In the previous chapter it has been argued that, in several instances, Crecquillon’s use of borrowed material can be taken as a signal indicating the importance, in a corporate sense, of the occasion for which the work was written. In the case of Da pacem domine, the numerous settings by other composers would have created some sort of environment for the work; Crecquillon’s motet would probably have been understood not as a piece standing by itself, but as part of a tradition, drawing additional resonance and meaning from the earlier examples of similar settings. In the same way, the liturgical use of the Te Deum laudamus at times of rejoicing would no doubt have given a framework for the listener of a particular sort within which Crecquillon’s setting of a related text would have been heard and appreciated.

The precedents for these two works therefore help to enhance our understanding of their general significance, and the means by which that significance was conveyed, but they do little to help us place the works in any more closely defined sense. I want, in this chapter and the next, to consider a small number of other works by Crecquillon which also use borrowed material, to try to suggest a more detailed context and meaning. This will require us to look in more depth at some musical analogues, and at some of the meanings that might have suggested themselves to a part, at least, of the audience of the time. It may serve, as well, to illuminate a little our understanding of works besides those by Crecquillon alone.
Diveine kingship

In 1515, at the Congress of Vienna, the Emperor Maximilian secured the Habsburg succession in Hungary. The ceremonial climax of the agreements reached was a double wedding, conducted with great show in St Stephen's Cathedral. The two marriages were between Lajos of Hungary and Mary, sister of Charles the future Emperor, on the one hand, and Ann of Hungary with Maximilian himself standing proxy for one of his two grandsons, Charles and Ferdinand, on the other. The agreement was marked, after the event, by the painting of a well-known portrait of Maximilian and his family by the German artist Bernhard Striegel. It is ostensibly a portrait of Maximilian, his wife Mary of Burgundy, son Philip, grandchildren Charles and Ferdinand, and the young Lajos, adopted by Maximilian only two days before the wedding. The picture exists in two versions, both by the same artist. The first version of the picture, the one marking the agreement and apparently painted in 1515 or 1516, was given by Maximilian to Cuspinian.

In itself, the picture is an artifice: the circumstances did not exist that would have allowed it to be painted from life. Maximilian's wife, Mary of Burgundy, had died as long ago as 1482, his son Philip had died in 1506. Neither Maximilian, nor presumably the artist, had seen Ferdinand, whilst Charles was in the Low Countries at the time the painting was executed. It is misleading, then, to take the family group simply to be a portrait. It is less a family memento, rather more a statement about, or record of, the legacy of Maximilian in dynastic terms, as might be inferred from the occasion of its commissioning. The second version of the picture was ordered by Cuspinian in 1520 and painted on the reverse of the original; Cuspinian then incorporated it in an altarpiece. In each case, it must have been obvious to any
viewer of the picture who was depicted, especially as three of the four male figures wear the insignia of the Order of the Golden Fleece; the profiles of Maximilian and Charles are unmistakeable. Nevertheless in each picture, the figures are named. For instance, in the earlier version, the figure of Maximilian is entitled ‘Maximilian I, Emperor, Archduke of Austria, Duke of Burgundy’, and his wife ‘Mary, Duchess of Burgundy, wife of Maximilian’. However, in the later version of the painting, those titles are replaced by others. The individuals remain as obvious to the viewer as before; there is no intention of hiding or changing their identities, far from it, but the names as well as the titles of each figure have been altered. Maximilian has now become ‘Cleophas, brother of Joseph the husband of the divine Virgin Mary’. Mary of Burgundy and the Archduke Charles are now changed into ‘Mary Cleophas, sister of the Virgin Mary the earthly mother of our Lord’ and ‘Simon Zelotes cousin of our Lord’ respectively. The earthly family has been transmuted into a sacred family, a family identified directly as part of God's family on earth, these names representing the orthodox Catholic understanding of Jesus’s close family. Charles, in particular, is not being called a distant relative, but in the context of the Holy Family, the nearest earthly relative of Christ beyond Jesus’s mother.

The process of sacralisation demonstrated by these two pictures is but one expression of the pervasive belief throughout the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and beyond, that rulers were in some sense divine. The appropriation of divine symbols in the portraiture of royalty is a commonplace. The symbols of Mary's purity, the ermine and the pearl, reappear frequently. The marguerite even decorated the wedding chambers of Margaret of York in 1468 when she married Charles the Bold in Bruges. We see the same process of appropriation of Godly or divine symbols and attributes in literature. The marguerite becomes a poetical device for royalty in
Another and older instance is the description of Charlemagne in *The Song of Roland*. Charlemagne is pictured as of an age beyond normal man's reckoning (more than two hundred years old) but not so much aged as ageless, still vigorous with a young son and nephew, and with his strength unimpaired. His beard is white but with the whiteness of spring blossom; he is emphatically not 'no more than a voice in the white winter of his age'. Angels talk with the Emperor, and the poet's matter-of-fact acceptance of this is quite startling. Charlemagne is shown as patriarchal, hieratic, and with quasi-divine characteristics.

Those examples from literature may be taken, I would suggest wrongly, as poetic licence, but similar thoughts are expressed in different ways in philosophical and political writings throughout the period. John of Salisbury put the matter pithily when he described kings as 'a kind of likeness on earth of the divine majesty'. Later writers echo that. Kings are described as 'living and speaking images of God, human Gods on the face of the earth'; a king is 'a God upon earth as God is a King in heaven'. Yates, in a brilliant study, has described at length the deification of Queen Elizabeth as the goddess Astraea; the queen who, when she died, was called nothing less than a second Virgin in heaven.

The belief in the representation of God by the ruler was reflected not only in art and literature, but in day-to-day ceremonial. Depictions of kings or rulers at mass sometimes show them in curtained enclosures. We learn from a document cited in an earlier chapter of the duties in the Imperial chapel of the butlers of the oratory. Apart from looking after the Emperor's devotional books and rosaries, the butler in attendance was responsible for drawing the curtains back at two points in the mass to display the Emperor. The moments when this was done are instructive. The first
was at the Gospel, when the book was presented to the Emperor; the second was at the Peace. The reading of the Gospel is the revelation of Christ to the world through the recounting of His words and deeds. It requires little imagination to see two interlinked symbolic messages through the public display of the Emperor and his reception of the Gospel book. First, just as the Gospel reveals Christ, and through Him the Father, the revelation of the Emperor shows the embodiment of God's presence in the world. The opening of the curtain is mimetically the opening of the book. Second, the reception of the Gospel book was no doubt intended to reinforce the royal and Imperial duties towards the maintenance of the Christian kingdom.18 Similar points could be made about the second time the curtain was drawn back: the Peace, one of the oldest parts of the mass, represents the earthly reconciliation that is the necessary precursor to heavenly reconciliation through the mass.19 The ruler was required to exercise justice, which was seen as a function derived directly from God. There was no distinction to be drawn in the just society between heavenly and earthly justice; they were one and the same. The uncovering of the ruler was thus a revelation of the means by which, and the person through whom, God had chosen to act. The ruler represented at the same time the opportunity for earthly reconciliation through justice and the visible sign of the consequent effectual heavenly reconciliation, another mimesis of Christ.20

Those examples do more than just suggest an identification between the Incarnation of Christ in Jesus and the representation of God by the Emperor, king or ruler; they make it very clear. That to modern sensibilities may be an exaggerated position, but it is an identification strengthened by looking briefly at ceremonial occasions.21 Charlemagne became Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire in the year 800. The ancestor to whom both the Imperial and French crowns looked for the legitimisation
of their royal rights and imperial pretensions, was crowned Emperor and Augustus by Pope Leo III in St Peter's in Rome on Christmas day. Charlemagne was, according to one of his biographers, only in Rome to restore the Church after the Pope had been attacked by the Romans themselves. In a few words (the more significant for their brevity), the chronicler shows us Charlemagne not only carrying out the Imperial function in the protection of the Church, thus justifying his coronation, but more dramatically, by the day of the ceremony, being linked through his consecration with the Incarnation of Christ, when God appeared in the world on that very day. The identification of Charlemagne as in some sense an incarnation, too, by the day of his confirmation could not be clearer. We can be certain that it would have been understood as such by the people of the time.

The example of Charlemagne is not an isolated one. Charles V was crowned Emperor at Bologna in 1530. There was one ceremony to invest him with the crown of Lombardy and a second, two days later, for the Imperial crown. The liturgies used at these services also emphasised the element of incarnation, quite explicitly. The Gospel at the earlier mass was 'Quem dicunt homines', a text in which Jesus asks who men say He is, and Peter replies that He is Christ the Son of the living God. The mass for the Imperial coronation was the mass for the Epiphany, not only a celebration of the coming of the Lord, but the time of the Magi, when the earthly powers of the old dispensation deferred to the newly-incarnate power from heaven. The Epistle at that mass is the passage from Isaiah foretelling the coming of the prince of peace to Jerusalem. We can see these liturgies again reflecting directly the belief in the representation of God by the royal.

Reception liturgies and ceremonial entries tend to demonstrate the same sorts of
characteristics. We have already noted how in Bruges the Trinity text *Honor virtus et potestas* was used over a number of years for the ceremonial entry and reception of rulers into that city. At a similar period to the Bruges entries, in 1452, the Emperor Frederick III journeyed to Rome. There exists a contemporary account by the humanist scholar Aeneas Sylvius of Frederick's Entry into Siena en route to Rome. The Emperor was met by a procession of the people of the city (some representing its institutions) carrying olive branches; all sang the hymn *Veni creator spiritus*. The liturgy seems to have been deliberately modelled on Christ's entry into Jerusalem, as celebrated in the Palm Sunday processions. One more brief example of this type of event must suffice. In 1415, Henry V made a splendid Entry into London after the victory over the French at Agincourt. He entered the city over London bridge; at the foot of the bridge, on top of a house, a choir of boys representing the heavenly host greeted Henry by singing the *Benedictus* - Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord, hosanna in the highest. This canticle is part of the ordinary of the mass, but was originally the song sung to greet Christ on his entry into Jerusalem, the same occasion that was invoked by Frederick's later reception in Siena. In the mass, the *Benedictus*, as part of the *Sanctus*, directly precedes and introduces the Canon, the central act of remembrance and re-enactment of Christ's sacrifice made possible only through the Incarnation, and with Christ again being made present through the mystery of transubstantiation. In practice, with a polyphonic mass, the *Benedictus* frequently acted as an Elevation canticle, being sung immediately before, or during, the moment when the Host, as the body of Christ, was held aloft to be shown to, and adored by, the congregation. Of course, the symbolism at entries was frequently much more complex than the concentration on this particular line of thought would suggest. The element of the incarnate God in the person of the ruler was only one strand amongst many. Strong (referring to two
Their assumptions about kingship are of a type that occur all over northern Europe in the late medieval and early modern period. They are rooted in a view which is almost wholly biblical, in which the king as Christ or one of his scriptural prototypes, takes possession of the New Jerusalem, in which the earthly state is directly presented as a mirror of the heavenly.29

It is not important for the immediate purpose to pursue the precise nature of the contemporary theology of royalty, but it is certain that a king or ruler as God’s representative was understood as the visible presence of the Heavenly powers and, through that representation, became in some sense the personification of the sacred.30 There can have been no conflict in the mind of Cuspinian between his Imperial family and his notion of them as forming part of God’s direct family on earth; the pictures are evidence of that, as is their use as part of an altar.31 Just as those two pictures convey the link between the royal and the sacred, we can be sure that music was used as much as the other arts to demonstrate and reinforce the understanding that royalty were God’s representatives, Christ’s family on earth, by the application of the sacred to them as well as directly to God in any of His persons, or to the Virgin, or the saints or any of the Heavenly company.32 In the remainder of this chapter I want to look at a group of pieces which seem to me to be a possible expression of the sacred nature of royalty, and which can perhaps be best understood within that context. Some of these works, with those to be discussed in the next chapter, are linked to two of the three great rites of passage, birth and marriage, and to a quite literal rite of passage as well.
As long ago as 1956 H. C. Wolff drew attention to a small number of motets, each based on a short text beginning *Philippe qui videt me*. The motets in question include Crecquillon's motet, the others being by Ludovicus Louys and Jan Louys, six-voice and five-voice motets respectively, and an anonymous five-voice setting, which Wolff believed because of its style to be earlier than the other works.

Wolff discussed these motets together, not just because they are all based on the same text, but because, in addition, they share melodic material. All the motets make clear reference to what seems to be a common source (although they are not polyphonic emulations), and their openings are strikingly similar. Wolff quoted the opening of the motets by Ludovicus Louys and Crecquillon to show the degree of similarity. In a footnote to his discussion, Wolff noted that there was another setting of this text, by Othmayr, but from the phrasing of his note he apparently did not have the opportunity to examine it. See Appendix 2.

Wolff outlined the importance of Philip of Spain, and considered that among the works on this text, there would be some honouring him on that account. The consistency of the melodic material in these motets, greater than that of comparable motets for other saints, led him to believe that it was reasonable to make such an assumption.

The liturgical use of the text set by the various composers is as the second psalm antiphon at Second Vespers of the feast of the Apostles Philip and James, although as it appears in the motets there is an interpolated 'alleluia'. The text also appears as
part of the third psalm antiphon for the same occasion, and in very similar form in
the Alleluia and as part of the Communion of the Mass for the same feast, where the
word 'meum' is omitted. In full, the text is:

    Philippe, qui videt me, alleluia, videt et patrem meum, alleluia.
    (Philip, he who sees me also sees my Father.)

Although the text is liturgically proper to this particular feast day, it is part of a
Gospel account of Jesus's words on his relationship to the Father.\textsuperscript{39} It has little to do
with Philip, except that it was his uncomprehending question which led Jesus to
make this asseveration on seeing the Father through his own person. Whilst this is a
text that forms part of the theological understanding of the Incarnation of Christ, the
examples quoted above from art and literature suggest that we should also keep in
mind the possible application of such a text to royalty or rulers as an embodiment or
incarnation of God.

The melodic material in the motets appears to have no connection with either of the
psalm antiphons or the alleluia or communion as they appear in the most common
chant sources. The chants are in any case in different modes from the motets.\textsuperscript{40}
Nevertheless, the melodic material does appear to have a chant origin. It appears as a
psalm antiphon for the Feast of Philip and James in the \textit{Antiphonale Pataviense}.
However, the minor variations in the form in which it appears in several motets
suggests strongly that the chant was not confined to that single source, but had a
wider currency in different liturgical Uses.\textsuperscript{41}

Few settings of this text remain, outside the four identified by Wolff; so far I have
traced only three further settings of the text as it stands: one by Senfl, one by Brumel and one anonymous (but possibly by Johannes Heugel). If we are right to accept the motets identified by Wolff as a group on the strength of their common melodic material and the consistency of its use, then all three additional settings appear to belong to the same group, as they use the same chant, and in a similar manner. Not a single setting of this text exists in the series of motet books issued by Attaingnant and Moderne, and only that by Crecquillon in all the motet books of Phalèse and Susato.

However, other settings of texts appropriate or proper for this particular feast do exist which incorporate the text above or some close relation, such as those of Domine ostende nobis Patrem by Clemens, In illo tempore by Gombert and Jacquet, and Tanto tempore vobiscum sum set by a number of composers, including Isaac, Verdelot, Manchicourt and Phinot. In none of these is there the obvious use of the melodic material referred to by Wolff. It is probably reasonable to assume, therefore, that the chant was not particularly widespread, as implied by its general absence from more central chant sources, despite the variations in the versions used in the motets, and that it did not have such a close association with the liturgical occasion that would lead to its frequent quotation, and settings upon its text. Indeed, other than those by the two Louys and Crecquillon, the identified group of motets seem to suggest a firmly German origin.

Brumel's Philippus qui videt me

Probably the earliest traced setting of Philippus qui videt me to quote the chant on which the later settings seem to be based is the one by Brumel. A comparison of it
with Brumel's other motets that quote or paraphrase chant suggests that it is unusual in its use of the chant. It presents the opening of the chant in equal crotchets with no ornamentation, and later in minimis as well. The clarity and rhythmic simplicity of the chant references are matched by the concentration of quotations in each of the three surviving voice-parts; the texture as a whole seems permeated with the chant to a degree that is unusual. It is quite possible that this unusual use of chant signalled some particular purpose for the work or special significance within it, but if so, it is not clear from the motet alone. Nevertheless, the later examples discussed below might suggest a possible reading of Brumel's motet, but one thing is certain, the work is too early to form part of any group of motets written for Philip of Spain, as Brumel died well before Philip was born. That may suggest one of two things: either the Brumel motet was a 'praise' motet to an earlier Philip, or Wolff's suggestion that the later motets represent a group may be undermined by the existence of Brumel's work. I believe that Senfl's motet, whether or not it was written in the knowledge of Brumel's piece, contains sufficient clues for the former to be the more likely explanation.

Senfl's *Philippe qui videt me*

Let us turn to the setting in six voices by Senfl, which appeared in print first in Ott's collection *Novum et insigne opus musicum* (RISM 1537/1) and which was reprinted in Berg and Neuber's 1558 enlargement (RISM 1558/4). The motet also exists in a manuscript source, MunU 401, the compilation of which is dated to 1536-40.46 This motet presents a cantus firmus in two-part canon. The canon is not absolutely strict: in three places the final note of a phrase is of different length in the dux and comes, with an adjustment to the length of the respective ensuing rest to
ensure that the dux and comes maintain their time interval at the next entry.47

One can readily ascribe a symbolic reason for the use of canon if one considers the words 'he who sees me, sees my Father also'. The symbolism of the canon may be extended a little further in two ways: the first, that the lower part, the dux, perhaps represents the Father, and that the comes, at treble pitch, perhaps represents the Son.48 If that is the case, one might have expected from the text the reverse arrangement of the two canonic voices, i.e. for the 'Father' to follow the 'Son', being seen by seeing the Son. The second point concerns the difference we have noted between three out of the four phrase endings in the cantus firmus (ignoring the final phrase). In each case it is the dux that has the longer note. There would seem to be no musical imperative for this difference; Senfl demonstrates elsewhere that he is more than capable of maintaining strict canonic writing, and in no case would the extension of the comes final note to the same value as the dux cause problems with the next entry of the dux; the intervals between the phrases are too extended. What therefore could be a reason for this oddity? Perhaps one answer might be that Senfl was using a rhetorical device. There are a number of works where the composer concerned appears to use long notes to denote 'majesty', either of God or of an individual, and of course a cantus firmus tends to consist of large note values, and could in some circumstances be seen as an embodiment of that concept.49 Perhaps, then, the implication of this minor difference of note values is to indicate that the Son at that time does not share fully in the majesty of the Father. The significance of these two observations, tenuous though they may appear at present, will I hope become obvious in a moment.

Even if we accept Wolff's conclusion that the later motets represent some form of
homage to Philip of Spain, that may not necessarily be true of Senfl's motet, especially with the earlier example by Brumel now having been identified, and with Senfl's active period in Imperial service having ceased when Maximilian's chapel was disbanded in 1520. The motet must date from before about 1536 because of its manuscript source, but assuming it was intended as a 'praise' motet for an individual, and not simply as a motet for the liturgical occasion, to whom would have been addressed? Senfl himself was too young for it to refer to Philip the Fair, who died in 1506, when Senfl is thought to have been aged about twenty. In any event, the text, with its pithy statement of the Incarnation, would be far more appropriate for a birth or, as we have seen from the entry and reception liturgies, for some form of recognition of royal status. That link was only appropriate to royalty, with its attribution or implication of divine power, approval and presence. With that background, the most probable explanation is that the motet was written to honour the birth of a son, Philip of Spain, to the Emperor Charles V in May 1527.50 In this light, the peculiarities of the musical symbolism of the cantus firmus take on new and more positive aspects, the Father coming before the Son, and the subtle distinction in their respective majesties, especially as not all of Charles's titles would automatically fall to Philip.

There are further grounds for considering this as the most plausible occasion for the composition of Senfl's motet. The use of canon in the first instance often seems a deliberate invocation of heavenly harmony, with the concomitant implications for the subject of the work. Alternatively, or in addition to, the suggestions made above, the discrepancy between the dux and comes may be signalling something else, something more complex. Modifications to, or irregularities in, a cantus firmus can indicate an underlying structure that the composer wished to maintain or achieve; this for
instance might be a numerical significance in the length of a movement, or in the
length of the cantus firmus itself.\textsuperscript{51} That significance may be of symbolic importance
generally to the work in question, or simply the achievement of a particularly
harmonious proportion. It might also relate, through a cabalistic calculation, to an
individual composer or someone of significance to the work.\textsuperscript{52} Examination in this
light of the two canonic voices in Senfl's motet yields an intriguing result.

First, it is necessary to calculate the numerical value of the name which, if our
suspicion is correct, we might expect to find hidden in the piece: Philip. This is done
in the most basic manner by substituting a number for each letter based on a=1,
b=2, etc., (\textit{v}/\textit{u} and \textit{w}/\textit{v} are generally accorded the same number respectively as they
do not exist separately in the Latin alphabet), thus:

\begin{align*}
\text{PhiIippe} & = 15 + 8 + 9 + 11 + 9 + 15 + 15 + 5 = 87
\end{align*}

If we then take the upper voice, i.e. the \textit{comes}, as it stands in the part book, and count
the final note as a breve, the total length of notes and rests is 87 breves,
corresponding with Philip's name.

Whether the difference between the two voices is anything other than a signal to the
hidden meaning of the \textit{comes} is still not entirely clear, given the necessity to be more
speculative to extract possible meaning.\textsuperscript{53} It is unlikely that there is further
numerical significance in the \textit{comes} as there is an odd semibreve between note
values. Equally, the difference in overall length between the note values of \textit{dux} and
\textit{comes} does not seem to be significant, but it is always possible that a more arcane
reference is hidden there. Nevertheless, the result seems satisfactory enough without
the need to force the interpretation.

The apparent use of a cabbalistic calculation within the work suggests very strongly
that the piece was for a living figure, rather than the ostensible religious object of
the text.\textsuperscript{54} It seems to confirms the piece as an offering on the birth of Philip of
Spain by Senfl, which beneath its surface, conceals an artful message of homage
allied with a demonstration of the composer's skill. If that is correct, then the text
can be seen as the equivalent in music of the sacralising of royalty seen in the
painting by Striegel, and of the statements of the divine nature of royalty quoted
earlier.

We might digress for one moment to consider why, if that hypothesis is correct,
Senfl should wish to commemorate the birth of an heir to the Emperor Charles. After
all, Senfl had been a member of the Hofkapelle of Wilhelm IV of Bavaria in Munich
since 1523. Bavaria, whilst part of the German Empire, was not part of the
Habsburg possessions, and the Emperor's position was not hereditary, but subject to
election, at least in theory. However, Charles had agreed the succession with
Ferdinand, that Ferdinand should succeed him as Emperor (see below), and so in any
event the birth of Philip carried no dynastic implications outside the Habsburg
inheritance. Further, even though there was a link between the two families, it was
by this stage relatively remote, deriving from the marriage of Maximilian's sister,
Charles's great-aunt, Cunegunde, to Albert IV of Bavaria in 1487. Relationships
between the Wittelsbachs and the Habsburgs were never particularly good, and
deteriorated even further in later years.\textsuperscript{55} Whilst there was considerable rejoicing
at the event in Spain as might be expected, it may be thought unlikely that the birth
of Philip should give rise to any particular expressions of joy at the Bavarian court.\textsuperscript{56} The reason for a tribute such as this therefore remains obscure, if our identification of its origin is correct. Perhaps, despite the political relationships, the motet formed a gift of some sort from Senfl’s employer, Duke Wilhelm, to Charles V on the birth of Philip.\textsuperscript{57} Regardless of their uneasy relations, it might be expected that some form of recognition of the birth of an heir to the Duke’s tutelary ruler would be made. Perhaps, alternatively, the motet is evidence of Senfl’s continuing efforts, documented earlier in his career, to secure a further Imperial position. If we are still in doubt as to the motivation of this motet, the artifice demonstrated perhaps suggests that Senfl was still setting out his wares, with the hope of Imperial employment or favour.\textsuperscript{58}

Two anonymous settings of \textit{Philippe qui videt me}

It is always possible that Senfl’s motet was intended for ceremonies connected with a Philip other than Philip of Spain, which cannot now be immediately identified. Whatever the origin of Senfl’s work, it seems very unlikely that Philip of Spain was the subject of the anonymous setting of \textit{Philippe qui videt me} from KasL 118. The manuscript was written for Philip of Hesse, and the motet carries a date of 15th March 1535. It is unclear whether this date represents the date of composition or the date of performance, but the latter seems the more likely.\textsuperscript{59} If that is so, then the date is not a feast-day of Saint Philip in the liturgical calendar, which might again support the notion that these motets carried a significance beyond the comparatively modest use suggested by their liturgical text. The motet has the chant as a cantus firmus in canon (unlike the Senfl, it is a strict canon), together with references to it in the remaining parts.\textsuperscript{60} The relative formality of the motet’s construction also
suggests a heightened significance. Whilst a precise event has not yet been identified which could have given rise to this particular work, it is worth noting that Philip of Hesse took the Protestant side in the religious struggles, and the years around 1534-5 saw his greatest successes against the Imperial forces. It would not be surprising to find an expression of the nature of his rulership arising as a result of his military victories.

The greatest of these successes was the restoration of Ulrich, Duke of Württemberg, to his Duchy, and it is in a manuscript from Ulrich's chapel, written in about 1548-50, that the other anonymous setting is to be found (in StuttL 36). As Wolff commented, the style of the motet is decidedly old-fashioned, and it is most unlikely that it dates from the same time as the manuscript itself. The restoration of Ulrich by Philip of Hesse might again provide a rationale for the motet which is consistent with the special nature of this group of works, as Ulrich might be supposed to have been grateful for his reinstatement. It is also possible that, in the remaining source at a later date, it did double duty for Philip of Spain as well. The Schmalkaldic League was defeated in the war of 1546-7. (Charles's famous victory at Mühlberg in April 1547 was later immortalised in Titian's well-known portrait of the Emperor, mounted and in full battle-dress.) Ulrich made his peace with Charles, who allowed him to continue as Duke, but with a garrison of troops in Württemberg. After the Entries of Philip and Charles in the Low Countries in 1549, Charles was in Germany in 1550, accompanied by Philip, and it is possible that the motet reflects some reception of Philip during that period.
We come now to the motet by Othmayr. What is known of his life does not readily suggest any link with Imperial circles; far from it. This therefore might suggest that Othmayr's motet, too, has some link to another Philip, rather than to Philip of Spain. However, what is known of his working life does not tend to support that view either. He is known to have filled two positions in Protestant institutions, but there is no clear court connection that could explain this particular work by Othmayr. His first works demonstrate his Reformed sympathies; for instance, his first printed work, published in 1546, is entitled *Epitaphium D. Martini Lutheri*. It seems incongruous to find a motet by Othmayr in the company of the pieces by the other composers with their probable political inspiration. Its publication date also seems to offer something of a puzzle. It appeared in a collection of motets published in 1546 by Berg and Neuber, *Selectissimae symphoniae* (RISM 1546/8). Thus it is too early to be linked with any of the events that will be suggested below for the motets by Crecquillon and the two Louys. Othmayr himself was only a child when Philip was born; nor is there any obvious way in which this motet could be linked to the period of Philip of Hesse's ascendency. The context of the motet's publication offers few clues either. The collection is a fairly miscellaneous assortment of motets by a wide range of composers, and there are no rubrics indicating the liturgical use of any of the items. It was, though, a publication of Berg and Neuber. I have already remarked on their apparently close connections with the composers of the Imperial chapel, and indeed, this collection includes motets by Crecquillon, Canis and Manchicourt. It is not being suggested that this provides any evidence of a link between Othmayr and the Imperial circle, but rather, that the motet's musical and textual material may have encouraged Berg and Neuber to print it because of the known allusion to Philip of
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Spain, or to other rulers of the same name.

However, if we take a wider look at Othmayr's works, a solution to the puzzle at once becomes much clearer. Othmayr wrote a whole series of works based on the mottos or symbols of famous men. The large majority of these, numbering some thirty-four, were published in 1547 under the title: *Symbola illustriissimorum principium, nobilium, aliorumque... virorum*. Two other similar works survive in manuscript. Each of these works is based on some form of motto associated with the subject of the composition. It would seem that this motet has to be seen as one of a type in line with those of the 1547 collection, and entirely unrelated to the motets written for specific occasions. However, it does serve to support the association of the text and thematic material with some historical Philip, and that in turn makes the deductions in relation to the other works that much more plausible. If the Philip concerned was a German figure, it is hard to see why Othmayr would not have been willing to make his identity obvious. However, one can readily understand Othmayr's reluctance as a Protestant to identify the object of this particular motet, if it was using a motto of a Catholic Prince, in the same way as his other motets.66 Certainly, the text seems to prefigure the formulaic usage that became standard later in Philip of Spain's reign in correspondence and the like, the phrase 'God and His Majesty', which matched the ever closer identification by Philip of his actions with the Divine will.67 Additionally, with its apparent association with him from his earliest days, if the hypothesis on Senfl's motet is correct, one might almost regard it as an omen, given the inflexibility and rigour with which Philip pursued his vision of God's will to the detriment of so much of his empire and its peoples.
Crecquillon’s *Philippe qui videt me*

Whatever Senfl’s precise impetus in the composition of his motet, it seems likely to be linked to a particular person, and by extension, to an event of particular significance for that individual, by its treatment of the canonic cantus firmus, its number symbolism and its use of a text incorporating the notion of divine kingship.

What of Crecquillon’s motet? The title of the publication in which it first appeared seems to point in the opposite direction. This publication was one of Berg and Neuber’s in Nuremberg. It appeared with two differing title pages in the partbooks: *Selectissimarum cantionum de precipuis sanctorum Dei domesticorum festis...* and *Carmina vere divina, a praestantissimis artificibus ad singula anni festa...* (RISM 1550/2). Moreover, the motet itself in that edition is headed ‘In die Philip. et Jacobi’, and in Susato’s eleventh book of his series of *Ecclesiasticarum cantionem* (RISM 1555/9) in which it was reprinted, ‘De sancto Philippo’. These rubrics strongly suggest either a liturgical context for the work, or perhaps more specifically the publisher’s wish to present it thus, despite the fact that the text and chant quotations, and the example of Senfl’s motet, suggest otherwise.

