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ABSTRACT

The thesis covers the life and selected works of Thomas Crecquillon. It reassesses the evidence for his career, concluding that he was maistre of the Imperial chapel from 1540 to 1545. Previous work dating his replacement to 1542 is refuted. Documentary references are clarified, allowing a more consistent picture to emerge. His retirement date is reassessed and shown to be most probably 1550. His date of birth is estimated at 1505-1510. Internal evidence is quoted consistent with his having worked in Antwerp and around Tournai. Authenticity and related issues in the motets are discussed. Conclusions are reached on several works that differ from those in the edition of Crecquillon's works in CMM, and several further cross attributions are considered. A motet by Crecquillon is identified as the model for a Guerrero mass. Borrowed material in Crecquillon's motets is identified as either fulfilling a didactic and exegetical purpose or representing heightened social importance of the work in question. Four motets are shown to have been originally two hymn settings. Several motets are read in the context of renaissance concepts of divine kingship and iconography as forming part of entry liturgies, with the reading of a Senfl motet as being written for the birth of Philip of Spain as a precursor. The use of texts from the Song of Songs in some manuscripts is identified as a further manifestation of concepts of royalty, with the ruer as Solomon, partly as an analogue of the ruler as David, and the wider context explored in some depth. The mass Kain [Adler] in der Welt is shown to contain a range of references to borrowed material and to the musical depiction of ideas of divine royalty, and to be one of a series of works for the marriage of Philip of Spain in 1543.
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</tr>
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

'...seems solid only because those who know the facts are dead and can't contradict it'.
[C. S. Lewis, in the Times Literary Supplement, November 28 1958, on much of the speculation in the study of literature.]

Thomas Crecquillon, some of whose works are the focus of this thesis, is a composer whose star has waxed and waned. He held one of the most prestigious positions open to a musician of his day, that of maistre de la chapelle to Emperor Charles V, and was distinguished in the Imperial court by the title of 'composer'. The dissemination of his music throughout Europe speaks as eloquently of the regard in which it was held as those comments of writers and musicians which have also survived. The title page of the posthumous collection of his motets issued in 1576 sums up his contemporary reputation; it calls him quite simply 'the most celebrated master' of Charles's chapel. Gombert was one of his predecessors, and so that is high praise indeed. A number of composers, too, chose works by Crecquillon as models for the composition of imitation masses.

His music has not wanted for admirers since then: Ambros characterised his works as showing strength, euphony, ingenious invention and simple grandeur of expression. Lowinsky described Crecquillon's motet *Quis te victorem* as 'a work of great terseness and persuasive power', and said of *Praemia pro validis* that 'the overall sound is of an extraordinary warmth and beauty'. He had equally high praise for *Domine Deus exercitum*. Van den Borren, in writing of the chansons, described
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Crecquillon as 'a master of refinement in every sense of the word', and Thomas, of *Toutes les nuitz*, remarked on its 'sustained mood of tender resignation...unmatched in the chanson repertoire of the time'.

Despite the appreciation for his work expressed by individual scholars, Bridgman could write that 'he has been unjustly neglected in our time', and Blackburn described him more recently as 'a highly interesting composer who is too undervalued'. That is not to say that Crecquillon has been totally ignored by the academic community, but his profile has remained far lower than some of his near-contemporaries such as Gombert and Clemens, despite a number of studies of his music. Brown's uncharacteristic and somewhat grudging view that Crecquillon's music lacks the peculiar qualities for him to be regarded as a major figure has perhaps been influential, despite the comments and work of other scholars who hold a more positive opinion. The lack of reliable and accessible editions until very recently, other than Marshall's of the four-voice motets and Hudson's earlier volumes of CMM of the masses, may also have played a part in Crecquillon's comparative neglect.

Specialist early music performance groups, too, have paid his music little attention. It is perhaps ironic that Clemens non Papa, with whom Crecquillon is sometimes said to have most in common stylistically, has been one of the more highly valued and more frequently performed of composers from Crecquillon's time.

This contribution to the discussion of Crecquillon's life and music proceeds from two broad initial assumptions. The first is that, with the music having the qualities to speak to a modern audience (which, in performance, it has been shown to do), it is
worth investigating because of its artistic worth, with the hope that greater understanding of aspects of the music may help restore some present interest in it. The second is that, without a deeper insight into Crecquillon’s works, and into the reasons for their popularity and how they may have been read in his own day, there is the risk that our view of the music of his period will be even more incomplete than the passage of time, and the changes time inflicts, makes inevitable. Acquaintance with Crecquillon’s music over the years has deepened the respect in which I hold it. Although the quality of his writing is variable, at its best, none of the enthusiastic commentaries of his own or of later times seem to me to be misplaced. It can stand comparison with any of the period.

Scope of this study

There are four substantial studies specifically on Crecquillon’s music beginning with Lueger’s pioneering work on Crecquillon’s masses in 1948. Trotter (1957) considered the chanson repertoire, whilst the majority of the motets, those for four and five voices respectively, were covered by Marshall (1970-1) and Walter (1975). A further study by Elias (1994) is on imitation techniques in the masses of three composers including Crecquillon. The motets for three, six and eight voices have not been separately considered. I shall outline the scope of this present study, and how it relates to the existing work, before discussing the state of research in a little more detail.

This is not a report of new archival research. It is an attempt to learn more about Crecquillon and his music from a close observation and a fresh synthesis of some of what is already known, and, because of the small amount of documentary evidence, it
has been necessary to work partly by inference and hypothesis. I have concentrated on the motets, but included in the discussion one mass and, more briefly, one chanson, which I believe are essential to the exploration of the broad idea behind the thesis, which can be summed up as context. The thesis falls into two sections, chapters 2 and 3 covering issues of Crecquillon's life and of authenticity, and chapters 4 to 6 dealing in much more detail with the reading of selected motets and the one mass.

Chapter 2 is an evaluation of the scanty evidence on Crecquillon's biography. There has been considerable confusion over the interpretation of the few facts that remain, and none of the specific studies of Crecquillon have attempted to consider the evidence in depth since Lueger's study. Trotter barely mentioned the biography and Walter did not discuss Crecquillon's life at all (although he did implicitly and obliquely in his discussion of chronology). Marshall reviewed the literature without adding significantly to the subject. Rudolf (1977) also included useful evidence on Crecquillon in his study on Canis, although I have been unable to agree with some of his conclusions. As part of my review, I will attempt to show that some of the confusion has arisen from the misinterpretation of existing information, and I will argue from the context of Crecquillon's motets a view of his probable birthdate and career that is a little different from that expressed by Hudson (1990). Without an attempt to place Crecquillon in his correct chronological and social position, the understanding of his music is inevitably hampered.

Chapter 3 is a discussion of authenticity and other related issues in the motets. The editions of the four- and five-voice motets contained in the studies of Marshall and Walter are being superseded by the completion of the CMM volumes under Hudson and
Ferer. The earlier studies were limited by much less easily available information on sources, and it is not surprising that the editors of CMM have identified many more problems of attribution. However, there are yet further questions not identified in CMM which render their discussions incomplete. I will also challenge the views reached by the editors in several cases. Again, I believe that the use of the context of Crecquillon's other works can assist in some cases where attribution is still doubtful. This also applies in reverse; it is difficult for future studies to place Crecquillon in any musical context until issues of authenticity have been clarified. I am unable to provide answers to all the problems identified, but believe that some progress can be made on several works.

In chapter 4, I will begin a more detailed contextual study by considering the use of borrowed material in a number of motets. This will suggest two categories for the use of such material, both of which can be taken as implying an original performance context and, in embryo, a wider intellectual context. This is an area which has not been covered in the previous studies. That will be followed up in chapters 5 and 6 by a consideration of a more limited number of pieces in conjunction with works by other composers, which together have, I believe, a developed and specific framework of use and belief underpinning them. The intention here is to show Crecquillon in some form of historical and artistic context arising from his position in the Imperial chapel. In order to articulate this context, there has to be a fairly substantial discussion on its nature, and this I have attempted in terms of the conceptual background, and in terms of other music that helps define it, both of which I believe formed part of Crecquillon's frame of reference.

Chapters 5 and 6 depart to some extent from what may be considered by some to be a
standard approach to the subject. A brief comment of the reasons for my approach
may be helpful. At its most basic, it is necessary to move the emphasis from some
forms of evidence and to concentrate on others in order to suggest the nature of the
framework within which I believe these works originally operated. Indeed, it is not
so much a change of emphasis, more a recognition that what needs to be understood
will not be conveyed by direct documentary evidence alone, but must be read from
one's appreciation of wider cultural issues. To illustrate the point, I will take an
example which has not been included in the body of the study. The reason for its
omission is that I cannot at present construct a convincing hypothesis to cover the
observations.

It is known that Crecquillon wrote a motet on the story of Susannah and the Elders.12
That this story was popular in the 16th century is obvious; it survives in just about
every form from motet, chanson and madrigal, to popular song, tapestry, sculpture,
stained glass and painting.13 Yet we miss something vital in trying to understand
Crecquillon's music if we do not seek to explore the popularity of this particular
story and thus to provide some sense of context for the work. The mere fact of
popularity is in itself insufficient to do that; there is a danger of the matter becoming
circular. We may assume that Crecquillon set this text because of the popularity of
the story, and we may explain the popularity by the number and variety of its
artistic manifestations. Both might be right to a degree but neither tells us anything
of real value about their interaction without some effort to enter the understanding of
the period. The tale must have spoken in some way to the mind of the times, a way
which we no longer necessarily appreciate without an effort to recover some of what
it must have meant. Moreover, in speaking, it must have done so in more ways than
one, ways which could be understood by the hearer of the popular song as much as
those ways applicable to the courtly and the learned.

We need therefore to ask both a general question and a specific one. What was the general context, and from that can we refine our understanding of the specific? If we take therefore a general context, which may have been the understanding of the tale as an exhortation to the pure life and the promise of heavenly reward for enduring the temptations of the way, we then need to ask whether there is any greater or more personal message understood from any particular manifestation, or indeed an entirely different message. When Margaret of Austria built the church of Brou as a mausoleum for her husband and her mother, Mary of Burgundy, was it mere chance or general popularity that suggested the story of Susannah as one of only two stained glass windows not immediately and obviously connected with the function of the church? Equally, was it popularity or chance that led to the same story being carved on the great fireplace of the Franc-house (now part of the Palais de Justice) in Bruges, where it is seen in company with carvings of Charles V, his parents and grandparents, and armorial bearings of Burgundy and Spain? Was it a survival of the medieval interpretation of Susannah as a symbol for the Church, and the Elders as the threats to the Church from Jewry and the Infidel that is the relevant line of thought? In the context of the ruler with a duty to protect Christendom, the latter has a degree of plausibility.

When we see a little of the wider picture, we may begin to suspect, given Crecquillon's positions in the Imperial chapel, that the text of the motet may have carried some quite weighty significance. In this case, the precise significance of the story in the Imperial context may elude us for the moment, but both the wider and the particular contexts suggest that we are in danger of failing to understand some of
the readings of Crecquillon's motet, unless we make some effort to examine those contexts. It is possible even that our understanding of elements of its construction and technique may be hampered and impaired by a failure to achieve some deeper understanding of the background to the work.

Page has recently objected to the generalisation of the medieval mind as allegorical and symbolic. His shaft is no doubt well directed if against those who would reduce the diversity of intellectual activity of any age to a single dimension. Yet the fact remains that such a generalisation is still a useful tool in trying to move the equally one-dimensional view of some musicology, which has been unnecessarily positivist and has studiously ignored insights from other disciplines relevant not only to the period but to our understanding of the music. Recent research by Higgins, Macey and others, not to mention the pioneering work of Lowinsky, has shown how those insights may illuminate individual works and even genres.

Several of the papers by Higgins, Macey and others, just mentioned, appear in a book edited by Pesce (1997). She summarises the aims of the approach as exemplified in that volume as follows:

The title Hearing the Motet reflects an increasing concern among scholars and performers with bringing to light the diverse ways in which these works may have been heard in their own time. This quest involves investigations of different sorts: examining the social-historical situation that may have prompted the creation of a motet, whether a patron's commission or an ideological response on the composer's part; discovering the performance context and function of a motet, particularly with respect to the liturgy;
reading the texts to uncover dual meanings possibly shared only by the composer and a select audience; reading the music to discover the attractiveness and innovative spirit it offered in its own time; and reading text and music together to uncover the ways in which composers made them serve one another to yield what can rightfully be called “music-poetic” creations.

It is obvious that to tackle problems of this sort, an inclusive approach has to be taken to the possible forms of evidence. Iconography, liturgy, literature and cultural norms may all be called into play. In trying in these two chapters to articulate a context for a handful of works that allows them to be seen as part of a wider musical response to, and reflection of, beliefs and concepts of the time, there is the need to exercise a degree of imagination; allegorical or symbolic thought and traditional exegesis are ultimately exercises in imagination within the framework of belief or value systems, and, however well-aimed Page’s objection, the validation of activity through the symbolic interpretation of the past was a vital element in medieval and renaissance thought. Haggh has written that ‘even secular pursuits, from war to courtly love, and events, such as banquets, plays, or Entries, were marked by sacred symbolism and meaning’. It is precisely this element of the sacred, in contexts that are perhaps relatively unfamiliar, which I believe can illuminate our understanding of some of Crecquillon’s music.

There are risks in this approach. There is always the danger that hypothesis will be nearer speculation when much has to be deduced; there is an equal danger of over-interpretation. These are implicit in trying to understand rather than simply exhume the past; but despite these perils, I believe that the effort is worthwhile, if
we are to begin to understand the significance that these works once had.

It is perhaps worth making a further brief observation on this methodology which has already yielded such positive results. The nature of the scientific process, always assuming we should regard musicology as such a process, is commonly said to proceed by speculation, hypothesis, and proof. That characterisation of the process ignores the profound implications of the more sophisticated epistemological process first propounded by Popper. This is one of hypothesis, and acceptance until disproof. It recognises that all knowledge is contingent upon assumptions, and that it is in the nature of the process that the limitations of those assumptions are not understood until the paradigm shift has taken place. Applied to musicology, the limitations of the assumptions may be expressible, but are frequently unacknowledged. In essence, there is no dividing line to be drawn between types of evidence per se; the only distinguishing test is one of probability. In testing what is probable, we have as much right to appeal to the belief systems of the relevant period as to its documentary remains.

State of research

This thesis is based on the sacred works of Crecquillon, mainly the motets. I will not therefore comment in detail on Trotter's work on the chansons, or on Lueger's on the masses. The majority of the studies of Crecquillon's work have been directed to the need to establish the basic information. Without establishing the musical texts, and the source and function of the words set, further work would be impossible. Yet the concentration on single genres, and (because of the volume of Crecquillon's work) sections of genres, brings its own dangers. For instance, connections of whatever sort
between individual works may be missed if a wide enough view is not taken, and conclusions may be reached which are not justified in the wider perspective. Worst of all, the focus on the single composer can mean that the obvious is stated at length.

There is, as to be expected, much useful material in the various volumes of CMM. Hudson in particular has put forward a brief view of Crecquillon's life, and made the only reasonable case for his year of birth (even though I will dispute it later). Texts have been identified with more accuracy than was occasionally the case in Marshall and Walter, and the liturgical uses more clearly specified. The problem of authenticity has been faced afresh, and largely, but not completely, dealt with effectively. Some editorial decisions have been taken with which it is possible to disagree, but the general level is such as to make the previous editions of Marshall and Walter redundant when publication is complete. 22

Marshall's study of the four-voice works, which omitted the four-voice Lamentations, was primarily aimed at the provision of a working edition. That Marshall achieved in a sympathetic and generally accurate manner. Although his edition is now being overtaken by CMM, it has formed an essential part of the bibliography for anyone working on Crecquillon. He also aimed at reviewing the literature to provide a clearer biographical picture. Here Marshall was less successful, and his study of this aspect is most useful simply as bringing together a number of the scattered references. He failed to achieve any real synthesis of the information or to present any convincing hypothesis based on his review. Marshall also considered a number of questions of authenticity, and his conclusions, based on the source information available to him, were sound. However, he was responsible for the tentative ascription of Sancta Maria succurre to Crecquillon, an ascription
accepted by Hudson (1980) but almost certainly erroneous.

The other major aspect of Marshall's study was a consideration of aspects of musical style, such as the treatment of the melodic line, texture, use of modes and dissonance. What seems to me the potential weakness of single-composer studies is most evident in these sections, for whilst Marshall is thorough and accurate, the information stands by itself rather than being compared with his immediate contemporaries. We therefore gain little or no sense of how Crecquillon's style agrees with or differs from that of those contemporaries.\textsuperscript{23} This is not something I tackle in this thesis, except in a few specific instances, but when someone essays a fuller stylistic analysis, no doubt Marshall's work will be of continuing value. As might be expected, the treatment of mode is very much of its time, and largely limited to the classification of works to a composite mode.

Overall, Marshall's study was a significant contribution to the literature, and one made with a feeling for the subject. The study and transcription by Walter of the five-voice motets is less successful, although the study itself is of greater length than Marshall's. The edition is less reliable, at times with obvious and major errors uncorrected or introduced. The application of ficta is rather more erratic than even the difficulties of the music make necessary, and word underlay is similarly unconvincing at times. The musical text has to be approached with caution.

The study itself does not deal with Crecquillon's biography, but does propose a chronology which, based on the appearance of works in the sources, is of dubious value. To be fair, Walter recognised the limitations of his method, but did not seek a means to overcome them. He also discussed the origin of the texts set by Crecquillon,
and indeed the identification of texts and their liturgical function, whilst not always complete or accurate, is the main achievement of the study. There are some useful comments on text underlay as found in different editions of several of the motets, but the general analysis of stylistic factors suffers the same drawback as Marshall's but is less convincingly achieved. However, Walter did make some effort to compare Crecqullon with several of his contemporaries. The results of this comparison are uneven; some potentially useful information is included with judgements that seem less secure. The discussion on mode, too, is at times muddled and confused. It cannot be taken as a safe starting point for further research without being checked. It also suffers, like Marshall's consideration, from the restricted understanding of mode prevalent at the time of its writing.24 Walter also covers the use of chant. His discussion goes hardly further than the identification of cantus firmus and quotations, and again has to be read with a degree of circumspection. Overall, Walter's study is of much more variable quality than Marshall's, and whilst it made an edition of some sort available to the student, the quality of some of its commentary and conclusions is debatable.

Research on other composers has yielded material that is valuable to the study of Crecquillon's life, career and works. Both Schmidt-Görg (1938) in his work on Gombert and Rudolf on Canis have transcribed and made accessible a number of documents which supplement the still absolutely indispensable work of vander Straeten, and help throw light on aspects of Crecquillon's career. Schmidt-Görg, in his monograph on Gombert, only touches on Crecquillon tangentially, but Rudolf discusses the relationship between Crecquillon and Canis in some detail. I disagree with some of his conclusions, but he nevertheless presents much useful information on the Imperial chapel and its organisation. His thoughts on the likely retirement
date of Crecquillon discussed in the next chapter appear to have been overlooked by others.

Only two other studies that I am aware of are of particular value for the motet repertoire: Lowinsky’s on Orlando di Lasso’s Antwerp music book (Lowinsky 1989e) and Beebe’s thesis on Clemens (Beebe 1976). Lowinsky is characteristically stimulating on stylistic factors in several of Crecquillon’s motets. The latter contains a consideration of authenticity and makes a number of very useful observations on some of the works with conflicting attributions to Crecquillon and Clemens. In addition, there are the more general studies of Wolff (1956) and Dunning (1970). The former has comments upon the possible function of a group of works, including one by Crecquillon, upon which I attempt to build in chapter 5. Dunning in his study of the ‘state’ motet has identified the occasion for several of Crecquillon’s motets. Again, I have attempted to go beyond his commentaries. In both instances, I have thought that our understanding of the works in question would benefit from a fuller consideration of the intellectual background, and this I have endeavoured to sketch.

I cover one mass within my study. It is perhaps unfortunate that it is a mass that did not come within the remit of Elias’s study, because her work on Crecquillon is the only one besides Lowinsky’s successfully to place sacred works by Crecquillon in a wider context. She has examined the technique of the imitation masses based on chansons of Gombert, Clemens and Crecquillon with fascinating results.

Of other studies, Tomiczek-Gernez has dealt briefly with several of Crecquillon’s masses in her work on Manchicourt, including the mass I discuss. I believe that she and previous commentators have misled themselves over the model, consequently
failing to note the significance and probable purpose of the work. Her comments on the imitation masses do not compare in subtlety and depth with the work of Elias, whose work is much to be preferred.

Summary

In summary, the research on Crecquillon has concentrated on the establishment of the canon and text, the first and necessary step towards further work, with the exception of the broader views of Lowinsky and Elias. The need now is for a deeper examination, based on that preliminary work, into the many aspects of Crecquillon's music, and its relationship to that of other composers and to the social and intellectual context in which he worked. This thesis is an attempt to reassess the evidence available for constructing some form of biography for Crecquillon, a review of the latest work on authenticity and a contribution to the discussion of that topic, including some new information, and an attempt to understand the context of selected motets, one mass and one chanson. It is a small effort to add a degree of context to the work of one of the finest composers of the era.
Notes to Chapter 1

1. I have been unable to trace the use of the term 'composer' in the Imperial circle of Charles before Crecquillon. An earlier example of its use is Senfl's description of himself in a letter as 'Komponist' whilst at the Bavarian court, see Bente (1980).

2. The title page of the 1576 volume includes the phrase 'Thomae Criquillon, Augustissimi Caroli Quinti Imperatoris chori magistri celeberrimi'. There were two chapels within the Imperial organisation, the small chapel and the large. Unless I have qualified the term 'chapel', it is intended to refer to the large chapel, the chapel which the musicians served.

3. The composers known to have used models by Crecquillon are Lassus/Lockenburg (2), Lassus/Vaet, Paix, Guerrero, La Hèle, Rogier and Szadek. For a note on the mass by Guerrero, see Appendix 2.


8. In Brown (1980a), Brown claimed that Crecquillon was less individualistic than Gombert, Willaert and Clemens. Whilst this is a subjective judgement, it is particularly hard to understand, given the difficulty experienced by scholars in trying to distinguish between the work of Clemens and Crecquillon.

9. Marshall (1970-1) and Hudson (1974 a-c and 1975). Unless the context requires otherwise, I have used the abbreviation 'CMM' to refer only to the Crecquillon volumes of the series Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae.

10. By a double irony, there is a commercial recording under Clemens' name of the eight-voice Pater peccavi, which Hudson (1990) pp. xxvi-xxix shows to be much more probably by Crecquillon.

11. See below. Walter did discuss the use of chant, but his work goes little beyond the identification of cantus firmi and chant quotations.


13. There are many examples, apart from those mentioned in the text. For instance, in painting, there is Tintoretto's canvas, now in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, and Altdorfer's in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich. A popular song, ‘There dwelt a man in Babylon’, the first stanza of which is given in Percy's Reliques Series 1, book 2, no. 10, is mentioned in Shakespeare's Twelfth-Night, act 2, scene 3, and a facsimile of the broadsheet 'Ballad of Constant Susanna' is in Day (1987) p. 33. Tapestries are listed on inventories for Hampton Court, others are now in the
Marmotan Museum in Paris. There is a study by Levy (1953) on Lassus' chanson and its numerous manifestations.

14. Brou now forms part of the outskirts of Bourg-en-Bresse in France.

15. See Hall (1979) 'Susannah', for the medieval understanding of the story.

16. Page (1993). Page's objections to such simplification and to the denial of diversity of thought are at the heart of the entire book. See particularly pp. 7-10.

17. I believe that Lowinsky more than once expressed frustration at those who were unable to appreciate the wider cultural context that he evoked with such imagination. His own comment on the process is typically forthright: 'If we search for deeper insight, we must abandon our one-sided preferences and strive instead for integration of as many approaches to the composer's work as have a bearing on its understanding'. Lowinsky (1989b) p. 959. Haggh (1996) more recently has been equally direct: 'Musicology, often suspicious of history, remains blind to the Middle Ages not only by failing to acknowledge the developments above [i.e those of outlined in her article]...but also by simultaneously projecting modern secular notions of culture onto the study of medieval music', p. 94. Her comments apply equally to the 16th century.

18. Studies that seem to me to exemplify the fruitful nature of the wider view are Higgins (1997), Macey (1991) and Lowinsky (1989c).

20. The essential text which acts as a warning to all on the danger of over-
interpretation is Crews (1964). It should be required reading for all researchers.

21. One might also suggest that modern thinking has a useful trope for any form of
enquiry in the acceptance in quantum physics that the act of observation changes both
the observed and the observer. The distinctions of 19th century philosophical
thinking between object and subject appealed to by some positivists may be no more
than illusory.

22. One would have preferred, for instance, the precise exemplar used of printed
sources to be noted; Milsom (1996) in particular has shown how different copies of
even the same edition of a print may vary significantly. The decision only to list the
items in any source relevant to the particular volume of CMM could obscure
potentially interesting or useful information, such as the apparent attempt to order
the 1576 posthumous collection modally. Some individual editorial decisions are also
open to question. For example, in Heu mihi domine, an error in the source for voice
2, bars 18.4 to 22.1 is compounded, leaving consecutive fifths and totally
unrealistic dissonances. The minim at bar 21.4-22.1 should be a crotchet, and
either the initial rest at bar 18.3 should be a minim, or an additional crotchet
inserted at bar 19.1 (possibly an f). The remainder of the original phrase then fits
perfectly without the further amendments made in CMM.


24. This is not to imply that our current understanding of mode is either complete
or unanimous. It has, however, been much enriched since the time of the studies of Marshall and Walter.
CHAPTER 2

LIFE

We know little of Crecquillon's life, 'distressingly little' for such a major composer, in Hudson's apt phrase. An outline of the few details we have can be given very briefly. Crecquillon was associated with the Imperial chapel from no later than 1540 to sometime in the 1550's. He is described as maistre de la chapelle of the Imperial chapel in a document of 1540, a position supposedly also given him on the title pages of three publications, including the posthumous 1576 collection of his motets published by Phalèse and Bellère. As late as 1628, he was still referred to as having been maistre. Other documents however refer to him as a singer, composer and chaplain, and accord Cornelius Canis the title of maistre de la chapelle during part of the period that Crecquillon was associated with the chapel. Crecquillon is known to have held a number of benefices, and it is believed that he died in 1557.

It is not surprising that, with such scanty information on Crecquillon's biography, interpretations of the few details available have varied, sometimes quite radically. Of his period in the Imperial chapel, Brown contented himself by saying that Crecquillon's exact role was unclear, whilst Schmidt-Görg regarded Crecquillon as Gombert's successor in the position of maistre des enfans. Bridgman considered Cornelius Canis to have been maistre de la chapelle whilst Crecquillon held the position of maistre des enfans as suggested by Schmidt-Görg. Marshall thought that Crecquillon might have been 'head choirmaster' from 1544 to 1546. The latest extended consideration of the evidence is by Rudolf in his study of Canis. He argues that Crecquillon was maistre de la chapelle only until 1542 when, he believes, Canis...
took over the position from Crecquillon. He also argues that the two positions of maistre de la chapelle and maistre des enfans were in reality a single office.7

With virtually nothing else known of Crecquillon’s life, and little agreement on what remains, it is again not surprising that different estimates of the likely year of his birth have also emerged. Brown assigned a probable birth date of circa 1480 to 1500, based on the likelihood that Crecquillon retired from Imperial service in the early 1550’s. Hudson has taken a different view; he considered that Crecquillon's Imperial service came earlier in his life, and that he was probably born between 1510 and 1520. Hudson’s picture, partly drawn from the appearance of Crecquillon’s music in the printed and manuscript sources, is of ‘a young man of great ability beginning an energetic career’ in contrast to Brown’s mature figure towards the end of his musical employment.8 At its greatest, the difference in these two estimates is no less than forty years. That degree of uncertainty clouds our understanding of Crecquillon’s music within its context. No modern writer has considered Crecquillon’s activities outside the Imperial chapel, and the lack of any working hypotheses on his career elsewhere also obscures the possible direction of future archival searches.

In this chapter, I want to review the available evidence to see whether any of the uncertainties can be resolved.

Crecquillon and the Imperial Chapel

We possess no hard evidence which indicates when Crecquillon joined the Imperial chapel or when he became maistre (which may not have been at the same time). It is
possible, though, to make some estimate of the likely period in which these two events occurred. The earliest known documentary record of him is in a collation list of December 1540 from the Imperial court. In this document his name appears three times as maistre de la chapelle.

Two other documents throw a little light on the activities of the Imperial chapel in the years immediately before 1540. The chapel seems to have been largely disbanded in the preparations for the Emperor's war in North Africa in 1535. Women, children and other 'useless' people were not permitted to be part of the expedition. It would appear that Gombert was required to start recruiting the personnel necessary to reconstitute the chapel after the successful conclusion to the hostilities. In November 1537 he was given a considerable sum of money, for schoolmasters for the children, chaplains, singers, children of the choir and an organist. In addition to a payment for joining the choir, the money covered their expenses in travelling to Brussels from where they lived, lodgings there for almost a month, and their onward journey from Brussels to Spain. The whole group was more than twenty strong. Gombert was also recompensed for his expenses over two years in selecting and gathering the new chapel members. Unfortunately we cannot tell from the surviving records precisely how many, if any, of the recruits had served in the chapel prior to its partial disbandment in 1535.

In August of the next year, the maistre de la chapelle, Adrian Pickart, was paid a sum over and above what had previously been paid to Gombert for employing a further five boys and three singers, and for them all to ride to Spain where the Emperor still was. It is not clear whether Pickart had been left behind when Gombert had taken the party in November the previous year, possibly to carry on recruiting, or
whether he had remained in the Emperor's service and had returned separately to the Low Countries at a later stage. If Gombert was in charge of the selection process for the revived chapel from late 1535 to 1537, then it seems more likely that Pickart had remained with the Emperor through his travels and campaigns. His presence in the Low Countries after Gombert had left for the court might partly have been leave of absence for his service through a difficult period.14

One major political event occurred after Gombert's group would have arrived at the Emperor's court, but before the further recruitment carried out by Pickart. In July 1538 Charles V and Francis I of France met at Aigues-Mortes to conclude a truce to their hostilities which, by the French seizure of Piedmont and Savoy, had been actively renewed in 1536. The Emperor and King were both accompanied by musicians. Pope Paul III was also present with a retinue of singers.15 This meeting, like many important political events, seems to have been marked musically, as well as in other ways. Dobbins has argued persuasively that the contents of Moderne's third motet collection for five and six voices (RISM 1538/2) are partly a reflection of these events. Certainly a number of the texts of the motets would have been particularly apposite. Dobbins instances, among others, Lupi's motet Vidi speciosam which opens the collection. This motet has a text from the Song of Songs with contains references to the dove, representing peace, and to the lily, the symbol of France, among the thorns, both therefore symbols appropriate to the occasion.16 Another motet is Lupi's Gregem tuum, pastor eterne, which includes additional text that makes it likely that it was deliberately constructed and addressed to Pope Paul. These are not isolated examples; Dobbins discusses a number more from this and other Moderne prints.17 If a composer of Crecquillon's stamp were a member of the Imperial chapel present at such an event, we might have expected to see a work of his
alongside those of Lupi, Courtois and Gombert. We find none.\textsuperscript{18}

Crecquillon is also unrepresented at this period in Moderne's chanson books and in Attaingnant's prints, although other composers from the Low Countries, including Gombert and Pathie from the Imperial circle, are represented in some of those collections.\textsuperscript{19} There is a further absence of music by Crecquillon when he might have been expected to have contributed works for a particular event, had he been in the Imperial chapel at the time. In this instance, it was the death of Charles V's wife, Isabella, in 1539. Two motets by Payen occasioned by her death survive; Payen was a composer of more modest output and attainment than Crecquillon, and there is no suggestion from his other works that he was normally expected to contribute works for state occasions. The fact that he wrote the only remaining funeral or memorial works for Isabella again suggests that Crecquillon was still to join the chapel. This, together with the apparent absence of music by Crecquillon from the prints marking the 1538 peace conference and from these other printed sources suggests that Crecquillon did not enter the Imperial circle until close to the year 1540, already established as the year of the earliest specific record of him.

It is not known whether Crecquillon was engaged first as a singer or chaplain, and then promoted to \textit{maistre de la chapelle}, or was recruited specifically for the senior position. If it was the former, then it is conceivable that Crecquillon was one of the additional singers accompanying Pickart in 1538, although this seems unlikely for the reason given above. However, the later appointment of Canis in 1542 at the age of about thirty-six suggests that those with the qualifications to be a \textit{maistre} were not sought at this period from within the ranks of the singers, a point reinforced by reference to other chapel appointments.\textsuperscript{20} Canis must have been a mature musician
by that age and quite possibly with experience as a maistre elsewhere. If we were to assume from the example of Canis that Crecquillon joined not as a singer but as a specially retained maistre, then there are several reasons for suggesting 1540 as the most probable year of his accession. As has been seen from Gombert's activities during 1535 to 1537, the process of recruitment was evidently not a speedy one. It is clear, too, that the chapel must have operated without Pickart for the period in 1538 when he was absent from the court recruiting men and boys. Pickart did not die until 1546, and his presence on the same collation list which names Crecquillon as maistre de la chapelle suggests that he retired in the normal course of events. With these factors in mind, the scenario of Pickart rejoining the court in the latter half of 1538 only to have Crecquillon recruited to replace him and in place before the court returned to the Low Countries at the beginning of 1540 seems improbable. Whilst therefore a considerable degree of uncertainty remains, the balance of probabilities is that Crecquillon became a member of the Imperial chapel no earlier than 1540 and joined as maistre.

Crecquillon and Canis

We come now to the question of Crecquillon's role in the Imperial chapel, and particularly, his position relative to that of Cornelius Canis. The benefice list of 1540 is consistent in its description of Crecquillon's position in the chapel; it gives it three times in exactly the same words. The term maistre de la chapelle would seem to imply musical oversight of the entire chapel, even if in itself it does not define the precise extent of the duties attached to the position. That is at odds with several of the conclusions reached by previous writers and which have been noted briefly at the
start of this chapter. However, Rudolf in his study of Canis argued that the terms *maistre de la chapelle* and *maistre des enfans* were used interchangeably in the documentary record, and therefore did not denote separate positions but a single post.\(^\text{22}\) If that is correct, it would mean that Crecquillon, until he was succeeded, undertook both the oversight of the music in the chapel, and the care and musical instruction of the choirboys. Rudolf’s interpretation of the record though differs significantly from Schmidt-Görg’s who, in his study of Gombert, regarded the two positions in the Imperial chapel (at least during the period of Gombert’s tenure) as separate. Rudolf also concluded that Crecquillon had been replaced by Canis by 1546 as *maistre de la chapelle*, and argued that ‘there would seem to be no apparent conflict with the idea that Canis replaced Thomas Crecquillon as *maistre de la chapelle* as early as 1542.’\(^\text{23}\)

**1542-1546**

It might be thought that the idea of the replacement of Crecquillon after such a short period, suggesting as it does some inadequacy on Crecquillon’s part, sits ill with the posthumous references to him as *maistre de la chapelle*, and particularly with the specific description in the 1576 motet publication of him as ‘the most celebrated master’ of the chapel. However, Rudolf’s contention that Crecquillon was replaced in 1542 has gained some currency.\(^\text{24}\) I want therefore to subject his argument to fairly detailed scrutiny before I come to the evidence of Crecquillon’s replacement by 1546, and the question of the single or dual positions of *maistre de la chapelle* and *maistre des enfans*. The discussion may shed a little light on these other issues.

Canis’s first known contacts with the Imperial chapel can be traced in documents
transcribed by vander Straeten. The organist of Mary of Hungary, Rogier Pathie, seems to have been actively recruiting yet further singers for the chapel in 1541 and 1542. In 1542, five choirboys whose voices had broken returned to the Low Countries from Spain, where Charles V and his court were at the time, accompanied by the schoolmaster Jean Taisnier. Rogier Pathie was deputed to search for replacements. Once recruited, the choirboys were gathered together and dispatched to Spain together with several singers presumably already retained. It is at this point that Canis is mentioned by name in a document relating to the travel of the group:

Audit Rogier Pathie, la somme de trois cens trente livres, que par le commandement et ordonnance desdits des Finances, ledit receveur générale luy a baillié et délivré comptant, pour les délivrer à aucuns chantres retenuz, par ordonnance de la royne, au service de l'empereur affin de incontinent partir des pays de par deça et aller ou sadit mate estoit, et le servir en sa chappelle, et premier; à me Cornille Canis, me des enffans, pour luy et quatre enffans qu'il devoit mener avecq luy, cl liv. A me Franchois Bourgignon, haut-contre, lx liv. A Pierre Brabants, taille, lx liv. Et à ung dessus mué, estant à Haerlebeke, lx liv. Reviennent lesdits parties ensemble à ladite somme de iii c xxx liv., pour ce icy, etc.

(The aforesaid Roger Pathie, the sum of 330 livres, which by the command and order of the said exchequer, the said receiver-general is to issue and deliver cash to him in order to deliver it to several singers retained, by ordinance of the Queen, in the service of the Emperor, providing for immediate departure from the present country and travel to where His Majesty will be, and to serve him in his chapel, and first: to Master Cornelius Canis, Master of the choirboys, for him and 4 choirboys he shall take with
him, 150 livres; to Master Franchois Bourguignon, alto, 60 livres; to Pierre
Brabant, tenor, 60 livres; and to a male soprano, formerly of Harlebeke, 60
livres; the entries comprising together the net sum of 330 livres... Rudolf's
translation)26

If the maistre de la chapelle and maistre des enfans are indeed terms for the same
position, then there is reason to accept Crecquillon’s replacement by Canis in 1542.
However, for Rudolf to write that ‘there would seem to be no apparent conflict with
the idea’ is disingenuous.

It is clearly important for the integrity of Rudolf’s argument that the contrary
evidence of the three printed title pages which describe Crecquillon as maistre de la
chapelle should be dismissed. The 1576 Phalèse collection is posthumous, and cannot
be taken as applying to any specific period. The title page of the Lamentations printed
in 1549 (RISM 1549/1) Rudolf regarded as demonstrably in error, a ‘promotional
gimmick’, which he equated with such phrases as nouvelle imprimes and
nouvellement composez & mises en musique, and to be approached with caution.
Certainly it might be thought that the title page of the Lamentations contradicts the
documentary record, and it will be considered below. The evidence of the third and
earliest print, Susato’s Tiers Livre de Chansons of 1544 (RISM 1544/11), is more
problematical.27

Susato’s Tiers Livre de Chansons

The Tiers livre is entirely of chansons by Crecquillon with one exception, a response
by Le Cocq to Crecquillon’s Pour vostre’ amour. The print itself does not carry a
date, but Meissner places it in September or October 1544.28 The reasons for that
dating are transparent: Susato’s Second livre and Quatriesme livre carry dates of
September and October respectively of that year, and the third book in the series
might reasonably be supposed to have been published between them. The title pages of
the part-books of the Tiers livre are quite specific in describing Crecquillon as
‘Maistre de la chapelle de Lempereur’. This is anachronistic under Rudolf’s
hypothesis, and to challenge the apparently straightforward witness of Susato, Rudolf
has called into question the dating of the collection. The main points of his argument
need to be summarised.

First, there is the form of the title-pages. Rudolf observed that the title page of the
Tiers livre appears ‘not only without a date, but also without any indication of
imperial privilege, or other information such as the address of the firm and often the
month of issue which is given on the title pages of the other publications of 1544’.29
He noted that it was the only extant publication of Susato not to include a privilege,
and concluded that ‘such variance in layout between the Tiers livre and the title pages
of Susato’s other early prints seems out of character’.30 Second, on the particular
issue of the privilege, he observed that the form of privilege displayed by Susato’s
first print, the Vingt et six chansons of 1543, was different from the later prints of
1544 which referred to the Imperial privilege for three years, granted in July
1543, and argued from that an earlier date for this print than has been generally
accepted.

Susato, before he set up on his own account, was in partnership with two others,
Willem van Vissenaecken and Henry ter Bruggen. Ter Bruggen is known to have held
an Imperial privilege from 1541, but he was removed from the partnership in
September 1542, and Vissenaecken published a book of motets sometime in that year, with or without Susato’s involvement: *Quatuor vocum musicae modulationes* (RISM 1542/7). The form of privilege in that book of motets is the same as in the *Vingt et six chansons*. Vissenaecken and Susato, Rudolf suggested, were on good terms at this stage because of the inclusion of a motet by Susato in Vissenaecken’s 1542 motet collection. Again, it is known that the partnership came to an end, with a court determination in April of 1543. At some time after that, Susato acquired his own fount and set up in business on his own. Rudolf argued that Susato’s next logical step was to apply for his own Imperial privilege to publish music, and considered it within the realms of possibility that, after the court determination in April 1543 but before the new privilege of July that year, Susato published the *Tiers livre* under the old privilege used by Vissenaecken, consisting of pieces by the person he mistakenly believed to be *maistre* of the Emperor’s chapel as ‘a gesture to flatter the Emperor into giving him a privilege’. To be able to suggest this, Rudolf conjectured that Susato may not have known of Canis’s appointment in 1542, and that, as Charles V and the court did not arrive in the Low Countries until September 1543, Susato would only have learned of the true position after that date. Alternatively, Rudolf considered it likely that Susato used the *Vingt et six chansons* as the means of applying for the privilege through Mary of Burgundy to whom it is dedicated, following that collection with the *Tiers livre* with its prominent mention of the Emperor’s chapelmaster, as ‘a normal means of currying the favor of Charles V’, but with Susato still operating under the same misapprehension.

Third, there is the admitted problem of the title - ‘the third book of chansons’. To avoid the evident difficulty with the number of the volume in the series, Rudolf suggested either that the collections were not issued in sequence, or that there were
other editions dated earlier than the extant copies, as evidenced by various bibliographical entries noted by Meissner, or that there was an earlier edition, unnumbered, of just this one print. Each of these possibilities would allow his thesis to be correct. There is the well-known oddity in the dates of Susato's three collections of masses, where the second book of masses is dated before the first, which Rudolf believed might support these alternative scenarios. He raised a further possibility: that the print was projected in 1543, delayed, and then assigned a volume number when finally issued in 1544.

