II and III)
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Peñalosa 72

ToleBC 10 Toledo. Biblioteca Capitular de la Catedral Metropolitana. MS B.10

Date: 1544-5
Provenance: Toledo
Contains 6 conflicting attributions: Jacquet 9, Josquin 258, Le Brung 226, Verdelot 184, Moulu/Verdelot 202, Verdelot 221
ToleBC 13 Toledo. Biblioteca Capitular de la Catedral Metropolitana. MS B. 13

Date: 1553-4
Provenance: Toledo
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Clemens 189, Fevin 223, Josquin 225

ToleBC 17 Toledo. Biblioteca Capitular de la Catedral Metropolitana. MS B. 17

Date: 1550-1
Provenance: Toledo
Contains conflicting attributions: Escobedo 112, Lhérétier 266, Lupus 123, Morales 41, 241, Verdelot 228

ToleBC 21 Toledo. Biblioteca Capitular de la Catedral Metropolitana. MS B. 21

Date: 1549
Provenance: Toledo
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Peñalosa 158, 222, Willaert 188

ToleBC 22 Toledo. Biblioteca Capitular de la Catedral Metropolitana. MS B. 22

Date: late 16th c.
Provenance: Toledo
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Richafort 88

ToleF 23 Toledo. Catedral, Obra y Fabrica. MS Reservado 23

Date: ca. 1520-35
Provenance: Low Countries?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Bauldeweyn 11


Date: ca. 1558-60
Provenance: Konigsberg
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 236
TourC s.s. Tournai. Chapitre de la Cathédrale. MS s.s.

Date: 16th c?
Provenance: Tournai?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 223

TrevBC 4 Treviso. Biblioteca Capitolare del Duomo. MS 4

Date: 1559-69
Provenance: Treviso
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Rore 149

TrevBC 5 Treviso. Biblioteca Capitolare del Duomo. MS 5

Date: 1559-72
Provenance: Treviso
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Berchem 6, C. Festa 223, anon. 116

TrevBC 6 Treviso. Biblioteca Capitolare del Duomo. MS 6

Date: 1560-8
Provenance: Treviso
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 152

TrevBC 7 Treviso. Biblioteca Capitolare del Duomo. MS 7

Date: 1558-71
Provenance: Treviso
Contains 5 conflicting attributions: Jacquet/Willaert 259, Jaques du Pont 42, Lupus 26, anon. 39, 265

TrevBC 8 Treviso. Biblioteca Capitolare del Duomo. MS 8

Date: 1556-69
Provenance: Treviso
Contains 4 conflicting attributions: Berchem 95, De Silva 142, Maistre Jhan 103, Mouton 110
TrevBC 29 Treviso. Biblioteca Capitolare del Duomo. MS 29

Date: ca. 1570-5
Provenance: Treviso

TrevBC 30 Treviso. Biblioteca Capitolare del Duomo. MS 30

Date: ca. 1570
Provenance: Treviso
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Arcadelt 230, Jhan 243, Lupus 136

TrevBC 34 Treviso. Biblioteca Capitolare del Duomo. MS 34

Date: late 16th c. and early 17th c.
Provenance: Treviso
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 188

TrevBC 36 Treviso. Biblioteca Capitolare del Duomo. MS 36

Date: ca. 1530
Provenance: Ferrara?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Jacquet 9

TurBN IV.45 Turin. Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria. MS Riserva musicale IV.45

Date: late 16th c.
Provenance: Turin?
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Jacquet 9, anon. 249

UlmS 236 Ulm. Münster Bibliothek, von Schermar’sche Familienstiftung. MS 236 (a-d)

Date: second half of 16th c.
Provenance: ?
Contains conflicting attributions: anon. 59
UlmS 237 Ulm. Münster Bibliothek, von Schermar'sche Familienstiftung. MS 237 (a-d)

Date: ca. 1530-40
Provenance: central Germany
Contains 7 conflicting attributions: anon. 8, 78, 107, 123, 126, 236, 265

UppsU 76b Uppsala. Universitetsbiblioteket. MS Vokalmusik i Handskrift 76b

Date: ca. 1515?
Provenance: France, or Troyes or vicinity?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Forestier 252

UppsU 76c Uppsala. Universitetsbiblioteket. MS Vokalmusik i Handskrift 76c

Date: ca. 1530?
Provenance: France
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Fevin 223, Richafort 136, anon. 39

UtreH s.s. Utrecht. Private Library of Peter Hecht. MS s.s.

