

Honey Meconi

London Royal 8 G. vii and the Motets of Pierre de la Rue¹

The extensive series of handsome manuscripts prepared by the scriptorium associated with the Habsburg-Burgundian court is dominated by the music of long-time court composer Pierre de la Rue². Many of his works in these manuscripts were copied with clear ascriptions to him, but others appear anonymously, and we know of his authorship only through concordances or theoretical writings.

The fact that court scribes sometimes presented La Rue's music anonymously has led scholars to wonder whether certain works in court manuscripts with no ascription anywhere might possibly be his. This line of inquiry has been especially fruitful with chansons (for both BrusBR 228 and VienNB Mus. 18746)³ and has been used for masses as well. Anonymous motets, though, have largely avoided this scrutiny, both because the few full motet collections in the Habsburg-Burgundian complex have received relatively little attention and because La Rue's motets have a somewhat different distribution and authenticity profile than his masses and secular works.

Figure 1 provides a summary of La Rue's surviving motets, fewer in number than either his masses or chansons, but more than the output of such contemporaries as Agricola, Compère, or Pipelare⁴. Fourteen of the motets appear with ascriptions to La Rue in court manuscripts; they are the most secure in their authenticity⁵. Two other motets appear anonymously in court manuscripts but with ascriptions to La Rue elsewhere, one in a print two decades after his death, and the other in one of very first sources to contain his work.

Three more compositions likewise appear anonymously in court manuscripts, but these lack ascriptions to La Rue elsewhere. *Maria mater gratie/Fors seulement* presents no stylistic issues here, but *O salutaris hostia* is unusually homorhythmic, and the infamous *Absalon fili mi* remains highly problematic⁶.

- 1 I would like to thank Wolfgang Fuhrmann and Christiane Wiesenfeldt for organizing the session that gave rise to this publication. Dr. Fuhrmann receives my thanks as well for his timely assistance at various stages in the preparation of my conference paper.
- 2 Reference to the Habsburg-Burgundian scriptorium does not imply a physical space, a formal entity, or even an official connection to the court. Common sense, though, recognizes a close if inevitably vague relationship between those who created the manuscripts and the court's chapel, given that Petrus Alamire, the supervisor of much of the manuscript production, was himself a member of the chapel. For basic information on manuscripts prepared by the court scriptorium, see *The Treasury of Petrus Alamire: Music and Art in Flemish Court Manuscripts 1500–1535*, ed. by Herbert Kellman, Ghent and Amsterdam, 1999 (hereafter *TA*).
- 3 Manuscript abbreviations are taken from *Census-Catalogue of Manuscript Sources of Polyphonic Music, 1400–1550*, 5 vols., ed. by Charles Hamm and Herbert Kellman (Renaissance Manuscript Studies 1), Neuhausen-Stuttgart, 1979–1988.

- 4 Throughout this essay the term »motet« is broadly inclusive, incorporating works that use hymn texts, for example, as well as (when discussing the London manuscript) *Dulces exuvie* settings. I would like to thank David Burn for alerting me to Henri Vanhulst's recent discovery of the Habsburg-Burgundian manuscript fragment that confirms La Rue's authorship of *Ave sanctissima Maria*. I would also like to extend my gratitude to Professor Vanhulst for kindly sharing information about this manuscript before publication of his paper, »Un fragment inconnu de Pierre de la Rue,« presented at the colloquium »The Musical Heritage of Brussels,« Royal Library of Belgium, 28 May 2010. According to Professor Vanhulst, the fragment containing the attribution, Brussels, Archives CPAS, H1135, was originally part of the same manuscript as the Sint Gudule fragments, BrusSG 9423 and 9424.
- 5 Not previously noticed is the remarkable structural similarity between La Rue's *Salve regina IV* and Josquin's *Victimae paschali laudes*. In the former, the Superius of Dufay's popular *Par le regard* appears in the first section and the Superius of the equally popular *Je ne vis oncques* (by Binchois or Dufay) is used in the third section. In the latter, more up-to-date (and even more popular) models appear: the *prima pars* features the Superius of Ockeghem's *D'ung aultre amer* while the *secunda pars* borrows the Superius of Hayne's *De tous biens plaine*.
- 6 *Maria mater gratie/Fors seulement* is not included in Pierre de la Rue: *Collected Works Vol. IX: The Motets*, ed. by

David J. Burn

Pierre de la Rue's Chant-Based Motets

To judge from his surviving output, Pierre de la Rue had an unusual fascination and admiration for chant. Viewed as a whole, his output contains chant-based works in all genres where a basis in chant is possible. Particularly striking is that chant is the most common model in his masses, and a source on which he seems to have relied throughout his career when composing mass settings, while secular models are eschewed to an unusual degree for a composer of La Rue's time¹. A second, small but interesting, group is formed by his motet-chansons, where a chant-derived tenor is combined with a vernacular text in the other voices, usually in the context of mourning a death². Third, there is a cycle of eight Magnificat settings, one in each of the modes³. And a basis in chant also plays a prominent role in his motets, as will be seen below.

