
Title: Influences on Josquin

Author(s): David Fallows

Source: *Autorität und Autoritäten in musikalischer Theorie, Komposition und Aufführung*, ed. by Laurenz Lütteken & Nicole Schwindt; Kassel, Bärenreiter-Verlag 2004, (troja. Jahrbuch für Renaissancemusik 3), p. 67–80.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25371/troja.v20033000>

Creative Commons license: CC BY-SA



Vorliegende Publikation wird unter obengenannter CC-Lizenz durch musiconn.publish im Open Access bereitgestellt.

musiconn.publish dient der kostenfreien elektronischen Publikation, dem Nachweis und der langfristigen Archivierung von musikwissenschaftlicher Fachliteratur. Auch Arbeiten aus der Musikpädagogik und der Künstlerischen Forschung mit Musikbezug sind willkommen. Außerdem bietet musiconn.publish die Möglichkeit zur digitalen Publikation von wissenschaftlichen Noteneditionen.

musiconn.publish ist ein Service des Fachinformationsdienstes Musikwissenschaft (musiconn – für vernetzte Musikwissenschaft), der von der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft gefördert und gemeinschaftlich von der Sächsischen Landesbibliothek – Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden und der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München betrieben wird.

Weitere Informationen zu musiconn.publish finden Sie hier: <https://musiconn.qucosa.de/>

Eine Übersicht zu allen Services von musiconn finden Sie hier: <https://www.musiconn.de/>

David Fallows

Influences on Josquin

Five hundred years ago Ottaviano Petrucci published a book with the simple title *Misse Josquin*. That may be the first such statement of *auctoritas* in music. Earlier monographic volumes were devoted to the work of Guillaume de Machaut and Adam de la Halle, for example, but these were part of a literary tradition, containing primarily poetry: there are many manuscript books devoted to the work of a single poet or literary figure, reaching back hundreds of years before Petrucci's *Misse Josquin*. But there is almost no evidence of such books in music before September 1502.

One could say the same about the history of ascriptions in music. Before about 1400 any such ascriptions in the musical sources are again within a literary tradition – for example in the troubadour and trouvère manuscripts – and may in most cases actually concern the poet rather than the composer. Then in the first decade of the fifteenth century there are quite suddenly a lot of manuscripts of polyphony that give the composers' names: the Chantilly Codex (F-CH, MS 564), the main Trecento manuscripts, the Mancini Codex (I-La, MS 184), and so on.

So the very habit of musical ascription was only about a hundred years old when Petrucci published that book devoted for the first time to the work of a single composer. And it is easy to go on from there and agree that there was a good reason why Petrucci featured a single composer: like so many music publishers after him he knew that one of the easiest ways of selling a book was to sell the author, to sell, in fact, by *auctoritas*. The rest was perhaps inevitable: *Misse Josquin* was such a success that Petrucci had to reprint it no fewer than five times;¹ soon those five masses had been produced in infinitely more copies than any other polyphony before then, and indeed more than any until Jacques Arcadelt's first book of four-voice madrigals in 1538. Moreover, Petrucci's *Misse Josquin* played a key role in making Josquin the most revered composer throughout the sixteenth century, the very personification of *auctoritas* in music.

1 Jeremy Noble, »Ottaviano Petrucci: his Josquin Editions and Some Others«, *Essays Presented to Myron P. Gilmore*, ed. Sergio Bertelli and Gloria Ramakus (Florence, 1978), pp. 433–45; Stanley Boorman, »Petrucci at Fossombrone: Some New Editions and Cancels«, *Source Materials and the Interpretation of Music: A Memorial Volume to Thurston Dart*, ed. Ian Bent (London, 1981), pp. 129–53.

That is the historical backdrop to my main discussion, which concerns the other side of the coin, namely the ways in which that same Josquin himself reacted to *auctoritas*, in other words, what older music he drew on and how he drew on it.