As a catch-all, Rudolf reminded us that we should not believe everything we read. As with the Lamentations of 1549, he considered that there was a danger in the literal interpretation of information on the title page.

From this argument Rudolf concluded that Susato's Tiers livre was 'totally inadequate' as evidence of Crecquillon's position after Canis had joined the chapel. Rudolf believed that his interpretation of the evidence was supported by two further publications, a lost 'Susato' edition of motets by Canis in 1544, and a Gardano print of 1544. These will be discussed briefly below.

Susato's testimony is one of the few pieces of evidence that we have, and we should accord it some credibility unless there are reasonable grounds for disbelief. It is obvious that if his witness cannot be impeached, either Rudolf's conclusion on the interchangeability of the terms maistre de la chapelle and maistre des enfans needs reconsideration, or the document naming Canis as maistre des enfans presents a problem. It is doubtful whether Rudolf's argument on the dating of the Susato print gives us the reasonable grounds necessary to disregard Susato's description of
Crecquillon.

The documents recording Rogier Pathie's recruitment of choirboys and singers for the Imperial chapel demonstrate that his search was a wide one. He was instructed to go to 'Lille, Arras and other towns and places round about'. His earlier search for singers had taken him rather further afield, to Cambrai, and to several towns in Flanders, Artois, Hainault and Holland. He assembled the group which included Canis from Ghent as well as Arras and Lille, before their departure from Brussels. It seems unlikely that such a widespread search for suitable talent should not have been well-known throughout the area. But let us leave aside the simple improbability that Canis's departure for the Imperial chapel as maistre des enfans, especially if that meant maistre de la chapelle, should have remained a secret within the musical community, and begin with Rudolf's central point, the one from which his whole argument essentially springs: the difference in title pages between the Tiers livre and the other collections issued by Susato.

The title pages of the chanson collections

I have examined the title pages for the Vingt et six chansons and the first ten collections of chansons for four or more voices, i.e. those volumes printed from 1543 to 1545. (After the Dixiesme livre there was a gap in Susato's chanson publications; the Unziesme livre did not appear until 1549.) That examination reveals that the greater part of these publications uses two forms of title page within each set of part-books. The majority of individual part-books have a full title page, with the contents listed on the reverse side of the opening leaf. In a number of cases though, the contents are listed on the recto side of the opening leaf together with the
title, which inevitably means that the detail from the full title page is somewhat abbreviated to allow room for the contents listing. The title page in each of the four part-books of the Tiers Livre is of this second sort. Of the other publications, the Dixiesme livre also has a combined title and contents page in all four part-books.

Only three out of the eleven publications examined use a full title page in every part-book - the Second livre, Quatrièsme livre and Huitiesme livre. Fifteen of the total of forty-seven individual part-books have the combined title and contents page.

What of the information on, or omitted from, these combined title and contents pages? Rudolf mentions three specific omissions from the title page of the Tiers livre: Susato's address, the date or month of issue and the privilege. On the first point, he appears to have allowed himself to be misled. Forney has identified three editions of this print, two of which do not contain Susato's address, which she dates tentatively from 1546-9 and 1558-61.37 The title page of the edition which she identifies as the original states 'nouvellement Imprimes en Anvers par Tylman Susato demourant audict Anvers aupres de la nouvelle Bourse En la Rue des xij Mois'.38 It is true that no date is given, but that is also true of the combined title and contents pages in three out of the eight publications that have them; moreover, it may be pointed out that in the case of the Vingt et six chansons, the other part-books carry no date either. The omission of the privilege is more consistent; it is absent from all the combined title pages with the exception of those in the Dixiesme livre. Even here, the form of the privilege is different to that normally used by Susato. It is 'avec grace et previlege'. Rudolf relied crucially in his argument on the difference in the form of privilege used in the Vingt et six chansons, 'cum gratia et privilegio', and the other publications of 1544 which on the full title pages have 'avec grace et privilege de sa [or 'la Imperiale'] Maieste pour trois ans' in order to redate Susato's
first print. Yet, apart from being in French rather than Latin, we find here exactly the same form of privilege being displayed in 1545 as in Susato's first publication of 1543.

Rudolf was not specific about what other information was omitted from the Tiers livre which was to be found on the title pages of other collections. I have therefore made a comparison of all the combined title and contents pages on a number of additional points as well. The results are shown in Table 2.1. It can be seen that there is no complete consistency in the information given; Susato, whilst using stock phrases, had no set form for these pages. It will be clear from the discussion so far that the grounds for supposing the Tiers Livre to be so radically different from other Susato publications simply do not exist in the form stated by Rudolf.

Certainly there is the question why Susato should have used the combined title and contents page for all four of the part-books of the Tiers Livre, rather than in one or two of the part-books only, as in the other sets other than the Dixiesme livre. Indeed, there is the question why Susato adopted two forms of opening leaf at all. One possible answer to both questions seems reasonably obvious if we list the number of folios in each part-book. See Table 2.2. Nearly all the part-books contain sixteen folios; it is evidently Susato's standard size. If for the moment we ignore the Dixiesme livre which, unusually, is shorter, only two out of the remaining forty-three individual part-books are not of sixteen folios. The reason for that number of folios is that each part-book could be printed from whole sheets of paper (four sheets per part-book in oblong quarto). Examination of those part-books with combined title and contents pages shows that, in each case, the combined opening page has been utilised to allow more room for other material, whether it is music or editorial matter such as a
Table 2.1

Selected elements from the joint title and contents pages of Susato's first series of chanson publications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>20 &amp; 6</th>
<th>1st b'k</th>
<th>3rd b'k</th>
<th>5th b'k</th>
<th>6th b'k</th>
<th>7th b'k</th>
<th>9th b'k</th>
<th>10th b'k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privilege</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for instruments</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2.2

The style of title page and the number of folios in the part-books of Susato's first series of chanson publications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Superius</th>
<th>Contratenor</th>
<th>Tenor</th>
<th>Bassus</th>
<th>5'ta/6'ta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 &amp; 6</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>J 18</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st book</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>J 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd book</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd book</td>
<td>J 16</td>
<td>J 16</td>
<td>J 16</td>
<td>J 16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th book</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th book</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>J 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th book</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>J 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th book</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>J 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>J 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th book</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th book</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>J 16</td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th book</td>
<td>J 12</td>
<td>J 12</td>
<td>J 14</td>
<td>J 12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S = separate title and contents pages
J = one combined title and contents page
dedication, to be printed, whilst maintaining the standard size of part-book.

In three instances, the verso of the last leaf is essentially blank, from which it would appear that the title pages for these were prepared before the entire part-book had been set in type. Susato anticipated the need for extra space that in the event was not required. Even so, in two of those three instances, Susato could not manage to accommodate everything in sixteen folios, but had to use eighteen folios. No doubt that was inconvenient, but in one case, it was the part-book from his first print containing the dedication to Mary of Hungary and the illustration of Susato presenting her with the publication; he could hardly have scrimped on that. It is possible in this instance that Susato wanted the dedication and initial illustration to appear in a single opening, rather than miscalculating the overall length of the part-book. Nevertheless, in both part-books where more than sixteen folios are required, he still appears to use the combined opening page to restrict the probable number of folios to an even one. Again there is a simple reason; if the part-book had required an odd number of folios, the normal folding of the paper would mean either an entire folio would have to be left blank (or given extra print), or a single leaf would have to be bound in to the book with a stub, or tipped in, things a printer would wish to avoid. Similar comments apply to the Dixiesme livre, despite its shorter length. Three of the part-books were printed on three sheets with an extra half sheet for the tenor part-book.

It appears that in the case of the Tiers livre it was necessary, unusually, to use the combined title and contents page for all four part-books simply to fit the music into sixteen folios. That is confirmed by the part-books themselves; in each instance the music starts on what would otherwise be the contents page i.e. folio 1v, and finishes
on the verso of the sixteenth folio. Susato wanted to give the public good measure: this collection contains thirty-seven chansons, compared with the thirty-one of the first and second books.

It is evident from Table 2.1 that Susato did not consider it important that his privilege should appear on these combined title and contents pages, but is there any specific reason for its omission? Equally, why omit dates in the Premier Livre, Tiers Livre, and Neufiesme Livre, and other details that we have noted from other pages? The answer seems as prosaic as the adoption of the combined page. If it was important for considerations of the printing process to keep the number of folios to no more than sixteen when possible, and to achieve this by means of the combined title and contents page, then that, according to the number of pieces to be indexed, would place physical constraints on the amount of other detail that could be included on the page. The most obvious explanation for these omissions is simply one of space. We can assume that Susato, not having a standard title page format from one collection to another, included what he could without any particular system, once he had accommodated the contents listing. A comparison of the title pages of the Premier livre, the Tiers livre and the Cincquiesme livre confirms this. In the first two, it would have been difficult for Susato comfortably to fit in more type, and he omitted the date; similarly, in the Cincquiesme livre Susato, having included the date, had to exclude his frequently used reference to the chansons’ suitability for instruments which appears on the title pages of the other two prints and for which there would not have been room in this case. The differences noted by Forney between the editions of the Tiers livre also confirms Susato’s lack of a standard layout.40

It therefore seems more than probable that there are straightforward explanations
for the features observed by Rudolf and that these features are not confined as he thought to the *Tiers livre*.

The dating of the *Tiers livre de chansons*

Rudolf has argued that the *Tiers livre* may have been issued before or after the grant of Susato’s privilege in July 1543 but before September 1543. We need to look at this on the basis of accepting the existing dating for the other prints, and also on the basis of the further possibility that Rudolf has raised of earlier editions of a number of the prints, or of the *Tiers livre* alone.

The *Vingt et six chansons* has been generally accepted as Susato’s first print, and with good reason. Susato’s dedication to Mary of Hungary makes it clear. He describes the print as his first work in a section of the dedicatory poem:

```
Pour presenter a vostre maieste
Et desdier ce, mon premier ouvraige
En suppliant d’humble cueur, & couraige
Vostre plaisir estre......
(To be presented to your majesty
and dedicated, this my first work
in the request of a humble heart, and [with] courage
to be your pleasure)
```

Although the print is undated, it seems likely that it was printed at the same time as the Imperial privilege was granted. As Forney (1978) has demonstrated, the process
of granting the privilege was not separate from the production of a printer's first publication, but intimately connected with it. Forney described it in some detail.\textsuperscript{41} The essential points for the present purpose are that the request for a privilege was initially considered by a delegated commissioner; a statement of the privilege would then be sent to the printer. The privilege was then only finally confirmed by the Judicial Council once an exemplar of the print had been submitted, with the original statement, and received approval. When we set this process of approval against the nature of Susato's first print with its dedication, its opening illustration, its repertoire, and the two colour printing it contains, the dating of the \textit{Vingt et six chansons} to July 1543 seems assured.\textsuperscript{42}

From these details it seems highly improbable that the \textit{Tiers livre} could have preceded the granting of Susato's privilege. It seems equally unlikely that the \textit{Tiers livre} could have been issued before Susato's \textit{Premier livre} which is dated November 1543. Rudolf perhaps overlooked Susato's message 'aux lecteurs'. Susato, among other things, wrote:

\begin{quote}
Jay mis dehors ung petit livre de chansonnetz imprimees a cinq. le quel sera le premier livre a cinq. & Cecy le premier a quatre....Et ay espoir de brief encoires imprimer. ung livre a trois dont lon pourra user a deux parties quant lon veult....Ces trois livres icy suyuray tout dung format. dont chascung livre aura son titlre appart. asscavoir le deuzisme livre a cinq. le troisiesme livre a cinc. au semblable le deuzisme livre a quatre. le troisiesme a quatre le quatreisme livre a quatre.

(I have already put out a small printed book of five-part chansons, which will be the first book for five [voices], and this book the first for four
\end{quote}
And I hope soon to print a book for three voices which can be used by two people if it is wished. These three books will all be made in the same format, while each book will be known by its title, the second book for five voices, the third book for five voices, and similarly the second book for four voices, the third book for four voices, the fourth book for four voices...)

The five-voice book already issued can be identified with the *Vingt et six chansons*; the book of three-voice chansons was published in 1544. Susato is quite specific that he had only issued one book of five-voice chansons previously. It would seem impossible for the *Tiers livre* (which is for four voices) to have been issued before the date of the *Premier livre* unless we are to assume that Susato was being deliberately dishonest, something for which there is neither evidence or reason. The context rules out the possibility of an error in the statement of the number of voice-parts of his previous print.43

We may remind ourselves that it was in September of 1543 that the court returned to the Low Countries, and even if he had not known before, Susato surely would have known by the time of the *Premier livre* who was *maistre* of the Imperial chapel. We may also note that Susato did not follow his announced plan of two separate series of four- and five-voice works. He actually issued a single series encompassing both. We may reasonably assume from the difference between his intention and its execution that the further collections had not by that stage been planned in detail, still less set up in type, although no doubt he had amassed material for them.

Further, there are typographical similarities between books two to four which
suggest that they were prepared relatively closely together. The opening leaf of music in the *Tenor* part books of books one to five all have an ornamental ‘T’ with the remainder of the voice name, ‘enor’, turned through 90 degrees so that it appears vertically to the right of the initial block. The positioning of this vertical is identical (to under approximately 0.5 mm.) in books 2-4, but differently placed in books one and five. Similarly in the *Superius* part-books: book one has an ornamental ‘A’ (the opening letter of the chanson text), books two to four have an ornamental ‘S’ with ‘uperius’, whilst books five and six have both the ornamental initial and ‘Superius’.

There is the further suggestion from Rudolf that the *Tiers livre* may have been prepared earlier than its number in the series would suggest, and was numbered only when finally issued. The typographical points just noted make that improbable, but that speculation can be ruled out on other grounds. It is highly unlikely that Susato had enough type to set more than two formes at once i.e. a single gathering of four folios (a quarter of one part-book). To have left the whole collection set in type at one time would have taken far more print than Susato is known to have possessed. Equally simply, if Susato had to prepare a title page for the collection when it was finally issued to accommodate the series number (or to amend an existing title page), he would have had every opportunity to correct the description of Crecquillon which appears in the lines of type immediately below the title of the collection. Apart from the question of the amount of type needed, it is clear from even a casual inspection of the title pages of the part-books of the *Tiers livre* that those for at least three of the four part-books could not have been prepared in advance of the printing being started. Blocks of type were reused by being transferred from one title page to another; the title pages must have been made up sequentially for the remaining part-books subsequent to the printing of the first. That only emphasises the
opportunities Susato would have had to correct any error, had it existed. The notion that the collection was prepared in advance of its issue raises too many practical problems to be accepted.

Difficulties arise with other aspects of the argument, too. Rudolf proposed that we should regard the *Tiers livre* as an attempt to flatter the Emperor. First, his own hypothesis requires us to accept that this attempt at flattery was produced by Susato at a time when the Emperor was not even in the Low Countries, and indeed, probably at a time when it was not known when the Emperor and the court would return.\(^{46}\) Second, if we compare the *Tiers livre* with the *Vingt et six chansons* it is hard to believe that Susato would have included no effusive dedication, no illustration, no other form of flattery (such as the inclusion of his own setting of a *Mille regretz* text in the earlier collection). The Emperor was the most august and powerful ruler on earth. It seems intrinsically improbable that Susato would have dared hope for anything from such a person by a publication without distinguishing it and its purpose in some way well beyond the fact of the composer being the Emperor's *maistre de la chapelle*.

We may also think it unlikely that Susato would have opened the *Vingt et six chansons* for presentation to Mary of Hungary with music by Crecquillon, giving him both pride of place and the honour of the largest number of pieces presented, all under a misapprehension that any official at Mary's court could probably have corrected.\(^{47}\) Rogier Pathie, who was responsible for finding replacement boys and singers and sending them with Canis to Spain, was organist of her chapel and a trusted functionary.\(^{48}\) The directive for his efforts had come from the Queen, who was known for her keen interest in music. Susato may well have known Pathie. Not only did he
include one of Pathie’s very few extant compositions in the Premier livre, but he wrote a response and replique to it. In any event, the Vingt et six chansons does not ignore Canis; it contains three of his chansons. If we are right to draw any significance at all from that, it may be that Susato was well aware of the relative positions of Crecquillon and Canis in the Imperial chapel, and that their respective contributions to the print reflect those positions.50

There is also the question of Susato’s access to the musical material he printed. Rudolf argued in his study that, for the most part, the appearance of Canis’s music in print was in line with its availability based on the movements of the Imperial court. It is not an unreasonable view. Rudolf suggested that the three chansons by Canis in the Vingt et six chansons were available to Susato before Canis left for Spain in about June 1542. To sustain this particular hypothesis, he had to explain Crecquillon’s contribution to the same collection. Rudolf resorted either to the notion that Crecquillon’s music was available before Crecquillon left the Low Countries with the court at the very beginning of 1541, or that there was perhaps a courier from the Emperor Charles to the Low Countries who carried musical manuscripts. If the Tiers livre was prepared before the return of the court in September 1543 Susato must have acquired over forty chansons by Crecquillon by the end of 1540, when Susato had not entered his first printing venture, let alone started on his own account. We can discount the idea that these works might have been in general circulation and acquired later by Susato, as there would have been no commercial value in printing what was freely available. Indeed, the larger number of pieces in the Tiers livre compared with its companion volumes suggests that the demand for Crecquillon’s music was considerable. We have also seen that it is possible that Crecquillon only joined the court in 1540. If the options of Susato putting together
his material in 1540 or earlier before the court left in January 1541 or the music being in general circulation both seem implausible, it is just as unlikely that Susato could have received music by courier from the Imperial chapel and court without becoming aware of the true position of its leading musical personnel. Moreover, Rudolf compounded the difficulties of his own position by accepting the dating of the Premier livre for his discussion on the sources of Canis's music. He assumed that Susato obtained both Crecquillon's and Canis's contributions to it after the court's return in September 1543. The unlikelihood of the Tiers livre coming before the Premier livre has already been established. The effect on his hypothesis on the dating of the Tiers livre of his acceptance of the dating of the Premier livre is obvious.

We may conclude from the extant editions of Susato's prints that Rudolf's position is weak. The problems associated with Rudolf's position disappear if we accept the evidence at face value, that the Tiers livre was prepared after the court's return in 1543 and after the Premier livre. Rudolf however raises the possibility that other and earlier editions of several of Susato's chanson books might have existed, and therefore the timescale we can derive from the remaining exemplars might be misleading. Whilst a speculative possibility hardly seems sufficient ground to controvert the available evidence, it needs to be addressed. It is impossible to prove that earlier editions did not once exist, but we can adduce evidence from the remaining editions which will suggest that it is highly improbable that they did. We may also note the inconsistency of this line of argument with Rudolf's thesis on the dissemination of Canis's music. It is not reasonable to accept the existing date for the Premier livre for the purpose of discussing the availability of material to Susato, and to propose another date for it by positing earlier editions in the effort to redate the Tiers livre.
It is clear that if a significant part of the series were to have been first issued before the crucial date for Rudolf of September 1543, the explanation of how Susato amassed his musical material whilst remaining in ignorance of Canis's appointment as *maistre de la chapelle* becomes even more pressing. Crecquillon had some twenty-six more chansons in Susato's first to eighth collections, besides those in the *Tiers livre*. From the prints themselves we have already noted the internal consistency of the dates of the editions with the statements Susato makes. Beyond that, the dates on all the editions tally with the series number; there are none of the anomalies one might expect from the random survival of sources from different editions and dates.

That is not to say that there were not other editions. As we have seen, it would not have been possible for Susato to have kept individual collections set up in type, and existing exemplars show the transfer of blocks of type from individual title pages to other part-books within the print, and also from print to print. Both these observations demonstrate that re-impressions would not have been feasible and that therefore none of the existing copies can be re-impressions with the original date amended. New versions had to be reset i.e. they were new editions. Forney (1978) in her bibliographical study of Susato's chanson publications found evidence for two or three editions, not just of the *Tiers livre* already mentioned, but of all but a single publication. On typographical grounds she dated all the later editions except one to 1546 or later. Almost all the later editions were issued under the earliest date that exists for each print.53 Had there been yet earlier editions, Susato would have needed to be consistent in redating the second editions and then in maintaining the date of that second edition in yet later editions, and every exemplar of the original editions to have been subsequently lost, to present the picture that the extant copies give.
Rudolf supports his argument on the possibility of earlier editions by reference to the varied dates ascribed to some of the prints in bibliographies, as listed by Meissner. The single most important point to note is that in the single case concerning the chanson publications of 1543 to 1545, the alternative date is after, not before, the date displayed by the remaining exemplars. This is also true of the motet prints; only in the case of the masses is there the apparent anomaly previously mentioned. Thus, the bibliographic listings give no evidence for, or reason to presume, an earlier edition of any of these chanson publications.54

In summary, Rudolf’s conclusion that Susato’s Tiers livre is ‘totally inadequate as documentary evidence that Thomas Crecquillon was chapel master of the court of Charles V after the time that Canis joined the chapel’ must itself be treated with very considerable reserve. On the contrary, there seems every reason to accept Susato as a reliable witness. None of the varied arguments against that proposition seem on examination to be substantial.

‘Ghost’ editions of other prints

Rudolf however sought support from two printed sources, one lost, the other extant, for his view that Crecquillon had been replaced by Canis in 1542.55 The first is a supposed collection of motets by Canis cited by Fétis: Cantiones sacrae seu motteta quinque vocum; Louvani 1544, in 4°.56 It was argued by Rudolf that, as Fétis elsewhere has incorrectly given Louvain rather than Antwerp as the place of publication of a print which can be identified as a Susato chanson publication, this collection too ‘may have been issued in Antwerp by Susato’. He pointed to collections by Susato dedicated to one composer, and concluded:
If one continues under the assumption that Canis was already chapel master when Susato published the *Tiers livre de chansons*, it would not be surprising to find Susato corrected his error by publishing another collection in 1544, featuring the works of the new chapel master of the Emperor. A collection devoted entirely to the works of Canis would not make sense in any other context so early in his career with the imperial chapel, especially in light of the fact that he was absent from the Netherlands from May 1542 to September 1543.57

Even if we leave aside the dubious nature of the argument, there are objections on several points of detail. First, it is evident that music printers of the period mostly operated by the issue of works in series by genre. Susato seems to have been no exception. He published chansons to August 1545, masses later in 1545 and 1546, motets in 1546 (following the masses) and 1547. He returned to chansons in 1549, and to motets in 1553.58 The issue of a collection of motets by Canis in 1544 would be out of sequence with Susato's stated production pattern. Secondly, the single-composer collections to which Rudolf refers are chanson collections, with the possible exception of a 1546 collection of motets by Clemens. This latter collection, if it ever existed, is also lost, but at least it would have fitted better with Susato's known prints.59 Thirdly, if we are to trust Fétis's title as a correct transcription (something which, from other bibliographical entries of his, we may well not be able to do), then the form of title is untypical. Susato's habitual form of title included 'vulgo moteta vocant', not 'seu motetta'. Susato's locution was the same as, or similar to, that used by all the printers of the Low Countries and Germany. As far as I have been able to check, only a few Italian prints use a phrase similar to that given.
by Fétis in the title of the Canis collection.\textsuperscript{60} Fourthly, and still relying on the accuracy of Fétis's description, the format is given as quarto. Until 1545, Susato used only an oblong quarto format, and Fétis seems to have distinguished between the two formats in many other of his entries. Lastly, if the place of publication and other details of the print could have been recorded wrongly, so could the date. If the correct date were 1554 instead of 1544, then the collection could well have been printed in Louvain, by Phalèse. Any adjustment to a date later than 1544 would seem to remove any force that the argument might otherwise have. We might also ask ourselves two questions. Firstly, if Susato was so intent on correcting the error that Rudolf supposed him to have made as to print a whole collection by Canis in 1544, why when the \textit{Premier livre} was printed in 1543, did he include in it six chansons by Crecquillon and only one by Canis? It was after all, on Rudolf's reckoning, the first opportunity to make amends that Susato would have had. Secondly, why, when the \textit{Tiers livre} was reprinted in 1546 or thereabouts did Susato not amend his description of Crecquillon's position as he had to reset the title page?

Gardano's \textit{Cipriani musici...liber primus}

The second print called in support of Rudolf's proposition is Gardano's \textit{Cipriani musici...liber primus} (RISM 1544/6).\textsuperscript{61} Rudolf argued that the appearance of music from the Imperial chapel in Italian prints of the period generally can be related to the travels of the Imperial chapel. He suggested that the movement of the Imperial court through Italy in 1543 would have allowed a degree of interchange between the members of the Imperial court and 'many important personages'. Yet as he had to admit, only one work by members of the chapel of that time appears in subsequent prints until 1549, the motet \textit{Ave sanctissima Maria} by Canis in Gardano's \textit{Cipriani musici...liber primus}.
musici...liber primus. On the strength of that one work and in the face of his general thesis on transmission, Rudolf concluded that had Crecquillon been maistre de la chapelle it would have seemed more likely that a work of his would have appeared, and that ‘there seems to be no means other than the trip of the court’ that could have made the motet available to Gardano.

Yet again, there are a number of difficulties with the argument, which will not be discussed in detail, as it will be apparent that the publication of Canis’s motet in a Gardano print is insufficient in itself to constitute firm evidence of the positions within the Imperial chapel. The main objections in outline are: the Emperor Charles’s main stay in Italy was not on Venetian soil, but at Bussetto near Parma, in the Milanese territories, part of the Imperial lands, where he met with the Farnese Pope Paul III, although he passed briefly through Venetian territory by way of Verona on his way through to the Brenner Pass (we are mistaken if we assume Italy was in any sense a single country at that time); Venetian music printers were noted both for their international repertoire and international market, a glance at the indices to Gardano’s prints will confirm his wide-ranging access to material; and the means of acquiring repertoire was readily to hand with the maintenance of Venetian and other Italian trading communities in many cities (including some in the Low Countries). It is evident from Scotto’s prints of Clemens, Crecquillon and Canis in 1554 that substantial amounts of repertoire from the Low Countries could be obtained entirely independently of the Imperial chapel’s movements.

Other circumstantial evidence

Despite those objections, Rudolf’s intended aim is a fair one: to see if there is any
appearance of works by either or both composers in a context which would implicitly support the status quo as it is believed to be. Apart from the Susato prints already discussed, there is another group of works that might suggest that it was Crecquillon rather than Canis who was *maistre de la chapelle* in 1543, after the date of Canis's joining the chapel. Moreover, these works are all from within the Imperial court circles. I will discuss much more fully in chapter 6 a group of motets, a mass and a chanson, which I believe can be shown beyond reasonable doubt to have been written for an event in November 1543 by a number of musicians associated with the courts of the Emperor Charles and Mary of Burgundy. These composers include Crecquillon, Canis, Manchicourt and Benedictus. Canis's contribution is a modest motet, whilst Crecquillon's is the mass, the twelve-voice chanson, and probably at least one motet besides.  

*Maistre de la chapelle* and *maistre des enfans*

Rudolf's reference to these two prints does nothing to undermine the witness of Susato's title page in his *Tiers livre*, which consequently cannot be dismissed. If we are to accept that the positions of *maistre de la chapelle* and *maistre des enfans* were identical, as claimed by Rudolf, we are presented with an apparent problem. We need now to consider how this difficulty can be reconciled. One possibility is that, when Canis was named master of the children, it meant no more than he was given responsibility for them during their journey, and that once the party had arrived in Spain where the chapel was at that time, he would be relieved of his responsibilities, and Crecquillon would take over. But it is difficult to read that into the document cited by vander Straeten:
In that case, we must revisit the question of whether the positions of *maistre de la chapelle* and *maistre des enfans* were indeed the same, as argued by Rudolf, a view at variance with that of Schmidt-Görg and others.\(^65\)

There are two documents known which describe the organisation of the Imperial chapel in 1545. One is in French, the other in Spanish, but they convey the same information, and one is probably a translation of the other. Neither document is dated, but they were not written in 1545. They were evidently prepared for Philip II at some time after Charles's abdication.\(^66\) The document in French is headed:

> Relation de la manière de servir qui s'observait à la Cour de l'Empereur don Carlos, notre Seigneur, en l'année 1545; la même est observée aujourd'hui à la Cour de Sa Majesté.

(A record of the manner of service which was observed at the court of the Emperor Charles, our lord, in the year 1545; the same is observed today at the court of His Majesty.)

A brief description of the remuneration and duties of the chapel members then follows, starting with the Grand Almoner. What is required of the *maistre de la chapelle* is clear:
Le maître de chapelle a vingt sous de gages. Il a sous sa direction les jeunes chantres de la chapelle, il doit leur donner à manger; il perçoit pour cela leurs gages, qui sont de quatre sous par jour et par enfant. On lui paye encore tout ce qu’il dépense pour les fournir de chausses, de pourpointes, de chemises, de souliers et autre choses diverses, sous réserve de l’approbation du grand aumônier.

Il est obligé de leur enseigner la musique et le service de la chapelle. Quand l’empereur voyage, le maître de chapelle a droit aux chariots nécessaires pour transporter les enfants et ses bagages.

(The master of the chapel has wages of twenty sous [per day]. He has under his direction the young singers of the chapel, he must give them their rations; he receives their wages on their behalf, which are four sous a day per child. In addition, he is paid all that he spends to provide them with breeches, doublets, shirts, shoes and various other things, subject to the approval of the Grand Almoner.

He is obliged to teach them music and the service of the chapel. When the Emperor travels, the master of the chapel has the right to the wagons needed to carry the children and their baggage.)

These documents are specific: the maistre de la chapelle looked after the children of the choir, although any responsibility he might also have had for the musical performance of the chapel was left unwritten. Yet the evidence from earlier documents appears to be at variance with this definition of a single position, and there are a number of pieces of evidence that we would have to discount if we are to argue that the position given for 1545 was one that always prevailed.
The argument for a single position prior to 1545 essentially rests on Rudolf's observation that it is only in the 1526 collation lists that the two positions are given with different names attached, and that Gombert, who was first mentioned as maistre des enfans in 1529, is subsequently variously referred to as a singer, master of the singing of the chapel, and master of the chapel. (All the chaplains were singers, and the term was obviously used at times without prejudice to any other position an individual might have held. This simple but important point clears a number of apparent confusions.) Rudolf suggested that Pickart took over from Gombert as a stopgap until Crecquillon was appointed, rather than having been maistre de la chapelle previously whilst Gombert was maistre des enfans. In 1538, Pickart was named in the same document as Gombert; it is the document mentioned above which records Pickart's travel to Spain in August of that year with a group of men and boys:

A mè Adriaen Picart, mè de la chappelle de l'Empereur, la somme de ....
et ce oltre et pardonssus la somme ... que ledit receveur générale avoit paié à
Mè Nicolas Gombert, mè des enfans de la chappelle de sa dite Majesté, pour
les déliver autre compagnons chantres at enfans.....
(To master Adrian Pickart, master of the Emperor's chapel, the sum of.... and this is over and above the sum... which the said receiver-general has paid to master Nicolas Gombert, master of the children of the said Emperor's chapel to deliver other fellow singers and children...)

It cannot be said with any certainty from this document that Pickart superseded Gombert. Indeed, the context suggests otherwise with its use of a different term within a few lines for the two individuals. Rudolf cited two further extant references to Gombert which he believed demonstrated the interchangeability of the two terms
for the maistre. The first is in a letter of 1533 from the court concerning a benefice. In it Gombert is called 'M[a]g[ist]ro Capell[a]e Caes[areae]'. The Latin is ambiguous; it could equally correctly be translated 'a master of the chapel' as 'the master of the chapel'. Given the purpose of the letter, accuracy of description would not be a prerequisite, but the Latin is in any event perfectly correct for either scenario. The second reference cited by Rudolf is in another letter, this one from the Emperor in 1534, concerning Gombert's benefice at Tournai. Gombert is described as 'M[aistr]e du chant de la chapelle dudict', but this is in the body of the letter following the opening in which Gombert is called 'Maistre des enfans du chant de nostre chapelle'. It is evident that the second reference is simply a scribal omission from, or contraction of, the first. These references are therefore by no means conclusive in favour of Rudolf's point, rather the reverse.

There is other evidence not cited by Rudolf which seems to confirm the opposite, that the two positions were separate during Gombert's and Pickart's time. Schmidt-Görg quoted a document that listed the members of the Grand Chapel:

en la gra[n] Capilla
Mastre adria[n] Picart maestro de Capilla
Mastre nicolas Gombert maestro de los Mochachos
[and then others listed]

The extant accounts for 1534-5 which include payments to the chapel also bear this out. When payments to the chapel are made en bloc, Pickart is listed first, Gombert second:
Similar entries, but without the heading of 'Chappelle', appear three times more within the surviving accounts, each time with Pickart and then Gombert at the head of the list. The implication that Pickart was the senior of the two is obvious.

The specific nature of these documents cannot be overlooked. There is no good reason to doubt that at the time of Gombert the positions of maistre de la chapelle and maistre des enfans were separate.

Let us return to the documents setting out the duties and organisation of the chapel. As has been said, they were retrospective, being written some years later, but both referring specifically to the year 1545. The obvious question to ask is: why specify the year, unless it had some significance? Given the evidence that we have showing a different structure in earlier years, at least in the one respect that is under discussion, we could assume that 1545 saw a reorganisation of some of the functions in the chapel, which led to a restatement of the duties of its members. The impression that this document represents some form of change to the previous practice is reinforced by an instruction within it that the members of the chapel are to observe the existing regulations in the exercise of their duties in the chapel services and ceremonies. That would also explain why the outline of the responsibilities for the maistre does not mention the oversight of the music, that being taken for granted, but
does cover the duties in respect of the children of the chapel, which might be taken therefore as the additional duties. That simple hypothesis then allows a natural interpretation of what is known of Crecquillon's and Canis's respective positions. Crecquillon was appointed as maistre de la chapelle in succession to Pickart, and remained in his position at least until after Susato had issued his Tiers livre towards the end of 1544. Canis was recruited as maistre des enfans under Crecquillon. We do not know precisely when Gombert left the chapel, but sometime in 1538 or 1539 is likely, nor do we know whether it was Crecquillon, once appointed, or someone else who took charge of the boys during the apparent interregnum. In 1545 when the chapel was reorganised and the two positions amalgamated, Crecquillon or Canis took over.

Whatever the formal positions of Pickart and Gombert, it is evident from what has already been discussed that the chapel sometimes operated with only one of the maistres. For instance, it must be assumed that whilst Pickart was recruiting in 1538, Gombert was responsible for overseeing the music as well as looking after the choirboys. After Crecquillon joined the chapel, in 1541 and 1542, the recruiting was no longer carried out by a chapel maistre but by Pathie, organist and court official of Mary of Hungary. That would suggest that there was no separate maistre des enfans to allow the task of recruitment to be undertaken from within the chapel. In that case, it is likely that Crecquillon fulfilled both functions until Canis was appointed.

Before we leave the question of Canis's succession to the combined post of maistre, there is one further hypothesis to mention to account partly for the change in Crecquillon's status. The comparison of the joint title and contents pages of Susato's
chanson publications in Table 2.2 showed that Susato did not always note his role as editor. When we examine the other title pages of the prints that omit it on the joint page, we are left with three prints that do not display it anywhere: the *Tiers livre*, the *Neufiesme livre* and the *Dixiesme livre*. Two of these are Susato's single composer prints: the *Tiers livre* of chansons by Crecquillon and the *Neufiesme livre* of Manchicourt's chansons. It would appear likely that Manchicourt saw his collection through the press; it contains a dedication by Manchicourt to the Antwerp greffier which refers to Susato as Manchicourt's friend. The lack of a similar description of Susato as 'correcteur' in the *Tiers livre* may simply be due to considerations of space, but it might alternatively imply that Crecquillon too was involved in seeing his own collection through the press.

However, the court had left the Low Countries in January 1544 and the collection cannot be dated that early. Charles returned after the Marne Valley campaign towards the end of September of 1544. It is not clear whether there would have been time enough for Crecquillon to be involved with the production of the *Tiers livre* once the court was back in residence. It is always possible that he returned earlier for some reason. Another possibility exists, which is that Crecquillon, perhaps through some reason such as recruitment or illness, did not travel with the Imperial retinue when it left for Germany at the beginning of 1544, rejoining it once it was back in the Low Countries. As we shall see, he was certainly with the chapel when news of Elizabeth of Poland's death reached the Emperor in July 1545. This scenario seems less likely than the alternatives in view of the lack of dedication within the collection. It might be expected that Crecquillon would have taken the opportunity to make a dedication when the print went through the press, unless we were to assume that there was simply no room for one. If for some reason Crecquillon was not with the chapel for
the whole of the time, unless whilst recruiting, one could more readily understand the combining of the two positions of *maistre*, and if his absence was due to ill-health, there would be an additional reason for his removal from the stresses of being responsible for the oversight of the chapel to concentrate on composition. Whilst there is no direct evidence of this, it accords well with the apparently early age at which Crecquillon retired, as will be discussed below.

1545-1550

Let us for a moment move onto more settled ground. In 1550, a listing of the entire Imperial court was published by Nicholas Mameranus: *Catalogus familiae totius aulae Caesareae per expeditionem adversus inobedientes usque Augustam Rheticae omniumque principum, baronum, etc. ibidem in comitiis anno 1547 et 1548 praesentium, per Nicolaum Mameranum*. In this publication, the two entries for Crecquillon and Canis read 'Magister Thomas Crecquillon, cantor et cantionum conditor, quem vulgò componistam vocant' and 'Magister Cornelius Canis, praefectus sacelli'. The context leaves no doubt that the term used for Canis means that Canis was the master of the chapel. His is the first name to appear under the heading of the 'Sacellum majus'. Crecquillon's name is included with the chaplains of the high mass, before the singers are separately listed, and we can assume therefore that Crecquillon was also one of the chaplains at this period, in addition to his designated role, a position confirmed in a list of the chapel from 1547.76

Despite the title of Mameranus's book, a further paragraph relating to the chapels makes it clear that the lists applied from the Diet of Regensburg, which convened from April to August of 1546.77 There is also circumstantial evidence, perhaps not
very strong, that Crecquillon might not have been maistre de la chapelle by early 1546. One chanson by Crecquillon and two by Canis appear in a print of Attaingnant's of 1546, his Dixneufiesme livre (RISM 1546/12). Rudolf has suggested that these chansons, based on works by Sermisy and incorporating canonic voices, would have been written around the time of the Utrecht meeting of the Golden Fleece in January 1546 specifically to honour Francis I of France, who was present, along with Henry VIII of England, at that meeting. He argued that the later publication by Attaingnant was in turn designed as a compliment to Charles V. In the Attaingnant print, Canis's chansons Il me suffit and Secourez moi come at the beginning of the collection; Crecquillon's Il me suffit appears less prominently further down the order. 78

Mameranus described Crecquillon as a composer, and his description is unlikely to be merely an acknowledgement of Crecquillon's abilities. 79 Several other members of the chapel were composers, Canis, Lestannier and Payen for instance, but none was given the title of composer that we know of. Indeed, the notion of a composer in the distinct and separate sense of later periods is largely alien to this period. People composed as part of the exercise of their function as priest, singer or maistre. It is probably reasonable to read into Mameranus's phrase not only that Crecquillon was effectively the official court and chapel composer, but also that this was a rare distinction. It is interesting to note that the earliest record of the term 'composer' at the French court dates from 1547, perhaps in direct imitation of the appointment of Crecquillon. 80

Crecquillon's position in Mameranus's list indicates that he was a chaplain of the high mass. It would appear that the normal complement of chaplains of the high mass was four. This is the number given in the 1540 collation document, and again in 61
documents of 1553, 1556 and 1557. Mameranus however had given five, if Crecquillon is to be included, and the list of the chapel members in 1547 also named five including Crecquillon. That number, although without Crecquillon, is also to be found in the 1550 collation document. From that, it could be assumed that the number was increased to accommodate Crecquillon, an increase that for some reason was maintained in 1550 but which later reverted to the original four. This may suggest that Crecquillon was not expected to play a full part in the services as a chaplain, but was given the position as one of the most senior of the chapel to reflect his continuing role as composer. This may be suggestive of either a burden of composition that could not easily be met without time away from the routine responsibilities of the chapel or, again, ill-health, or both.

It is very probable that Crecquillon was fully occupied with compositions for court use in the latter part of 1545 and in the early part of 1546. Whilst there is a general problem of chronology in his works, several can be dated with a reasonable degree of certainty to this period. His motet *Cur Fernande* would have been written in July of 1545, when Charles learnt of the death of Elizabeth of Poland. Charles received the news on the 7th; a vigil was said on Sunday the 19th, with a mass the following day. The mass was attended by Ferdinand King of the Romans (Elizabeth’s father), the Archdukes of Austria (Elizabeth’s brothers) and the Emperor. Many other distinguished people were also present. The text of Crecquillon’s motet was written especially, and it seems inconceivable that the work could have been intended for any other occasion than this mass, given its references to those who were present and the text’s sense of immediacy:

*Cur Fernande pater, cur luges Anna genetrix. Archiduces fratres quis novus iste*
(Why Ferdinand her father, why do you weep Anne her mother? What new grief is this, Archdukes her brothers?....)

The motet is an extremely fine work, the more so given the limited time in which it must have been produced.83

In early January 1546, a meeting of the Order of the Golden Fleece took place in Utrecht. Although no details of the actual music performed have come down to us, we know that music played its part in the celebrations.84 I will suggest reasons later for supposing that Andreas Christi famulus, one of Crecquillon's only two eight-voice motets, was written for the meeting. We have noted the probability that the chanson Il me suffit found in Attaingnant's Dixneufiesme livre was written for this occasion too. The singers of the chapel were present at one of the banquets, and it is possible that the pair of table blessings, Benedicte dominus and Jubilate Deo published by Susato in 1547 were written by Crecquillon for it. Both are relatively substantial works; they must certainly have been written for some grand occasion.85 The text of the second motet may suggest this meeting would have been an appropriate one. It ends with the words 'Da pie Jesu vivis gratiam, defunctis requiem, ecclesiae tranquillitatem, Imperatori victoriam per Christum dominum nostrum, amen'. (Grant, holy Jesus, grace to the living, rest to the dead, peace to the church, and victory to the Emperor through Christ our Lord, amen - CMM). Both Francis I, a long-time thorn in the Emperor's side, and Henry VIII, whose divorce from Catherine of Aragon Charles had vigorously opposed, were present at this meeting. The text might have had some particular point in that context.
Whether or not these blessings were for the meeting of the Order of the Golden Fleece, it is certain that the Emperor would have required an appropriate display of magnificence to impress his position upon his fellow monarchs. Besides Francis and Henry, Maximilian of Bohemia, Cosimo Medici and Duke Albert of Bavaria were present, with knights of the Order from Spain, Germany and Italy, as well as the Low Countries. The two Vespers services, the Mass and two feasts would no doubt have required more music from Crecquillon than we can now identify, and there are signs from another work that he was under some pressure.