Date: ca. 1549-50
Provenance: Wittenberg?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Stoltzer/(Josquin/Verdelot) 73

VallaC 5 Valladolid. Catedral Metropolitana, Archivio de Música. MS 5

Date: third quarter of 16th c.
Provenance: Valladolid
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Mouton 215, anon. 72

VallaC 15 Valladolid. Catedral Metropolitana, Archivio de Música. MS 15

Date: second quarter of 16th c.
Provenance: Italy?
Contains 5 conflicting attributions: Conseil 17, Jacquet 9, 10, Verdelot 221, anon. 39
**VallaC 16** Valladolid. Catedral Metropolitana, Archivio de Música. MS 16

- **Date:** mid 16th c.
- **Provenance:** Valladolid
- **Contains 1 conflicting attribution:** Jacquet 9

**VallaC 17** Valladolid. Catedral Metropolitana, Archivio de Música. MS 17

- **Date:** last third of 16th c.
- **Provenance:** Valladolid
- **Contains 1 conflicting attribution:** Jacquet 9

**VallaP s.s.** Valladolid. Parroquia de Santiago. MS s.s.

- **Date:** the second half of the 16th c.
- **Provenance:** Valladolid
- **Contains 1 conflicting attribution:** Willaert 188

**VatC 234** Vatican City. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. MS Chigi C VIII 234

- **Date:** ca. 1498-1503
- **Provenance:** Brussels/Mechlin
- **Contains 2 conflicting attributions:** Fevin 223, Regis 175

**VatG XII.4** Vatican City. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Cappella Giulia MS XII.4

- **Date:** 1536
- **Provenance:** Rome
- **Contains 11 conflicting attributions:** Gombert 218, Jacquet 42, 209, Josquin 163, Lhéritier 215, Lhéritier 110, Lupus 107, Maistre Jhan 17, Sermisy 7, Verdelot 228, Willaert 184


- **Date:** ca. 1528-31
- **Provenance:** Brussels/Mechlin
- **Contains 7 conflicting attributions:** anon. 11, 36, 39, 106, 160, 170, 188

Date: ca. 1518-23
Provenance: Rome
Contains 5 conflicting attributions: anon. 121, 144, 160, 214, 215

**VatS 13** Vatican City. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. MS Cappella Sistina 13

Date: ca. 1536-42
Provenance: Rome
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Escobedo 112

**VatS 17** Vatican City. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. MS Cappella Sistina 17

Date: ca. 1535-7
Provenance: Rome
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Maistre Jhan 17, anon. 18

**VatS 19** Vatican City. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. MS Cappella Sistina 19

Date: ca. 1535-7
Provenance: Rome
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Arcadelt 81, Josquin 163

**VatS 24** Vatican City. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. MS Cappella Sistina 24

Date: ca. 1538-50
Provenance: Rome
Contains conflicting attributions: Brunet 258, De Silva 238, Jacquet 216
VatS 38 Vatican City. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. MS Cappella Sistina 38

Date: ca. 1550-63
Provenance: Rome
Contains 6 conflicting attributions: Jacquet 9, Josquin 194, Mouton 43, 214, Verdelot 228, anon. 221

VatS 42 Vatican City. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. MS Cappella Sistina 42

Date: ca. 1503-12
Provenance: Rome
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Mouton 225, Ninot 229, Viardot 150

VatS 45 Vatican City. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. MS Cappella Sistina 45

Date: ca. 1511-4
Provenance: Rome
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Brumel/Brumes 14

VatS 46 Vatican City. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. MS Cappella Sistina 46

