Concerning the Ontological Status of the Notated Musical Work in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries

Leeman L. Perkins

In her detailed and imaginative study of the concept of the musical work, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works* (1992), Lydia Goehr has made the claim that, prompted by "changes in aesthetic theory, society, and politics," eighteenth century musicians began "to think about music in new terms and to produce music in new ways," to conceive of their art, therefore, not just as music per se, but in terms of works. Although she allows that her view "might be judged controversial" (115), she asserts that only at the end of the 1700s did the concept of a work begin "to serve musical practice in its regulative capacity," and that musicians did "not think about music in terms of works" before 1800 (v). In making her argument, she pauses briefly to consider the Latin term for work, *opus*, as used by the theorist and pedagogue, Nicolaus Listenius, in his *Musica* of 1537. She acknowledges, in doing so, that scholars in the field of music—especially those working in the German tradition—have long regarded Listenius's opening chapter as an indication that, by the sixteenth century, musical compositions were regarded as works in much the same way as paintings, statuary, or literature. She cites, for example, the monographs devoted to the question of "musical works of art" by Walter Wiora (1983) and Wilhelm Seidel (1987). She concludes, however, that their arguments do not stand up to critical scrutiny.

There can be little doubt, surely, that the work-concept was the focus of a good deal of philosophical dispute and aesthetic inquiry in the course of the nineteenth century. This is evident alone from the writings of E.T.A. Hoffman, whom Goehr invokes in her opening pages. In the twentieth century it generated as well a good deal of unusually intense musicological discussion (see below). In the process, obviously, the notion of what can be considered a "work" of music has varied considerably.

Goehr seems ideally situated to deal with the issues that have thus been raised. She is competent, as I am not, to engage critically the modern analytic theories of philosophers such as Nelson Goodman and Jerrold Levinson, whose writings she has discussed in some detail. She is also able to examine the philosophical position of the prominent German musicologists who have studied the question.

At the same time, however, Goehr affirms her preference for an approach to the problem that is "rooted in history" (vi). While I am in no

Current Musicology, no. 75 (Spring 2003)
© 2003 by the Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York

position to challenge her primary argument concerning the work-concept on philosophical grounds, or to join in the broader discussion by German scholars of music whose reflections are so clearly rooted in the idealist philosophical thought of the nineteenth century, my understanding of the historical questions to which she refers suggests that some of the evidence most pertinent to her arguments could be construed quite differently, that a good deal more has been left aside—unavoidably, undoubtedly, given the nature and the scope of Goehr's inquiry—and that she has ultimately failed to place the Listenius treatise in its proper historical context.

In sharp contrast to Goehr, I would claim, primarily on historical grounds, that the concept of a musical work as an identifiable ontological entity began to take shape long before the 1800s; that, in fact, by the time Listenius was writing the basic concept was already clearly discernible, not only in theoretical treatises in Latin, but even in the vernacular vocabulary of the period. And although it may be stating the obvious, I would also suggest that the emergence of a work-concept was intimately linked from the outset with the development of a uniquely European historical phenomenon: an increasing reliance on musical notation for the study and performance of music.

I am aware of only one other scholar who has questioned Goehr's conclusions concerning the work-concept: Reinhard Strohm. Strohm sees her treatment of the pertinent history as both faulty and incomplete.[1] He objects that, "no coherent account has been given of [the concept's] relationship with previous eras or, indeed, of alternative concepts that might have survived parallel with it" (2000:136). And he goes on to point to what he sees as "the factual frailty of several of [the book's] historiographical arguments" (138).

In her response to this critique, Goehr concedes that Strohm is perhaps correct in saying that she did not get "all the history right," but she stoutly maintains her philosophical position, declaring that she "was careful to produce credible philosophical arguments that Strohm has not succeeded in undermining" (Goehr 2000:245). She also observes that, "critics of the 1800-thesis always seem to assume the 1800-concept even as they criticize it, perhaps . . . because they are describing the same concept" (246). It may also be, however, as Strohm observes, that fewer and fewer people now have "professional acquaintance" with music dating before 1800 and are consequently ill-prepared to test their ideas and hypotheses against the earlier repertory (Strohm 2000:141).

This ought not to be the case with respect to Heinz von Loesch, whose closely argued monograph concerning the work-concept in the theoretical treatises written in Protestant German-speaking circles in the sixteenth

and seventeenth centuries clearly defines a position very close to that taken by Goehr (Loesch 2001).[2] In a thorough-going critique of the German scholars who have posited a connection between Listenius and the modern work-concept,[3] he lends support to Goehr's position, arguing that their conclusions are based on a fundamental misperception (the *Missverständnis* of his title). His thesis, simply put, is that the work-concept of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was not at all what is currently understood by the term—and, in fact, did not exist.[4]

He contends, to the contrary, that the introduction of the terms that he views as critical—*Musica poetica* and *opus perfectum et absolutum*—were simply borrowed, as had been well established earlier,[5] from Aristotle's moral philosophy and, as had been suggested by Peter Cahn (1989:14ff.), from Quintilian's treatise on rhetoric, and transferred by Listenius to theoretical discourse about music. There, he claims, they were first redefined under the weight of older traditions and then progressively abandoned. He holds, therefore, that they could never have been, as had been suggested by the scholars he criticizes, either a terminological response to the emergence of a modern conception of music or its postulate.[6]