Later in 1546, Charles attended the Diet at Regensburg and the attendant colloquy. It is probable that Crecquillon's mass *Domine Deus omnipotens* (and probably the motet upon which it is modelled) was written for it or connected with it; it is dated 1546 in its manuscript source. There are two apparent borrowings from the motet *Andreas Christi famulus* which give the impression that Crecquillon was looking to take short cuts where he could. (These borrowings are discussed in a subsequent chapter.) It is probable that the composition of chansons was also required on a regular basis. Crecquillon's total output of chansons, almost two hundred, taken together with his masses and motets suggests that the process of composition must have been almost continuous throughout his career. The self-borrowings and other small signs of pressure that it is possible to see in some of the works that can be dated from around 1545 and 1546 suggest that it was not Crecquillon who voluntarily relinquished his position as *maistre de la chapelle* to be able to compose at his leisure, but that he was required to compose, and that the burden on him was one that he could meet sometimes only with a little help. We have then a picture not of someone who composed at his own inclination, but someone expected to write to order for the court and the chapel.
If we take these works in conjunction with the apparent change in the role of the *maistre de la chapelle* in 1545 and the circumstantial evidence of the Attaingnant print, it seems more than probable that it was in that year that Canis took over the combined position, and that Crecquillon was given official recognition of his function as the court composer. It is possible that the events of the following year were already being planned, and that the change was partly in anticipation of Crecquillon producing appropriate works.

That would mean that Crecquillon had served some five to six years as *maistre de la chapelle* rather than the shorter period proposed by Rudolf. I have advanced two possible reasons for the change in Crecquillon's status, which may be connected: his ill-health and the requirements of the court for his compositions. Ill-health might have impaired his ability to meet all the demands placed upon him, and led to the removal of the relatively routine duties involved in looking after the choir. Rudolf's thesis may have given the impression that Crecquillon lacked the ability to run the choir and that his change of status was in effect a demotion. The picture I have outlined suggests otherwise. The fact that Susato, when he reprinted the *Tiers livre* twice more, probably in 1546-9 and 1558-61, did not alter his description of Crecquillon, is significant and accords better with the latter scenario, as do the title page of the 1576 posthumous motet collection and Sweertius's much later description of 1628. Crecquillon's prominent position, second only to Canis, in a publication of 1548 (RISM 1548/2) of music by four court composers, dedicated to the Emperor, also supports the notion that he continued in the Emperor's favour. However, there is one title page that still seems anomalous if given the reading previously accepted.
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That would mean that Crecquillon had served some five to six years as *maistre de la chapelle* rather than the shorter period proposed by Rudolf. I have advanced two possible reasons for the change in Crecquillon's status, which may be connected: his ill-health and the requirements of the court for his compositions. Ill-health might have impaired his ability to meet all the demands placed upon him, and led to the removal of the relatively routine duties involved in looking after the choir. Rudolf's thesis may have given the impression that Crecquillon lacked the ability to run the choir and that his change of status was in effect a demotion. The picture I have outlined suggests otherwise. The fact that Susato, when he reprinted the *Tiers livre* twice more, probably in 1546-9 and 1558-61, did not alter his description of Crecquillon, is significant and accords better with the latter scenario, as do the title page of the 1576 posthumous motet collection and Sweertius's much later description of 1628. Crecquillon's prominent position, second only to Canis, in a publication of 1548 (RISM 1548/2) of music by four court composers, dedicated to the Emperor, also supports the notion that he continued in the Emperor's favour. However, there is one title page that still seems anomalous if given the reading previously accepted.
The Lamentations of 1549

The title page of the 1549 print of the Lamentations is apparently the only other one besides Susato's *Tiers livre* to describe Crecquillon as a *maistre* whilst Crecquillon was attached to the chapel. The precise term used on the title page was 'chori magistro'. We have already noted the ambiguity of the Latin - it does not necessarily mean the master. Gombert was described in similar terms in a document deriving from the court itself, and that is a strong indication that the term 'a master' cannot be taken necessarily to mean 'the master' of the chapel, given the other evidence that shows Gombert as *maistre des enfans* only. It might also be noted that the term used in this instance is 'a master of the choir', not 'a master of the chapel'. On both counts, there is sufficient reason to say that the title page is ambiguous enough for it not to be taken as conflicting evidence of Crecquillon's position vis-à-vis Canis. Alternatively, if we have correctly painted the picture of Crecquillon who, having held the position of *maistre* for five to six years or more with distinction, had been required to relinquish it to undertake the duties of court composer, or had been relieved of his position because of his ill-health, then, if the suggested reading of the term is incorrect, it might have seemed right to the publisher that Crecquillon be accorded the courtesy of being referred to by his former position just as if he had retired. Moreover, the position of composer was a comparative novelty, and the publisher may have been uncertain how to describe him. To call him a master of the choir might have seemed only proper, and it is unlikely that a printer would have been concerned with the precision of language that might be expected within the court documents. No doubt the publisher had an eye to the effect on the public, but we need not regard the use of the title as simply a gimmick, in error, or indicating confusion.
Retirement

When did Crecquillon retire? Brown thought that he probably retired in the early 1550's, whereas Rudolf thought that he had retired by 1550, but made no estimate of how early. We can be reasonably certain that Crecquillon had left Imperial service by 1555. In a document about the permutation of a benefice dated that year, he is named as a former singer of the Emperor.\(^87\) I will show reasons later for believing that Crecquillon’s motets *Philippe qui videt me* and *Honor virtus et potestas* date from Philip of Spain's ceremonial entries into the cities of the Low Countries in 1549. Dunning places the motet *Quis te victorem dicat* at this time, too.\(^88\) The period to be examined therefore seems to be between 1549 and 1555.

Rudolf based his conclusion that Crecquillon had probably retired by 1550 on two documents: the 1550 collation list, which is known only in Pinchart's transcription, and the 1553 list.\(^89\) Rudolf pointed to the absence of Crecquillon's name from the former, and noted that his inclusion in the latter was for a very minor type of benefice normally reserved for choirboys or newly-recruited singers. His conclusion therefore seems reasonable. However, Rudolf did not deal with several other pieces of evidence.

The first is a document relating to the appointment of Crecquillon to a benefice at St Peter's Louvain transcribed by vander Straeten, as follows:

> Van brieven van colleytie vander scolastrien van S\(\text{t}^\text{e}\) Peeters tot Loevene, voere m\(\text{r}\)\(\text{e}\)n Thomas Cricqillon, zanger van der cappellen der K. M\(\text{r}\), in daten den xvi\(\text{e}\)n anno xve vyftich, signata VERREYKEN; maer want dese vry is,

\(^67\)
ergo nyet.90

(To a letter of collation to the school of St Peter's, Leuven, on behalf of master Thomas Crecquillon, singer of his Majesty's chapel, dated 16th May 1550, signed Verreyken; but since this is free, therefore not.)91

The source quoted by vander Straeten was the Register of the Rights of Ratifications of Brabant. The document is in essentially the same form and with the same signature as others quoted by vander Straeten regarding chapel members, and there is no doubt that this particular benefice of Crecquillon's was obtained as part of the normal process of awarding benefices within the Imperial gift which the collation lists also document. This suggests that Crecquillon could not have retired at any earlier date than May 1550, as he is called a singer.

If we assume that Crecquillon's absence from the 1550 list is not the result of an error in transcription by Pinchart, the omission is surely significant. As far as one can tell, these lists when prepared were comprehensive, covering all the chapel personnel including the children; most members of the chapel were listed more than once. As a senior member of the chapel up to that point, for Crecquillon's name to be missing suggests that it is unlikely to be the result of error in transcription because it probably would have appeared more than once, had it been the intention to include it. Moreover, it has already been noted that there were five chaplains of the high mass listed in 1550, one more than in earlier and later collation lists, and presumably therefore a full complement. It seems unlikely that Crecquillon could still have been a chaplain even if he had retained some lesser position. However, his absence suggests that it is much more likely that Crecquillon had for some reason left the chapel. The transcription gives no precise date for the collation list, which could
well have been compiled subsequent to Crecquillon obtaining the benefice at Louvain in May. If he had retired just before the fresh collation list was prepared, having recently received a new benefice, then his absence from the revised list is understandable. 92

The second document seen by vander Straeten was an octroi from June 1553, an exemption from taxes, of some of those from the Imperial chapel. Vander Straeten did not transcribe the entire document, but his partial transcription is sufficient to make it highly improbable that Crecquillon was amongst those named in the document. 93 The octroi covers a relatively small number of named individuals, but includes three chaplains of the high mass. However, vander Straeten claimed to have seen a third document, which unfortunately he did not transcribe, that named Crecquillon as a chaplain of the high mass in 1553. 94 That document has not subsequently been traced. The surviving 1553 collation list gives names and positions but, unlike other individuals, accords Crecquillon no title. The 1553 list of benefices has only one other chaplain of the high mass listed besides those named in the octroi, thus completing the four that was the number of chaplains of the high mass in the majority of the collation lists and which seems to have been traditional. Moreover, Crecquillon, when his name was given, was not only listed for a position suitable for children and new singers, but was given no function in the chapel, rather like the appearance of Pickart's name in the 1540 collation list when Crecquillon had taken over as maistre. 95 In the light of these points, it seems possible that vander Straeten for some reason was mistaken when he said that Crecquillon was chaplain of the high mass in 1553. Unless the document comes to light on which he was relying, then Rudolf's hypothesis seems sound, with the proviso that Crecquillon is unlikely to have retired until after his appointment to the benefice at Louvain. It might also be
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observed that this timescale fits with the departure of the court in June 1550 from the Low Countries. Perhaps the ill-health that might have kept him in the Low Countries in 1544 under one hypothesis above or the prospective strains of further prolonged travel were too much for him. Whatever the reasons for his retirement, it does suggest that Crecquillon was not by this date a fit young man, especially as there is no evidence that senior members of the chapel would leave to pursue careers outside the Imperial circle.

The motet *Ne projicias me*

Walter suggested that Crecquillon's motet *Ne projicias me* might have been a late motet of a personal nature or perhaps written for a patron such as Charles V. It is a beautiful and mature work which could easily be from the end of Crecquillon's career. The text is certainly one that is difficult to imagine being set for any general use in the chapel; it is as follows:

*Ne projicias me in tempore senectutis; cum defecerit virtus mea, ne derelinquas me. Annos aeternos in mente habeam et senectus mea sit in uberi tua misericordia. In pace in idipsum dormiam et requiescam, ut portio mea sit in terra viventium. (Do not cast me not off in the time of my old age; when my strength shall fail, do not forsake me. Let me keep the everlasting years in mind, and may my old age be in thy abundant mercy. I will lay me down in peace and take my rest, that my lot may be in the land of the living. CMM amended)*

The motet was written no later than 1553 as it first appears in a Susato print in that
year (in RISM 1553/14). One may doubt whether it was written for a patron. There is no evidence that Crecquillon had any patron other than the Emperor, and Charles did not begin the process of his abdication until late in 1555, although succession issues had occupied his mind rather earlier. The possibility that this motet is Crecquillon's reference to his own position is perhaps that much the stronger, given the similarity between part and the chant *Serve bone et fidelis*, 'O thou good and faithful servant' at the point where the text being sung is 'I will lay me down in peace'. See Example 2.1.97 I argue in chapter 4 that chant quotations in Crecquillon's music are both comparatively unusual and denote particular significance for the work concerned, either in terms of heightened importance for a community or in terms of exegetical intention. This quotation or resemblance is out of line with the general conclusions reached there, which might suggest that the 'quotation' is the result of chance. Alternatively it could perhaps have been included as a coded request for Crecquillon not to be overlooked, especially when pensions were considered. Coming immediately after the wish 'may my old age be in thy abundant mercy' and in the top voice of a largely homophonic section of the motet, the point would no doubt have been appreciated. It would not be the first musical prompting of a patron's fiscal conscience. We may conjecture from Crecquillon's inclusion in the 1553 list with a potential benefice that the motet had been heard in both senses. Other documents confirm that Crecquillon was provided with livings of some sort, though their status is unclear. Fétis recorded a canony at Saint Aubin in Namur, which Crecquillon resigned to take a canony at Termonde. That in turn was exchanged in 1555 for a canony in Béthune.98 A permutation document survives which confirms the last change.99 That shows that the move was probably undertaken for personal reasons, involving as it did three individuals swapping positions between them, rather than the grant of a new benefice under the Imperial pre-emption rights. From
Example 2.1

i) Chant: Serve bone (AM p. 673)

```
Serve bone et fideliss
```

ii) Ne projicias b. 96-104

```
In pace in
```

dipsum

dormiam

what remains, it cannot be determined whether the earlier changes were similar or not. Nevertheless, we can assume, as Crecquillon had retired by the date of the last change of benefice in 1555 at the latest, that he was no longer exempt from residence, and that he therefore lived in Béthune, and quite probably Louvain, Namur and Termonde also whilst he held a benefice in each one.¹⁰⁰

Death

It has been assumed that Crecquillon died in 1557 as his successor in Béthune was named in March of that year.¹⁰¹ His name does not appear in the last chapel lists compiled for Philip of Spain in 1557 after Charles's abdication, which would seem to confirm that probability.¹⁰² He was certainly dead by 1566; Guicciardini listed Crecquillon as one of the deceased composers in his description of the Low countries.¹⁰³ One further detail supports a date of death at around the time generally accepted. Phalèse printed a collected edition of Crecquillon's four-voice motets in 1559. This was one of a series of books devoted largely to Clemens, who also died in about 1557. It seems likely that these collections were intended to be some form of memorial publication to both the composers concerned.

Early life

I have discussed that part of Crecquillon's life that is comparatively well-documented (if that term is not misleading in the context of Crecquillon, given the paucity of hard information); I want now to go backwards, to see whether there is anything we can draw from the available evidence to suggest a probable date and place of birth for Crecquillon. If 1550 is correct as the year of his retirement, he was
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most unlikely to have been under forty, unless he was chronically ill. If Walter's conjecture on *Ne projicias* is also correct - and the apparent chant quotation strengthens that possibility - then it would suggest that Crecquillon was quite possibly older still, perhaps more broadly in line with Brown's suggested birth date of c. 1480 to 1500, based on retirement in the early 1550's, than with Hudson's suggestion of 1510-1520 (although there of course may have been an element of irony in the motet text). I want now to see whether we can distinguish between the probabilities of these two rather different views. If we conclude that Crecquillon was not appointed to the Imperial chapel at the start of his career, then we shall need also to look for evidence of earlier activities.

Date of birth

Hudson proposed the terminal years of 1510 and 1520 for the date of Crecquillon's birth on two pieces of evidence. The first was the observation by Hudson that the earliest source for a work of Crecquillon's is a manuscript of 1542. Hudson considered the possibility that Crecquillon had been replaced as maistre by 1542 in order to devote his time to composition accorded well with the appearance of Crecquillon's works in the sources. He wrote:

The decades following [1542] saw a near avalanche of masses, motets, and chansons in large numbers of manuscripts and printed sources. This is what one might expect of a young man of great ability beginning an energetic career. And a great number of works began to appear immediately after Crecquillon relinquished the position of *maître de la chapelle* to become a court composer.
It is possible that an earlier source for a work of Crecquillon's exists, although the manuscript of 1542 remains the earliest with a firm date. MunU 401, which contains Crecquillon's *Surge propera*, is thought to have been written in Augsburg between 1536 and 1540.107

The second piece of evidence cited by Hudson was contained in a publication from later in the century: Paix's *Thesaurus motetarum* (RISM 1589/17). The contents of the collection, twenty-four motets, were said on the title page to have been printed in the order in which the composers had lived; Crecquillon's work appears after pieces by Rore, Clemens and Hollander, all with probable birth dates within the second decade of the 16th century. Whilst there are some anomalies in the ordering it appears from what is known to be generally chronological. Hudson concluded that Crecquillon may have been around the age of forty when he died in 1557, and that with this revised birth date, his career 'resembles even more closely than heretofore supposed that of his great and prolific contemporary, Clemens non Papa'.

The time span for Crecquillon's birth proposed by Hudson, however, does not give us one clear picture, but two very different pictures. To take the extremes of the decade, if Crecquillon had been born in 1510, then he could have been an established musician and also a relatively mature composer before he joined the Imperial chapel. On the other hand, if he had been born in 1520, then the picture is one of a young and inexperienced musician taking responsibility for the most prestigious chapel in the Empire, the Emperor's own. In either case, his appointment was over four years before that of his supposed contemporary, the great Clemens (who had a work published by Attaingnant as early as 1536), to the position of Succentor at Saint
Donation's in Bruges. The former picture is one that raises questions, but the latter is surely improbable. Hudson from his suggestion that Crecquillon may have been around the age of forty at his death seems to incline towards the younger age. I want to put forward an alternative view, which would suggest that a slightly earlier date of birth is more likely, and that the evidence of the Paix print, with the inherent uncertainties of so many of the dates of birth of the composers within it, cannot be taken too prescriptively. After all, Paix himself worked at some distance from the Low Countries at Lauingen in der Donau in Swabia and was not born until approximately the date of Crecquillon’s death. His sources of information may not therefore have been wholly reliable, as can be seen from the anomalies which are apparent to us.\textsuperscript{108}

Of the little we do know of Crecquillon, or that we can assume, there are two points which suggest that Crecquillon was unlikely to have been appointed to the position of maistre at so young an age as twenty to twenty-five. First, Crecquillon would very probably have been a priest as maistre de la chapelle. The normal minimum age for a priest was twenty-five without papal dispensation.\textsuperscript{109} Dispensation of course was always a possibility, but the second point probably makes that irrelevant. Crecquillon in the 1540 collation lists was called ‘maistre’, i.e. a master of arts.\textsuperscript{110} Besides the period of study needed for a second degree, it was a normal condition of medieval universities, which remained unchanged until later, that masters of arts should lecture for at least two years after their graduation. Given the uncertainties of initial age (students could go up at fourteen, or even younger, for the first degree, although seventeen would probably represent a nearer average) and the absence of a fixed period of study, we cannot be sure what age someone such as Crecquillon would be even if they had proceeded from one degree to the other without a break, but
twenty-five or twenty-six years of age would be a reasonable estimate. Certainly, twenty would seem to be too young, especially with the normal lectureship period involved.

Appointment at the age of twenty to twenty-five or even a little older also seems out of line with what can be deduced from the appointments to the chapel after Crecquillon. Recruitment seems to have been of experienced and relatively mature musicians. Canis was born in 1506; he would have been thirty-five or thirty-six years old when he joined the chapel and nearly forty when he succeeded Crecquillon as maistre. Similarly Payen, when he took over from Canis on the chapel becoming Philip's royal chapel after Charles's abdication, was over forty. Manchicourt, who succeeded Payen in the chapel, was even older at the time of his appointment. In addition to these instances, we have the correspondence preserved by vander Straeten which paints a fascinating vignette of the process of recruitment and the type of individual sought when Manchicourt was replaced. Two musicians were approached to take over as maistre of Philip's Flemish chapel. One, a composer named Chastelain, was both a canon and maistre of Soignies Cathedral probably in his sixties or even seventies. He declined on account of his age and health, and in his stead, another composer, Bonmarché, was invited to take the position. He had been Dean of Lille, and was a canon and the maistre of Cambrai; he had a masters degree, and was over forty years old when recruited. These examples show a consistent pattern of the recruitment of mature and experienced musicians and suggest that it was not the practice of the Imperial chapel and Philip's successor chapel to appoint young, untried and untested musicians as maistre. It might be expected that the earlier practice of the chapel may well have been different due to a desire on the young Charles's part to surround himself with a court not too out of keeping with his own
youth. Even so, Pickart was about thirty when first mentioned in the surviving records, and Gombert about thirty-four when first mentioned as maistre des enfans. Whilst both of these examples are slightly younger than the later ones, there is no evidence from earlier practice either that a maistre would be appointed at a particularly young age.

The evidence of the sources

Let us now turn to the appearance of Crecquillon's music in the sources. Hudson's conclusion that it fits well with Crecquillon relinquishing his position as maistre is based on the possibility that Crecquillon was replaced by Canis in 1542. The discussion above has shown that the grounds for that assumption put forward by Rudolf are contentious; it is far more probable that Crecquillon was replaced in 1545, well after his music started to be published. Hudson's view is based on the fact that the date of publication at least gives a terminus ad quem, but unless there is some means of ascertaining how long music might have remained in manuscript form before being printed, it is perhaps difficult to draw firm conclusions from the date of publication alone. In the absence of any other determining factor, even an approximate dating is impossible simply from the appearance of works in a source. Assumptions about Crecquillon's age from such data are therefore problematical. However, I think some guidance from the sources is available. As has already been noted, the earliest manuscript source for a work by Crecquillon may be up to six years earlier than previously thought.  

Turning to printed sources, even if the question of works printed posthumously is ignored, it is obvious if we look at examples from collections by Susato and Phalèse
that they were content at times to print material long after the first date that can be assigned to it. A few examples for each printer will serve to make the point and highlight the difficulty of reading any form of chronology into the sources:

*Os loquentium* - Berg and Neuber 1546 (as second version *Practicantes mal*); Susato 1553 (original version).\(^{116}\)

*Surge illuminare* - Ulhard 1548; Susato 1553.

*Philippe qui videt* - probably written 1549; Berg and Neuber 1550; Susato 1555.\(^{117}\)

*Dirige gressos* - Scotto 1549; Phalèse 1555.

*Quam pulchra es* - probably written 1543; Susato 1546 (as Benedictus); Phalèse 1554 (as Crecquillon).\(^{118}\)

The same is probably true of all the other publishers at the time. We may note Berg and Neuber’s apparently prompt printing of *Philippe qui videt me*, which may be explained by it being useful liturgically, but its apparent connection with Philip of Spain (discussed in chapter 5) makes that unlikely as the sole reason. The only known edition of *Cur Fernande pater* was printed by them in 1559, when from the text the motet can be dated to 1545.\(^{119}\)

Phalèse did not begin issuing his various series of chanson books until 1552 and his motet books until 1554. Whilst no doubt Phalèse spent some time collecting material prior to the start of each set of collections, they first appeared well after the probable date of Crecquillon’s retirement. What we can legitimately read into the appearance of works printed by Phalèse is therefore likely to be extremely limited. Certainly, I have been unable to discern evidence of a continuing compositional
career from them. Susato was the only music printer in the Low Countries to have operated over a period covering a substantial part of Crecquillon's ten years or so in the chapel, and the more likely to be of some value as a result. As Susato published by genre, it is easiest to examine his publications of the motets, masses and chansons separately.

Chanson collections

Susato's first publications were his chanson collections, in which works by Crecquillon were particularly prominent. Indeed, overall, Crecquillon was by far the largest single contributor to Susato's chanson publications. By the eighth book of May 1545, almost seventy chansons by Crecquillon had been printed. What is interesting is not simply the number of chansons printed, but the comparison between the first books and those issued after the gap in production from 1545 to 1549, both in numbers and in the relative representation of Clemens, with whose career Hudson suggests a resemblance.

There are eleven chanson books in the first tranche of Susato's prints: volumes one to ten together with his first publication, the Vingt et six chansons. Four of these are wholly or largely devoted to a single composer, and for our immediate purpose can be ignored, except for the Tiers livre. Even allowing for the number of chansons published in the Tiers livre Crecquillon is very well represented in this first series of chanson books, but Clemens is poorly represented. Only one book, the eighth, contains chansons by him; this is effectively the last collection of the first series of prints - the ninth book is devoted to Manchicourt and the tenth to pieces such as Jannequin's La Bataille and Gombert's Le chant des oiseaux. Clemens does at least
arrive with a bang, as it were, having no fewer than nine chansons in this collection. However there is no comparison to be drawn with the steady representation of Crecquillon in addition to the entire *Tiers livre*.

Susato resumed the printing of chansons in 1549 with the *Unziesme livre*. The title page of this collection featured both Crecquillon and Clemens, and it is therefore no surprise that both composers have several works included. Susato had had four years after his last chanson publication to compile the material for this print, and in addition to the title page, we see immediately the prominence given to Clemens. There are eight pieces by him compared with Crecquillon's seven. In the next book, published in 1550, Crecquillon's contribution is down to three, whilst Clemens has seven (eight if a *response* is counted separately) and the thirteenth book, also of 1550, of six- and eight-voice pieces, contains no Crecquillon works at all, but four by Clemens. We can accept that this last might be affected by the apparently very small number of pieces written by Crecquillon in more than five voices, but the drop in Crecquillon's representation and the rise of Clemens' in the first two books of the renewed series suggests both that Crecquillon music had reached a degree of popularity rather before Clemens' had, and was now no longer so freely available. From this we might deduce some support for the idea that Crecquillon had ceased composition at around this time. However, two or three collections is a small number from which to draw any firm conclusions, but we will see below a similar pattern in Susato's publication of Crecquillon's motets.

In addition to the number of chansons printed by Susato, Crecquillon was only the second composer to have a complete print dedicated to his works by a printer from the Low Countries, the *Tiers livre*, the dating of which to September/October 1544
has been discussed extensively above. The first composer to be honoured in this way was Benedictus, Mary of Hungary’s maistre de la chapelle from 1537, with a publication in 1542 by Henry Loys of twenty-three chansons (RISM A1291), when Benedictus was in his fifties or early sixties. The third composer was Manchicourt, on good terms with the printer and with senior figures in Antwerp’s public life, in his mid-thirties, whose collection was published by Susato as his Neufiesme livre. This popularity or prominence of Crecquillon’s music must have been gained whilst the Imperial court was largely absent, if we are to countenance Crecquillon joining the chapel as a young man. Between our first notice of Crecquillon and the publication of the Tiers livre the court had been in the Low Countries a total of about five or six months only. Clemens, by contrast, had no single collection devoted to him that can be dated prior to his death, even though he worked as far as is known in the Low Countries, without undertaking the travel that Crecquillon must have endured.\footnote{122}

Masses

Crecquillon wrote twelve masses that are still extant. Of these twelve, seven appear in sources dated from within Crecquillon’s life. The other five all appeared after Crecquillon’s likely date of death.\footnote{123} They may therefore have been written at any time. We certainly cannot assume that they were all later works. All but one of the masses which have a terminus ad quern were published by Susato; the remaining work exists in a manuscript source which gives 1546 as the year of composition. What is striking about these masses is that they all come from 1545/6 or even earlier.\footnote{124} In other words, there is not a single mass which can be securely dated between 1546 and Crecquillon’s death. Table 2.3 shows the position. Not only that, but the other composers represented in the Susato collections are, besides Susato
Table 2.3

The number of masses within Susato's publications by the composers represented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Book 1</th>
<th>Book 2</th>
<th>Book 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crecquillon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellinck</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchicourt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richafort</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susato</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|               | 4      | 6      | 5      | 15    |
himself, well-established names: Hellinck, who had died in 1541; Manchicourt in his mid-thirties; Barbe, in charge of the music at Antwerp’s Church of Our Lady from before 1530; and Mouton and Richafort, both of an older generation, one dead for over twenty years, the other within a year or so of his death. Moreover, Crecquillon was not simply represented within these three volumes, he dominated the collection. Out of a total of fifteen masses and seven different composers, Crecquillon provided no fewer than six, 40%, of the works Susato printed, and he was the only composer whose works appeared in all three books. That again might seem unusual prominence for a young composer to have achieved in a few years when, for much of that time, the Imperial court was not resident in the Low Countries. Manchicourt, in his mid-thirties and presumably at the height of his powers, and with his evident connections in Antwerp with Susato and with a prominent city official, has two masses only in the three books. It is of course possible that Crecquillon simply gave up writing masses rather earlier than motets and chansons, but there are no obvious reasons to make that more than a speculative possibility. The continuity of his service in the Imperial chapel would argue strongly against the abandonment of a major genre.

It is possible, indeed probable, that Susato began collecting music for his collections of masses and motets some time before their printing. The issue of books in sequence, sometimes in close proximity to the previous one, suggests that the repertoire was gathered in advance. How far in advance we cannot know, but Susato had at least been contemplating, if not planning, his mass and motet books of 1545-7 as early as 1543. The preface to the reader in his Premier livre of chansons from November 1543 includes the following:
Esperant avec layde de dieu imprimer aultres semblables livres de motetz. & messes. qui naurant iamais estees imprimees. affin de contenter ung chascung selon son desir.

(Hoping with the help of God to print other similar books of motets and masses which have never been printed before, to the end that everyone according to his wishes may be satisfied.)

As we noted in the discussion of the dating of the chanson books, Charles and the court were absent from the Low Countries from the beginning of 1541 until September that year. If Susato had amassed sufficient material by the date of the Premier livre it is at least possible that some might have been in his hands before the Imperial court left in January 1541. If that were to be the case, then some of Crecquillon's music is likely to have predated his joining the Imperial chapel. However, as discussed in the dating of the Tiers livre, an early date for the assembling of Susato's repertoire does bring its own problems, and it is more likely that the 1543 forward was an expression of hope rather than of firm plans already in execution.

Motets

Despite the possible time taken by Susato to acquire repertoire, only one motet by Crecquillon appeared in print before Susato's first set of motet publications, and two others can be dated earlier from manuscript sources. In this first set of four prints, Crecquillon is again the most represented composer; he accounts for almost a fifth of all the eighty-three motets printed, whilst Clemens has fewer than half the number by Crecquillon. However, when we come to the series of motet books printed from 1553 onwards, the position is markedly different. It might have been
expected that the hiatus of six years in motet publications would have given Susato
the opportunity to acquire a reasonable number of pieces by the composer.
Crecquillon was by far and away the largest contributor to all Susato's previous
collections. Yet, whilst the first two volumes contain three motets each by him, after
those, only a single volume, the eighth, has as many as that. The shift of numbers
relative to Clemens' contribution is also marked; Clemens proportion becomes
almost the same as Crecquillon's was of the earlier series, 20%, whilst
Crecquillon's proportion is now less than 10%. We can assume from this that it was
unlikely to have been a change of editorial policy on the make-up of collections that
led to Crecquillon's smaller representation. It also seems unlikely that Susato would
have been constrained in his choice had Crecquillon still been active. Several of these
motets in the second set had appeared elsewhere in earlier sources not particularly
close to the Imperial chapel, which suggests that Susato was casting his net widely to
obtain pieces by Crecquillon. We must also assume from the publications of Phalèse,
including the two posthumous collections, and the similarity in style of Crecquillon's
music to that of Clemens, who was being published more extensively by Susato and
Phalèse, that Crecquillon's popularity had not waned. Two possible explanations
arise from the relative shift in the numbers: either Susato found it difficult to obtain
copy by Crecquillon, perhaps because of his residence in Louvain, Namur, Termonde
and Béthune, or perhaps because Crecquillon had given up composition, wholly or
largely, on his retirement from the Imperial chapel.

The evidence of the masses, chansons and motets all tends in the same direction: that
Crecquillon's active period of composition had ceased by around 1550, and that is
reflected in what we can infer from Susato's books. Before 1550 Crecquillon is the
single most printed composer in all genres; after 1550 he is overtaken by others,
particularly Clemens. In addition to these observations, Crecquillon's only other extended work, the two sets of Lamentations, was printed in 1549 and therefore fits the scenario that has developed. Those few motets that can be dated, tentatively or otherwise, on grounds other than their appearance in sources are likewise from the 1540's whilst Crecquillon was in the Imperial service. We have noted that not a single mass can be securely dated after 1546 and not a single motet after 1549 (if we exempt the possibility of Ne projicias having been written at or after his retirement). This does not seem to be the pattern that one might expect, had Crecquillon been still a comparatively young man at his death, and an active and vigorous composer.

Overall, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the appearance of Crecquillon's music in the printed sources has far more to do with the accidents of the printing trade than with the chronology, general or particular, of his works, especially given the lack of any local music printing until 1542. The intermittent nature of the publications in particular must have affected the appearance of his work in print. Moreover, the appearance in print of works by a number of other composers is similar to Crecquillon's; for instance, the earliest source for music by Canis is from 1542, when he was about thirty-six.128 With the exception of those few composers whose work found its way into publications abroad, there was no opportunity for music to be printed locally until the Antwerp trade began. Nevertheless, the impression gained is not that of a young composer making his mark, but more one of a leading musician being given his due recognition. The comparison with Clemens and with the single composer collections of Crecquillon's fellows also tend to the impression that a year of birth of anything much later than 1510 does not accord with the evidence, even though it is circumstantial. The evidence of other
appointments in the Imperial and Flemish chapels also points strongly in the same direction, as does Crecquillon's possession of a masters degree. It is always possible that Crecquillon was exceptional, and so before proposing a revised date, or range of dates, for Crecquillon's birth I want to consider the possibilities of Crecquillon working elsewhere. If Crecquillon was thirty or more by the time he joined the Imperial chapel, then what we can deduce from his previous activities may help determine his probable age.

Earlier activities

It is difficult to imagine a maistre being appointed to the Imperial chapel who did not have some proven compositional expertise. From Pickart and Gombert to the later Flemish chapel of Philip II every maistre was a composer, with the majority being among the most able of their time. It is therefore probable that Crecquillon would have had to prove himself as a composer prior to his appointment. The sheer volume of music in the early prints in each genre published by Susato also suggests not only that Crecquillon must have been able to compose whilst undertaking the onerous duties of maistre de la chapelle, but in addition must have also been writing before his years in the Imperial chapel. The maturity and achievement of some of the works which date from no later than the mid 1540's also point us in the direction of an earlier career. The masses Mort ma privé and Domine Deus omnipotens represent high points of his mature writing. The moving motet Cur Fernande pater with its wonderfully effective use of homophony and of the tonal palette (later extended in the motet Praemia pro validis for Maximilian van Egmond), and the poise, wit and delicacy of some of his chansons similarly point to a composer at the peak of his powers. These are works unsurpassed in his output.
There are several motets which, taken in conjunction with a secondary source that seems to have been overlooked by previous commentators, may give a reasonable indication of where Crecquillon worked. In addition, there are a small number of works which suggest that Crecquillon was active in more than one place in his earlier career. In addition to these, there is the motet *Quaeramus cum pastoribus* which may be relevant to the place and date of Crecquillon’s birth or early musical training.

The Biographie Nationale [de Beligue] has in its entry on Crecquillon, the following:

> Il avait enseigné la musique à Ratisbonne et fut chargé paraît-il de certain fonctions musicales à la matrice de la cathédrale d’Anvers.

(He taught music at Ratisbon [Regensburg] and was in charge it would appear of certain musical functions at the choir school of Antwerp cathedral.)

I have found no evidence from the works of Crecquillon which would support the drawing of any conclusions about Crecquillon’s activities in Regensburg, except perhaps his only work to a German text, *Grüss dich Gott*, which is by no means the most sophisticated piece of writing and therefore might be early. It is also worth observing that the earliest source by some margin for a Crecquillon work, MunU 401, comes from Augsburg. However, there are a number of motets which appear unlikely to have been written for the Imperial chapel. Crecquillon would have spent the majority of his ten years with the chapel away from the Low Countries (assuming he did not have extended leave of absence), and there is little or nothing to suggest that he could have been composing for anywhere but the Imperial court and chapel itself whilst he was a member of it. Such works probably therefore precede his
The first motet is *O virgo generosa* on a text in honour of Saint Christine. This has three points of interest: the chant upon which its cantus firmus is based, the fact that it is a cantus firmus motet, and the saint to whom it is addressed. It is argued in chapter 4 that the use of a cantus firmus in Crecquillon's motets distinguishes the work in question as one of especial significance as a communal expression of thanks, invocation or the like. That suggestion is borne out by the cantus firmus itself, which repeats a litany phrase 'Saint Christine, pray for us'. The chant formula is not to be found in Parisian or Roman sources, which are probably the Uses adopted by the Imperial chapel, but it has been identified as coming from an Antwerp chant source. The Antwerp Use may have been more widely utilised than in Antwerp alone, but the motet is a second example of a work that almost certainly comes from before 1540. That is reinforced by the text and the Saint to whom it is addressed. Two documents preserve some indication of the liturgical practices of the Imperial chapel: the 1515 statutes, and a similar document of 1556 drawn up for the successor Imperial chapel but modelled on those of Charles's chapel. In neither is there any indication that Saint Christine was included in those saints venerated in Imperial circles. The 1515 document is quite specific about which Saints days were to be particularly marked, and Saint Christine is absent from the list. That is not unexpected; Saint Christine, Christine the Astonishing, was a local saint particularly venerated in the Low Countries. She had been born at Brusthem and had lived and was buried at Saint-Trond [Sint-Truiden] not far from Louvain.

Another connection with Antwerp, or at least with its chant tradition, can be seen in one of Crecquillon's motets to Saint Cecilia. He wrote no fewer than five, a large
number to be addressed to any one saint, and I want to consider them together. The five are:

*Ave virgo glorigosa*\(^{136}\)

*Domine Jesu Christi*\(^{137}\)

*Dum aurora finem daret*

*Virgo gloriosa semper, 2nd pt. Cantantibus organis*

*Virgo gloriosa semper, 2nd pt. Domine Jesu Christe*\(^{138}\)

Of the saints' days noted in the 1515 ordinances to be observed by the Imperial chapel with greater liturgical solemnity, Saint Cecilia's is as absent as that of Saint Christine. The later document from 1556 does suggest that by that time Saint Cecilia's day sometimes received some very small recognition beyond the normal liturgical observance. It instructed that if Saint Cecilia's day fell on a Sunday, first vespers, i.e. those of the evening before, would be sung solemnly.\(^{139}\) It is possible to gauge to some extent the degree to which liturgical observance was matched by the production of polyphony by noting the number of motets with texts to the saints listed in the 1515 ordinances with motets by Canis and Crecquillon. For instance, the list included Saints Barbara and Catherine; not a single motet by either composer survives with a text to one or the other of these saints. It seems very unlikely therefore that the instruction on the singing of first vespers implies any great devotion to the saint, and it may have been no more than a small concession to the growing popularity of her cult with singers that was occurring elsewhere. Neither document gives any hint as to why there should be such a number of Cecilian motets by Crecquillon, if they were written for use within the chapel. Crecquillon was not alone in writing a number of motets to this saint; Canis too wrote a comparatively
large number, three or four, and in one case we can be reasonably certain from the date of publication that it precedes his time in the chapel. His motet *Cecillam intra cubiculum* was published in 1542 (RISM 1542/7). The conclusion must be that these motets by Crecquillon and Canis were written wholly or mainly for performance elsewhere.\(^{140}\)

The adoption of St Cecilia as the patron saint of musicians seems to have been a late development. Depictions of her with her organ seem to have developed only in the 15th century.\(^{141}\) In Antwerp, Saint Cecilia’s day was an occasion for the giving of wine to the musicians of the church of Our Lady for their celebration of her feast; Cecilia appears to have become the musicians’ patroness by 1530 and possibly rather earlier, and the festivities are comparatively well-documented.\(^{142}\) Even apart from the number of Cecilian motets that exist, it is possible to imagine the celebrations that must have attended such an event from the requirement in 1550 to continue to supply ‘beautiful music’ in return for a doublings of the amount of drink given to the singers.\(^{143}\)

We can link at least one of these motets, *Virgo gloria semper, 2nd pt: Domine Jesu Christe* with the Antwerp chant used as a cantus firmus in the motet to Saint Christine; it uses precisely the same section of chant at the end of the second part to the words ‘Saint Cecilia pray for us’. The chant quotation is given complete in the upper voice, although other parts refer to it too. The chant quotation is accompanied by particularly active part writing which would have been entirely appropriate for a piece addressed to the patroness of musicians.\(^{144}\) One wonders, too, given the part some of the guilds played in the Saint Cecilia day celebrations, whether the text of another of these motets is perhaps linked to one of the military guilds of the church.
at Antwerp:

Dum aurora finem daret, Caecilia dixit: Eia! milites Christi, abjicite opera
tenebrarum et induimini arma lucis.
(When dawn had passed, Cecilia said: Come, soldiers of Christ, throw down the
works of darkness and let us put on the arms of light.)

That text also forms the second part of *Domine Jesu Christi* which resembles the
setting of *Virgo gloriosa semper* mentioned above; it also ends with a direct
invocation of the saint, but this time without reference to the chant. We cannot be
certain that these motets were written for Antwerp; too little is yet known about
such observances in other cities and about other local chant traditions, but in
conjunction with the secondary evidence from the *Biographie National* [de Belgique]
it seems more probable than not that they were.

There are other pieces which would have fitted well into what we know of Antwerp
religious life, but could equally be from elsewhere. Again though, they point to an
active career before Crecquillon joined the chapel. Among the motets which use
borrowed material, and which are discussed in some detail in chapter 4, are *Salve
salutis unica spes*, *Virgo ante partum* and *Cum inducerent*. The first of these has a
particularly cloying Marian text, but it quotes two well-known chants, *Salve regina*
and *Regina caeli*. The second, with a text on Mary's virginity, quotes the opening of
the *Inviolata* sequence, and the third, on a Purification text, again quotes *Inviolata.*
The discussion in chapter 4 suggests that the purpose of these quotations from well-
known and popular chants was didactic to some degree, and that the quotations were
intended to be audible. Those features both lead to the possibility that they were
intended perhaps for a *lof* service, or possibly for one of the occasions when the image of the Virgin was paraded round the church in Antwerp. The feast of the Purification was one of the few feasts to have instrumental participation at both mass and *lof* for the services of the Confraternity of Our Lady, and so might well be marked by the performance of polyphony. Elsewhere, motets seem to have formed a regular part of *lof* services. The moving of the statue of the Virgin was part of the Assumption *ommegang*, and both the *Salve regina* and *Inviolata* formed part of the ritual for the movement of the image.