To outline the scope of the question, the appendix to this article lists compositions ascribed to Josquin that draw on other materials. The only category of materials not listed is church chant, simply because it is there throughout Josquin's music and had been in much polyphony since the eleventh century. Chant had of course the most complete *auctoritas* of all music: it was as authoritative as the bible; it was devoutly believed to have been communicated to Pope Gregory the Great by the Holy Ghost, in the form of a dove singing in his ear. Presumably God was the composer, the ultimate *auctoritas*.² But in all borrowings, whether of polyphony or monophony, a major problem here is that many »Josquin« works are of dubious authorship; I have tried to be clear on their current status as I see it. Another is that it is often hard to be certain which way a particular kind of influence went; and we shall need to return to that question.

Only one clear point emerges from this listing. Johannes Ockeghem appears more often than any other composer; and that is perhaps inevitable, particularly since Josquin's lament »Nymphes des bois« appears to imply that Josquin was not only a favoured pupil but the most famous. (I use the word »pupil« in the very broadest sense, for there is no clear evidence of any such relationship between the two composers, however plausible the suggestion may seem.) For the rest, there is little to see: Binchois once, perhaps twice, Guillaume Dufay perhaps once, Hayne van Ghizeghem with five different settings of his most successful song, »De tous biens plaine«, though perhaps not all of them are by Josquin. Otherwise, nobody appears more than once apart from Josquin's apparent contemporary Jean Mouton, but both his appearances in the list are unclear: there is room for dispute as to whether (as I believe) Josquin's »Dulces exuviae« is based on the setting by Mouton; and it is not at all certain that there is any direct relationship between the »Le villain« settings of the two composers. That is to say that the appendix is – at least to me – remarkably lacking in clear pointers. I present it nevertheless, in case others can see patterns. There is no trace here of the name that will be important for the latter part of this paper, that of Jacob Obrecht.

2 I owe to Jesse Rodin (Harvard University) the observation that Josquin incorporated passages from plainsong Credo I into Credo settings ostensibly based on other material more consistently than any other composer of the time except Marbriano de Orto – with whom Josquin is united in many other ways.

Perhaps a better way to start exploring Josquin and *auctoritas* is with a naive question about which composers are likely to have influenced his earliest work. First among those of the older generation must inevitably be Dufay, quite simply because he was the greatest musical figure of the age. I have recently suggested elsewhere that Josquin went to Cambrai as a young man, in the early 1470s, and that the »Des Pres« mentioned in the Cambrai motet »Omnium bonorum plena« by Loyset Compère may indeed be Josquin.³ Now the only traces of Dufay normally discussed in Josquin are the slight similarities between what seems to be Josquin's earliest Mass, *L'ami Baudichon*, and Dufay's Mass *Se la face ay pale*. But Dufay's Mass must have been at least a quarter century old when Josquin wrote his; and the piece much more likely to have fuelled Josquin's imagination is the first of the six anonymous *L'homme armé* Masses in the Naples manuscript (I-Nn, MS VI.E.40), now known to have been copied in the very late 1460s, therefore shortly before the likely date of Josquin's *L'ami Baudichon* Mass.⁴

On the other hand there may be one case that has been overlooked, namely Josquin's motet »Alma Redemptoris mater / Ave regina caelorum«. Generally this has been cited as a clear allusion to Ockeghem, because there is an absolute identity between the unaccompanied opening of the Tenor line in Ockeghem's »Alma Redemptoris mater« and the Superius in the two-voice opening of Josquin's motet.⁵ Three points need to be stressed, however. First, the similarities are to some extent fuelled by their both being based on the same chant, which has a very distinctive opening melody. Second, the similarities reach no further than the seventh note, the first bar; while the allusion may have been intentional, there is nothing else to support it and there is no deeper trace of Ockeghem in this motet. Third, Josquin has not picked up on the most original feature of Ockeghem's piece, namely that the paraphrase of the chant is in the second voice down, which thereby becomes the Tenor, with two voices in ranges below that, so strictly both a Bassus and a Sub-bassus. So Josquin, despite a bar in common, has not followed Ockeghem's texture; and he has nothing in common with Ockeghem's formal design.

For this, it would seem that Josquin indeed went to Dufay. As concerns texture, chant treatment, and formal layout, the closest predecessor is Dufay's late four-voice »Ave regina caelorum«. Josquin has precisely the same voice-ranges as Dufay (and quite different from those of Ockeghem); he opens with

3 David Fallows, »Josquin and Trent 91: Thoughts on *Omnium bonorum plena* and his Activities in the 1470s«, forthcoming in a volume edited by Marco Gozzi and Danilo Curti-Feininger.