In order to be absolutely clear as to the modern concept to which these apparently deceptive (if pregnant) expressions could not possibly apply in his view of the matter, he identifies and defines what he regards as the constituent elements of the post-1800 construction of the work-concept: (a) polyphonic composition; (b) the treatment of consonance and simultaneous composition; (c) newness; (d) individuality or originality; (e) aesthetic autonomy; (f) unity and form; and (g) timelessness or enduring validity, none of which, as he attempts to demonstrate, were mentioned in connection with the two expressions in question either by Listenius or by any of the German theorists who followed in his wake.[7]

To these arguments it is possible to reply in a variety of ways. If, in the first place, writers on music theory adopted the terms *Musica poetica* and *opus perfectum et absolutum* and continued to use them for well over a century, it may well have been because they saw in them a useful reflection of perceived musical realities. And even though the locution, *Musica poetica,* fell from currency after (only) a couple of hundred years, this does not mean that the concept it was thought to represent disappeared at the same time. Indeed, Loesch himself demonstrates that it was simply replaced in technical discourse by other terms referring to musical creation (composition) (2001:63–73, passim).[8] As for the word *opus,* although it may have been used in certain contexts, as he observes, to mean—in addition to a notated composition—both a theoretical treatise and a printed collection of music (58–68, passim),[9] it was in the former sense that it was most frequently understood and used continuously from the sixteenth century to

the present, as we shall see.

As to the conditions posited by Loesch as necessarily embodied in the work-concept as it is construed at present, they raise at least two problems. It is not clear to me, to begin, that there is any consensus among either scholars or philosophers as to which of them must be considered truly indispensable. Most basic definitions of the term "work" are much more circumscribed. Michael Talbot, in his introduction to the essays that grew out of the symposium he organized under the evocative title, *The Musical Work: Reality or Invention?*, reported agreement among the participants that "a musical work, to merit the description, has to be discrete, reproducible, and attributable" (2000a:3). Goehr is a bit less succinct, albeit basically in agreement, when she posits as a given that works "are (a) created, (b) performed many times in different places, (c) not exhaustively captured or fixed in notational form, yet (d) intimately related to their performances and scores" (1992:3), and she attaches considerable significance to its repeatability and transportability. In neither case de we hear of such technical procedures as Loesch seems to insists must be present if a piece of music is to be described as a "work."

One could also demonstrate persuasively, I believe, that many compositions of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (to go, at this point, no further back in time than to repertories that Listenius might have known) do in fact meet all of Loesch's conditions. The polyphonic Masses of the period from Okeghem and Josquin to Palestrina and Lassus include many such compositions, and an argument could be made as well for pieces of much more modest dimensions, such as chansons, madrigals, and *Lieder*.[10]

The real question, then, simply put (if that is possible), is whether or not musical compositions were seen (and heard) as fixed identifiable artifacts that were both reproducible and transportable before the supposed "sea change" that has been fixed about 1800—that is, perceived in some sense as "works"—and if so, when that first began to be the case and what it might have meant to those who had a significant engagement with music, whether as theorists, composers, or performers.

Let us turn, then, to the relevant passage in Listenius, one of the most frequently cited and extensively glossed in all of the theoretical works of the sixteenth century. He opens with the declaration that, "Music is the science of singing correctly and well" (*Musica est rite ac bene candendi scientia*), which science, he declares, is threefold in nature: theoretical, practical, and poetic. Each of these parts he describes in turn, as follows:

Theorica est, quae in ingenii contemplatione ac rei cognitione tantum versatur, cuius finis est scire. Unde Theoricus Mucus, qui artem ipsam novit, verum hoc ipso contentus, nullum eis specimen agendo exhibet.

Theoretical [Music] is that which is concerned solely with the contemplation of [its] inherent qualities and the understanding of the subject. Its goal is to know. Hence the theoretical musician, who has learned this art, [is] truly content with this alone and presents no example of it in performance.

Practicae, quae non solum in ingenii penetralibus delitescit, sed in opus ipsum prodit, nullo tamen post actum relicto opere, cuius finis est agere. Unde Practicus Musicus, qui ultra artis cognitionem caeteros docet, in eaque se circa alicuius operis effectum exercet.

Practical [Music is that] which does not lose itself in the arcane mysteries of [musical] properties alone, but also results in a work, although no work remains after the performance. The goal of practical music is performance. Hence the Practical Musician [is one] who teaches others more than an understanding of the art [and] trains himself in it to be able to perform any given work.

Poetica, quae neque rei cognitione, necque solo exercitio contenta, sed aliquid post laborem relinquit operis, veluti cum a quopiam Musica[11] aut Musicum carmen conscribitur, cuius finis est opus consumatum et effectum. Consistit enim in faciendo sive fabricando, hoc est, in labore tali, qui post se etiam artifice mortuo opus perfectum & absolutum relinquat. Unde Poeticus Musicus, qui in negotio aliquid reliquendo versatur. Et habent hae duae posteriores sibi perpetuo coniunctam superiorem sed non e contra.[12]

Poetic [Music is that] which is not content with either an understanding of the subject or with practice alone, but rather leaves some work behind after an effort, as when music or a musical song is written by someone, the goal of which [music] is a complete and finished work. For it consists in making or constructing, that is in such labor that, even after the composer is dead, a complete and discrete work remains. Hence the Poet-Musician is one who is trained in his art to leave something behind. And the two others are always necessary to [*musica poetica*], but the opposite is not true.

If this passage has been given a good deal of attention since a facsimile of the treatise was published in 1927, it is perhaps in part because it seems a clear departure from the medieval classification of music as either *mundana, humana,* or *instrumentalis,* and, even more so because by placing *poiesis* at the top of the pyramid, it reverses so dramatically the Boethian hierarchy in which the performer and the poet are both regarded as much inferior to the *musicus,* "who possesses the faculty of judging, according to speculation or reason, appropriate and suitable to music," all relevant matters (Strunk 1998:142).