These motets are all consistent with the possibility that Crecquillon worked in Antwerp, as stated by the Bibliographie Nationale, although they may also indicate a wider sphere of activity. If the Bibliographie Nationale is correct, then it is almost certain that he and Susato would have known each other, which goes some considerable way to explaining both Susato's ready access to material by Crecquillon, and the high profile accorded him in the early publications.

Antwerp is not the only place where, from the evidence of his works, Crecquillon may have been active. The motet *Surge Badilo* and the chanson *Dedans Tournay* [Tournai] together give a further clue to Crecquillon's activities before his Imperial service. The chanson appears in the *Tiers livre* with a text beginning and ending 'Dedans Tournai ville jolie'. The original verse, by Clement Marot, began 'Dedans Paris', but the scene has been changed to refer now to another city. These may seem slim grounds for supposing that Crecquillon may have worked in Tournai or its environs, but the motet *Surge Badilo* adds credibility to the possibility. The motet is a prayer to an obscure saint, yet it is a substantial piece of writing, with chant quotations which, it will be seen from chapter 4 below, suggests that the motet was
written for a major corporate occasion. I have been unable to trace any cult for Saint Badilo in Antwerp or other major cities, but the town to which his remains were translated, and where we might expect some specific cult, was Leuze in Hainault, little more than a stone’s throw from Tournai.148

Scarcely further than Leuze from Tournai is the major city of Lille; Lille at that time was an important city of the Imperial possessions, rather than coming under the French crown. Among Crecquillon’s motets are four with texts connected liturgically with the dedication or building of a church: *Signum salutis*, *Terribilis est locus*, *Videt Jacob*, and *Zachee festinans*. It is quite possible that some, if not all, of these pieces predate 1540; Charles’s chapel was largely itinerant, and attached to Charles himself, not to a physical location. These motets stand out too because of their specific liturgical uses and the number of them. *Signum salutis* was for the blessing of a cornerstone of a church, whilst the texts of *Videns Jacob* and *Terribilis est locus* were for a dedication. *Zachee festinans* too was for dedications as well as for the consecration of churches. Dedication texts were repeated at the anniversaries of dedications as well as at the dedication itself, but that does not apply to *Signum salutis*. There is no means of knowing whether the three dedication motets were written for the same occasion or for different ones, but their presence in Crecquillon’s works, together with the text for the blessing of the cornerstone, again points strongly to activities outside the Imperial chapel. It may be only coincidence, but shortly before Crecquillon joined the chapel, in 1538, there was one large church dedication in Lille, that of the church of St Catherine. Given the proximity of these three places, it seems quite possible that Crecquillon had spent some time at least working in this particular area.
Crecquillon's origins are shrouded in an obscurity even darker than his age and later life but, as with his earlier career, it is possible that there are some clues within his works. There may at first sight be an apparent French bias to some of his work; for instance, two of his masses use French models, but the possibility that this bias arises from the requirements of aspects of the Emperor's diplomacy and politics must not be overlooked. For example, as was noted by Rudolf (see above), Crecquillon's chanson *Il me suffit* may well have been written for Francis I when he attended the 1546 chapter of the Order of the Golden Fleece. We must also be aware of the availability in Antwerp of French chansons such as Sandrin's *Douce mémoire*, one of the models for a mass by Crecquillon, and the brisk trade and passage of people between Antwerp and Paris, before placing too much weight on the use of French texts or models. The other French model, Sermisy's *Congratulamini*, was printed as a work of Verdelot's in Augsburg in 1540 (RISM 1540/7) and may therefore have had a wide circulation. Moreover, the paucity of Crecquillon's works in French sources suggests that there was no active French connection.

Whilst it would be difficult if not impossible to argue that all the use of French models and texts was politically motivated, there is only one work which seems to suggest firmly that this was a matter of more than taste or penchant on the part of Crecquillon or, perhaps more importantly, his master - Crecquillon's motet *Quaeramus cum pastoribus*. This motet is an imitation motet based on Mouton's motet of the same title (see below, chapter 4). The work is so unusual and the evidence of deliberate manipulation of the structure sufficiently strong, possibly to include a numerological reference to Mouton's name, that it is justifiable to suggest that it
carries particular significance. There is reason from this motet to suggest the possibility of a link with Mouton personally or perhaps a French connection with Crecquillon's musical training or early career. Of course, if Crecquillon had been a child in the French chapel royal, then he would have presumably studied under Mouton there, but that possibility is speculative. Mouton did work in Burgundian territory, in St. Omer, during the 1490's, but to postulate a connection from that date would require a more radical reappraisal of Crecquillon's possible age than the other evidence warrants. However, the possibility of a personal link gains a little more credence if we simply note that Mouton had been described as a cleric from Therouanne, a French enclave in Imperial territory (and a town razed by Charles in 1553) near St. Omer. Crecquillon's last benefice, obtained through a permutation and therefore for personal reasons, was at Béthune, very much closer to Thérouanne than his previous one at Termonde had been, and again close to the French border. It seems quite possible in the light of these points that Crecquillon originated somewhere in the region of St Omer or Béthune. It is certainly unlikely that he would have come into contact with Mouton had he come from anywhere but French or border territory.

It has to be admitted that suggesting a date of birth from the circumstantial evidence is an exercise of judgment rather than the application of precise science. However, it seems certain that Crecquillon did not join the Imperial chapel at the beginning of his career. He appears to have worked elsewhere, most probably Antwerp and Tournai or thereabouts, before his Imperial service; nor can the secondary evidence for his spending time in Regensburg be entirely disregarded. The evidence of Crecquillon's previous activities together with his master's degree, priesthood, and the incidental evidence of the other chapel appointments all suggest that a date of birth later than
1510 is not consistent with what can be deduced.

That impression is reinforced by the large amount of Crecquillon's music in early prints, which suggests that he was writing well before 1540. The difficulty in dating any mass beyond 1546, and the maturity of his works from the mid 1540's, and his apparent retirement in 1550, even allowing for the toll of travelling for much of the time, all support that view, too. Together, they may suggest an earlier date of birth than 1510. It may also be thought that, if Crecquillon's apparent homage to Mouton in his imitation motet *Quaeramus cum pastoribus* implies a personal relationship, it was unlikely to have developed at too young an age. Mouton died in 1522, and again that might suggest slightly earlier than 1510 as the year of Crecquillon's birth.

A date of 1510 or earlier would not invalidate the evidence of the Paix print, which contains apparent errors of up to twenty years. There is enough doubt over the birth dates of Clemens and Hollander, the composers whom Crecquillon follows in Paix's publication, to make it as consistent as some of the other dates. On balance, though, I would suggest that a range of 1505-10 might accord better with the overall balance of circumstantial evidence. If Crecquillon's background is a mystery to us, perhaps it was not entirely clear to Paix either. He could possibly have made an assumption based on the year of Crecquillon's death relative to Clemens in the absence of firm information on Crecquillon's birth, and even 1505 is well within the margin of error that Paix displays.

**Summary of Crecquillon’s life**

Crecquillon was probably born about 1505-10, possibly in the border area between
France and the Empire. He was a priest and held a masters degree. He is said to have worked in Regensburg at some stage, and it is quite possible that he was active in Antwerp and around Tournai before joining the Imperial chapel, probably no earlier than 1540. The evidence suggests that he was *maistre de chapelle*, whilst Canis was *maistre des enfans*, until he relinquished the position in 1545 to become the official court composer. He appears to have retained a position of seniority as a chaplain of the high mass until his retirement, which very probably occurred in 1550. During his time in the chapel, he is known to have held one benefice in Termonde, and almost certainly another in Louvain. After his retirement, he appears to have held benefices in Namur, Termonde and Béthune, where he died, probably in 1557. Beyond 1550, he seems to have written little music, if any.
Notes to Chapter 2


2. See Sweertius (1628) p. 693, who referred to Crecquillon as: 'musicus excellens, invictissimi Imp. Caroli V chori praefectus'.

3. References for all the details mentioned in this brief summary will be given in the discussion below.


5. Marshall (1970-1) vol. 1, pp. 7-8. Marshall cited what he believed was evidence from vander Straeten that Crecquillon may have spent time in Hungary and Florence. Marshall's point seems to arise from a misunderstanding. Vander Straeten vol. 6, p. 323, note 1, said that Bartoli (a Florentine diplomat) appeared to have known, at Florence or elsewhere, several eminent musicians from the Low Countries, including Crecquillon. He quoted Bartoli as follows: 'Ruggier, Francese, che hozzi sta al servizio della regina di Ungheria'. Ruggier is probably Rogier Pathie, as vander Straeten believed; the reference to the Queen of Hungary is to Mary of Hungary, Charles's regent in the Low Countries. In Bartoli's original book, the references to Crecquillon and Pathie are not placed together, Crecquillon being discussed separately with Gombert. Bartoli's literary form is that of a conversation, and the individual into whose mouth he puts the phrase that might imply knowledge is known to have travelled north of the Alps. For a modern transcription and discussion
of Bartoli, see Haar (1988).

6. Rudolf (1977). Detailed references will be given below.

7. As an example of the continuing confusion, see for instance the summary of Crecquillon's life in Elders (1991) p. 145. Elders writes `According to certain documents (including some [sic] from 1540), he was maître de chapelle at the court of Charles V; according to a document of 1547, however, he was a singer. It is naturally possible that he was demoted in 1547, but he also may have succeeded Gombert as master of the choirboys, whilst Cornelius Canis held the position of chief master of the chapel'.


9. On the detailed workings of these collation lists, see Rudolf pp. 88-96. They were essentially lists drawn up under broad headings of the order of preferment to benefices within the Emperor’s preemption rights as they became vacant. Thus without some further qualification indicating the actual granting of a benefice (usually ‘porveu’ or a contraction of it), it can neither be assumed that a benefice did become vacant within the life of the collation list or that an individual named necessarily ever held the position listed, especially as there was normally more than one candidate for preferment within any given category and place of benefice. Thus Brown (1980a) is making an assumption which cannot be confirmed when he says that the 1540 collation list shows Crecquillon holding benefices in Termonde and Béthune. Only in the case of Termonde is it certain that Crecquillon was granted the benefice, because of the note ‘porveu’ but he was also listed for a prebend at
'Tournot' [Turnhout] according to Rudolf's transcription, p. 358, omitted from Schmidt-Görg's transcription. For a further consideration of Imperial preemption, see Lindell (1994).


11. The document is only known from vander Straeten's transcription, vol. 7, pp. 318-9; it has been reprinted from there by Schmidt-Görg and Rudolf.

12. It is not possible to be precise because the document says twenty, counting two boys as one singer. The group would therefore have been larger, probably about twenty-five in all.

13. See vander Straeten vol. 7, pp. 312-3, also reprinted by Schmidt-Görg and Rudolf.

14. I have assumed for the moment that the maistre de la chapelle and the maistre des enfans were separate posts. If Rudolf's contention on a single maistre were to prove correct, then this evidence would have to be read slightly differently.

15. See Elton p. 164, and Dobbins (1992) p. 222. Generally, details of Charles V's itinerary have been taken from Tyler (1956), and have not been separately noted.

16. I argue in chapter 6 that there is a particular connection between texts from
the Song of Songs and rulers or royalty, so the origin of the text in this instance may be more significant than just the references it contains.

17. See Dobbins (1992) pp. 222-3. In addition to the motets in that particular Moderne print, Dobbins also notes Benedictus's motet addressed to Francis I, *Foelix es Regno Francisce et Francia foelix*, which appears in Moderne's third book of four-voice motets from 1539 (RISM 1539/10), and suggests others of this collection may have had occasional significance. There is also the motet by Morales which by its text clearly belongs to the peace conference, *Jubilate Deo*, from Moderne's 1542 fifth book for five and six voices (RISM 1542/5), pp. 224-5, 227-8. Dunning (1970) p. 333 suggests the Peace of Cambrai as the occasion of the writing of the Benedictus motet.

18. It is possible that works were composed for the occasion which were not contained in any of the Moderne prints. If that is so, there is no extant Crecquillon motet which, from its text, could convincingly be suggested as related to this particular event. It might be expected that works from such an occasion would be of sufficient interest as to merit inclusion in a printed edition.

19. Heartz (1969) provides a complete listing of Attaingnant's publications. Composers represented include: Berchem (1540), Clemens (from 1536), Gombert (from 1529), Manchicourt (from 1532) and Pathie (1534). Heartz p. 97 also gives a summary of the overall representation of Franco-Flemish composers from 1525. Dobbins (1974) provides a detailed inventory of Moderne's *Paragon des Chansons*. Few composers from the Low Countries are represented, but music by Gombert and Pathie is in the earlier volumes from 1538 to 1540.
20. Recruitment of maistres for the chapel is discussed further below; the example of Canis does not seem to have been an isolated one. In one case only is it evident that a maistre de la chapelle was appointed from within the ranks of the chapel, and that was the appointment of Payen to succeed Canis when, in 1555, the latter retired rather than face the prospect of going permanently to Spain with Philip after Charles's abdication. See Rudolf pp. 60-3. Payen had been a child in the chapel, clerk to the oratory and chaplain of the high mass (apparently the most senior group within the chapel), in addition to being a published composer. Thus his position could not be equated to that of someone joining as a singer and within a short period being elevated to maistre.

21. For Pickart's death see vander Straeten vol. 1, pp. 184-5. In the 1540 collation list Pickart is included without any reference to any position he might have held. The collation lists normally give details of an individual's position. This point is of relevance to the discussion below on the date of Crecquillon's retirement.

22. Rudolf pp. 22-4. As far as I am aware, Schmidt-Görg (1938) does not specifically address the possibility raised by Rudolf but accepts the documentary record at face value.


24. Picker in Hudson and Picker (1980) gives 1542 as the date of Crecquillon's replacement as established fact without qualification. Hudson (1990) has a degree of caution but supports the acceptance of 1542 by saying that it fits well with the
appearance of Crecquillon’s music in print. This point is considered in detail later.


27. Rudolf discusses the title pages on pp. 25 & 33-4. His examination of the dating of Susato’s Tiers livre is pp. 27-34.


29. Rudolf p. 28.

30. Forney (1978) sees no particular significance in the omission of the privilege, p. 83; I reach the same conclusion as she does. However, to rebut the argument of Rudolf of which Forney was presumably unaware, I have gone into rather more detail to support that conclusion.

31. Forney (1978) p. 79 places this court action in 1544, reading the date of the action in 1543 as according to the Flemish style i.e. with the year beginning at Easter. It would appear from Bain (1990) that this is not necessarily accepted; she continues to give 1543 as being the year of the action. However, the change of year of the court action would not affect the tenor of Rudolf’s arguments and makes no difference to the points I raise.
32. The extant copies of the three books of masses are dated: Book 1 - 1546; book 2 - 1545; book 3 - 1546. Meissner suggested that there may have been an earlier edition of book 1, Meissner vol. 2, p. 53. Forney (1978) suggested an alternative, that the first book simply took longer than planned to produce, p. 99. The apparent clear division between the publication of different genres observed by Susato (confirmed in the dedication to his first book of motets), and the change in format between the chanson and mass prints make Forney's alternative the more likely. In any event, any earlier edition could not have been issued prior to August 1545, because the last of the first series of chanson books is dated that month.

33. Rudolf p. 34.

34. Rudolf pp. 34-6 & 36-42.


36. I have used numbers 1 to 11 of the facsimile set of Susato's chanson collections, CEM 1970. These, as confirmed by Forney (1978) pp. 188-9, are all taken from the earliest editions now in Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale.

37. Forney (1978) p. 191-2 Table 11.

38. Unusually, Rudolf does not identify which exemplar he was using. It must have been a copy of one of the later editions. Forney (1978) provides a bibliographical transcription of the three title pages, pp. 291-3.
39. It is not only the chanson part-books that are generally of a standard length. The motet publications are either of sixteen or twenty folios, with the majority containing sixteen.

40. See note 38 above for Forney's transcription of the title pages of the different editions.


42. Rudolf's further speculative possibility that the *Tiers livre* actually preceded the *Vingt et six chansons* despite Susato's statement in the latter, can be disposed of, if we leave aside the possibility of earlier editions (which from the details of the approval process seem highly improbable). Susato had a set of ornamental woodblock letters which he used for the initial capital of some of the items. It would appear that at the time of the *Vingt et six chansons* Susato had a block for each letter that he needed, with the exception of 'T'. None of the parts for the chanson *Trop a regretz* (the only one in the collection that starts with that letter) has the ornamental capital. Instead, a plain capital is used. The ornamental block is used however in the part-books for the *Tiers livre*, suggesting that this print is later. There are other observations to be made on the typography. Forney (1978) p. 147 stated that Susato had only a single set of ornamental capitals (her Type II). Whilst that in general seems to have been the case, the 'C' in the *Vingt et six chansons* has a fault running off the vertical from top to bottom, presumably caused by shrinkage from poor seasoning. That letter had been recut by the time it was next needed in the *Second livre*. Similarly, it appears that the letters 'I' and 'P' were also recut, but that the original blocks were retained. Both versions appear in the *Premier livre*. They can
be distinguished quite easily: the original ‘I’ has a gap in the frame to the upper left, corrected in the recut version; the original ‘P’ has a gap on the left upright of the letter which ‘bleeds’ into the landscape, again corrected. Curiously, these two recut blocks then seem to disappear from the prints, whilst the recut ‘C’ replaced the original block, which is not used again in the first eleven prints. The ‘C’ (Forney’s Type III) was also recut after the first print. I have not been able to examine Susato’s first collection for two or three voices from 1544; my comments exclude it.

43. The identification of the Vingt et six chansons as the print referred to is standard. See for example Bernstein (1969) p. 200. The end of the tenor part-book in the earlier print ends with ‘Fin du premier livre a cincq parties’. That confirms beyond any doubt the reference in the Premier livre and the inclusion of the Vingt et six chansons in the plan which Susato laid out in the Premier livre, and from which he subsequently departed.

44. Forney has worked out approximately the amount of type Susato possessed. Her calculations suggest that Susato owned a total of around 12,000 to 15,000 pieces. A single forme would take approximately 1,400 pieces. From that, she believed that the danger of running short of individual items would prevent more than about two formes to be set at any one time, Forney (1978) pp. 162-3. Even if every single piece of type could be utilised, with eight formes required for each sixteen-folio part-book in quarto format, no more than a single part-book could be complete at the same time.

45. This is clear if, for instance, the alignment of the contents lists and of the folio numbers is compared.
46. Charles left Spain in May 1543 to raise troops in Italy to deal with the incursions Francis I was making into Imperial lands. The final campaign was unexpectedly short, and it is unlikely that there was any realistic timescale for his return to Brussels until he had dealt with the threats to the Empire. See Elton (1963) pp. 241-2 for a summary.

47. Forney (1978) p. 147, argued that there was no significance in the ordering of pieces within Susato's chanson prints such as can be read into many manuscripts. Whilst that may be generally true, this first print seems to me to be an exception, given its dedication, its repertoire, and the evident care devoted to its production.

48. Pathie was also valet de chambre, and almoner, see Dobbins (1980).

49. Pathie's D'amour me plains has as its response and replique Si tu te plains and D'argent me plains by Susato. The latter uses large parts of the superius of Pathie's original. Additionally Susato and Pathie may have come into contact when Susato was being granted his first privilege. See the earlier comment on the process of gaining a privilege. In the case of Susato's 1549 L'unziesme livre, the examination of the proposed print was carried out by Benedictus Appenzeller, who was at that time Mary of Hungary's maistre. It seems probable that either he or Pathie would have been delegated to carry out the initial approval of Susato's first print. The 1549 document is given in full in Rudolf p. 378. It is also in Forney (1978) and Thompson (1975).

50. Whilst superficially attractive, one recognises the limitations of such an
argument. It presumes a direct connection between status and representation in a source. There may be occasions when that inference can reasonably be drawn, but as a generality, they are limited. Nevertheless, a source may provide circumstantial evidence. Rudolf uses the argument without appearing to accept its fundamental weakness. There seem to me to be two classes of works where it is likely that such an inference may be valid: one is works in sources with particular dedications, where the dedicatee may have influenced, actively or passively, the choice of works (and I think Susato's first print is one of these); the other is where political concerns or state occasions are involved, and the honour of being allowed or required to compose may reflect status. For instance, Pickart is scarcely known as a composer, yet he evidently wrote music for ceremonies connected with the Coronation of Charles V; see Cummings (1992) pp. 129-31.


52. Rudolf p. 199.

53. The dates for the additional editions of the first chanson publications assigned by Forney (1978) are no earlier than 1546; the only chanson prints with new editions dated subsequent to the presumed originals were both from the later series in 1550's: the twelfth and fourteenth books; Forney p. 99.

54. I have been unable to substantiate Rudolf's reading of Meissner, Rudolf p. 32, where he states that all the publications of 1543 and 1544 appear in bibliographies with other dates. That appears to be true only of Susato's first publication, where the dates are later rather than earlier (1544 and 1555). There is one possible
exception which concerns Susato's own collection for two or three voices of 1544. Goovaerts (1880) p. 186-7, lists a collection for two and three voices from 1543, and the 1544 publication separately, with a description which matches no known copy. Forney (1978) concluded that Goovaerts had confused himself over the 1544 publication. The extreme brevity of the information given by Goovaerts for the 1543 publication makes it most unlikely that he had ever had a copy under his sight, which supports Forney's conclusion.

55. Rudolf pp. 34-6 for his discussion of the 1544 print.


57. Rudolf p. 36.

58. That Susato made a clear distinction between his various series of publications is evident from the dedication of his first motet print, RISM 1546/6, where he said that he had printed chansons first, then three books of masses. See Boorman (1997) pp. 122-3 for some comments on the practice of printing by genre.

59. The weight of opinion seems firmly against the existence of the Clemens print. It is listed by Goovaerts p. 191. Meissner, vol. 2, pp. 50-1, discounts it largely on the basis of the inconsistency of Goovaerts' descriptions of the format and Susato not normally issuing single composer editions. Goovaerts said that the volume contained six motets. Forney (1978) additionally pointed out, pp. 101-2, that six motets would be far too small a number to fill a normal Susato publication. It might be added
that if Clemens was sufficiently popular as to merit a single composer collection, one might have expected to see a far greater number of his chansons in the early Susato collections than in fact appear. Only the eighth book of the first eleven collections, i.e. the *Vingt et six chansons* and books one to ten, includes chansons by him.

60. Scotto in RISM 1554/14-16 used 'sive'.

61. Rudolf pp. 36-42.

62. One might note in passing the friendship between Aretino and the Emperor himself. See Bull (1976) p. 29.

63. See note 50 above on this sort of evidence. This particular group of works appears to fall into the category of a political/state occasion when one might reasonably infer relative status from the works.

64. Vander Straeten vol. 7, p. 357.

65. For example, Nugent (1980).

66. Rudolf transcribed the French document, pp. 367-70; Schmidt-Görg, the Spanish one, pp. 338-40.

67. It is obvious from the records that the use is as I note, yet the description of Crecquillon as a singer has, against the evidence, been taken to mean a singer only. See the description of Thibault/Pickart in the collation list of 1526, where he is
described in the same document as *maistre de la chapelle* and a singer (Schmidt-Görg p. 279-90). Gombert was called a singer in 1531 when by that time he was *maistre des enfans* (Schmidt-Görg p. 105) and Canis when he was *maistre* likewise, in a collation document of 1548 (vander Straeten vol. 3, p. 245). Lueger (1954) p. 84, raised the possibility that descriptions were not necessarily exclusive, but his suggestion was not followed up, although it was repeated by Marshall.


69. See Schmidt-Görg p. 105.

70. As usual in Latin, the context determines the necessary article in translation; thus 'sacellanus' has to be translated as 'a chaplain'. It is noticeable that even in French, no article is used for individuals, so that the description is e.g. 'chantre' rather than 'un chantre'. The same is true of positions such as *maistre* where no definite article is given.

71. Schmidt-Görg p. 254. One might also observe in another document, from 1534, Schmidt-Görg p. 252, the scribe had written 'maistre du chan', had crossed out 'du chan' and continued 'des enfans du chant'. It is evident that there was a distinction that mattered.


73. Schmidt-Görg pp. 323-36.
74. See Rudolf p. 83. The previous regulations are presumably those of 1515.

75. This comment excludes the title pages of the resumed series from 1549.

76. Lueger (1948) reproduced the list, which is a petition from the members of the chapel; see pp. 10-4. It is evidently the same document as given by vander Straeten vol. 3, pp. 146-7, despite an erroneous reference to Madrid in the latter. Rudolf is perhaps unintentionally misleading in saying that Crecquillon's name precedes those of the general singers in Mameranus, p. 26, if by that it is taken to mean that Crecquillon is included at their head; Brown (1980a) also misses the significance of the placing of Crecquillon's name in saying that he was 'merely' listed as a singer and composer, as well as failing to appreciate the potentially inclusive nature of the term 'singer', a point already made. Steinhardt (1969) p. 287, in his list taken from Mameranus, moved Crecquillon from the position in which Mameranus had shown him, and listed him before the chaplains, thus obscuring the detail on which the inference on Crecquillon's position is drawn.

77. Rudolf provides a transcription from this publication, pp. 373-5. The lists are described as including newcomers. Whilst two deaths are noted within the chapel, there is no indication of who, if any, are newcomers. It is possible therefore that this listing should only be read as providing the picture at the end of the period. Nevertheless, in the face of other evidence adduced by Rudolf, and my argument on the likely date of the change in status of the positions of maistre, that seems an unnecessary point to pursue.

78. See the previous comments on this type of evidence. I doubt if the evidence of
the Attaingnant print warrants the firmness of conclusion reached by Rudolf on p. 53. One might also ask: why appoint someone specifically as a composer, with the inference that can be drawn on his status, if his music is to be upstaged by others from the chapel?

79. The translation by Rudolf p. 26 of the phrase used by Mameranus as 'required to compose' is a misreading. It has also been quoted by Hudson (1990) from Rudolf. It is no more than 'who is commonly called the (or 'a') composer'.

80. See Brown's observation that the earliest record in the French court of the term was in 1547 for Sandrin. Brown (1980c).

81. That number may have been derived from earlier practice at the Burgundian court. See Fallows (1983) p. 110.

82. Rudolf helpfully gives the personnel of the chapel from the various documents in tabular form, tables 6-12, pp. 103-111. The 1550 lists show larger numbers than other lists in all other sections of the choir, as well as the chaplains. The reasons for this are unclear. Steinhardt (1969) p. 291, offered a reconstruction of the chapel in 1549 based on Mameranus and later lists. He suggested five chaplains, but showed Crecquillon separately only as composer; he also failed to distinguish between chaplains of the high mass and those of the low mass. Taking two chaplains of the low mass, Steinhardt's reconstruction suggests four chaplains of the high mass including Crecquillon. Mameranus had noted that one of the chaplains, Pierre Hoyer, had died in December of 1547. It is impossible to tell from the surviving records when the chaplains first listed in 1550 were appointed.
83. The year of 1543 quoted by Walter (1975) and Ferer and Hudson (1996a) for the death of Elizabeth cannot be sustained, and arises from a misprint in Dunning p. 186, who gives it correctly on p. 222. See also Vandenesse's Journal for July 1545, Gachard (1874) pp. 309-10. The CMM edition of this motet is unsatisfactory is two ways. The first is the translation; this translates 'dolor' as 'colour', rather than 'grief' or 'sorrow', and rather bizarrely manages to convey the impression that somehow Elizabeth was the spouse of the Archdukes, her brothers! Secondly, the editors regard the mensuration of uncut C as an error despite its appearance in all five part-books. There seems to be no reason for that view. It is entirely appropriate for a memorial motet such as this to have an indication of slow performance. The use of the uncut signature can also be found in a number of Crecquillon's chansons.


85. Smith (1965) p. 248, notes that they are among the more elaborate of table blessings.

86. Hudson (1975) p. xi. There is an inscription in the bassus part-book of its earliest source, RegB 956-9, as follows: In Gratiam Carissimi ac Nobilis viri / D[omi]n[Di]ni Carolj Villingeri Baroni / a Schönenberg: Ratispone tr[an]scri/bebat, faciebatque Thomas / Criquellonius An° .1.5.4.6. / .1.5.5.4. / 28 Septe[mer] / S. C. 'In thanks to the most loved and noble of men, [my] Lord, the Lord Charles Villinger, Baron Schönemberg: copied at Regensburg, and composed by Thomas Crecquillon, 1546, 1554, 28th September 1554, S. C.' As Hudson noted, the Emperor Charles was in Regensburg in 1546 for a Diet and colloquy, from April.
until the beginning of August. Hudson does not comment further here, but in Ferer and Hudson (1997b) p. xxiii, it is said that the mass was written for a nobleman of Regensburg. It is not clear to me that the inscription can necessarily bear so definitive a reading. It can be read in different ways: one, as suggested by Ferer and Hudson; the second, that the work was the gift of someone else, perhaps the Emperor himself (it seems highly improbable that an Imperial composer would write such a major work directly for someone without prompting from his masters); third, that the gift was of the copy, not the composition of the work itself (that seems quite likely as the motet model has a text highly appropriate to the colloquy, see chapter 3); last, the inscription may be some form of dedication by ‘S. C.’ and be entirely unconnected with Crecquillon. This last reading seems to me to be the most probable: Mameranus’s extensive and immensely detailed lists, not only of Charles V’s household, but also of the retinues of the other dignitaries attending the events of the period covered by his book, appear to make no mention of anyone who could be identified with this dedicatee. Neither does the name appear on lists of the knights of the Order of the Golden Fleece, such as that in Guicciardini (1567) pp. 71 onwards. However, it is clear that the work was composed for performance in 1546. The fact of the year of its first performance being recorded suggests, like the text of its model, that it may well have been written for a major public occasion such as the Diet or colloquy.

87. Essentially, a permutation document arose from the agreement of two or more individuals to swap positions between themselves. Thus it was not necessarily the granting of a new benefice, and might well be undertaken for reasons personal to the individuals concerned.

89. It is important to note that the 1553 list is not a full collation list. See Rudolf p. 97.


91. The precise meaning of this last phrase is unclear. Rudolf p. 58, in dealing with a similar document, suggested that it be translated as stating non-residence for the nominee, reading 'free' as 'exempt'; alternatively, it may simply mean that as the position was vacant, it was to be kept so for the Imperial choice. If Rudolf's interpretation is correct, it would add even greater weight to the likelihood that Crecquillon was still active in the chapel at the time of this benefice.

92. There is another reason for assuming that Crecquillon's name was not omitted accidentally. There is a list of 1557 which named those who had left the chapel or had died since the 'final' collation list. Rudolf pp. 127-130 argued cogently that the 'final' list referred to was that of 1550. Crecquillon's name does not appear as one who has either left or died since that list. Again, the conclusion must be that he was not in the chapel by the date of the compilation of the 1550 list. See also Steinhardt (1969).

93. Vander Straeten vol. 3, pp. 148-9. The document is not known to exist now, and so it cannot be checked.

95. On the nature of the benefice, see Rudolf pp. 132-3. Steinhardt pointed out that there was a considerable change of personnel around the years 1550-1, p. 292. Twelve members left in these years and seventeen new names appear in the 1550 list. This may be relevant to Crecquillon's retirement.

96. Walter (1975) p. 26. The motet is in Ferer and Hudson (1997a). I have taken all the extracts of Crecquillon's works for the Examples from CMM, or, where the work has not yet been published in CMM, from Marshall (1970-1) or Walter (1975).

97. Original note values have been halved, unless otherwise stated, and bar numbers used to facilitate reference to modern editions.


100. That leads one to wonder whether Phalèse gathered any of his repertoire directly from the composer during a residence in Louvain. It is certainly possible.


102. The list for 1557 is printed in Rudolf pp. 414-420.

103. Guicciardini (1567) p. 29.
104. Pickart retired at about forty-three, and died at forty-nine. See vander Straeten vol. 1, pp. 184-5. It is likely that ill-health, perhaps brought about by hard service, had something to do with the age at which he retired. It appears from the earlier discussion that Pickart had been with Charles through his North African war in 1535 and the subsequent French campaign. Canis only retired at the abdication because he did not want to go abroad permanently, at the age of fifty or so. Payen died in service, as did Manchicourt. These perhaps support the possibility that when Crecquillon retired, he also did so as a result of ill-health.


107. MunU 401 contains some dubious ascriptions, but even if the work were not by Crecquillon, his name must have been well enough known for it to have become attached to the piece at some stage in its transmission.

108. The reliability of Paix as an accurate rather than general guide can be assessed from the following extract (after Hudson 1990) of the composers after Crecquillon in his list:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iach de Wert</td>
<td>1535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Lud. Daser c. 1525
Orland. Lassus 1532
Phil. de Monte 1521
Wil Formelius c. 1541
Ivo de Vento c. 1543-5
Ioh. Petralosius [Palestrina] 1525-6
V. R. [=Valentin Rabe?] c. 1522
Alex Utentaler [Utendal] c. 1530
Leon. Lechner c. 1553
Theod. Riccius [Riccio] c. 1540
Iacobus Paix 1556.

As Hudson rightly acknowledges, our knowledge of the birth dates for many of the composers is insecure. That makes it important to examine the wider evidence carefully, rather than to rely solely on an extrapolation from Paix, for an estimate of the year of Crecquillon’s birth.

109. That Crecquillon was made a priest at some time seems certain: all the chaplains of the high mass, unless they had the title of maistre, were listed in the court documents as ‘messire’, the normal term for a priest, and reference to the earlier Burgundian statutes clarifies their role - they were to officiate at the altar on ferial days, and thus must have been priests, Fallows (1983) p. 148. It also seems very probable that Crecquillon would have been a priest as maistre de la chapelle. His predecessor, Pickart, is known to have been one, as are Canis and Payen, the next two maistres. See vander Straeten vol. 7, p. 310 for Pickart. Payen was a chaplain before becoming maistre, and was given the title ‘Messire’; for Canis,
see his positions at the time of his death, Rudolf (1977) p. 69.

110. That the term *maistre* denotes a higher degree, rather than being derived from the position of *maistre de la chapelle*, is evident from two points: that other individuals are also given the title, and that Crecquillon continued to be accorded it when no longer *maistre de la chapelle*.

111. It is probably reasonable to assume that Crecquillon, as a musician, would have been a choirboy. That is likely to have ruled out an early entry into university.

112. Grove 6 'Chastelain, Jean' (no author) suggests a birthdate of 1490.

113. Vander Straeten vol. 8, pp. 75-9.

114. One accepts that exceptions might have been made. Who would believe the probability of Pitt the Younger as Prime Minister of UK on the basis of the average age of Prime Ministers before or since?

115. There appears to be a relatively small number of manuscripts surviving with dates from the five to ten years prior to 1540 when Crecquillon’s position at the Imperial court is first documented. It would be unsafe to draw inferences from the lack of sources for his music during that period. Canis’s music shows a similar absence from sources within this period.

116. For the argument that the motets should be viewed in this order, see chapter 3.
117. For the reasons for assigning this motet to 1549, see chapter 5.

118. See chapter 6 for an extended discussion which includes this motet. Its authenticity is discussed in chapter 3.

119. One gains the impression from their repertoire that Berg and Neuber maintained some connection with Imperial circles, a point that arises later, too. It would be worthy of further research.

120. For the purpose of this discussion I am ignoring the chansons of two or three parts by Susato himself, even though they are largely modelled on those of other composers. The compositional process removes these even further from any reliable timescale.

121. Confirmation that this was not caused by a change of taste can be found in the large number of instrumental versions of some of Crecquillon's chansons, but more particularly in the use by Susato of many models by Crecquillon in his Tiers livre a deux ou a trois parties [1552]. See Bernstein (1969) p. 214 ff, table no. 2.

122. In addition to the 'lost' 1546 collection of six motets mentioned above, there is a volume titled Secundus liber modulorum for which neither a printer or date has been assigned. However, the form of the title suggests that it is unlikely to be a print from the Low Countries.

123. It is possible that the undated six-voice Mass Domine da nobis auxilium
modelled on Crecquillon's own motet is relatively early, too, despite the absence of a dated source. See the stemma for the motet constructed by Hudson (1990) p. xlvii. The earliest dated sources for the motet, WhalleyS 23, 1552, and DresSL 1/D/3, 1547-51, are separated from the archetype, from which the mass would have been drawn, by at least two intermediate conjectural sources now no longer extant.

124. Obviously the masses would have been written over a period. Beyond that, there is the apparent anomaly over the dating of the Susato mass prints, mentioned above. As noted there, Meissner assumed an earlier edition of the first book which would push the timescale slightly further back, whilst Forney thought that it had simply taken longer than anticipated to produce. I also noted that any earlier edition was most unlikely to have been earlier than August 1545.

125. *Signum salutis* in RISM 1545/3; *Impetum inimicorum* in BerIPS 40043, from 1542-4, and in GothaF A98 from 1545; *Surge propera* in MunU 401 from 1536-40.

126. There are fifteen motets ascribed to Crecquillon out of eighty-three.

127. See note 121.

128. There is a motet *Nos qui vivimus* in a manuscript of 1539, but Rudolf rightly regarded it as dubious, see pp. 196-7.

129. It has been argued above that the likelihood is low of Crecquillon joining the Imperial chapel first as a singer. In any event, whether or not he joined as *maistre*
or as a singer, the evidence to be discussed suggests activities outside the scope of the chapel.

130. Biographie Nationale (1866-) 'Créquillon'. This item was contributed by August Vander Meersch. However, Leon de Burbure was a member of the commission overseeing the compilation of the Biographie; he had carried out archival research, still of value, in Antwerp prior to the issue of the Biographie. It is unlikely that the results of his work would not have been available to the individual contributors, and the relative precision of the comment together with the phrase 'it would appear' suggest that some firm evidence was available on which to base the statement on Créquillon's role at Antwerp. It is harder to see a reason on present knowledge to be as positive about Regensburg, although the entry is unqualified in this respect.

131. I discuss Créquillon's mass based on a German lied Kain [Adler] in der Welt in chapter 6, and the motet with a conflicting ascription Quam pulchra es based on the same lied in chapters 3 and 6. In my view, neither gives any reason to suppose that Créquillon worked in Germany. Trotter p. 16 treats Grüss dich Gott, Créquillon's only work with a German text, as dubious but in any event, Créquillon certainly travelled to Germany with the Imperial chapel.

132. This motet exists in two versions given in parallel in Ferer and Hudson (1996a) under its alternative text Ave stella matutina. They note that it is difficult to determine the original version, although they prefer O virgo generosa. Their caution seems unnecessary; both the source and musical evidence appear to favour it, and together to be more than adequate to confirm the point beyond reasonable doubt.
133. The chant was identified by Bloxam for the editors of CMM. Bloxam (1987) discusses the Use within the Imperial chapel, pp. 66-88. She shows that the Use of Paris was maintained into the 16th century, and suggests that the weight of tradition and the background of Margaret of Austria would have led to its continuation. On pp. 202-3, she adduces a further reason from Alamire’s mis-identification of a chant cantus firmus whilst copying La Rue’s Missa de Sancto Antonio for supposing the Use of Passau to have had no currency at the later Imperial court. It might be added that Charles’s chapel was established before Maximilian’s was disbanded, with no apparent influx of personnel from the latter into Charles’s chapel. Moreover, some of the terms of the 1515 statutes of Charles’s chapel are almost word for word the same as the 1469 statutes of the Burgundian chapel. See Fallows (1983) pp. 145-159, and Schmidt-Görg (1938) pp. 337-8. The Use of Rome is a rather less likely alternative, although it is to be found in a number of books of Hours associated with the Burgundian court e.g. those of Mary of Burgundy and Philip the Good. See Harthan (1977) pp. 104 and 112.


136. On the basis of information supplied to him by M. Huglo, Walter (1975), pp. 29-30 & 255, assigned this motet not to the well known saint, but to a more obscure saint of the same or similar name with a more localised cult. It was said that the text was used as part of an office hymn for the feast of St Cilinia, celebrated in Laon and Reims as the mother of St Remi (or Remigius). This St. Cilinia was said to be known also as Cecilia. It is likely that there is some confusion. The text of the first part of
the motet refers specifically to Cecilia as a virgin, which makes it inherently improbable that the text would be used in the celebration of a mother other than the Virgin Mary herself. A second virgin birth would be a theological novelty which might have been expected to cause more than a ripple within the Church. Moreover, the text of the first part of the motet refers to the husband of Cecilia as Valerian. This is the name traditionally given for the husband of Cecilia with the musical associations, whilst the husband of Cilinia and the father of Remi is normally given as Emilius. Reference to the standard Books of Saints also fail to substantiate the use of the name Cecilia for Cilinia. The specific nature of the text makes further investigation into this unnecessary.

137. Hudson and Ferer (1996b) p. xxxvi are not convinced of the authenticity of this piece, but the grounds for their doubts seem relatively slight.


140. Gombert wrote two motets to Cecilian texts, but given the time he is known to have spent away from the Imperial chapel whilst he was a member, and that he apparently continued to compose after his enforced departure, it would be difficult to argue that these motets had any particular origin.
141. Luckett (1973) provides an overview of the growth of the cult of Cecilia as patroness of music. He suggests a date of between 1450-1500 for the initial connection in the iconography, p. 19. It seems to have been a late 15th century development in the Low Countries. For instance, the painting of *Virgin among Virgins in a Rose Garden* by the Master of the St. Lucy Legend, dating from c. 1480 shows Cecilia with no musical icon. The painting is in the Detroit Institute of Arts, reproduced in Harbison (1995) p. 14. However, the *Isabella Breviary* from the last decade of the century has Cecilia pictured with her organ; Backhouse (1994) p. 63.

142. See particularly Spiessens (1994).


144. See the extract from the motet in chapter 4.

145. See Forney (1987) p. 11 for a document from 1556 instructing the organist at Bergen-op-Zoom to play a motet after the *lof*. See also Haggh (1995b) pp. 336-7 for earlier examples of motets probably intended for a similar service.


148. No trace of Saint Badilo is to be found in the comprehensive lists in Haggh (1988) for the Sanctorale for the various Brussels churches, pp. 276-332, and for the dedications of the chapels, altars and chaplaincies in Brussels, appendix 2, p.
700 onwards. Similarly, Bloxam (1987) makes no mention of him in her notes on the local saints to be found in the surviving sources for Bruges, Ghent, Brussels, Antwerp, Cambrai and 'sHertogenbosch. Weale (1889) prints a number of medieval calendars. Again, to mention only the most likely places out of the thirty-nine listed by Weale, calendars from Bruges, St Omer, Lille, Brussels, Antwerp, Cambrai, Mons and Utrecht make no mention of any recognition of St Badilo, however minor. The only liturgical trace of Saint Badilo that I have been able to find is in a 14th century breviary from Vézelay, where Badilo was a monk, see Leroquais (1934) vol. 2, p. 183, where he is described as Abbot of Leuze. For more detail on his legend, see the Bibliotheca Sanctorum (1961-) 'Badilone'. The full text of the motet is given in chapter 4.