Date: ca. 1508-27
Provenance: Rome
Contains 5 conflicting attributions: Carpentras 57, Compère 181, Mouton 196, 203, anon. 226

VatS 57 Vatican City. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. MS Cappella Sistina 57

Date: ca. 1535-77
Provenance: Rome
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 224

VatS 76 Vatican City. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. MS Cappella Sistina 76

Date: ca. 1579-99
Provenance: Rome
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Mouton 225
VatVM 571 Vatican City. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. MS Vaticani Musicali 571

Date: ca. 1520-30
Provenance: Rome
Contains conflicting attributions: anon. 3, 44, 123, 188, 214, 228

VerA 218 Verona. Società Accademia Filarmonica. MS CCXVIII

Date: ca. 1536
Provenance: Padua?
Contains 6 conflicting attributions: Gombert/anon. 245, Gombert/Mouton 133, Gombert/Sermisy 128, Jacquet 224, Mouton/Lupus 255, Verdelot 102

VerBC 756 Verona. Biblioteca Capitolare. MS DCCLVI

Date: ca. 1508
Provenance: Brussels/Mechlin
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 213

VerBC 758 Verona. Biblioteca Capitolare. MS DCCLVIII

Date: ca. 1500
Provenance: Verona
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 225

VerBC 760 Verona. Biblioteca Capitolare. MS DCCLX

Date: ca. 1520-30
Provenance: Verona
Contains 11 conflicting attributions: Danglon 155, Josquin 114, Lhéritier 23, Lupus 186, Sermisy 7, Willaert 188, anon. 63, 121, 182, 223, 225

VienNB 9814 Vienna. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Handschriften- und Inkunabelsammlung. MS Mus. 9814

Date: 1515-34
Provenance: Brussels/Mechlin
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Richafort 136
VienNB Mus. 15500 Vienna. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Musiksammlung. MS Mus. 15500

Date: 1544
Provenance: Germany
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Josquin 153, Willaert 188

VienNB Mus. 15941 Vienna. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Musiksammlung. MS Mus. 15941.

Date: ca. 1521-31
Provenance: Brussels/Mechlin
Contains 9 conflicting attributions: Baudeweyn 11, Champion 53, 55, Fevin 182, Mouton 36, 90, 196, Mouton/Ninot 106, Richafort 160

VienNB Mus. 16195 Vienna. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Musiksammlung. MS Mus. 16195

Date: 1559
Provenance: Bantzen, or Meissen?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Verdelot 221

VienNB Mus. 18825 Vienna. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Musiksammlung. MS Mus. 18825

Date: 1515-34
Provenance: Brussels/Mechlin
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Le Brung 44, Mouton 39, 114

VienNB Mus. 19189 Vienna. Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Musiksammlung. MS Mus. 19189

Date: last third of 16th c.
Provenance: Germany?
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Clemens 125, Crecquillon 173
WeimB B Weimar. Bibllothek der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirchengemeinde. MS B

Date: 1540-4
Provenance: Torgau
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Senfl 123, Walter 59, anon. 89

WhalleyS 23 Whalley. Stonyhurst College Library. B.VI.23

Date: 1552
Provenance: Brussels or Antwerp
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Clemens 65

WolfA 293 Wolfenbüttel. Herzog August Bibliothek. MS Guelferbytanus 293 Musica Handschrift

Date: ca. 1560?
Provenance: Ferrara?
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: Rore 249, anon. 248

WrocS 1 Wrocław. Former Stadtbibliothek. MS Mus. 1

Date: second half of 16th c.
Provenance: ?
Literature: Bohn Die Musikalischen Handschriften, pp. 1-7
Contains 7 conflicting attributions: Caen 107, Jacquet 9, Josquin 221, 245, Lasson 265, Walter 59, anon. 189

WrocS 2 Wrocław. Former Stadtbibliothek. MS Mus. 2

Date: 1573
Provenance: ?
Literature: Bohn, Die Musikalischen Handschriften, pp. 7-13
Contains 8 conflicting attributions: Gascongne 3, Gombert 156, Josquin 44, 221, 245, Richafort 39, Verdelot 172, Werrecore 238
WrocS 3 Wrocław. Former Stadtbibliothek. MS Mus. 3