It would be easier to accept that Crecquillon’s motet was originally a ‘praise’ motet, if we could identify a plausible occasion for its composition. It certainly cannot have been written in Philip of Spain’s honour as King of Spain. At the date of the publication of the Crecquillon motet, Philip was, in addition to his ducal titles, regent but not King of Spain. Philip had his own chapel, and apart from a visit by Charles and his entourage to Spain in 1541-3, there was no direct contact between Charles and Philip, only by letter, as Philip remained in Spain whilst Charles spent his time elsewhere. It is possible that Crecquillon wrote his motet during that visit,
but a more likely occasion will present itself if we keep in mind both the text set by Crecquillon (and the other composers), and the origin of the chant quotation with its connections to royal liturgies through the idea of royalty representing God not just in a metaphysical way, but in a quite literal sense.

In 1548, Philip embarked from Spain on a journey that was to take him from there to Genoa, and thence through Germany to the Low Countries. He eventually met Charles in Brussels in April of 1549. The grand progress continued with ceremonial Entries into Louvain, Ghent and a number of other towns. The most spectacular entry of all was into Antwerp in September of that year.‌ Everywhere much of the allegory presented in the towns' reception of the Imperial progress was centred on Charles and Philip as father and son. Strong sums up the prevailing imagery of the Entries which was both Biblical and classical: 'The relationship of Charles and Philip was acted out in the stories of Abraham making Isaac his heir, Joseph visiting Jacob, or Solomon crowned King of Israel at the behest of his father David. Classical prototypes were Philip of Macedon and Alexander the Great, Coelus Adrian succeeding Trajan, Priam choosing Hector or Flavius Vespasian attended by his son Titus.'‌ The text of Crecquillon's motet would have been particularly apposite in that context.

We have, too, a good picture from only a few years earlier of how such ceremonial motets might be performed. In 1540, Charles V made a formal Entry into Cambrai. A description of part of that Entry records that:

"there were handsome young boys and girls who, when the said Majesty passed under the said arch, began to sing in beautiful, sweet and harmonious counterpoint, "O vera unitas.";
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and that, from the summit of a triumphal arch, the cantors of the bishop

‘sang melodiously songs and motets made and composed in honour of His Majesty and all the said princes, and notably a motet with excellent music composed by Master Jehan Courtois...’70

Whatever the intimations of the prints of Crecquillon's motet, there is nothing in it that would have prevented its use in such circumstances to mark a ceremonial entry of Philip, or even that would have rendered it unsuitable.71 On the contrary, there are several points of interest that suggest that it would have been particularly appropriate. First, of course, are the points upon which our discussion is based: Wolff's observation of the thematic similarity with other motets on the same text, our suggested rationale for the Senfl motet, and the more general connection between incarnation and royalty. Second, it is noticeable that Crecquillon does not at first pursue the imitation of the cantus firmus beyond the immediate opening, but he then draws attention to it by having it appear later in equal semibreves (original values) in both the bassus and superius parts, after the initial exposition, in bars 14 to 21. This phrase has the text ‘Philippe, qui videt me’. The prominence given to these words is unmatched elsewhere in the motet; the remainder of the text certainly receives no comparable treatment. Indeed, the highlighting of these particular words in precisely this way is difficult to parallel in any other motet by Crecquillon. It has though much in common with the marking of important words and phrases already noted from the earlier discussion on borrowed material. The impression that the full liturgical text is subordinate to the specific reference is difficult to avoid.
There are three further reasons for suggesting that this is the probable occasion of the motet's composition. Two reasons concern Crecquillon's chant quotation. The first is the identity of the chant itself. As has been noted, this does not appear in any central chant source, and therefore does not seem to have been widespread. The earlier settings of the text all suggest a peculiarly German tradition. As far as one can tell, the Use within the Imperial chapel by Crecquillon's time would have been either of Paris or, less probably, of Rome. It has also been suggested that the evidence is against any adoption of the Passau rite in the Imperial chapel after Maximilian's death. Whilst Senfl's use of this particular chant may be explicable in several ways, it is harder to see why Crecquillon would have adopted it, and not one from the Use of his particular institution, unless it was for precisely the historical resonances that it carried from its earlier adoption by Senfl, Brumel and the anonymous composers. These resonances would have been particularly appropriate to this occasion.

The second reason to support this particular view of the motet is its use of the chant. Like *Honor virtus* the texture is filled with chant quotations, even allowing for the textual emphasis mentioned above. This is in marked contrast to the ways in which Crecquillon uses chant elsewhere, and which were discussed in chapter 4. These two motets stand alone in their technique; certainly none of Crecquillon's other motets with texts ostensibly to saints is comparable. If the logic of the use of chant that was derived from the review of borrowed material is pursued, then the indication of corporate importance signalled by the incorporation of chant would reach its apogee in a work for an occasion such as these Entries, where city and ruler were united in ceremonies which emphasised the connections between the ruler and God or Christ, and the realm's reflection of the heavenly kingdom. In this context, the sustained use
of the chant within the motet is entirely appropriate.

Having said that, Crecquillon's opening point is not modelled completely on the opening of the chant. The third reason which seems to confirm the conscious and deliberate construction of the motet as a work for such an occasion is the possible link with another chant, *Verbum caro*, through a work in a different genre, and which would support a connection with Philip of Spain.

The opening of the *superius* of the Crecquillon motet may be compared to the opening line of a Spanish villancico printed in the collection *Villancicos De diversos Autores*, published in Venice in 1556 (RISM 1556/30) by Scotto. It will be seen that apart from the elision of the two phrases of the villancico in constructing the opening point, and the Crecquillon motet's subsequent extension beyond the quotation, the notes are identical. It is also significant that, in a piece where the imitation is not as exact as it often is in Crecquillon's motets, the precise matching of the villancico melody only occurs in the *superius* voice, the most obvious and audible part, although the *tenor* too, corresponds fairly accurately, but is curtailed before the complete exposition. It will also be seen that the later 'motto' phrase which appears twice in Crecquillon's motet matches exactly the opening half of the villancico phrase derived from its own chant as well as the chant used by Senfl. Crecquillon's use of the villancico in this context is a subtle double reference which serves to introduce an appropriately Spanish note at the same time as strengthening the divine kingship element by reinforcing the original text by reference even more directly, if that were possible, to the Incarnation.

The text of the villancico's first line is:
Verbum caro factum est porque todos hos salveys (or salveis)
(The word is made flesh to save you all)

The quotation of the chant *Verbum caro* in the villancico argues too that the chant must have been sufficiently well known generally for such a reference to be understood by the hearer, despite its lowly liturgical position in one of the minor offices. That in turn lends credence to its use by Crecquillon as an allusion that would add further symbolic weight to his motet.73

An additional, or alternative, chant reference may also have been intended.

Larchier's motet *Laudemus puerum* has a cantus firmus which is again very similar to the chants for both *Philippe qui videt me* and *Verbum caro*.74 Its text is also one linked with the Incarnation, the motet being for Christmas. Larchier is only known from a small number of works printed in Antwerp and Louvain, and his cantus firmus may therefore represent a local chant tradition. It might be that Crecquillon, if he was seeking to make a symbolic point in a work for a public occasion such as an Entry of Philip, would have used a chant that would be familiar to the people, rather than one from the Imperial chapel's own Use.

The accumulation of these features is sufficient to conclude that the primary purpose of Crecquillon's motet was unlikely to be liturgical, even if subsequently a liturgical context was suggested by the printers. It is difficult to see that Crecquillon's motet could apply to anyone but Philip of Spain, whatever the occasion that generated it. However, it is worth considering a little further the symbolism involved and the circumstances that could render it valid.
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In discussing the Senfl motet, I have said that its allusions to the nature of royalty would be fitting for the birth of royal or imperial progeny. Clearly, such symbolism would seem less fitting for Philip at the age of twenty-one or so. There are, however, the entry liturgies into the pattern of which the chant allusion would fit perfectly. The text itself could be read in different ways which might be equally valid. First, we should consider the quite literal position. Philip had been born in Spain and raised in Spain. He had never been outside the country, except for a minor excursion into the margins of France. Yet his existence must have overshadowed much of the Emperor's thoughts; Charles corresponded with him, effectively trained him from afar, and ensured that he had trusted advisers. Philip must have represented an ever-present concern, but an always-absent person. To the court especially, but to the Low Countries more generally, he must have been someone known by reputation and by anecdote only. Yet on this occasion, that of his introduction to the domains outside Spain, he became a real person, not just the object of stories, speculation and rumour. What better text could be found than 'the word is made flesh'? The Spanish origin of this quotation in Crecquillon's motet must have lent it a special piquancy for the first appearance of Philip in the Low Countries' towns and cities, particularly for Philip himself and his father, Charles. One might even speculate that Crecquillon chose this villancico because it was known in court circles. Second, as future ruler of the Low Countries, Philip would become the embodiment of God within the realm, and the allusion to his father could be both to Charles his father in the flesh, and to the heavenly Father.

At another level, it is clear that despite Charles's agreement of 1519 with Ferdinand, ratified in 1522, that Ferdinand would succeed him, the issues of
Charles's succession were by no means closed. They came to a head in 1550, only shortly after the events that I have suggested as the likely occasion for Crecquillon's motet. It was rumoured that Charles wished to replace Ferdinand as King of the Romans, and Charles certainly saw the need for a unified dynasty, with Philip succeeding Ferdinand at the very least, rather than that the empire be fragmented or lost to another branch of the family. In Charles's mind, too, throughout his reign, was the ideal of Christian universalism achieved through a world monarchy. We may reasonably imagine therefore that the manner of Philip's presentation to the Low Countries was intended to convey to Ferdinand and to others the unmistakeable message of Philip's right to inherit the Imperial throne as Charles's son. 75 Again the text 'he who sees me, sees the father also' makes eminent sense. We should not be surprised if music written by a member of Charles's own chapel was designed to reflect and amplify that political message.

There is further confirmation of this train of thought. Among the records of the splendid Entry into Antwerp are illustrations of some of the triumphal arches. 76 These include one arch surmounted by the figures of Charles and Philip bearing the world on their shoulders. Another arch displayed an image much more closely linked with the sentiments of Crecquillon's motet and its Spanish villancico reference, that of God the Father crowning Philip, giving visual confirmation of the narrower political context in which we have just placed the motet. We may be reasonably sure, then, that the musical and textual scheme of reference of the motet would have been very suitable for what I believe was the likely occasion for which it was composed.

In addition to what we can infer from the motet and elsewhere about its probable use for one of these Entries of Philip, we know that the members of the Imperial chapel,
as we might expect, must have been involved in them in some capacity. The expenses of the town of Ypres for their Entry in July 1549 include four jars of wine to Cornelius Canis, at that time maistre of Charles’s chapel. Whether this payment was for a suitable composition performed at the Entry, or for the chapel members for singing (or both), we cannot tell. If it were for the former, then it is not possible to identify the piece with any certainty as one of Canis’s extant compositions. His motet Gloria tibi trinitas has a text from two antiphons for second Vespers on Trinity Sunday, and does not appear in a source earlier than the Entry. Whilst we may notice the coincidence of liturgical time with the text used for the Bruges Entries, Honor virtus also from the feast of Trinity, it is difficult to suggest from the precise text of Canis’s motet that it would have been particularly suitable for such an occasion.

The weight of classical and biblical allusion brought to bear in these and other Entries of Charles’s reign, and partly reflected in these motets, was, as we have noted, entirely consistent with the prevailing views on kingship. This was mirrored by the dense symbolism of the slightly later festivities at Binche, which were redolent with similar imagery. Nevertheless, the notions of incarnation and salvation through the ruler can seem to stand rather outside today’s more secular concept of royalty. I want therefore to emphasise their validity by brief reference to a few other specific instances. These further examples will also serve to help confirm the assumption we have made about the use of a chant concerning the Incarnation in the context of a royal or imperial birth as well as in the wider aspect of divine kingship.

Aside from the obvious hopes placed on all rulers of Western Christendom for protection from heresy within and infidels without, the type of language used of
royalty outwith formal state occasions continues to represent the ruler as, in some sense, a saviour. Philip began his journey that culminated in his extensive formal taking possession of the Low Countries, which is what the Entries signify, by embarking for Genoa. The flotilla was under the charge of the Emperor's aged admiral, Andrea Doria. Doria, an experienced seaman, had seen action in plenty in the hostile environment of the Mediterranean Sea. Not a man, one would imagine, to be given over to excessive sentiment. Yet when he met Philip for the voyage to Genoa, he is said to have knelt on the shore and, overcome by emotion, to have said the words of the Nunc Dimittis, the words with which the aged Simeon greeted the infant Jesus: 'Lord now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation'.

Other examples of the notion of salvation and the representation of the divine are readily to hand, from the reign of Queen Mary in England, which demonstrate the currency of these particular types of expression of belief at very much the same time as Philip's Entry into the Low Countries, with the marriage of Philip and Mary providing a neat link between the two.

It may be recalled that the events in England during the years before Mary came to the throne had led to the excommunication of the entire country. At that stage, the temper of the country as a whole was not Protestant, and Mary's reign, initially, had much popular support. Reynard, the Emperor Charles's ambassador, wrote that 'God, men said, had visited his people, and "the Virgin Mary" had been set upon the throne for their redemption'. Such a reference to Mary was by no means unique. When as part of the Imperial and royal plans to bring England back to the fold of the Universal Church, the papal legate Reginald Pole arrived in England in the autumn of 1554 to
begin the process of reconciling the country and English Church to Rome, he greeted
Mary with the words of the ‘Ave Maria’, the angelic salutation in which Mary learns
of her choice as the vessel of the Incarnation. (Additionally, the Virgin Mary was in
effect widely regarded as co-redemptrix with Christ, even if it was not official
doctrine.) Later, after a less than satisfactory period in England as Mary’s
husband, Philip left the country to rejoin his father on the continent. Cardinal Pole
composed a long prayer for Mary as a consolation in her loneliness. In this prayer,
Pole refers to Philip as being in the image of Christ. These few examples will be
sufficient again to demonstrate the highly charged language and thought which
surrounded royalty of the time, both within and outside the context of ceremonial
occasions, and help to validate the conclusions we have so far drawn. The language is
such at times that some later writers have found it almost blasphemous. We need be
in no doubt that the implications of Crecquillon’s motet, as well as Senfl’s, would
have been entirely in tune with the contemporary view of royalty.

Motets by J. and L. Louys

The motets by J. and L. Louys identified by Wolff show that Crecquillon’s motet is
unlikely to have been an isolated example of the use of this particular symbolism,
and suggest that Crecquillon was working, in this instance, within a context that was
wider than an emulation of, or reference to, an earlier work might of itself imply. I
want to comment briefly on these two motets by two composers about whom little is
known and whose corpus of works is modest. Certainly Ludovicus is not to be
identified with Jan; compositions by both appear in the same volume of at least one
print (book four of Berg and Neuber’s Thesauri musici RISM 1564/4) with initials
and names carefully distinguished. Jan is thought to have been connected with
Antwerp in the earlier part of his career. He published a three-volume set of French psalm settings there in 1555, each volume being separately dedicated to a different Antwerp citizen.

In that publication Jan Louys refers to his youth, but he appears to have been publishing from 1552 onwards, although at least two of the earlier works attributed to him may be by Clemens and Rore. No doubt his 1555 collection took some time to complete, and even if those two motets are not his, there is no reason why we should not accept that he was writing as early as 1552, and that works published under his name are indeed his. However, if we take his remark at face value, it would seem most unlikely that his motet could have been written for the same circumstances as we have suggested for Crecquillon's motet.

It is possible though that Jan Louys had some connection with the Imperial court or chapel. Individuals with the surname 'Loys', who may have been related, appear within the court records, and from February 1 1558 to his death on 15 October 1563, a certain Jhan de Loys was a singer in the chapel of the Emperor Ferdinand I. It has been pointed out that between 1552 and 1556, Jan Louys' music was published at Antwerp or Louvain, but that the remaining publications, in 1564 and 1568, were in Nuremberg, in anthologies some of which had close ties with the Habsburg chapels. From that, it seems likely that the singer and composer are one and the same.

If little is known about Jan, virtually nothing nothing is currently known about Ludovicus. His few six-voice and five-voice motets survive in volumes of Berg and Neuber's *Thesauri musici* (RISM 1564/3 and 1564/4); there is also a three-voice
motet first published in 1567 in Nuremberg.\textsuperscript{89} The co-incidence of two minor composers of the same surname, setting the same text and referring to the same source material (two out of a known group of eight) is too great to consider it as such, especially as their total output of motets seems to have been modest. The immediate inference is that Ludovicus and Jan were related, perhaps brothers. This supposition is given some credence by the fact that their works in the five-voice volumes of the Berg and Neuber collection (RISM 1564/4) are placed next to each other, when there is no observable method of organisation discernable generally for the ordering of the contents, certainly not alphabetical.

The music of both motets again seems to refer to the chant model, but in these two instances there seems no additional point of reference or any particular refinement of the symbolism that is obvious to the listener or that one can suggest. The fact though that these motets were unlikely to be contemporary with the Crecquillon motet again suggests that the musical and verbal allusions were ones that had some enduring force.\textsuperscript{90} There is one small but interesting point. Crecquillon’s chanson \textit{Cessez, mes yeux} appeared in print in one of Phalèse’s collections of chansons, published in 1554. Following it in the partbooks is a response by Jan Louys, beginning with the same words, \textit{Cessez, mes yeux}. That seems to add at least a little weight to the possibility of the two Louys having some sort of Imperial court or chapel connection.

If the music of these two motets itself tells us little beyond the bare fact of the reference to one or more of the earlier possible models, it also makes it more difficult to construct a convincing case for any particular occasion for their composition and performance, (assuming that they were both written for the same
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event). We may assume that they are not simply homages to the Crecquillon setting from the lack of musical correspondences, other than those one could regard as derived from the chant. We may by now reasonably assume, if the arguments above are valid, that these motets too are in honour of Philip of Spain. If so, they may well have been written for an entry or other similar ceremonial event, which narrows the options down.

After his introduction to the Low Countries and his grand series of Entries with the Emperor Charles, Philip stayed with him for about two years. After the Diet at Augsburg in 1551 he made his way back to Spain. He did not stay there long; in 1554 Philip arrived in England to pursue his marriage with Mary Tudor. The failure of Mary to produce the longed-for heir, and the consequent more general frustration of Charles's foreign policy towards England, led finally to Philip giving in to Charles's blandishments to return to the Low Countries. Philip left Greenwich in August 1555, not to return to England until March 1557.

During the months towards the end of 1555 and the beginning of 1556, Charles gradually divested himself of his responsibilities, conferring on Philip the Spanish crown amongst other titles and responsibilities. It is possible that the motets by Louys could have been proper to any of this, but the record of Charles's abdication and the manner of it do not suggest that there were any great celebrations, rather the reverse. The formal abdications were sombre events. There is a more plausible alternative. For the first and only time, Philip attended a meeting of the Order of the Golden Fleece, in Antwerp in January 1556. As in previous Entries there were triumphal arches with musicians playing and singing from them, although in one respect it was an ill-starred meeting: one of the triumphal arches collapsed killing
several of the spectators below.\textsuperscript{92} The full meetings of the Order were infrequent; Vandenesse has left sufficient detail for us to see that the 1546 meeting was a grand event.\textsuperscript{93} It is likely that the 1556 meeting was equally splendid. The mass at Westminster Abbey on St Andrew's day in 1554 when Philip was still in England had been attended by no fewer than three hundred lords dressed in various fine costumes, although that was also the occasion for an absolution of the congregation as part of the reconciliation with Rome.\textsuperscript{94} Not only would that 1556 meeting be a time when one might expect politically charged motets and chansons to be composed and performed, especially as it was the first meeting under Philip as head of the order, but it would accord well with the publication of music by Jan Louys in Antwerp and Louvain up to the same year, and his likely removal to Vienna by the beginning of 1558.

Although the evidence is circumstantial, there is nothing to suggest that these two motets do anything other than continue a series of works directly connected with royalty, in this instance Philip of Spain, and the Entry at the meeting of the Order of the Golden Fleece gives a timely occasion for their composition that fits well with the earlier motets, and for which the symbolism would have been fitting. More generally, the tradition of music associated with the Order is becoming clearer, and these two pieces make an interesting probable addition to its later musical history.\textsuperscript{95}

The motet \textit{Honor virtus}

Crecquillon's motet \textit{Philippe qui videt me} can be assigned to the Entries of Philip of Spain on strong grounds. Dunning has also linked Crecquillon's motet \textit{Quis te victorem} to the same set of Entries.\textsuperscript{96} So far in this chapter, I have only commented on Crecquillon's motet \textit{Honor virtus} in passing. I want briefly to give a little more
background which, together with the motet's paraphrase technique, will support the thought that this motet also was probably first written for this series of celebrations. The use of the text in a number of Entries at Bruges has already been noted. However, the Imperial links with the Trinity were more widespread and deep-rooted.

It is clear, for instance from the Journal entries of Vandenesse that the Trinity occupied a special place in Imperial circles. Two journal entries in particular may be noted. The first, from May 1544 records the annual memorial mass for Charles's deceased wife:

...et le lendemain la messe, à la Trinité, que se célébroient pour la feuë impératrice.
(and the next day the mass of the Trinity which they celebrated for the late Empress)\(^97\)

The second journal entry is from a year later, July 1545. News had reached Charles of the birth of a son, Don Carlos, to Philip of Spain and his wife Maria of Portugal. Charles was overjoyed, and after a night of bonfires, the court gave thanks:

Et le lendemain l'on chantre en court, en la chappelle, *Te Deum laudamus* et une messe de la Trinité, à laquelle furent présens le roy des Romains, les archiducz, le cardinal d'Augsbourg et plusieurs aultres.
(And the next day at the court in the chapel the *Te Deum* and a mass of the Trinity were sung, at which the King of the Romans, the archdukes, the cardinal of Augsburg and several others were present.)\(^98\)
The Trinity it seems was called on at times of particular solemnity, both joyous and sad, for the Imperial family. Macey has drawn attention to a prayerbook of Charles V in which the connection is reinforced. The manuscript contains a Trinity miniature with Charles as donor. On the facing folio is the *Sancta trinitas* text as set by Févin.99 This is perhaps not surprising. There was a long-standing Imperial association with the Trinity. Heer notes: 'Imperial charters were regularly issued in the name of the Trinity as the patron and protector of the Empire.'100 But the background was not solely Imperial; there was a Burgundian element in the Trinity association, too. In 1383 Philip the Bold began building the religious foundation of Chartreuse de Champmol in Dijon, consecrated five years later. This foundation, the pre-eminent Burgundian foundation, was intended to act as a quasi-royal burial place for the Burgundian dynasty, no doubt in imitation of Saint Denis. It was dedicated to the Trinity and its seal showed the throne of mercy, a depiction of the Trinity in which God the Father is seen seated on the throne of mercy with the crucified Christ, the Holy Spirit hovering above.101 With what has been discussed already about divine kingship, it seems very probable that the particular Trinitarian association grew from the royal or Imperial throne being seen as the earthly equivalent of the heavenly throne, yet another mimesis of the heavenly, with the strong Trinitarian connections arising from the depiction of the 'throne of mercy' being carried over as a part of the divine representation. It would not be stretching the interpretation to suggest that the 'throne of mercy' represented the Christian commonwealth: the King on his throne guided by God, with Christ representing the Church.102 Another slightly later example of this specifically Trinitarian imagery in a Burgundian context is to be seen in a miniature of Margaret of York, Duchess of Burgundy, kneeling before an altar, on which is shown the throne of mercy as in the earlier seal
from the foundation of Philip the Bold, and again, the ‘throne of mercy’ depiction of the Trinity is also shown in the Hours of the Holy Spirit in the Hours of Mary of Burgundy.\textsuperscript{103}

Whatever its precise significance and origins, the Imperial association with the Trinity was evidently widely expressed. At the Entry into Cambrai in 1540 mentioned above, the Emperor Charles was greeted not just with music from the arches, but with a play on the mystery of the Trinity, which was followed by the motet on the same subject, \textit{O vera unitas}.\textsuperscript{104} We can perhaps trace this association in some of the settings of the \textit{Sancta trinitas} text. The four-voice setting by Févin appears in LonBLR 8 G. vii, a manuscript from the Habsburg court; the motet was subsequently expanded by Bruck into a six-voice version of some splendour. A later three-voice motet by Prenner (in RISM 1569/5) refers to the opening of the Févin setting, and on another Trinity text, \textit{Salve suprema trinitas}, Maessens wrote an extraordinary series of canons (in RISM 1549/11).\textsuperscript{105} The three last composers all worked prominently in Habsburg circles.

The evidence that \textit{Honor virtus} was intended for a similar event to \textit{Philippe qui videt me} is therefore a little more circumstantial. Nevertheless, the combination of the motet’s style, with its heavy emphasis on key phrases which would have been particularly appropriate to an entry, and the more general association of the Emperor and the Trinity, suggest that this motet too was written originally for a particular Imperial ceremony; its chant paraphrase technique also points in the same direction. During the period that Crecquillon is known to have been in the Imperial chapel, the Emperor made a number of ceremonial Entries. It is not certain that Crecquillon was a member of the choir at the time of the Entry into Cambrai.
cited above. In any case, the record of that particular Entry shows that the music and its performance was by local musicians. Other Entries occurred in 1541 in Majorca and Milan, but apparently no more until the series of Entries with Philip in 1549. If we can extrapolate from the example of Cambrai, it would seem unlikely that the Imperial chapel would be involved in those at Majorca and Milan. It is more probable that their involvement would come with Charles’s lavish preparations for Philip’s reception in the Low Countries. On that basis, it is reasonable to suggest that Crecquillon’s motet *Honor virtus* was also written for one of the Entries of Philip, along with *Philippe qui videt me* and *Quis te victorem*.

Conclusions

The group of motets that has been discussed provides a detailed context in which Crecquillon’s two motets can be placed. The circumstances of the setting by Brumel of *Philippe qui videt me* are unknown. Whether Senfl knew the Brumel piece and deliberately adopted similar symbolism for a similar purpose cannot now be determined, but that seems probable, given the degree and method of use of the chant in Brumel’s motet. Nevertheless, Senfl’s motet links the broader symbolism of divine kingship drawn from the text to the person of a royal Philip, probably Philip of Spain, and all the other motets seem probably to fit within the narrower context of rulers of that name. Crecquillon’s *Honor virtus*, through the Trinitarian connections with the Imperial house, seems to exhibit a very similar conceptual frame. His *Philippe qui videt me* seems to make both the immediate and wider context more specific by his apparent reference to a Spanish villancico based on an Incarnation text and chant. Crecquillon also seems to have used pervasive chant paraphrase as a method of indicating the extreme importance of the occasions for which his two
motets would probably have been written. The later examples by the two composers Jan and Ludovicus Louys, on the present analysis, appear not to extend the original symbolism further, but give confirmation that they and Crecquillon were writing in a continuing tradition, rather than developing their own personal frame of reference. All the works, with the possible exception of Othmayr’s, would appear to belong together as similar expressions of the basic underlying beliefs, probably to be performed on public occasions involving royalty (again with the exception of Othmayr’s motet), when the distinctions between sacred and secular, the Church and state, and the earthly and the divine were erased in the one central image of the divine ruler taking possession of his inheritance to rule as the just king.
Notes to Chapter 5

1. The notion of dual or multiple readings is one that has been aired in several recent studies; see the Introduction to Pesce (1997), particularly pp. 3-4. Pesce has the happy formulation of 'music-poetic' for the type of creation covered in some of the essays in that volume. My approach is similar to that adopted by several of the authors in Pesce. The recognition that there is ambiguity and differing levels of discourse in music just as there is in other arts seems incontrovertible. I also accept her point that not only could symbols be subject to differing levels or forms of interpretation, but also that the meaning of the symbols may not necessarily have fixed significance. An example from Habsburg iconography is the ship of state. At the obsequies for Charles V in Antwerp the ship of state was given a detailed allegorical exposition (see Strong (1984) pp. 95-6), highly personal to Charles in many ways as one might expect, yet when the duchess Isabella entered Antwerp in 1615 the ship of state again formed part of the procession (see Denis van Alskoot's famous painting of the Entry now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London) and must perforce have been very differently interpreted. Incidentally, Alskoot's painting is so similar to the engraving of the ship from 1557 by J. and L. van Duetcum printed in 1559 (reproduced as Illustration no. 68 in Strong 1984) that it must have been copied from it. I do not therefore claim any exclusivity for the readings suggested, but do suggest that the ones offered may have had some priority.

2. Some details of the ceremony were recorded by Cuspinian, a humanist scholar and diplomat in Maximilian's service, who was instrumental in securing the succession treaty. See Cuyler (1973) p. 95.
3. Wheatcroft (1995) p. 91 identifies the last figure as Lajos. It seems more probable to me that it represents Charles's sister, Mary.

4. It is in this respect by no means unique. See for instance the portrait in the style of Holbein of Henry VIII with Prince Edward and Jane Seymour, with the two Princesses Mary and Elizabeth, in the Queen's private collection. Like Mary, Maximilian's wife, Jane Seymour died before the picture was painted, in her case in giving birth to Prince Edward.

5. The picture in one form or the other is reproduced in Jardine (1996) and Wheatcroft (1995) whilst Heer (original German version only) reproduces both. Both versions of the painting are discussed in Heer (1968) pp. 145-6, and one in Wheatcroft pp. 91-2.

6. The inscriptions for these individuals on the painting read: MAXIMILIANUS I IMP/ARCHIDUX AUSTRIAE/dux BURGUNDiae and MARIA DUCISSA/BURGUNDiae MAX: UXOR.

7. The inscriptions for these individuals on the picture are: CLEOPHAS FRATER CARNALIS IO/SEPHI MARITI DIVAE VIRG. MARIAE, MARIA CLEOPHAE SOROR VIRG MAR PUTATIVA MATERETERA D N., and SIMON ZELOTES CONSObRinus DNI NRI, respectively. I take 'frater carnalis', 'brother of the flesh' to be a means of ensuring that 'brother' in the modern sense is understood, rather than 'cousin' which was an alternative meaning of 'brother' in the Hebrew.

8. For a discussion of the traditional understanding of Jesus's family, see Ashe 338.
Chapter 3, sections 4 and 5. The biblical references to Jesus’s brothers are traditionally taken to refer to Jesus’s cousins, hence the closeness of relationship being implied.

9. See for instance Yates’s discussion of the ‘Ermine’ portrait of Queen Elizabeth attributed to Segar, Yates (1975) pp. 215-6. See also the portrait of Elizabeth I in coronation robes, posthumous copy by an unknown artist c. 1600-10 in the National Portrait Gallery London. On the decoration of the chambers of Margaret of York see Weightman (1993) p. 56. It is possible to read this gesture as symbolising the purity of Margaret, but dynastic marriage paid little attention to the value of virginity. In the light of the points made below, I prefer to read this as a means of equating the marriage consummation and its hoped-for outcome with the Incarnation itself.