Goehr alludes, for example, to the traces of humanistic learning mentioned earlier in the obvious influence of Aristotelian thought in the conception of the treatise (1992:115–17). Loesch is more specific, stressing the humanistic enterprises that were flourishing in the 1520s at the University of Wittenberg, where Listenius studied under the direction of Melanchthon (2001:89–94). However, in many ways Listenius's little volume is quite unremarkable, and, as Goehr observes, the author was much indebted to his "intellectual ancestors" (1992:116)—as indeed the author of any such treatise must be. More importantly, neither author takes account as fully as I believe one must of the importance of the medieval traditions in which Listenius's treatise is so clearly rooted.

Despite the faintly humanistic aura of the initial chapter, the design of the work is essentially medieval in its conception and in its two-part design. Following the didactic sequence that had been followed for centuries in teaching music to choir boys, Listenius begins with the fundamentals of plainchant, introducing the practical tools that were used to interpret it: letter and hexachordal names for the degrees of the scale; the musical staff; the use of clef signs; solmisation and hexachordal mutation; and the modes. This is followed, in Part Two, by instruction in the use of mensural notation: note forms; rests; ligatures; the three levels of mensural organization (*modus, tempus,* and *prolatio*); the mensural signs indicating each of these; and the use of proportions to augment or diminish the durational values actually written.

This general outline, proceeding in two sections from chant through mensural notation, is to be seen in one treatise after another from the fourteenth century on[13] and was often adopted for those intended, as was that of Listenius, for the Latin schools of the period.[14] Such, for example, was the organization of related treatises such as the influential *Enchiridion Musices* of Nicolaus Wollick, first published in Paris in 1509 (and in several later editions); the *Elementorum Musices Practicae* of Claude Martin, published by du Chemin in 1550; and the vernacular treatise by Maximilien Guilliaud, *Rudiments de musique practique,* brought out by the same publisher in 1554.[15]

Listenius's plan for his *Musica* had been anticipated half a century earlier in the highly systematic (and much more extensive) theoretical writings of Johannes Tinctoris. The most obvious difference between the two is that Tinctoris devoted separate treatises to topics that were handled in lapidary fashion by Listenius in a single chapter. In addition, with his detailed treatise on counterpoint, Tinctoris went well beyond what Listenius was able to achieve; he capped the treatises meant for both theorist and performer with careful instruction for the aspiring composer. It is surely significant that by so doing he anticipated, in a sense, completion of the overall plan implied by Listenius's threefold division of music with what might be seen as a treatise on *Musica poetica*, as the latter defined it. Interestingly, Listenius had apparently intended to add something of the sort to his own modest publication (as he implies in Part 2, Chapter 2)—a third section devoted precisely to that subject. Unfortunately, if he did in fact follow through on that intention, no trace of it remains.

Admittedly, Listenius does not include Tinctoris among the few authorities he cites, but he does make reference repeatedly to Gafforius, whose *Practica musice* of 1496 relied heavily on Tinctoris's paradigmatic work.[16] There are significant parallels, moreover, in the basic distinction made by both Tinctoris and Listenius between (presumably polyphonic) music that is merely performed, leaving no "work" behind, and a composition that is notated. With Tinctoris it is the difference between *cantare super librum*, the polyphonic elaboration of notated chant melodies, and *res facta*, a composition for several parts or voices written in mensural notation. With Listenius, it is the distinction between the performance of a work that leaves nothing behind and an *opus perfectum & absolutum*. In either case it is the contrast between counterpoint that is done *mentaliter* and that which is *scripto* (to adopt Tinctoris's terms).[17]

That this was the meaning that Listenius had in mind is clear from his examples. Although he includes in his initial section pieces in mensural notation, (at that point not yet explained), he closes it with a series of psalm intonations written homophonically in four parts but using chant notation—"punctus contra punctum," so to speak—and contrapuntal formulae of the type that were undoubtedly to be employed when "singing on the book." By contrast, in the second part of his treatise, specifically entitled *De musica mensurali*, the examples—always fully written out in two or more parts—are all clearly intended to illustrate the intricacies of mensural notation that he attempts to explain.

In an admirable article that considers carefully Tinctoris's use of the terms most clearly relevant to the present discussion, Margaret Bent has concluded that, "*resfacta* is composition, usually but not necessarily written, a completed piece resulting from application of, and choices [among],

the rules of counterpoint" (1983:371–91). Although I concur with her observations and conclusions generally, I do take exception to the suggestion that *res facta* was "not necessarily written." Like other scholars who have examined the question, I have come to the conclusion that *res facta* was understood to designate only a "polyphonic work, fully elaborated in all of its parts, and fixed in writing" (i.e. notated), to quote the admirably concise formulation of Markus Bandur.[18]

I also believe that by the time Tinctoris was writing, this essential dichotomy was widely understood. If, as has been suggested repeatedly—and as I am inclined to believe—*res facta* is Tinctoris's Latin translation of the vernacular term, *chose faite*[19], it is possible to conclude that even in common parlance and in layers of the social fabric where learned Latin treatises on music were not necessarily known, the written composition, whether sacred or secular, had assumed a special status—and a verbal expression—that distinguished it from other known forms of musical expression, such as plainchant and extemporized polyphony.