Perhaps, in the light of Honey Meconi's elegant portrayal of La Rue as pious, religious, and »free from the crimes of Venus,« such an inclination towards chant is no surprise⁴. Nonetheless, much remains to be clarified concerning La Rue's knowledge of chant traditions, and the ways in which he manipulated his pre-existent

material. So far as the former is concerned, La Rue was, despite stable employment at a single institution, an »international man of mystery,« to borrow another memorable characterisation of the composer⁵: his travels in France, Spain, the German-speaking Empire, and England must have brought him into contact with a wide variety of chant traditions, some of which may have left their mark on his music. Furthermore, though the Habsburg-Burgundian court where La Rue worked nominally followed the Use of Paris, there was more than one Parisian Use, and chant books from other Uses are known to have been available at the court⁶. La Rue's upbringing in the diocese of Tournai may also conceivably have left an impact on his chant preferences⁷. Investigating the chant background to La Rue's music thus has interesting potential rewards. However, such an investigation is not without its concomitant difficulties. Chant research, particularly broad studies with a focus on later-fifteenth and sixteenth-century melodic forms, are not plentiful. And even when available, La Rue's own tendency towards paraphrasing his models—freely altering, extending, and decorating them, perhaps under the influence of Johannes Ockeghem—makes the determination of specific features of those models sometimes problematic⁸. Despite these complications, what follows aims to highlight some of the possible insights that a more detailed examination than has hitherto been undertaken of La Rue's chant models may offer. Case-studies are drawn from his motets, but the same lines of investigation are of course equally relevant for his chant-based music in other genres.

1 See Honey Meconi: *Pierre de la Rue and Musical Life at the Habsburg-Burgundian Court*, Oxford 2003, p. 115. Despite the masses being the most studied part of La Rue's output, much still remains to be known about their chant background, including, in some instances, basic aspects of cantus firmus identification.

2 See Honey Meconi: *Ockeghem and the Motet-Chanson in Fifteenth-Century France*, in *Johannes Ockeghem: Actes du XLe Colloque international d'études humanistes*, ed. by Philippe Vendrix, Paris, 1998, pp. 381–402; Meconi, *Pierre de la Rue*, p. 180ff.

3 The setting in the third mode is now lost, but, on the basis of archival documents, can be assumed to have once existed. Following current standard work-lists (the *New Grove*, 2nd edition, and Meconi, *Pierre de la Rue*, pp. 314–337), I treat the Magnificats as separate from the motets, and accordingly leave them out of consideration in what follows.

4 See *Pierre de la Rue*, p. 142 and passim.

5 Fabrice Fitch: *Pierre de la Rue: International Man of Mystery*, in *Early Music* 32 (2004), pp. 143–144; on La Rue's working environment, see Meconi, *Pierre de la Rue*.

6 Meconi, *Pierre de la Rue*, p. 115.

7 Meconi, *Pierre de la Rue*, p. 115.

8 Meconi, *Pierre de la Rue*, p. 171.

Christiane Wiesenfeldt

Dedikationsmotette oder Messteil?

Pierre de la Rues (?) *Te decet laus* zwischen Liturgie und Diplomatie

Die liturgische Beziehungsgeschichte zwischen der Messe und der Motette ist ebenso lang wie verworren. Gingen Moser¹, Mattfeld² oder Strunk³ ursprünglich von einem Substitut-Verhältnis aus, in dem eine Motette einen Part des Messritus ersetzen konnte (wie etwa in den *in loco*-Traditionen der *Motetti Missales*), so wandelte sich dies Bild in neuerer Quellenforschung und -deutung zur liturgischen Funktion von Motetten mehr und mehr zum Akzessions-Verhältnis⁴: Die Motette ergänzte die Liturgie nun um einen weiteren musikalischen Part. Diese Akzession konnte je nach Ritus oder Region selbstverständlich ganz unterschiedlich ausfallen, sei es (mal fixiert, mal *ab libitum*) im Rahmen der Eucharistiefeier⁵, sei es als Teil des Propriums (etwa im Graduale, Offertorium oder Benedicamus)⁶, sei es während der Hei-

ligen Kommunion⁷ oder sei es – in seltenen Fällen – während des Stundengebets⁸.