11. The Song of Roland. See also Sayers’ Introduction pp. 14-5. At the height of the battle with the Saracens, Charlemagne makes the sun stand still in the sky to give more time. This reflects a further attribute of royalty, the close connection with nature, which is relevant to the next chapter.

12. The crucial point is of course why such poetic licence would be meaningful in the first instance without the underlying belief.

14. On divine kingship, there is a masterly section in Clark (1997): Chapter 41 Marvellous Monarchy. The quotations are from an anonymous book *De Droict divin* (Paris 1622) and Henry Finch, and are taken from Clark p. 620. On this point, it is possible to read a history of medieval political thought such as Canning (1996) almost entirely as the exploration and realisation within different social models of this single central concept.

15. See the entire essay ‘Queen Elizabeth I as Astraea’ in Yates (1975). For the descriptions of Elizabeth as a second Virgin after her death, see particularly pp. 78-9.

16. See for example the miniature of Philip the Good attending mass in Brussels, Bibliotèque Royale, Ms 9092, reproduced in Wangermée (1968) fig. 18. It will be seen that the words ‘Pater noster’ are painted on the inside of the curtained enclosure, clearly to be taken as applying to Philip himself.

17. The document is that listing the duties of the chapel personnel prepared for Philip II after the abdication, but preserving the Imperial order as it was in 1545. See chapter 2.

18. There was probably a third strand in the symbolism of this moment. Liturgical practice varied on from where the Gospel was read, but in some uses there
was a movement of the gospel book, with a symbolic meaning becoming attached to it. Thus a movement to the north was taken to represent the dissemination of the Gospel to the gentiles, and the reading at the north symbolised God's word to those that were cold towards it. We do not know what practice was used in the Imperial chapel, but the physical movement of the Gospel book would undoubtedly have attracted an additional symbolic significance. On English practice, see Staley (1911) p. 188.

19. On the Pax, or Kiss of Peace, see Dix (1945) pp. 105-10.


21. Another manifestation of this, the possible identification of the king in his enclosure in close proximity to the altar with the host in the tabernacle, emerged in questions at a recent conference: Chapels Royal - Politics, Doctrine and the Arts at the Early-Modern Court 1400-1720, organised by The Society for Court Studies, London 13-15th February 1997.

22. See Einhard p. 81.

23. Einhard is the more reliable factually of Charlemagne's biographers, and the Christmas day coronation has long been accepted. Even if it were not so, the change to that day in the chronicle would in itself be indicative of the same point.

24. Cummings (1992) chapter 11, gives an extended account of the Imperial Coronation of Charles V. He does not identify the Coronation mass as the Epiphany
mass, which detail has been taken from Heer (1968) p. 151. Cummings does not discuss any of the texts within quite the same framework as the one here that I am suggesting is appropriate. The same mass was apparently used in 1520 when Charles was crowned King of the Romans at Aachen after a bitter election, see Heusch (1960) p. 165.

25. See chapter 4.

26. Aeneas Sylvius was elected Pope as Pius II in 1458.


28. On the coincidence of the Benedictus with the elevation, and some symbolism arising from that in music by Josquin, see Long (1989) p. 6 onwards. There was an instruction in the Imperial chapel that the singing should stop immediately before the Elevation so that the Host might be more reverently adored. See vander Straeten vol. 7, p. 183, no vii; the document is the 1556 laws and constitution of the chapel.


30. There are yet other manifestations of the belief in divine kingship not touched upon that could be explored; for instance, the traditional theological arguments which allowed war contrary to the prohibition of the sixth commandment provided three specific justifications. Two were to do with the nature of the enterprise: war for a just cause, and for a lawful intention. The third, and the first in practice, was by the authority of the ruler. We see in yet another way the ruler able to speak, as it were,
for and as God in suspending the operation of something so fundamental as one of the ten commandments. A ruler's decision on this was subject to no explicit limitation; see Gautier (1884) pp. 2-4.

31. It is possibly important when considering the vitality of this concept to remember that Cuspinian was a noted humanist scholar. It is evidently therefore no relic of medieval thinking that had little real currency.

32. It is probably fair to say that what is now frequently taken for the routine flattery of royalty is a fundamental misunderstanding of the mindset of the times. The belief in the reality of the divine in the person of the king or ruler, or at the very least, the divine guidance and inspiration, could lead to powers being attributed that seem to us to be unrealistic but which were no more than a conventional response to what, in whatever guise, was an accepted fact. The miraculous powers of kings included the well-known cure by touch. On this see Clark (1997) pp. 653-4. Clark's comment is particularly apposite: 'Divine rulers had miracle-working properties that allowed them to transcend nature altogether'.

33. Walter (1975) accepts Wolff's conclusion that this motet is in honour of Philip II of Spain without further discussion, vol. 1, pp. 22-3.

34. Wolff (1956) pp. 166-167. The two motets by L. and J. Louys are in RISM 1564/3 and 1564/4; the anonymous motet is in StuttL 36; the Crecquillon motet is in Ferer and Hudson (1997b).

35. Wolff described the anonymous setting, in StuttL 36, as having a cantus
firmus in two-part canon, the origin of which he was unable to identify. There seems to have been some confusion. The motet has no cantus firmus, nor does it contain a canon. Perhaps Wolff muddled it with the setting by Senfl, or another anonymous setting, in Kasl 118, to be mentioned below. This does not vitiate his point.


37. To facilitate comparison, incipits and transcriptions of some of the motets are given together in Appendix 2.


40. As covered by Bryden and Hughes (1969). The psalm antiphons are in modes 7 and 3, the Alleluia and Communion, modes 8 and 4, respectively. All the motets are in mode 6 transposed.

41. Greisheimer (1990) made the identification of this chant quotation, see his transcription of the motet, Pt. 2, pp. 230-42. The chant is reproduced in EDM vol. 88, f. 74. It is clear from the differences between Senfl's cantus firmus and this version of the chant that Senfl did not take it from this particular source. That conclusion is supported by the consistency in certain respects between Senfl's version and the cantus firmus used in other compositions within this group of pieces.
42. The Brumel survives incomplete in a single source, ZwiR 81/2. It is printed in CMM 5/5. The anonymous/Heugel setting is the one in KasL 118 mentioned above. Nugent (1980) lists a setting by Gombert in RegB 876, a repertorial layer of the manuscript RegB 875-7. An examination of it has failed to identify a setting by Gombert, although it contains a number of other Philippine motets.

43. I have not carried out a comprehensive search of single composer volumes. Heartz (1969) lists no settings of this text. Lincoln (1993) lists only those settings mentioned, together with a motet by Zacheus, which appears in Waelrant and Laet's second book of *Sacrarum cantionum* (RISM 1555/6); unlike the pieces we are concerned with, all of which are in a single section, it is in two parts, extending the text set in the other motets, and it does not appear to make reference to the common melodic material of the others.

44. In addition to these, Lincoln (1993) lists settings of *Tanto tempore* by Prenner and Mornable. As far as one can tell from the incipits given by Lincoln, these motets, too, are unlikely to contain any reference to the chant in question. There is however a setting of this text by Ivo de Vento where he does refer unmistakably to it within the body of the piece, at the words 'qui videt me'. Its rather later date (Vento was born c. 1543-5, and his first book of motets was published in 1569) suggests that if the quotation was significant, it may have been based on one or more of the examples that are the subject of this discussion.

45. This and one other motet, *Haec dies*, by Brumel exist in a single late German source, see note 42 above. The latter is ascribed only to 'A. B.', but *Philippe* to
‘Antho. Bromel’. The pieces are very similar in style, which would be an earlier one for Brumel. It is possible that both motets are misattributed, or that these motets might themselves suggest that we should consider the possibility of Brumel having worked in Germany during one of the periods when we have no knowledge of his biography. I am very grateful to Professor Hudson for his comments, upon which this note is based.

46. The examples have been taken from RISM 1558/04, facsimile edition.

47. Comparison with the earlier printed source, RISM 1537/1 shows that the differences in the cantus firmus between the dux and comes discussed below were not introduced at a later stage; the earlier manuscript source is incomplete, but the surviving canonic voice contains no signs that would suggest that the canon was originally strict. In any event, the printed sources seem to preserve a slightly more reliable reading than MunU 401, which contains an error absent from 1537/1.

48. It is possible of course to suggest that God the Father, being higher in a three-layered medieval cosmos, might be depicted by the upper part, much in the way, for instance, that painters depict God the Father at the top of pictures. That would remove one of the suggested anomalies. I believe the point may be irrelevant in the light of the other observations made on the canon, besides which there may be some precedent to the view that where similar symbolism is presumably intended, the upper voice represents Christ and the lower, the Father. The manuscript MilD 3 contains a copy of a mass by Isaac, one of two on Wohlauf gesell von Hinnen/Wohlauf gut gsell (the title of the mass is given differently in Grove 6 to that given by Brown (1987) in the index to the facsimile edition of the manuscript - the mass is unnamed in the
manuscript). The mass contains a number of canons; the final Agnus Dei has one with the rubric ‘Qualis. pater talis. filius. talis. sp[iritus] s[an]c[tu]s.’ (fol 97v). The phrase might be translated as ‘Even as the Father, so is the Son, so is the holy Spirit’. The triple canon is begun in a tenor voice, and from the disposition of the parts, it seems certain that at least one of the two following voices, if not both, would have been at the octave above, rather than at the unison. The dux, therefore evidently represents the Father. It is quite possible that Senfl, because of his close connections with Isaac, may have been familiar with this mass, and hence with this particular piece of symbolism.

49. See as other examples the held chords of Crecquillon’s motet Carole magnus erat on the words ‘Caesar sanctissime’, or in Courtois’s Venite populi terrae written for the Entry of Charles into Cambrai in 1540, on the words ‘ave Caesar, ave majestas sacra’. Note, too, the term ‘sacra’ in this context. The use of homophony seems to me to be essentially the same rhetorical device.

50. Greisheimer (1990) p. 287, suggested a date of 1520-1 for this motet. His chronology was based on stylistic principles except where specific information was available, and he did not elaborate on his reasoning in each individual case. Nevertheless, his proposed dating is not very far out of line with the date that my argument would require. He presumably based his opinion in this instance on the fact that the manuscript MunU 401 is an extension of three prints, all from 1521. However, one motet in the manuscript by Senfl is dated 1530, and the later repertoire within the manuscript, and its time of compilation, 1536-40, all suggest that there is no compelling reason to date the piece so early as 1520.
51. See for example, Wegman (1994) p. 337, where he quotes Marcus van Crevel’s discovery of minor changes to the cantus firmus of Obrecht’s mass *Sub tuum presidium* which lead to a total duration of 888 semibreves, which divide up into 333 (Kyrie and Gloria) and 555 (the remaining three movements).

52. See Elders (1991) pp. 76-86 for a general discussion of Gematria, where he brings together a number of examples, including ones from Tinctoris, Obrecht, and Josquin.

53. For those who place value in this type of process, it might be observed that, when we turn to the other voice, the *dux*, the total length is 91 brevies, which does not seem to match anything that can easily be derived from the name of Philip or of his father Charles. However, applying a reductive process used in numerology, if the rests are totalled first, as the part begins with rests, and then the notes, 53 and 38 respectively are obtained. Adding 5 and 3 gives 8; adding 3 and 8, 11, 1 and 1 then gives 2. The resultant 82 is the value for Charles’s name ‘Carolus’. It is worth commenting that even if the result is fortuitous, this is the only practical division of notes and rests possible which will give this result.

54. The identification of individuals with saints of the same name was already an established practice. See for example Agricola’s *Sancte Philippus*, a prayer to Saint Philip, which appears in BrusBR 9126, a manuscript written for Philippe le Beau and Joanna of Castille. The name ‘Philip’ is decorated, so that its significance could not be missed. A later example is given in Rees (1995), p. 46, note 46, where he suggests that the close association of Dom João with his saintly namesake, John the Baptist, may have led to the establishment of the altar and confraternity of Saint
John, and was also apparent in the date and choice of dedication of the mass at the yearly memorial services held for the king at Santa Cruz.

55. This was partly due to the disposition of the respective territories, the Wittelsbach lands being met on three sides by Habsburg possessions. Duke William was a contender in 1531 for election as King of the Romans, which honour Charles V secured at considerable cost for Ferdinand, his brother. See Rady (1988) p. 57.

56. On the celebrations in Spain, see Calendar of State Papers (Venetian) no. 124, Andrea Navagero to the Signory, writing from Valladolid: 'Neither is anything thought of here at present, save jousts of various sorts and cane games, and as many entertainments as possible, to celebrate the birth of the heir apparent; . . . so it is said these rejoicings will last for another month, and that when the Empress is in a state to attend them, more entertainments will be given than before.'

57. It is sometimes surprising just how close relationships between rulers were, despite political differences. The example of Charles V and Francis I of France demonstrates over a period the speed with which outright hostility could be replaced by protestations of friendship, and vice-versa.

58. Bente (1980). Senfl lost his position in the Imperial Hofkapelle in 1520 when the majority of Maximilian's household was disbanded, following Maximilian's death in 1519. This motet may suggest that Senfl's ambitions to return to Imperial employment were rather more long-lasting than hitherto realised, and if so, they perhaps sit rather oddly with his correspondence with the Lutheran Duke Albrecht of Prussia, which Bente dates from 1526, and with Senfl's own Lutheran sympathies. If
one assumes from Senfl’s religious convictions that this motet was more probably an ‘official’ gift, then the symbolism used is perhaps even more pertinent.

59. It seems unlikely from the layout of the manuscript that it represents the date of copying. The music is probably all by the scribe, Johannes Heugel. One might consider the spasmodic appearance of dates therefore to be more likely to represent performance dates of particular note, rather than composition dates. There are quite a number of occasional motets within this source; see MGG vol. 6 col. 342 for details of some of them.

60. The manuscript lacks the highest voice, but it is reasonably obvious that it opened the motet with a point derived from the opening of the chant. The other parts do likewise.


62. The picture is reproduced in Wheatcroft (1995), illustration no. 6.


64. There is a modern edition of this motet and of the work mentioned in the next paragraph (Symbola... ) in EDM xvi and xxvi.

65. See the summary in Krautwurst (1980).

66. Among the dedicatees of the volume are Luther and Melanchthon. Philip of
Spain would have sat very ill in such company.

67. See Hume (1897) p. 156 (referring to the year 1570): ‘For God and your Majesty,’ was now the current phrase in all addresses to him. He never gave an order - hardly an opinion - without protesting that he had no worldly end in all his acts. It was all for the sake of God, whose instrument he was.

68. Philip’s progression is usefully summarised in Parker (1985) Map 1, p. 24.


70. Wangermée (1968) p. 178. A full discussion of this Entry and its music is in Bridgman (1960).

71. In general, illustrations of entry arches do not show musicians, despite the evidence from other sources that they were sometimes used as in the example from Cambrai. See History Today vol. 47, no. 11, p. 22 for an illustration of an arch from the Entry of James I into London in 1604, which does show musicians.

72. See chapter 2, note 129 on the Use within the Imperial chapel. It was almost certainly Paris.

73. It is possible that the melody is common stock, a ‘tono’. See Rees (1994-5),
who comments on two largely unexplored areas of the Iberian song repertoire. One is the use of common melodies; the second is the use of chant references. On the former, see also Ros-Fábregas (1993). In this instance, the correspondence between the chant and text makes it unlikely that this was a tono, unless it had been adapted for other words. It is therefore possible, though perhaps unlikely, that the textual reference may have been different from that suggested by the surviving version. It also adds a further example of chant quotation.


76. Three of these illustrations are reproduced in Strong (1984) figs. 63-5.

77. See vander Straeten vol. 2, p. 244.

78. Lineage was an important part of the 'legitimisation' process for all kings and rulers. English kings traced their ancestry to a legendary Trojan, Brutus, from as early as the 12th century (it appears in Geoffrey of Monmouth) whilst the Habsburgs' own lineage went back to several of the classical antecedents illustrated in Entries and the like, such as those mentioned earlier. On the Binche festivities, see Devoto (1960), Heartz (1960) and Strong (1984) pp. 91-5.

79. It is also interesting to note that a very similar symbolic use of a chant-derived cantus firmus to that proposed here has been suggested by Noble for the Puer
natus chant used by Tallis in his mass of the same name. Noble has speculated that Tallis might have written the mass for the combined chapels of Philip and Mary for performance at Christmas 1554, which was celebrated with uncommon joy in England because of the Queen's supposed pregnancy. With the example of the motets honouring Philip, the connection with the Incarnation and royalty, and the type of references to Queen Mary mentioned in the text, weight is perhaps added to this suggestion.

80. Related in Hume (1897) pp. 24-5.

81. Froude (1910) pp. 46 and 165 respectively.

82. Froude (1910) p. 219, note 4, gives the whole of the prayer. See also p. 174 for what Froude rightly describes as an amazing comparison. Pole wrote to the Pope following the service of reconciliation to Rome, including the following passage, referring to Philip and Mary: 'And oh, how many things, how great things, may the church our mother, the bride of Christ, promise herself from these her children? O piety! o antient faith! Whoever looks on them will repeat the words of the prophet of the church's early offspring; 'This is the seed which the Lord hath blessed.' How earnestly, how lovingly, did your holiness favour their marriage; a marriage formed after the very pattern of that of our Most High King, who, being Heir of the world, was sent down by his Father from his royal throne, to be at once the Spouse and the Son of the Virgin Mary, and to be made the Comforter and the Saviour of mankind: and, in like manner, the greatest of all the princes upon earth, the heir of his father's kingdom, departed from his own broad and happy realms, that he might
come hither into this land of trouble, he, too, to be spouse and son of this virgin; for, indeed, though spouse he be, he so bears himself towards her as if he were her son, to aid in the reconciliation of this people to Christ and the church.' Froude gives the original Latin in footnote 1, p. 175.

83. For example, Hume (1897) p. 39.

84. It is interesting to note the survival of this belief in a modern instance. Following the death of Diana, Princess of Wales, a report from the Times 12 November 1997 noted that Christmas crib figures in the form of Diana as the Virgin Mary were now available.

85. Details on Jan Louys are taken from Slenk (1980). However, there is some small confusion in the work list; Slenk lists RISM 1564/03 as containing two works by Jan Louys; both are clearly identified in that publication as by Ludovicus Louys. The two motets are *Philippe qui videt me* and *Misit Herodes rex magnus*. I have used the form 'Jan' rather than 'Jean' as this is how it appears in the majority of the printed sources.

86. *Dispeream nisi sit Dea* in RISM 1553/09 is attributed to C. Rore in RISM 1549/08. *Haec est arbor dignissima* in RISM 1553/14 is attributed to Clemens in RISM 1555/12.

87. See Slenk (1980).

89. His known works are, in total, the two six-voice motets mentioned above, one five-voice motet *Peccavi quid faciam tibi*, and the three-voice *Lauda Jerusalem*.

90. The paucity of information on Ludovicus makes it difficult to be certain that he could not have written his motet earlier than the one by Jan. However, the sources of his music are later than the earliest sources for Jan, which may suggest that he was younger.

91. See for instance the accounts given in Robertson (1887) pp. 539-41, and the extended one in Motley (1855) Chapter 1.


93. See the entries for January 1546, Gachard (1874) pp. 314-5, 323-7.


95. Prizer (1985) concentrated his discussion of polyphony on earlier meetings of the Order. I have argued earlier that Crecquillon's eight-voice motet *Andreas Christi famulus* was written for the 1546 meeting, contrary to Hudson's view, in Hudson (1990), that it is likely that it was written for this one.


98. Gachard (1874) p. 310.

99. This observation was reported by Kellman (1987) p. xii, note 15. The manuscript LonBLR 8 G. vii, originally from the Habsburg court, contains Févin's motet in a position which implies some importance; see the discussion in chapter 6. Kellman suggests that the association is with the Habsburgs; it is likely that the association was wider in origin than that, however much the Imperial and Burgundian inheritances may have been personified by the Habsburg dynasty.

100. See Heer (1968) p. 74, note 1.

101. Mosneron-Dupin (1992) p. 196. I have been unable to consult this article; the citation is taken from Inglis (1995) p. 66.

102. I believe there is, though at present cannot trace it, a reference to a bishop speaking to a ruler, making the precise point that as a cleric he 'only' represented Christ, but that the ruler represented the Father.

103. The miniature is reproduced in Weightman (1993) p. 199, from Ms 9272-76, Bibliothèque Royale, Brussels. The depiction in the Hours of Mary of Burgundy is on f. 51r.

105. This collection also contains Maessens' *Discessu dat* to Maximilian (II), who was Archduke at the time the motet was written.
The previous chapter explored the readings of several motets where the concept of divine kingship had been incorporated by means of a direct reference to the Incarnation of Christ. The occasions for which the motets were written seem as though they were sui generis, even though the events which gave rise to them must have covered a period of some years. I want now to look at a number of other pieces, including a mass and motet by Crecquillon, which I believe incorporate similar ideas, but which are distinguished by a wider range of reference and by their likely connection with a single event.

The iconography of the Entries of Philip in 1549 emphasised not just the single aspect on which I have so far largely concentrated, the direct expression of the divine, but a much wider set of classical and biblical allusions. That is partly in accordance with Strong's observation, quoted earlier, that such Entries were made by the ruler as Christ or as one of his scriptural prototypes, and partly because of the special nature of those Entries, which led to the concentration on images of father and son. The Biblical prototypes in those 1549 Entries included David and Solomon, the two great kings of the Old Testament. Charles and Philip were being likened to these Old Testament figures in a way that was wholly conventional, but none the less powerful.

The identification of individual kings with David has attracted some musicological interest. Connolly has drawn attention to the depiction of rulers as David,
particularly in the guise of what he calls the 'David-in-penitence' figure to be found at the opening of the Penitential Psalms in illuminated manuscripts. One instance that he discusses in some detail is a portrait of Henry VIII of England as 'David in penitence'. Other identified portraits of a ruler as David are of Francis I of France, and the iconography of Entries contains many more. Macey has gone further and linked the imitation of the rule of David with the production of psalm-motets by Josquin and others for Louis XI. There is a logic, of course, in the use of psalm texts in this context: David was traditionally regarded as the author of the psalms, and to commission settings of psalm texts was the nearest that a ruler could reasonably come to making the psalms his own in his guise as a modern David, and to emulating the creative element of David's character. In a sense, there is an appropriation, a claiming of ownership almost, that is implicit in this process, which directly mirrors the other forms of appropriation that we have already noted, of language, symbol and name.

The image of the ruler as a new David was evidently widespread, but perhaps particularly cultivated in France. Less attention has been paid in musicological literature to the figure of Solomon as a prototype, one who evoked a number of very powerful images. Before we deal with the specific works by Crecquillon and others which are the main subject of this chapter, I want to discuss in a little more detail the ruler as Solomon, and its illustration in music, because it illuminates, I believe, the background against which these specific works must be viewed. I want to suggest that this particular image of the ruler led, like the imitation of David and the use of psalms to validate it, to an appropriation of Solomon's part of the Bible, the Song of Songs, and that motets on texts from the Song of Songs had a particular significance in relation to royalty. I want to draw some inferences from a number of sources to
support this view, and to suggest reasons why these texts may have been regarded in this context as particularly appropriate.

The Ruler as Solomon

The image of the ruler as Solomon reigning over the peaceful and just society has its origins in two key Old Testament texts. Solomon himself (who 'loved many strange women' - something, no doubt, that added a frisson to his adoption as a prototype) was seen from these texts as the archetypal just king, the Prince of Peace who was an anticipation of Christ, and whose reign was the earthly Paradise to be regained by the ruler until the Heavenly one should come. The first text is the lengthy history of Solomon's reign in 1 Kings 2 to 11. Within this, there is the story of God's grant of wisdom to Solomon, when Solomon asked for the ability to govern his people justly. God's response was not only the gift of unequalled wisdom, but because of the nature of Solomon's request, wealth and honour such as no king of his time could match. Under such a king, the people 'ate, and they drank and enjoyed life'. Throughout his reign the kingdoms continued at peace, every man 'under his own vine and fig-tree'. Not only was the country at peace, but Solomon ruled over a wide area, whose own kings were subject to him and paid him tribute. The second text is psalm 71, which carries the title of 'a psalm for (or 'of') Solomon'. The psalm speaks more poetically of the same themes of a just society through the application of divinely-guided justice, the protection of the poor and needy, the plenty that God grants to the kingdom, and the king's own rewards in riches and hegemony.

The peaceable kingdom of Solomon contained therefore a number of the key concepts that arose out of the broad idea of divine kingship. The duty of the king to execute
justice was, as we have already noted, central, as was his duty to protect the poor and needy. Indeed, the consent to undertake the latter was one of the oaths which the Emperor Charles swore at his coronation, in a direct echo of Solomon’s psalm. The plenty which would attend a good king through the blessings of God was also a deeply entrenched notion. We can imagine too, that the ideas of wealth and influence beyond one’s borders would appeal to rulers with dynastic and Imperial pretensions. It seems likely from this that royal displays of magnificence arose not only from the chivalric ideal of largesse, but also from the idea that such displays were demonstrations that God had rewarded the ruler with sufficient means, and were therefore a confirmation of God’s favour, and thus of His approval of the ruler as good and just.

The portrayal of Philip of Spain as Solomon in the 1549 Entries was by no means an isolated instance arising from the special circumstances of those occasions. It had very old roots. The son of Charlemagne, Louis the Pious, was likened to Solomon, as his father was to David. Nearer to the period that we are concerned with, Charles VIII of France was depicted as Solomon on his Entry into Rouen in 1485 with the acclamation of figures representing France and its provinces: ‘Vivat rex Salomon’. A detailed description of the 1515 Entry of the young Archduke Charles into Bruges gives a similar example. One tableau vivant showed Charles as Solomon on his throne surrounded by his court. At his feet four young women sat, praising him with four sentences, each of which mirrors an aspect of the Solomonic kingdom: ‘Sire tu es plain de magnificence, de puissance, et de gloire’, ‘tu es le roy par dessus tous auttres’, tu es le prince de richesse et de gloire ton domaine passe tout’, ‘Lord, you are full of magnificence, strength and glory’, ‘You are the king above all others’, You are the prince of riches, and the glory of your realm surpasses all’, and ‘Your
wisdom and your good deeds crown your glorious renown'. Another tableau had Charles asking God for the ability to discern good from evil to be able to govern His people, a direct reference to the prayer of Solomon which God rewarded so fully.

Again, at the Emperor Charles's 1540 Entry into Cambrai, a quotation from Solomon's psalm was to be seen on the arch by the town hall, richly painted, declaring: 'In his time shall the righteous flourish and abundance of peace'. Even in the 1549 Entries, not all the depictions of Solomon were in the context of David his father handing on the crown to his son. That at Haarlem had Solomon uniting his prayer with that of his people to ask of God the grace to govern with discretion and wisdom.

There is one further expression of this equation of the ruler with Solomon, and the kingdom with the peaceable kingdom of the Bible, which we may mention here, a painting by Antoine Caron: Augustus and the Sybil. This shows an idealised city en fête with arches like those used at Entries. In the foreground is a structure with two twisted and vine-covered columns. Yates describes it and other elements of the composition as follows:

The dominant structure shows two great columns, surmounted by a crown. Perched on the festoon which links them there is an imperial eagle, and the motto Pietas Augustii hangs from the festoon. Charles IX [of France] himself, as Augustus, is kneeling to the Tiburtine Sybil who points to the skies, where a vision of the Virgin and Child announces a tremendous religious destiny awaiting this king-emperor.

She continues:
There can be no doubt that the allusion [of the columns] is to the Temple at Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{14}

The inclusion of a sufficient visual clue to the Temple, built by Solomon, was evidently enough in itself to invoke the parallel of the Solomonic kingdom and its connection with the destiny of the royal figure within the painting, in common with that anticipated and claimed for all royalty, especially for those with imperial pretensions.\textsuperscript{15}

We can see from these examples that Solomon was an important prototype, and one who was part of the rich frame of reference surrounding medieval and renaissance rulers. If Macey is right to discern a connection between psalm settings and the ruler in the persona of the new David, we might also expect to find a similar connection between royalty and settings of Solomon's parts of the Bible, especially the Song of Songs. I want now to turn to evidence from a number of sources which I believe supports this connection.

**Royal Sources**

If readings of motets from the Song of Songs are being proposed which reflect some aspects of the contemporary beliefs about kingship and royalty, then we might expect to find examples in court or presentation manuscripts. I wish first to look at two - LonBLR 8 G vii and LonBLR 11 E xi. I want to establish that motets on texts from the Song of Songs appear in contexts and with features which together suggest strongly that these texts were imbued with some special significance.
The manuscript LonBLR 8 G. vii was evidently a gift from the Habsburg court to King Henry VIII of England and Catherine of Aragon, his wife. It is thought that it was prepared and presented at sometime in the years following 1515, but before the rift in relations between the two courts in 1525. The opening three motets, *Celeste beneficium* by Mouton, *Adiutorium nostrum in nomine Domini* by A. Févin, and the anonymous *Nesciens mater virgo*, are all directed towards the desire for children, particularly a son, which in view of the dynastic position was understandable enough. The second motet originally invoked St René, a saint particularly resorted to by those desiring sons; in this, the text is adapted from its original so that Henry and Catherine are mentioned by name, with St George replacing St René as a more appropriate saint for English as well as Habsburg invocation. The application of the text of *Nesciens Mater* to the royal couple is indicated by a Tudor rose in the centre of the decorated initial to the topmost voice-part. There are other motets with Burgundian associations within the first four fascicles. The manuscript is evidently therefore carefully prepared in both the selection and presentation, at least in part, rather than a haphazard choice from the court repertoire. Kellman has also commented on the orderly structure of the majority of the remaining sections of the manuscript, which confirms the impression given by those initial works. The third to sixth fascicles contain pieces with no obvious Habsburg connection, but each fascicle has a group of Marian motets, together with one motet addressed to Christ, except for the sixth, which has instead a motet to Saint Christopher.

The last motet with explicit links to the donors or recipients of the manuscript is *O sancta Maria, virgo virginum*, a prayer to Mary for Charles. Within this section of
the manuscript ending with *O sancta Maria* there are two motets both with texts
derived from the Song of Songs. (There is another later in the manuscript which will
be mentioned below.)