Even though the terms in question apparently did not achieve wide currency in treatises on music, either in Latin or in French, their meaning is confirmed by their use in the other treatises mentioned earlier. Nicolaus Wollick, for example, equates *res facta* with "figural," that is notated (and generally polyphonic) music: *musica figurativa, que et rerum factarum dicitur.* Claude Martin and Maximilien Guilliaud, both of whom follow Listenius in the bi-partite organization of their treatise, make the same distinction, but in the vernacular: to quote Guilliaud, "Music is of two kinds, that is simple, also called plain chant . . . and figural, that is commonly called 'chose faite.'"[20]

I would argue, further, that once a musical composition (a *cantus compositus* in Tinctoris's vocabulary) has been given notated form, it takes on an ontological status that is significantly different from that generally accorded counterpoint "improvised" in performance, however thoughtfully or skillfully. With the "multiple relationships of one part to another" specified in writing for both pitch and duration,[21] it became a complete and discrete entity, accessible to anyone adequately instructed in the use of mensural notation. In sum, it was for Tinctoris a "work," recognizable not only in its visual representation from source to source but also in its sonorous realization from one performance to another.

That this was indeed Tinctoris's view is suggested by his own Latin usage, as Peter Cahn has already observed (1989:20). In the final chapter of his book on counterpoint the theorist, pointing to the need for variety in written composition, equates the terms *res facta* and, in its plural form, *opus,* when he declares: "Every composed work (*res facta*), therefore, must be diverse in its quality and quantity, as may be seen in an infinite number

of works (*opera*), those composed not only by me, but also by innumerable composers flourishing in the present age."[22]

It is evident from the statements he makes concerning them that Tinctoris attached special ontological significance to such compositions, seeing them as comparable in a very real sense to the literary works of classical antiquity to which he so frequently refers. In the Prologue to his treatise on counterpoint (in a passage much quoted because of its historical implications), he asserts that the preceding forty years had seen a remarkable change in the quality of music composition. He credits the transformation to "countless composers," some of whom he names—first his direct contemporaries: Okeghem, Regis, Busnoys, Caron, and Faugues; and then the most noteworthy of their predecessors and mentors: Dunstable, Binchoys, and Du Fay. Concerning their compositions—and his word is once again *opera*—he declares:

> Nearly all the works of these men exhale such sweetness that in my opinion they are to be considered most suitable, not only for men and heroes, but even for the immortal gods. Indeed, I never hear them, I never study them, without coming away happier and more enlightened. As Vergil took Homer for his model in that divine work, the *Aeneid*, so I, by Hercules, have used these composers as models for my own modest works. . . (Strunk 1950:199).[23]

The very fact that he speaks of both "hearing" and "studying" the compositions of which he speaks suggests very clearly that a completed musical composition, whether heard in performance or simply studied in its notated form, was the same distinctive and recognizable musical entity, what we would now refer to as a work without hesitation or compunction.

If, as I have claimed, the concept of a musical composition as a work can be construed from Tinctoris's writings of the 1470s, when did it begin to take shape? What were the factors that contributed to its emergence and its definition in the terms that have been explored here? And what is the evidence upon which my opinion is based? The arguments that I find most compelling can be considered from a number of different points of view, each of which is briefly considered below.

The Musical Work and Notational Practice

The development of the concept of a work in connection with musical composition was undoubtedly tied to the ever-increasing capacity of European notational practice to fix in writing the essential parameters of the musical practice current at the time, making it possible for the musician to

determine with some precision indispensable elements of pitch and duration independently of a known text or a preexistent melody. One sees the consequences of that kind of creative freedom already with the modal notation of the twelfth century in the exuberant polyphonic elaboration of melisma that characterizes the discant *clausulae* in the repertory linked to the church of Notre Dame in Paris.

It was, moreover, the sections with lengthy passages on a single syllable that were soon treated as discrete entities, pieces of music capable of an independent existence. These melismatic sections could be lifted directly from their liturgical context and provided with additional text, or even played on instruments, giving rise in the thirteenth century to a new genre, the motet. The establishment of this new compositional type led to further innovations affecting the clarity and specificity of meaning for all notational symbols. Moreover, the development of the motet as a predominant compositional type brought with it the regular participation of instruments in the performance of notated polyphony. This is, then, a very early stage in the long process by which instrumental genres began to adapt the compositional procedures developed in the setting of texts that will finally allow them to achieve an analogous degree of autonomy as works, a point to which I shall return.

Following the thread of notational practice into the fourteenth century, it is noteworthy in the present connection that, as notational practice became both increasingly sophisticated and more precise, the motet was adopted as a vehicle for the development of large-scale musical designs of an abstract nature. Through the use of isorhythm and the manipulation of its distinctive formal units—*taleae* and *colores*—composers of the period created elaborate musical structures that were largely independent of the texts they were meant to bear, even in the formal design of the piece.

Not surprisingly, it was also during the fourteenth century that advances in notational practice, as codified early on by Philippe de Vitry and Marchettus of Padua, established ways of indicating unambiguously all of the parameters of rhythm and meter that are currently possible in our traditional system: binary, ternary, and compound meters; dotted rhythms; a bewildering array of proportional relationships; and, of course, a precise designation of pitch that included all twelve steps of the chromatic scale. At that point composition was already possible on much the same terms as in later periods. Musicians well trained in their art had every tool needed to create an individual piece of music and to fix in writing all of its essential musical elements so that others, even if many miles distant from its place of origin, could bring to sonorous life the melodies and harmonies imagined by their (possibly unknown) creators.