149. On the connections between Paris and Antwerp, see Bernstein (1969) p. 211, who provides a useful comment; see also Bernstein (1969) pp. 201ff, table no. 1 for the models of Susato's Premier livre a deux ou a trois parties, 1544. These models include pieces by Certon, Sandrin and Claudin de Sermisy. Several French chansons, including Sandrin's Douce mémoire, were included in the main series of chanson books. Phalèse also published the Sandrin piece, but under Pathie's name. Other reasons for not regarding any apparent French preference as necessarily being Crecquillon's include the fact that Eleanor, wife of Francis I, was the sister of Charles and Mary of Hungary; Pathie was French and had been an organist to Francis; and the visit of Eleanor in 1544 to the Low Countries, as well as Francis's later trip in 1546 mentioned in the text. Blackburn (1994) has discussed Crecquillon's chanson Se Salamandre; the salamander was a symbol for the French monarch, but again, it would be difficult to argue a specifically French connection from it, other than might be explained by the foregoing.

151. See Brown (1980b).
A number of works from the 16th century are ascribed to more than one composer. That is hardly surprising: the hazards of transmission, the desire of some publishers to present more music by popular composers than was available, the potential for muddle between composers' names or between different settings of the same text, and the normal human capacity to make mistakes must all have contributed to the confusion that sometimes exists. Crecquillon's motets, or at least those ascribed to Crecquillon in one source or another, are by no means immune from the problems of double attributions, to the extent that some forty or so motets have survived in sources that offer conflicting evidence of the correct composer. The edition of Crecquillon's motets in CMM represents the latest evaluation of authenticity, based on the widest review of source material that has been undertaken. The purpose of this chapter is to comment on and question some of the conclusions reached in the CMM edition, to identify several omissions from CMM's discussion, and to examine motets of particular interest. Possible additions to the work-list are discussed first, then motets with cross attributions to Benedictus (Appenzeller), Arcadelt and Lupi. A number of motets exist with attributions to both Clemens and Crecquillon; several of these are covered in one section. Two further motets subject to modern questions of authorship are mentioned. Finally, two motets are discussed where CMM's attribution to Crecquillon is not questioned, but where, for different reasons, a further consideration reveals points of interest.
Before discussing the motets with conflicting attributions, two pieces should probably be added to the list of Crecquillon’s works. They are a motet *Peccata mea* and a Litany. Both are lost, but their titles appear in inventories where they are ascribed to Crecquillon. The first has only the short textual *incipit* and so it is impossible to identify the text accurately, but it is probably *Peccata mea domine sicut sagittae*, a text set by several composers. The motet was apparently the opening item of a book of motets once used in the chapel of Philip II of Spain. A search of anonymous settings has not produced any piece that might be identified with this lost motet. The second piece is listed in an inventory of sources at Tarazona Cathedral in Spain simply as a Litany, ‘Letanias’. It is a particular pity that it appears to be no longer extant, as Litany settings are rare.

Motet attributed to Benedictus:

*Quam pulchra es*

The editors of Crecquillon’s motets in CMM have been unable to suggest the probable composer in only three instances of dual attribution. Two of these motets have ascriptions to Clemens and will be discussed below. The third, *Quam pulchra es*, is attributed to Benedictus (i.e. Benedictus Appenzeller) in Susato’s *Liber secundus sacrarum cantionum* (RISM 1546/7), and to Crecquillon in Phalèse’s *Liber sextus cantionum sacrarum* (RISM 1554/5, reprinted as RISM 1558/5). It also appears in the 1576 Phalèse collection of Crecquillon’s motets. That later edition of the motet seems to have been copied from the earlier Phalèse volumes because an error in the cantus firmus in the earlier volumes is carried over uncorrected. There is one
known manuscript source which, as is derived from the Phalèse 1554 print, gives no independent evidence as to the correct composer. 6

The motet is unusual in that the cantus firmus is secular, the lied Kain Adler in der Welt. Ferer and Hudson consider it more likely that the piece is the work of Crecquillon rather than Benedictus. They base their view on the fact that the cantus firmus is German, and that Crecquillon is known to have travelled in German-speaking lands and is thought to have composed a work to a German text, Grüss dich Gott. It is also pointed out that Crecquillon wrote a mass on the same cantus firmus.7

Quam pulchra es is of particular interest as it appears to belong to a group of pieces linked by their use of a specific cantus firmus. It is necessary to anticipate in part the discussion of these pieces in chapter 6 in order to suggest the likely composer. Certainly at the dates of publication of this motet, motets with secular cantus firmi were rare, and this one would be unique amongst Crecquillon's known motet compositions. Benedictus used a secular tenor in his motet Aspice Domine which utilises the chanson Tartara mon cueur sa plaisance, but its year of publication, 1555, may have little bearing on the date of composition. 8 Benedictus is known to have been composing at a very much earlier date when the use of a secular cantus firmus was less unusual. 9 However, as has already been indicated, the motet Quam pulchra es is not a work standing by itself, but one of a group of works all using the same lied. The origin that is proposed later for these works arises from a specific event, one for which the cantus firmus is particularly appropriate. That makes comparison with other motets by Benedictus and Crecquillon of doubtful value if based only on the use of a secular cantus firmus.
The collection of pieces to which it will be argued that this motet belongs seems to fall into two parts distinguished by the precise form of the cantus firmus used. These forms of the cantus firmus are discussed later. It will be argued that, although the two versions of the cantus firmus are close, there are sufficient points of detail to allow the division of the motets and the mass using it into the two proposed groups. The mass by Crecquillon and a motet by Canis are in one, and motets by Manchicourt, Bacchius and this motet in the other. If Crecquillon were the composer of *Quam pulchra es* as well as the mass *Kain Adler*, it seems unlikely that he would have adopted two different forms of the lied for the cantus firmus, especially as the works are very probably contemporary. Neither can it be said that one form of the lied is likely to have been derived from the other; the variations, small though they are, are not indicative of a filial relationship, rather the reverse. That alone would suggest Benedictus as the more likely composer of *Quam pulchra es*, but other points emerge from a comparison between this motet and the Crecquillon mass, as well as from a more general comparison with Crecquillon’s motets, to support that view.

The most obvious point to be noticed from a comparison is that the motet and mass do not appear to share musical material other than the cantus firmus. That in itself provides no direct evidence on authorship, but it is suggestive, given the differences in the form of the cantus firmus in the two pieces. Similarly, the cantus firmus is utilised differently in the mass and the motet. The motet presents the lied in augmentation, whilst the mass retains the original note values of the lied. The motet gives the tune in note values twice the length of those in the mass.

The motet displays other marked differences from the mass, and also from Crecquillon’s motets, in its use of the range of the voice parts. *Quam pulchra es* can
be assigned to the transposed first mode, i.e. with a signature of one flat and a final on $g$. It is sometimes the case with works in this mode that the top voice does not use the full octave to $g''$, but stops short at $f''$. This is so in the motet, but not in the mass, where Crecquillon uses the full modal octave. The point has to be qualified; Crecquillon uses the slightly restricted upper range elsewhere in some of his motets, but rather less frequently than the full range. None of Benedictus's other printed motets are in the transposed first mode, and so a direct comparison is impossible. The considerations which led composers to adopt one or the other are unknown, but whatever the reasons for the distinction in range between pieces, it might be expected that the same composer working with the same cantus firmus might be consistent in his use of the *ambitus*.

However, the difference in the use of the range of the top voice is clearer if we look at the lower end of the *ambitus*. The range extends to $d'$ below the final $g'$ in both the motet and mass, which is consistent with a number of Crecquillon's motets in this mode. However, it is the use that is made of the fourth below the final that is distinguishable. Crecquillon in his mass touches on the $e'$ and $d'$ comparatively rarely, whilst the motet uses these low notes much more freely. They are used more in the motet than in the whole of the mass, which is over six times as long. That difference from Crecquillon's normal practice is borne out if his motets in the transposed first mode are examined. In almost all cases, the note $d'$ is touched on only briefly, sometimes for as little as a quaver, rarely for more than a minim. Only *Memento salutis author* amongst the five-voice motets is an exception, but even here the use of the lowest end of the range does not begin to match that of *Quam pulchra es*. Similarly with the rather fewer four-voice motets in the transposed first mode: only *Cognoscimus Domine* uses the lower end of the range to any noticeable extent (but...
still rather less than *Quam pulchra es*), even reaching c'. The words of the phrases in which it does so are 'quia peccavimus tibi', 'for we have sinned against you', and the unusual tessitura is clearly determined by the text, but we cannot attribute any such reason to the use of the range below the final in *Quam pulchra es*.

The *superius* voice of this motet is not the only voice-part to show a difference from Crecquillon's normal practice; the free *tenor* part is similarly extended, in this case to a fifth below the final, although it uses the range below the final very much less frequently than the upper voice. Nowhere does Crecquillon in his motets extend the *tenor* so far below the final in an authentic mode, rarely a fourth and then usually only for a single note.\(^\text{13}\) There are two exceptions, both in the four-voice motets: *Cognoscimus Domine* in the passage already mentioned, and *Impetum inimicorum ne timueritis*. This latter piece has an unusual combination of clefs (C1, C3, C3, F4) which may account for the slightly more frequent use of the lower fourth in the second of the *tenor* voices (the first *tenor* does not duplicate the range of the second), but again it seems probable that the use the low notes is text-driven. Similarly, Crecquillon maintains a clear distinction in the *ambitus* of the *tenor* when he uses a plagal mode, by limiting the upward extension of the voice so that it does not complete an octave above the final.

If we take for comparison the motet by Benedictus already mentioned, *Aspice Domine*, then it is clear that Benedictus is not always so scrupulous in observing the distinction in the *ambitus* in the *tenor* voices between plagal and authentic modes with the same final. All three inner voices of this piece have a C4 clef; one carries the cantus firmus derived from the chanson *Tartara mon cueur* (in augmentation like *Quam pulchra es*) whilst the other two *tenor* parts are free. Both cover a range from
a fourth below the final to an octave above it, using the whole range without apparent restraint.\textsuperscript{14}

In addition to these points, there are further details in Quam pulchra es which are not characteristic of Crecquillon's other work, and which point therefore to Benedictus as the probable composer. The opening and general style of the motet are extremely unusual for Crecquillon.\textsuperscript{15} The opening is given in Example 3.1. The motet starts with both the cantus firmus and another voice, the remaining voices entering quite rapidly and all the voices having begun within two-and-a-half bars. Crecquillon is usually, though not always, more expansive, and, moreover, this opening is quite unlike Crecquillon's practice in motets with a cantus firmus. It is dissimilar to his treatment, too, of the cantus firmus in his mass Kain Adler, his only mass based on a cantus firmus. In his few motets with a cantus firmus Crecquillon always develops normal imitative entries, and delays the cantus firmus entry until all the other parts have started. That applies almost as strictly to the secunda pars which they all have, unlike the single pars of Quam pulchra es.\textsuperscript{16} In contrast, Benedictus's cantus firmus motet, Aspice domine, shows a marked similarity in its treatment of the opening to Quam pulchra es, with the cantus firmus opening the motet in company with a second voice, and the remaining voices entering with little pause, Example 3.2. In fact, four out of the five entries in each motet enter at precisely the same moment. Even without a cantus firmus, it is difficult to find a comparable opening amongst Crecquillon's other motets. The nearest is Sicut lilium inter spinas where the early entries arise from the use of paired imitation, something that does not apply to Quam pulchra es.\textsuperscript{17}

The opening is notable for another feature which emphasises that disparity with
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Example 3.1

Quam pulchra es b. 1-8
Example 3.2

Benedictus: Aspice Domine b. 1-7 (Sherr 1996)
Crecquillon's work. I have already commented on the range of the upper voice. Even in those few instances where Crecquillon uses notes a fourth below the final, he does so within the body of the motet, when the mode has been securely established. The introduction both of notes and intervals as in the entry in the top voice in bar 5 of Example 3.1 which disturb the clarity of his modal exposition are not to be found.\textsuperscript{18}

It also follows from what has been said about the range of the upper voice that Crecquillon would not approach the final cadence in an authentic mode with the upper voice rising to the final from below (other than the normal use of the lower neighbour) as we see in \textit{Quam pulchra es}, Example 3.3. Again, there is no comparable example to be found in his motets.

There are yet other aspects of the motet which are hard to parallel in Crecquillon's output: the non-imitative style, and the relative lack of control over the rhythmic movement of the individual voices and of their interaction, seem crude when compared with Crecquillon's music. The restriction of the bass voice at the end of the first phrase of the cantus firmus to a purely harmonic function, Example 3.4, where it alternates between c and g, is likewise foreign to Crecquillon's style; it is difficult to find a comparable example in his music.\textsuperscript{19} However, a similar example of such bass movement is to be found in Benedictus's motet \textit{Super flumina Babylonis}.\textsuperscript{20} See Example 3.5., which also confirms the freedom with which Benedictus treats the \textit{ambitus} (the final of the motet is g).

The dates of publication of the two editions containing this motet might also be significant. I argue later that the group of works related by their use of the cantus firmus \textit{Kain Adler} were written for an event which occurred in 1543. If that is
Example 3.3

Quam pulchra es b. 80-83 Superius (CMM 63/9)

(corona -- be - ris, et co - ro - na - be - ris.)
Quam pulchra es b. 18-21 (CMM 63/9)
Example 3.5

Benedictus: Super flumina b. 46-57 (1546/6)
strae. qui-a il-lic in-ter-ro-
qui-a qui-a il-lic in-ter-rogae-
qui-a
qui-a qui-a
qui-a
qui-a qui-a qui-a il-lic
qui-a qui-a il-lic
qui-a qui-a il-lic
qui-a qui-a il-lic
qui-a qui-a il-lic
qui-a qui-a il-lic
qui-a qui-a il-lic
qui-a qui-a il-lic
correct, the attribution to Benedictus in the publication by Susato less than three years later may be more reliable than the Phalèse print some eleven years after that event, especially as it was Susato who published the mass *Kain Adler* by Crecquillon. It could have been confusion between the motet and the Crecquillon mass, or an assumption that as the cantus firmus was the same the composers were the same, that led Phalèse to attribute the motet to Crecquillon. Overall, the difference in the treatment of the cantus firmus and the various stylistic points noted together suggest strongly that the composer of *Quam pulchra es* was not Crecquillon but Benedictus.

Motet attributed to Arcadelt:

*Signum salutis*

The motet *Signum salutis*, omitted from the discussion in CMM, was attributed to Arcadelt in the destroyed manuscript Ms 30 of Treviso Cathedral. A contrafactum of the same motet, *Diem festum sacratissime*, with the same attribution to Arcadelt was in Treviso Ms 29, also lost. Both these sources are rather later than the two printed sources ascribing the work to Crecquillon: *Cantiones septem, sex, et quinque vocum* (RISM 1545/3) and *Tertius tomus Evangeliorum* (RISM 1555/11), publications respectively of Kriesstein, and Berg and Neuber. The differences between the two printed sources are minimal, and it is likely that the later print was derived from the earlier. Kriesstein’s edition (like Ulhard’s editions also edited by Salminger in Augsburg) is strong in its representation of composers from the Low Countries. The date and the nature of the repertoire of the Kriesstein print suggest that its ascription to Crecquillon is to be preferred.
Motets attributed to Lupi:

*Nos autem gloriari; Christus factus est*

Two motets, also omitted from the discussion of authenticity in CMM, are ascribed to Lupi as well as to Crecquillon. In the case of the motet *Nos autem gloriari*, the attribution to Crecquillon rests on a single and relatively late manuscript source, VienNB Mus. 19189. This is thought to have been compiled in the last third of the sixteenth century. The manuscript includes pieces by a number of composers from the Imperial court, such as Manchicourt, Canis and Lupi, with Clemens as the largest single contributor. Its Flemish repertoire, and the obvious connection with the earlier Imperial chapel that is implied, suggests that its attribution should not be disregarded, despite its dating. However, it is believed that the manuscript is of German provenance, which perhaps would suggest that it would be unwise to place too much reliance on the nature of its repertoire, although it appears to be reliable in its other attributions. The other source for this motet is BrusC 27088. This manuscript, dated to around 1555 to 1560, contains a number of works by Crecquillon and again particularly by Clemens. Given its earlier date and provenance in the Low Countries, its attribution of this piece to Lupi might be thought to be the more reliable, but not all of its attributions can be accepted without question. It contains another motet with a double ascription, *Da pacem*, which is discussed below.

The style of the music of the motet offers little by way of details on which we might differentiate it from either Lupi’s or Crecquillon’s other works, but the music itself does provide one pointer to the more likely composer. Both Crecquillon and Lupi use responsory forms. Lupi in particular does so quite frequently in proportion to the number of his extant motets, even sometimes where the text differs at the end of the
The text of Nos autem gloriari is in responsory form, though, and the music to the last part of the text of the first section is duly repeated at the end of the second. However, there is one conspicuous difference: the final cadence is not the same in each half. Several of Lupi's motets show a variation in the final cadence, after the literal repeat of earlier music, for instance Sancte Dei genetrix and Veni electa. In these cases, each half of the motet cadences on the same note, but the extension is varied from part to part. Sometimes, Lupi's variation of the ending extends rather beyond simply the final cadence. Crecquillon does something similar in his motet Expurgate vetus fermentum (CMM no. 43), where the cadence is more extended in the second part than in the first.

In the case of Nos autem gloriari, the cadences are not on the same note, despite the repeated material preceding them. In the first part, the cadence is on the confinal, in the second on the final. We find just such a technique being used in Lupi's motet Stirps Jesse. There is only one example similar to this in Crecquillon's motets, his Domine Deus qui conteris. Given Crecquillon's much larger output, and the rarity of this technique of repetition with a degree of variation within it, the probability is that Nos autem gloriari is the work of Lupi, who displays a much more frequent use of this technique of variation.

With the source evidence slightly favouring Lupi as well, we may conclude that Lupi is the more probable composer of Nos autem gloriari. Nevertheless, a significant element of doubt still remains.

The second motet also ascribed to Lupi is Christus factus est. Blackburn reported that the motet is ascribed to him in the index and the three lower parts of Berg and
Neuber's *Quartus tomus Evangeliorum* (RISM 1555/12). This print is omitted from the sources collated in CMM. Blackburn did not accept the attribution to Lupi in the face of other sources ascribing the work to Crecquillon. There are four other sources known, all prints. Three of these ascribe the piece to Crecquillon, but two of these are dependent upon the third for their text. The earliest source, a Susato print (RISM 1553/12) has the motet by 'incertus autor'. There is a greater degree of uncertainty, therefore, than the sources might otherwise imply, and the motet should probably be added to the list of *dubia*, although Crecquillon remains the more probable composer.

**Motets attributed to Clemens**

The composer with whom Crecquillon shares the greatest number of conflicting attributions is Clemens. The authorship of many of the motets with ascriptions to these two has been satisfactorily resolved, but there are nine motets on which comment may be made.

*Quis te victorem dicat*

The attribution of one work can be disposed of fairly quickly. Clemens and Crecquillon both wrote settings of *Quis te victorem dicat*. The setting ascribed to Clemens in Susato's *Liber decimus ecclesiasticarum cantionum* (RISM 1555/8) and elsewhere is said in Hofman and Morehen (1987) to be ascribed to Crecquillon in two late and peripheral English manuscripts, both associated with the Paston group of manuscripts. An examination of the sources shows that the work is the Crecquillon setting, correctly attributed, and that the entry in Hofman and Morehen
is in error.

*Domine ne memineris*

Hudson and Ferer (1996c) state that *Domine ne memineris* is ascribed to Crecquillon in three late and peripheral English manuscripts and prefer the evidence of Phalèse's ascription to Clemens in his *Liber quartus cantionum sacrarum* (RISM C2698). The English sources are associated with the Paston group of manuscripts, and date from the late 16th or early 17th century. A comparison of the motets in the tablatures shows them to be the same as each other, but to be different from the Clemens setting. There are evidently two separate settings of the same or similar text (the lute tablatures contain nothing but the opening words and consist of a single part only), one by each composer. Crecquillon's separate setting has evidently been confused by Hudson and Ferer with the misascription of the Clemens setting to Crecquillon.

However, the work cannot be securely attributed to Crecquillon; it also exists as a two part motet with an attribution to Christian Hollander. The two earliest sources, RISM 1546/6 and 1554/11, prints by Susato and Berg and Neuber respectively, carry no attribution. Berg and Neuber reprinted the work in RISM 1564/4, and on that occasion they ascribed the work to Hollander. There is no other work attributed to Hollander before 1553 (nor is there any known unattributed motet with a later ascription to Hollander other than this), although he is known to have been active from 1549 as a choirmaster at Oudenaarde. The date of the earliest source for this motet is seven years before the earliest definite attribution to Hollander, and three years before the first record of him as a musician. This,
together with the lack of an attribution for this motet to Hollander earlier than 1564, and the fact that, whilst late, the Paston manuscripts seem to reflect, at times, accurate attributions to Crecquillon in the face of alternatives existing elsewhere, all suggest that, while the correct attribution of this work remains doubtful, Crecquillon is the more probable composer.\textsuperscript{34}

\textit{Os loquentium; Practicantes mali}

As Marshall discovered, \textit{Os loquentium} and \textit{Practicantes mali} are closely linked.\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Os loquentium} is essentially the same as \textit{Practicantes mali} but lacks thirty-five bars of music and its attendant text which appears at the beginning of the latter. The shorter version with the text beginning \textit{Os loquentium} was ascribed to Clemens by Phalèse in his \textit{Liber quintus} (RISM C2702), but to Crecquillon by Susato in his \textit{Liber secundus ecclesiasticarum cantionum} (RISM 1553/9).\textsuperscript{36} It also appears in LeidGA 1441, attributed to Crecquillon. The Phalèse version, despite its attribution, seems to have been derived directly from Susato's print. \textit{Practicantes mali} was printed by Berg and Neuber in their \textit{Selectissimae symphoniae} (RISM 1546/8) under Crecquillon's name. Hudson and Ferer (1997c) and Beebe (1977) are of the opinion that Crecquillon removed the opening section of \textit{Practicantes mali} to construct \textit{Os loquentium}.\textsuperscript{37} Both reasonably enough ascribe the motet to Crecquillon, and only the full version, \textit{Practicantes mali}, is printed in CMM. I do not wish to dispute the attribution to Crecquillon, but the motet is of interest partly because of its existence in two forms, and partly because it throws light on the weight to be placed on some attributions by Phalèse.

Beebe advanced no reason for according \textit{Practicantes mali} the precedence; it is
possible that she had regard for the relative dates of publication. Hudson and Ferer do
however give a reason for their view. In Practicantes mali, the join with the first
section of the text requires an extra word at the point where Os loquentium begins.
Thus the text for that particular imitative point in the longer version starts ‘ubi os
loquentium’ as opposed to ‘os loquentium’. They regard the fit of the former text as
superior to the latter. However, I believe that a comparison of the two does not
necessarily support the suggestion that Practicantes mali was the original version of
the motet, and Os loquentium the adaptation. On the contrary, there are several
reasons for concluding that the version represented by the earlier print was more
probably created by the addition of an initial section placed at the beginning of a pre-
existing motet. (To facilitate the following discussion, I have called the longer
version, printed first, version P, and the shorter and later printed version, version
O.)

First, let us consider the point raised in CMM: the way in which words and notes fit
together. Example 3.6 shows the top voice at the start of this section in both
versions. We may agree that in version P ‘ubi os loquentium’ fits the phrase better
than version O, but it seems to be at the expense of the fit of the word ‘iniqua’. In any
case we must be wary of applying modern sensibilities to a repertoire that not
infrequently displays a different concern for word accentuation to our own.
Nevertheless, if we pursue the point raised in CMM, we may also notice in the altus
of version P a similar displacement of ‘iniqua’ caused by the extra word, Example
3.7. More telling is the first repetition of the point in the superius. Example 3.8
gives it as in CMM (version P), as in the source for the same version, and in version
O. It will be seen that ‘ubi’ has been added by the editors in CMM to maintain the
consistency of the imitative point, but in order to do so, ‘iniqua’ has had to be omitted
Example 3.6

i) Practicantes mali b. 36-39

ii) Os loquentium b. 1-4
Example 3.7

i) Practicantes mali b. 37-44 (Altus)

ii) Os loquentium b. 2-9
Example 3.8

i) Practicantes b. 46-9 as in CMM 63/12

\[ \text{ubbi os loquentium} \]

ii) Practicantes b. 46-9 as in 1546/8

\[ \text{os loquentium iniqua} \]

iii) Os loquentium b. 11-4

\[ \text{os loquentium iniqua} \]
as there are insufficient notes in the phrase to accommodate it, even though the word appears in the source. However, the text in version O fits perfectly, a syllable a note. Even with the editorial intervention in CMM, the integrity of the opening point cannot be maintained satisfactorily in version P. That is emphasised by the next entry in the same voice, Example 3.9, where the shape of the phrase defies editorial emendation, and has the same words in both versions.

Further support for the alternative view may be garnered from the altus part. Example 3.10 shows a small variant between the two versions. It is evident that the minim marked with an asterisk from version O has been divided into crotchets in version P to facilitate the underlay. It appears to be version O which again maintains the integrity of the opening point. We may also notice a section of the tenor part, Example 3.11. (I have adjusted Marshall's underlay slightly, but not in any crucial respect.) The setting in the version O repeats 'iniqua' at the end of the phrase and begins the next after the crotchet rest. Again, to fit in 'ubi', 'iniqua' has been omitted in version P, and now the phrase of the text goes over the rest with rather unsatisfactory underlay for the rest of it. It seems then that despite the reservations of Hudson and Ferer about the accentuation of the opening point of Os loquentium, there are more reasons to be derived from the fit of the text to suppose it to have been the original rather than the reverse.

The second reason for considering Os loquentium to be the original version is the structure of the motet as presented by Practicantes mali. The section beginning 'ubi os' in version P is badly integrated with the previous section in several ways. The join between the two sections is contrived by the simple expedient of prolonging the bass note from the previous cadence, Example 3.12. Even then, the top voice is left
Example 3.9

Practicantes b. 50/Os loquentium b. 15
Example 3.10

i) Practicantes b. 52 (altus)

```
u - bi os lo - quen - ti - um i - ni - qua
```

ii) Os loquentium b. 17

```
os lo - quen - ti - um i - ni - qua ob - stru-e(tur)
```
Example 3.11

i) Practicantes b. 48-53 (tenor)

ii) Os loquentium b. 13-8
Example 3.12

Practicantes b. 34-7
unsupported by a second for several beats. Crecquillon's normal practice, once a
motet has finished its *exordium*, is to maintain a two-part texture at the least.
Moreover, the new section begins not at a normal textual division, but in the middle
of a sentence, a moment in the text which would suggest the need for continuity:

Practicantes mali quibus venenum est sub labiis eorum durissime
tractabuntur in die visitationis Domini ubi os loquentium iniqua obstruetur
et implii misere peribunt....

(The practicers of evil, on whose lips there is poison, will be exercised most
shamelessly on the day of the Lord's visitation when the evil-speaking mouth
will be closed, and the impious shall perish in a wretched manner....

Marshall)

Such disregard for the structure of the text and such awkwardness in the musical
transition is entirely foreign to Crecquillon's style. There is a degree of
sectionalisation in some of Crecquillon's motets, but rather differently handled.
Compare *Practicantes mali* with *Ingemuit Susanna*, for instance. In the *prima pars* of
the latter, Crecquillon brings the voices to a close and starts a new point, but with a
purpose: to identify and emphasise the direct speech of Susanna. Another example is
*Quis dabit mihi pennas* (if it is by Crecquillon) where he twice starts a new point
with a single voice after a close, but at the beginning of new sentences, and without
the clumsy continuation of one voice to cover the join. In other words, Crecquillon
makes clear breaks only where there is textual justification for doing so. That
justification is absent from *Practicantes*, which shows the opposite: an attempt to
cobble a join out of musical material that is poorly integrated.
The last reason for according Os loquentium the precedence is the nature of its opening. I have said that we would expect Crecquillon to have integrated the imitative point better had it originally been the continuation of Practicantes mali. Nothing about it however is inconsistent with an opening point; on the contrary, it only makes musical sense as an opening. Moreover, it is virtually identical for nine bars to the opening of Crecquillon’s motet O virgo generosa, which exists with an alternative text Ave stella matutina. It seems much less likely that Crecquillon would turn to an opening of another motet for a central section of a motet, or alternatively, take an opening from the middle of another work. If the borrowing was from O virgo generosa for Os loquentium, this may give a reason for the less than perfect accentuation of the opening that Hudson and Ferer believe that they have detected. In short, the structure of Practicantes mali is entirely unconvincing; no other motet displays such an apparent disregard of normal textual and musical structures.

There is even reason to question the authenticity of the opening section of Practicantes. It displays several unusual features. The first is that the number of vertical relationships without a third or sixth seems unusually high in the first few bars. Second, the opening phrase is not developed in the way one might expect from Crecquillon, but is simply repeated for the first ten bars. The superius for instance repeats it once at pitch and then once a third lower. Third, there is a small phrase the precise outlines of which appear to be unique in Crecquillon’s motets; I have been unable to see a single example elsewhere, yet here it appears in all four voices. See Example 3.13. The reason for two of these peculiarities might lie in the text, with the open fifths illustrating ‘mali’ and the lack of melodic development representing the sterility of the evil-doers’ practice. One is therefore reluctant to conclude that
Example 3.13

Practicantes b. 14-5 (superius)
it could not be by Crecquillon, despite the detail of the quavers, but it is certainly highly uncharacteristic.

The evidence tends to support the view that Os loquentium came before Practicantes mali, despite its later date of publication. We appear to have a motet altered by the addition of extra material, possibly by someone other than Crecquillon, leaving a very unsatisfactory and atypical result. Why the adaptation? We can only speculate, but it is possible that the text with its additions was required as a suitable blast against the Protestant 'heretics' at one of the colloquies or on some similar occasion, but no firm reason can be suggested.40

This discursion on the original form of the motet should not overshadow the misattribution of it by Phalèse, especially as he appears to have copied his text from a correctly attributed version. Indeed, if the stemma constructed by Hudson and Ferer is right on that point, Phalèse appears to have been either remarkably careless or simply dishonest. It is not the only example of a dubious ascription to Clemens in his editions. Beebe considered the authenticity of a number of motets for her work on Clemens. She concluded that Phalèse certainly or probably had misascribed no fewer than seven motets to Clemens in the posthumous 1559 collections devoted to Clemens's works. She regarded Phalèse's attributions for the works in question as particularly suspect, and remarked that Phalèse 'had not hesitated to capitalise on the fame of the recently deceased composer'.41 We might add to that; Crecquillon probably died in 1557. If that is correct, then Phalèse could have been sure that, in dealing in his apparently cavalier way with the correct authorship of these motets, he could have met with no opposition from either composer. A more charitable explanation may be that Phalèse was preparing posthumous collections for
Crecquillon and Clemens at the same time, and that the misattributions represent no more than a degree of muddle and confusion in the process. The probable derivation in this instance of Phalèse's version from one giving Crecquillon as the composer reinforces Beebe's view on the care that must be exercised with Phalèse's attributions. All but two of the resultant double attributions involve Crecquillon, which may suggest that confusion rather than deliberate misrepresentation was the likely cause. In three cases including Os loquentium, the editors of CMM come to a similar conclusion to Beebe in accepting Crecquillon as the composer of the disputed pieces, and there is no reason to disagree. In each of these three cases, Phalèse seems to have derived his version, attributed to Clemens, directly from sources attributing the works to Crecquillon.

*Verbum iniquum et dolosum*

The demonstrable unreliability of Phalèse may be important in considering the CMM editorial conclusions for the two remaining works to be discussed here with attributions to Clemens from Phalèse's 1559 publications of Clemens's motets, elsewhere attributed to Crecquillon: *Verbum iniquum* and *Quis dabit mihi pennas*. The authorship of the former Hudson and Ferer (1996c) regard as uncertain, and the latter they consider more likely to be by Clemens. In both of these cases, Hudson and Ferer differ from Beebe, who favours Crecquillon as the composer.

*Verbum iniquum* presents a peculiar problem in that it does not simply appear with two differing attributions. One source preserves a voice-part that varies considerably from the other sources whilst presenting the other voice-parts without any significant variation. The printed sources are: Susato's *Liber tertius*
ecclesiasticarum cantionum (RISM 1553/10), Scotto's Motetti del Laberinto, a quatro voci libro secondo (RISM 1554/14), Berg and Neuber's Tertia pars magni operis musici (RISM 1559/2), Phalèse's Liber tertius (RISM C2694), and finally Berg and Neuber's Thesauri musici tomus quintus (RISM 1564/5). Susato and Berg and Neuber (1559) ascribe the work to Crecquillon, the remaining sources to Clemens.

From the differences between the prints Beebe constructed the following possible stemma:

```
  Susato
    /\  
  (β?) /  \  
  Berg and Neuber (1559)
```

Phalèse

Berg and Neuber (1564)

Scotto

Hudson and Ferer considered the conflicting attributions to be in sources of equal reliability, an assumption that has been shown to be doubtful. They appear to have implicitly disregarded Scotto (see the discussion below on *Quis dabit*). The dependence of the two Berg and Neuber prints on their immediate sources is readily apparent. They follow them almost exactly, including much of the text underlay, and can be ignored. Phalèse differs from Susato largely in rhythmic detail, but there are a few variants which suggest that Phalèse was independently derived from an earlier source, rather than being taken from Susato as suggested by Beebe, even through an
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intermediate source. Scotto presents a text, other than the altus, which is closer to
Susato, but like Phalèse, Scotto does not share the same two errors present in Susato.
This suggests that it too came from an earlier source, rather than from Susato. Based on the collation of the same variants as noted by Beebe, the following
alternative stemma may tentatively be suggested:

Both Susato and Scotto seem to present versions closer to the archetype than Phalèse.
Neither Susato nor Scotto is inaccurate in their ascriptions to the extent that Phalèse
would appear to be, but even if we discount Phalèse, we still have a conflict of composer attribution. Whilst we might wish to accord the priority to Susato’s attribution on the basis of his location, the nature of Scotto’s collection should not be overlooked. He specifically mentions both Crecquillon and Clemens in his title pages, and had collected enough music of theirs to fill the majority of the three extant volumes of the series. These volumes contain over forty motets by Clemens, Crecquillon and other northern composers. Venice was hardly a cultural backwater, and the maintenance in Antwerp and other major trading cities of Italian communities would have given Scotto ample opportunity to have received copies of music directly

166
from the Low Countries. To dismiss the evidence of Scotto as peripheral, as Hudson and Ferer do for Quis dabit (discussed below) seems unjustified, especially as in this instance Scotto and Phalèse, apparently separately derived from the archetype, agree on their ascription. In this instance, suspicions of Phalèse’s attribution seem unjustified.

However, there remains the curious question of the altus part. Beebe noted that there were places where Scotto’s altus and the one preserved in all the other sources were identical, and other places where they diverged. She made the persuasive suggestion that the part had been imperfectly transmitted, either through faulty memory or through damage to a written copy. In either case, the part was edited or reconstructed by Scotto, or someone on his behalf, extremely effectively. However, it does seem that Scotto’s copy may have been imperfect. In that case, we might have considered Susato’s ascription perhaps more likely to be correct, had there been similar signs of damage to the other voice-parts, but there is not. Moreover, in three instances within Scotto’s three collections, motets which are known from concordant sources to be by either Clemens or Crecquillon are presented anonymously. That suggests a degree of scrupulousness about Scotto’s composer attributions which should not be lightly disregarded, given that the prints are largely of motets by these two composers.

There is one further and striking feature of Verbum iniquum which may be indicative of the probable composer. The motet seems to be in transposed mode 2, with an irregular ending. See Example 3.14. The motet cadences on g in the two modally leading voices, but then is extended to end on a chord based on the confinal. It is unusual for two reasons; the first, that cadences and final chords at the end of motets
tend to be on the final, those on the confinal being far less frequent by comparison; second, the construction of the cadence forces a minor third to be sung (assuming the pitch of the note was not varied once the final chord was reached). There seems to be no textual justification for this unusual ending. As Beebe has remarked, Crecquillon’s treatment of mode is often clearer than Clemens’s.46 Certainly Clemens is more ready to end motets on the confinal than Crecquillon.47 There is no example in Crecquillon’s other motets that is remotely similar.48 There are though two examples in Crecquillon’s motets of an ending with a ‘forced’ minor third, both in deuterus modes. By chance or otherwise, they are both in motets considered doubtful in CMM: Quis dabit and Pater peccavi. There is a similar example in Clemens’s Si ambulavero, also in a deuterus mode. In none of these other examples is the cadence on the confinal. The cadence as a whole seems more in line with the relative freedom in modal practice that is sometimes displayed by Clemens, rather than Crecquillon’s closer adherence to modal norms.

In summary, the source evidence, on the basis of the revised stemma, seems to points more strongly towards Clemens, with two versions apparently being separately derived from the archetype, both with an ascription to Clemens. That, together with the peculiarity of the motet’s ending, suggests that the probabilities favour Clemens quite strongly as the composer of Verbum iniquum.

**Quis dabit mihi pennas**

Scotto also published *Quis dabit mihi pennas* in the same collection as *Verbum iniquum* (RISM 1554/14). In this instance he attributed the motet to Crecquillon. Phalèse, perhaps unsurprisingly by now, included the motet in the *Liber sextus*
(RISM C2705) of his collection of motets by Clemens. As already noted, Hudson and Ferer dismiss the Scotto print as peripheral, and, in this instance where Phalèse and Scotto differ, accept Phalèse's attribution. That seems a little hasty in the light of the points already made. Beebe considered the motet more likely to be Crecquillon's on stylistic grounds, as well as taking note of the earlier date of the Scotto print.

A collation of the variants in the two sources suggests that Phalèse's version was not taken from Scotto's, but that both may have been derived from the same source. That source may not have been the original; there is one note that seems to represent an error and which is common to both sources.

Scotto's attribution of *Verbum iniquum* appeared to be reliable, and there is no substantial reason to discount Scotto's attribution here, either. Beebe is probably right to prefer Crecquillon, but at the very least the motet should be regarded as dubious. It does not seem that to credit it to Clemens conclusively is supportable on the evidence of the sources.

*Ave Maria*

A further motet with a conflicting attribution omitted from the discussion in CMM is *Ave Maria*. It exists in only one source LeidGA 1442. It was originally ascribed to Clemens, but the name was crossed out and appears to have been replaced by Crecquillon's or Gheerkin's. That in turn was crossed out and the other composer's name inserted. These alterations appear to be in contemporary hands. Finally, it was indicated that the piece was not by Crecquillon, but was by Clemens. In the absence of any other source and of any particular distinguishing characteristics in the music,
the attribution remains doubtful, but, if we are to place any reliance on the reinstatement of the attribution to Clemens, then more probably he is the composer.

*Da pacem domine*

*Da pacem domine* is another motet with a cross attribution to have escaped CMM. It is to be found in only two sources, BrusC 27088 with an attribution to Clemens, and Phalèse’s 1576 collection of Crecquillon’s motets. As we have seen, the manuscript’s attribution of *Nos autem gloriari* is likely to be accurate, and whilst there are some other known problems of attribution affecting the pieces it conveys - there is, for instance, confusion between Jachet Berchem and Jachet of Mantua in the index - there is no reason to doubt its attributions wholesale. We cannot dismiss the evidence of Phalèse without consideration, though. There is little sign that he was as cavalier with his attributions in the 1576 volume as he seems to have been with some of the pieces in his 1559 prints of Clemens’s motets. Moreover, he had acquired a number of pieces that are unique to his print, at least on the basis of the remaining sources, including some that seem likely to have originated from Crecquillon’s time in the Imperial chapel, such as the impressive six-voice *Respice quaesumus*.

*Da pacem domine* is a cantus firmus work, and it is discussed in Chapter 4. Several of the features it displays suggest Crecquillon as the more probable composer, but given the small number of cantus firmus motets by both composers to serve as comparisons, the points must be treated with a degree of caution, especially as some may be affected by considerations that are not evident to us.

The first detail to be noticed in *Da pacem* is that the cantus firmus is given at a pitch
at which its final is the confinal of the motet. This is unusual and distinct from the more common practice of giving an ostinato at different pitches within a motet section, something which Clemens does, but Crecquillon does not. In the instances of transposition of an ostinato within a motet section, Clemens contrives no ending that would match the peculiarity of the cantus firmus in Da pacem, and no cantus firmus in other motets of his is set out in that way. However the second part of Crecquillon’s Congregati sunt inimici provides a precise parallel to Da pacem. The pitch of the cantus firmus, derived from precisely the same source, is such that its final too is the motet’s confinal. In both motets, because of the transposition, the cantus firmus appears in an altus part (only in the second part of Congregati sunt inimici). All Clemens’s cantus fermi are in a tenor or superius voice, except one, Tota pulchra es, and in this one instance there is no wholesale transposition of the cantus firmus.54

The second detail is one of how the final cadence is constructed in Da pacem at the point where the cantus firmus ends. The composer seems to go out of his way to avoid the implication that the last note of the chant could be taken as the final. In his two motets where the cantus firmus finishes on the confinal, Clemens in Tota pulchra es simply ends the entire motet with a cadence on the same note.55 In Deus qui non patrem Clemens does not do that, but ends on the final. In this case, as in the case of Crecquillon’s Congregati sunt inimici, the cantus firmus does not permit the construction of a similar cadence to Da pacem. The comparison on this point is therefore inconclusive, but if we take into account Crecquillon’s generally greater clarity and consistency of modal use, then it is possibly relevant.