4 This, too, is discussed in Fallows, Josquin and Trent 91 (*ibid.*).

5 As for example in Helmuth Osthoff, *Josquin Desprez*, vol. 1 (Tutzing, 1962), p. 8.

the same broad gesture, a duo for the Superius and Contra followed by a duo of the same length for Tenor and Bassus treating the same material (but, in Josquin's cases, including an inversion of the counterpoint), leading to the first appearance of all four voices together. In its outward form, and indeed in its contrapuntal transparency, Josquin's »Alma Redemptoris mater / Ave regina caelorum« owes enormously more to Dufay than to Ockeghem.

The nature of Josquin's debt to Ockeghem is quite different. It is easy to make the case for his influence on Josquin, as well as for Josquin treating him as *auctoritas*. The prime witness is obviously Josquin's lament for Ockeghem, »Nymphes des bois«. This is astonishingly unlike any other known work of Josquin and could be read as a brilliant exercise in blending the techniques of Ockeghem with his own style in the late 1490s.⁶ That the poem – by Jean Molinet – puts Josquin's name first among the list of musicians who will mourn their »bon père« is as clear a statement of debt and, I take it, of *auctoritas* as one could hope to find. Other elements of that debt have been mentioned many times: the way »Adieu mes amours« draws directly on a tradition of combinative chansons established by Ockeghem with his own »Petite camusette«; the way Josquin's »Petite camusette« reflects techniques found in Ockeghem's much earlier setting; the way the Superius of »D'ung aultre amer« is built into Josquin's »Victimae paschali laudes«. These are enough to make a clear case. So it is less important that scholars have now been expressing some doubt about whether Josquin is really the composer of the Mass *D'ung aultre amer* and the two works that Albert Smijers printed alongside it. Nor does it matter so much whether Josquin composed any of the three »Fors seulement« settings ascribed to him, or even the unasccribed »Fors seulement« setting that many of us are convinced is indeed by Josquin.⁷

»Fors seulement« raises another question, namely the difference between the *auctoritas* of a composer and the *auctoritas* of a piece. Famously, Ockeghem's »Fors seulement« provided the materials for twenty-six later settings plus the

6 Jaap van Benthem now believes that »Nymphes des bois« was composed some years after Ockeghem's death in 1497; see Jaap van Benthem, »La magie des cris trenchantz: Comment le vray trésorier de musique échappe à la trappe du très terrible satrappe«, *Théorie et analyse musicales, 1450–1650: Actes du colloque international Louvain-la-Neuve ... 1999*. Musicologica neolovaniensia, Studia 9, ed. Anne-Emanuelle Ceulemans and Bonnie J. Blackburn (Louvain-la-Neuve, 2001), pp. 119–47.

7 This is the one in the manuscript D–As, 2^o Cod. 142a, fols. 40^v–42^r. The best available edition is in *Fors seulement: Thirty Compositions for Three to Five Voices or Instruments from the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*. Recent Researches in the Music of the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance 14, ed. Martin Picker (Madison, 1981), no. 22, pp. 76–9. The case for this as a composition of Josquin was made by Martin Staehelin, Martin Picker, Louise Litterick, and Joshua Rifkin.

Mass of Obrecht. Plainly this case is very different from the ones mentioned earlier. Perhaps the tradition stems partly from Ockeghem's eminence, his position as a figure of authority. Certainly it stems partly from the bizarre nature of the song's music: this is one of the most unusual and distinctive songs of its generation, with its Superius and Tenor seeming almost interchangeable at certain points, and with the Bassus covering an enormous range and running down well below the other voices. But it must also be a matter of individual emulation, of one composer noting that several others have composed settings of »Fors seulement« and wishing to add to the tradition. It is easy to agree on that much, but it is almost impossible to quantify the proportion with which those various components, and others, contributed to the growth of that tradition.

In the case of the largest tradition of all in those years, namely the settings of »De tous biens plaine«, it would be very hard to argue that the original chanson is either distinctive or especially fine, merely that it soon turned out to have a Tenor that worked very well for brief abstract pieces. More than that, though, it was a Tenor that did not work at all well for Mass cycles. The very few attempts at Masses on »De tous biens plaine« all seem to have been stillborn.