Even though there were undoubtedly differences in performance prac-

tice from one region to another and in the resources available for a given performance, the piece itself was surely regarded as a distinct and identifiable entity by those who came together to sing and/or play it. Moreover, the rhythmic and melodic complexities found in repertories such as that of the Chantilly Codex (ca. 1390s)[24] testify to the composers' desire not only to explore the capabilities of the notational system in fixing the rhythmic and melodic details of a composition but in fact to expand them to the highest possible degree.

Musical Works and Composer Attributions

It was also during the fourteenth century that notated polyphony was included in manuscript collections of music ever more frequently under the names of individual composers. Guillaume de Machaut is clearly a case in point. It is surely significant that, as the century unfolded, he came to be celebrated as much for his musical compositions as for his poetry. I would suggest that his fame was due at least in part to what might be described as the gradual elevation of the ontological status of the music itself and a growing tendency to see the individual pieces as essentially equal in artistic value to the poetic works with which they were repeatedly copied. One is reminded of the nineteenth proposition of Tinctoris's *Complexus effectuum musicae*: "Music brings fame to those skilled in it,"[25] meaning already in Machaut's time, presumably, not just the skilled performer but also the composer of "works" that were in their notated form both transportable and repeatable.

Moreover, although the remarkably comprehensive nature of the sources in which his oeuvre has been transmitted is unusual, Machaut's is not an isolated case. The fourteenth century can be seen as a watershed in the attribution of musical works to a specific composer. Whereas the surviving sources for the motet of the thirteenth century—even one as beautifully prepared as the Montpellier Codex—only rarely identify the author of the musical setting (to say nothing of the poet), the manuscripts of the fourteenth are ever more consistent in attaching a composer's name to individual pieces.

Although there are some notable exceptions, the same trend is even more marked in the musical sources of the fifteenth century. And with the invention of music printing early in the sixteenth, the authorship of individual compositions had clearly become important enough to potential buyers that publishers found it commercially advantageous to identify the composers whose work they were offering for sale. Already with Petrucci we find complete prints given over exclusively to the compositions of a single composer: Josquin, of course, with two volumes, but also Obrecht, Brumel, Ghiselin, La Rue, Agricola, De Orto, Isaac, and Weerbeke. The

practice continued all through the century (and beyond, of course) and was extended to secular genres as well, taking on its most dramatic proportions with such dominant figures as Palestrina and Lassus.[26] What is more, as we shall see, the reputation of those capable of making such an impression, commercially as well as musically, would become a recurring topic of discussion, not only among music theorists but also with humanist scholars, who saw the artistic achievements of composers of music as being somehow on a par with the works of revered authors of antiquity and linked the names of those composers and authors in their writings (see below).

Musical Works and the Dissemination of Repertory

As we have seen, by the end of the fifteenth century (at the latest), developments in notational practice made it possible for musical compositions to circulate in a written form that fixed in gratifying detail all of their essential components. Perhaps even more significantly, they were also being disseminated in ever greater numbers, and ever more frequently under the name of the presumed composer. I believe it is therefore possible to assert that a "work concept" had at that point begun, in Goehr's terms, to "serve musical practice in its regulative capacity," meaning that music was being circulated as discrete entities, very often associated with a known composer, and gathered into notated collections as individual works (1992:v). But what evidence do we have that it did indeed function in this way?

Perhaps the most compelling indication is that, by then, notated musical compositions had come to be an international commodity that had commercial, political, and social, as well as aesthetic, value. This was possible, obviously, only because virtually any such piece could be transported beyond the region where it had originated and reconstituted in performance elsewhere—in however distant a place—by anyone familiar with current notational practice, and, whatever the differences in detail, with a degree of concurrence to any other performance that would have made it immediately recognizable. It was this transportability of the musical composition as an identifiable, individual object that accounts for the practice of selecting music as the sole content for some of the most luxurious manuscripts known from the period and, most notably, those prepared with extra-musical purposes in mind.

It was in some sense this idea of the work, I would suggest, and the high regard in which many compositions were consequently held, that prompted the preparation of richly decorated collections of musical repertory as sumptuous, prestigious gifts, often for a ruling noble of the period, and that lent to those selective anthologies their perceived value. What but the prized nature of their contents could explain the stunning

visual presentation given the music in codices such as the Chantilly Codex, mentioned earlier, the Mellon Chansonnier, the Newberry Part Books, the Medici Codex, and the numerous manuscripts prepared in the Alamire workshop, to cite only a few of the most characteristic examples?[27] It is striking that the labor and expense lavished on these collections rival, or even surpass, that expended on manuscripts into which were copied not only the most important works of classical literature and philosophy,[28] but even some liturgical tomes and books of hours.

The admiration with which notated compositions were regarded also enabled music printing to become a profitable international commerce. It is surely not by chance that the first volumes of music printed from movable metal type were published in Venice, where the Aldine press had begun just a few years earlier to produce scholarly editions of the classical works of Greek and Roman literature. The newly acquired and growing status of music in notated form also offers at least some explanation as to why it was commercially viable for Ottaviano Petrucci to publish, as the inaugural volume of music produced with the new technology, a collection of chansons without their accompanying texts: the *Odhecaton A* (Hewitt and Pope 1942). This was possible only because the individual compositions were seen as complete in and of themselves—with or without the poems on which they were usually based—and thus able to satisfy the idea of a "work" much as we continue even now to understand it. Significantly, Petrucci's initiative was quickly emulated in other regions, and by the end of the century music printing was thriving in a number of the more important urban centers, most notably Paris, Antwerp and Nuremberg. And the publications of these presses were being disseminated in considerable numbers all across Europe.[29]