Date: second half of 16th c.
Provenance: ?
Literature: Bihin, Die Musikalischen Handschriften, pp. 13-15
Contains 4 conflicting attributions: Arcadelt 81, Fevin 223, Lasson 265, anon. 224

WrocS 5 Wrocław. Former Stadtbibliothek. MS Mus. 5

Date: late 16th c.
Provenance: Wrocław
Contains 10 conflicting attributions: Arcadelt 81, Fevin 223, Gascongne 3, Josquin 44, 221, 245, Lasson 265, Richafort 39, Verdelot 172, Werrecore 238

WrocS 6 Wrocław. Former Stadtbibliothek. MS Mus. 6

Date: 1567
Provenance: ?
Literature: Bohn, Die Musikalischen Handschriften, pp. 22-26
Contains 6 conflicting attributions: Lupus 109, Mouton 169, 249, 255, anon. 159, 221

WrocS 8 Wrocław. Former Stadtbibliothek. MS Mus. 8

Date: late 16th c.
Provenance: Wrocław
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: anon. 44, 201

WrocS 10 Wrocław. Former Stadtbibliothek. MS Mus. 10

Date: late 16th c.
Provenance: Wrocław
Contains 4 conflicting attributions: Ducis 63, Guyot 94, Verdelot 81, 228

WrocS 12 Wrocław. Former Stadtbibliothek. MS Mus. 12

Date: early 17th c.
Provenance: Wrocław
Contains 8 conflicting attributions: Caen 107, Verdelot 81, 228, 265, Walter 59, anon. 52, 174, 242
Wrocł 15 Wrocław. Former Stadtbibliothek. MS Mus. 15

Date: late 16th c.
Provenance: Wrocław
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Mouton 169

WrocłU 42 Wrocław. Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, Oddział Zbiorów Muzycznych. MS Brieger Musikalien-sammlung K.42

Date: last third of 16th c.
Provenance: Brzeg
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 63

ZwiR 33/34 Zwickau. Ratsschulbibliothek. MS XXXIII, 34

Date: ca. 1580
Provenance: Zwickau
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 4

ZwiR 34/35 Zwickau. Ratsschulbibliothek. MS XXXIV, 35

Date: second half of 16th c.
Provenance: Zwickau
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Walter 59

ZwiR 46/120 Zwickau. Ratsschulbibliothek. MS XLVI, 120

Date: last third of 16th c.
Provenance: Zwickau
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: anon. 107, 212

ZwiR 73 Zwickau. Ratsschulbibliothek. MS LXXIII

Date: mid 16th c.
Provenance: Magdeburg, or Wittenberg?
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Josquin 256, Verdelot 123, anon. 179

ZwiR 74/1 Zwickau. Ratsschulbibliothek. MS LXXIV, 1

Date: late 16th c.
Provenance: Zwickau
Contains 5 conflicting attributions: Arcadelt 81, Clemens 135, Josquin 83, Phinot 242, Verdelot 228
ZwiR 75/1 Zwickau. Ratsschulbibliothek. MS LXXV, 1
Date: 1621-3
Provenance: Aue and Zwickau
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 107

ZwiR 79/2 Zwickau. Ratsschulbibliothek. MS LXXIX, 2
Date: second half of 16th c.
Provenance: Zwickau?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: Verdelot 228

ZwiR 81/2 Zwickau. Ratsschulbibliothek. MS LXXXI, 2
Date: mid 16th c.
Provenance: Wittenberg
Contains 3 conflicting attributions: Moulu 202, Stoltzer 58, Verdelot 236

ZwiR 94/1 Zwickau. Ratsschulbibliothek. MS XCIV, 1
Date: late 16th c.
Provenance: Zwickau?
Contains 2 conflicting attributions: anon. 44, 139

ZwiR 96/1 Zwickau. Ratsschulbibliothek. MS XCVI, 1
Date: second half of 16th c.
Provenance: Wittenberg?
Contains 1 conflicting attribution: anon. 221
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