Before we discuss these two motets, I want to look briefly at a third with a text
unconnected to Solomon, the motet *Egregie Christi martir Christophore* by Févin. As
has just been noted, this motet with a text to Saint Christopher disturbs the
otherwise orderly structure, appearing where one might expect a further work to
Christ. The reason for the discursion is that the motet does not appear within the
opening section of the manuscript; it is outside the part which contains the motets
with explicit links to either the Habsburg or English courts. However, on
examination it suggests strongly that there is a level of meaning elsewhere within the
manuscript that has yet to be fully appreciated.

Like that of *Adiutorium nostrum*, the text of *Egregie Christi martir Christophore*
appears to have been changed; the motet was first published in 1514 (RISM
1514/1) with its presumed original text to Saint Martin rather than Saint
Christopher. Unlike *Adiutorium nostrum in nomine Domini*, in this instance there is
no obvious reason for the change of saint's name. It is improbable that the alteration
was a matter of whim; we also may reasonably attach some significance to the choice
of Saint Christopher because of Kellman's observations on the structure of the
manuscript. It is unlikely that the structure would have been disturbed for no good
reason. We are therefore justified in assuming that we should look for some meaning
arising from that alteration. In looking for a reading that takes account of the change,
we may note the apparent importance of Saint Christopher in Burgundian circles.
This can be deduced from the extraordinarily prominent position that St Christopher
occupies in the Suffrages of the Hours of Mary of Burgundy. First in this section of the Hours is Saint Michael the Archangel, second Saint Peter, and then third, before even Saint George, and a host of others, is Saint Christopher, occupying a position that indicates the status and importance accorded him.\textsuperscript{19} There was possibly a more specific connection between Saint Christopher and knighthood or chivalry that is not evident from the legend of the saint. In a wall-painting in Burgundy from the first part of the 16th century, we see the local saint presenting a knight to Christ; the real point of interest is that in this presentation Christ is shown on the shoulders of Saint Christopher in a river, the classic depiction of him.\textsuperscript{20}

The legend of Christopher told of the giant who ultimately refused to serve any master but Christ, but he is better remembered as the saint who carried Christ, in the form of a child who became heavier and heavier, across a river. That could be seen as symbolic of Henry as a king, being the bearer of Christ through the turbulent river of this life for his people, and the motet could be read as encouragement that, however great the burden, Henry could indeed bear it. More than that, this is the Saint the very sight of whose image was sufficient to ward off misfortune for that day, powers not unlike those attributed to royalty with their abilities to effect miracles and cures. A more political reading is possible, though, which perhaps better accords with the concept of divine representation. The precise relationship between pope and emperor had been a matter of contention over the centuries. From a low point, in terms of authority and influence, reached by Maximilian's father Frederick V, Maximilian had reasserted the Imperial rights and strengthened Imperial symbolism. In that light, the invocation of St Christopher could be seen as a call to Henry to resist papal claims to temporal authority, and in his turn to reassert the kingly role (as a fragment of the Imperial role) as the personification of the
divine to his people, something Henry did with no half measures at the Reformation.

Further, with the evidence of the Burgundian wall-painting, we can also read the motet as reflecting in several ways on Christian knighthood. Henry had been for some years a member of the Order of the Golden Fleece, and although Christopher was not its patron saint, it is possible to see the figure of Christopher as symbolising the dedication to Christ's service required of the Christian knight, in a similar way to the meaning suggested for Henry as a king. The Golden Legend seems to confirm the attribution of knightly qualities to St Christopher:

he was named Christopher, which is as much to say as bearing Christ, of that that he bare Christ in four manners. He bare him on his shoulders by conveying and leading, in his body by making it lean, in mind by devotion, and in his mouth by confession and predication.21

The essential point, for our purpose, is that this motet undoubtedly is intended to convey more than the bare text might immediately suggest. It serves to alert us to the possibility that other apparently uncomplicated texts in this particular manuscript may also bear a significance that needs teasing out, especially those within the opening section that appear to have no direct function.

We return then to the two motets on texts from the Song of Songs. The first is the anonymous Descendi in [h]ortum meum 22 which has been taken as an allegory of Christ, although the text is more usually found in a Marian context.23 The text of the motet is:
Descendi in ortum meum ut viderem poma convallium et inspicerem si florisset vineæ, et germinassent mala punica, revertere ut intueamur te Alleluia.

(Come down into my garden that we may see the blossoms of the valley and see whether the vines have budded, and whether the pomegranates are in bloom, return that we may look upon you. - Adapted from RSV)

We are still on the same ground as that covered by the opening motets and indeed others within the manuscript; this motet is another expression of the desire for children, this time through the symbolism of the burgeoning of nature, the flowering of the vines and the budding of the pomegranates. The symbolism would have spoken directly to the recipients of the manuscript. The reference to pomegranates especially was one hardly likely to be missed, given that the pomegranate was Catherine's personal badge or symbol as well as a more general symbol of fertility. Indeed, the opening of the manuscript is illustrated not only with Henry's arms, but with roses for the House of Tudor, and pomegranates for Catherine. The motet is as much an allegory of Henry and Catherine, if it is to be read as allegorical at all, as of Christ or Mary. More probably, with the examples of divine kingship in front of us from the previous chapter, it is to be read as drawing no distinction in the objects of its symbolism between the sacred, as we might interpret it, and the manifestation of the sacred in the royal.

The more important motet, though, for the purpose of this discussion is Tota pulcra es/Salve, which suggests even more strongly that these motets were not intended to be read allegorically, but incorporated a more direct association between text and royalty on the basis of the sacredness of the royal; that these texts, too, are to be
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understood as the proper address of sacred words to kings and queens as images of God. In the manuscript, this motet immediately precedes the motet *O sancta Maria*, the prayer for Charles V which closes the opening section as categorised by Kellman. The motet text is again more familiar, at least in part, in a liturgical context. The motet has a double text, with two parts singing the well known four-note incipit to the *Salve regina* chant at various pitches in canon. In the first part of the motet it is the two higher voices; in part two, the two lower voices. The text of the first part is as follows:

Tota pulc[...]ra es amica mea et macula non est in te, quam pulc[...]ri sunt gressus tui oculi tui columbarum et come capitis tui sicut purpura regis collum tuum sicut turris eburnea, quam pulc[...]ra et quam decora carissima veni veni de libano veni coronaberis.

(You are beautiful my love and there is no fault/spot in you; how beautiful are your steps, your eyes like those of doves, and the locks of your hair are like the/a king's purple, how beautiful and how lovely dearest; come, come from Lebanon, come and be crowned.)

That the text is intended to apply to Catherine is suggested not only by the inclusion of the familiar phrase 'veni coronaberis', 'come and be crowned', but by the intrusion of a slight adaptation of part of a separate verse: 'et come capitis tui sicut purpura regis', 'and the locks of your hair are like the King's purple'. This insertion is the more pointed if two things are recalled: that the unamended version, which no doubt would have been familiar, is 'and the locks of your hair are like purple, a king is held captive in the tresses'; second, that the Tudor rose was in Latin called the 'rosa purpura'. The second part of the motet gives no such specific clues, but is not, as far
as I can trace, to be found liturgically related to the *Tota pulchra es* text. It is again not taken directly from the Song of Songs but a composite of a number of fragments of text. It does nothing however to detract from the motet’s address to Catherine which I believe was intended, beginning: ‘O pulcherrima mulierum, surge propera amica mea’, ‘O most beautiful of women, rise up my friend, my fair one’.27

The text ‘You are beautiful my love and there is no fault in you’ had very strong Marian connections. Aside from its liturgical use, it was the summation of the Perfections of Mary (the Perfections were the allegorical names by which she was known, such as ‘Star of the sea’ and ‘an enclosed garden’). It was a text at the core of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.28 Despite that, we shall see it later in a context which is evidently secular (if one can any longer speak of ‘secular’ in the discussion of royalty).29 In this motet, too, the deliberate construction of the remainder of the text suggests that a purely Marian interpretation was not the original intention.30

If the possibility is accepted that the text, especially in conjunction with the repeated *Salve*, was addressed directly to Catherine (and the motet appears to be a unicum, which could allow it to have been specially written or adapted for this manuscript), then the canon of the voices singing *Salve* only can be read in a number of ways. It could be intended to symbolise the closeness of Catherine’s kinship or friendship with Charles, in which case the placing of the motet immediately before the prayer for Charles becomes of itself relevant, or it may be intended to symbolise the closeness of the relations between the two courts, or yet again the desire for children with one part coming out of or proceeding from the other as it were, or even Catherine’s relationship with Henry, following faithfully in the same steps as her
husband.\textsuperscript{31}

There is also a possible element of number symbolism in the repetitions of the 'Salve'; there are twelve in each part, six in each voice. It has been argued by Elders from this that the motet is best explained as a symbol of the Virgin.\textsuperscript{32} There are several ways to understand the possible number symbolism beyond the Marian association with the number twelve, but it will be clear from the argument so far that the association with the Virgin does not prevent the application to the divine royal. Indeed, the application to the royal gathers its force precisely from the otherwise divine nature of the symbolism, and any ambiguity that remains is positive rather than negative. In addition, the number six, which is the number of times 'Salve' appears in each voice in each part of the motet, is a 'perfect' number (1+2+3=6). The perfection implied by the repetitions of 'Salve' matches the perfection specifically stated by the opening of the text of the non-canonic voices, and with the general appropriation of the language of the divine for royalty that we have already observed, and with the specific features of the motet text, it may be concluded that the intimation of perfection was not confined to the heavenly sphere.

Nevertheless, there are other plausible reasons for a twelve-fold greeting which would be more specific to the context of this manuscript. These might include reference to the twelve Sibyls, the twelve paladins of Charlemagne, the companions of Alexander, Worthies and Apostles, or the twelve virtues of chivalric tradition. It is unlikely that any of these would have been remote or arcane references at the time. The evocation of the court of Charlemagne and the equation of it with the Habsburg court would be no more than a recognition of one of the recurrent elements of Habsburg iconography. The story of Alexander, too, was popular in Burgundian
circles. Similarly, there was apparently an English group of twelve Worthies as against the more familiar nine; these, in the Entry already cited of Henry V into London in 1415, greeted Henry in company with the Twelve Apostles. We may be unsure quite which of the meanings that might have been conveyed by this motet would have been the most obvious at the time, but there are sufficient features to suggest that its inclusion in the manuscript carried more resonances than are immediately apparent. Of course, these two motets are only two out of a number in the manuscript; but through them can perhaps be discerned some particular relationship between texts drawn from the Song of Songs and royalty. That can be supported by examples from elsewhere.

LonBLR 11 E. xi

Another presentation manuscript, LonBLR 11 E. xi, was also prepared for Henry and Catherine at around the same time as LonBLR 8 G. vii. In this case, opinion is divided on the origin of the manuscript, although it was apparently prepared in 1516. Some of its limited repertoire is Continental, and it is obviously influenced by an Antwerp publication of 1515 addressed to Maximilian and Charles: Lofzangen ter ere van Keizer Maximiliaan en zijn kleinzoon Karel den Vijfden. Its value in this discussion is in its brevity and in the influence of the earlier publication which was connected with the 1515 Entry of Charles into Bruges. It contains only a handful of motets, and so it is at least likely that each carries a significance that might be difficult to argue in each individual case in a longer compilation. The manuscript opens, musically, with a double canon, written in two circles on the motto Salve radix produens germine ramos followed by Sampson’s setting of Psallite felices, which sets the words of a long poem in praise of Henry and which form part of the
Those are followed by only four further motets: *Sub tuum presidium* by Benedictus de Opitiis, which also appears in the 1515 publication and whose text is a prayer for Mary's protection; *Quam pulcra es* by Sampson; *Hec est preclarum vas* and *Beati omnes qui timent*, both anonymous. The last motet is a setting of psalm 127 which, as with many of the pieces in the manuscript LonBLR 8 G. vii, is clearly directed to the hope or wish for children - 'Thy wife shall be as the fruitful vine...thy children like the olive branches...May you see your children's children'. *Hec est preclarum vas* was originally a Marian antiphon, with parts derived from the Song of Songs, and again, the text seems directed in this instance towards the desire for children, but the only motet whose symbolism is not immediately clear, and as clearly directed, is Sampson's *Quam pulcra es*, with yet another text that is a compilation from the Song of Songs.37

The composer named Sampson is thought to have been Richard Sampson, a diplomat and official of the King and Thomas Wolsey, who was between 1514 and 1517 Wolsey's vicar-general in the diocese of Tournai.38 Benedictus, too, had court ties; he had left his position as organist of the Church of Our Lady in Antwerp in February 1516, becoming court organist to Henry by the beginning of March the same year.39 Both composers are likely to have been familiar with Margaret of Austria's court and its practices, where Charles had grown up. With the very small number of pieces within the manuscript, it is unlikely that the motet *Quam pulchra es* was inserted at random or merely for its musical qualities, but was a piece chosen carefully for rather greater effect, a choice perhaps influenced by Sampson or Benedictus (or both) and their knowledge of Imperial practice. I want to move now from specific manuscripts to a group of pieces on similar texts which appear to have royal connections.
Motets on *Anima mea*

LonBLR 8 G. vii contains, in addition to the motets that have already been discussed, a motet by Isaac also on a text from the Song of Songs, *Anima mea liquefacta est*. This manuscript is a product of the same workshop and has some repertoire in common with Margaret of Austria's large songbook, BrusBR 228, although the Isaac setting does not appear in the latter.\(^{40}\) There are, though, two pieces to which I wish to draw attention in the songbook. The first is *Anima mea liquefacta est* by Weerbeke. The text has in this instance rather a different colour from the sentiments expressed by the motets so far mentioned:

\[
\text{Anima mea liquefacta est ut dilectus meus locutus est, quaesivi illum et non inveni, vocavi et non respondit mihi...}
\]

(\(\text{My soul failed when my beloved spoke; I sought him, but I could not find him; I called him, but he gave me no answer...}\))

Despite the sense of loss that this text conveys, it nevertheless forms part of a Marian liturgy, and the Weerbeke setting appears in another source, and in presumably its original context, as the fourth movement of a substitution mass formed of otherwise obvious Marian texts (none of the texts of the other sections are derived from the Song of Songs).\(^{41}\) The choice of this section instead of any of the others to be used in a largely secular collection may be partly due to the text itself, in that it can bear a worldly interpretation, but in the light of the examples of other motets already cited, that seems an incomplete explanation.\(^{42}\)

There is a further work in the songbook, this time by Compère, linked to the piece by
Weerbeke: *Plainne d'ennuy/Anima mea*. Here, Compère has derived his tenor from that of the Weerbeke motet.\(^4^3\) The sentiment of the chanson is one of disappointment in love and of welcoming death, and given Margaret's unhappy life and her association with the 'Regretz' chansons, it may be considered probable that this piece was chosen for its ability to reflect her frame of mind, especially after the death of her third and most beloved husband, Philibert.\(^4^4\)

Whilst we can readily see a reason for an association between Margaret of Austria and the text of *Anima mea liquefacta est*, the possible connection of the text with the Burgundian court may well be of longer standing. The motet *Anima mea/Stirps Jesse* by Busnoys survives in two sources, one a choirbook from the Burgundian chapel.\(^4^5\) Natvig has argued that the motet was written around August 1468 as part of the festivities surrounding the marriage of Margaret of York to Charles the Bold.\(^4^6\) Higgins has proposed a different reading, relating the motet to Margaret of Scotland who, at the tender age of twelve, was sent to the French court as bride for the future Louis XI in 1436.\(^4^7\) She died early, surrounded by the suspicion of adultery. It is not necessary for us to pursue the merits of these two different interpretations here, except to observe that for strong reasons in both cases, a direct association of the motet with the wife of a Burgundian or French ruler has been found to be plausible.\(^4^8\)

If we look at other settings of texts beginning *Anima mea liquefacta est*, we find that a surprising number of the surviving works seem either to come from composers within the Imperial orbit, or to be preserved in sources with a similar origin. The Isaac motet has already been mentioned; in addition to that, there are three settings, two anonymous works and one by Senfl, in RISM 1520/4, a collection of twenty four motets taken from the repertoire of the Imperial chapel; one of two settings by
Ghiselin is in FlorC 2439, the Basevi codex. In addition, there are settings by Gombert, Prenner and Cabiliau. It is also surprising how many of these extant settings make reference to chant; all three motets from RISM 1520/4 do so, as well as settings by Isaac, Gombert, Thomas Martini, and the second setting by Ghiselin (in RISM 1502/1). This prevalence of chant quotation is hard to explain in terms of the liturgical use of the text which functions as an antiphon for the Assumption and for the birth of Mary; it is not a general feature of motets written on other texts taken from the Song of Songs that also happen to have a liturgical function. We would probably be right to ascribe some significance to these details. It seems probable that these later settings are in some sense connected with Busnoys's setting, but even if they are not, the link with the Imperial circle is evident.

It is possible that the link can be strengthened even further. Another work, possibly by Busnoys, *Fortuna desperata*, proved extremely popular. It was reworked a number of times and in different ways by various composers. Again, there are several Imperial composers who used *Fortuna desperata* as the basis of other compositions. Isaac, Senfl and Agricola between them composed a number of versions, both instrumental and vocal. It might be thought that references to the goddess Fortuna fitted as well with the uncertainties of kingship as well as with any other estate; Senfl is known to have written a small group of pieces built on the *Fortuna* tune for Albert of Bavaria in the 1530's. However, with the motto of Margaret of Austria being 'Fortune, infortune, fort une' we are probably right to see some connection between the large number of settings of this piece from within the Imperial circle and Margaret herself.

The point in suggesting this probable connection between Margaret, or the Imperial
court, and *Fortuna desperata* is that it helps, through a further motet, to confirm the same connection with the *Anima mea liquefacta est* settings. *Fortuna desperata* appears as a cantus firmus in a motet by Cabiliau on *Anima mea liquefacta est* to be found in Susato's *Liber nonus ecclesiasticarum cantionum* (RISM 1554/9). There is more than one composers with a similar name, and it is not certain which wrote this motet, but the most probable composer is believed to have been a child in the chapel of Charles V, and as an adult singer to have been in Margaret's own chapel.\(^5\) It is not, however, just the probability that the composer came from Margaret's chapel, but a feature of the work that is striking. The cantus firmus is not used precisely as it appears in the original work. It is transposed from a tritus mode (starting on f) to a deuterus mode (starting on e). Such a transposition is not unprecedented; in Josquin's lament for Ockeghem, *Nymphes des bois*, the chant *Requiem aeternam* is treated in exactly the same manner, being notated in its original mode but with an instruction to begin it a semitone lower. Obrecht also used the same chant as Josquin's lament, again transposed into a deuterus mode, for his motet *Mille quingentis*, written on his father's death.\(^5\) With these precedents and with Margaret's motto, there seems little doubt that the Cabiliau motet was a funeral or memorial motet for Margaret of Austria.

**The chanson: Belles sur toutes**

The discussion of *Anima mea liquefacta est* has shown the text being used in a secular as well as a sacred context. I want to mention one further piece from the Imperial and Burgundian courts, the chanson *Belles sur toutes* by Agricola.\(^5\) None of the surviving sources is fully texted, but in FlorC 2439, the text for the *bassus* is given: *Tota pulchra es amica mea et macula non est in te*. The two upper parts have the text
incipit *Belles sour toutes* (sic). Even without a full text, it is evident that this most central text for Mary is being used in a context that could not have been liturgical or appropriate to Office or Mass. The modern editors of the *Agricola* have identified the chanson text from elsewhere; it starts:

Belles sur toutes et sans quelque macule
je vostre serf ma divine maistresse
a vous seul humbliment je m'adresse
vous suppliant que peche ne macule.

(Beautiful above all and without any fault, I am your bondsman my divine mistress, to you alone I humbly address my pleas, begging you who are without sin or fault.)

We do not know for whom this chanson was written, but with the idealisation in the text of the person to whom it is addressed and the *Song of Songs* quotation, both in the direct statement and in its incorporation into the chanson text, with all its attendant connotations, it was probably for Margaret or someone of similar standing. However, whoever it was written for, it provides another example of a *Song of Songs* text being used in the probable context of royalty, but certainly outside the normal sacred environment of the liturgical or votive use of the *Song of Songs* texts. Moreover, it is not simply a text from the Song, but the key statement of perfection applied to the Virgin Mary, and which I have already suggested was directly addressed in the manuscript LonBLR 8 G. vii to Catherine of Aragon, Henry VIII's wife.

Through all these examples, we see, either by deliberate construction and composition or by choice of pre-existent works the connection between texts drawn
from the Song of Songs and royalty being developed and emphasised, in a way which
suggests again that it is not simply a case of allegorical reference, one more layer to
an already over-interpreted text, but the direct association in line with the divine
imagery that royalty presented. It is of course not being argued that there is any
exclusivity in the use of these texts, that would be to miss part of the point, but it is
being argued that enough of these settings appear in circumstances which suggest that
they form part of a recognisable body of works with a particular function, that of
recognising the sacred nature of royalty.55 Moreover, they appear to show that this
particular association of text and royalty was found well developed within the
Habsburg courts.

Solomon and the Song of Songs

It is possible to see a parallel between Macey's picture of Louis XI commissioning
psalm settings in his persona as the new David, and the ruler as Solomon using the
Song of Songs (traditionally written by Solomon) as his expression of that persona.
Although that would give a rationale for the use of these texts, it is only a part of the
story. I suggested earlier that the figure of Solomon and the Song of Songs would
carry powerful resonances. We looked briefly at some of those for Solomon himself. I
now want now to touch on some of those of the Song of Songs, which may help explain
why these texts would been even more appropriate in the context I have suggested
than the parallel with the new David, in the form expressed by Macey, by itself
allows, and to add to the meanings that these motets may convey. The importance of
the Song in medieval thinking is so great that the treatment must of necessity be
extremely cursory.56 In general, the use of texts from the Song of Songs seems of a
piece with the discussion of the motets for Philip of Spain and the more general
appropriation of the sacred for royalty, whether in language, symbol, iconography or
liturgy, and we need not elaborate on that aspect of these motets and chansons, except
to say that the idealisation of women, particularly of queens, in the chivalric
tradition is no doubt closely linked.

The medieval and renaissance attitude to birth and lineage reflected the great weight
given to the past in almost every aspect of the culture; knighthood became restricted
to those who could demonstrate the required paternal descent from a knight in their
ancestry; priesthood required a papal dispensation for those who were illegitimate;
the certificate of purity of lineage was required in Spain for Cathedral posts; kings
traced their ancestry to ancient Troy, to Charlemagne, and to saints.57 The Spanish
historian Sandoval thoughtfully avoided all problems of lineage for Charles V by a
genealogy that went back to Adam.58 Earlier, Maximilian had set scholars compiling
several volumes of his ancestors, who even included obscure Middle Eastern deities
(yet another element of the divine king concept).59 These royal genealogies may
appear fanciful, but they embodied truths about legitimacy of position for the society
of the time. So to use the Psalms or the Song of Songs was not only a reflection of a
persona, but as also a statement about ancestry at the same time; not only was the
ruler the inheritor of Solomon’s throne through God’s election, he was an inheritor
through birth as well. The adoption of the Song of Songs for royal texts, as with the
use of psalm texts, was not only to act in the persona of the Biblical prototype, but
also to demonstrate lineage through the use of the quite literal inheritance. These
parts of the Bible belonged to royalty, as much as any other asset of the crown passed
down from earlier generations. The belief in Solomon (and David too) as ancestors
was demonstrated by an intended pageant at the Entry of Charles V and Henry VIII into
London in 1522. Although it was eventually replaced by one depicting Alfonso of
Castile and his descendants, it had all along been planned to show Solomon and his line, culminating in the two royal figures making the Entry.\textsuperscript{60} Perhaps sheer weight of numbers eventually suggested the more modest final presentation, but the original idea confirms the direct Solomonic descent of the royal personages.

The Song itself was widely read as an allegory of the mystical marriage between Christ and His Church. Its use in a royal context would suggest two different but not exclusive interpretations; the first would be the representation of the union between the ruler as God's earthly image and his realm as the Christian commonwealth. Secondly, shorn of its allegorical meanings, but taken at face value as the love song of Solomon and his bride, it would carry a more personal application to the royal marriage itself. More than that, the examples quoted earlier from the marriage of Philip of Spain and Mary Tudor show that there was no hesitation in likening a royal marriage to the mystical one which was commonly taken as being represented by the Song of Songs. It therefore functioned in this second application on at least two levels.

In both of these contexts, a central image of the Song of Songs, the garden, would have had recognised symbolic meanings. In the narrower context of the royal family, the sexual imagery of the garden was well understood, and the garden of the Song was no exception.\textsuperscript{61} Moreover, the garden was understood to represent the court.\textsuperscript{62} When the procreative necessities of dynasties required assistance, it would have been natural that the Song of Songs should be invoked. Part of the power of these texts arises not just from the images, sacrificed by their Biblical origin, of burgeoning nature, but from the age-old connection between nature and royalty.\textsuperscript{63} The plenty with which the kingdom of a good king was blessed was the result of the fecundity of nature operating within what one might describe as a 'sympathetic' environment. One might regard the

381
use of these texts almost as a form of magic designed to bring about the desired end.\textsuperscript{64} An additional level of reference may possibly be added to this. The story of the Virgin's parents may have been linked with the use of Solomon's texts. Anne and Joachim were childless, and traditionally it was in Solomon's Porch of the Temple, the Golden Gate, that they met and kissed (believed to be the origin of Mary's conception), both having been assured by angels that Anne would have a child. The wish for an heir, expressed in the language of Solomon, would have held an echo of the granting of the same wish to the parents of the Virgin under the covering of Solomon's Porch, especially as this was the standard representation of the Immaculate Conception in the first half of the 16th century.

In the wider context of the ruler and his kingdom, the garden was a recognised image of the just society. At Charles's 1515 Entry, another of the tableaux was of Orpheus within an orchard or garden charming the animals.\textsuperscript{65} The orchard represented the kingdom of Charles, and he was being exhorted to begin his reign with the 'perfect consonance' and 'melodious harmony' of all the virtues.\textsuperscript{66} The just kingdom was shown not only in the figure of the ruler as Orpheus, but in two wildmen figures, literally beyond the pale; these represented social ills who were kept at bay by justice and virtue within. The earthly kingdom was also seen as a mirror of the heavenly, and from that, the realm under a just king was both the successor to the garden of the Song, in itself a recovery of the Garden of Eden, and a pre-echo of Paradise to come, the perpetual garden of Dante, Fra Angelico and many others. The portrayal of the just ruler as Solomon emphasised this understanding of the kingdom. The Entries to which I have turned for some of the imagery also emphasise this through their extravagant demonstrations of plenty, with conduits and fountains running with wine, and through the explicit linking of peace and agriculture.\textsuperscript{67}
idea of plenty was not simply an abstract concept, but for many a matter of life or death in a medieval or renaissance economy.\textsuperscript{68}

The Biblical text records that God said that He would give Solomon 'such wealth and honour as no king of your time can match'. There is one final point on these Song of Songs texts, particularly those such as \textit{Ego flos campi} which use the flower metaphor. Aside from flowers as a conventional symbol of purity, we have Jesus's words, 'Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: and yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these'. When these texts are read through Jesus's words, the implication is that the pomp and show displayed by the court could be compared even with Solomon's, and pomp and show was the prime manifestation of power. In any case, the inheritor of Solomon's throne would expect to demonstrate his possession of 'such wealth and honour as no king of your time can match', and overt reference to Solomon by the use of these texts would make that aspiration clear.

These texts and their musical settings are capable of embodying not only the contemporary beliefs in divine kingship, but also more complex aspects of the related beliefs and concepts of the period. They form a necessary background for the works by Crecquillon and his contemporaries that I now want to discuss.

\textbf{Mass \textit{Kain Adler in der Welt}}

Amongst Crecquillon's masses is one which stands out from the rest on two grounds: its model and its technique. The mass \textit{Kain in der Welt so schon} is based on a German lied, \textit{Kain Adler in der Welt}. It stands apart because it is the only mass by
Crecquillon to have used a German model. The models for all his other masses are either French chansons or motets either by Crecquillon himself or by Flemish or French composers. Moreover, his chansons also sometimes incorporate material by French composers. Crecquillon is fairly typical in these respects; the use of a German model is unusual therefore, the more so when viewed in the context of Crecquillon's Flemish contemporaries.

The use made of the model is also unique amongst Crecquillon's masses. Instead of using the lied as a model for an imitation mass, as with all his other masses, Crecquillon takes the lied tenor as a tenor for his mass. The use made of the tenor is also dissimilar to that of monophonic models used as cantus firmi by Crecquillon's contemporaries, in that the tenor is not drawn out in longer note values; rather, segments of the tune are repeated in various ways to extend the material. So far as it stands alone, the mass presents something of an enigma. It is as unusual in its treatment of the material as it is in the initial choice of it. It is difficult though to discern from a superficial view of the mass itself any particular reason for its peculiar nature.

Crecquillon's mass was published by Susato in his second book of masses in 1545 (RISM 1545/1). It is possible that the lied Kain Adler in der Welt was unfamiliar to Susato because of his omission of the word Adler from the title when publishing Crecquillon's mass. It is of course possible that the omission was simply an oversight, but if so, it went uncorrected when the mass was later copied into manuscript. However familiar or unfamiliar the model may have been to Susato or to others, we can trace its use in a number of other works of the period. Attention has previously been drawn to the motet Quam pulchra es, for several reasons, one of
which is that the motet also uses *Kain Adler* as a cantus firmus, but it is not
precisely the same as that used in the mass, a point that will be considered later. The
motet exists with an attribution to Benedictus as well as to Crecquillon; the
authorship been discussed earlier. However, that is not the full extent of the use of
this particular tune as a cantus firmus, or in some other form; it is also employed by
Manchicourt, Bacchius, Maessens, and Canis. Table 6.1 gives a list of the pieces,

It is noticeable immediately that all the sacred texts are from the Song of Songs, and
that texts similar to those commented on in earlier manuscripts are fairly
prominent, particularly *Tota pulchra es*. If the use of a German lied as a cantus
firmus was unusual in Crecquillon’s mass, the similar use of such a cantus firmus in
motets, especially by the dates that can be assumed for these motets, is even more
rare. The inclusion in a French-texted chanson is also highly unusual.

Indeed, it is hard to find any parallel to these motets and the chanson elsewhere in the
literature, and the lied tenor itself does not seem otherwise to have been widespread.