»L'homme armé« shows the opposite situation. Composers recognized that this symmetrically formed melody was perfect for large-scale designs and particularly for Mass cycles. Shorter settings are not only very few in number but musically disappointing pieces.

The difference between the situations of »De tous biens plaine« and »L'homme armé« is important because both traditions appear to arise from elements of musical convenience and from elements of emulation. That is to say that in considering the widest application of musical intertextuality – the myriad ways in which one piece of music can allude to another – it is good to see different subcategories but also to remain aware that any particular pair of pieces can sit in several different subcategories at the same time.

Even more intriguing are the cases of the Mass cycles based on the chansons »Malheur me bat« and »Fortuna desperata«. These are among Josquin's most impressive Masses, in some ways the most technically ambitious of all his works. Both Masses use all three voices of the three-voice song on which they are based and, more surprisingly, do so in much the same way: they take the Tenor as the Tenor in the Kyrie and Gloria; Superius as the Superius in the Credo; Contra as Contra in the Sanctus. Both Masses break new ground in using the Contratenor of the original song as the cantus firmus in the Sanctus.⁸ Both include several

8 The same does happen in the anonymous Mass *Ma bouche rit*, known uniquely from A-Wn, MS 11883, fols. 285^v-94^r.

quotes from all three voices of the original song at the beginnings of movements. Both, bizarrely, use the same melodic material to open the section »Et incarnatus est« (ex. 1). So the two Masses belong together in many ways, most of them apparently conscious. And I think it is possible to show that the Mass *Malheur me bat* must be the later of the two.⁹

Example 1a: Josquin, *M. Fortuna desperata*, »Et incarnatus est«

Example 1b: Josquin, *M. Malheur me bat*, »Et incarnatus est«

Intriguingly the polyphonic songs on which they are based are both almost certainly by composers of no other known music. The song »Malheur me bat« does appear twice with ascriptions to Ockeghem, and twice with ascriptions to Johannes Martini, but all who have studied it now agree that by far the most likely composer is the one given only in the chansonnier of the Biblioteca Casanatense in Rome, namely »Malcort«. As so often, there is a very good case for thinking that the piece is by the most obscure of the composers named, Malcort.¹⁰

9 I have outlined my reasons for thinking this in David Fallows, »Approaching a New Chronology for Josquin: An Interim Report,« *Schweizer Jahrbuch für Musikwissenschaft* N. F. 19 (1999), pp. 131–50.

10 Barbara Haggh has identified two possible candidates for the composer of this song. An Abertijn Malcourt, active as a singer, music copyist and choirmaster at the church of Ste Gudule

A roughly similar situation obtains with the composer of the song »Fortuna desperata«. Like »Malheur me bat«, it survives in a large number of sources (in fact 29), of which until recently it was thought that just one had an ascription: the Segovia Cathedral choirbook (E–SE) credits the song to Antoine Busnoys.¹¹ People have long been inclined to doubt ascriptions in Segovia if they were not supported elsewhere; and it was in any case obvious that the song has nothing in common with any other known work of Busnoys. But it was only a few years ago that Joshua Rifkin noticed that we do indeed have another ascription for this piece, namely in the Cappella Giulia chansonnier (I–Rvat, C.G.XIII.27) copied in the early 1490s in Florence. This clearly credits the song to »Felice«. Fortunately we have a little documentation about Felice, owing to the researches of the indefatigable Frank d’Accone, who found a certain Felice di Giovanni Martini as a singer at Florence Cathedral from 1469 to 1478, when he may have died.¹²

It may be just a bizarre coincidence that these two matching Masses, among the greatest Josquin composed, are both based on chansons by composers of such complete obscurity. And it is certainly true that Josquin chose two of the most successful songs of their generation; that is, we could well be dealing with the *auctoritas* of the song, not the composer. It is possible that Josquin neither knew nor cared who composed these two songs: both survive in a large number of anonymous copies. But if it is true that Josquin went out of his way to explore songs by obscure composers, there may at last be a pattern here.