The esteem accorded notated musical compositions is also reflected in the care with which scribes copied from their exemplars and the pains that printers took to produce a text that could be deemed "correct." Anyone who engages in the exacting process of collating sources for the music of this period will be struck, not by the occasional variants from one reading to the next, but rather by the surprisingly few differences of any substance. As Sean Gallagher has pointed out, this is especially remarkable for those pieces that were widely disseminated and remained in circulation over a period of some years.[30]

Also instructive is the concern of a number of authors who wrote about music—in particular the theorists—as to the reliability of the sources upon which they depended in making their observations. As Gallagher has observed, when Johannes Tinctoris cites the contrapuntal practice or the mensural usage of composers such as Busnoys, Caron, and Okeghem, and provides notated examples to illustrate some of his comments,[31] "it is clear

that he understands these [excerpts] as belonging to a textually stable object" (Gallagher 2000).

Similarly, in her discussion of Pietro Aron's use of Petrucci prints as a source for the examples adduced in the *Trattato della natura et cognitione de tutti gli tuoni di canto figurato,* Cristle Collins Judd observes that "Aron accepts Petrucci's authority as arbiter of repertory in a way that simultaneously bolsters his own credibility by instantiating his writing with references to printed sources, available in multiple copies with fixed notation" (2000:57).[32]

Heinrich Glarean was also careful about the reliability of the sources he cites, both written and notated. He expressed his concern as to the accuracy of the versions available to him of the treatises on music that he consulted, in particular that ascribed to Boethius. He indicates, in the preface to his *Dodecachordon,* that he searched far and wide for uncorrupted versions of that and other authors' writings. His research in the rich medieval collection of the monastery library in St. Gall is well known. He himself speaks of it and mentions research done elsewhere, specifically with regard to a volume of treatises (an "encyclopedia") that he had discovered in a monastery "at the head of the Black Forest" (Glarean 1965:40).

He was apparently no less preoccupied by the correctness of the musical texts that he selected as examples for his treatise. According to Miller, Glarean indicated in a hand-written annotation on his own copy that he could not be sure that the polyphony he had included was free from errors in the sources on which he drew, but that he had left it unchanged, *ne in alieno opere ingeniosus videretur* (Glarean 1965, 1:ix.). Here again the underlying premise appears to be that the music quoted was a fixed entity, a work for which a correctly written source was essential to the validity of the theorist's observations. Moreover, when Judd places the writing of the *Dodecachordon* in the general context of humanistic scholarship, with its reliance on commonplace books and the *exempla* copied into them, she establishes a clear parallel between the authorities drawn upon in the production of literary works and the notated examples that Glarean took such great pains to include with his text. It is her view that just as the humanist culled from the *exempla* in his commonplace book an apt citation from an authoritative literary work to bolster his argument, so did Glarean draw upon the compositions of the most respected and widely-known composers of his day to substantiate his assertions concerning the modal system elaborated in his treatise.[33]

A similar premise also lies behind the rather different purposes to which the citation of musical texts is put by Giovanni Spataro and his correspondents, Pietro Aaron and Giovanni del Lago in the many letters exchanged among them in the 1520s and 1530s. In critiquing one another's

works, these theorist-composers reveal their attention to the smallest details of contrapuntal practice, especially in those passages where one or another of them departed from what they understood to be the accepted rules for composition. Their attitude toward the notated music was very much like that taken regarding the authoritative theoretical texts that they invoke in making their arguments. Indeed, Spataro does not hesitate to compare gifted composers with poets, observing that in either case the art and grace required for truly exceptional creative work could not be taught but had to be inborn.[34]

The Emergence of a Written Instrumental Repertory

In a lengthy discussion tracing the history of "Musical Meaning" from antiquity to the Enlightenment, Goehr links the emergence of the work-concept in music with what she sees as a shift in "musical understanding away from 'extra-musical' towards 'musical' concerns" (1992:120ff). She emphasizes the preoccupation of the writers of the ancient world with the "ritualistic and pedagogical value" of music (122) and insists on the long history of music's association with and subordination to verbal texts. She observes that because of this focus on the moral and educational role assumed for music, its sister disciplines were not those now defined as the "fine arts," such as painting and sculpture, but rather the language arts of the *trivium*—grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric—and the mathematical studies associated with music in the *quadrivium*: arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy (130).

Goehr also claims that the general "extra-musical" understanding of music changed but little over the long period that she surveyed. She asserts that, due in large measure to the enduring influence of the Christian Church during the Middle Ages, it was "the predominant belief that tonal structures were meaningful only when mediated by a text, usually a religious one," and that "the human voice was the only pure musical instrument." She goes so far as to contend that, "Melodic patterns were usually designed to follow the 'natural' rhythms of the words, so that the length of individual notes would correspond precisely with the time it took to utter each word's syllable" (133).

This last assertion ignores entirely the numerous complaints of later humanist scholars about the "barbarisms, obscurities, contrarieties, and superfluities" that riddled, in their view, the setting of texts in the traditional chants of the Christian liturgy,[35] as well as the significant place of melismatic effusion in the most elaborate of them, the Graduals and Great Responsories. And Goehr suggests that when—exceptionally, in her view—texts were set to pre-existent music, it was enough to "worry the authorities," simply because, "The word had traditionally come first and . . . should

continue to do so" (124), a claim that is belied by the history of the thirteenth-century motet, which (as has been observed) owed its very existence to the addition of texts (often secular) to music originally composed for religious purposes.