Erscheint das akzessorische Verhältnis der Motette zur Liturgie weniger bedeutsam als das substituelle, so ist diese Perspektive weit mehr der geschichtsmächtigen historiographischen Lesart des *Ordinarium Missae* als gewichtigste »Gattung« ihrer Zeit denn der funktionalliturgischen Realität geschuldet. Tatsächlich sind nicht nur die Grenzen zwischen motettischem *Zu*-satz und *Er*-satz nicht selten fließend bis aufgehoben (etwa wenn spontan umdisponiert wurde, wenn keine geistlichen Gewänder vorhanden waren⁹). Auch konnte der Zusatz fixiert, also zwingend sein, um die Messe zu komplettieren, wie schon die frühen, von Peter Wagner und Reinhard Strohm ermittelten Dokumente zur »cum motetto post missa«-Tradition des 15. Jahrhunderts belegen, eine Tradition, die die schließende Motette als Teil der Messe begriff, obwohl sie formal als Zusatz hätten gelten müssen. Dies lässt sich auch für persönliche Stiftungen feststellen, in denen das Messritual – etwa im Kontext der Suffragien – um eine beauftragte Motette ergänzt und damit die Messe rückwirkend individualisiert wurde. Als nicht weniger grenzüberschreitend – zumal im musikalisch korrespondierenden Sinne – darf die für das 16. Jahrhundert mehrfach dokumentierte gemeinsame Aufführung von Parodiemesse und motettischer Vorlage im Rahmen eines Messritus gelten.¹⁰

1 Hans-Joachim Moser: *Die mehrstimmige Vertonung des Evangeliums*, 2 Bde., Leipzig 1931–1934.

2 Jacquelyn A. Mattfeld: *Some Relationships between Texts and Cantus Firmi of the Liturgical Motets of Josquin Desprez*, Diss. Yale 1959, insbes. S. 176f.

3 Oliver Strunk: *Some Motet Types of the 16th Century*, in: *PAMS* 1939, S. 155–160. Repr. in: *Essays on Music in the Western World*, New York, 1974, S. 108–113.

4 Insbesondere befördert durch die Institutionen-Forschungen zur Sixtinischen Kapelle, einzelnen Kirchen, jesuitischen Kollegien oder Fürstenhöfen.

5 Schon im frühen 16. Jahrhundert belegt für Rom, vgl. Richard Sherr: *The Singers of the Papal Chapel and Liturgical Ceremonies in the Early Sixteenth Century. Some Documentary Evidence*, in: *Rome in the Renaissance: The City and the Myth*, hg. von P. A. Ramsey, Binghamton 1982, S. 249–264, sowie die entsprechenden Diarien allerdings des späteren 16. Jahrhunderts. Eine Zusammenschau der unterschiedlichen römischen Dokumente bietet u. a. Anthony M. Cummings: *Toward an Interpretation of the Sixteenth-Century Motet*, in: *JAMS* 34 (1981), S. 43–59, insbes. S. 46f.

6 Vgl. etwa den Usus in jesuitischen Kollegien, dokumentiert bei T. Frank Kennedy: *Jesuit Colleges and Chapels: Motet Function in the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries*, in: *Archivum historicum Societatis Jesu* 65 (1996), S. 197–213.

7 Vgl. hierzu die Ausführungen von Michael Silies: *Die Motetten des Philippe de Monte (1521–1603)* (= Abhandlungen zur Musikgeschichte 16), Göttingen 2009, S. 219–221.

8 Ebd., S. 222.

9 Belegt etwa Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts in den Diarien der Cappella Sistina: »quia non habebant paramenta cantores non cantaverunt missam sed solum motettum«, zit nach Cummings, *Toward an Interpretation of the Sixteenth-Century Motet* (wie Anm. 5), insbes. S. 46, FN 8 (bezogen auf das Diarium vom 15. April 1547).