There may on the other hand be an entirely different pattern. One of the classic intractable problems in music around 1500 concerns the relationship

in Brussels from 1474, retired in 1513 and reported as dead on 9 December 1519. And a Hendrick Malecourt reported as a tenor at the Guild of our Lady in Bergen-op-Zoom from 1480 to 1497. See Barbara Hagg, »Crispijne and Abertijne: Two Tenors at the Church of St Niklaas, Brussels«, *Music & Letters* 76 (1995), pp. 325–44.

- 11 The case of Busnoys as an influence on Josquin must await another occasion. I have elsewhere remarked on how the third Agnus Dei of Josquin’s Mass *L’homme armé sexti toni* alludes to Busnoys; and there have been many comments about Josquin’s indebtedness to Busnoys. But the more direct line of influence from Busnoys actually leads to Obrecht – a matter perhaps stated clearly for the first time in Edgar H. Sparks, *Cantus Firmus in Mass and Motet 1420–1520* (Berkeley, 1963, Reprint New York, 1975), p. 238, and more fully explored in Rob C. Wegman, *Born for the Muses: The Life and Masses of Jacob Obrecht* (Oxford, 1994).
- 12 Joshua Rifkin, »Busnoys and Italy: The Evidence of Two Songs«, *Antoine Busnoys: Method, Meaning, and Context in Late Medieval Music*, ed. Paula Higgins (Oxford, 1999), pp. 505–71. It should be stated clearly that Rifkin’s view is by no means universally accepted, see in particular the extended statements by Honey Meconi, »Poliziano, *Primavera*, and Perugia 431: New Light on *Fortuna desperata*«, *ibid.*, pp. 465–503, and *Fortuna desperata: Thirty-Six Settings of an Italian Song*. Recent Researches in the Music of the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance 37, ed. Honey Meconi (Middleton 2001). My statement above makes my own position clear.

between Josquin's Mass *Fortuna desperata* and that of Obrecht. There is an undeniable intertextuality between Obrecht's »Osanna« and Josquin's final »Agnus Dei«. Reinhard Strohm was perhaps the first writer to suggest that Obrecht came first;¹³ before that, writers from Otto Gombosi to Helmuth Osthoff and Barton Hudson had been inclined to believe that Josquin could never have borrowed from a lesser composer. With the more recent views on the dates both of Josquin's life and of his music, it begins to seem as though he was a composer who continued to borrow ideas from others throughout his life. It is emphatically my own view that Strohm was right and that any attempt to describe the difference between the two versions can work only if Obrecht is considered the model. Again, I am not going to argue the case here, partly because another researcher is currently at work on it and partly because I wish to move on to a few more details about the *Fortuna desperata* Masses of Josquin and Obrecht.

Example 2a: Josquin, *M. Fortuna desperata*, »Sanctus«

Example 2b: Jacob Obrecht, *M. Fortuna desperata*, »Agnus I«

The first is just to point out that there is at least one other respect in which the two Masses share material. It is most easily seen in the opening of Josquin's »Sanctus«, where the Superius has a simple turning figure that then serves as an ostinato throughout the »Sanctus« section on two different pitches, F and C (ex. 2a). The origin of this is in fact in the first »Agnus Dei« of Obrecht's Mass

13 Reinhard Strohm, *The Rise of European Music 1380–1500* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 620–33.

(ex. 2b), where the Altus has an ostinato figure, slightly longer and always on F, but again carrying throughout the movement. There is another difference in Obrecht's ostinato figure, which is that it has appeared in all the earlier movements, often in particularly visible passages at the beginnings of sections, so its use in the first »Agnus« is a culmination of something fed in from the first. Josquin uses it just the once and – if you accept my view that Josquin's Mass is later than Obrecht's – he prefers to keep it to just that one movement. The second point to make is that in most external respects the two Masses are astonishingly different, a matter that has always made the question of the relationship between the two hard to see clearly. It is almost as though Josquin had answered the astonishing fluency of Obrecht by working for the simplest means, the sparsest textures. As Osthoff noted, Josquin's Mass is only 824 bars long as against the 1117 bars of Obrecht's.¹⁴