Goehr also claims, in support of her primary thesis, that it was only after 1800 that the "extra-musical understanding" of music began to lose ground, and that "serious" music, "as an art took on autonomous, musical, and 'civilized' meaning," allowing it "to be understood on its own terms" (122). She argues that only by means of a "radical change in aesthetic attitude, one that transformed the classical into the romantic age," could instrumental music achieve an "acceptable status." Only then, in her view, was it possible to believe "that instrumental music could be a fine and respectable art in service to nothing but itself," and to establish "a 'specifically musical' music and a very 'civilized' understanding" of it (147).

The implication is that the emergence of a work-concept for music was inextricably linked to the development of instrumental forms and genres that are essentially independent of the requirements and assumptions imposed by the setting of words to music, and that music conforming to such a definition did not come into its own, aesthetically or musically, until the nineteenth century. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, Goehr's interpretation of history requires a radical redefinition of the word "musical" that would severely restrict its current meanings, which include everything pertaining to "the creation, production, or performance of music" or "having the nature of music." And who would deny that the qualities that make instrumental music (of whatever century) "musical" are precisely those found in vocal composition from its outset: a rhythmic organization of sound that can be identified as pitch, whether as a simple melody or a polyphonic piece?

Moreover, even if one were to accept Goehr's narrow definition of this term, it is possible to assert that instrumental music of the kind to which she refers appeared on the aural landscape as early as the sixteenth century, establishing for itself well-defined genres and characteristic means of formal organization. It was then, thanks in good measure to increasing musical literacy (and hence a growing international market for printed music of all kinds), that textless composition began to emerge from an earlier improvisatory practice that depended a good deal more on memory than on written notes. What had been largely a performer's art was transformed in relatively short order by the fixity needed for the notational process, resulting in compositions in written form that could be offered to the public by the recently established presses, thus stimulating the development of new repertory and facilitating the dissemination of newly composed pieces.[36]

It is of course widely recognized that, even as the new instrumental genres began to be codified, instruments were still being used in a variety of ways in the performance of music conceived as a setting for text. In addition, arrangements and intabulations[37] of vocal works continued to form a substantial part of the instrumental repertory, both written and unwritten (as they would as well during the nineteenth century). Perhaps even more significantly, as we shall see, the compositional styles that had become current in the vocal music of the time had a determinant stylistic influence on the development of the newly emerging genres fashioned specifically for instruments.[38] Nonetheless, among the earliest printed sources of instrumental music was a type of composition that, however modest, was based neither on the setting of texts nor on vocal models; these were the *ricercari* for lute of Francesco Spinacino and Joan Ambrosio Dalza,[39] which simply exploited the idiomatic possibilities of the instrument for which they were written: chordal strumming and rapid scale passages.

In Italy the loose structures of *ricercares* such as these, which owed their beginnings to the spontaneous improvisation and virtuosic display characteristic of a particular instrument, soon gave way to the more rational procedures of imitative counterpoint and the juxtaposition of contrasting textures. Although these compositional procedures had already made their appearance in the vocal compositions of Du Fay, Okeghem, and Busnoys, they are as useful in instrumental composition as they are in setting words to music. Consequently, they were widely adopted by instrumental composers who flourished in the course of the century, beginning, it would seem, with Girolamo Cavazzoni whose four modest *ricercares* in the *Intavolatura . . . libro primo* of 1543 consist entirely of points of imitation linked, here and there, by figurative passage work.[40]

These same compositional techniques—systematic imitation and the alternation of contrasting textures, both contrapuntal and homophonic—are also to be seen in the *ricercari* of the two celebrated organists of the Church of St. Mark in Venice, Andrea Gabrieli (ca. 1510–86) and Claudio Merulo (1533–1604), in the *tientos* and *fantasias* of Iberian composers such as Luys de Narváez (1526–49) and Antonio de Cabezón (ca. 1510–66), and in the *fantasias* of English composers such as William Byrd (ca. 1540–1623), Giles Farnaby (ca. 1563–1640), and others.[41] In all of these repertories rigorous counterpoint and exuberant passage work have a significant role in building up autonomous musical structures, just as they did in the vocal composition of the time, and they continued to be so used into the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Similarly indebted to vocal models but clearly musically autonomous in nature are those instrumental genres that take their shape from the

elaboration of a cantus firmus, whether liturgical or secular in origin. Of particular note in this regard are the settings of the chant segments identified as *In nomine*[42] and *Felix namque.*[43] Particularly impressive for their scope are two of the latter attributed to Thomas Tallis (ca. 1505–85), which combine the incorporation of the traditional chant melody in extended values with imitative counterpoint and luxuriant keyboard figuration.[44] In addition, both works are clearly articulated into sections by contrasting patterns in the type of figural elaboration used, giving the effect of a variation form.

Significantly, instrumental variations also came into existence as a discrete musical genre in the course of the sixteenth century. Whether based on secular song, like the many pieces of this kind by English composers included in *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book,* or on a simple melody, such as those seen in the *diferencias* of the Spanish *vihuelists* Narváez and Cabezón, the variation techniques used are autonomously musical in nature and far removed from the procedures adopted at the time for the setting of texts. Moreover, the genre has had a continuous history from the sixteenth century through the 1800s and beyond, and the compositional devices used in many of the early examples were still very much in vogue at the turn of the nineteenth century when, in Goehr's terms, the "classical age" was being transformed into the "romantic."