10 Vgl. Lewis Lockwood: *A View on the Sixteenth-Century Parody Mass*, in: *Queen's College: Twenty-Fifth Anniversary*

Stefan Gasch

Pierre de la Rues sieben Freuden

Einige Bemerkungen zur Motette *Gaude virgo mater Christi*

I – Text

Gaude virgo, mater Christi gehört zu einer Gruppe von sequenzartigen Gebeten, die in der Zeit des späten Mittelalters und den ersten Jahrzehnten des 16. Jahrhunderts äußerst beliebt und weit verbreitet war.¹ Ursprünglich von Bonaventura gedichtet, wurde der Text in zahlreichen unterschiedlichen Versionen überliefert und regte während des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts besonders in Großbritannien und Italien zu einer kompositorischen Auseinandersetzung an.² So listet Franz Joseph Mone im zweiten Band seiner *Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters* rund 25 Texte solcher »Prosaen«,³ die in der Regel aus mehreren Strophen bestehen, die für gewöhnlich mit dem lateinischen Wort »Gaude« beginnen und deren Verse ein ähnliches oder sogar dasselbe Reimschema mit vierhebigen Trochäen und Terzetten in Endreimen aufweisen. Schnell wird dabei aber deutlich, dass alle Gedichte – einschließlich jenem von La Rue – weder eine einheitliche Form noch Strophenfolge haben und sich durch eine beträchtliche Zahl von Varianten unterscheiden.⁴

Gemein ist allen Gebeten der devotionale Charakter: Die meisten von Ihnen thematisieren in unterschiedlicher Auswahl die fünf bzw. sie-

ben Freuden Mariens: also Verkündigung, Heimsuchung, Geburt Christi, Anbetung der Könige, Darstellung im Tempel, Wiederfinden des zwölfjährigen Jesus, Auferstehung Christi, Himmelfahrt Christi und die Aufnahme Mariens in den Himmel.⁵ Üblicherweise lautet die erste Strophe des in den Stundenbüchern des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts am häufigsten überlieferten Gedichtes *Gaude, virgo, mater Christi, quae per aurem concepisti Gabriele nuntio* und reflektiert die Empfängnis Jesu durch die Jungfrau Maria mittels Einhauchen durch den Heiligen Geist, in der Malerei oftmals durch eine schwebende Taube dargestellt, die Lichtstrahlen zum Ohr Mariens aussendet,⁶ und genau dieses Gedicht ist es auch, das in mehreren, z. T. anonymen Vertonungen vorliegt.⁷

La Rues Textfassung wird oftmals Thomas Becket (Thomas von Canterbury) zugeschrieben und unterscheidet sich grundsätzlich von den sieben angesprochenen vertonten Gebeten gleichen Titels (siehe den nachfolgenden Vergleich der Sätze von Josquin und La Rue).⁸ Im Unterschied zu diesen weist La Rues Text nämlich sieben Strophen in gereimten Doppelversikeln auf⁹ und erweist

1 Die nachfolgenden Ausführungen beziehen sich auf die Edition der Motette in Pierre de la Rue: *Opera omnia, Vol. 9: The Motets* (= Corpus Mensuralibus Musicae 97/9), hg. von Nigel St. Davison, Neuhausen 1996, S. 38–47, der Kritische Bericht auf S. XLVI–XLIX.

2 Einen genauen Editionsachweis für den Text bietet Howard Mayer Brown: *The Joys of Mary by Josquin and Others*, in *All Kinds of Music. In Honour of Andre D. McCredie*, hg. von Graham Strahle und David Swale, Wilhelmshaven 1998, S. 30–46, Fn. 10.

3 Franz Joseph Mone: *Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters*, 3 Bde., Freiburg 1853–1855, hier Bd. 2, Nr. 453–482. La Rues Text auf S. 176ff.

4 Eine detaillierte Untersuchung zur Überlieferung dieses weit verbreiteten Gebetstextes steht noch aus.

5 Die Beliebtheit dieser Thematik spiegelt sich auch in der bildenden Kunst wider. Für eine Übersicht vgl. Karl Kolb: *Freuden Mariens*, in: *Marienlexikon*, hg. von Remigius Bäumer und Leo Scheffczyk, Bd. 2, St. Ottilien 1989, S. 538.

6 In einigen Fällen ist sogar ein neugeborenes Kind abgebildet, das diese Strahlen herabzusteigen scheint. Für eine Diskussion dieser Glaubenshaltung siehe beispielsweise Michael P. Carroll: *Catholic Cults and Devotions. A Psychological Inquiry*, Kingston und Montreal 1989, S. 34, passim.