These matters all become intriguing when seen in the context of Josquin's *Malheur me bat* Mass, because once again there is a Mass by Obrecht on the same song. What first drew my own attention to this Mass in the context of Obrecht is that this is the only known case of Josquin using a segmented cantus firmus of the kind so often used by Obrecht.¹⁵ Just as Obrecht does in his Mass, Josquin divides the Superius and the Tenor of the song into totally irrational sections, which are then repeated or otherwise transformed. There is another detail that is not found elsewhere in Josquin, namely the Tenor treatment in the first »Agnus Dei«, in which all note values less than a semibrevis are ignored and omitted; again it is a technique much favoured by Obrecht. With those two details taken on board, there is another detail that strikes the ear, namely the second »Agnus Dei«, an astonishing duet in canon at the 2nd. Here Josquin makes use of sequential repetition more than anywhere else in his known work. One figure of a rising fourth and a fall of a step appears six times in each voice, and it is followed by a series of falling thirds that seems never to end. It is almost as though he were offering a parody of Obrecht: certainly it seems very hard to listen to these grotesquely overextended sequences without smiling. The two Masses also have musical sounds in common that I cannot yet put my finger on, though there are two that are presented here.

¹⁴ Osthoff, *Josquin Desprez* (cf. fn. 5), pp. 147–8.

¹⁵ The classic statement on segmented cantus firmus is in Sparks, *Cantus Firmus* (cf. fn. 11), pp. 259–68.

S
T
A
B

Qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta

Example 3a: Jacob Obrecht, *M. Malheur me bat*, »Qui tollis«

S
T
A
B

Qui tol - lis pec - ca - ta mun - di

Example 3b: Josquin, *M. Malheur me bat*, »Qui tollis«

The first (ex. 3), at the beginning of the second section of the »Gloria«, with the words »Qui tollis peccata mundi«, is really just a matter of textural spacing, though the sounds are remarkably similar. The second, in the »Credo« at the words »Et homo factus est« (ex. 4), is intriguing in that for exactly half the chords Josquin uses a different chord; but again the sound seems related. Both could easily be coincidences were it not for: (a) the other Obrecht-related details already mentioned in Josquin's *Malheur me bat* Mass, (b) the demonstrable links between Josquin's *Malheur* and *Fortuna* Masses, and (c) the demonstrable links between the *Fortuna* Masses of Josquin and Obrecht. One further detail – which I first noticed in Wolfgang Schlüter's novel called *Dufays Requiem* (Berlin, 2001) – is that the two titles *Fortuna desperata* and *Malheur me bat* are both extremely surprising for Mass cycles. No further text survives for »Malheur me bat«, but the full poem of »Fortuna desperata« is full of contradictions to the Christian message. Neither gives any hint of the promise of a better world to come, which is surely the central message of most religions.

Now these various considerations obviously lead to the conclusion that if anybody took an interest in these two songs by otherwise unknown composers it was Obrecht, not Josquin. Beyond that, though, if we agree that in both works Josquin drew on Obrecht, it may be appropriate to describe Obrecht as a major figure of *auctoritas* for the mature Josquin.

a)

S
T
A
B

ho - - - - mo fac - - - - tus - - - - est - - - -

b)

S
T
A
B

Et ho - mo fac - tus est
y n y n y y n

Example 4a: Jacob Obrecht, *M. Malheur me bat*, »Et homo factus«, and 4b: Josquin, *M. Malheur me bat*, »Et homo factus«

APPENDIX

Borrowed materials in Josquin (excluding chant)

(Note: All works are preceded by their number in the New Josquin Edition; in the case of those already published in the NJE, a single prefixed star denotes that the editor considers their authorship doubtful and two prefixed stars that the editor thinks it impossible that the work is by Josquin des Prez. Those not yet published in the NJE (and therefore without accepted judgment on their status) have their numbers in square brackets. Items in vol. 28 (the secular works in four voices) have the stars allocated by me, as the editor of the completed but as yet unpublished volume, though it is not certain whether the Editorial Board will accept my views.)