It is of course possible that these motets, chanson and mass have no particular link
with each other beyond the common material, but their unusual nature and the
coincidence of the type and source of the texts of the motets suggests that they may be
related to a greater degree. If that is so, there seem to be two main possibilities. The
first is that the works concerned were written in response to, or for, some external
event; the second is that they incorporate in some manner an extra-musical
reference which is signified by the lied, much as we have seen with the incorporation
of a motto of Philip of Spain with its attendant musical reference in motets that may
be widely spaced across the years. It is also possible that, whatever the reason or
Works so far identified on, or incorporating, the lied *Kain Adler in der Welt*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>(Earliest) Source</th>
<th>Modern edition</th>
<th>Use of other lieder etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>7 pt. canon</td>
<td>VienNB Mus 19237</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacchius</td>
<td><em>Ego flos campi</em></td>
<td>1564/4</td>
<td>None - see App. 2</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictus</td>
<td><em>Quam pulchra es</em></td>
<td>1546/7</td>
<td>CMM 63/9</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandt</td>
<td><em>Kein Adler</em></td>
<td>1556/29</td>
<td>CW 63</td>
<td><em>Es taget/chant</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruck</td>
<td>Quodlibet</td>
<td>1534/17</td>
<td>DTÖ 72</td>
<td><em>Es taget</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canis</td>
<td><em>Tota pulchra es</em></td>
<td>1553/15</td>
<td>Sherr (1997)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crecquillon</td>
<td><em>Belle sans per</em></td>
<td>WhalleyS 23</td>
<td>MME ii, 2</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crecquillon</td>
<td><em>Mass Kain Adler</em></td>
<td>1545/1</td>
<td>CMM 63/1</td>
<td><em>Es taget/chant?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maessens</td>
<td><em>Tota pulchra es</em></td>
<td>1568/8</td>
<td>None - see App. 2</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchicourt</td>
<td><em>Osculetur/Tota pulchra</em></td>
<td>M 272</td>
<td>None - see App. 2</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senfl (i)</td>
<td>Quodlibet</td>
<td>1544/20</td>
<td>SW 5</td>
<td><em>Es taget/Ich stuen</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senfl (ii)</td>
<td><em>K. dein bin ich</em></td>
<td>VienNB Mus 18810</td>
<td>SW 2</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senfl (iii)</td>
<td><em>Ich sag und clag</em></td>
<td>VienNB Mus 18810</td>
<td>SW 2</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senfl (iv)</td>
<td>Quodlibet</td>
<td>VienNB Mus 18810</td>
<td>SW 2</td>
<td><em>Es taget</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senfl (v)</td>
<td>Quodlibet</td>
<td>VienNB Mus 18810</td>
<td>SW 2</td>
<td><em>Es taget</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
rationale for the composition of the initial work of the series (and we do not have sufficient information to know which might be the earliest from the evidence of the sources), other composers decided, for reasons which now are not clear, to emulate it. The answer may not be clear-cut; one can imagine a scenario in which a number of works were written, for instance for a particular event, the importance of which then led to other composers emulating these works. However, it is necessary to test the three main options first.

Starting with the initial assumption that all these pieces, or at least a core of them, were written for, or to commemorate, a particular event, then before the music itself is examined, the dating of the works should be considered. It can then be seen whether those dates are compatible or incompatible, in terms of their sources or composer biography.

Whilst no single piece can be dated completely accurately, a reasonable terminus a quo and terminus ad quem can be applied in the case of the mass by Crecquillon. Its latest date is given by the publication by Susato in 1545. Crecquillon's music is not known in any musical source earlier than 1536-40, although we have to exercise some caution on that point, simply because of the sporadic survival of sources from that period. His first known association with the Imperial chapel is in 1540, and I have suggested in chapter 2 that his joining the chapel was unlikely to have preceded that year by much, if at all, although there are grounds for thinking that his composing career is likely to have started at least several years earlier. If the mass was linked with the Imperial chapel, then 1540 is probably the earliest date that could be assumed.76
The Benedictus motet *Quam pulchra es* similarly was published for the first time by Susato, in 1546; it was subsequently reprinted by Phalèse in 1554 under Crecquillon's name. The date of its initial publication is close to that of the Crecquillon mass, which may reinforce the suggestion that a single event provided the impetus for some or all of these works to be composed. It is perhaps relevant that Benedictus and Crecquillon both had Habsburg court connections. Benedictus was master of Mary of Hungary's chapel from 1537 until about 1551, well after the date of this motet. It is most likely that if there was a single occasion behind these works, it would be of some magnitude and so most probably would have occurred in court circles. In that case, the time frame can probably be refined even further, as Canis also worked for the Imperial court. In his case, the earliest record we have is his travelling to Spain in 1542 accompanying four choirboys needed for the Chapel, which at that time was in Spain with Charles, following Charles's return from North Africa. It seems therefore if this first assumption is true that the works originated between 1542 and 1545.

It is not possible to be so precise with the motet by Manchicourt. *Osculetur me/Tota pulchra* appears in his 1554 collection, book 5 of the *Cantiones Sacrae* by Phalèse, given entirely to Manchicourt's works (RISM M272). Manchicourt's first collection appeared in 1539 printed by Attaingnant (RISM M269). The absence of this motet from the earlier collection may imply that it had not been composed by then. Even if it had been, it is difficult to see how Manchicourt, from a position in Tours, would be contributing to a group of pieces that otherwise seem related to the Imperial court. However, knowledge of Manchicourt's biography is sketchy at best, being derived very largely from the dedications of his motet and chanson publications. That he later worked in the Habsburg orbit is known. His second motet collection, that of
1554, is dedicated to Antoine Perrenot, Bishop of Arras, later Cardinal Granvelle. Later still Manchicourt became the master of Philip II's Flemish chapel. It is known, too, that at some time between the original publication of his first collection in 1539 and its reissue in a slightly amended form in 1545 (RISM M271), Manchicourt had moved from Tours to Tournai. He was sufficiently acquainted with Susato by 1545 to refer to him as a friend in the dedication of his book of chansons, Susato's ninth, the dedication being to an Antwerp worthy and law officer. Manchicourt was also able to refer to his longstanding friendship with his dedicatee. These terms in the dedication suggest that despite Manchicourt's earlier position in Tours, he maintained friendships in the Low Countries, and that he and his work were far from being unknown when he arrived at Tournai. It might also be mentioned that twelve of his masses were copied into a manuscript for use in Mary of Hungary's chapel; his music was evidently greatly appreciated by Mary. At some time too Manchicourt wrote a motet in honour of Charles V, *Nunc enim si centum*, which appeared in print in 1547, but which has been dated to 1543-5. From that, it might be deduced that, either directly or through his patron, Manchicourt had some form of contact with the Imperial court dating from at least as early as 1543 and possibly earlier still. Despite the comparatively late date of its initial appearance in print, there seems little reason to suppose that *Osculetur me/Tota pulchra* could not be contemporary with the works of Crecquillon, Canis and Benedictus.

Of the two remaining composers, Maessens had Imperial connections over a considerable period, both as a military man and as a musician. In 1540, having given up soldiering, he became chapel master at Courtrai, and in 1542 Mary of Hungary recommended him to Ferdinand I as assistant to Arnold von Bruck in Vienna. Maessens took up his position in 1543, staying in Vienna for some years. (Bruck is one of
the three composers to have written a lied setting of *Kain Adler in der Welt.*) The printing of Maessens's motet *Tota pulchra es* in 1568 is five years after his death, and the publication gives no clue to the likely date of its composition. The four pieces discussed so far, if written for the same event, seem to date from 1542 to 1545; that would fit well with the period at which Maessens appears to have been under some form of court scrutiny, to recommend him to Vienna, and his early service for the Imperial courts as a musician. We are on more difficult ground with Bacchius, simply because of the paucity of information about him. That he was later in Imperial service in Vienna is known, and it is not impossible or improbable that he should have been in some form of service in the Low Countries before that. There is some form of indirect evidence from the appearance of works of his in Phalèse's chanson collections which, if they are similar in this respect to the motet collections, would reflect to some degree at least, the local musical scene a little earlier than the years of publication in the 1550's.86

So far as can be determined, therefore, there is no intrinsic reason why these motets and the mass should not have been written either at the same time or very closely together. All the composers had some relationship with court circles at some time, even if it is impossible always to be certain of its nature or timing. Indeed what is known or can be deduced tends towards the impression that the works are coeval.

Before this hypothesis is considered further, or the other potential scenarios examined, it is necessary to look in more detail at the possible significance of the cantus firmus, the lied *Kain Adler in der Welt so shon.*
The earliest of the settings of the lied are those by Senfl. Only one setting has an original text, and I will consider that first. It is not a setting of this tune only; the lied is found in a quodlibet with two others: *Es taget vor dem Walde* and *Ich stued an einem Morgen*. The lied, as printed by Ott, has four verses:

KAin Adler in der Welt so schon
schwebt, lebt, ob seinem G’fieder
geziert ob gleich führt ein’ Kron’
und prangt hin- und herwieder,
als du zart, edle schöne Frucht
schwebst, lebst ob allen Weiben
mit schönem Bärd, Lob, Ehr’ und Zucht:
dabei mußt du mir bleiben.

TRlebsal, Unfall sei weit von dir,
bist nit dazue geboren!
Orgien, Singen, dergleichen Manier,
so züchtig speist dein’ Ohren,
dir wohnet bei in rechter Weis’.
Mit Ehr’, Vernunft und Tugend
dergleichen hast du großen Preis
und ziert ganz wohl dein’ Jugend.

NAchdem du so begnadet bist
ob allen Mensch'n auf Erden,
gedenk derhalben sunder List,
ob mir Genad' möcht' werden
umb meine Dienst', so ich dir trag'
in steter Lieb' und Treuen,
dann soll, glaub du mir, all dein' Tag'
dich nimmer meehr gereuen.

VON Herzen ich dir das zuesag'.
Lueg, schau und merk gar eben,
daß ich soviel ich kann und mag,
dieweil ich hab' mein Leben,
dir will erzeigen alles das,
so deinem Herzen g'fället.
Allein schaff Beut' mit mir etwas!
Ich bin zezun Bot gestellet.

(There is no eagle in the world that hovers so beautifully, even if it is
decorated with a crown above its wings and moves to and fro resplendently, as
you, tender, noble and beautiful creature with fair manners, praise, honour
and breeding; you must stay like that for me.

May sorrow and harm never come near you; you were never born for that.
Organ playing, singing and other such things as properly delight your ears
may keep you company. With (your) honour, reason and virtue, you have
great glory, and they adorn your youth.

Since you are so blessed (with virtues) above all people on earth, consider sincerely if I should not be raised up (in your favour) for the services I render you in constant love and faithfulness. If you do, believe me, you will never regret it all the days of your life.

Sincerely I promise that to you. See and understand that I, as much as I am able and capable of, whilst I am alive will grant you all which pleases your heart. Give me some reward. I am at your service.

The initial verses of the two other lieder quoted by Senfl are:

Es taget vor den Walde: Stand auf, Kätterlein,
die Hasen laufen balde: Stand auf, Kätterlein, holder Buehl!
Heidaho, du bist mein und ich bin dein: Stand auf, Kätterlein...Kätterlein mein.

(Before the forest dawn is breaking: arise little Katy,
the hares are running about swiftly: arise little Katy, Heyho, I am yours and you are mine, arise little Katy, my Katy.)

Ich stüend an einem Morgen heimlich in einer Ecke
da hatte ich mich verborgen
ich hörte klagende Worte von einem Fräulein hübsch und fein
das stand bei seinem Buehlen; es müßt geschieden sein.
One morning I was secretly standing in a corner, where I had hidden myself. I heard lamenting words from a pretty, fine lady standing beside her lover; they had to part.)

Taking the third lied first, it is known in a number of variant forms, some satirical, most of them relating to events, political and otherwise, in the last ten years of Maximilian's life, and it has been thought that the lied as a whole might refer to Maximilian and Anne of Brittany as the two lovers. The context here though does not suggest overt, or even covert, political or satirical intention, being joined as it is with two love poems. This particular lied does not reappear in any of the other settings of Kain Adler. Whilst its presence here suggests a link between all three lieder and Maximilian, its significance seems to be limited in the wider context of these settings.

The second lied, *Es taget*, is found in several of the Senfl settings of *Kain Adler* as well as in the Bruck version, and, to a lesser extent, in the one by Brandt. From that, it seems likely that it is more significant than *Ich stueand an einem Morgen*. It is certainly clear to whom it is addressed, giving us the name 'Katy'. The later setting by Brandt emphasises the same name, not only by opening one voice of the lied with the greeting 'Ave Katharina', but also by setting it to the incipit for a plainchant hymn to Saint Katharine. He then maintains in that voice an ostinato based on the phrase 'Stand auf Kätterlein'. He also includes a reference to the opening of the lied melody and its opening words within the body of the piece (most clearly in bars 53-60 in the bass voice), but as a whole the lied seems subservient to *Kain Adler*. The Bruck version, whilst making no such obvious reference to the name Katharine,
nevertheless presents the melodies and first verses of both lieder together in their entirety. The original significance therefore seems likely, partly at least, to lie in the combination of these two lieder rather than solely in *Kain Adler*. However, it is only *Kain Adler* that Crecquillon uses for a cantus firmus.

The very opening of this lied is redolent of Imperial imagery; the eagle instantly conjures up no-one less than the Emperor Maximilian himself, and the reference to a crown on the eagle's head emphasises the point.92 (There is also almost certainly an intended pun on the word 'adler', being connected with the word for aristocracy, from the same root.) Moreover, playing the organ and singing mentioned in the second verse could have been fit occupations only for a court lady. The text, too, appears to confirm the identity of the lover with whom this declaration of love is being made. The editors of the Senfl lied, having made allowance for Ott's inconsistent orthography, concluded that the lied conceals an incomplete acrostic (capitalised above) Ka-tri-na von H. which confirms the name given in the lied *Es Taget* and later by Brandt.93 The form of the text also suggests that it is intended to be read or heard as a dialogue, that what we have is a mutual declaration and pledging between the lady Katrina and Maximilian, which is consistent with the formulaic usage of *Es taget* and its antecedents.

The four other settings of the lied *Kain Adler* by Senfl are grouped together in one manuscript source and are labelled 'das erste' etc.94 It seems from this that they were intended to form a discrete group. Two of these settings also include the lied *Es taget* as well as *Kain Adler*. It is particularly unfortunate that all four settings have lost their original texts, but the two settings incorporating *Es taget* have the motto or textual incipit: *M dein bin ich*, and a third has *K dein bin ich* upon which the new text
has been built. The editors of Senfl's lieder believed that Kain Adler originally had more verses which would have completed the name and that with these lieder 'we look into nothing less than into a love affair, apparently of Emperor Maximilian with some aristocratic lady'. The Senfl editors' point seems well made, especially if we add the possible affiliations of Ich stüend an einem morgen, the later continuation of the association of Kain Adler and Es taget in the settings by Bruck and Brandt, and Brandt's emphasis on the name Katharina and his use of chant to highlight and sacrfify it. The courtly origin of the lied Kain Adler, together with its apparent association with Maximilian and his lady, and its use later by Imperial composers, must surely be linked.

There is, then, a lied from Maximilian's court with very specific allusions to one of his lovers; this and an associated text are serious and mutual declarations of love. Other lieder by Senfl within the same group, by their mottos or incipits, seem also to represent an exchange of vows, thus strengthening the specific nature of the texts set in the first version. The composers of all the later motets and the mass appear to have had some form of Imperial or Habsburg court connection, and the motets in question are all based on the Song of Songs, which, it has been argued, can carry a considerable weight of royal symbolism. With these features in mind, is it possible to identify an actual event for which these works might have been written within the time frame that has been suggested? It seems likely from the background that such an event would be the celebration, formal or informal, of a love-match or marriage. The absence of any single manuscript source for these works makes it impossible to know whether they could have formed a gift from the Imperial court to another, but the use of the reference to Maximilian's affair would perhaps have carried most weight within the Imperial family itself. If that is correct, to whom could these pieces have
referred? The Emperor Charles himself was a widower from well before the earliest possible date of these works, as Maximilian had been when Senfl wrote his lied, but what is known suggests that, despite occasional liaisons, Charles remained emotionally attached to the memory of his dead wife. It is probably not therefore with Charles that any answer lies. Charles's illegitimate daughter Margaret had married for the second time at the end of 1538, which is probably too early for the time frame. There remains one other possibility, and one which seems to offer a convincing fit: the marriage in November 1543 of Philip of Spain to Doña Maria of Portugal. His birth had occasioned great celebrations, and his marriage was likely to do the same. It is improbable that the marriage of Charles's son, and heir to much of his empire, should be a modest affair. The implications of marriage were too profound at this level, implications such as the protection and continuation of the dynasty, the strengthening of political alliances and the accretion of territory. An alliance through marriage would be an occasion for demonstrating Habsburg power and prestige through the most lavish displays and costliest show.

An earlier marriage, that of Eleanor of Toledo (the choice of the Emperor Charles on behalf of the groom) to Cosimo Medici in 1539 gives some insight into the celebrations that would surround an important union. A publication by Gardane (RISM 1539/25) preserves Corteccia's eight-voice motet *Ingredere felicissimis auspiciis*, and his nine-voice marriage 'hymn' (each voice representing a muse), together with a number of madrigals by other composers (each representing a city or river within the Medici territory), and details of the entertainments that took place. The motet was sung from an arch of one of the city gates by twenty-four singers in one group, and four trombones and four cornets in the other upon Eleanor's arrival. At the wedding banquet itself, the 'hymn' and madrigals were performed, with a
singer as Apollo performing to his own lyre accompaniment in between them. There
was also a comedy, with a prologue, intermedii and an epilogue all by Corteccia.99 If
so much was fitting for the daughter of the Viceroy of Naples and a Medici, how much
more was due the Emperor's own (and only) son?100

If Philip's marriage to Maria does provide the rationale for the pieces by
Crecquillon, Canis and others, it solves one puzzle immediately: why there should be
a number of motets but only one mass using Kain Adler as their cantus firmus. A
marriage might present a number of opportunities for the performance of motets,
but there would only be one nuptial mass celebrated. More than that, we might expect
the mass, at the centre of the marriage, to be composed by the senior court musician,
and at this stage Crecquillon seems to have been master of the Imperial chapel.101 It
would also account for the use of Kain Adler only as a cantus firmus, and not either of
the other two lieder utilised by Senfl: Ich stuend would have had entirely the wrong
connotation with its talk of parting. Es taget might have been regarded as too specific
in its text and perhaps too light-hearted in general, despite its incorporation of a
traditional pledge, but as will be seen below, it is also employed within Crecquillon's
mass in a striking manner. The texts used, too, for the cantus firmus in the various
motets, would all have been suitable for a marriage. It is notable that of the three
texts used, Tota pulchra es, in three motets, opens with the same words as the motet
from the Habsburg court to Queen Catherine of England discussed above. This
statement of perfection, whilst appropriate for a queen, must have been doubly
fitting for a marriage: 'You are all beautiful my love and there is no fault in you'. One
of the other two is Quam pulchra es, similarly prominent in earlier royal contexts,
and again highly suited to such an occasion: 'How beautiful you are, my love, how
beautiful!'. Again, if we return to the lied text, its declarations may be taken as a
poetic equivalent of the marriage vows, but it has even more to commend it as the model for this particular marriage. It refers to the lady playing the organs and singing; courtly accomplishments for any lady, to be sure. Doña Maria, though, was particularly noted for her interest in and knowledge of music, which would have made the reference even more apposite.

It is possible to gauge a little of the scale of the festivities by a further brief comparison with the earlier marriage of Eleanor of Toledo and Cosimo Medici. There, Eleanor had been greeted by a motet sung from the arch of one of the city gates. Doña Maria, by contrast, was met at the border of Spain and Portugal by the Duke of Medina Sidonia and other dignitaries and escorted in some splendour, being accorded Entries in more than half a dozen towns and cities before she arrived at Salamanca, where the marriage took place. Despite the importance of such a union, the Emperor Charles himself was not present. He had been forced to leave Spain earlier in the year, at the very beginning of May, to deal with problems caused by the French king Francis I, and with unrest in the Netherlands. Presumably his chapel left with him. Whether it had been Charles's intention to remain in Spain for the marriage is not known. Nevertheless, what is known suggests that the festivities were on the lavish scale that could have been expected, despite Philip's characteristically low key announcement in his letter after the event. The princess had arrived from Portugal towards the beginning of November in 1543. As so often, the contemporary record mentions music only peripherally, and in this instance concerns itself as much with the opulence of the costumes and the jewellery as with anything else, and from those details alone the expense and scale seem extraordinary. The marriage itself must have been very tiring as it took place at 5.30 in the morning after a ball that did not end until 3 o'clock. There is no specific record of whether there was
music at the service, although it is impossible to imagine there not being, and of course the marriage was a nuptial mass. There certainly were musicians in attendance, as to be expected, at other stages of Doña Maria’s progress; the Duke of Medina Sidonia had been accompanied by a band of instruments when he went to meet the Portuguese contingent, and when Maria reached Salamanca, she was met at the city gate and escorted through ceremonial arches to the main chapel where she heard prayers. It is known from elsewhere that such arches frequently provided a platform for musicians who would sing or play appropriate music for the Entry, but in this instance there is an even more intriguing detail.\textsuperscript{107} When Doña Maria heard prayers in ‘la capilla mayor’, the main chapel of the city, ‘some motets were sung by the singers’. This would have been a perfect opportunity for the performance of at least some of the motets under discussion here.\textsuperscript{108}

The case to be drawn from the particular cantus firmus, and from the specific textual allusions and references of both the lied and the motet texts for linking these works with the marriage of Philip and Maria seems strong. It is worth considering some aspects of these works in a little more detail to see whether the case can be further supported.

The motets, because of their relatively modest lengths when compared to the mass, utilise the cantus firmus only once or twice. The mass though requires several repeats of the cantus firmus to accommodate the whole of the Ordinary. The way that Crecquillon sets it out is as follows (sections without the cantus firmus are not noted):

\textbf{Lied:} \texttt{ABABCDEFII}
This disposition is interesting for two reasons: first, despite the different lengths of the various movements, Crecquillon contrives to have two complete, or almost complete, statements in each movement except the Sanctus, that no doubt due to the comparative shortness of the Osanna which makes the complete statement impossible without major distortion of the structure. (This would be achieved in the Agnus Dei by the repetition to provide the normal 'dona nobis pacem'.) Where additional material is needed for a section, he repeats phrases but does not revert, except in the Creed, to the opening of the lied in order to do so, thus maintaining the ostensible basis of duple statements. The Kyrie is also interesting in that in the face of its three-part structure, Crecquillon has chosen not to divide the two statements across the three sections and thus to obscure its pattern, but to use a pattern of repeats phrase by phrase. This maintains the audible double statement, and in the opening movement of the mass, makes the emphasis on the double presentation even more evident. Whether there is any further and more arcane symbolism concealed in this pattern of use, either in the order of phrase repetition or in the number of repeats is
not clear, but the restriction of the cantus firmus to two repetitions in each movement and the device he uses in the Kyrie to overcome the tripartite structure point well enough to a symbolism appropriate for a wedding. ¹⁰⁹

There is another aspect of the mass to consider: the points of imitation are sometimes related to or built from elements of the cantus firmus, but by no means wholly. That might simply suggest that Crecquillon wanted a greater variety of melodic material than could have been derived from the cantus firmus alone. However, several phrases are reminiscent of plainsong formulae, and in three cases it is possible to suggest a resemblance to specific chants. See Example 6.1. The opening of the Creed seems to follow the opening of Omnes gentes, 'O clap your hands together, all ye people'; the Sanctus is possibly modelled on Laetentur coeli, 'rejoice O heavens, whilst the Incarnatus in the Creed could be intended to refer to Haec est virgo sapiens, 'this is a wise virgin'.

It is true that the resemblances are not extended, but if the congruity is fortuitous, then it is particularly happy chance that indicates such appropriate words for the plainsong incipits as those suggested by the melodic outlines. ¹¹⁰ However, it is not simply the appropriateness of the opening words in each case, but the fact that in each case, the reference can be seen as a gloss in a similar manner to the use of borrowed material discussed in chapter 4, which makes these quotations more convincing. Omnes gentes is taken from the beginning of psalm 46, which refers to God as the great King over all the earth. Coming at the opening of the Credo, this might be seen as confirming belief in the divine nature of the royal figures, particularly Philip. Similarly with Laetentur coeli; the song of the heavenly host adoring God is linked with a chant associated with the Incarnation, implicitly inviting
Example 6.1

Omnes gentes plaudite

Patrem omnipotentem, factorem

Lactentur caeli

Sanctus

Haece est Virgo sapientissimamquam

Et incarnatus est de
adoration of the divine-made-flesh in the person of the royal.

The opening of the Credo and of the Sanctus may seem places where the attention of a listener may be directed to them, and the more plausible on that account, but at first sight the beginning of the Incarnatus within the Creed may be thought less obvious as a place to make some melodic allusion. However, this point is signalled musically by the absence of the cantus firmus in the tenor, the only place other than the reduced-voice sections where it is not used (other than for the odd few rests between phrases). The Incarnatus is at the heart of the Creed, and at the heart of the Faith, and we have seen elsewhere the strong identification of the language of the Incarnation with royalty. In that light, it is one of the two central moments of the mass ordinary, the other being the Benedictus with its use as an elevation text. Although the cantus firmus is absent at this point, the tenor voice is not silent. It continues with other material which yet again emphasises the divine royal element, and suggests strongly that the hypothesis that the mass is for a wedding is correct. The initial motif in the tenor is derived from the beginning of the lied Es taget vor den Walde, and is perhaps intended as a signal to draw attention to what is about to follow, because Crecquillon does not use the whole of Es taget here. This is not a replacement cantus firmus: the section is too short, and only part of the lied is given. The real significance of this use of part of the lied seems not to be in the musical borrowing, but in the words that would have applied to the chosen sections in their original form. See Example 6.2. Phrases sanctified by Maximilian's use - 'Arise Katy dear lover', being combined with 'she is a wise virgin', and 'heyho, you are mine' from the old pledging of troth, are the clearest indication possible of the special nature of this work when presented at this moment in the mass.
Example 6.2

Et incarnatus (tenor) with lied text

Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Vir.
(Es) ta get vor dem Walde hei-a-ho du bist mein stand auf Kääter-lein hol-

der Buchl, hei-a-ho du bist mein, stand auf Kääter-lein,

et homo factus est, et homo factus est.
hei-a-ho du bist mein, stand auf Kääter-lein.
This place in the mass is pointed up in the music not simply by the use of the
different tenor, but also by the avoidance until now of any overt musical reference to
the second lied. Once it has been introduced, however, Crecquillon uses it slightly
more freely for developing his points of imitation, for instance in parts of the
remainder of the Creed. The point of this restraint is clear, the most sacred point of
the mass Ordinary is chosen by Crecquillon as the place to refer most directly to the
sacred but temporal vows being exchanged, with clear signs towards that hidden
meaning being supplied. The *Incarnatus* is being used not only because of its
solemnity as the centre of the Faith, but because it signifies God's presence in the
royal figures too, as well as the hoped-for fruit of the union. Yet again, the language
of the Divine might be said to be being applied to royalty by such a juxtaposition.
Even if the identification of the chant were to be discounted, the verbal correlation
between the mass section and the lied, which Crecquillon had refrained from
introducing earlier in the mass, is striking. Its impact, symbolically, at this point is
considerable. Only one further part of the mass uses *Es taget* so clearly, and provides
another example of a similar symbolic point being made. It is in the *Benedictus*,
where Crecquillon uses the opening of the lied for the opening of the section. 'Blessed
is he who comes in the name of the Lord' is set together with an implied reference to
Maria. We have seen earlier that the *Benedictus* had its part in statements of divine
kingship.¹¹¹ The choice of this section of the mass to refer more prominently to the
lied *Es taget* would have been no accident. There may be yet greater depths of subtlety
beneath the surface, but these examples are sufficient to show that the work is
complex and that its symbolism is entirely in accordance with the marriage for
which it may have been written and the representation of God by royalty.
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If Crecquillon's work tends to confirm the connection, what of the motets by the other composers? The range of works is quite wide, from Canis's motet of only fifty-six breves' duration, to Manchicourt's motet of over twice that length; from the free counterpoint on the cantus firmus, in most instances, to the canonic complexity of the motet by Maessens. What is immediately seen by a comparison of these pieces is that there is no overt sharing of melodic material, either with each other or with the mass. They therefore stand largely on their own in terms of any further clues that may be inferred from them.

Taking the motet by Canis first, the piece is marked by two features: its brevity and the low scoring of the upper voice. The treatment of the cantus firmus is straightforward, a single exposition without augmentation or repeats. The low scoring of the upper part could be for a number of reasons. It presumably implies performance by men only, and in the context of the details of the marriage that we have, it might suggest that this was a motet that was performed from an arch during Doña Maria's Entry into Salamanca, as the boys available might have been kept for the main performance in the chapel. That use would also account for its brevity. However, that can only be speculative. The scoring using lower voices only might also be intended to be a representation of the address from the bridegroom to the bride. The brevity of the piece might also be explained simply by Canis's relative status. At this stage, he was, compared with Benedictus and Crecquillon, a newcomer to Imperial circles, and so his contribution for this event might have been comparatively modest.

The motet by Maessens is for five voices, a four-in-one canon together with a free
part. It appears in a small collection of canonic works of which the majority, either by their texts or their composers, have a connection with Habsburg circles.\(^{112}\) Maessens' motet is clearly identified as being based on *Kain Adler*, and it is possible that the rubrics for the motet may refer obliquely to its original purpose that has been proposed. The canonic voice-part says: 'Quatuor in partes carmen distinguere debes/Quintum virginea iungito voce melos', 'You must distinguish four parts in this song to which the virginal voice of the tune must join'. Maessens does not use *Kain Adler* as it stands, but derives from it the canonic voice, which contains more than sufficient quotations for its dependence on the lied to be obvious. The use of canon mirrors earlier practice of associating canon with dedicatory or similar pieces, and the symbolism would be entirely appropriate for the marriage: two people and two countries being brought into accord by the event signified by the lied. It is possible, too, that the opening of the free voice is making an allusion to the opening of *Es taget*, albeit in inversion.

The anonymous setting of *Kain Adler* from ViennaNB Mus 19237 might be mentioned briefly here as, like Maessens's motet, it is a canon. The solution to the canon is not yet clear, but the heading states that it is for seven voices, a number with very strong Marian connections.\(^{113}\) It is difficult to suggest any convincing reason for the linking of the lied with the Virgin, and its seems much more probable that any Marian symbolism understood from the number of parts to the canon would have been intended to apply to someone like Maria, Philip's bride. The canon also carries the motto 'simile gaudet simili', 'like rejoices with like'. Perhaps there is a similar echo here, too, of the event that I have suggested.