7 Für Beispiele vgl. *New Josquin Edition (NJE), Vol. 24: Motets on non-biblical texts 4: De beata Maria virgine 2, Critical Commentary*, hg. von Willem Elders, S. 24f.

8 Aufgrund der mehrfach gleichen Textanfänge wird La Rues Vertonung häufig mit dem Satz Josquins gleichgesetzt.

9 La Rues nächststehende Textfassung ist Mone, *Lateinische Hymnen 2* (wie Anm. 3), Nr. 465, S. 176ff.; allerdings auch hier mit einigen Abweichungen.

Jacobijn Kiel

Songs and Salves:

The case of *Vita Par le regart* by Pierre de la Rue¹

Pierre de la Rue's various settings of the antiphon *Salve regina* form one of the best examples to study this polyphonic genre. For that reason a more adequate subtitle for this article should have been: »Pierre de la Rue, or how to handle a Salve«.

Like many of his contemporaries, La Rue composed a collection of polyphonic settings of Marian antiphons, among them *Ave regina celorum*, *Regina celi* and *Salve Regina*. He wrote six settings of *Salve regina*, one of the most popular models for a motet in the early sixteenth century. The popularity of polyphonic Salve settings is clearly reflected by their transmissions². Apart from manuscripts with only polyphonic Magnificats, there appears no other text setting that is important enough to devote a complete manuscript or even a large section with a selection of Salve settings. From the late fifteenth century and the first decades of the sixteenth century, several manuscripts with collections of Salve settings are preserved. MunBS 34³ transmits 29 Salve settings, most of them by Franco-Flemish composers like Pierre de la Rue, Jacob Obrecht, Josquin des Prez and Jheronimus Vinders. RegB C98⁴ includes eighteen settings, but only a minority of them may have been written by Franco-Flemish composers. In the Eton choir book, EtonC 178, fifteen settings

are transmitted by English composers like John Browne, Robert Fayrfax and Walter Lambe⁵. Other manuscripts are LonBLH 1709⁶ (six settings), MunBS3154⁷ (eight settings) and BerlS 40021⁸ (six settings).

With six settings preserved, Pierre de la Rue has the largest collection of Salve settings by one composer⁹. His settings are only transmitted in a few sources. Five settings are preserved in MunBS 34, of which three are unique. A sixth setting is transmitted in the manuscripts BrusBR 9126 and RegB C98. *Salve Regina I* is also preserved in a later source, ParisBNC 1591¹⁰, dating from the middle of the sixteenth century. *Salve Regina II* is also printed in *Motetti libro quarto* (RISM 1505²) by Ottaviano Petrucci. This print and BrusBR 9126 are the only sources that have been compiled during his lifetime. MunBS 34 dates from the early 1520s and RegB C98 possibly from a decade later (see table 1).

5 Eton, Eton College Library, MS 178.

6 London, British Library, MS Harley 1709.

7 Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Musiksammlung, Musica MS 3154 (= MaiM 42) (»Chorbuch des Nikolaus Leopold«).

8 Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Mus. 40021 (*olim* Z. 21).

9 The settings by La Rue in this article are numbered according to the edition Pierre de la Rue: *Collected Works Vol. IX: The Motets*, ed. by Nigel St. John Davison, Corpus mensurabilis musicae 97/ix, Neuhausen, 1996. See also Nigel St. John Davison: *The Motets of Pierre de la Rue*, in *Musical Quarterly* 48 (1962), pp. 16–35; On the Salve settings by La Rue see Martin Just: *Das Salve regina-Repertoire von Pierre de la Rue in den Handschriften Brussel, Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, Ms. 9126 und München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Musiksammlung, Musica Ms. 34*, in *The Burgundian-Habsburg Court Complex of Music Manuscripts (1500–1535) and the workshop of Petrus Alamire: Colloquium Proceedings, Leuven, 25–28 November 1999*, Yearbook of the Alamire Foundation, 5, Leuven-Neerpelt, 2003, pp. 337–348.

10 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département de la Musique. Fonds du Conservatoire. MS Rés. 1591.

1 I thank Jaap van Benthem and David Fallows for their valuable comments on this article. See also the following commentary on this article by David Fallows.

2 For an overview of the polyphonic *Salve* see Sonja Ingram Stafford: *The Polyphonic Salve Regina 1425–1550*, Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina, 1973.