Ach hülf mich Layd (Adam von Fulda)

NJE *28.2: Ach hülf mich Layd (accepted only by me so far): Adam's T is B

Allez regretz (Hayne van Ghizeghem)

NJE **7.1: Mass »Jo de pratis« in Jena U 21 (almost certainly by Johannes de Stokem): Hayne's ST are ST

NJE **7.2: Mass (almost certainly by Compère): Hayne's T is T

A une dame (Busnoys)

NJE [20.7]: Missus est Gabriel angelus, 5vv (perhaps by Mouton): Busnoys' T is T

Comme femme desconfortee (Binchois)

NJE [27.8]: Stabat mater, 5vv: Binchois' T is T

De tous biens plaine (Hayne van Ghizeghem)

NJE 13.2: Credo De tous biens: Hayne's T is T

NJE [22.6]: Victime paschali laudes: Hayne's S is S

NJE [20.12]: Scimus quoniam (Annaberg 1126¹⁶): Hayne's S is S

NJE 27.6: 3vv song; Hayne's S with two voices in canon

NJE 28.9: 4vv song; Hayne's ST with two voices in canon

Dulces exuviae (Mouton)

NJE 28.11: Dulces exuviae: Mouton's S is S

D'ung aultre amer (Ockeghem)

NJE 7.3: Mass D'ung aultre amer (problematic authorship): Ockeghem's T is T

NJE 13.10: Sanctus (*Fragmenta misarum*): Ockeghem's S is S

NJE [22.5]: Tu solus qui facis: opening of ST used

NJE [22.6]: Victimae paschali laudes: Ockeghem's S is S

16 See Helmuth Osthoff, *Josquin Desprez*, vol. 2 (Tutzing, 1965), p. 102–3.

Fors seulement l'attente (Ockeghem)

NJE *28.16: 4vv setting (probably by Ghiselin): Ockeghem's B up a 12th is S

NJE [30.4]: 6vv setting (only one voice survives): Ockeghem's T is T

Fortuna desperata (probably by Felice)

NJE 8.2: Mass Fortuna desperata: S A T are S A T

NJE *27.11: 3vv song: S T with new florid bassus

J'ay pris amours (anon.)

NJE [25.14, VII]: Christe fili Dei: S is A

Je ne vis oncques la pareille (Dufay or Binchois)

NJE [29.13]: L'amy e a tous, 5vv: T is T

La belle se siet (monophonic song)

NJE *13.3: Credo (probably by R. de Fevin): is T

NJE 27.20: setting, 3vv: melody paraphrased in all voices

L'ami Baudichon (monophonic song)

NJE [5.1]: Mass L'ami Baudichon: is T

Le villain (Mouton)

NJE 28.22: Le villain, 4vv (relationship unclear)

L'homme armé (monophonic song)

NJE [6.2]: Mass L'homme armé sexti toni: all voices

NJE [6.3]: Mass L'homme armé super voces musicales: is T

NJE *28.23: setting, 4vv: is T

Ma bouche rit (Ockeghem)

NJE [29.15]: 5/6vv song (doubted): Ockeghem's S is S

Mais que ce fust (Compère)

NJE [30.5]: J'ay bien cause, 6vv (doubted): Compère's S is S

Malheur me bat (?Malcort)

NJE 9.1: Mass Malheur me bat: S A T are S A T

Mater patris (Antoine Brumel)

NJE 10.1: Mass Mater Patris (sometimes doubted): paraphrase, with S A T in Agnus III

Mon seul plaisir (Ninot le Petit)

NJE **9.2: Mass in Leipzig Thomaskirche 51 (only two voices survive: rejected by NJE):
paraphrase

N'aray je jamais (Robert Morton)

NJE 9.3: Mass Di dadi (sometimes doubted): Morton's T is T, but B in Osanna and Agnus III

Petite camusette (monophonic song)

NJE [30.7]: Petite camusette, 6vv

Quem dicunt homines (Richafort)

NJE **12.3: Mass in MilA 46, fol. 1^v-11^r, »Josquin«, perhaps also by Richafort, rejected by NJE (unpublished)

Rosina wo war dein gestalt (anonymous)

NJE **9.4: Mass in Leipzig Thomaskirche 51 (rejected by NJE): T is T

Tout a par moy (Walter Frye or more probably the Agricola version)

NJE 8.1: Mass Faysant regretz: T is T, with S as S in Agnus III

Une musque de Biscaye (monophonic song)

NJE 28.35: Une musque, 4vv: is S

NJE [5.2]: Mass Une musque (sometimes doubted): is T