Bacchius's motet, like that of Canis, has but a single part and a single presentation of
the cantus firmus, but in this instance the cantus firmus is effectively in longer note values. It is the way that this is achieved which is noteworthy; Bacchius uses the old device of augmentation by having the cantus firmus presented under the mensuration sign of uncut C, whilst the remaining parts use the conventional cut C. This method of presenting a cantus firmus is to be found in earlier works, but by the date of these pieces it appears to be unusual. The adoption of the unusual is perhaps to draw attention to it. The point of the notational method is entirely visual: the difference between that and simply adopting longer note values obviously could not be audible. It is therefore symbolic in the way that for instance the adoption of all-black notation can be. The cantus firmus gives two in one by its use of augmentation, or two of the other parts becomes one in the cantus firmus. There are a variety of ways of expressing the point, but as with the Maessens motet, the possible interpretation of such symbolism seems to be in accordance with the event proposed. The other noticeable feature of Bacchius's motet is the weight given to the word 'dulcis', in the phrase 'his fruit was sweet to my taste' (bar 82 of the transcription). It would be difficult to construct a reason for highlighting this word so clearly in a liturgical context, but it makes eminent sense in the context of a marriage.

The emphasis on the dual so appropriate to a marriage is also seen in Manchicourt's contribution. In this instance, Manchicourt uses two statements of the cantus firmus, one in each part of the motet. Whilst it might rightly be observed that the vast majority of motets are in two parts, it is not straining the point here to suggest that it is symbolically intended, as the other four motets within this group of works have only a single part, as have many 'praise' or 'political' motets. The motet is for six voices which requires two voice parts to be doubled, and Manchicourt chooses to double the top and lowest parts, arguably the most audible voices, preserving a form
of symmetry and throwing the cantus firmus in the tenor into greater relief by avoiding doubling its part. The words of this motet are relatively unusual too. Manchicourt uses a text for the free parts which, whilst it has a liturgical use, seems to have been relatively uncommon: 'Osculetur me osculo oris sui, quia meliora ubera tua vino', 'O that you would kiss me with the kisses of your mouth! For your love is better than wine.' The overtly erotic nature of the sentiments would no doubt not have prevented the use of this text in other contexts, given the capacity of the times to use terms which in other days might be regarded as indelicate or inappropriate, but they certainly would have fitted the celebration of a marriage. Beyond the general character of the text, it might also be noted that the second part of the motet rather more specifically has words which again fit well with a royal wedding: 'introduxit me rex in cellaria sua', 'the king has brought me into his chambers'; 'exaltabimus et letabimur super unum recti diligunt te', 'We will exult and rejoice in you, rightly do they love you'. The latter phrases would have been well suited to Maria, having come from the Portuguese court where the love her parents bore her was sufficiently great as to excite comment. Confusion in the text given in the printed source for this motet also suggests that it had no common liturgical use, or if it had, that it had been specially altered; (see the notes to the transcription in Appendix 2).

The Benedictus motet has similarities with others within this group of pieces. It presents the cantus firmus in augmentation but without the notational device used by Bacchius and presents it just once. Also like the Bacchius work, the tenor has as its text the same text as the rest of the motet rather than the dual texts of the Manchicourt motet. As with that motet, though, there are some parts of the text which suggest that it was chosen with the marriage in mind. Although the motet starts
with words used liturgically, the text as a whole seems to be a composite. Again as with the Manchicourt, the general tenor of the words is in keeping with the occasion, but there is one specific phrase that is perhaps more telling. The motet ends with the words ‘veni, veni electa mea, sponsa mea, veni soror mea, veni et coronaberis.’ ‘Come, come my chosen one, my bride, come my sister, come and be crowned.’ That phrase does not exist in that form within the Song of Songs, although the phrase as a whole appears to be based on chapter 4, verse 8 - ‘veni de Libano sponsa veni de Libano veni coronaberis’. In its construction two phrases, ‘electa mea’ and ‘soror mea’, have apparently been inserted with the corresponding deletion of the phrase ‘de Libano’. Both insertions are probably significant. Before Prince Philip married Doña Maria other marriages had been proposed for him. It was known that Philip had expressed the desire to marry someone who spoke the same language and who was his personal choice rather than a choice dictated by the normal considerations of politics and alliances. In this he was allowed his way by Charles V, his father, and to marry Maria was Philip’s own decision. The insertion of the words ‘my chosen one’ is no doubt a reflection of that. Philip’s desire not to marry a stranger was expressed as wanting to marry one of his own kin, and the phrase ‘my sister’ no doubt reflects the kinship of Philip and Maria.116

What can be gleaned from the motets appears to support the more detailed symbolism of Crecquillon’s mass, and all these pieces through their dating, symbolism and texts seem to support the proposition that they were written for a Habsburg marriage, that of Philip and Maria.

So far, apart from noting the use made of the cantus firmus, no detailed comparison of the actual cantus firmus has been made, either within this group of pieces or
within the lieder that employ it. The differences are largely confined to the ends of phrases; see Example 6.3. It will be seen that variations are relatively small, but nevertheless, some deductions can probably safely be made.

The first observation is that there are two clear groups within the motets and mass, with the Crecquillon and Canis works in one, and the remaining pieces in the other. Note for instance the cambiata figures in the former which are represented by a rather different outline in the latter on a consistent basis. That there are two versions split in this way would fit well with Canis and Crecquillon being associated with the Imperial court and the others having different, but still Habsburg, affiliations. The consistency amongst the other three motets suggests that they too had a common source or provenance, although the Bacchius variant consistently maintains the rhythm of the lieder versions more closely than the other two. If it is the case that these three variants have a common origin, then outside the Imperial chapel itself, the most likely place for them to have come from is the court of Mary of Burgundy. The differences in the two versions of the cantus firmus are such that it is also possible to suggest that neither was derived from the other. It will also be noted that neither of the two versions is identical with any of the secular settings. Again the differences are such that it is possible to suggest that none of the secular versions were the direct precursors of the cantus firmus in either variant, at least not in the precise form in which they have been transmitted. It will be seen that the version adopted by Crecquillon and Canis is most closely matched by the Brandt setting; however, there is one crucial difference. In the approach to the last cadence, Brandt, in common with all the other versions, has $c$ on the last crotchet of the antepenultimate bar, whereas Crecquillon and Canis are united in having $d$. All the differences though are relatively small; it is possible therefore that all the versions
i) Kain Adler b. 8-10
   a) as in Senfl and Bruck
   \[\text{music notation}\]
   b) as in Bacchius, Machicourt and Benedictus
   \[\text{music notation}\]
   c) as in Crecquillon, Canis and Brandt
   \[\text{music notation}\]

ii) final cadence
   a) as in Senfl and Bruck
   \[\text{music notation}\]
   b) as in Bacchius, Manchicourt and Benedictus
   \[\text{music notation}\]
   c) as in Crecquillon and Canis
   \[\text{music notation}\]
   d) as in Brandt
   \[\text{music notation}\]
are closely connected. It could be assumed from this that the use of *Kain Adler* was no antiquarian exercise, but one based on a continuing performance tradition, and that the significance of the lied was intrinsic, and not derived from any particular polyphonic model. That supports what has been deduced from the texts of the lieder and from Crecquillon's manipulation of them in his mass.

*Belle sans per*

The circumstantial case for the wedding of Philip and Maria seems reasonably strong, but it is reinforced by another work of Crecquillon's - the chanson *Belle sans per*. Again, the work adopts *Kain Adler* as a cantus firmus, and its special nature is emphasised by the fact that it is in twelve parts, unique amongst Crecquillon's surviving works. The use of twelve parts, a number again closely associated with the Virgin, for a chanson addressed to Maria is very much in line with the earlier examples of divine and royal symbolism, a point reinforced by the opening words of the text: 'Beautiful without equal', redolent of the Song of Songs and the Marian 'Tota pulchra es'. The chanson text has other phrases which may be taken as conventional sentiment, but which seem particularly appropriate to this occasion:

*Belle sans per* [pair], ou gist tout mon espoir,
Secourez moy ou je meurs autrement,
Tenu m'aves tant au matin qu'au soir
En vous servant du tout a mon pouvoir,
Mais pour servir je n'ay alligement.

(Beautiful without equal, where rests all my hope, help me or otherwise I die; you have captured me as much in the morning as in the evening, in
serving you with all my power, although I am unacquainted with service.)

The most likely time for this chanson to be performed would have been the dance held immediately before the wedding, perhaps even for one of the dances which Philip and Maria performed by themselves.\textsuperscript{118} The intimation that the lover was unused to service might refer both to Philip’s youth (and inexperience) and his position as a prince. The assurance of service in the morning, after the marriage itself, as in the evening immediately prior to it, would be particularly appropriate as an expression of affection within a marriage that, however much Maria was a personal choice of Philip’s, remained an essentially dynastic affair.

Suitable though the text might be, and however unusual the structure of the chanson, there is a more particular reason to suggest that this piece strengthens the link between Kain Adler and the particular event. One of the chanson’s two remaining sources is an arrangement for two keyboards, the only such arrangement in the collection printed in 1557: Venegas de Henestrosa’s \textit{Libro de cifra nueva}.\textsuperscript{119} We can thus be certain that the piece was known in Spain. Moreover, Henestrosa’s publication is one of two printed sources containing the music of Cabezón, the organist of Philip’s chapel at the time of the marriage, although there is no indication that he was the intabulator in this instance.

\textbf{Alternative occasions}

It has been argued that the marriage of Prince Philip and Doña Maria was the event that led to the composition of these motets and mass. The case for Philip of Spain’s first marriage may seem strong, but the evidence needs a brief review in the light of
the other two main possibilities outlined initially: that these works form a series of offerings to an individual figure separate from such a celebration, or that they could be a series of emulations. Taking the first of these, it could again be assumed that, if these works were addressed to an individual, the recipient or dedicatee must have been someone of very considerable position. Taking into account the affiliations of the composers involved, the timescales that we can assume, and the scale of the offerings, the only feasible person would appear to be Mary of Hungary, Charles's sister, and, until the Emperor's abdication, regent of the Low Countries. The evidence seems weighted against this. Firstly, the nature of the allusions to the lieder, with their protestations of love and especially the vows implicit in Crecquillon's use of phrases from the lied Es taget in the mass, seem inconsistent with the status of Mary as a long-widowed woman. The text of Manchicourt's Osculetur me/Tota pulchra, 'Kiss me with the kisses of your mouth', might similarly seem a little inappropriate to the sensibilities even of that time. The same observation may be made about the text of Benedictus's motet, with its reference to a bride, and the minor but significant textual changes and references that appear to have been made. Although it could be argued that Mary as regent was a chosen one, the phrase 'come and be crowned' in the same motet would tend to diminish that possibility. Secondly, under this scenario it is harder to account for the consistency of the cantus firmus in the two groups that have been observed, but not - it must be admitted - impossible. Thirdly, despite Mary's patronage of music, there is no other observable tradition of homage pieces as there is with Charles or Philip. In the perhaps comparable instance of Margaret of Austria, composers largely set chansons to texts which were associated with Margaret, but purely homage pieces are hard to discern. Again, the scale of this group of motets and a mass seems to make a reference to Mary of Hungary improbable. No doubt because of her name some apparently Marian pieces were
intended to relate to her, but we encounter the familiar difficulty of being able to
detect the alternative or additional reference within a piece that had a liturgical use,
or a clear application to the Virgin. Lastly, if Kain Adler were to have been used in
relation to Mary, the omission in the title of the mass in Susato's print, whether by
error or oversight, would have been less likely to have occurred; it would have been
readily apparent. On balance, the possibility that these works were written for an
individual seems to fit the symbolism and set of allusions much less well. Similar
arguments apply, with greater force, to the possibility that these works were a
series of emulations unconnected with either a person or an event. There seems little
to suggest it as a viable explanation, especially as, apart from the cantus firmus
itself, there appears to be little by way of cross-reference or musical allusion. It is
reasonable to conclude, therefore, that the marriage of Prince Philip and Doña Maria
was the event for which some, or all, of these works were written.

Other motets

The contemporary record for this occasion has shown that the opportunity for motets
to be sung was not confined to the marriage service itself. How large that opportunity
was cannot be known, but the possibility arises that other as yet unidentified works
could also be proper to these festivities. It is tempting to look more widely, to see if
other works can be associated with the same event, works which do not display the
use of the cantus firmus which has enabled us to be sure of the link between the
motets and mass already discussed. There is a problem, though, which has already
been alluded to - it is that the symbolic force of these works derives partly from the
cantus firmus when present, but partly too from the liturgical or sacred context
from which the texts are taken. It is their original heavenly use that helps makes
them suitable for allegorical, symbolic, or direct application to royalty because of
the sacred nature of royalty itself, but without some form of signpost, such as the
cantus firmus in the works discussed so far, it will be hard to be certain of a work's
original purpose. Any evidence is therefore likely to be more indirect. For instance,
we may be very tempted to consider one of the several motets on the text Quae est
ista. It would after all be difficult to imagine any more appropriate text for a
November marriage than that of the opening of the second part of de Wisme's motet on
this text, especially with the association with nature's plenty and the royal:

Sicut dies verni circundabant eam flores rosarum et lilia convallium.
Viderunt eam filiae Syon, et beatam dixerunt, et reginae laudaverunt eam.
(As in the days of spring, roses and lilies of the valley shall surround her.
The daughters of Sion shall see her and call her blessed, and queens shall
praise her.)

Equally suitable would be Crecquillon's Sicut liliurn with its reference to a lily
among thorns, a name for Mary indicating her Immaculate Conception, one of her
Perfections:

Sicut liliurn inter spinas, sic amica mea inter filias. Sub umbra alarum
suarum sedi dextera sua, amplexata est me, et osculetur est me, osculo oris
sui. Gaudete filiae Jerusalem, nam floras apparuerunt in terra nostra et
vinea nostra dedit odorem suum, quae rite filiae Syon, quia eius amore languio.
(As the lily among thorns, so is my love among the daughters. I sat at her left
beneath the shade of her arms. She embraced me and kissed me with a kiss of
her mouth. Rejoice daughters of Jerusalem for flowers have appeared in our
land and our vineyard has given off its scent. Seek, daughters of Sion, my mistress, my beautiful mistress, and announce to her that I am weak for love of her. Walter)120

Tempting though it may be to speculate in these instances, there is nothing beyond the suitability of the texts to support a link with this occasion or group of works when read in the light of the context that I have suggested, except that Sicut liliaum is one of Crecquillon's very few motets using paired imitation (although very briefly). Whatever the liturgical or Biblical origins, the fact that these texts were set by a number of composers confirms the difficulty to be overcome if any of them are to be considered as part of this complex of works. There is possibly a slightly less speculative case to be put forward though for four other motets, one by Crecquillon and three by Manchicourt. The motets are Nigra sum, Tota pulchra es, Quae est ista, and Vidi speciosam, respectively.121

Taking two of Manchicourt's motets first, Tota pulchra es and Quae est ista were both printed in the same collection as Osculetur me/Tota pulchra es, the 5th book of Phalèse's Cantiones Sacrae. The dedication of this volume to Antoine Perrenot, bishop of Arras, protégé of Charles V and future adviser to Philip, has already been noted. These motets not only appear in the same publication, but they appear in sequence, with Tota pulchra es first, Osculetur me/Tota pulchra es second and Quae est ista last of the three. That some inference is to be drawn from Tota pulchra es being placed before the motet Osculetur me/Tota pulchra es, which has it as its tenor the same text to the lied Kain Adler in der Welt, seems reasonable. (The text in Tota pulchra es moreover had strong associations with not just this group of pieces but with royalty more generally as I have already shown.) It is inherently unlikely that the unusual
nature of the second motet would have gone unnoticed, even when published several years after the event that has been proposed for its composition, and the grouping of these motets in the print by Phalèse therefore may well be indicative of some form of relationship between them. The published order of these motets is not the only pointer that there is. Each motet is similarly scored, a scoring that does not appear elsewhere in this volume, with top and lowest voice doubled (although in the case of Tota pulchra es with a C4 clef rather than the F3 clef of the bassus). This twinning of the outer voices repeats some of the possible imagery that has already been discussed in relation to the mass, and Manchicourt’s Osculetur me/Tota pulchra es. In addition to this feature, there are some family likenesses to be observed in the melodic material used by Manchicourt, and in one case, a striking resemblance with the fourth motet, Crecquillon’s Nigra sum. The resemblances between Manchicourt’s own motets are not extended, and may have been unconscious, but they may suggest that the three motets might be contemporary. In the case of the resemblance between Tota pulchra es and Crecquillon’s Nigra sum however, short though it is, the shape of the phrase is sufficiently unusual to consider it outside the realm of chance. See Example 6.4.

If Manchicourt’s motet is one of several perhaps connected with this occasion, then the similarity between it and Crecquillon’s Nigra sum is of importance. There is a last point that might suggest that Manchicourt’s contribution to the music for Philip’s marriage could have been larger than is immediately obvious, namely, his eventual appointment to head Philip’s Flemish chapel in Madrid.

Nigra sum is another and popular text from the Song of Songs, and other than the similarity with Manchicourt’s Tota pulchra es in its opening point, there is no
Example 6.4

i) a) Manchicourt: Osculetur

\begin{music}
\includegraphics{music1.png}
\end{music}

b) Manchicourt: Quae est ista

\begin{music}
\includegraphics{music2.png}
\end{music}

ii) a) Manchicourt: Tota pulchra es

\begin{music}
\includegraphics{music3.png}
\end{music}

b) Crecquillon: Nigra sum

\begin{music}
\includegraphics{music4.png}
\end{music}
musical reason to connect Crecquillon's setting directly to a royal marriage. Like other motets considered earlier though, it text would not be unsuitable, especially with its inclusion of a reference to Solomon.\textsuperscript{127} The motet uses a text from the Song of Songs which only in part appears in a liturgical form:

\begin{quote}
Nigra sum sed formosa, filiae Jerusalem, sicut tabernacula Cedar, sicut pelles Salomonis. Nolite me judicare quia fusca sim, quia decoloravit me sol. Filii matris meae pugnaverunt contra me. Posuerunt me custodem in vineis, vineam meam non custodivi, Indica mihi quem diligit anima mea, ubi pascas, ubi cubes, ne vagari incipiam post greges sodalium tuorum.
\end{quote}

(I am black but beautiful, O ye daughters of Jerusalem, as the tents of Cedar, as the curtains of Solomon. Do not consider me that I am brown, because the sun hath altered my colour, the sons of my mother have fought against me. They have made me the keeper in the vineyards, my vineyard have I not kept. Shew me, O thou whom my soul loveth, where thou feedest, where thou liest, lest I begin to wander after the flocks of thy companions. Walter)

The motet appears to have been a popular one, and certainly was known in Spain, for it appeared in an instrumental intabulation for voice and vihuela in 1576, opening the second volume of Daza's \textit{Libro de Musica}, and was used as the model for a mass by a master of Philip's chapel, George de La Hèle, in a volume of masses dedicated to Philip II published in 1578.\textsuperscript{128} It might appear that there is little to be read into the choice of models adopted by La Hèle as it is fairly diverse.\textsuperscript{129} However, it has been pointed out that two other models used by La Hèle, both Josquin motets, appear elsewhere in intabulations also dedicated to Philip, with the suggestion that the works might have been popular with him.\textsuperscript{130} It is therefore possible at least that the
models had some significance for Philip, or were works for which he had some particular affection. In either case, if a motet had been written for his marriage, it might retain some interest for him and might explain its choice as the model for a parody mass.

The evidence for those three motets is certainly less conclusive than for any within the main group of pieces, but it is not entirely negligible. There remains Manchicourt's *Vidi speciosam*, and here the ground is admittedly rather more weak, but given the motet's status as Manchicourt's only one for eight voices, it is worth brief consideration.¹³¹ As it is alone among Manchicourt's motets in the number of its voices, that may suggest that it was written for an important event. The motet can be dated fairly reasonably to the same few years as the mass and motet by Crecquillon and Benedictus respectively, because it did not appear in Attaingnant's 1539 edition of Manchicourt's motets, but in the 1545 reprint it replaced an earlier work, and was chosen to open the slightly revised collection.¹³² It is also its appearance rather later, in 1564, in the monumental collection of Berg and Neuber entitled *Thesaurus Musicus* where it was chosen to open the eight-voice volumes, the first volumes of the entire collection, that suggests it may have carried more than a purely local or musical value, especially in the light of the Imperial court connections suggested frequently by the repertoire of Berg and Neuber's publications.¹³³ Whether this last motet by Manchicourt truly belongs to the group of pieces surrounding the marriage of Prince Philip and Doña Maria remains an open question, but those for which the case seems persuasive, and the others where the argument seems reasonable, are more than sufficient to illustrate, in a way that is not often detailed, not only the scale of musical celebrations that must have attended such an event, but the particular care taken to ensure that the music fitted the occasion in more than
simply superficial ways.

Conclusion

The search for a context for Crecquillon's mass, and for one or two of his motets as well, has of necessity ranged widely. It has suggested a fresh interpretation of works with texts from the Song of Songs within the context of royalty. As part of that, it has suggested that the concept of divine kingship, which, as we noted from the previous chapter, received very specific recognition in music as well as in iconography and literature, was extended and deepened by the use of the persona of Solomon for the ruler, and by the ability of texts from the Song of Songs to reflect a number of specific ideas about royalty, the nature of kingship and of the realm of a just king. The interaction of this general background with the more specific set of references derived from the lieder has shown Crecquillon to be fully alive to the ways of demonstrating the divine nature of royalty at those moments in the mass most appropriate for such a point to be made. In this, he appears to be following the traditional use of entry liturgies and the like, in which a form of incarnation was seen, in which royalty was represented as the manifestation or personification of the divine, as a mimesis of the Incarnation of Christ. The mass demonstrates the same traits that were noticed in chapter 4, in its addition of a gloss by its use of borrowed material, and the recognition of the corporate importance of the occasion by the highly-wrought nature of the work.

The discussion has also shown other composers working within the same context for the same event, but it is noticeable that Crecquillon's mass is more complex in its use of symbolism than the motets appear to be. This may reflect the centrality of the
mass to the marriage, with the intertwined theology of the mass and of kingship being
called into play, or may reflect a greater propensity on Crecquillon’s part to use the
concepts of his time in a way that incorporated them into his music with greater
subtlety. With what has been discussed in the previous two chapters, the latter is a
distinct possibility. It has perhaps also demonstrated some possible reason beyond
the purely aesthetic why Crecquillon was so highly regarded as a composer.

The use of the Song of Songs, or of texts based on it, directly addressed to royalty
seems to form an analogue to the psalm motets which Macey has argued were
connected with Louis XI as the new David. The prototype of Solomon seems as
productive as that of David in the consequent artistic results. These Song of Songs
motets might be seen as something akin to a specific genre, comparable with
specially written ‘honour’ motets. The additional significance that these works gain
by the use of Solomonic texts already associated with the Virgin is in accordance
with, and emphasises, the divine element of royalty.

Regardless of the reading of these works offered here, the identification of the first
marriage of Philip of Spain as the immediate context for these pieces also adds to the
information available about the ceremonial use of music within the Habsburg orbit,
and about which comparatively little is known.

Finally, the identification of these pieces as probably having been written for this
event may shed a small ray of light on the court connections of Manchicourt and
Bacchius in particular, given the paucity of biographical information on them.


3. See Macey (1991), entire article.

4. There was a portrait of Charles I mentioned in the Spectator (no. 58) for May 7, 1711, where the image 'has the whole Book of Psalms written in the Lines of the Face and the Head of Hair'. It is not clear whether this curiosity was a drollery of Addison's invention or an actual portrait, but it provides an interesting commentary on the notion of using the Psalms to suggest the David persona of a ruler. See Addison, Steele and others (1945) vol. 1, p. 178.


13. The painting is in the Musée du Louvre, Paris; it is reproduced in Yates (1975) illustration no. 21, and Strong (1984) no. 52.


15. Yates (1975) also pointed out, p. 146 note 1, that the vine columns appear in the Rubens paintings in honour of James I, the 'British Solomon', in the Banqueting House in Whitehall, London. See also Wright (1994) for some further discussion of the symbolism of the Temple itself.


17. One should not overlook the importance of St George in Habsburg and Burgundian circles. Frederick III established an Order of St. George which was particularly honoured by Maximilian, and he had planned to be buried in the Church of St George in Wiener-Neustadt, see Heer (1968) pp. 144-5. See also the reliquary of Charles the Bold under the protection of St. George, his personal patron, in Liége Cathedral; reproduction in Weightman (1993) p. 66. See also the position of
St George in the suffrages in the Hours of Mary of Burgundy.

18. The motet is on fol. 28v.

19. The prayer to St. Christopher is on fol. 117r.

20. The wall painting is to be found in the Abbey church at St. Seine-l'Abbaye, not far from Dijon, and is dated 1521.

21. Voragine (1900) p. 111-2

22. The motet is ascribed to Josquin in VienNB Mus 15941, but the attribution has not been generally accepted.

23. Kellman (1987) p. vii. Kellman's interpretation as an allegory of Christ presumably rests on the allegorical meanings of the Song of Songs. However, it is more normal to find this text associated specifically with Mary. An almost identical text to the motet is used as an antiphon of the Virgin, see Sarum Processional, f. 125r. See also the setting by Gaffurius in MilD 1, f. 69v, where the text has the addition of an invocation of Mary at the end; also, the anonymous setting in RISM 1534/10, headed 'De Beata Maria'.

24. Part of the text is used as a Marian antiphon; see Sarum Processionale f. 123v. The same text is used for Virgins; see Clemens's use of it in this context for St Margaret, in CMM 4/16.
25. It is perhaps surprising just how far the use of something with a sacred connotation could be applied in other ways, presumably to sacrifice the person concerned, and still convey an acceptable resonance. An example from a source relevant to the later discussion is to be found in the opening motet of Manchicourt's 1554 collection, Phalèse's fifth book of Cantiones Sacrae, the motet O decus o patrie. The book is dedicated to Antoine Perrenot, bishop of Arras, and the first motet is in his praise. At the opening of the second part, with the text Salve pontificum iubar, Manchicourt unmistakably utilises the opening four notes of the Salve regina chant for the word 'Salve'.

26. I have not been able to find elsewhere in this context the interpolated section from chapter 7 verse 5 mentioned here. Likewise, the text as it stands does not appear as far as I can trace to be a liturgically proper text.

27. See the comment in chapter 3 by Dr Bonnie Blackburn on composite texts: that they may well indicate that a specific point was being made.

28. For a vivid illustration of this text as the summation of Mary's Perfections, see the tapestry in the Marian series presented to the Cathedral of Notre Dame in Reims by Archbishop Lenoncourt in 1530, now to be seen in the Palais du Tau in Reims.

29. I have already made the point in passing that there is probably no meaningful distinction to be made between sacred and secular when discussing works applicable to royalty. I use the term 'secular' here and later simply to denote a work mainly in the vernacular, rather than with a scriptural or liturgical text in Latin.
30. This line of thinking may be strengthened by two observations. The first is that in at least one liturgical source, a text from the Song of Songs, *Ista est speciosa inter filias* was specifically allocated to the reception of Empresses or Queens; Processionale Monasticum p. 312. Second, that there is a similar use of a motet *Veni sponsa mea* at the Entry of Mary Tudor into Montreuil-sur-Mer in 1514. See Lowinsky (1968) vol 3, p. 222.

31. Although it is not the present argument, it is a feature of a number of homage or praise pieces that they employ canon in some form or other. The fact that canon is used here may support therefore the interpretation that I am seeking to place on this motet.

32. See Elders (1994) pp. 68-9; he comments that 'Although the text of the motet might have served perfectly as an homage to Henry's first wife, the two series of twelve "Hails" are best explained as a symbol of the Virgin.' (The significance of the number 12 arises from the association of Mary with the woman with a crown of twelve stars in Revelations chapter 12.) The textual interpolation and its significance in conjunction with the personal badge of Catherine make Elders explanation less likely in my view. In any event, Elders should perhaps have considered the effects of deliberate ambiguity. Twelve-fold symbolism is to be found, as might be expected, in Marian works e.g. Josquin's *Salve regina*, but the tenor of my argument is that such symbolism cannot be seen as exclusive to the Virgin, and was probably sufficiently well established in relation to royalty that an allegorical reading alone is too limited.
33. The twelve peers of Alexander were familiar from chivalric literature, see Keen (1984) p. 108. See also Harbison (1995) p. 48-9 for the popularity of Alexander at the 15th-century Burgundian court, together with a reproduction of a tapestry of c. 1459 illustrating Alexander's exploits. The stories evidently retained their attraction: Altdorfer painted in 1528-9 an amazing picture of the Battle of the Issus, now in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich. On the twelve virtues, chivalric virtues which would have been a particularly apposite reference in the context of this manuscript, see Keen (1984) pp. 158-9. It seems to me that the strongest association, and the one from which some of the above may have flowed, is likely to have been the twelve Sibyls whose prophecies were thought to have foretold the coming of Christ, and who became associated with the twelve Old Testament prophets as a result, and the twelve disciples of Jesus. Thus twelve would represent in the context of a ruler the association of him with the divine, both in terms of his legitimacy and his rule.

34. The manuscript has the date 1516. Hughes-Hughes (1906) p. 259 suggested from a device on f. 1 that it might have been compiled by William Peto, later tutor to Princess Mary. Dunning in his consideration of Sampson's Psallite felices from this manuscript read the device differently, suggested a Peter Opuciis whom he thought might be the brother of Benedictus de Opitiis; see Dunning (1970) pp. 124-5. The Census-Catalogue suggests that the manuscript was commissioned by Benedictus's father.

35. See Harrison (1963) pp. 339-40. Harrison considered it likely that Sampson and Benedictus had met in Antwerp. He suggested further reasons for believing the manuscript to be based on the Antwerp publication.
36. Dunning (1970) reproduced the illuminated opening of the manuscript containing the poem set by Sampson and the motto set in the anonymous canon; illustration no. 1.

37. It is probably no coincidence that Henry VIII's only known sacred composition is on a text from the Song of Songs, beginning *Quam pulchra es*.

38. See Bowers (1980).

39. Harrison (1963) p. 172. It seems that Benedictus's father may have been employed in Maximilian's court, see Cuyler (1980).

40. See Picker (1965) pp. 32-5.

41. The complete motet cycle is in MiD 1.

42. This section of Weerbeke's substitution mass seems to have been relatively popular. It appears in a number of manuscripts. In the light of the Isaac motet in LonBLR 8 G. vii and the other examples of settings of the *Anima mea* text to be mentioned, it is possible that its popularity arose from its appropriation by the Habsburg court, rather than the reverse of it being included in the Songbook because of a more general popularity.