3 Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Musiksammlung, Musica MS 34. All abbreviations used in this article are based on *Census-Catalogue of Manuscript Sources of Polyphonic Music, 1400–1550*, 5 vols., ed. by Charles Hamm and Herbert Kellman, Renaissance Manuscript Studies 1, Neuhausen-Stuttgart, 1979–1988.

4 Regensburg. Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek, MS C 98.

David Fallows

Nine breves of Du Fay or Binchois

In Pierre de la Rue's *Salve regina* »Par le regard« (Salve regina no. 4 in Nigel Davison's edition) the final polyphonic section, to the words »O pia«, has as its Tenor just the first nine breves of the Tenor of the polyphonic song *Je ne vis oncques la pareille* put up a fifth and presented in augmentation¹. Exactly the same happens in Brumel's puzzling song *Jamés que la*, though Brumel then presents the melody in retrograde. The same passage appears at its original pitch followed by a diminution in the first Kyrie of Obrecht's first *Missa Plurimorum carminum*. In addition, mm. 1–9 of the Discantus are used, also up a fifth, at the start of Ghiselin's *Salve regina*—which, like La Rue's *Salve regina* »Par le regard«, is known only from the Munich choirbook Mus. ms. 34.

To take just mm. 1–9 for a cantus firmus is totally uncharacteristic of musical borrowing in those years. Earlier sections of La Rue's *Salve regina* »Par le regard« use the entire Discantus of *Par le regard* and *Je ne vis oncques*, also up a fifth. Even Obrecht's two *Plurimorum carminum* masses regularly take entire lines from polyphonic songs except in two cases where he uses just one complete section of a virelai. But this passage from *Je ne vis oncques* does not even take us through to the mid-point cadence of the song: it is an irrational subsection, except in that it at least ends on the »final« of the song.

That four composers quite exceptionally chose this passage cannot be a coincidence. But which could be first? Not Obrecht, surely, because he could so easily have used the entire tenor voice, which would match his procedure elsewhere in his *Missa Plurimorum carminum I* and would give the first Kyrie a comfortable length; besides, that this is the only section in his entire mass to be in *tempus perfectum* rather suggests that he is consciously alluding to something specific—not just the tenor of the song,

but some other use of that tenor. Not Brumel either, because following this passage with a retrograde is surely an attempt at outsmarting the others. But also not Pierre de la Rue, because finishing up with that little fragment in augmented note-values after two complete chanson lines is entirely foreign to the logic of the piece up to that point. So, unless there is a relevant setting that is lost, we must conclude by elimination that the Ghiselin piece is the earliest².

Here is that passage of the setting by Johannes Ghiselin-Verbonnet, presented in the transcription by Jacobijn Kiel who kindly made it available (see example 1)³. Above the notes of the second voice she has put crosses to denote pitches taken from the *Salve regina* chant. And that more or less proves why Ghiselin chose that portion of that melody. The asterisks over the top voice acknowledge that the Discantus of *Je ne vis oncques* is taken over without change, albeit transposed up a fifth.

Like many other composers of the time, Ghiselin set the *Salve regina* alternatim, with chant for sections 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9, using polyphony only for sections 2, 4, 6 and 8. So his opening polyphonic section is for only the words »Vita dulcedo, et spes nostra, salve«⁴. Most of the chant for those words fits perfectly to the first nine bars of the Discantus of *Je ne vis oncques*. At the beginning of m. 5 Ghiselin needed to add the extra *a'* to the chant in order to avoid parallel fifths with the borrowed Discantus and in m. 8 he needed to rewrite the chant entirely.

1 Pierre de la Rue: *Collected Works Vol. IX: The Motets*, ed. by Nigel St. John Davison, *Corpus mensurabilis musicae* 97/ix, Neuhausen, 1996, pp. 149–156 at 154–156.

2 It is published in *Johannes Ghiselin-Verbonnet: Opera omnia*, ed. by Clytus Gottwald, *Corpus mensurabilis musicae* 23, American Institute of Musicology, 1961–1968, vol. 1, pp. 17–20.

3 It will be obvious to readers that I owe much here to Jacobijn Kiel's article as well as to her complete transcription of the Munich manuscript.

4 A survey of the entire repertory of early *Salve regina* settings is in Sonja Stafford Ingram: *The Polyphonic Salve Regina*, PhD. dissertation, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1973.

Wolfgang Fuhrmann

Who composed Pierre de la Rue's psalm-motets?