The last detail is that Da pacem seems to display some relationships between the cantus firmus and the surrounding music and text, of a type which is matched by
other motets by Crecquillon (see the discussion in Chapter 4 below). I have been unable to identify similar relationships in Clemens's cantus firmus works. The later discussion also suggests that Crecquillon reserved the use of a cantus firmus for motets of special importance, a point not so apparent from Clemens's cantus firmus motets. The nature of the text of *Da pacem* and Crecquillon's reservation in the use of a cantus firmus to works of particular significance might suggest that the motet would fit well with his involvement in the Imperial chapel.

The similarity between aspects of *Congregati sunt inimici* in particular, and *Da pacem* is interesting. Overall, the probability that Crecquillon is the composer of *Da pacem domine* therefore seems greater than for Clemens.

*Salve mater salvatoris*

*Salve mater salvatoris* is known from only one source, the second edition of Phalèse's *Liber octavus cantionum sacrae* (RISM 1556/2), where it replaced a work of Manchicourt's, ascribed incorrectly to Crecquillon, in the first edition. Phalèse had printed the Manchicourt motet, *Audi filia*, in an earlier collection still, and it seems likely that he realised his mistake, and introduced this work instead. In one voice part and the index the work is ascribed to Clemens; the remaining voice-parts give Crecquillon as the composer. It is possible, as Ferer and Hudson suggest, that Phalèse had doubts as to the correct composer, because in the third edition he reinstated *Audi filia*, this time correctly attributed. 56

The motet displays a number of features that individually would be unusual in Crecquillon's writing; together, they suggest that the motet is unlikely to be his. 57
That is not to say that it is necessarily by Clemens. It would also be unusual as a work of his. Firstly, the motet is in the untransposed first mode, a mode which Crecquillon only uses twice in all his other motets - in Confessor domine and the canonic Quicquid agas. Secondly, the end of the motet repeats material (from the end of bar 120 to bar 127 is repeated with minor variants from bar 130 to 136). Again, Crecquillon does such a technique elsewhere, but rarely, as for instance in Dirige gressos meos. Thirdly, the opening of the motet is very loosely constructed, with the opening interval of a fourth being converted into a third in another voice, and one voice, perhaps quoting the Salve incipit, presenting different material. No other motet has an opening like it, see Example 3.15. Fourthly, the motet has some unusually pungent dissonances (also in Example 3.15). Lastly, the bass voice is uncharacteristically weighted towards longer note values than is usual with Crecquillon. Whilst none of these points individually would be sufficient to raise doubts on the authenticity of a piece, to find them together in one short work is enough to raise serious questions as to the reliability of the attribution. Phalèse's withdrawal of the motet when he reprinted the collection perhaps confirms the questionable nature of the ascription, whether we take it to be to Crecquillon or Clemens.

Other dubious motets:

Sancta Maria succurre; Pater peccavi (4vv)

Sancta Maria succurre was printed by Scotto in the third volume of his collection entitled Motetti del Laberinto (RISM 1554/15) where it is unascribed. Marshall suggested that the motet might be by Crecquillon; he noted the prominence of Crecquillon's name on the title page and the fact that the collection contains one other
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i) Salve mater: opening

ii) Salve mater b. 58-60
anonymous motet which is known from concordant sources to be by Crecquillon, but no other motets by him. He thought it illogical that the collection should contain only one motet by Crecquillon when he featured so prominently on the title-page of the print. His tentative attribution was accepted by Hudson (1980) who included it in his list of Crecquillon's works.

Volume one of the collections entitled Motetti del Laberinto is no longer extant, but may have been of works by another composer; volumes two and three have four-voice works, whilst volume four contains five-voice motets. Volume two (RISM 1554/14) consists entirely of motets by Clemens and Crecquillon with a single exception by Manchicourt. Volume three by contrast has seven motets out of a total of sixteen by other composers, one by Galli, and six by Canis (one of these is attributed elsewhere to Benedictus). That perhaps suggests that Scotto was running short of material for four voices by Clemens and Crecquillon, but that the title-page was nevertheless carried over from the earlier volumes. The first of the two anonymous motets, known from other sources to be by Crecquillon, comes within a run of works by Clemens, but Sancta Maria by contrast is placed last in the collection after the motets by Canis. These few details may make the probability of Crecquillon being the composer less than Marshall's approach might otherwise suggest.

The work itself is a technical tour-de-force, having one part that can be sung either as a superius at one pitch, or as a bassus an octave and fifth below. When one makes allowance for the limitations imposed by such a structure, there are no stylistic details to point clearly to or from Crecquillon as the composer.

The same motet has been ascribed to Canis by Rudolf on the strength of a manuscript
of the bass part. This manuscript source, BudOS 23, appears to predate the print, containing dates between 1545 and 1550, and cannot therefore be derived from it. It also has a slightly different opening to the text: Sancte Jesu succurre. Also, vander Straeten lists two settings of this motet by Canis in his transcription of the inventory of books from Philip II's chapel compiled in 1602. One of those settings was for four voices, the other for five. With the evidence of the manuscript and this further circumstantial detail, the attribution to Canis appears secure.63

Pater peccavi (the four-voice setting) is unrelated to the eight-voice motet on an almost identical text. It remains in a single manuscript source, LeidGA 1441. Hudson and Ferer raise questions about the authenticity of the motet on two grounds; first they note that certain style features do not coincide with Crecquillon's normal practice; second, they note that the attribution is from the index, and that such attributions are often less reliable than those at the headings of pieces.64 Whilst accepting the second point, it is a generalisation that in itself tells us little in an individual instance, unless there are other grounds on which to question authenticity.

The stylistic points on which Hudson and Ferer rely are that the opening has two motives presented simultaneously, 'a characteristic not found elsewhere in his motets', and groups of four semiquavers which 'are rarely if ever found'. The opening of Pater peccavi is a particularly clear example of the use of double motives, but it is not unique in Crecquillon's works. Example 3.16 shows the opening of Virgo ante partum, where the use a double subject and its development is quite extended. Sicut lilium also uses double motives, rather more briefly.65

On the second point raised by Hudson and Ferer, one may question the value of a
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Virgo ante partum: opening
comment such as 'rarely if ever'; there seems to be a difference in evidential terms between something rarely used, and something never used elsewhere. In any event, similar groups of semiquavers may be found in several other works by Crecquillon, such as Congratulamini mihi, Quicunque baptizati sumus, Domine da nobis auxilium and the five-voice Lamentations, although it must be admitted that they are not used in every voice as they are in this instance. The grounds upon which Hudson and Ferer are relying do not therefore seem to be quite as strong as their commentary would suggest. Until a more detailed stylistic analysis of Crecquillon's music is essayed, the attribution of Pater peccavi to Crecquillon should be accepted.

Other motets of interest:

*Congratulamini mihi; Andreas Christi famulus*

There are two further motets to be covered because of their intrinsic interest: *Congratulamini mihi* and *Andreas Christi famulus*. The first I want to mention only very briefly. It has an ascription to Hollander in one source, but is ascribed to Crecquillon in a number of others.66 The conclusion of Ferer and Hudson (1996a) in preferring Crecquillon is not in question, but the motet and therefore its authorship is of particular concern as the motet was used by Guerrero as the model for his mass of the same name. None of Hollander's music is known to have survived in Spanish sources, and it seems likely that his music, if it reached Spain at all, was limited in its circulation, whilst Crecquillon's music survives in printed sources, including intabulations, and in a number of manuscripts.67 It is known too, from the Tarazona inventories referred to above, that his music was more widely disseminated in the country than is apparent from the remaining sources. As a member of Charles V's chapel, Crecquillon would have been in Spain from November 1541 to May 1543,
and it is likely that both Payen and Manchicourt would have taken repertoire from the Emperor Charles's disbanded chapel with them when they were each master of Philip II's chapel in Madrid. The use by Guerrero probably therefore strengthens the attribution to Crecquillon which is already very strong from the evidence of the sources. The model for Guerrero's mass has previously been thought to be the motet on a similar text by the French composer Guillaume Le Heurteur, but a comparison shows that Crecquillon's motet is the true model. This motet can be added to the two by Crecquillon already known to have been used as models for masses by composers in Spain, La Hèle and Rogier.\textsuperscript{68} The motet and mass are discussed briefly in Appendix 1.

For many composers of Crecquillon's generation the writing of eight-voice music, sacred or secular, was an infrequent occurrence, if the evidence of the surviving sources can be assumed to give a representative picture.\textsuperscript{69} It is unfortunate therefore that the authorship not only of the eight-voice setting of Pater peccavi but also of Andreas Christi famulus should be in doubt. Andreas Christi famulus survives with an attribution to Morales which has been accepted by scholars of that composer.\textsuperscript{70} Hudson reviewed the sources of the motet and, based on his view of them, preferred Crecquillon as the more probable composer. It cannot be said though that the attribution is entirely secure.\textsuperscript{71} Hudson gives weight in reaching his view to the motet's appearance in the 1576 retrospective collection of Crecquillon's motets printed by Phalèse. We have already seen that in the case of Clemens, Phalèse's attributions at times must be treated with caution. We have also seen that Phalèse's attributions of Quam pulchra es and Da pacem Domine to Crecquillon are not above question. Given the comparative rarity of eight-voice writing, and the quality of the music, it is worth considering whether there is more to be added to the discussion.
Hudson has also suggested that *Andreas Christi famulus* might have been written for a meeting of the Order of the Golden Fleece, the one that took place in 1556 or less probably that of 1546. If that suggestion is correct, it makes the authorship of the motet of even greater interest as little seems to be known about music for the meetings of these dates. It would also aid our understanding of Crecquillon's life and career to know, if possible, for which meeting, if either, the motet was written.

It may be helpful to review briefly the evidence of the sources, before looking at aspects of the motet itself. There are two printed sources, one the first volume of Berg and Neuber's monumental *Thesaurus Musicus* (RISM 1564/1) which attributes the piece to Morales in the index, but not on the actual parts, which carry no composer's name. The other printed source is the 1576 Phalèse collection.

The accuracy of Berg and Neuber's ascriptions has been commented on unfavourably elsewhere. They certainly published considerable amounts of music from composers within the Imperial circle, and it seems likely that they maintained connections with the various courts as some of those pieces are the earliest or only surviving prints. The accuracy of their ascriptions of that particular repertoire has not as far as I am aware been challenged in general. However, it is already clear from the discussion of the motets also attributed to Clemens, that they were at times uncritical at the least in accepting the attribution of their source. It is difficult to see otherwise how they could have printed the same motet twice under different composers' names. The attribution of neither printed source therefore can be accepted without question.
Of the manuscript sources, WrocS 11 is known to have attributed the work to Morales, but the manuscript was lost in the second World War. Although it has now reappeared, I have not been able to examine it. Its relationship, if any, to other sources cannot therefore be determined yet, although it is dated 1583 on the covers of the part-books, and therefore probably post-dates the prints. Given its date, provenance and the attribution of this work to Morales, it may well be derived from the Berg and Neuber print. A second manuscript source, RegB 786-837, carries no composer’s name, but has a musical text seemingly derived from the same print of 1564. A third manuscript, MunBS 1536, uncollated in CMM, also ascribes the work to Morales. It too is derived from Berg and Neuber’s edition. The two remaining manuscripts give Crecquillon as the composer. One, StuttL 3, probably predates both prints, containing the date 1562. The other is a later lute tablature, LonBL 29247, which may also have derived its musical text from the Berg and Neuber print, despite its ascription.

The evidence of the sources then seems inconclusive, although slightly favouring Crecquillon rather than Morales. There are a number of features of the motet however which will serve to support the probability of Crecquillon being the composer. Several of these features are relatively small in themselves, but cumulatively they are persuasive.

The first feature is the use of the incomplete cambiata used at the end of a phrase; see Example 3.17. This figure is a normal part of both composers’ melodic vocabulary, but they appear to employ it somewhat differently. The frequency with which it appears in some of Crecquillon’s music is far greater than in Morales’s motets. If we take the use in the bass voice first, Morales seems to use it sparingly. His motets,
Example 3.17

Incomplete cambiata
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other than the motet under discussion, include only eight examples in seventy-two motets.\textsuperscript{78} If we turn to Crecquillon's motets then the position is different. Many more instances of the incomplete cambiata figure at the ends of phrases can be found in this voice-part; the motet \textit{Domine da nobis auxilium} has three, \textit{Congregati sunt inimici} two, for example.

At least one source for \textit{Andreas Christi famulus} preserves a reading which shows the cambiata at the end of the lower bass part at the end of the first section.\textsuperscript{79} If this reading is authentic, then that provides a further distinguishing point. In none of the Morales examples of this figure in the bass voice is it used at the end of a motet section. However, Crecquillon has no hesitation in so doing, for instance, at the ends of the first section of \textit{Congregati sunt inimici}, and at the end of the section \textit{Prophetae tui} from the five-voice Lamentations.

If we turn to the use of this figure at the ends of phrases in voice-parts other than the bass, then the disparity between Crecquillon's practice and that of Morales is equally apparent. Only two examples from all Morales's motets are to be found, whereas even a single motet such as Crecquillon's \textit{Domine da nobis} contains three, and other examples are not difficult to find. Compared with these differing uses in both bass and upper voice-parts, \textit{Andreas Christi famulus} shows a greater affinity with the use that Crecquillon makes of the cambiata. There are seven examples in the upper voice-parts alone at the ends of phrases.

The next feature of \textit{Andreas Christi famulus} to consider is its clefs. These are slightly unusual, having one voice-part with a clef outside the 'standard' clef combination. The clefs are: C1, C1, C2, C3, C4, C4, F4, F4.\textsuperscript{80} The use of an interpolated clef
within the standard combination is one that can be found elsewhere in Crecquillon’s works. Morales too has works with what we may describe as anomalous clef combinations, but we can again distinguish between the two composers on this point. In Crecquillon’s motets and masses, a clef that is outside the standard combination only occurs in addition to the standard combination. In Morales, apart from two examples to be mentioned, the ‘odd’ clef appears in place of, not in addition to, a standard clef. Thus in Crecquillon’s motet Invocabo nomen tuum for example, the clef combination is C1, C2, C3, C4, F4, whilst in Morales’s motet Jam non dicam it is C2, C3, C4, F4, and in Lamentabatur Jacob it is the same with an additional C4 clef. In every case (other than the two exceptions) Morales only uses the ‘odd’ clef for the highest voice of a four- or five-voice texture, a use which Crecquillon appears never to adopt in his motets or masses.

The question is therefore whether or not the two exceptions in Morales’s motets can also be distinguished from Crecquillon’s usage, or whether their presence undermines the point I am seeking to make. The two motets are Exaltata est and Regina coeli laetare. In both motets, the second voice is notated with a C1 clef in an otherwise normal high-clef combination. A degree of caution is required in commenting on the ambitus because in both motets the second voice-part is clearly chant-derived as an ostinato and also in the second motet used canonically as well. Both these factors may mean that the ambitus normally implied by this clef combination (if indeed any such ‘normal’ implication exists) is not necessarily displayed in these two motets. Nevertheless, in Exaltata est the voice-part consistently rises to within a tone of the top voice’s highest pitch and goes only one tone lower than its lowest. The range of the second voice is almost identical to that of the top voice in Regina coeli laetare too, except that it rises to within a minor third.
It seems that, in general, when such a clef combination is used in Crecquillon’s motets, a different relationship is implied between the voices represented by the two top clefs when compared with each other to that shown in the Morales motets, arising from a very different range displayed by the lower of the two voices. It may also be noted that there is a larger number of pieces, seven, with this type of clef combination. For instance, in Caesaris auspiciis, the difference in range is an augmented fourth at the upper end of the relative ranges and a fifth at the lower end. Similarly, in Domine demonstrasti, it is a fifth and sixth respectively. It is true that in two instances the upper range approaches to within a third, but never as close as a tone and not as consistently high, but the downward range is consistently larger than a tone, being never less than a fourth. That compares with Andreas Christi famulus where the upward difference is a fifth and the lower a fourth. This fits exactly into the pattern of Crecquillon’s motets, and seems distinct from the use within the two motets of Morales. Before we leave this point, it should be noted that another example of Crecquillon’s employment of this type of clef combination is in the Mass Domine Deus omnipotens. This may be of interest when the last point on this motet is discussed below.

The third feature is the opening point of the motet. It seems to refer briefly to the plainsong incipit for the antiphon whose text forms that of the motet’s prima pars. Both are given in Example 3.18. The notion that it is based on the chant rather than there being a chance resemblance is strengthened by the similarity of the opening to that of the setting of a similar text by Hesdin, also shown in that example, and by the mode of the motet. The correspondence between the opening of the eight-voice motet,
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Hesdin's, and the chant is in contrast to the slightly different version, presumably on account of a different chant tradition, displayed by Morales's five-voice setting of this text.\textsuperscript{84}

Next we may consider part of the text of the motet. Hudson noted that the final sentence of the \textit{secunda pars} varies from source to source.

The texts in the various sources are as follows:

\begin{itemize}
\item C4410 \hspace{1cm} \textit{Sancte Andrea, ora pro nobis.}
\item RegB 786-837 \hspace{1cm} \textit{O Jesu Christe, fili Dei, ora pro nobis.}
\item StuttL 3, 1564/01 voice 6 \hspace{1cm} \textit{Sanctus Andreas, gaudet in coelis.}
\item 1564/01 other voices \hspace{1cm} \textit{O Jesu Christe, fili Dei, gaudet in coelis.}
\item MunBS 1536 voices 2 & 8 \hspace{1cm} \textit{O Jesu Christi fili Dei, ora pro nobis.}
\item MunBS 1536 voice 6 \hspace{1cm} \textit{Sanctus Andreas, gaudet in caelis.}
\item MunBS 1536 voice 3 \hspace{1cm} \textit{O Andrea Christe famule, ora pro nobis. Amen.}
\item MunBS 1536 voice 7 \hspace{1cm} \textit{O Jesu Christe, ora pro nobis.\textsuperscript{85}}
\end{itemize}

It is probable that all the texts except that of Phalèse and MunBS 1536 represent an attempt to increase the utility of the motet for a broad range of religious sympathies in a more Protestant environment, where the text as given by Phalèse might be unacceptable. If that is so, then that in turn means that Phalèse had access to a source for the motet before it was amended. It could be argued that if the version printed by Berg and Neuber was amended by them, which it probably was, then that might mean that they too could have had access to a good source. However, the curious difference in one voice part, corresponding with the slightly earlier Stuttgart manuscript, suggests more strongly that their emendation was from a version already altered at least once from the presumed original, especially as there is no direct filiation.
between that earlier manuscript and the Berg and Neuber print. The version available to Berg and Neuber therefore appears to be further down the evolutionary chain as it were, and thus there might have been more opportunity for the composer attribution to become confused. That might add slightly to the weight that can be granted to the attribution of the Phalèse print. MunBS 1536 seems to present a special case in being derived, directly or indirectly, from Berg and Neuber’s print, but readapted for use in a Catholic institution.

The last feature to which I wish to draw attention is the ending of both sections of the motet. Each displays a slightly different but closely related decoration of the final chord. They are shown in Example 3.19. As with the cambiata figure, if we compare the motet with the motet repertoires of the two composers, we find that there is no really comparable example within Morales’s work. Crecquillon though has similar endings, but not so extended, in some of his motets. The eight-voice Pater peccavi (if it is by Crecquillon), Ave salutis janua, Congregati sunt, and Quaeramus cum pastoribus all show a tendency in the same direction.

However, it might be more instructive to compare the motet with an example of eight-voice writing by each composer. Morales though is not known to have left any eight-voice music, sacred or secular, not even in the Agnus Dei of his masses where an additional voice, or sometimes more, is customary. The only surviving eight-voice motet attributed to Crecquillon is Pater peccavi, also ascribed to Clemens, on which we have already commented, but there is one example of undisputed eight-voice writing by Crecquillon, the second Agnus Dei of his mass Domine Deus omnipotens. It is not just that there a family likeness in the endings of both parts of Andreas Christi famulus and the Agnus Dei (the ending of which is not derived from
Example 3.19

i) Andreas Christi: end of part 1
ii) Andreas Christi: end of pt 2
iii) Mass Domine Deus: end of Agnus 2

(transposed and with barring adjusted)
the motet model), but that there is a remarkable similarity between them which can
be seen better if the mass ending is transposed to the same pitch as the motet; that is
also shown in Example 3.19, and it may be noted that the mass has an unusual
cleffing like the motet. It appears from a comparison of these endings that it is likely
that the end of the Agnus Dei was directly derived from the motet, and the
ornamentation of the final chord expanded even further.

This is not the only self-borrowing that may have taken place. The opening of the
first Agnus Dei follows the motet model fairly clearly for a few bars. It then
diverges, and the bars which immediately follow have a considerable resemblance to
a section of Andreas Christi famulus, a resemblance not matched elsewhere within
the motet Domine Deus omnipotens. Whether this was a conscious borrowing or
ingrained technique that manifested itself in the similarity is not possible to
determine as the remainder of the mass seemingly has no further borrowings and
there is nothing systematic or, as far as one can tell, symbolic about the apparently
arbitrary use of a small section of the motet. 87 See Example 3.20.

However, with the apparently deliberate reworking of the motet ending for the mass,
the further similarity or borrowing, whichever it is, and the evidence of the points
of technique which strongly favour Crecquillon too, we can both reasonably assume
Crecquillon to be the composer of Andreas Christi famulus and provide a terminus ad
quern for it. 88 The mass can be dated accurately (provided the copyist of one of its
sources can be trusted). That source has an annotation dated 1554 indicating that the
mass was composed in 1546, the year of the Diet of Regensburg and of a colloquy
between the Catholic and Protestant sides of the religious disputes. Indeed, the scribal
note implies that the mass may have been written for such a major event, since
Example 3.20

i) Andreas Christi b. 103-8
ii) Mass Domine Deus b.12-7, Agnus 1
otherwise the date of its composition would be unlikely to be known and would be of no particular interest. 1546 was also the year of a meeting of the Order of the Golden Fleece, which occurred at the beginning of the year, before the Diet and colloquy. Given the evident connection between the two works and that Andreas Christi famulus seems to precede the mass, it is probable that Crecquillon composed the motet, to the patron saint of the Order, for the celebrations in 1546, and it would seem, if this motet is typical of the music used at meetings of the Order, that the later celebrations must have continued on the same lavish scale as the ceremonial connected with the earlier meetings of the Order.

Conclusions

This brief review of the attributions of a number of works suggests that the study of the problem undertaken by the editors of Crecquillon’s works in CMM can be supplemented in several respects. First, there are several other works with dual ascriptions; of these, Nos autem gloriari and Da pacem domine may be regarded as the most material, but the attribution of Christus factus est also seems less than entirely secure. Second, there is room for disagreement on the discussion in CMM of Pater peccavi (4 vv) and Quis dabit mihi pennas. Third, Domine ne memineris appears to be a separate work from Clemens’ setting, although it is still subject to a conflicting attribution to Hollander, although Crecquillon is the more likely composer. Fourth, the analysis of Quam pulchra es suggests strongly that the editorial leaning towards Crecquillon is misplaced, and that the work is by Benedictus. Similarly, the neutrality shown in CMM in the case of Verbum iniquum should perhaps be replaced with a leaning towards Clemens. Fifth, Salve mater salvatoris may be by neither Crecquillon or Clemens. Sixth, the editorial commentary on the precedence of Os
Ioquentium and Practicantes mali is also open to another view. The analysis of Andreas Christi famulus strongly supports Hudson's attribution to Crecquillon, and provides a likely date for the work of late 1545.

The incidental identification of Congratulamini mihi as the model for Guerrero's mass of the same name is also worth noting.
1. Ferer and Hudson (1996a) and Hudson and Ferer (1996c) cover the problem of attributions for the five- and four-voice motets respectively in specific notes, largely from the perspective of the sources. Hudson (1990) covered it within individual commentaries for the remaining eight-, six-, and three-voice motets. Both Walter (1975) and Marshall (1970-1) also gave authenticity some consideration, but CMM is generally to be preferred, being based on more complete information and the consequent identification of many more conflicting attributions than previously known. However, Marshall also usefully identified some errors of ascription made by Eitner (Marshall vol. 1, pp. 17-18). Beebe’s (1976) contribution from the perspective of her work on Clemens is also valuable; it is unclear to what extent it has been given weight in CMM.

Lincoln (1993) lists the motet *Sint lumbi vestri*, yet to be printed in CMM, as attributed to Simon Moreau in RISM 1558/05. That is based on the ascription in the superius part-book only. The other part-books and the index are unanimous in ascribing it to Crecquillon in line with its earlier publication in RISM 1554/05, and the ascription to Moreau in the one voice-part must be regarded as an error. There is a similar error in the following motet, not noted by Lincoln, where the motet *Quam pulchra es* is given to Clemens in the tenor part-book, whereas the other parts and the index ascribe it to Crecquillon, which suggests that the printer had some technical or proof reading problems which he had failed to overcome.

Créquillon; relié en cuir bai garni de cuivre.' The inventory was compiled in 1602.

3. Lincoln lists as anonymous a setting of the text *Peccata mea domine sicut sagittae* in RISM 1554/11. He notes that the index of the source ascribes it to Courtois. Lincoln fails to note that the bassus part-book also gives Courtois as the composer. The motet is stylistically very different from Créquillon's work. There is an anonymous setting of this text in RosU 52, a manuscript that also contains works by Créquillon; again, however, the style of the music is such as to preclude its consideration as Créquillon's lost motet.

4. Calahorra (1992) no. 343. It would appear that this and several pieces by Arnalte, Morales and Bricio were later additions to the manuscript concerned as they are all noted in the second inventory of sources compiled in 1570, but were not mentioned in the earlier but undated inventory also transcribed by Calahorra. There is an unattributed Marian Litany in GranCR (5), copied in the late 16th century at the Capilla Real in Granada. The piece is a simple harmonisation of the chant formulae, and as such, it lacks any distinguishing features. One might observe, though, that the manuscript is from a royal chapel where Créquillon's music might have remained in use (as demonstrated by its presence in GranAF 975 from the same city and of approximately the same date), and that the inclusion of the chant formulae themselves in the manuscript might suggest that it was not a local use. The extreme rarity of Litany settings is also striking. However, there are no grounds on which one could realistically attribute the work to Créquillon.

5. In the note in Ferer and Hudson (1996a) the editors indicated that they were unable to reach a conclusion on the authorship of this motet, but in the subsequent
volume containing the motet (1997a) the editors came down heavily in favour of Crecquillon as the composer. There is additionally the attribution in the tenor to Clemens mentioned in note 1. Ferer and Hudson reasonably discount that from the discussion.

6. The manuscript is DresSL 1/D/6.

7. The statement in the commentary on the mass by Hudson (1974a) is here repeated, that the cantus firmus is taken from Kain Adler in der Welt so schon by Jobst vom Brandt. I attempt to demonstrate later that the statement is incorrect.

8. The motet was published in Susato's Liber undecimus ecclesiasticarum cantionum (RISM 1555/9). It is included in Sherr (1997) vol. 18.

9. LonBL 35087, the Chansonnier of Hieronymus Lauweryn van Watervliet, which has been dated no later than 1509 by McMurtry (1989), includes two chansons one of which, Tout plain d'ennuy, is known to be by Benedictus from concordances; the composer of the second, Buvons ma comere, is given as Benedictus Appe[n]sc[h]elders, who may be the same person. The dating of this manuscript is not without its difficulty, because it contains a contrafactum motet by Mouton, Salve mater salvatoris, which includes the words 'regis nostro Karolo'. Whilst one can translate rex as ruler rather than as king, Charles assumed no position of authority until 1515 that would justify such a term being applied to him.

10. However, it has to be noted that Crecquillon used the same cantus firmus in a chanson, Belle sans per, and introduced variants from the form used in his mass.
However, for the purpose of the present argument, the consistency between the two versions exhibited in the motets and the mass, and the fact that the variants in the chanson are different from both versions, suggest that the point is valid.

11. It is unlikely that one could attribute this difference in cantus firmus treatment to the different requirements of a motet and a mass. One might expect that the mass, with its comparatively extended musical periods, would use a more conventional augmentation of the cantus firmus. In fact, what exists is the other way round. I ascribe a symbolic meaning to the layout of the cantus firmus in the mass, when it is discussed in a later chapter. The chanson by Crecquillon presents the cantus firmus in the same note values as in his mass.

12. Sherr (1997) p. xxi makes the point that, in the Susato volumes of motets he reprints, pieces in high clefs use $g''$ sparingly: ‘it is generally treated as a special case, reserved for dramatic purposes... or sometimes avoided altogether.’ The complete avoidance of it for modes with finals on $g$ or $c$ is rare in Crecquillon’s motets; in the five-voice motets, even those in mode 5 use $g''$ far more often than they avoid it, and there are instances of $a''$ in two motets. It does not appear either that Crecquillon always uses the extremes of the upper range particularly sparingly, though it has to be admitted that the mass uses $g''$ fairly infrequently. Equally though it would be difficult to regard its use in the mass as exemplifying Sherr’s ‘special case’ suggestion. Benedictus uses the full modal octave in his motet *Ave verum corpus*, which is in mode 7.

13. Typical of the few motets in this mode that have such a downward extension would be *Christus factus est* (Ferer and Hudson (1996a)) where, in a two part motet
of 99 bars in normal transcription, the fourth below the final is touched once.

14. Printed in Sherr (1997) vol. 18. Aspice Domine presents some interesting points for a discussion of its use of mode. The motet is included in Susato's 11th book of Ecclesiasticarum cantionum, which contains motets than can be assigned to mode 6. Sherr assumes that the final is f, that is, the final bass note. That accords with other motets in the collection which all have finals on f with one flat or on c with no signature. The contrapuntal cadence though appears to be on c. It is unusual insofar as such cadences are usually on the fifth above, not the fourth below, the final in the tenor. However, this is forced on Benedictus by the cantus firmus. It would be impossible to regard c as the final in the light of the melodic and cadence patterns of the piece as a whole, which support a final on f. The cadence then is unusual, and Susato seems to have in effect ignored it in assigning the motet to the same mode as the other pieces in the collection. The free use of the authentic range in the tenor voices without any corresponding shift in the outside voices is also of interest.

(Powers (1981) notes one exception within this particular collection: Hollander's Congratulamini mihi, actually almost certainly by Crecquillon. It is difficult to agree with Powers's view that the assignment 'must have been made solely on the basis of the opening melody, without regard to the finals or to other parts of the piece', see Powers p. 469 and p. 456. The piece seems in almost every respect a 'typical' mode 6 motet.)

15. Walter, vol. 1, pp. 110-111, drew attention to unusual features in the motet but was apparently unaware of the attribution to Benedictus. He noted that 'imitative counterpoint occurs only at the beginning of the motet.... Thereafter, a system of free counterpoint is to be found in which the individual voice lines bear little
resemblance to one another. Also unusual in this motet is the apparent rhythmic stratification between the three upper and the two lower voices..... Thus what results is a motet that is seemly unique in this [Crecquillon's] repertory.' Examination of the motet does not quite bear out Walter's comment on the relationship of the voices. There are several recognisable points of imitation, but they are certainly handled very loosely. However, his unease with the authenticity of the motet seems well justified.

16. The exception is the secunda pars of Da pacem domine, where only three of the four other voices enter before the cantus firmus.

17. I have doubts from the style of Sicut lilium as to whether it is correctly ascribed to Crecquillon, but there is no evidence to suggest any alternative ascription. It is in Walter (1975) vol. 3.

18. That is not to say that Crecquillon never opens a motet with an exordium that is at odds with his eventual final. Salve crux sancta (Marshall (1970-1) vol. 2) is an instance where he does. Nevertheless, the opening is still clear and consistent within itself.

19. Even in the extension to final cadences, it is rare for Crecquillon to use the unadorned alternation of two notes, although on occasion he does so, as in Christus factus est, for example (but which may in any case be by Lupi).

21. Walter vol. 3.

22. See Blackburn (1987) pp. 73 & 107 for the listing of the motet within the
inventories for these manuscripts. It appears from Blackburn’s study that a number
of contrafacta were made at Treviso for the demands of the local liturgy. She suggests
that 1575 is the earliest likely date for the compilation of Ms 29 (p. 34) and that
Ms 30 dates from a few years prior to that (p. 45). Blackburn identifies Crecquillon
as the composer from other sources.

23. Walter lists a single variant in his critical commentary on this motet, vol. 1,
pp. 309-10.

24. Göllner (1990) states that Kriesstein’s prints contain numerous first
editions and unica by German and Netherlands composers. A review of the listings in
Lincoln for the 1545/3 print bears this out. It is reasonable therefore to regard
Kriesstein’s attributions as generally trustworthy.

25. *Nos autem gloriari* is printed as a work of Lupi in CMM 84/2; it is also in
as Crecquillon’s, and did not include it in her later CMM edition of Lupi’s works.

26. Walter vol. 1, pp. 138-43 discusses sectional repetition in the five-voice
motets.

27. That is not the end of the apparent confusions on the sources for this motet.
Lincoln (1993) lists it as anonymous in RISM 1555/12. Lincoln also records an
ascriptions to Crecquillon in RISM 1553/12, whilst Hudson and Ferer (1996b) record 1553/12 as ‘Incertus autur’. Lincoln appears to be in error.

28. The text set by both composers (with minor differences, which may have arisen in the course of the later transmission of the motets) was discussed by Dunning (1970) pp. 195-200. He associated it with the Entries of Philip of Spain into the Netherlands. The text is directed to, and seems more suited to, an occasion glorifying the Emperor Charles but as Dunning pointed out, Charles accompanied Philip on some of his Entries. We will see later that the iconography of some of the Entries gave prominence to Charles as well as Philip. Crecquillon’s motet is in Ferer and Hudson (1997b).


30. Precisely which manuscripts have the attribution to Crecquillon is not noted in CMM. However, two lute tablatures can be identified which contain motets with the same textual incipit, both with Crecquillon’s name attached. They are LonBL 29246, and LonBL 31992. The reference to three sources in CMM may be an error.

31. Now that the motet has been identified as a separate work, Professor Barton Hudson intends to include it in a later volume of the CMM Crecquillon edition. The original is a five-voice work, although the note on its authenticity is in the first volume of the CMM edition of the four-voice motets.

32. Hofman and Morehen (1987) ‘Crecquillon’ note a similarity between the
Crecquillon setting and the setting by Hollander. When allowance is made for the fact that the lute tablatures omit the highest voice, it can be seen that the works are in fact the same. It may also be noted that this motet was attributed by Fellerer to Canis, and included in the list of Canis's doubtful works by Rudolf (1977) pp. 522-3. There seem to have been no strong grounds for that particular attribution, which apparently was not based on the evidence of any source ascription, and may be disregarded.

33. See Wagner (1980b). Wagner mentions the possibility that Hollander is to be identified with an earlier composer, Jean de Hollande. That requires an assumption of a change of name, and the most probable explanation for the sources which give both names is simply confusion when Hollander's music first was printed in 1553. It is noticeable that after 1553, this particular problem of attribution or identity ceases.

34. See below, in the discussion on Andreas Christi famulus, for an example of the apparent accuracy of attribution from the Paston group of manuscripts, in an instance where the musical text appears to have been taken from an incorrectly-attributed source.

35. Marshall vol. 3, p. ii noted in the critical note on the latter that Os loquentium had the same music as part of Practicantes. He did not pursue the point further. Hudson and Ferer (1997c) present only Practicantes; both versions are in Marshall vol. 3.

36. In a review of volumes 6, 7 and 11 of CMM in Ham (1997), I incorrectly suggested that the Clemens attribution of Os loquentium had been overlooked by the
editors. It was not apparent until the subsequent issue of volume 12 that it had been included under *Practicantes mali* which, in that form, does not have a dual attribution.


38. The correspondence in the openings is suggested in Lincoln. Blackburn (1995) also made the point not noted by Lincoln (because it appears in a manuscript source) that *O Virgo Generosa* exists in an alternative version: *Ave stella matutina*. Dr Bonnie Blackburn has also pointed out to me that Crecquillon seems very fond of this opening. She instances *Congregati sunt* (Hudson (1990)), *Dum aurora* (Hudson and Ferer (1996b)) and *Quid gloriar i* (Hudson and Ferer (1997c)). However, I have found no comparable use as an internal point.

39. See Meier (1988) pp. 244-7 for a discussion which might lend support for such a reading.

40. Dr Bonnie Blackburn has commented to me on the strangeness of both texts which she regards as anomalous. As she says, when a text is a compilation, one may guess that a specific point, and probably a contemporary one, is being made; that it sounds deliberately biblical gives it a veneer of respectability. She also remarks that 'practicantes' is medieval Latin.


42. The two other motets with attributions to Crecquillon are *Gabriel angelus* and
Surge illuminare Jerusalem. The two motets apparently appropriated by Phalèse from other composers are Laqueus contritus est by Gombert and Super montem excelsum by Manchicourt. Curiously, this latter also exists with attribution to Crecquillon. Whilst Beebe (1976) and Hudson and Ferer (1996c) ascribe the motet to Manchicourt on the strength of its earlier appearance in a 1539 print by Attaingnant (RISM M269), neither mentions the fact that the print seems to have been seen through the press by Manchicourt personally, thus removing the last element of doubt. See Heartz (1969) no. 85 and Appendix, Document 10.


44. The key variants which suggest that neither Scotto nor Phalèse was taken from Susato are: (i) bar 46.4 altus: c in Susato, b flat in the other two, where the point in other voices suggests strongly that c is an error; (ii) bar 17.3 superius, g in Susato, f in the other two, which appears correct. The full listing of variants is in Beebe pp. 418-26.

45. Beebe classified and discussed the motet as mode 4 transposed, relying, it would seem, on the last bass note as the indicator of the final. That seems to be less likely in the light of the overall cadence pattern and the melodic material than the mode I suggest. However, in some respects, the cadence pattern is less clear than is often the case within Crecquillon’s works, which may serve to reinforce the point I make in this paragraph.

46. Beebe comments: ‘An outstanding characteristic of Crecquillon’s style was the
clarity with which modal practice influenced his melodies and the harmonic structures of his motets', p. 363. As a generalisation, her view is one that can only be supported.

47. Motets of Clemens which appear to end on the confinal include Accesserunt ad Jesum (CMM 4/16), Fuerunt mihi (4/15), Jerusalem surge (4/13), Hoc est praeceptum (4/15), Inclita stirps (4/9) and Lapidabant Stephanum (4/12). This is by no means a complete list, and compares with Crecquillon's otherwise total observance of the modal final (in contrapuntal cadence terms) at the ends of his motets, with the exception of one work where the final is determined by the cantus firmus; see the next note.

48. In Te Deum laudamus (Walter vol. 3) Crecquillon ends on a pitch other than the final. This is forced on him by his cantus firmus. In any event, this motet is in a deuterus mode in which endings on the fourth above the final are not unusual. This motet is discussed briefly in Chapter 4.

49. On the basis of their argument, Hudson and Ferer do not present an edition of this motet. It may be found in CMM 4/20 and Marshall vol. 3.

50. Both prints have an doubtful f in the altus as the first note of bar 114 (Scotto)/113 (Phalèse), but there are sufficient other variants to make it unlikely that Phalèse derived his version from Scotto, e.g. ligatures in Phalèse are not in Scotto - bars 65 superius and 92 (91) altus, and bar 65 altus a e semibreve breve/a breve. There is an error in Marshall's transcription in bar 113, where the last two crotchets should be minims. See Beebe pp. 417-8 for the full list of
variants.

51. The motet is printed by Kempers and Maas in the opera dubia of Clemens, CMM 4/21. They suggest that the original attribution was to Gheerkin. It seems to me that Clemens’s name was the original. That is confirmed by Jas (1997) p. 193, and also by Professor Kellman. It is unclear which was the second name. Professor Kellman suggests probably Crecquillon’s, whilst Jas suggests Gheerkin’s. Additionally, Professor Kellman suggests that the hand in which Clemens’s name is given the second time may be early 17th century. I am grateful to Professor Kellman for making a copy of his notes on the inscriptions available to me.

52. Pierre Phalèse (i) may even have been dead by the time that the 1576 collection was printed. He had entered into some form of association with Bellère in 1570. Both factors may have affected the care with which the 1576 collection was compiled, especially if the earlier dubious attributions had been deliberate on Phalèse’s part.

53. Hudson (1990) could not identify the text of this motet. It is a prayer with a number of uses in Holy Week, most prominently in the Good Friday liturgy. It was retained in translation in the Book of Common Prayer as the first of the Good Friday collects.

54. The cantus firmus is an ostinato which, as is frequently the case, is used at two different pitch levels, reverting to the original level at the end of each section.

55. The cantus firmus of the second half of the motet is a retrograde of the first
half, and ends on the fifth above the final.

56. See the critical commentary, Ferer and Hudson (1997b) p. xxviii.

57. I thank Professor Barton Hudson for alerting me to this motet, and for sharing his doubts about the authorship of it.

58. In Hudson and Ferer (1996b) and (1997c) respectively.


60. Marshall vol. 1, p. 20. The title pages of this series of prints are almost identical apart from the number of voices and the book number: 'Motetti del Laberinto....Sacrarium cantionum sive motettorum Thomae Cricquillonis, Clementis non Papae, aliorumque praestantissimorum auctorum...'

61. The motet does not appear on the list of pieces with conflicting ascriptions in Hudson and Ferer (1996c). On the basis of the argument presented here, Professor Hudson will omit it from CMM. It is printed by Marshall vol. 3.

62. Eitner (1877) p. 136 says that volume one was devoted to works by Hieron[ymous] Carlo Reggiensi.

63. Vander Straeten vol. 8, pp. 364-83.

64. Hudson and Ferer (1997c) p. xxvii.
65. *Virgo ante partum* is in Marshall vol. 2. I have, however, noted earlier my doubts on the authenticity of *Sicut lilium*.

66. See the Critical Commentary p. xlii in Ferer and Hudson (1996a) for the list of sources.

67. Spanish sources containing works by Crecquillon include GranAF 975, TarazC 8, ToleBC 13, VallaC 17 and PueblaC 19.

68. La Hèlle's mass was based on Crecquillon's motet *Nigra sum*; Rogier's on *Dirige gressos meos*. See also chapter 1 note 3 for other composers who wrote imitation masses on works by Crecquillon.

69. There are of course the double-choir compositions of Willaert, Jachet and Phinot, but within the Imperial orbit the multi-voice compositions of Gombert seem to be very much an exception and are only a small part of Gombert's total output.