43. Picker (1965) p. 142. Maniates (1966), pp. 28-9, noted that the beginning of Ghiselin's *Anima mea* and the 'quia amore langueo' section of Josquin's *Ecce tu*
*pulchra es* also quote this melody, and suggested a common chant origin. This is a particularly interesting point considering the frequency of chant quotation mentioned later in settings of *Anima mea*.

44. See Picker (1965) p. 55-7 on the plaintive nature of a number of the texts from this manuscript; also Picker (1989) pp. 230-1.

45. BrusBR 5557.


47. See Higgins (1997).

48. Whilst it may be thought important for the argument whether the original association was Burgundian or French, the essentially French nature of the Burgundian court should not be overlooked. Additionally, given the dating of the Busnois motet, there would have been time and opportunity for its significance to have been transferred and applied elsewhere.

49. *Fortuna desperata* may not be by Busnoys, but be of Italian origin. It may have come into the Burgundian circle through Charles the Bold. See Hudson (1985-6) pp. 291-6. I am grateful to Professor Hudson for drawing my attention to this point, and to his article. The origin of the piece does not seem to materially affect the point I am making, given the piece’s evident use in Habsburg circles.

51. See Wagner (1980a).

52. See Wegman (1994) pp. 22-5 for a discussion of Obrecht's *Mille quingentis*.

53. In addition to FlorC 2439, the piece appears in LonBL 31922, a manuscript associated with Henry VIII's court, which contains a number of Continental pieces together with its English repertoire. The three items which open the manuscript are by Busnoys, Hayne, and an anonymous setting of *Een frolyk weson*. A modern edition is in Musica Britannica 18.

54. See the commentary to the piece in CMM 22/4.

55. The examples of this association of texts from the Song of Songs and royalty can be multiplied. See for instance CamM Pepys 1760. This manuscript was produced in France in the early years of the 16th century, possibly destined for, or connected with, Ann of Brittany. However, it was slightly amended and became a gift to either Prince Arthur or, more likely, Prince Henry at the English court. See Brown (1988) pp. v-vi. The manuscript has the inscription 'In laudem celestis regine' above the table of contents. The manuscript opens with an *Ave Maria* as a canon a 4, followed by three Song of Songs texts, the first two likewise distinguished by being in canon, *Que est ista* a 4, and *Ista est speciosa* a 12. The third, *Dulcis amica mea* was marked by having its lowest part used as a cantus firmus by Moulu (twice) and by its being used as a model for a mass by Ceriton. Moulu, although no archival evidence survives, appears to have been closely connected to the French court. This group of pieces may form a vestigial or embryonic group from the French court in imitation
of the Habsburg appropriation of certain texts. See also the manuscript which Lowinsky (1989d) argued was prepared for Ann Boleyn, LonRC1070. Lowinsky discussed a number of textual changes and points which he believed were significant in understanding the particular works under his scrutiny. He did not address the Song of Songs texts within the manuscript. It is now believed that the manuscript was associated with the French court, not the English. However, the presence of Song of Songs motets, together with the other apparently carefully chosen and amended works, whatever the correct interpretation of those alterations is, and the royal connections of the manuscript, seem to me to support the observations I have made. I am grateful to Professor Herbert Kellman for his advice on the origin of this particular manuscript.

It might be argued that if this particular hypothesis is correct, there should be significantly more of these texts in royal manuscripts than elsewhere. I think that argument is misplaced. First, it might have been the very popularity of texts in other contexts that led them to be adopted for royalty. There is no serious doubt about the connection between the ‘Regretz’ chansons and Margaret of Austria, yet they were apparently very popular at large; see Montagna (1987) p. 149. Secondly, with the application of these texts in a Marian or other sacred context, we might expect to find concentrations of them in manuscripts reflecting that particular repertoire. Nevertheless, I have, I believe, cited enough manuscripts to establish both the regular appearance of works with these texts in contexts where we might expect some additional significance to attach to them, and that enough of these settings show signs by one means or another of that significance, to cover the point. A broader assessment of the corpus of Song of Songs settings undoubtedly should be a follow-up to the thesis presented here, but is outside the current scope.
56. For the influence on an earlier corpus, see Huot (1997) pp. 72-84.

57. For the importance of lineage in knighthood, see Keen (1984) pp. 32-3, 59.


58. Sandoval (1955) vol 80, pp. 5-12.


60. On the intended pageant, see Robertson (1960) pp. 173 and 178.


62. The garden in medieval castles was frequently where court was held in summer. See Lewis (1936) p. 119 on the garden as the world of courtly life in the Romance of the Rose, a text still copied and read in the 16th century.

63. There is the well-known episode in the Song of Roland when the sun was held still in the sky at Charlemagne's prayer to allow more time for the battle, stanzas 179-80. For the negative side of the same belief, see Canning (1996) p. 28, where failure of nature was taken as a sign that the king had either lost his sacredness or had incurred divine displeasure, and was removed.
64. On the continuing belief in the power of words and signs, see Clark (1997) chapter 18.

65. Orpheus was yet another prototype of Christ.

66. See Wangermée (1968) illustration no. 6 for a reproduction of this tableau, and Jacquot (1960) pp. 416-7.

67. See for example the pageants cited in Chambers (1903) vol. 2, pp. 169-70; see also Jacquot (1960) p. 446 for another, and p. 476 for the connection with agriculture.

68. See also Yates (1975) pp. 217-8 for a discussion of the similar significance of the flowers on the bodice and sleeves in a portrait of Elizabeth I.

69. See Hudson (1980) for a list of the models. Composers include Clemens, Pathie, Sermisy and Sandrin.

70. See for instance the use by Crecquillon of material by Sermisy in *Il me suffit*. There is possibly an external reason for this borrowing, which has already been mentioned in chapter 2, arising from the 1546 meeting of the Order of the Golden Fleece.

71. If one takes Gombert, Clemens and Manchicourt as a representative sample, then there is not a single German model amongst their masses.
72. Hudson (1974a) p. xi noted that the mass is possibly the only genuine work of Crecquillon's with a German title. Hudson, p. xv, presumably following Lueger's identification of the Brandt lied as Crecquillon's source for the cantus firmus, stated that the cantus firmus is identical to the Brandt setting. He gave the Brandt setting from Eitner - Publikationen ältere praktischer und theoretischer Musikwerke, IV, 185-6. The version quoted from Eitner gives the lied differently from the CW edition of the Brandt, but in neither case it is identical with Crecquillon's tenor, although differences are very slight. Lueger (1948) pp. 78-83, in his consideration of the mass, also identified the use of the lied Es taget, but he did not ascribe any particular significance to its employment. Tomiczek-Gernez (1993) pp. 97-9, did not explore the work's peculiarities any more fully. She disagreed, however, with Hudson's description of the mass as a cantus firmus mass, arguing that it was an imitation mass based on Brandt's setting of the lied. Her objection was not one of terminology i.e. whether the term 'imitation' should be used for a work employing a monophonic model, but was based on her belief that the mass borrowed from the polyphonic fabric of Brandt's setting of the lied. There are a number of difficulties with both views, most of which should emerge from the discussion, in which I will argue a significance for the cantus firmus that makes it highly improbable that it was taken from Brandt. In any event, an examination of the two pieces shows no clear borrowing of the polyphonic fabric of the lied, and such correspondences as there are arise from both composers modelling their opening point on the lied, but are by no means sufficiently close to permit the conclusion that Tomiczek-Gernez draws.

73. The mass is in RegB C96, compiled later in the 16th century.
74. The evidence for Benedictus's authorship partly rests on the use of the cantus firmus, which will be discussed later in this section. Stylistic aspects have been discussed in chapter 3. Benedictus is considered by me to be the more likely composer and the argument here makes this assumption. If that should prove incorrect, the argument in this section is not affected other than in marginal respects.

75. Perhaps the best known example of a secular tenor being used in a motet rather than a mass, is Josquin's *Stabat Mater*, with its use of Binchois's *Comme femme desconfortée* as a cantus firmus. Senfl's *Ave rosa sine spina* uses the same chanson as Josquin's *Stabat Mater*. Two other motets which use a common secular tenor are the settings of *Sufficiebat* by Jaquet of Mantua and Richafort. These use the tenor of Hayne van Ghizeghem's *Mon souvenir*. These two works appear in the same manuscript, BoIC Q19, and are quite probably linked. They certainly share a similar scoring for low voices. The case of the Binchois chanson provides an earlier example of the symbolism in the tenor doing duty in two differently texted motets. Another example is the group of motets which includes two motets by Moulu (*O dulcis amica mea* and *Vulnerasti cor meum*), and Certon's mass *Dulcis amica mea*, all based on the motet tenor of *Dulcis amica mea* by Prioris, mentioned above. There is an anonymous setting of the same text 1521/07 (incomplete) which may be the Prioris setting. Examples from later in the 16th century become harder to find. Examples include Maillard's *Exaudi Domine orationem nostram*. This has the tenor *Faute d'argent*, and seems to be a barely disguised plea for cash. It does not therefore provide a comparable example. The nearest precursor to the motets under discussion seems to be the single motet by Strus, *Sancta Maria succurre miseris*, in LonBLR 8 G. vii and elsewhere with a tenor on *O werder mondt*. 
76. There is a degree of retrospection in Susato's second book of masses in the inclusion of two by Hellinck, who had died at the beginning of 1541. Susato's third book, too, includes masses by Hellinck, Richafort and Mouton. See chapter 2.

77. See chapter 2 for Canis joining the Imperial chapel. Charles V had arrived in Spain from his second North African campaign in November 1541.

78. See Heartz (1969) no. 86 where Manchicourt is called 'prefect' of the church of Tours.

79. These are discussed in the biographical chapter of Wicks (1959) and in Wicks (1980).

80. Son of Nicholas Granvelle who was an adviser, counsellor and vice-chancellor of Charles V. Perrenot had been brought up at court and had been favoured at an early age by Charles. Indeed he became Bishop of Arras in 1537 when he was aged only nineteen or twenty. He was later Philip II's principal adviser in the Low Countries, and ultimately Cardinal Granvelle.

81. By the time of the reissue of 1545, Manchicourt evidently held a position of responsibility for the choirboys at Tournai. See Heartz (1969) no. 119.

82. The dedication of this collection was to Ioachim Polites, and Manchicourt refers to 'nostre ancienne & bonne amitie'.
83. These are to be found in MontM 768.


85. There is an apparent oddity in the biographical information given on Maessens in Dunning (1980). Maessens is said to have been dismissed from his post at Courtrai at Easter 1543, and to have been appointed on the recommendation of Mary of Hungary as second chapelmaster in Vienna on 1 March the same year. Easter cannot date from earlier than 22nd of March and so there appears to be an overlap which would benefit from clarification. Is it possible that there is a confusion of calendars?

86. On Bacchius, see Mattfeld (1980). In a number of instances where pieces can be dated, it seems that Phalèse was publishing works well after the date of composition. In addition, it seems probable from the discussion in chapter 2 that Crecquillon had retired in 1550, and there is no evidence that I can see which suggests that he continued composing, yet he is well represented until after his likely date of death in Phalèse's collections.

87. In SW 5. Ott's publication of the lied was in 1544. It will be seen from the discussion that the year of publication may be significant.

88. I am most grateful to Professor John Smeed for his considerable help in translating these texts. He also drew my attention to the point that the phrase 'du bist mein und ich bin dein' in Es taget is an ancient and traditional formula. It perhaps echoes the Song of Songs: 'My beloved is mine and I am his'.
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90. I do not know if Cuyler's suggestion that \textit{ich stuend} refers to Maximilian has been generally accepted. However, the discussion below, based on the other two lieder, is sufficient to make reliance on this point unnecessary. It is possible that its appearance in this particular context is evidence of some form of intended reference, even if that reference were not to be carried through to settings in other contexts.

91. See Bryden and Hughes (1969) vol. 1, alphabetical index. Senfl (1937-) p. 128 is the critical commentary to Senfl's \textit{Kain Adler/Es taget/Ich stuend} which also mentions the Brandt.

92. Dr Leofranc Holford-Strevens has observed that the spelling of 'Kain' immediately suggests the Bavarian-Austrian orbit. See also Aretino's address to Henry VIII, headed significantly enough to 'the divine King of England': '...great King, excelling in every virtue like the eagle which is sovereign over all the birds, deserving all honour and glory...', letter 56, in Bull (1976) p. 163.

93. Senfl (1937-) p. 128.

94. VienNB Mus 18810.


96. Senfl (1937-) p. 128.
97. Charles was noted for his devotion to his wife Isabella. Titian was commissioned to paint a posthumous picture, normally dated c. 1545, which he kept with him until his death along with two other pictures of her, and on his deathbed, he used her crucifix as his aid to devotion. See Prescott (1887) pp. 613 and 653. The portrait of Isabella is now in the Museo Nacional del Prado in Madrid. These suggest no other deep emotional attachment on Charles's part that could explain these works.

98. Margaret's first husband had been assassinated, and she married Octavio Farnese, the Pope's nephew, in December 1538. See Letters and Papers of Henry VIII, 1539, no. 14.

99. Minor (1980). There is also an edition (which I have not consulted) by Minor & Mitchell (1968), full reference in Minor (1980). See also the facsimile of RISM 1539/25.

100. Charles had two other legitimate sons, but both died in infancy.

101. See chapter 2 for a discussion of Crecquillon's position in the Imperial chapel at this time.

102. In July 1543 the Spanish ambassador, Luis Sarmiento, wrote a description of Doña Maria following reports at the Spanish court that she was so fat that it would be an obstacle in childbirth. He was reassuring about Maria's figure, and in his description noted also that 'She dances well, and knows more of music than a chapel-master. She also knows Latin, and, above all, is a good Christian.' See Calendar of Letters and State Papers (Spanish), 1543, no. 187A. March (1941) gives the
original Spanish, vol. 2, p. 61. The context suggests that this was a more objective assessment than might sometimes have been the case with royalty.

103. See Marsden (1960) pp. 392-3, and 397-9 for notes of the Entries of Maria. See also March (1941) vol. 2, pp. 78-91 for two contemporary documents. There are also some details in Sandoval (1955) vol. 82, pp. 168-71.

104. 'I went to Salamanca in the first days of November at the same time as the Princess [of Portugal], and on the 15th of the same month we were married.' Calendar of Letters and State Papers (Spanish) 1544, no. 31. Kamen (1997) p. 12, following March (1941) gives 12th November as the date, which appears correct.

105. Another measure of the cost involved may be gathered from the instruction given by Charles to Philip after the event to recoup the cost from the Cortes. As so often, the Habsburg cupboard was bare. Calendar of Letters and State Papers (Spanish), 1544, no. 41.


107. See chapter 5 for some examples of music from arches at Entries.

108. It is worth noting that three tapestries remain of a set of nine, which were brought with Maria to the wedding. See Valencia (1903) vol. 1, p. 15; the reproductions are plates 20-22. Although they are ostensibly moralities, the first tapestry of the series appears to show an allegory of Doña Maria's progress into Spain. The symbolism involved is so dense as to defy simple or complete explanation,
but it is noticeable that the figure of Solomon, the author of the Song of Songs, is shown in close proximity to the figure of Maria herself, who rides a unicorn and appears to be pierced with an arrow of love. No doubt this is to draw attention to Maria as the perfection of womanhood, but serves to reinforce the association of texts from this book of the Bible and royalty. The tapestry is reproduced in March (1941) vol. 2, facing page 72. I do not know its present location. It seems to me that the other two tapestries are also allegories with Maria as the central figure. Jaap van Benthem has pointed out that, with the time taken to create tapestries, they may have been made subsequently to the wedding, rather than before. It is also worth observing that a bundle of arrows was an impresa of the Spanish royal house in the 16th century. The use of an arrow in this context may have been double-edged.

109. Jaap van Benthem has suggested an additional or alternative significance for the double presentation of the cantus firmus: the representation of the double-headed Habsburg eagle. That, given, the opening of the lied, has a plausible air.

110. See chapter 4 for some discussion on the question of chant quotations. Whilst the melodic opening of Laetentur coeli is relatively common, that of Omnes gentes is far less so. Lincoln lists only one motet which follows the same melodic outline in a leading voice to the same extent as in Crecquillon's mass. It is Pynchon's Summe Deus regnorum. From the incipit, it may well be that this, too, is a deliberate quotation.

111. The historical precedent of the Benedictus as a welcome song for royalty in the Entry of Henry V of England into London in 1415 after the Battle of Agincourt has been cited earlier. Other Biblical songs were also used elsewhere during that Entry.

112. In addition to the Maessens motet, there are other pieces with clear Habsburg links: Walter's *Vivat Maximilianus*, Crecquillon's *Quicquid agas* and three pieces by Vaet.

113. The manuscript is a single sheet folded into a bifolium, and contains no obvious clues as to its origins. The text of *Kain Adler* is given in a Germanic hand. From a microfilm copy, it is possible that the musical text is in more than one colour, which, if correct, might help towards a solution of the canon. I have yet to see a colour copy of the manuscript.

114. The text appears as an antiphon in WA. Lincoln (1993) lists only one motet, by Phinot, with the same or similar text. Heartz (1969) contains none. I am grateful to Dr Bonnie Blackburn for drawing my attention to anonymous settings in StuttL 42 (the first part of which may be a contrafactum of Hellinck's *Cursu festa dies*), CambraiBM 125-8 (a contrafactum of Caen's *Ecce video celos apertos*), and PiacD (3). Two other settings, by Gascogne and Barbireau appear in manuscripts that had royal connections: VatP 1976-9, for Anne of Hungary and King Ferdinand, and BrusBR 9126, for Philippe le Beau and Joan of Castile.

115. Sarmiento (reference in note 102) noted: 'I must add that her father and mother love her most passionately'.

116. Maria was Philip's cousin. Her mother was a sister of Charles V. The comments on circumstances of the choice of Maria as Philip's bride are not to deny
the political importance of the marriage, but merely to say that political
considerations were not the only, or necessarily foremost, ones.

117. It may be helpful to summarise the reasons for believing that the Brandt
setting of the lied was not the model for the Crecquillon mass, in addition to the
general argument on the symbolism of the mass:
i) there is no evidence that the Brandt setting was written as early as
Crecquillon wrote his mass; any imitation could have been in the opposite direction,
especially as the lied was from the earlier Imperial circle (see below);
ii) there is a significant variant, particularly when the harmonic context is
considered, in the final phrase;
iii) Crecquillon makes no reference to the plainchant in the Brandt setting,
although he introduces others;
iv) both composers quote *Es taget*, but importantly, Crecquillon uses more of the
melody and text than does Brandt; equally Brandt treats *Es taget* as a minor
component of his setting, whilst Crecquillon shows it to be vital to the whole;
v) the other works show that *Kain Adler* had some currency in court circles at
the least, and possibly wider, in the Low Countries.

Despite the points that suggest that Crecquillon's cantus firmus was not taken from
Brandt's lied setting, their respective versions of the lied are very close. There is
reason to suggest that Brandt may have acquired the piece directly from the Imperial
circle. Brandt was a personal servant of Frederick II, the Elector Palatinate; see
Haase (1980). The Elector was present at some of the events attended by the
Emperor in the years 1546-8, and his court was listed, with all the others, by
Mameranus (1550). Among the nobles of his court was 'locudus á Brandt iunior
cubicularis', p. 68. Thus Brandt almost certainly would have been in direct contact
with the Imperial chapel musicians, possibly for an extended period, and that provides a ready explanation for the transmission of the lied and the similarity between the versions used by the two composers.

118. March (1941) vol. 2, p. 84.

119. See MME 2, pt. 2. The Crecquillon chanson is on pp. 158-62. The other source is WhalleyS 23, containing three voice-parts only. Fortunately, the part with Kain Adler is one of the three remaining. I am grateful to Professor Barton Hudson for giving me a copy of his reconstruction of this chanson.

120. In Walter (1975) vol. 3. I have noted earlier my personal doubts on the authenticity of this work, but it could still be from within the Imperial circle.

121. The Crecquillon motet is in Ferer and Hudson (1997a). The Manchicourt motets are all in RISM M272 (reprinted in 1558, RISM M 273). There is no modern edition that I know of. There is a similarity in the opening of Clemens’s motet Beata es virgo, CMM 4/15, and the lied, but it is not convincing, and the text of this motet does not correspond to the pattern of the others. It has therefore been discounted.

122. Wicks (1959) p. 126 refers to Manchicourt’s Osuletur as ‘totally unlike any other of Manchicourt’s ostinati’. The possibility that these three motets may have been grouped by the publisher because of the common origin of their texts seems unlikely, if the ordering of other collections by Phalèse is any guide.
123. This text was a relatively popular one if we judge by the number of settings of it. In that context it is interesting to recall the influence of this text on portraits of Mary, and the popularity of certain black Madonnas in the middle ages as figures of devotion such as that from Guadalupe (see Pelikann (1996) pp. 25-6), where, incidentally, there are the 15th-century tombs of Prince Dinis of Portugal and his wife Joanna. Another manifestation of the affection for this particular imagery is seen in the Spanish villancico *Yo me soy la morenica*, in which the Virgin calls herself the 'little brown one', in RISM 1556/30. This text would seem to have had sufficiently strong Marian associations to be validly transferred to royalty.

124. Reference to the thematic index of Lincoln (1993) shows only one other work with such an opening in a leading voice out of all those catalogued, Guyot's *Decantabat populus in Israel*. Even in this one instance of pitch agreement, the rhythm is markedly different. It seems reasonable therefore to regard the similarity as being deliberate.

125. There is one potential difficulty with the argument: the analysis of the use of the cantus firmus has suggested that there are two groups of 'Kain Adler' motets and the mass, with the works by Crecquillon and Manchicourt in the two separate groups. One possible explanation of that difference might be that the works by Canis and Crecquillon were written whilst the chapel was in Spain or travelling, and out of touch with Mary of Hungary’s court, where the others may have been composed. The similarity between these two motets under discussion suggests, by contrast, the opportunity for one composer to co-operate or at least to know the work of the other. The difficulty is by no means without possible explanations, but they are of necessity speculative. For example, it is known that Charles left Spain in May, and was in the
Low Countries by the beginning of September, still giving time for composition and
despacht to Spain. The courier normally took between two and three weeks. Equally,
Crecquillon’s motet might have for some reason been sent from the court to the Low
Countries; that might be so if these works were ever put together in a presentation
manuscript as a wedding gift. It is possible also that the slightly different versions of
the cantus firmus only reflect differences in the sources of the lied available to the
composers at the two courts.

126. Manchicourt became master of Philip’s Flemish chapel in Madrid on the death
of Payen in 1559. Any part that Perrenot may have played in this appointment would
continue the earlier relationship between the composer and him. The dedication of the
1554 volume to Perrenot, together with the motet in his praise, indicates the extent
to which Manchicourt was Perrenot’s protégé. Manchicourt was also connected with
Toumai, the Cathedral church of which was dedicated to the Virgin, and the
possibility must not be entirely discounted that some of these works were written for
performance there.

127. There is a second motet on a text beginning Nigra sum which was ascribed to
Crecquillon, but is more likely the work of Jacquet of Mantua. Its text is again a
composite with parts taken from a liturgical text based on the Song of Songs, but with
additions that appear to be neither liturgical nor Biblical. The text is:

Nigra sum sed formosa filia ideo dilexit diligit me Dominus meus,
desiderio vocabat Dominus meus. O quam pulchra es amica mea dilecta mea
formosa filia. Accede in sinu idoli tui et tandem introduxit me in cubiculum
suum.
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(I am a black but beautiful daughter, therefore my lord loved, loves, and will love me, my lord called with desire. O how beautiful you are my friend/mistress, my beloved, handsome daughter. Come to the bosom of your idol, and at last he brought me into his bedroom.)

The confusion with Crecquillon's setting may have arisen from the specific nature of the alterations to the text of this version. Points of interest (apart from the curious mix of person in the last sentence) include the omission of 'Jerusalem' which allows the text to apply more widely rather than having to be understood symbolically. The emphasis given by the different tenses assuring the continuing love of her lord, and the invitation to come into her lover’s arms, with the consummation 'at last' implying the physical urgency of that consummation, all add to the impression that the text is one glorifying earthly love for itself rather than as an allegory of heavenly love. That is not to say that the liturgical text would not still have given the gloss that such love was not only of this earth but was a reflection of the heavenly love. The occasional nature of the entire text makes it probable that this motet too was written for a wedding. It may serve to demonstrate that the use of these texts could have been wider than our concentration on the Habsburg court might otherwise suggest, and may support the contention that Crecquillon's version was for the royal marriage.

128. It is also in GranAF 975, a manuscript probably copied in Granada about 1575 for either the Royal chapel or the cathedral. It is the only sacred piece by Crecquillon within this manuscript, although it contains a number of his chansons. See Christoforidis and Ruiz Jiménez (1994).
129. Other models used by la Hèle are by Clemens, Lassus, Rore and Josquin.


131. There is a modern edition in CMM 55/1 p. 163.

132. The contents of the two volumes are given in Heartz (1969) numbers 85 and 119.

133. It might be noted in passing that Berg and Neuber also included Corteccia's Ingredere, written for the 1539 marriage of Eleanor of Toledo and Cosimo Medici, in this collection.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSIONS AND AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The point of departure for this thesis was the attempt to provide a greater degree of context for Crecquillon and for some of his works, with a hope that an understanding of the context might deepen the appreciation of the works. I began with Crecquillon himself, with a review of the evidence on his life and career; as a result, a slightly firmer frame has been provided in which Crecquillon may be seen. A hypothesis on his age and his place of origin has been presented, which suggests that he was neither as old or as young as the extremes of previous estimates, but which, importantly, places him before Clemens. The information available to Vander Meersch which led him to say that Crecquillon worked at Regensburg and Antwerp has partly been supported by the discussion of some of Crecquillon's works which are not inconsistent with an employment in Antwerp, and other works have been cited which suggest activities within the area of Tournai. The previous confusion over Crecquillon's position in the Imperial chapel has now largely been clarified, with different readings having been offered of several pieces of evidence. Crecquillon can now be seen to have served for some five to six years as maistre de la chapelle, justifying the later records of his position, rather than having been demoted and losing favour after a short time. The evidence for the year of Crecquillon's retirement has also been re-examined, and 1550 shown to be the most probable, and from that and the hypothesis on his age, it has been suggested that Crecquillon probably suffered from ill-health, something that would explain further some of the details of his career.
These hypotheses and corrections to the record do not go nearly far enough in allowing us to gain a full picture, but they do point to possible areas of future archival research, in Antwerp, Regensburg, Tournai and in the border areas of the Empire and France around Therouanne and St. Omer. However, with the destruction of records, there may be little left for the future archival searcher. It is possible therefore that more will emerge from the analysis of the music. To that end, the determination of the canon remains important, together with a greater understanding of the origin and function of some of the texts and the works that embody them.

The discussion on authenticity and related issues in the motets has achieved several clarifications and corrections to the work-list adopted by the editors of CMM. *Quam pulchra es* has been shown to be almost certainly the work of Benedictus, not of Crecquillon. Of the other cross attributions, two that have been identified are material: *Da pacem domine*, where Crecquillon seems the more likely composer, and *Nos autem gloriari*, where Lupi is the probable composer. Additionally, the grounds for accepting Crecquillon’s authorship of *Christus factus est*, also ascribed to Lupi, have been shown to be less strong than previous studies have assumed. *Domine ne memineris* has been confirmed as being a different work from the Clemens setting, with which there has been confusion, although still with a cross attribution to Hollander. Clemens has been suggested as the more probable composer of *Verbum iniquum*, but the basis for the acceptance of the attribution to Clemens of *Quis dabit mihi pennas* has been shown to be questionable, as have the grounds for doubting the attribution to Crecquillon of the four-voice setting of *Pater peccavi*. However, fresh questions have been raised on the authenticity of *Salve mater*. The modern attribution to Crecquillon of *Sancta Maria succurre* has also been shown to be erroneous. Crecquillon’s authorship of *Andreas Christi famulos* has been confirmed, whilst the
model for Guerrero's mass *Congratulamini mihi*, previously thought to have been the
motet by Le Herteur, has been identified as Crecquillon's *Congratulamini mihi*.
Grounds have been advanced to regard *Os loquentium* as the original version of
*Practicantes mali*, with some doubt being raised on the authenticity of the latter's
opening section.

The clarification of authorship in some cases has allowed a little more insight into
facets of Crecquillon's music, such as the dating of his only eight-voice motet to 1545/6, and showing that assumptions of German influence that might have been
made on the basis of the motet *Quam pulchra es* and the mass *Kain Adler* would have
been misplaced. Further research, it may be suggested, is now needed into two
particular and linked aspects of the oeuvre: the chronology and a detailed stylistic
analysis. The work on Crecquillon's life has possibly given a starting point for some
form of chronology to be attempted by suggesting that certain works may have been
written in Antwerp, or at least before Crecquillon's time in the Imperial chapel, and
by the suggestion that Crecquillon ceased writing wholly or partly in 1550. A
stylistic analysis, if one could be developed that is capable of differentiating at the
level of an individual work between compositions by Crecquillon and others,
particularly Clemens, would be particularly valuable in resolving remaining issues
of authorship. I believe that this is only likely to be achieved by a refined form of
probability analysis (which should be mode-specific) rather than the application
alone of a statistical method like an equivalent of Cusum (which, in its original form
applied to language, has come under severe criticism).1 The ability to date a few
works to the middle to late 1540's, especially those which, subjectively, seem the
most mature and fully realised, may also assist in the construction of an internal
stylistic analysis to assist with the establishment of a chronology.

1
The general discussion of borrowed material in Crecquillon's motets has shown that its use was far from casual, and two clear contexts have been suggested: occasions of heightened corporate significance, and those where a didactic element was originally appropriate. A number of the works in the first category display a degree of artificiality; most are highly-wrought expressions encapsulating references between text and music that can scarcely have been audible or obvious to the listener, but which are symbolic by their concentration on key words. As a distinct variant, there are the two motets discussed in chapter 5 where the high reliance on an obvious and pervasive paraphrase indicates, it seems, a very public expression of the importance implied by chant borrowing. The second use is marked by a concern for deepening and widening the theological import of the text, rather than introducing extraneous significance, as with some other composers. From this, their use in popular services, such as the lof, where such a didactic element would not have been out of place, has been suggested. Crecquillon's use of cantus firmi has also at times suggested an element of intended symbolism, similar to that found in pictorial arts and literature. Four motets have been shown originally to have been two hymn settings, and to have treated their chant in a similar manner to hymn settings by other composers.