Three settings of psalm texts (discounting contrafacta) are ascribed to Pierre de la Rue in sixteenth-century sources: *Domini est terra*, *Lauda anima mea Dominum* and *Laudate Dominum omnes gentes*. Of these, *Domini est terra* was considered as *opus dubium* in Nigel St. John Davison's standard edition of La Rue's motets, while the other two were included in the authentic canon, albeit not without strong reservations¹. In the following, I will argue that none of them is likely to have been composed by La Rue (of course, I can't answer the question in my title, which is a homage to a famous paper in Haydn research)². If this reasoning is valid, the authenticity problem leads to two more general conclusions, one of them considering La Rue's posthumous fame, the other the status of the psalm-motet at the Habsburg courts around 1500.

At the outset the source situation must be discussed very briefly. *Domini est terra* is transmitted only in an incomplete set of part books once in Königsberg, which are now (it seems) destroyed save the Bassus. This was a manuscript of sacred music originally compiled by a certain Matthias Krüger between 1537 and 1544, later acquired by Albrecht, duke of Prussia, around 1564³. *Lauda anima mea* was

printed under La Rue's name in Montanus & Neuber's *Tomus tertius Psalmorum selectorum*, Nuremberg 1553. It is also transmitted anonymously in the Utrecht partbook from the private library of Peter Hecht, a fragment of a manuscript prepared 1549 or 1550 by Jodocus Schalreuter (1486–1550), possibly at Wittenberg⁴. Finally, *Laudate Dominum* was copied into a manuscript—now in Kassel—prepared for Count Philipp I of Hessen by his court composer Johannes Heugel between 1534 through 1550 (internal dates reach from October 1534 to January 1536)⁵.

A strangely homogeneous picture emerges: All sources of psalm-motets ascribed to La Rue were prepared two or three decades after his death, in German sources far away from the places he lived and composed. More specifically, all sources are associated with centers of the early Lutheran reformation. Both Albrecht of Prussia and Philipp of Hessen were leaders of the protestant cause.

If this were a paper on Josquin's motets, such a source constellation would instantly ring all alarm bells. There is a long-standing consensus in Josquin scholarship that Josquin's so-called »late« psalm-motets, first transmitted under his name in German

1 Pierre de la Rue: *Collected Works Vol. IX: The Motets*, ed. by Nigel St. John Davison, *Corpus mensurabilis musicae* 97/ix, Neuhausen, 1996. *Lauda anima mea* and *Laudate Dominum* are edited as nr. 7 and 8 on pp. 48–57 and 58–63, respectively, while *Domini est terra* is banned to the dubious works as nr. D2 on pp. 208–213. My following remarks on the sources are very much indebted to Davison's fundamental work. I am also indebted to several commentators at the London panel, especially Jeffrey Dean. A special thank is due to Honey Meconi, who read and commented on the paper in advance.

2 Alan Tyson, Howard Chandler Robbins Landon: *Who Composed Haydn's Op. 3?*, in *The Musical Times* 105 (1964), pp. 506–508.

3 Königsberg, Staats und Universitätsbibliothek, MS 1740, no. 48: three part-books (Vagans, Tenor, Bassus) out of five (Tenor, fol. 138–140; Bassus, fol. 125–127). The source was, to the best of our knowledge, destroyed in World War II except for the Bassus part book, which

had been transferred to the Staatliches Archivlager in Göttingen. It is now preserved in Berlin, Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Mus. MS. 7, while the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Preußischer Kulturbesitz stores microfilm copies of the two other part books. The only in-depth study of the manuscript remains Eckhard Loge: *Eine Messen- und Motettenhandschrift des Kantors Matthias Krüger aus der Musikbibliothek Herzog Albrechts von Preussen*, Kassel, 1931 (*Königsberger Studien zur Musikwissenschaft* 12).

4 Utrecht, MS s. s. no. 55, Private library of Peter Hecht, fol. 33–33^v. I am indebted to Eric Jas for providing me with a copy of the manuscript. See also Willem Elders: *Ein handschriftlicher »Liber Psalmorum« aus der deutschen Überlieferung, in Formen und Probleme der Überlieferung mehrstimmiger Musik im Zeitalter Josquins Desprez*, München, 1981 (*Wolfenbütteler Forschungen* 6), pp. 47–69.

5 Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel und Landesbibliothek, Ms. 4^o Mus. 24/1–4 Item 80 (four of five partbooks).