70. For example, the motet is listed under Morales's name in the work-list in Stevenson (1980) and edited in MME by Anglés. It is also in Hudson (1990).

71. I have difficulty with Hudson's reasoning on *Andreas Christi famulus*, which was to prefer Crecquillon because of the work's appearance in Phalèse's 1576 collection, Hudson (1990) p. xxi. However, he adduced no evidence to show that this particular collection was reliable in all its other ascriptions, and even if it had been (which it is not) that could only be persuasive at best, but by no means conclusive in
the case of an individual motet. It might be thought that a single-composer collection may imply greater care in its preparation than an anthology. Conversely, in the case particularly of a posthumous collection, it may imply the opposite: a willingness to give the composer the benefit of any doubt in order to be able to present impressive pieces of music. The scrupulousness or accuracy of earlier Phalèse attributions is seriously questioned by the case of the 'Clemens' motets already discussed.

72. On the polyphonic music for meetings of the Order, Prizer (1985) discusses repertoire at meetings rather earlier than those for which Crecquillon could have written pieces. Likewise, Haggh's (1995a) discussion does not cover the period when Crecquillon was active.

73. Brown says in his Introduction to the facsimile edition of the three volumes of Berg and Neuber's *Novum et Insigne Opus Musicum* (RISM 1558/4, 1559/1 and 1559/2): 'Indeed, it is the notorious unreliability of their attributions that has drawn the most scholarly attention to this anthology', Brown (1986) p. xii. There are undoubtedly areas where there is truth in that statement such as some of the motets printed under Josquin's name, but to apply such a negative view to all their ascriptions would be to distort the picture considerably. Incidentally, Brown himself misread the index in attributing the four-voice motet *Cantate domino canticum novum* to Courtois, when it is actually unascribed and known from concordances to be by Carpentras.

74. For instance, as Brown (1986) p. xi points out, the collections mentioned in note 73 contain, apart from the large number of motets by Clemens, far more music from Imperial composers such as Isaac, Senfl, Gombert, Crecquillon andVaet, than
from any other identifiable source. Additionally, the five-voice print is the only 
source for Crecquillon's motet on the death of Elizabeth of Poland, Cur Fernande 
pater, and for several pieces by Vaet. As noted earlier, the sources of Berg and 
Neuber's repertoire might be a topic that would repay further research.

75. The manuscript is now in Berlin, Preussische Staatsbibliothek. It was 
apparently copied in Breslau.

76. MunBS 1536 is dated 1583. Its variants make it clear that it is derived from 
Berg and Neuber, and in addition, the manuscript contains other works apparently 
copied from RISM 1564/1-3.

77. Hudson notes a distinctive variant which is shared by 1564/1, RegB 786- 
837 and LonBL 29247. See the critical commentary to the motet, Hudson (1990) p. 
xxi. There is a further source uncollated in CMM, a lute tablature, OxfBT 340, which 
ascribes the work to Crecquillon. It is however linked with LonBL 29247, and 
therefore offers no independent evidence.

78. This is based on a review of those motets published by Anglés in MME and 
excluding two pieces extant only in instrumental versions. I have excluded masses 
from consideration because of the possibility of distortion arising from the conscious 
copying by the composer of stylistic traits of the model. Crecquillon's use of the 
cambiata, whilst capable of being distinguished from Morales's, is common in the 
work of his contemporaries from the Low Countries. The use by Morales of a motet by 
Gombert, for example, as a model for a mass may therefore have "tainted" Morales's 
normal style.
79. There is a difference between editions. The critical commentary in Hudson (1990) notes that all sources except StuttL 3 have c as the penultimate note i.e. with no cambiata. MME, transcribed from an unidentified exemplar of 1564/1, has b. The British Library copy of 1564/1 gives c in line with Hudson's commentary. Whether or not MME is correctly transcribed, StuttL 3 is the earliest source and c may represent a modernisation by the printer at some stage.

80. The preparatory clef for the fourth voice in MME is shown incorrectly as C2.

81. The same applies mutatis mutandis to the high clef combinations. An example in high clefs would be Domine demonstrasti (Hudson and Ferer 1996b) with clefs of G2, C1, C2, C3 and C4.

82. The motets are printed in Anglés, vol. XX, nos. 10 and 23.

83. One might wonder if the ambitus is almost the same why a different clef from the first voice should be used for the second voice. It is possible that it arises out of nothing more than a scribal quirk, though one is reluctant to make that assumption. The use by Crecquillon of unusual clef combinations is too extensive, and the ambitus of the voices generally too distinctive, to explain in that way.

84. There appear to be few settings of this text. Hesdin's is the only other motet listed in Lincoln (1993) beginning with the same words. Hudson (1990) suggests that the antiphon melody is alluded to more widely within the first section of the motet. I would be less confident, at least on the basis of the form of the chant given in
LU, that it is clearly referred to, except for the opening point. However, the motet is in mode 8, which is the mode of the chant, and a mode which Crecquillon uses rarely. In the majority of those few instances when he does use it, it is when he is utilising chant. That in itself adds weight to the likelihood of chant being quoted. It is also noticeable that Morales too uses mode 8 infrequently, only once (and then somewhat ambiguously in terms of the opening point and the ambitus of the two modally leading voices) in *Sacerdos et pontifex*. His five-voice setting of *Andreas Christi famulus* against which we are making this comparison is in mode 7, but the melodic emphasis on the opening ut-fa is uncommon in this mode, which again supports the suggestion that it is chant-based. Additionally, Stevenson (1961) p. 74 comments that 'exact literalness in quoting a plainsong being always a cachet of Morales's style'.

85. MunBS 1536 contains only five of the original eight parts. I have referred to them by the voice-parts in Hudson's edition to facilitate comparison.

86. The manuscript is thought to have originated at the Augustinian monastery of St. Zeno, Bad Reichenhall in Bavaria.

87. Is it possible that Crecquillon was writing these pieces more or less contemporaneously and using *cartelle*, and that he might have used work already done and in front of him where it allowed him a short-cut? That might account for the similarity across several voice-parts between a section of the mass, and bars from the middle of the motet which appears, from the borrowing of material from the endings, to predate the mass.

88. There is one further point that could be argued in favour of Crecquillon’s
authorship. In the few pieces with two bass parts of Morales and Crecquillon, there appears to be an observable difference in their technique as measured by the pitch of entry of one bass voice in relation to the other. Morales tends to have more frequent entries on intervals other than the unison (or octave) and fifth. The available sample is too small and the possibility in Morales's case of distortion of his normal technique to follow the style of a model too great to place much reliance on the results of such an observation if they were to stand alone, but as added confirmation of the direction of the other stylistic points, it may be taken as a small makeweight.

89. See note 86 in chapter 2 on the annotation.
The incorporation of pre-existing material into motets, whether as a cantus firmus or in some other form, seems to have been a comparatively little-used technique by the time of Crecquillon and his contemporaries. Before considering in some detail the context and meaning of a small number of works by Crecquillon using pre-existing material, I want to look generally (but not exhaustively) at Crecquillon's use of borrowed material in other pieces to see what conclusions, if any, can be drawn about the significance of its use.¹

Six motets attributed to Crecquillon use a cantus firmus, and of these, two are also attributed to other composers: *Quam pulchra es* and *Da pacem domine*. *Quam pulchra es* is more likely to have been composed by Benedictus, and is not discussed in this chapter; *Da pacem domine* may be by Clemens or Crecquillon.² Approximately twenty more motets seem to involve some form of chant paraphrase or quotation, the latter rather more frequently than the former, even if sometimes the original form of the chant cannot now be traced.³ In addition to these, there are two motets that stand apart from the rest: *Quaeramus cum pastoribus* based on a motet by Mouton, and *Philippe qui videt me* which uses both chant and other material. (The latter will be discussed in chapter 5.) From these bald figures, it can be seen that the extended use of pre-existing material is relatively infrequent in Crecquillon's motets, but taking account of the quotations, borrowings are possibly slightly more common than Beebe found in the comparable corpus of Clemens's motets.⁴ As we might expect, in every case the material used is taken from chant, with the one exception already mentioned.
Having excluded *Quam pulchra es* from the discussion, there are five remaining motets which use a conventional cantus firmus as their method of employing chant. Four of these are five-voice motets, one is for six voices. We may infer from the lack of four-voice motets with a cantus firmus that Crecquillon, in common with other composers of the period, preferred to maintain a reasonably full texture as the basis of these works, something that would be more difficult to do with only three voices in addition to the cantus firmus; certainly, his normal technique is to employ the cantus firmus only when all the other voices have entered. In addition to what they may disclose about the use and significance of borrowing, these five motets also give pointers to Crecquillon's treatment of mode.

Two motets, *Da pacem domine* and *Congregati sunt*, are related both in terms of the general sentiment expressed by their texts, and in their use of a cantus firmus drawn from the same source. The text of *Da pacem domine* speaks of a longing for peace, something that in the often turbulent and troublesome times of Charles V's rule as Emperor must have been close to many hearts:

```
Da pacem domine in diebus nostris sustinentibus te ut prophetae tui fideles inveniantur: exaudi preces servorum tuorum et plebis tuae Israel. (P.t. 2)
Fiat pax in virtute tua et abundantia in turribus tuis. Propter fraters meos et proximos meos loquebar pacem de te: propter domum domini Dei nostri quaesivi bona tibi.
(Give peace, Lord, in our day to them that patiently wait for thee, that thy prophets may be found faithful: and hear the prayers of thy servants, and of
```
thy people Israel. (Pt. 2) Let peace be in thy strength: and abundance in thy

towers. For the sake of my brethren, and of my neighbours, I spoke peace of

thee. Because of the house of the Lord our God, I have sought good things for

thee. Walter)

The cantus firmus is taken from an antiphon for peace (LU p. 1867), repeating the

plea 'Da pacem domine in diebus nostris', 'Give peace, Lord, in our day', a number of
times. The plainsong is given in a slightly ornamented form, rather than in a literal
transcription, similar for instance to Brumel's setting. See Example 4.1. There is no
apparent pattern to the statements of the cantus firmus and the opening and closing
notes of the two phrases of the cantus firmus vary in length between some of the
repetitions. Minor details of the cantus firmus also change slightly in several
instances. It is also noticeable that the cantus firmus does not define the cadence
pattern of the work. From these small points it would appear that Crecquillon did not
amend his technique of simultaneous composition to accommodate the cantus firmus.
The impression given is of the cantus firmus being adapted and incorporated
according to the requirements of the general polyphonic fabric, rather than acting as
a fixed framework around which the polyphony is built.

If the influence of the cantus firmus on the overall structure of the piece seems
negligible, it would appear that the musical influence of the cantus firmus on the
motivic content of the motet is also limited. The opening point of the motet makes
reference to it, particularly to the opening three-note cell 'Da pacem', even stating
its first six notes clearly in the bassus without any ornamentation. The second part of
the motet also opens with the same three-note motif, this time to the words 'Fiat
pax', 'let there be peace', reflecting the opening of the chant. Beyond these, there is
Example 4.1

i) Brumel: Da pacem - cantus firmus (1520/1)

ii) Crecquillon: Da pacem - cantus firmus (pt.)
little observable use of the cantus firmus to provide melodic material. However, there are three further references which, taken in conjunction with the opening of the two sections, seem designed to emphasise subtly the crux of the text. See Example 4.2. The three-note cell is used to begin the phrase ‘ut prophetae’ where the text is: ‘that thy prophets may be found faithful’. It similarly appears for the phrase ‘exaudi preces’, ‘hear the prayers’, in the most immediately audible voice, the superius, and in the small extension of the cell a few bars later on ‘et plebis tuae’, ‘and of thy people’, lending weight to the request for peace directed to the Almighty. The lower voices use it for the words ‘servorum tuorum’ at the same time. These congruities between the cantus firmus and other parts of the musical texture may seem fortuitous, but we shall see that there are similar examples in three of the next four pieces.

The mode of the motet is transposed mode 2; the original chant is also in mode 2. Crecquillon shows considerable freedom in his use of the chant by retaining it at its original ‘pitch’, i.e. untransposed, and placing it in the altus part. Thus the modes of the chant and the motet, whilst the same, begin and end on different pitches. This means that the chant paraphrase emphasises three pitches d, f and g. The original final of the chant on d becomes the confinal of the motet, whose final is g. Crecquillon tends to avoid clear cadences on f which ends the first phrase of the cantus firmus, presumably to reduce the tonal disturbance that would otherwise occur from the use of a cadence pitch outside those normally found in his works in this mode. At the end of the first part of the motet, the cadence is on the confinal, but it is interesting to see how, at the end of the entire piece, the approach to the cadence is constructed to avoid the possibility that the last note of the cantus firmus could be approached with a raised leading note, and thus mislead as to the true contrapuntal final. See Example
Example 4.2

i) Da pacem b. 21-3 (superius)

ii) b. 47-8

iii) b. 53-5

et ple - bis tu - ae Is - ra - el
A comparatively large number of other pieces use the same text as *Da pacem* or a similar one. It was one of the most popular texts to be set in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, no doubt a reflection on the understandable preoccupations of people of the time. The majority of these settings use the chant in some form, whether as a cantus firmus or by paraphrasing it, and a number do both. Crecquillon’s motet should, therefore, be seen as a contribution to an established type, rather than as an isolated example. However, his particular treatment of the cantus firmus is extremely unusual.

*Congregati sunt inimici* has several similarities with *Da pacem domine*. The text expresses similar sentiments, but this time with more than a suggestion of urgency, no doubt caused by the exigencies of war:

```
Congregati sunt inimici nostri et gloriabantur in virtute sua: contere
fortitudinem illorum domine et disperge illos: ut cognoscant quia non est alius
qui pugnet pro nobis nisi tu Deus noster. (Pt. 2) Tua est potentia tuum
regnum domine: tu es super omnes gentes: da pacem domine in diebus nostris.
Creator omnium Deus terribilis et ortis justus et misericors.
```

(Our enemies have gathered together, and they boast of their power. Destroy their strength, O Lord, and scatter them, that they may know that no one fights for us but thou, our God. (Pt. 2) Thine is the power; thine is the kingdom, O Lord; thou art above all peoples. O Lord, give us peace in our days. Creator of all, fearsome and strong, just and merciful. CMM)
Example 4.3

Da pacem: b. 131 to end

\[\text{quae- sivi bo- na tibi, bo- na tibi.}\]

\[(d)i(-b)us no- stris.\]

\[(bo)n(a t)i- bi, quae-si- vi bo- na ti- bi.\]

\[(qua)si-vi bo-na ti- bi, bo-na ti- bi.\]

\[qae-si-vi bo-na ti- bi, bo-na ti- bi.\]
Through this, the cantus firmus runs:

Da pacem domine in diebus nostris: quia non est alius qui pugnet pro nobis
nisi tu Deus noster.

(O Lord, give us peace in our days, because there is no-one else that fights for
us but thou, our God.)

The cantus firmus is from the same antiphon as that used for *Da pacem domine*. In
this instance, Crecquillon uses it in its entirety, unadorned or undisguised by any
paraphrase or ornamentation. Again, although it does not determine the structure,
the cantus firmus is deployed in an interesting manner. In the first part, it is
transposed to the same written pitch as the motet (mode 2 transposed with one flat,
with an additional flat in the bassus), but in the second part of the motet the cantus
firmus is transposed up a fifth from its pitch in the first part (alternatively, given
at its original untransposed pitch), with similar effects to those seen in *Da pacem
domine*. The conclusion of the motet is again constructed to exclude any possibility of
the final of the cantus firmus being heard as the final of the piece as a whole.9 See
Example 4.5.

We also see a similar intensification of the message of the text, this time by the
selective transfer of motives from the cantus firmus to the other voices when the
text coincides with the cantus firmus text, and on a slightly more extensive scale.10
In the first part of the motet, the final phrase beginning 'quia non est', 'for there is
none other', reflects the chant, most clearly at 'qui pugnet pro nobis', 'who fights
for us'. See Example 4.6. In the second part, the final phrase beginning 'da pacem',
'give peace', starts each time with the three-note cell which begins the chant.
Example 4.4

Congregati sunt: final cadence of c. f.
Example 4.5

i) Congregati sunt - part of c. f.

\[\text{qui pugnet pro nobis}\]

ii) b. 64-6 (superius)

\[\text{qui pugnet pro nobis}\]
Although this text, too, was popular with composers, the number of surviving settings is rather smaller than in the case of *Da pacem domine*. There is less consistency, too, in the use of chant in those remaining versions. Hudson points out the resemblance between Crecquillon’s setting and one by Verdelot, as Verdelot also uses the chant *Da pacem domine* as a cantus firmus. One other setting is similar in that regard, that by Leonardo Barre. The Verdelot and Barre settings were published in the 1540’s, and it may be that Crecquillon was aware of them when he wrote his setting (or vice versa). The works do not display any other connections or similarities which would justify regarding them as linked to any greater degree.

It may be worth considering very briefly the purpose of transposing the chant in these two works, especially as the three remaining cantus firmus motets display no similar treatment in their use of the chant. Motets which present a cantus firmus in canon not infrequently do so at two pitch levels. However, there is no such mechanism operating in these two instances. It is sometimes the case that modal irregularity within works is for an affective purpose, in some way to illustrate facets of the text being set. These irregularities are usually at the level of detail rather than affecting the work as a whole. However, there are examples which suggest that more wholesale modal peculiarities may equally be designed to reflect the text. If we look at Crecquillon’s technique in these two motets in that light, we may perhaps see it as an attempt to suggest symbolically some of the confusions and troubles of war by the deliberate mixing of two pitch levels.

*Veni in hortum meum* inhabits a different world of feeling from the two motets discussed so far. It has a text from the Song of Songs, and the Marian intention of
the words is made explicit by the cantus firmus, the opening of the well-known Marian antiphon *Salve regina*. In this instance, it is difficult to find any link between the cantus firmus and the other voice parts. There is no clear assumption of melodic material, not even to add emphasis to small elements of the text in the manner we saw earlier. The cantus firmus does not point the text by the timing of its entries, nor are its entries at cadence points that would draw attention to itself. It seems almost detached from the remainder of the work. Nevertheless, the very familiarity of the chant must have acted as a focus for the listener, and perhaps Crecquillon considered that nothing more was required to make it effective.

The cantus firmus though may not be as innocent of further significance as it at first appears. Each part of the motet contains two statements. Two was widely regarded as a number symbolising the move from the Old Covenant to the New, the old man to the New Adam, from the earthly to the heavenly. It was a commonplace in pictorial art. That symbolism would be particularly appropriate in the context of the allegory of the Song of Solomon, where the earthly bride from the Old Testament was understood to signify the heavenly mother of the New, and the mystical bride of the Church.

The fourth motet to use a cantus firmus is *O virgo generosa* with a text in honour of Saint Christine, which also exists in a version with a Marian text, *Ave stella matutina*. This motet uses a litany formula with the text ‘Sancta Christina, ora pro nobis’, ‘Holy Christine, pray for us’, as the cantus firmus. (The same phrase is introduced at the end of Crecquillon’s four-voice motet for Saint Cecilia *O Virgo gloriosa*, but there it does not serve as more than a quotation.) The opening of the chant is characterised by a rising fifth, moving to the sixth and back. Crecquillon bases his opening point on the chant, but the only place that he adopts a rising fifth
elsewhere at the beginning of a phrase is on the word 'audi', 'O hear'. Similarly, only once does Crecquillon appear to reproduce the fall of a fifth in the middle of the chant. He does so in the superius with a phrase not precisely matched in the lower voices, which seems deliberately to echo the chant whilst the word being sung is 'gloriosa', which, in a motet to the glorious virgin Cecilia, may once again be taken as a subtle underlining of key words by the use of material from the cantus firmus, whilst the remainder of the musical texture remains separate; Example 4.6.

The last motet with a cantus firmus is *Te Deum laudamus*. The text is not the text of the *Te Deum* canticle, but one influenced by it: 18

Te Deum laudamus te Jesu benedicimus te regem regum benedicimus
confitemur te crucifixus colimus gloriosum dulcem et amabiliem
redemptorem qui nos aspertione tui sanguinis abluisti; dignus es domine
accipere laudem tuam benedictionem et honorem. (Pt. 2) Exultet tibi omnis
caro et glorificet nomen tuum humilietur omnis facies pedibus tuis omnis
creatura serviat tibi laudet et extollet in aeternum.

(We praise you God; we bless you King of kings; we bless you Jesus; we acknowledge you, Lord; we cherish you who have been crucified, you the glorious, sweet and beloved Redeemer who purified us with the sprinkling of your blood; you are worthy, Lord, to receive praise, benediction and honour.
(Pt. 2) Let every man rejoice in you who are esteemed, and glorify your name, and let every face be humbled before your feet, and may every creature serve and praise and extol you forever. Walter)

In the earliest source for the motet, it is headed 'Gratiarum actio', 'an expression of
Example 4.6

i) O virgo generosa: part of c. f.

ii) b. 24-6 (superius)

iii) b. 16-8 (superius)
thanks', recalling the traditional use of the *Te Deum* itself on occasions of particular joy or thanksgiving. It was, for instance, used to mark the births of royal children.\(^{19}\)

The cantus firmus is the incipit of the traditional *Te Deum* chant used as an ostinato, on which Crecquillon builds his opening point. The ostinato is given five times in the first part of the motet, and three in the second part. Whilst that disposition may simply reflect the differing amount of text to be set, and the corresponding lengths of the two parts, there may again be some symbolism intended. The central element of the first part of the text is Christ's crucifixion, and our purification by the sprinkling of his blood. That would bring to mind the five wounds of Christ suffered on the cross, and from which the purifying blood flowed. Popular devotion to the five wounds of Christ was widespread and considerable. We need not doubt that the five-fold repetition of the cantus firmus would have been understood to be symbolic of the Passion. The three repetitions of the second part would probably have been taken as representing either (or both) God the Trinity to whom thanks were being given, or the holiness to which the redemption, by the crucifixion and purification talked of in the first part, allowed man to aspire.\(^{20}\)

There seems to have been a mystical connection between the Passion and the Trinity to be discerned from some medieval writing.\(^{21}\) Compare Crecquillon's text with this from Julian of Norwich's very first revelation:

...I saw the red blood trickling down from under the garland...just as it did at the time of His passion...who suffered for me.....At the same moment the Trinity filled me with heartfelt joy... 'Benedicite Domine' I said.\(^{22}\)

The melodic outlines of the chant are less distinctive than those of *Sancta Christina*, and accordingly it is more difficult to be sure when the chant is being alluded to, but
the clearest exposition in other voices is at the phrase 'dulcem et amabilem Redemptor', 'sweet and beloved Redeemer', showing yet again the intensification of a key element of the text, especially when taken in conjunction with the opening also dependent on the chant. See Example 4.7.

The motet can best be categorised as mode 3 or 4, following the Te Deum chant itself.23 Deuterus modes often carried an affective ethos very much removed from the joy and thanksgiving of the Te Deum or of this motet text. They were frequently used for instance for funeral motets.24 It is interesting to note how Crecquillon deals with this difficulty. Firstly, the cantus firmus and the entire piece are transposed up a fourth. Transposition was commonly thought to alter the basic affection of a mode, so that, as in this case, a conflict of modal affection and text could be avoided.25 Secondly, Crecquillon constructs his cadences on degrees that allow him to avoid the characteristics of Phrygian cadences which one might expect to find in this mode. There is no clear cadence pattern that would lead, in the absence of other factors, to the conclusion that this was a piece in a deuterus mode. By these two means, Crecquillon effectively negated the ethos of the mode of the chant and of the motet itself.

Additionally, the final cadences at the end of each part are similar to those we have observed in the first two motets discussed (Da pacem domine and Congregati sunt inimici). The portion of chant used by Crecquillon ends a fourth above the final; the first cadence is a clear cadence on d, a regular cadence note in these modes transposed, whilst the second cadence seems to avoid the same by using a point of imitation which, if followed strictly, would preclude the approach to the final by way of the smallest interval. If ficta is applied to achieve that, then the phrase as a whole
Example 4.7

i) Te Deum: cantus firmus

\begin{music}
\begin{pmatrix}
\text{Te De um lau - da} - \text{mus}
\end{pmatrix}
\end{music}

ii) b. 33-5 (superius)

\begin{music}
\begin{pmatrix}
dul - cem et a ma - bi - lem
\end{pmatrix}
\end{music}
has an unsatisfactory shape. See Example 4.8. It may be suggested that Crecquillon was deliberately trying to avoid associating the last note of the chant with the modal final. In all three of these motets where the last note of the cantus firmus does not coincide with the modal final of the motet, Crecquillon appears to find means to make the difference clear.

Three of these five motets are works which appear from their texts to represent highly formal and serious responses to important events such as war and communal thanksgiving. Perhaps we can see the use of the cantus firmus, which in each case is closely linked to the text of the motet, as a means of adding solemnity by the invocation of the common identity of the Christian commonwealth and the Church. At moments of great peril or great rejoicing, we can see the Emperor's role as God's elect, the defender of the Church militant, being emphasised by the use of the ancient songs of the Church. At the detailed level, contrary to what we sometimes see elsewhere, the cantus firmus is not used to import or imply a significance beyond that conveyed by the text itself. Rather, it appears to emphasise the basic thrust of the motet text by reference to a chant which acts not as the focal point of the music, but largely of the text alone. The essential message of the text is in several cases reinforced by a subtle interplay between the cantus firmus and the remaining musical fabric.26

Similarly, the use of a cantus firmus in the motet to St Christine with its repetition of the calling on the saint to pray on behalf of the worshippers suggests not a work for the day-by-day observances of the calendar, but something of major importance to some community in which St Christine played a leading role as local or patron saint. The cult and worship of the Virgin was so widespread that, without the other
Example 4.8

Te Deum: end of final c. f. statement

![Musical notation]

lau - det et ex - tol - let in ae - ter(num)
(ex)tol - let ti - bi, lau - det et
(lauda) - - - - mus.
ser - vi - at ti - bi lau - det et
lau - det et ex - tol(let)
examples, it would be difficult to read into Veni in hortum meum the elevation of intent implied by the use of the cantus firmus. Nevertheless, with those other examples in mind, we are probably right to assume that it too represents some occasion of particular solemnity for the community in which it was first performed.

Paraphrase motets

Among the motets which paraphrase chant are four which have several features in common, and may therefore be conveniently considered together: Veni creator spiritus, Accende lumen sensibus, O lux beata trinitas, and Te mane laudum. All survive in a single source, a choirbook dating from 1548, ErlU 473/2, copied at the Cistercian monastery in Heilbronn. The texts of all four of these motets are verses taken from hymns. Veni creator spiritus sets the first two stanzas of the Pentecost hymn, whilst Accende lumen sensibus has for its text the fourth verse of the same hymn. O lux beata trinitas and Te mane laudum set the first and second verses respectively of the hymn O lux beata trinitas. This hymn had two liturgical uses, at Vespers on Saturdays, and as a Trinity hymn for Vespers or Lauds. In each motet the tune of the liturgical hymn is clearly paraphrased extensively.

The manuscript as a whole is a collection of music for Vespers, largely drawn from printed sources. Both pairs of motets by Crecquillon with texts from the same hymn are placed together in verse order, and the Trinity motets follow closely the Pentecost ones in the liturgical procession. It is evident from the ordering of the manuscript that the latter were intended to be used for the Feast of Trinity itself, rather than for Saturday Vespers (at least, in this context). However, if these motets are in reality hymns, then they do not appear to conform to the traditional
alternatim approach, providing polyphony for alternate verses, either odd or even, nor in either case do they present a through-composed version. Moreover, the index to the manuscript lists the works as separate items.

It is possible that Crecquillon composed these settings of various hymn stanzas as separate motets, with them being brought together to do duty in place of hymns, but this seems unlikely for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the fact that all four paraphrase their respective plainsong hymn tunes. No other identified examples exist within Crecquillon's works of motets based on hymn verses containing chant paraphrases. Additionally, each of the motets has an unusual but similar clef combination, with an apparent mix of high and low clefs. As there is only the single known source for these motets, it cannot be determined whether this clef combination is the result of a scribal alteration at some stage to an earlier conventionally-cleffed source or the faithful transmission of the original source. A comparable clef combination only appears once elsewhere within Crecquillon's motets, in Da pacem domine, the correct attribution of which is still in doubt. Unless a result of scribal idiosyncracy, which is improbable, these odd clef combinations also suggest that there may be some connection between the two motets for each liturgical occasion, and possibly between all four motets.

The problem of the index may be dismissed fairly quickly. Within the manuscript, two other hymns, both by Dietrich, also have individual verses identified in the index as separate items. As these appear to have been taken from a printed source which makes no such distinction, there seems to be no particular significance to be attached to the way in which the index was compiled.
There are several indications in the manuscript that what remains does not represent the original form of these pieces, but that the manuscript presents them in a form in which the original has been adapted, possibly to reflect or conform to some local liturgical practice. *Veni creator spiritus*, for instance, is in two parts, each setting one verse. The music for each verse is identical, and the notation almost identical too (i.e. in the placing of ligatures and the use of coloration). It is therefore probable that the music of one verse was at some stage in its transmission underlaid with the text of the other in addition to its own. That would have been normal practice in alternatim hymn settings in order to provide polyphony as necessary for additional verses for those hymns long enough to require it, and where the composer had provided no separate setting, but it is unusual to find consecutive verses provided with music in that way. In any event, that does not indicate which verse was the original to be set.

In the case of *Veni creator spiritus* there is sufficient evidence in the manuscript to suggest not only that it was verse two which was the first of the two stanzas to be set, but also that it was the writer of the manuscript who carried out the exercise of underlaying the other verse. The first detail we may note is an error in one voice-part in the text to the first verse. The passage is shown in Example 4.9. Only the third voice part includes the word ‘*donum*’, and at a place where the prevailing point of imitation would suggest ‘*mentes*’, the beginning of the second line of the verse. The beginning of the corresponding line in the second verse is ‘*donum Dei*’, and it looks as though the scribe incorrectly wrote ‘*donum*’, taking it from the second verse; also in Example 4.9. Possibly realising his error, he did not add ‘*Dei*’ but did not correct or delete the word that he had already written. In addition to this error, it may be noted
Example 4.9

i) Veni creator - verse 1 (tenor)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{do} & \quad \text{num} & \quad \text{men} & \quad \text{tes} & \quad \text{tu} & \quad \text{o} & \quad \text{rum} \\
\text{do} & \quad \text{num} & \quad \text{De} & \quad \text{i} & \quad \text{al} & \quad \text{tis} & \quad \text{si} & \quad \text{mi}
\end{align*}
\]

ii) verse 2 (tenor)
that in the hymn the distribution of syllables between the words of the second line in the first and second verses is different; verse one has ‘mentes tuorum visita’ (2, 3, 3), whilst verse two has ‘donum Dei altissimi’ (2, 2, 4). Where the error occurred, we can see that the words ‘donum Dei’ of the second verse fit the four-note phrase well, a syllable a note, whereas because of the different division of words and syllables only ‘mentes’ from the first could have been inserted. That in itself is not impossible, but it is improbable given the paraphrase of the chant involved, that phrase being the first four notes of the second line of the hymn tune. Similarly, in the upper voice, ‘mentes tuorum’ requires the ligature derived from the chant to be ignored to provide sufficient notes for the syllables, something that is not needed in verse two where the ligature is observed. Additionally, if we ignore some of the underlay as given in the manuscript and follow the hints given by the chant paraphrase itself, then again we find that verse two fits the music rather more satisfactorily than verse one at several other points, e.g. the setting of ‘altissimi’. See Example 4.10.

Those details show that verse two was the likely original, and that the first stanza was probably underlaid by the writer of the manuscript. It seems reasonably clear that Veni creator spiritus and Accende lumen sensibus represent a single original alternatim hymn, not two separate motets, and that it reached its present form whilst being copied into the manuscript at Heilbronn. Quite how the hymn would have been performed is unclear, because the normal performance sequence in hymns, of alternating verses in chant and polyphony, has been broken, and whether the other verses not underlaid in the manuscript would have been chanted, sung or even omitted, is not hinted at.
Example 4.10

i) *Veni creator* - verse 1, b. 21-5 (bass)

```
vi - si - ta, vi - si - ta
```

ii) verse 2, b. 68-72

```
do - num De - i al - tis - sii mu. al - tis - sii mu
```
If the two pieces of *Veni creator spiritus* and *Accende lumen sensibus* form a single hymn, the same is likely in the case of *O lux beata trinitas* and *Te mane laudent*, and a similar problem of performance exists. The original hymn had two verses and a doxology only. We might have expected that polyphony would have been provided for verse one and the doxology, or for verse two only. Instead, the manuscript gives both verses in polyphony, but gives no indication of how the doxology is to be treated. It seems most unlikely that the doxology would be omitted. The most plausible suggestion is that the doxology would be sung to polyphony too. In that case, the entire hymn would be in polyphony. If that were to be so, then we could surmise that *Veni creator spiritus* might also have been performed in the same manner, with polyphony throughout, although we would have to guess at the disposition of the four- and five-voice options over the various verses. Perhaps the four-voice setting would have been used for the first three stanzas and the five-voice from verse four, *Accende lumen*, to the end.

The five-voice setting of the second stanza rather than the doxology for *O lux beata trinitas* may suggest that, whilst it was placed for use at Trinity in this manuscript, its original use was for Saturday Vespers. It was the liturgical custom for the doxology used to change according to the season. Thus for Trinity, the hymn would have one fixed doxology, the season being constant, whilst for Vespers each Saturday its doxology would change a number of times through the year in accordance with the prevailing season.

*Honor, virtus et potestas* is one of a small number of other motets that appear to paraphrase chant. The text is that of a responsory associated with Trinity (although it may have had a use at All Saints). I have not been able to trace the
precise form of chant used by Crecquillon, but there are more than sufficient similarities with the version of the responsory from the Sarum Processional, f. 116v., for us to be sure that the motet does indeed use a related chant. The chant is apparently used very extensively: the texture is apparently saturated with chant-derived material, but Crecquillon still seems to make an effort to intensify even further the impact of the text. For instance, the opening words ‘Honor virtus et potestas’, ‘honour, strength and power’, appear in one voice-part or another almost continuously through the opening nineteen bars. Thereafter, the words ‘et imperium’ and ‘unitate’ also stand out from the general texture; both are given at some point in minimis in the upper voice, clearly quoting the chant. See Example 4.11.

Walter identified the motet Sint umbi vestri as a paraphrase of the chant proper to the text’s liturgical use as a responsory for the Common of Confessors. 40 It is Crecquillon’s only other definitely identified paraphrase work. 41 There is one further work which I believe is a chant paraphrase (or at least may be quoting chant), but cannot yet trace the chant concerned. Laudem dicite Deo is on a text normally associated with All Saints. Walter considered that there might be a relationship with a mode 5 antiphon chant to these words, but only a single phrase can be identified in that manner, and the motet appears to use chant more extensively. 42 As Walter also noted, the chant normally associated with this text and the motet are in different modes. The motet is in mode 3, one very rarely used by Crecquillon. When he does use it, it is usually for sad or sombre texts, such as Cur Fernande, a memorial motet, or Respice quaesumus, a Holy Week collect on Christ’s passion. Laudem dicite is very much out of character with motets such as these, and it is much more likely that any chant was a local one not known from surviving sources.
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Example 4.11

i) Honor virtus b. 17-20 (superius)

ii) b. 28-30

iii) b. 46-8
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Given that four of the paraphrase motets have been shown almost certainly to be two hymns, there are fewer paraphrase motets than those having a cantus firmus. The hymns fall into the conventional pattern of hymn settings in their use of chant paraphrase, but the question arises as to the significance of the technique in the other three motets. In the case of *Sint lumbi vestri* the text would have served, by definition, for any saint who, within that category of the Common, was unprovided with a specific office. It is likely therefore that it would have been used in the veneration of a saint with a strong local cult. The paraphrase could be seen to convey a similar degree of importance to that we can deduce from the use of a cantus firmus for Saint Christine.

The case of the two remaining motets is slightly less straightforward. From the use made of borrowed material so far, we could conclude that it is likely that the text of *Laudem dicite Deo* must have had some significance beyond its currently-known liturgical use to be composed in that manner (if our conjecture on its use of chant is correct). That possibility seems to be confirmed by another motet, the text of the first part of which is almost identical to Crecquillon's motet. Pieton's *Laudem dicite* appears in an Antwerp publication (RISM 1542/7), and is there specifically designated as proper for Easter. That Easter, the most important festival of the entire Church year, was also an occasion on which the use of chant was considered appropriate is clear from a motet by a companion of Crecquillon's in the Imperial chapel. Payen's *Resurrectio Christi* uses a chant cantus firmus, *Surrexit Christus spes nostra*. This might well account for the apparent use of chant by Crecquillon in a context that is not dissimilar to that suggested for the previous works. Additionally, if the liturgical use of the text was unusual, then it may well have been associated
with a different chant from that which survives from other sources.\textsuperscript{45}

Honor \textit{virtus et potestas} is slightly different. We know that the devotion to the Trinity was a popular one, particularly in the Low Countries and in England, and that the Trinity had a special place as Imperial patron too.\textsuperscript{46} However, that would hardly seem to account for the lack of comparable settings for other major liturgical feasts.\textsuperscript{47} So far, the motets discussed have fallen into two group: those connected with major communal events such as war and thanksgiving, and those equally connected to communal events but on a different scale, by being centred on the veneration of particular saints or on the resurrection of Christ.

It is possible that \textit{Honor virtue et potestas} represents the worship of some community such as a guild with the Trinity as its patron. However, a more attractive possibility arises from the place that this text is known to have had in the liturgies of the reception of rulers. This text was first recorded as having been sung at the Entry of Duke Philip of Burgundy and his wife Margaret into Bruges in 1384. Thereafter, the Bruges ceremonies were apparently unaltered for some considerable time.\textsuperscript{48} When we see (and hear) the emphatic repetitions in the opening of Crecquillon's setting of the words 'honor virtue et potestas' and the weight given to the words 'et imperium' and 'in unitate', it is quite easy to see how this motet could be suitable for such an occasion when the Emperor Charles made an Entry into some city or other.\textsuperscript{49}

\textbf{Quotations}

Not all chant use is as immediately apparent or so extensive as in those works
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discussed so far, where the chant appears as a cantus firmus or in an extended paraphrase. There are several motets which use chant in the form of relatively short quotations. The status of such chant quotations has been the subject of some debate, but as we will see, the majority of those identified below seem incontestable.\(^50\)

The first example of a motet that includes a chant quotation is *Salve salutis unica spes*.\(^51\) The text, the origin of which has not been traced, is a prayer to the Virgin of a particularly fulsome sort. The text is:

Salve salutis unica spes et solamen tristium; salve mitis salve pia omnis boni plenissima; salve Deum quem concipis semen virile nesciens fructus honoris sext tibi productus a te flosculus. (Pt. 2) Salve caeli dignissima regina caeli quae choros sublata super arduos miras preces non despiris; te nunc or dignam tui iram; relaxa filii irae morte praessum criminis irae farcina praeoccupet.

(Hail, sole hope of salvation and comfort for those who mourn; hail, gentle and devoted one full of every good; hail, you who, without knowing the male seed, conceives God, the distinguished fruit brought forth from a little flower. (Pt. 2) Hail, most worthy queen of heaven who, extolled in heavenly choruses, does not scorn our strange, laborious prayers; I pray you now, abate your deserved anger; let the burden of your sorrow outweigh the provocation to anger caused by the death of your son. Marshall)\(^52\)

Despite the invitation presented by the opening 'Salve', Crecquillon begins his motet with a subject that appears to owe nothing to the familiar *Salve regina* incipit, but the sequence of entries through the prima pars is almost as though Crecquillon is
teasing his hearers: the first entry has a downward second, but no upward turn; the appearance of the word 'salve' a second time opens with a four-note figure, but one which descends a fourth, not a fifth; he later begins a new point that finally presents what might be taken as the Salve incipit, but with different words. See Example 4.12. Whether this was deliberate or not, and if deliberate, the result of a conscious unifying device, we can only conjecture, but he certainly makes use of chant quotations in the secunda pars. Here Crecquillon unmistakeably employs the Salve incipit, using semibreves for emphasis. He reverts to chant quotation at the words 'regina caeli' moving from one chant to another, this time Regina caeli. Again, the quotation is emphasised by being stated in semibreves, and each quotation is used as a point of imitation. It is presumably for that reason that Crecquillon quoted the second chant, as the continuation of the Salve regina may have been too complex melodically for such concise treatment and reference, even if it would have continued to be recognisable. It will be seen that, for the word 'Salve', the chant figure is detached from the phrase continuation in three out of the four voices, which ensures its audibility. Similarly, in at least one voice, the phrase 'regina caeli' is set apart from its continuation, presumably for the same reason. See Example 4.13.

The reason, if there is a substantive one, for the avoidance of the Salve incipit at the opening of the motet when it is used so prominently later is difficult to pin down precisely, especially as Crecquillon then quotes two different chants in rapid succession. It is possible that he considered that the impact would have been dissipated by a quotation right at the outset, whereas the later appearance when the general nature of the text would have become clear to the listener would have allowed the references to make a greater impact. That would be particularly so if the sequence of entries shown in Example 4.12 had been deliberately contrived as a
Example 4.12

i) Salve salutis: superius entry b. 7-9

\[ \text{Sal} - \text{ve} \]

ii) b. 42-4

\[ \text{sal} - \text{ve mi} - \text{tis} \]

iii) b. 78-9

\[ \text{se} - \text{men vi} - \text{rile} \]
Example 4.13

i) Salve salutis b. 101-6

\[
\text{Salve caeli dignissima.}
\]

ii) b.112-117

\[
\text{(dignissima regina caeli.}
\]

\[
\text{regina caeli, regina caeli,}
\]

\[
\text{regina caeli, regina caeli.}
\]
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heightening of the hearers' expectations. There does not appear to be any reason to be derived from the text alone. The opening of the second part was about as near to the heart of the motet as possible, so perhaps there is an implication that reference was at the heart of the text.

The *Salve regina* was a particularly well-known chant. The evening *lor* service sung in a number of churches was centred on the singing of it, as the popular name for the service of the 'Salve' would imply. These services sometimes included the singing of motets, and it is possible given the nature of the text and the chant quotation that the motet was written by Crecquillon to be performed at such a service.