The more specific discussion of the context of the small number of works dealt with in more detail has shown that Crecquillon was sometimes writing within a complex and rich tradition of reference, both musical and intellectual. The analysis of Senfl's setting of *Philippe qui videt me* has demonstrated the special nature of that work, with Crecquillon's motet extending the symbolism of his presumed model to include a more direct reference to divine kingship by his use of a Spanish villancico, with its
associated chant model. Crecquillon's piece can be seen to be part of a continuing
tradition of settings that can be related to royal entries or to similar occasions, but it
is a setting which is apparently more complex than subsequent examples by the
lesser composers Ludovicus and Jan Louys. To that extent, Crecquillon can be seen as
adding his own gloss to the tradition upon which he drew. It has also been suggested
that the highly audible and extensive paraphrase technique of Honor virtus where,
nevertheless, there was still a concentration on key elements of the text, would have
been appropriate to the known use of this text in entry liturgies. The most probable
occasions for such a use would have been the entries of 1549 of Philip of Spain, when
it seems likely that Philippe qui videt me would also have been performed.

The final discussion, on the use of texts from the Song of Songs and the group of pieces
which, it has been argued, were written for the first marriage of Philip of Spain, has
had three outcomes. First, the direct application of texts from the Song of Songs to
royalty has in certain cases, I believe, been established, and can be seen to have
proceeded from the related beliefs in the divinity of kings and rulers, and the
representation by the ruler of the Biblical prototype of Solomon. It has also been
suggested that this adoption of Solomon as a prototype would have carried powerful
resonances for the hearers, which mirror those to be observed in the iconography of
the period, and which the musical examples cited do nothing to contradict. This point
is of considerable potential importance for a reassessment of our understanding of
the repertoire of pieces with texts from this source. The second, the identification of
works for the marriage of Philip of Spain, is of value in itself. It not only adds to the
knowledge of the use of music at ceremonial occasions, but does so in a way in which
the antecedents, both particular and general, are particularly clear. Thus, the
relevance of the musical contribution can be seen to have been as specific as other
aspects of the ceremonial would have been. The third is that the discussion of Crecquillon’s mass in particular has shown how the composer relied not only on the model for its associations with Maximilian, but on how it was manipulated within a framework of a musical representation of the concept of divine kingship. It has been demonstrated that an understanding of the piece has to take account of this wider intellectual framework in order for elements of its structure to be appreciated. The effort to provide a broader context for these pieces can be seen to have been crucial in providing a sufficiently wide frame of reference to give a reading the mass that begins to unravel some of the complexities of the work.

The whole discussion on borrowed material suggests several lines of further research. First, a wider of examination of the use of borrowed material seems warranted. I do not mean by that a duplication of the work particularly of Fromson, who has discovered significance in ‘imported’ chant references, but an effort to try to discern whether the possible original context of pieces seems linked in any meaningful way to the type and nature of chant citations which are appropriate to the work in question, i.e. a determination of how far Crecquillon’s techniques of treating borrowed material are personal and how much they reflect a practice that can be recovered and used to increase our understanding of works by other composers. The second area of possible research is a more extended reconsideration of the possible significance of works with texts from the Song of Songs in the context of royalty, to see how extensive, in time and place, the interpretation presented here might be applicable. The more general points on kingship, not only in its adoption of the persona of Solomon, but in its divine nature may also prompt a reconsideration of other texts and works. Further, the identification of two groups of works which appear to recognise these elements of contemporary belief may lead to a search for
others which perform a similar function.

There is one other aspect on which I believe research would be well rewarded; although it has not been a matter of specific study here, mention has been made of Crecquillon's use of mode. It appears that mode was a vital part of Crecquillon's compositional technique and style. A definition, drawn from an analysis of the works, of what the concept of mode appeared to be for Crecquillon, and an examination of his use of it, would be of interest in the wider debate on mode as well as helping to illuminate the meaning of his own works. It is possible, in addition, that Crecquillon's modal practice might provide one element in any stylistic analysis, for the determination of chronology and authenticity.

The attempt to delineate a context for Crecquillon and for some of his compositions has proved fruitful both in the outline of Crecquillon's life and career, and in enabling a view to be taken of how some of his works relate to the specific context in which he worked for much of his career, the Imperial chapel and court. I end where I began, with C. S. Lewis's rather sardonic comment. Insofar as anything in this thesis seems solid, it is only because the means of knowing better are gone; there can be no recovery of the 16th-century mind, individual or corporate. However, the effort to regain even a fragment of understanding, albeit contingent, is worthwhile when faced with Crecquillon's fine music and the alternative of accepting defeat without a struggle.
1. Cusum, Cumulative Sum Analysis, was developed by the Rev. A. Morton, and was predicated on the assertion that everyone has a linguistic ‘fingerprint’, determined by the frequency of use of certain words. Cusum and similar statistical techniques have been used in the determination of authorship and related problems, but have not found universal acceptance. In particular, the use of Cusum in court cases has come under attack recently; see the Times, 29th September 1997. It is relatively easy to demonstrate that a number of possible determinants can vary widely within a single composer's output, hence the suggestion that a probability analysis based on a number of independent determinants might prove more productive.
APPENDIX 1

A NOTE ON GUERRERO'S MASS CONGRATULAMINI MIHI

The identity of the model for Guerrero's mass *Congratulamini mihi* has been generally accepted as the motet of the same title by Le Heurteur. In chapter 3, I suggested that the identification was incorrect, by saying that the model was Crecquillon's motet, which is on a very similar Easter text. The purpose of this appendix is not to carry out an exhaustive analysis of the mass, but to give sufficient grounds to support that statement, and therefore to enable Crecquillon's motet to be accorded its rightful status as the model.

I do not know the origin of the identification of Le Heurteur's motet as the model for Guerrero's mass; it is mentioned in Stevenson (1961), taken as a fact by Merino (1972) in his study of the masses, and repeated in Llorens Cisteró (1991) in the relevant volume of the complete edition. Indeed, in Merino's study, the mass *Congratulamini mihi* proved to be significantly different in a number of ways from the masses with which it was compared, so much so that it would not have been surprising if Merino had smelt a rat. If he did so, he was too polite to mention it. At the very least, if Le Heurteur's motet was not the true model, comparing the mass with it would certainly have presented some challenges.

The strength of the case for each of the two possible models is best demonstrated by a direct comparison. Example A1.1 gives the opening bars of the *Kyrie* of the mass, together with the opening of both motets. (The Examples are given together at the end of the Appendix.) The layout of the voices in the mass is the same as Le Heurteur's...
motet, but that is the extent of the similarities in its favour. Both motets open with
an upward interval of a fourth. It will be seen that the mass preserves the rhythm of
the opening bar of the Crecquillon setting and, although it alters the rhythm of the
second bar in two instances, it preserves it in the other entries. Those two instances
apart, the head motif is not just closer to Crecquillon's motet than to Le Heurteur's
version, but quite obviously identical. The similarity is not simply in the use of the
melodic phrase. Guerrero recast the opening to some degree, possibly to accommodate
his change of vocal scoring, but aside from the initial entry in the second voice, he
then adhered very closely to Crecquillon's pattern of entries. This can be seen in
Example A1.2 in which I have noted direct correspondences only. It will be seen that
over the first twelve bars or so, they are extensive. At that point Crecquillon
continued with new material, whilst Guerrero continued to work the opening point a
little further.

Merino concluded that Guerrero, in this mass, had used his model with a far greater
degree of freedom than in the other masses with which it was compared, and, equally
unusually in Merino's view, had not borrowed from what Merino called 'the original
complex' i.e. the polyphonic fabric. Here, it can be seen that Guerrero was following
the opening motif of Crecquillon's motet closely in both respects, and was therefore
writing very much more in accordance with his other imitation masses. The
correspondences between the very opening of the mass and Crecquillon's motet are
more than sufficient to put the matter beyond question. However, a few more brief
observations may be useful.

The Christe section begins with a phrase that is of such common material that it could
be from almost any work. See Example A1.3. It can be found, as noted in the Example,
in both motets. However, Merino also noted that, in the *Kyrie* of his imitation masses, Guerrero tended to present his themes in the order in which they appear in the model, and again, Merino thought this mass to be an exception. That would be so if this theme had been derived from the motet by Le Heurteur where it appears in the second part of the motet, but in Crecquillon's case, the phrase appears between the opening theme and the one which Guerrero evidently took to begin the second *Kyrie*. The comparison with the other masses, as well as the opening section, suggests that it is far more likely that this theme is derived from Crecquillon.

Taken by itself, this second borrowing is sufficiently generalised not to point clearly towards either motet, but any doubt that it might induce on that account is dispelled by the third section of the opening part of the mass, the second *Kyrie*. It begins with a point of imitation which Merino assumed Guerrero to have rewritten (for the better) from Le Heurteur's motet; see Example A1.4. Merino remarked on the upward turn at the end of this phrase, which indeed makes it a more interesting shape than Le Heurteur's, but it will be seen that, far from altering the phrase, Guerrero had instead faithfully used a motif from Crecquillon's motet.

The other feature of this second *Kyrie* is that it introduces a motif based on a four-note downward sequence. Merino commented on the striking use of sequences in this mass, but which occur infrequently in the other masses. The nearest Le Heurteur's motet comes to a downward sequence is the passage in Example A1.5 although Merino thought that the sequence had been derived from the second figure shown in the Example. However, in the discussion of Crecquillon's motet in chapter 4, I drew attention to a passage which preceded a chant quotation. Part of that section of the motet is also given in Example A1.5 (Example 4.19 gives a fuller extract). Although
Guerrero altered and manipulated this sequence in a number of ways at different points in the mass, it seems obvious from the comparison that his prominent featuring of sequences was derived from Crecquillon's bold and effective use of one in his motet, rather than from Le Heurteur's much more anodyne passage or from the fragment suggested by Merino. I have also given the end of the second *Kyrie* in the Example, as well as a particularly distinctive phrase to be found in the bass parts of Crecquillon's motet and in the mass.

These further examples from the opening movement of the mass seem to be quite sufficient to differentiate between the two possible models, and to see clearly, in line with the very opening, that it was Crecquillon's motet that was being used by Guerrero. Similarly clear examples can be found throughout the remainder of the mass. Example A1.6 gives the opening of the *Qui tollis* section of the *Gloria*, Cantus 1, and the opening voice of the second part of Crecquillon's motet. Again, the relationship seems evident. The borrowing from the opening of the second part is used elsewhere e.g. the opening of the *Et in Spiritum Sanctum* section of the *Credo*. It cannot be compared with Le Heurteur's motet, because that has no point of imitation from which this motif could have been derived. One further example will suffice: Example A1.7 shows a phrase from the *Gloria*, together with Merino's suggested origin and a phrase from Crecquillon's motet.

Merino's comparison of some of the imitation masses also showed that Guerrero borrowed from the endings of his models as well as from themes from the opening and body of the work in question. Again, he found the mass *Congratulamini mihi* to be exceptional, with no use being made of the ending of Le Heurteur's motet. Example A1.8 shows the end of the second *Agnus Dei* together with the end of Crecquillon's
motet. Whilst Guerrero has reworked Crecquillon's cadence to quite an extent, there is no real doubt that the two are closely linked. There is an equally apparent reference at the end of the *Credo*.

There is one further point to which I wish to draw attention. In chapter 4, I suggested that part of the purpose of the passage in Crecquillon's motet quoted in Example A1.5 was to draw attention to the chant quotation which followed. The ostinato that Guerrero adopted for the first *Agnus Dei*, and which appears quite noticeably in the second one as well, could have been derived from the opening of either motet, but it is more directly the opening of that quotation which Crecquillon had contrived to make so prominent in his motet.

The congruence of Guerrero's mass and Crecquillon's motet leaves very little doubt that it was the real model for the mass. Not only does the mass fit better with the Crecquillon motet, but it will have been seen from the above, that where Merino thought that the mass was unusual compared with other imitation masses by Guerrero, it is in fact much more of a piece with them in its use of imitation technique than Merino supposed, when compared with Crecquillon's motet as the model. Merino observed that Guerrero 'saturated' his counterpoint with borrowed material, and that this mass was again an exception in presenting much of the material in altered form. The alternative view, based on Crecquillon's motet as the model, cannot be illustrated briefly, even though the examples that have been given show something of the close correspondences to be found. A broader examination of Crecquillon's motet and Guerrero's mass shows that again the mass conforms to the pattern of the others in this respect by using the themes taken from Crecquillon's motets in recognisably similar forms. It seems, then, that in all essential ways, the
apparently unusual application of Guerrero's imitation technique in the mass

*Congratulamini mihi* has arisen from the mis-identification of Le Heurteur's motet as the model, and not from any adoption by Guerrero of a markedly different compositional approach.

Crecquillon's motet is a much more impressive work than Le Heurteur's, and it should now be given its due, too, as the model upon which Guerrero wrote his equally fine mass.
Notes on Appendix 1

1. A paper based on the identification of the model for this mass was read at a TAGS seminar at the University of Surrey in June 1996. On that occasion, some music examples were played which had been recorded for the seminar by the vocal group Octave and Mr. D. McKinny, to whom my thanks are due.


3. By no means all the models for Guerrero's masses have been positively identified. Merino made a detailed comparison of six masses: Dormendo un giorno, Congratulamini mihi, Della batalla, Inter vestibulum, Iste sanctus and Sancta et immaculata. As will be seen from the discussion, Merino found a considerable degree of consistency between five of them. He summed up his findings on pp. 104-7, which should be read in conjunction with the references given below.


i) Guerrero: Kyrie 1 (MME)
ii) Crecquillon: Congratulamini
iii) Le Heurteur: Congratulamini (S & M)

\[\text{Music notation image}\]
Example A1.2

i) Guerrero

ii) Crecquillon
i) Guerrero

ii) Crecquillon
Example A1.3

i) Guerrero: Christe motif

\[ \text{Christe eleison} \]

ii) Crecquillon b. 19-20

\[ \text{Christe eleison} \]

iii) Le Heurteur b. 118-9

\[ \text{Christe eleison} \]
Example A1.4

i) Guerrero: Kyrie 2 (tenor)

ii) Crecquillon b. 33-5

iii) Le Heurteur b. 51-4
Example A1.5

i) Le Heurteur b. 44-7

ii) Le Heurteur b. 35-7 (Merino's suggestion)

iii) Crecquillon b. 73-8

iv) Guerrero: end of Kyrie 2

v) Guerrero: Kyrie b. 84-7
Example A1.6

i) Guerrero: Qui tollis

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{example-a1.6-i}}
\end{array}
\]

ii) Crecquillon: opening of pt. 2

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{example-a1.6-ii}}
\end{array}
\]
Example A1.7

i) Guerrero: Gloria b. 94-8

\[ \text{Music notation image} \]

ii) Crecqillon b. 135-7

\[ \text{Music notation image} \]

iii) Le Heurteur b. 44-7

\[ \text{Music notation image} \]
i) Guerrero: end of Agnus 2
ii) Crecquillon: end of Congratulamini
APPENDIX 2

TRANSCRIPTIONS AND INCIPITS

This Appendix brings together, for ease of comparison and reference, material relevant to chapters 5 and 6. Transcriptions have been provided for some of the works mentioned in those chapters and for which there are no readily available modern editions. These transcriptions are not intended to be full critical editions, and accordingly, where more than one source exists, the various sources have not been collated.

General notes

i) Note values have been halved;

ii) modern clefs have been adopted - original clefs are given in the notes to individual works;

iii) coloration and ligatures are likewise given in the notes below;

iv) the text underlay follows as far as is reasonably possible that in the source, and repeat marks have been expanded without comment; purely editorial text is in brackets;

v) editorial suggestions for ficta are placed above the notes concerned.

Contents and Commentary

A2.1 - Chant: *Philippe qui videt me*

Source: Antiphonale Pataviense f. 74.
A2.2 - Chant: *Philippe qui videt me* as derived from Senfl's setting (see A2.4)

A2.3 - Incipit of Brumel: *Philippe qui videt me*

Source: CMM 5/5

Note: contratenor missing. Note values quartered.

A2.4 - Senfl: *Philippe qui videt me*

Source: RISM 1558/4, no. 21. Facsimile copy, which reproduces an exemplar from the Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin.

Clefs: G2, G2, C2, C3, C3, F3.

Time signature: cut C.

Notes: Ligatures - v1, b. 34(2)/35(1); b. 63(2)/64(1); b. 69; b. 76(2)/77(1); v2, b. 38/39; b. 69/70; b.84/5; v3, b. 6; b. 12; b. 20; b. 63; b. 70(2)/80(1); v4, b. 61(2)/62(1); b. 75; v5, b. 37/8; b. 68/69; b. 83/84; b. 88/89; v6, b. 13; b. 20(2)/21(1); b. 61; b. 65(2)/66(1); b. 78; b. 81(2)/82(1). The source is particularly clear on the text underlay, with very few points requiring editorial decisions.

A2.5 - Incipit of Anon/Heugel: *Philippe qui videt me*

Source: KassL 118 no. 43.


Time signature: uncut C.

Note: Discantus missing. Dated 15th March 1535.

A2.6 - Anon: *Philippe qui videt me*
A2.7 - Incipit of Othmayr: *Philippe qui videt me*

Source: EDM XXVI.

A2.8 - Incipit of Crecquillon: *Philippe qui videt me*

Source: Ferer and Hudson (1997b) (CMM 63/9).

A2.9 - Anon: *Verbum caro factum est*

Source: RISM 1556/30 fol. 35v. Facsimile copy, which reproduces the only known copy at Upsala.


Time signature: cut C 3.

Notes: repeats indicated by signs have been expanded. Color - v2, b. 6/7; 10/11; v4, b. 31. The source does not underlay the text either clearly or accurately; there are also minor differences of orthography which have been standardised.

A2.10 - Chant: *Verbum caro factum est*
A2.11 - cantus firmus from Larchier: *Laudemus puerum*

Source: RISM 1553/15; also in Sherr (1995).

A2.12 - J. Louys: *Philippe qui videt me*


Clefs: G2, C2, C2, C3, F3.

Time signature: cut C.

Notes: Ligatures - v1, b. 55; v3, b. 44 with color; b. 63; v4, b.35(5)/36(1); b. 41(2)/42(1); b. 42(2)/43(1) with color; b. 53/54(1); v5, b. 48; b. 52; b. 59.

V3, b. 17(4)/18(1) a-g. Underlay is generally clear.

A2.13 - L. Louys: *Philippe qui videt me*


Clefs: G2, G2, C2, C3, C3, F3.

Time signature: cut C.

Notes: v3 b. 36 - the sharp is actually placed before b. 35(3); b. 39(3), precautionary sharp.

A2.14 - The lieder *Kain Adler and Es taget*

Source: Senfl SW5.

Note: rests greater than a bar have been omitted.

A2.15 - Bacchius: *Ego flos campi*


Time signature: v's 1-3 & 5, cut C; v4, uncut C.

Notes: v2, b. 19 & 41(bt's 3-4) color; v3, b. 26(2) & 48(2) precautionary sharp.

V5, the first phrase of the c. f. has the word 'convallium' at the end; however, there are insufficient notes to accommodate it. No attempt has been made to regularise the minor differences when music is repeated.

A2.16 - Maessens: *Tota pulchra es*

Source: RISM 1568/8 no. 3. Microfilm supplied by the Deutsches Musikgeschichtliches Archiv of an exemplar in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich.

Clefs: C1, C3.

Time signature: cut C.

Notes: underlay is generally reasonably clear. Voices 2-5 appear as a continuous part, with the canonic entries indicated by fermata. V1 also has a fermata over the first note, which indicates that the canon should end on that chord (presumably with an adjustment as necessary of the underlay, which at times goes across that point). The motet is headed 'Petrus Massenus super Cantionem Kein Adler'. The canon is given the rubric - 'Quatuor in partes carmen distinguere debes Quintum virginea iungito voce melos'. It is clear from the harmony that all the parts should sound together from the beginning, rather than entering in canon.

A2.17 - Manchicourt: *Osculetur me osculo/Tota pulchra es*


Clefs: G2, G2, C2, C3, C4, C4.

Time signature: Cut C.
Notes: underlay is particularly unclear and inconsistent - even the cantus firmus is underlaid differently on its repetition. There is also confusion at the end of part 2; sometimes 'super unum' is used, sometimes 'super vinum'. The editor believes that the later, derived from the original Biblical text but making no sense without the previous phrase that appears there, was in error. V's 2 & 5 are reversed between parts one and two. V3, b. 27, color; b. 119, ligature.
Antiphonale Pataviense

Philippus qui videt me, alleluia.

Videt et patrem meum, alleluia.
A2.2

Chant as derived from Senft's Philippe

\[\text{Philippus qui videt me, alleluia, videt et pa-}\]

\[\text{trem meum, alleluia, alleluia.}\]
Brumel: Philippe qui videt me
Senfl: Philippe qui videt me
Lu - lu - iia, Phi - lip - pe qui vid - det me, 

le - lu - iia, Phi - lip - pe qui vid - det me, qui 

Phi - lip - pe qui vid - det me, 

Phi - lip - pe qui vid - det me, al - le - lu - iia, Phi - lip - pe 

det me, al - le - lu - iia, Phi - lip - pe
A.2.4

Philippe qui videt me, alleluia.

Philippe, Philippe, Philippe qui videt me.
me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me.
me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me, qui vi - det me,
A2.4

le - lu - ia, al - le - lu - ia, al - le - lu - ia, +I le --- lu IL a1 - le

et pa - trem me - dium, al -

le - lu - ia, al - le - lu - ia, al -

et pa - trem me - dium, al -

le - lu - ia, al - le - lu - ia, al -

et pa - trem me - dium, al -

le - lu - ia, al - le -
Anon/Heugel: Philippe qui videt me

Philippe qui videt me.

Philippe, (Philippe qui videt me) hal.
pe qui videt me, Philippus

qui videt

(qui) qui videt

501
Anon: Philippe qui videt
Anon: Philippe qui videt
Anon: Philippe qui videt

A2.6
Anon: Philippe qui videt
Anon: Philippe qui videt
Anon: Philippe qui videt

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.

Vide et parorem meum, hallelujah.
Anon: Philippe qui videt
Othmayr: Philippe qui videt me
Crecquillon: Philippe qui videt me
Anon: Verbum caro factum est

Verbum caro factum est, por que todos os salveys, por que todos os salveys.

Y la virgen le dereza, vida de la no da reys u.
Chant: Verbum caro

Verbum caro factum est: Alleluia, alleluia.

Et habitavit in nobis. Alleluia, alleluia.
C. f. from Larchier: Laudemus puerum


Alleluia Alleluia.
I. Louys: Philippe qui videt me
A2.12

Philippe qui videt me, alleluia, alleluia, alleluia, alleluia.
Phi-lip-pe qui vi-det me, al-le-lu-ia,
A2.12

Ia, vi - det et pa - trem me - um, al - le - lu -

Ia, al - le - lu - ia, al - le - lu - ia, al - le -

Ia, al - le - lu - ia, al - le - lu - ia, al - le -

Ia, al - le - lu - ia, al - le - lu - ia, al - le -

Ia, al - le - lu - ia, (al - le -}
ia, alleluia.

ia, alleluia.

ia, alleluia.

ia, alleluia, alleluia.
L. Louys: Philippe qui videt me
A2.13

An alleluia, Philippe me, alleluia, alleluia, alleluia, Philippe qui vident me, Philippe qui vident alleluia, Philippe qui vident me, alleluia, Philippe qui vident
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A2.13

als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
als - lu - ia, als - lu - ia,
a) Kain Adler
b) Es taget

\[ \text{Musiknoten} \]
Bacchius: Ego flos campi

Ego flos campi et lilium convallium,

Ego flos campi et lilium

Ego flos campi et lilium convallium, et lilium convallium, et lilium

gogo flos campi et lilium convallium, et lilium convallium, et lilium convallium,
A2.15

val- li- um, et li- li- um con- val- li- um, con-

val- li- um, et li- li- um con- val- li- um, et li-

val- li- um, et li- li- um con- val- li- um, et li-

val- li- um, et li- li- um con- val- li- um, et li-

val- li- um, et li- li- um con- val- li- um, con-

val- li- um, si- cut li- li- um, (li- li- um.)

val- li- um, si- cut li- li- um in- ter spi- nas, in-

val- li- um, si- cut li- li- um in- ter spi- nas, si-

val- li- um, si- cut li- li- um in- ter spi- nas, spi-
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si - cut li - li - um, (li - li - um) in - ter spi -

ter spi - nas, in - ter spi - nas, in -

cut li - li - um in - ter spi - nas, in - ter spi - nas, in -
cut li - li - um in - ter spi - nas, in - ter spi - nas, in -
cut li - li - um in - ter spi - nas, in - ter spi - nas, si - cut li - li - um in -
cut li - li - um in - ter spi - nas, in - ter spi - nas, si - cut li - li - um in -
cut li - li - um in - ter spi - nas, in - ter spi - nas, si - cut li - li - um in -
cut li - li - um in - ter spi - nas, in - ter spi - nas, si - cut li - li - um in -
cut li - li - um in - ter spi - nas, in - ter spi - nas, si - cut li - li - um in -
cut li - li - um in - ter spi - nas, in - ter spi - nas, si - cut li - li - um in -
cut li - li - um in - ter spi - nas, in - ter spi - nas, si - cut li - li - um in -
cut li - li - um in - ter spi - nas, in - ter spi - nas, si - cut li - li - um in -
cut li - li - um in - ter spi - nas, in - ter spi - nas, si - cut li - li - um in -
cut li - li - um in - ter spi - nas, in - ter spi - nas, si - cut li - li - um in -
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cut malsus, malsus inter ligna sylva-

ter ligna sylva-rum, syl-

ter ligna, sic cut malsus inter ligna (syl-varum), sylva-
sic cut malsus

ter ligna - sylva-rum, ligna sylva-rum,
inus me-us, filius me-us in-
me-us inter filios, inter fil-
us me-us inter fi-
sic filiius

us me-us inter fi-

ter filios,

os, inter filios, sub um-bra

lios, inter fi-

me-us inter filios,

lios, inter filios, fi-
sub umbra ilius, sub umbra ilius, sub umbra ilius, sub umbra ilius, sub umbra ilius, sub umbra ilius, sub umbra ilius, sub umbra ilius, sub umbra ilius.
ius dulciscis guturimi meo, dulciscis guturi meo, dulciscis guturismo, dulciscis guturisme o, meo, dulciscis guturisme o, meo, dulciscis guturismo, meo.
Maessens: Tota pulchra es

Tota pulchra est amica mea et guentorum, odor unguentorum, macula, et macula non est, et macula non est in te, o-

mi - ca me -

ma - cul - a, et lac, mel et lac o - dor un - guen - tor - rum sub su - per om - ni - a a - ro - ma - ta, a - ro -
dor unguentorum tuorum, tuorum su-
et macula non est
sub lingua tua
lingua, sub lingua tua
matata, super omnia aromata
per omnia aromata
in te, in te
a, odor un
a, odor unguento
matat.
Manchicourt: Osculetur me/Tota pulchra

Osculetur me osculo oris sui, osculo oris.

Osculetur me osculo oris sui, (oris sui.)

Osculetur me osculo oris

Osculetur me osculo oris sui, (amica

Osculetur me osculo oris sui, osculo oris

Tota pulchra es, (amica

Osculetur me osculo oris sui, osculo oris
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qui a meliora sunt, (qui a meliora sunt,
qui a meliora sunt, (meliora sunt,
i, (sui), qui a meliora
mea,)
a - mi - ca mea oris sui, sui,
sui, qui a meliora
ora sunt, ubera tua vi -
ubera tua vi -
ora sunt, ubera tua vi -
a,
qui a meliora, (meliora) sunt,
ora sunt, uber
Guentis optimis, oleum effusum, (ef-

Guentis optimis, oleum effusum, oleum

Tu a) labia tua mel

Guentis, oleum effusum,

Oleum effusum,

Oleum effusum, nomen tuum, no-

Oleum effusum, oleum effusum, (ef-

Oleum effusum, (ef-

Oleum effusum, nomen tuum, (nomen

Et lac,

Oleum effusum, oleum effusum, (ef-
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\[ \textit{nom en tu um, nom en tu um, (nom en tu um,)} \]

\[ \textit{nom en tu um, nom en tu um, (nom en tu um,)} \]

\[ \textit{sub lingua tua, tua, una,} \]

\[ \textit{nom en tu um, nom en tu um,} \]

\[ \textit{ide o adulescentu lae, (adulescentu lae,)} \]

\[ \textit{nom en tu um, ide o adulescentu lae,} \]

\[ \textit{ide o adulescentu lae, ide o adulescentu lae,} \]

\[ \textit{tu um, (tu um, ide -)} \]
A2.17
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ta, di·le·x-e·runt te. Tra·he me post
ta. di·le·x-e·runt te.
ta, di·le·x-e·runt te.

te cur·re·mus in o·do·ro·do·····

he me post te cur·re·mus in o·do·ro·do·····

Tra·he me post te cur·re·mus in o·do·ro·do·····

Tra·he
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Trahe me post te, trahe me post te, curremus

Rem, curremus in odorem.

Rem, unguentorum tumrem.

To-ta pulchra es, amica mea.

Rem, curremus in odorem.

Rem, unguentorum tumrum, (tumorum.)

Rem, unguentorum tumrum in odorem.

Rem, unguentorum tumrum in odorem.

Post te curremus in odorem.
unguemento rum tuorum, (tuorum) introxit unguemento rum tuorum, unguemento rum tuorum, introxit unguemento rum tuorum, (tuorum,)

introxit me rex, introxit me rex,

et macula non est in me rex,

introxit me rex, introxit me rex,
bi-mus, et lae-ta-bi-mur,
ex-ul-ta-bi-mus, et lae-
ta-bi-mus, et lae-ta-
bi-mus, et lae-ta-bi-mur,
lac sub lingua tua, sub
exul-ta-bimus et lae-ta-
bi-mus, et lae-ta-bi-mur, (lae-ta-
bi-mus,) su-
bi-mus, et lae-ta-bi-mur, et lae-
super u-num, (su-per u-
ta-bi-mur su-per u-num, (su-per u-
numum,) su-per u-
lingua tua, (tu-a.)
per u-num, (su-per u-
numum, su-per ta-
bi-mur, su-per u-num, (u-numum,) su-per u-
recti diligunt te, (diligunt te.)
gunt te, recti diligunt te.
diligunt te.
recti diligunt te.
recti diligunt te.
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