The intention of the quotations seems to be to draw the hearer's mind to other texts which would have been familiar to the hearers in a way that perhaps the text of the motet may not have been, to deepen and enlarge the meaning of the work. And if the listeners could not understand the text, as some might not have done, then the musical quotations would have given a reference point that could have aided the devotions of all present, not just those who understood Latin. That would again suggest the motet's place within a popular service of devotion.

A second example of chant quotation can be seen in the motet, *Domine Deus exercitum*. The text of the first half provides little opportunity for chant quotation, having no known liturgical use and no words that provide a ready reference to other chants; it is as follows:

> Domine Deus exercitum qui sedes super cherubin: tu es Deus solus tu fecisti coelum et terram; inclina domine aurem tuam et audi; aperi oculos tuos et
vide.
(Lord God of armies who sits above the Cherubim, You alone are God; You have made heaven and earth. Incline your ear, O Lord, and hear; open Your eyes and see.)

However, the second part brings the motet to the crux of the text, which is not self-evident from the first part. It is:

Salva nos de manibus inimicorum nostrorum ut cognoscant omnia regna terrae quia tu es Deus solus.
(Save us from the hands of our enemy so that all the kingdoms of the earth may know that You alone are God. Marshall)

This motet expresses similar sentiments to *Da pacem domine* and *Congregati sunt inimici* discussed earlier. It is perhaps then no surprise that Crecquillon takes the opportunity to incorporate a chant quotation that must have been familiar to the hearers of the motet, *Salva nos domine*, the antiphon for the canticle at Compline, Example 4.14. The procedure he adopts is similar to that in the previous motet. His opening point of the second part is formed from the chant cell, with the upper voice giving it in longer note values. The chant is then emphasised by the bassus entry and even more by the tenor giving it in breves, before the next point of imitation takes over. Again, the gloss being suggested on the text is fairly self-evident; the text of *Salva nos* is: ‘Save us O lord waking, guard us sleeping, that awake we may watch with Christ and asleep we may rest in peace’.

The text of the second half of the motet, like the first, has no identified liturgical use.
Example 4.14

Domine Deus b. 85-90 (superius)

\[\text{Sal - va nos, sal - va nos}\]
That is also true of *Salve spes unica*. It seems unlikely that these texts would have been compiled without the possibilities of the references being implicit and intentional.\(^{56}\) We need therefore to regard these motets as less simply settings of pre-existing texts, but much more as deliberately conceived unities, where the text is constructed to allow the composer to illustrate musically the textual implications; they are almost miniature sermons in music. Perhaps we could see them as a musical analogue to the sermons for the unlettered contained in the stained glass of many churches.

These two motets tend to support Fromson’s contention (1996) that chant quotations would occur at significant structural points within a work, but that is not always so in Crecquillon’s motets. Two others in particular illustrate a different approach, one of working the chant reference into the general contrapuntal fabric of the motet as a point of imitation at a moment removed from a structural point. Both, and it is unlikely to be coincidental, quote the same chant. Crecquillon's motet *Virgo ante partum* has a text which again has no identified liturgical use, but which is a statement of Mary’s perpetual virginity (and may therefore have been intended for the Feast of the Purification or for another Marian occasion):

\[
\text{Virgo ante partum, Virgo in partu, Virgo post partum inviolata permansit, et matrem se laetam cognoscit quae se nescit uxorem.}
\]

(The Virgin remained inviolate before, during, and after childbirth, and knew herself to be a happy mother who herself had not known her husband.\(^{57}\)

The word ‘inviolata’, from the body of the text, opens of one of the most popular of Marian sequences, *Inviolata integra et casta es Maria*.\(^{58}\) The sequence, liturgically
proper for the Feast of the Purification, was also relatively popular as a motet text, no doubt influenced by the ubiquity of the sequence; settings exist by Josquin, Festa and Gombert amongst others. Many of the motets use the chant incipit, even when they make no more extensive use of the chant. The opening of the sequence chant is given in Example 4.15. The text of the sequence refers prominently to Mary’s continuing virginity, and it seems that the coincidence of the word in the text being set with the opening word of this sequence was sufficient for Crecquillon to make a musical allusion to the chant incipit. But as we shall see, the allusion is not a passing one; it is deliberately contrived in several respects.

Example 4.16 gives an extract from the motet. When Crecquillon reaches ‘inviolata’ in his setting, it is clear that he goes out of his way to draw attention to it in several ways. The previous section, ending with the words ‘post partum’, is drawn to a cadence on g, the final of the motet which is mode 2 transposed. From there, by means of the point of imitation beginning in the second voice at the cadence, Crecquillon leads into the next section. That point is similar to, but does not match, the chant incipit, having a semitone only between the second and third pitches, but it can be seen as a bridging mechanism to move the prevailing pitch level for the next set of entries. That enables Crecquillon to achieve the series of seven entries beginning on f and b flat which are his main focus in this part of the motet; the point beginning on d is used only twice more, once to enable a short passage of fauxbourden to be constructed, and once prior to the next structural cadence at the end of this passage which brings the music back to a cadence on the pitch of the mode’s final, g.

The seven entries of the quotation are probably intended to be symbolic; of all the number symbolism that exists, the association of Mary with seven is one of the
Example 4.15

Opening of Inviolata chant

\[
\text{In} \quad \text{vi} \quad \text{o} \quad \text{l} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{ta}
\]
Virgo ante partum b. 30-48

Post partum

Post partum inviolata

(Vir)go post partum

Post partum inviolata

Inviolata permanuit.

Inviolata permanuit, inviolata permanuit.

Inviolata permanuit, inviolata permanuit.
inviolata
permanet.

inviolata
permanet.
strongest and most common.\textsuperscript{61} It is likely also that the brief passage of fauxbourdon is more than just a passing feature of the contrapuntal texture. Fauxbourdon was frequently used symbolically too, and that short passage in fauxbourdon is no doubt intended to symbolise the Holy Ghost, especially as it appears precisely at the point where all three upper voices are singing the word 'inviolata', the only moment in the motet that they do.\textsuperscript{62} It is unclear whether there is any affective intention in the choice of the mode for the piece as a whole, but the mode chosen certainly throws into relief the entire passage that has been discussed.

A similar example to the quotation in \textit{Virgo ante partum}, though one rather better integrated into the musical fabric, may be observed in the motet \textit{Cum inducerent puerum Jesum} with a text from the Feast of the Purification.\textsuperscript{63} The text of the second part of the motet is as follows:

\begin{quote}
Senex puerum portabat puer autem senem regebat: quem Virgo concepit, quem Virgo peperit et post partum Virgo inviolata permansit.

(The old man carried the boy, the boy however ruled the old man: whom the Virgin conceived, to whom the Virgin gave birth, and after the birth, she remained Virgin.)
\end{quote}

The second section of this text is a similar statement of the belief in Mary's perpetual virginity to that in the text of \textit{Virgo ante partum}, and again therefore closely linked in its ethos with the sequence \textit{Inviolata}. The end of Crecquillon's setting is given in Example 4.17. The motet in this instance is in mode 1 transposed (i.e with the final on g), allowing a more natural integration of the chant quotation into the texture without the need for the manipulation that was evident in \textit{Virgo ante}}
Example 4.17

Cum inducerent: b. 110 to end
partum. It will be seen that here again the majority of entries of the *Inviolata* quotation are on $f$ and $b$ flat, but there are still entries on $d$ which cannot reproduce the chant incipit without alteration to accommodate the major third that it spans. The texture, as might be expected at the end of a piece, is relatively full, but reason for the entries on $d$ seems to be that a similar form of symbolism to that in *Virgo ante partum* is being employed, though more subtly, despite the additional voice part and denser texture. The three lower voices at the first statement of ‘inviolata’ still seem to be using fauxbourdon, although the rhythmic displacement of the second voice makes it less immediately obvious. Similarly, at the homophonic repetition of the word in the four upper voices, the lower three voices again make the same symbolic point about the mystery of Mary’s continuing virginity by the same means. Then, to round the piece off, there is the repetition of the chant quotation as part of the cadential extension. Not only is it in the most audible place in the highest voice, but pointed up by being preceded by a rest.

These two examples demonstrate that the chant quotation need not necessarily be at a structurally significant point such as the opening of a motet pars, although it is possible to consider the ending in the second of the two examples as such.\textsuperscript{64} The quite evident manipulation of the musical fabric, particularly in *Virgo ante partum*, and the similarities in the introduction of the chant incipit between the two motets, with the common symbolic use of fauxbourdon, suggest that these chant quotations are by no means incidental (or even accidental), but quite deliberately contrived to convey a particular point. It must therefore be concluded from these two pieces that, for well-known chants at least, it is unlikely that their presence in a work by quotation would pass without notice, however integrated with the musical text they might be. Again, the point may be made that these musical allusions were clearly designed to enhance
the understanding of the text and its theological context, rather than being purely musical conceits.

These two motets quote a chant that was undoubtedly well known. Other examples of chant quotation from chants unconnected with popular devotion seem difficult to pinpoint when they are not made evident by some means such as those we have noted so far. The motet *Congratulamini mihi* provides an example of one that can be identified. This motet is on an Easter text, and Fromson (1996) used settings of this particular text to show that there was no evident chant quotation, deliberate or accidental, in the many settings she examined, which included Crecquillon's. The point to which I wish to draw attention occurs quite near to the end the motet. (The motet is in responsory form and both music and text at this particular point of the work are the same in both sections of the motet.) The text of the motet refers to Mary Magdalene weeping at the tomb, and the appearance to her of the risen Lord. Each part of the motet concludes with an Alleluia. There is at the point at which the Alleluia starts an upward theme that could have been derived from the opening motif of the motet. It is also similar to the Alleluia of the Mass for the Paschal vigil, *Confitemini*. The melodic coincidence is not extended, but is readily apparent. We may be disinclined to accept such a relatively short passage as a deliberate quotation, but there are a number of reasons to suggest that we should. First, there is a marked similarity in the motif that Crecquillon uses with another work based on the same chant. Sheppard wrote a polyphonic setting of *Alleluia Confitemini*, the start of which is also shown in Example 4.18. Second, if the resemblance to the chant is chance, it is serendipitous that it should be to a chant not just proper to the same liturgical season, and with a text that illuminates the text of the motet so happily, but one for the first mass of Easter, which fits precisely with the text of the motet. The words of
Example 4.18

i) Congratulamini: b. 80-2

![Music notation for Congratulamini]

ii) Alleluia: Sheppard (after Harrison ex. 171)

![Music notation for Alleluia]
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the Alleluia, the first verse of Psalm 135, are as follows:

Confitemini domino quoniam bonus quoniam in saeculum misericordia eius.

(O give thanks unto the Lord, for he is gracious; and his mercy endureth for ever. BCP)

Reference to it reminds us that the crucifixion and the resurrection were the means by which God's saving grace and mercy were made effective to man, and that the events celebrated in the Easter story were theologically the once-and-for-all act of redemption that would last for ever. Moreover, the quotation comes at the end of the section on the text 'while I was weeping at the tomb I saw my Lord', the crucial and first moment of the revelation of the resurrection and the new order that it heralded from the Easter story. It provides the perfect match for the Alleluia text.

There are also musical reasons to suggest that this reference is not a result of chance. Example 4.19 gives the passage in the context of the section that leads up to it. Two details will be noticed. First, the only point at which the quotation is given clearly is in the highest voice. Nowhere else does this precise motif appear; similarities are inexact, and still the prevailing movement of the other voices is downwards, as in the previous passage. It is not therefore a normal point of imitation, but it comes in the most prominent or audible voice. Second, the previous passage draws to an obvious cadence despite the careful dovetailing of the one passage into the other. The combination of that downwards movement and the cadence throws the sudden upwards leap of the next phrase into prominence to a far greater degree than just its appearance in the highest sounding voice would otherwise do. One may also suggest that the sequence in the earlier section may well require the addition of ficta.67 That
Example 4.19

Congratulamini: b. 73-84

vi di Domi num me um, vi di Dom

vi di Domi num me um, vi di Domi

vi di Domi num me um, vi di Domi

vi di Domi num me um, al le

vi di Domi num me um, al le

vi di Domi num me um, al le
too, if ficta was intended by Crecquillon, would help make the quotation with its reversion to the intervals of the exordium particularly telling.

In this instance, the final section setting the 'alleluia' is not extended. It would be difficult to regard the point at which the quotation occurs as structurally significant. We have seen how Crecquillon appears to contrive to make it musically significant, but the true significance is again in the text associated with the relevant chant, and its interaction with the motet text, not in the music. In the light of this, as well as the two previous motets, it would appear that such quotations may appear at moments which are significant in the text as well as, or rather than, in the musical structure.

Other quotations

I want to mention three other motets very briefly: Virgo generosa, Andreas Christi famulus and Surge Badilo. All reinforce one of the associations of chant use or quotation that we have noted: the association with saints and the Virgin. We have inferred that a degree of special significance was attached to these particular works which differentiates them from the general run of Crecquillon's other motets, and which was signalled by the use of borrowed material. It would be interesting to see if these three remaining motets support the thrust of the argument. The first is a motet with a text to St Cecilia. We have already noted the fact that it quotes the same litany phrase as the motet to St Christine. In this motet, the phrase is used as the culmination of the motet which ends with a display of particularly active part writing. This deliberate show of bravura would have been appropriate for use on the Saint's day so closely associated with musicians, especially in the Low Countries.

See Example 4.20.
Example 4.20

Virgo gloriosa: b.147 to end

\[\text{Sancta Cecilia, Sancta Cecilia, Cecilia, Sancta Cecilia, Sancta Cecilia} \]

\[\text{(Cecili)li a, Sancta Cecilia Cecilia o} \]

\[\text{Sancta Cecilia, Sancta Cecilia, Sancta Cecilia, Sancta Cecilia} \]

\[\text{(Cecili)li a, Sancta Cecilia Cecilia o} \]

\[\text{Sancta Cecilia, Sancta Cecilia, Sancta Cecilia, Sancta Cecilia} \]

\[\text{(Cecili)li a, Sancta Cecilia Cecilia o} \]
It has already been suggested that *Andreas Christi famulus* was written for the meeting of the Order of the Golden Fleece in Utrecht in January 1546. The motet is distinguished by particularly sonorous eight-part writing. It quotes the opening of the antiphon which provides the motet with its text. Saint Andrew was the patron of the Order as well as the patron saint of Burgundy, and the small chapter of the Order was held on his feastday. His importance to the Order hardly needs stressing.

The third motet, *Surge Badilo* is very much the antithesis in one sense of *Andreas Christi famulus*. The latter was associated with an order which represented the highest echelons of society: the Emperor, kings, and the highest nobility were its members. Saint Badilo however was an obscure saint, one whose cult seems to have been very limited. The text is:

"Surge Badilo et nostras Christo preces aperi, tua vox est dulcis in aurem Domini, vitam mundam quam duxisti, hoc in terris seminasti quod in caelis messuisti. (2nd pt.) Transfer nos ad amoena paradisi, qui requiem meruisti fine carentem adipisci."

(Rise up Badilo and open our prayers to Christ; your voice is sweet in the ear of the Lord; that which you sowed on earth, the pure life which you led, is that which you have reaped in heaven. Bring us to the pleasant places of paradise; you who have deserved rest, attain it without end. - Walter adapted)

Yet the two works are alike in one respect. We could expect that the patron saint of such an order as the Order of the Golden Fleece would have been venerated with all the customary magnificence that characterised the meetings of the Order, and the formal
occasions of the Imperial court. Yet whatever community venerated Badilo had acquired in some way a five-voice motet by Crecquillon of considerable size (the motet is 147 bars long) which appears to quote chant, although I have been unable to trace the precise chant involved. Its apparent use of the chant is similar to several of the other motets discussed i.e. it is key words which are emphasised, particularly those asking for Badilo’s intercession with Christ on behalf of those praying, to bring the faithful to paradise. See Example 4.21. There are no obvious signs that the motet is a contrafactum. Indeed, the fit of the words and chant argue against that. To a small community, whether town, confraternity or religious house, that motet must have represented their efforts to adorn the service of their particular saint as they believed was fit. In its way, it is a far more moving tribute to the depths of piety of its community than any number of pieces commissioned essentially for courtly show.

Quaeramus cum pastoribus

There remains one motet to discuss in this section, one which is unique in Crecquillon’s output and unusual by any standards. His motet Quaeramus cum pastoribus uses material from a motet by Mouton. Hudson (1990) in the critical commentary on it noted that it was motivically related to the Mouton setting, but it is not so much motivically related as a fully-fledged imitation motet, written in the same manner as a section of an imitation mass; for instance, Crecquillon’s version retains the cadence structures of the original Mouton piece, a common practice in parts of imitation masses, and one which Crecquillon follows in his own masses. It is by no means unknown for motets to exist with an additional part or more added by a different composer, but the piece under consideration is not the expansion of a work by such an addition. The text is almost but not quite identical; the differences seem
Example 4.21

i) Surge Badilo: b. 1-2 (superius)

\[ \text{Sur - - ge} \]

ii) b. 32-5

\[ \text{pre - ces a - pe - ri} \]

iii) b. 89-94

\[ \text{trans - fer nos ad a-moe - . . . . na} \]
to be innocuous and not significant. The number of voices probably is significant, though. The motet is for six voices, whereas Mouton’s motet is for four. When that is compared with Crecquillon’s normal imitation practice, it can be seen to be unusual. In only one of his other imitation works, the five-voice mass *Se dire je l’osoie* based on Appenzeller’s four-voice chanson, does Crecquillon expand the basic voice numbers of his model; he adheres to it every other time, except for the final *Agnus* in some masses, when an expansion of the number of voices was a commonplace. The addition of two voices for a whole work occurs nowhere else, and even in an *Agnus Dei* only once, in the final *Agnus Dei* of the mass *Domine Deus omnipotens*. I have suggested earlier that this particular mass was very probably written for the Diet and colloquy at Regensburg in 1546; one might note that writing for six or more voices was unusual for Crecquillon, and several of the relatively few examples can be tied to his time in the Imperial chapel when display might have been the order of the day, as in the case of this particular mass.

The motet, unusual in its form and within Crecquillon’s output, does not strike one as a particularly mature work. There is a degree of awkwardness in fitting entries for the additional voices into the opening, which consequently lacks the balance and poise that Crecquillon’s music often displays. There are, too, several uncharacteristic underthird endings to phrases, which sound slightly old-fashioned, one of which leads to passing consecutive unisons. The overall structure lacks the clarity of his music at its best. Having said that, the work is not entirely unsuccessful; it is most unlikely to be a student attempt at learning the craft of composition by the imitation of another’s work, although the features described do suggest an early date for its composition.
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If the number of voices employed suggests that the piece has some particular significance within Crecquillon's work, so do some other details of the motet. It is possible that there is some meaning hidden in the motet's proportions. Both parts of the motet are longer than in the original Mouton motet. One is struck by two features: the first is that the original length has been extended by exactly the same amount in each part (counting the last note and the fermata note in the first section of the Mouton as longs - original note values) by thirty breves, even though the two parts of the original were not particularly symmetrical. These together are close to the length of the original part two at sixty-two breves. This may be chance; if it is not, it is hard to see its precise significance. The other observation is that the second half of the motet is ninety-two breves long, the numerical value of the name 'Mouton'. If that was indeed intended, then one is left with the first part of one hundred and six breves, which does not appear susceptible to a ready explanation. There are other possibilities, but the orthography of Crecquillon's name is so uncertain as to make any suggestions based on him very speculative. Nevertheless, the possible number symbolism, the apparent manipulation of the structure, and the unusual features already noted, together suggest strongly some form of deliberate homage by Crecquillon to Mouton. The most obvious possibility is that Crecquillon was in some way a pupil of Mouton's, which has implications for Crecquillon's year of birth and place of origin already mentioned in chapter 2.

Conclusions

Four of the motets that use chant appear on examination to be two hymns. These are conventional in their use of paraphrase, and require no additional comment. Of the other works discussed, the use of borrowed material seems to fulfil one of two broad
functions: to represent and mark in some way communal acts of particular and heightened importance and significance, or to deepen and widen the meaning of the text. It is possible, too, that these functions may overlap within a single work.\textsuperscript{74}

The first, that of communal representation, seems largely a symbolic function. In none of the cantus firmus motets does Crecquillon seem to take any steps to ensure the audibility of the cantus firmus, nor could we expect the hearers uniformly to notice the intensification of the text through the artful interplay of the cantus firmus and key words from the text. Four of the five cantus firmus motets also seem to have some additional form of symbolism hidden within the cantus firmus, either in terms of the pitch it is presented at, or in the number of its repetitions. The importance or significance of the occasion for which they were written is therefore conveyed by the highly-wrought nature of the works themselves, which sets them apart from the generality of Crecquillon’s motets.

The few paraphrase motets seem similar except that they are in a sense more extrovert. The transfer of material from the chant is made very obvious. It is less certain that they fulfil the first function, but the comparison of their treatment of the chant with the cantus firmus motets and the possible uses of two of the three texts suggests that we should regard them in the same light, especially as the technique of emphasising key words still seems to be in evidence.

When we come to the motets quoting chant more briefly, it is clear that audibility is of great importance. The quotations, if they do not come at structural points within the work, are signalled clearly, and in some cases the treatment of the quotation is extended. In all but a single case, the quotations are of chants that we know or could
assume would be widely known, and in the case of \textit{Congratulamini mihi}, it is reasonable to assume that the motet would have been performed in close temporal proximity to the liturgical performance of the chant. Only in the case of the two works quoting \textit{Inviolata} is there further symbolism apparently associated with the quotation. The other examples discussed seem devoid of conceits of that type. These motets are not then artificial constructions in the sense that the cantus firmus motets are, but are more a demonstration of the practical unity of music and text designed to guide the hearer in his understanding of the text, to aid and deepen piety. Perhaps Crecquillon’s status as a priest is not unrelated to the care that is shown in these motets for the theological whole.

If we are to generalise further from these examples of quotations, several conclusions can be drawn which largely but not completely support the observations of Fromson. Firstly, resemblances to chant which might be taken for quotations are hard to find. Secondly, in each identified case, there is sufficient reason and sufficient propriety in the reference to suggest that it is deliberate. Thirdly, all quotations, wherever they appear within a motet, are given sufficient musical prominence to ensure that their presence and thus their significance would not be lost on the hearers. However, they do not always appear at structurally significant moments. Crecquillon’s approach appears to be one almost of exegesis rather than the importation of meaning from external references, in contrast to many of Fromson’s observations from other composers.
Notes to Chapter 4

1. Marshall (1970-1) did not discuss borrowings in the four-voice motets. Walter (1975) devoted a chapter, vol. 1, pp. 59-70, to the use of chant. He identified twelve motets which he believed used chant. Amongst those twelve, he included *Quam pulchra es*, which I have argued in Chapter 3 to be the work of Benedictus. Nevertheless, this motet is relevant to some of my later arguments and will be mentioned in Chapter 6. I have omitted two further motets on Walter’s list, *Nihil proficiet* and *Christus factus est*, from the discussion in this section, but identified others not noticed by Walter. Walter himself accepted that the two examples omitted here were questionable. In these cases, the alleged similarities between the elements identified by Walter and the chant seem too tenuous to be regarded as intentional, see Walter vol. 1, examples 26-7. Although Walter discussed the use of chant, his observations hardly go beyond a basic description of the works in question.

2. It is from the discussion of *Da pacem domine* in this chapter that I draw the view that the motet is more probably by Crecquillon. The position was summarised in Chapter 3.

3. By paraphrase I mean the quotation of chant, usually fairly extensive, in one or more voices of the motet, in a form which appears to ornament or extend the original material, and/or to incorporate it into a polyphonic line.

4. Beebe (1976) p. 244 estimated that approximately one tenth of Clemens’s motets used borrowed material. The figure for Crecquillon is approximately double
that. In any event, these figures have to be regarded as tentative as they depend on our ability to identify borrowings, and it is certain that some will have escaped notice.

5. Dr Bonnie Blackburn has kindly drawn my attention to the rarity of four-voice cantus firmus motets.

6. *Da pacem* is in Hudson and Ferer (1996b); *Congregati sunt* in Hudson (1990).

7. Several of these variants are likely to be scribal as the two sources differ on them, but they are in agreement on others.

8. Settings exist for instance by Brumel, Agricola, Gombert, and La Rue. Without needing to conduct any systematic search, I have been able to list well over twenty motets on this text.

9. No doubt through an oversight, Hudson (1990) in bars 77/8 of part one has an obvious mistake where an error in the ligature in several sources, and noted as such in the critical commentary, is included in the transcription. The reading should clearly be two minims, not two semibreves.

10. Lowinsky (1989e) discussed this motet and drew attention to the use of the chant and to the particular resemblances, p. 415 note 122.

11. Hudson (1990) noted that there are nine settings of this text, including one by Verdelot which is also coupled with the same cantus firmus.
12. The Verdelot was originally published in RISM 1542/10 and the setting by Barre in RISM 1544/6. Lowinsky (1989e) p. 424 suggested that Crecquillon's setting was influenced by Barre's. I doubt that our knowledge of the chronology of Crecquillon's works allows us to determine with any certainty which was the earlier setting, whatever the dates of publication.

13. Meier (1988) Part 2, Chapter 5, discusses modally irregular procedures through entire works. The essence of his examples is the musical depiction of the text through manipulation of modal characteristics. Thus, individual words, or longer passages of text, of a particularly negative import may be illustrated by modal irregularities, which may be quite extensive. The use by Crecquillon of a 'confusion' of the mode by being sounded at two different pitches, in a text conveying the troubles of conflict and beseeching God's aid, seems entirely in line with the type of examples adduced by Meier.

14. Walter (1975) vol. 3. There are two clear errors in the edition: tenor voice (the cantus firmus) bar 120 contains six beats; the first note is correct as a tied minim; the following breve should therefore end a minim later than shown, and the added rest in bar 123 then is superfluous; same voice, bars 163/4, the second half of ligature should be dotted semibreve with the resultant bringing forward of the cantus firmus by a minim until the end of the motet. The motet also appears in the edition of LeidGA 1438 by Kempers and Maas in Monumenta musica neerlandica IX, 1 & 2.

15. See Fuchs (1978) pp. 16-7, including the reproduction of Geertgen's The
Holy Kindred, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.


17. Walter's conjecture, vol. 1 p. 64, that the source of the quotation was a Litany has proved correct. As noted earlier, this appears to be the original of the two versions of this motet. Both are in Ferer and Hudson (1996a).


19. See for instance Vandenesse's Journal for July 7-21, 1545, when a Te Deum was sung on news of the birth of a son to Philip of Spain. Gachard (1874) p. 310.


21. The Te Deum itself is a Trinitarian hymn.


23. Powers (1981) identified this motet as an exception in his listing of the works in the Susato volumes arranged by mode because it appears in the volume of
works in modes 3 and 4 but ends on d with a signature of one flat. Walter had particular difficulty with this motet from a modal point of view. He correctly stated (vol. 1 p. 61) that the chant melody had been transposed up a perfect fourth, but then suggested that the concluding d acted as finalis of mode 1. That ignores the evidence of the Susato source and would also be in conflict with the ambitus, which would suggest a plagal mode if the final were really d, and with the b flat signature. Crecquillon, unlike Gombert, does not seem to use Mode 1 with a b flat. Gombert’s practice in this respect was clearly viewed as unorthodox (see Stevenson (1961) p. 125, n. 240). The cadence structure does not support Walter’s view either. However, he seemed unsure of his ground, because elsewhere, (vol. 1, p. 196) he included the motet as an example of transposed Aeolian mode, equally debatable.

24. For example, the settings of Quis dabit occulis by Payen, Mouton and Senfl.


26. Bloxam (1987) pp. 223-31 discusses the use of pre-existent material in an earlier repertoire. She concludes that the choice of material conferred ‘authority’ on the work in question. That conclusion would seem to support the suggestions that I have made in this section for Crecquillon’s use of chant. Similarly, Milsom has argued that the interrelationship of cantus firmus and text in the music of Josquin and his contemporaries may be richer than has generally been realised; see the abstract of a paper of his in the Journal of the Royal Musical Association, vol. 115, pt. 1, 1990. I have not been able to see the full paper.

sensibus Ferer and Hudson (1996a); O lux beata trinitas Hudson and Ferer (1997c); and Te mane laudum Walter (1975) vol. 3.

28. Despite the obvious connection implied by the texts, and other points which will be raised, these motets have effectively been treated as freestanding motets by Marshall, Walter, and Ferer and Hudson, and discussed and presented as such. The commentary on Accende lumen sensibus in Ferer and Hudson (1996a) for example notes that Crecquillon’s setting forms part of a cycle of hymns and responsories arranged in order of the liturgical year. The editors then note that the choirbook also contains the four-voice setting of the first two verses, without seeking to draw any inference from these facts or to examine the possible connections further.

29. It seems from the paraphrase that it is likely that the version of the tune used by Crecquillon was not that proposed by Ferer and Hudson (1996a) i.e. LU p. 885, but one with a significant variant in the last line, which is also reflected in Palestrina’s setting. A later chant version which seems closer in this respect is that given in the English Hymnal, no. 154.

30. The two best represented composers are Resinarius and Sixt Dietrich and a sizeable proportion of the manuscript was apparently copied from RISM D3018 and R1196.

31. Folio numbers are:

Veni creator spiritus - fols 88v-92r

Accende lumen - 92v-96r

O lux beata trinitas 103v-106r
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32. Clefs are:


*O lux beata trinitas* - G2, C3, C4, F4.


33. Marshall, vol. 1 p. 45, noted the textual oddity but despite its appearance in only one voice, and the damage that it does to the metrical structure of the verse, took it to be an addition to the text of the hymn. He compounded that by taking the textual insertion to be ‘donum visita’, although that requires the assumption that one of the repetitions of the word ‘visita’ in one of the other voices relates to ‘donum’; the actual placing of the text in the other voice parts makes that highly unlikely. He had further difficulty in translating this addition, suggesting ‘visit our home’, possibly confusing ‘donum’ and ‘domum’. The manuscript is clear - the word is ‘doIlum’ - and Marshall transcribed it as such.

34. It is interesting to note that whilst verse two may have been the original version from which verse one was taken, it itself does not underlay the music particularly satisfactorily e.g. the repetition of ‘altissimi’ when the music might suggest a repetition of ‘donum Dei’ bars 67-69 of voice 3, Marshall no. 36. Ferer and Hudson make a similar point in respect to the setting of the fourth stanza. The underlay they present, which faithfully reflects that of the source, does not recognise the chant ligatures in the opening phrase of the upper parts, evident from the tenor and bass parts. It is unclear from a reading of the manuscript whether it is likely
that the underlay would have been adjusted in performance or whether the
performers would have been as indifferent to the chant original as the scribe.

35. One might note however that at the comparable place in verse 4, the same
three-note phrase opens line three of the hymn, ignoring both the ligature and
phrase structure of the chant.

36. See Julian (1907): 'O lux beata trinitas'.

37. It is possible that performance practice for hymns in the Imperial chapel, or
elsewhere in the Low Countries, differed from the normal alternatim method. Whilst
Canis's hymn A solis ortus cardine (listed by Rudolf (1977) and Bernstein (1980)
as Beatus autor seculi) sets verses 2, 4, 6 and 8 of the hymn, his setting of Hostis
Herodes (Ibant magi) sets verses 2, 4 and 5 (the doxology), with verse 4 to five
voices, verse 2 and the doxology to four.

38. See for instance the commentary on practice under 'Doxologies' in Julian
(1907).


40. In Walter vol. 3.

41. Both sets of Lamentations refer to the recitation formula, but are probably
best not regarded as paraphrases, as the use of the formula appears to be limited to
the beginnings of phrases.
42. The motet is in Ferer and Hudson (1997a). Individual passages that strike one as particularly likely to be quoting chant are, for instance, bars 50 to 57 and 65 to 72.

43. The parts are headed ‘De Resurrectione domini’. Forney (1987) p. 47, suggested that the pieces in this 1542 collection could easily have been employed as repertoire for confraternity services. Pieton’s music was widely disseminated, but the rubric is almost certainly that of the Antwerp printer.

44. The motet is in RISM 1546/7. The rubrics assign part 1 to Christmas, and part 2 to Easter. This suggests extreme care should be exercised in accepting printers’ rubrics as necessarily indicating anything more than the general suitability of the text for the occasion given, unless one is prepared to countenance the possibility of the two parts of the motet being performed at widely separated times. It seems in this instance that the motet’s text is more appropriate to Easter than to Christmas.

45. It is possible that, on the basis of this point, Laudem dicite should be added to those motets discussed in chapter 2 as being likely to have preceded Crecquillon’s time in Imperial service.

46. The connection between the Trinity and the Imperial house will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

47. Crecquillon’s existing motets are so numerous, and the difference in
technique between this motet and those with texts specific to major liturgical
occasions so marked, that it is most unlikely that the observation could be explained
away by the partial survival of his music.

48. See Murray (1994) pp. 137-8 for a contemporary account of the Entry of
Philip of Burgundy and Margaret the Duchess in 1384 which included the singing of
Honor virtus. It is unclear whether this was a polyphonic setting. Murray discusses
this Entry in detail. He makes a point that is important in the later discussion: the
identification of the ruler with Christ. See also Strohm (1985) p. 97, who confirms
that the form of the 1384 entry was followed at subsequent entries in 1405, 1419
and 1468.

49. Entries are also mentioned below in chapters 5 and 6. Background which
supports the possible use of this motet at an Entry is given in chapter 5.

50. The question of chant citation in C16th polyphony has attracted some
attention. Fromson (1994) proposed a reading of motets and madrigals from
Willaert's Musica nova based in part upon her identification of a number of chant
quotations within Willaert's music, and the symbolic import of those quotations when
read with the text of the work. The possibility that these chant quotations could have
been the result of chance was rejected in a subsequent paper, where she sought to
demonstrate that chant quotations are extremely rare, despite the frequent modelling
of opening points of imitation on modally-derived melodic criteria, Fromson
(1996). Fromson also suggested that such quotations normally appear in the
'structural contrapuntal' voices or at major formal articulations, and that such
quotations normally convey some additional information. That last suggestion is one
that has arisen in a number of other studies of borrowed material, whether derived from chant or borrowed from elsewhere. Indeed, it would be hard to think of a reason, unless it were pure caprice, for using such a technique without it having some meaning. Fromson's (1996) conclusion that chant citations were both rare and unlikely to be the result of chance resemblances was based on a survey of a number of settings of the text *Congratulamini mihi*. She looked at fourteen settings and concluded that none of them matched the chant, either for the same text, as given in LU, or for any other chant indexed in Bryden and Hughes (1969). Whilst Fromson's work is directed at the use of chant to different texts from that of the polyphonic setting, to add and extend meaning, her points may usefully be taken as a starting point, to see whether other types of quotation demonstrate similar characteristics. With the qualification that we can only identify with the tools at our disposal, Fromson's general point that chant quotations are rare seems true, even of other forms of chant quotation from those which are her main concern, if the process of trying to identify quotations in Crecquillon is any guide.


52. No source is known for this text, but it may well have been more widespread than the lack of a known source might suggest. It seems close to those prayers that Erasmus objected to so strongly: 'Every body comes to me; as if my Son were to be always a Child, because he is Painted so; And because they see him at my Breast still, they take for granted, that he dares deny me nothing that I should ask him, for fear that, when he has a mind to't, I should deny him the Bubby.' Erasmus p. 19.

53. Perhaps we should not overlook the possibility of a sense of humour, in
leading the listener to expect a quotation, only apparently to frustrate the expectation, but then to give the quotation later.


55. In Hudson and Ferer (1996c).

56. It is possible that Crecquillon as a priest, and therefore certainly competent in Latin, could have compiled them himself, although there are no grounds to support such a supposition.

57. Part of the text, from 'et matrem' is the same as part of the reponsory Videte miraculum. The motet is in Marshall vol. 2.

58. Strohm (1985) p. 5 comments that just about everybody in Bruges must have known the tune of Inviolata.

59. For instance, the settings by Willaert, Gombert and Isaac.

60. It will be seen that on its second appearance an f sharp is specifically notated which allows the intervals of the chant incipit to be copied exactly with the initial pitch on d, as well as on f and b flat. That however destroys the apparent symbolism of the seven entries. This motet has a number of accidentals notated in its only source. There must have been a particular reason for these, as they are rather more frequent than normal; perhaps in the source available to the printer they had been used as a teaching aid or as a help to inexperienced singers. The presupposition must
be that the f sharp is not Crecquillon’s original, partly because it would be out of line with the relatively few accidentals used in other sources for other works (excluding instrumental tablatures) but also because it creates a diminished fourth, not, as far as I can trace, to be found elsewhere. However, the fact that the sharp was added in those circumstances suggests again that the quotation was well recognised, even if the seven-fold symbolism was not.

61. The Joys and Sorrows of Mary are obvious examples. See Elders (1994) pp. 151-71 for an extended discussion.

62. See Meier (1988) p. 246. The setting of Inviolata by Josquin heavily emphasises the number three in different ways, and the original sequence text itself does, too.

63. In Ferer and Hudson (1996a).

64. I have a difficulty in considering the ending structurally significant. Unless the work is already known, the ending would only become apparent to the hearer of the motet once the final cadence is reached. Anything of significance that leads up to it would have to be in some way signalled to the listener as part of the ending. That would set music apart from a comparison with rhetoric (a comparison which may, in any case, be anachronistic). Apart from the chant quotation itself, there seems to be no audible or intentional trigger. The text itself could not be relied on to indicate the approaching end because text repetitions could still make it impossible to predict, except in a general sense. In this context, it is worth making a comment on Crecquillon’s use of mode. Beebe (quoted in chapter 3) has remarked on
Crecquillon's general adherence to modal norms, and there is no reason to disagree with her judgement. The clarity of Crecquillon's *exordia*, the observance (within certain consistent limits) of the modal *ambitus*, and his use of regular cadence patterns all support a view which suggests that, for Crecquillon, modal concepts formed a vital part of his compositional frame. I suggest in chapter 7 that this is an area where further research would be of value, and that it is conceivable that, in conjunction with other stylistic aspects, it might help form a template for the construction of some form of chronology of the works. There is a facet of Crecquillon's writing which I have not noted to the same degree in the music of other composers (although I have made no detailed search) and which, so far as I know, has not been mentioned in any study on mode, and which tends to draw attention to the approaching final cadence. In a number of motets, particularly the four-voice ones, the modal *ambitus* in one of the leading voices, most frequently the *tenor*, is delineated with sufficient clarity at the approach to the final cadence to suggest that it was a deliberate technique by which the mode could be reconfirmed or emphasised. It is possible that this could arise from a natural sense of climax, and indeed, the two aspects could be linked. This, if the observation is confirmed by others, could be a useful additional factor to consider in the nexus of modal features that are worthy of consideration and analysis within individual works. In the context of quotations, it might be one method in which the ending could be rendered 'structurally significant'.

65. In Ferer and Hudson (1996a). I have already suggested in chapter 2 that the motet *Ne projicias* quotes chant, possibly for reasons which were personal to Crecquillon. As such it presents a special case, and is not discussed further in this chapter.
66. Harrison (1963) p. 379 and Ex. 171, considered the Sheppard work to be based on the chant. I am of course not suggesting any connection between the pieces by Crecquillon and Sheppard, but seeking support by means of another apparent quotation from the same chant for the idea that the quotation would have been recognisable to a listener of the period. See also Appendix 1, where I suggest that the ostinato used by Guerrero in the Agnus Dei of his mass modelled on this motet, is more probably derived from this quotation than from elsewhere in the piece.

67. The modest approach of Ferer and Hudson in this respect is generally to be welcomed. I suspect however that their approach is too reticent in this particular instance. I have indicated in the Example some additional ficta. Experience in performance of this fine motet bears out the points I make about the prominence that the quotation actually achieves.

68. Editions: Virgo generosa Marshall vol. 3; Andreas Christi famulus Hudson (1990); and Surge Badilo Walter vol. 3.

69. This is discussed in more detail in Chapter 2.

70. See Prizer (1985) p. 117 with regard to the meetings of the small chapter of the Order.

71. The funeral solemnities held in Mexico for Charles V were on St Andrew's day. See Stevenson (1952) pp. 87-90.
72. An example of a motet expanded in that way is Arnold von Bruck’s version of *Sancta trinitas* by Févin in RISM 1558/4. The use of imitation technique in motets seems to have been extremely rare. Vaet provides one exception, see Steinhardt (1951) pp. 54-9. However, Vaet was considerably younger than Crecquillon. As he was listed in the Imperial chapel in 1550, it is even possible that he might have known Crecquillon’s imitation motet.

73. The translation presented in Hudson (1990) loses the question and answer nature of the text by introducing a third person possessive, rather than the first person, into the response of the Christ-child. (The possessive is understood in the Latin but needed in the English.)

74. In a recent article, Dean (1997) has posed the question of who, apart from God, was the audience for sacred polyphony c. 1500. His conclusion was that ‘the actual listeners, the expected listeners, the listeners for whom the music was composed and performed, comprised the singers themselves, and a few outsiders’. At first sight, it might be thought that his conclusion undermines some of the suggestions that I have made in this chapter on the purpose of borrowed material in Crecquillon’s music. His article deserves a much fuller consideration than can be given here, but I do not believe that his conclusions are so generally applicable that they can be taken as applying at a rather later date to the two broad categories of use that I have suggested. Bourgeois support of music, through guilds and endowments for instance, in both ritual and non-ritual contexts was a major force in the dissemination of polyphony, and gives a reasonable context for the didactic process that I have suggested for some borrowings. The differences, too, between the institutions he examines (largely the Vatican) and the chapel of Charles V are
fundamental, both in their constitutions and the use made of them by their masters. Moreover, apart from the political use of the chapel undoubtedly made by Charles, it is probably easy to underestimate the size of the potential audience on major occasions (which is what I am concerned with for the remaining examples).

Mameranus's 1550 list of the household of Charles V runs to some fifty pages with up to twenty names per page, and those were only the ones that merited mention. At some of the events of the years covered by Mameranus's book, the total number of people present was probably approaching two thousand (and one has to remember the very much smaller population of towns and cities of the period to put that number into context). Formal events such as Entries would also be corporate occasions involving whole communities. It does not seem to me that Dean's article was intended to cover either of these contexts, and it would be unsafe to extrapolate from his conclusions by applying them to the examples I discuss. See also Forney (1993).