In addition to the genres mentioned thus far, there flourished in the sixteenth century yet another type of composition that was frequently—if not exclusively—instrumental in nature: dance music. Indeed, traces of its use have survived from the fifteenth century in the celebrated manuscript of *basses dances* that originated at the court of Burgundy[45] and in the earliest of the instructional manuals describing the dancing of the age.[46] As is evident from these sources, much of this music was undoubtedly improvised early on by professional instrumentalists over well-known melodies selected or written for the purpose. By the sixteenth century, however, dance music had evidently been liberated to a degree from its servitude in the ballroom and become a favorite repertory for the recreation of amateurs. It was also stylized to a degree in the process as a market grew for such pieces in notated (and published) form, whether intended for keyboard, lute, or instrumental ensemble.

Looking only to the publications of the Parisian publisher Pierre Attaingnant, one finds for all three of these performing media important collections given over largely, or entirely, to dance music. Already in 1530, less than two years after he had begun printing music, Attaingnant brought out a large collection of dances of various kinds for lute, and two others for consort, one with only dances, the other with six *galliardes,* and as many *pavanes* in a collection of *chansons.*[47] Dances for keyboard followed in 1531,

and collections for consort were published regularly thereafter (Heartz 1969: no. 28). The latest, dating from 1557, is identified as the seventh in a series, suggesting that dance music arranged for an ensemble of instruments was in constant demand over the twenty-five or so years that the Attaingnant presses were in production (Heartz 1969: no. 173).[48] (Similar observations could be drawn from a number of the other publishers of the period who specialized in the difficult craft of printing music.)

Although there could be some doubt as to the intended purpose of the collections of dances for consort, it seems beyond question that the pieces arranged for lute or keyboard, both instruments with a delicate sonority, were intended not so much to accompany dancing as for the pleasure of the player(s), and perhaps of their listener(s). It is highly likely, moreover, that this was also true for the consort music; professionals hired to play for dances may not have needed notated arrangements, whereas the amateur who took pleasure in making music with friends, would have found the dances rewarding and not unduly demanding of technical skill. The well defined, often catchy rhythms, the largely homophonic textures, the frequent repetition of well-defined sections, and the regularly balanced phrases in mensural (and metrical) units of four and eight make this music easily accessible to the ear and relatively easy for performers to master.

It is noteworthy, as well, that in Attaingnant's seventh book of *danceries*, the *pavanes* and *gaillardes* are ordered in alternating pairs, thus constituting small "suites" of contrasting movements, the first slow, the second lively. That this grouping of contrasting movements was adopted early on in other regions as well is suggested by the development in England of the "fantasia-suite," a new genre that originated in the instrumental compositions of John Coprario (ca. 1570/80–1626). He left some two dozen pieces of this kind, written for one or two violins, bass viol, and organ, in a three movement sequence that consisted of a fantasy (of the sort discussed earlier), an *almaine*, and a *galliard*. And a number of the leading British composers of the seventeenth century followed his lead in this regard: William Lawes, John Jenkins, John Hingeston, and Christopher Gibbons.[49] Such combinations came to be fundamental, of course, to the composition of the instrumental genres we know as suites and sonatas, which have a continuous history from the seventeenth century on.

It is possible to argue, as a result, that music of this kind is "specifically musical" (to return to Goehr's formulations) and perhaps even an "art in service of nothing but itself." Given its modest scope and lack of pretension, there is clearly some question as to whether or not she would allow that it can be seen as "a fine and respectable art" that inspired at the time a "very 'civilized' understanding of music." I think it possible to claim, nonetheless, that these printed collections satisfy—if, at times, only in more

or less embryonic form—the most essential conditions that Goehr links to the fundamental character of the instrumental music of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

It is also possible to argue that it was the publication of music in notated form that continued to regulate musical practice all through the seventeenth century, and with a good deal of continuity with respect to what had been done earlier for both vocal and instrumental genres. Although much music still circulated at the time only in manuscript, this was also the age in which published collections of music began to be identified by opus numbers.[50] Such was the case especially for the instrumental repertories that stand at the initial stages in the development of the sonata as an instrumental genre. Starting as early as 1617, Biagio Marini (ca. 1597–1665), Giovanni Legrenzi (1626–90), Mauricio Cazzati (1616–78), and others began publishing groups of instrumental compositions with opus numbers,[51] suggesting that the practice of thinking of music of this kind in terms of works was becoming well established.[52] And if there was some confusion early on as to whether the term "opus" referred to the print, as the product of a printer's art, or the music itself, it was increasingly in the latter sense that it was used.

This suggests that the attention and polish needed to prepare such compositions for publication bestowed on them a distinctive status, not unlike that we are inclined to attribute to musical works in the present day. It must have been a concept of this sort that prompted composers to place (and perhaps to imagine) their compositions in an ordered sequence to be presented formally in print under an opus number. Certainly this must have been the case for Arcangelo Corelli (1653–1713), a violinist trained in Bologna who spent most of his active career in Rome and composed, exceptionally for the time, only for stringed instruments.[53] He allowed his compositions to be heard repeatedly in performance but held them from publication for revision and refinement until he was satisfied with them. Then, when he was already well along in his distinguished career, he had them published in six neatly ordered collections. Opus 1 (1681) and Opus 3 (1689) each included twelve *sonate da chiesa*; Opus 2 (1685) and Opus 4 (1694) consisted each of twelve *sonate da camera.* With Opus 5 (1700) came another twelve sonatas for solo violin and basso continuo, half for the church and half for the chamber, and his Opus 6 (1714), finally, presented an even dozen *concerti grossi.*[54]

This pattern for publication, grouping a set number of pieces (usually half a dozen) under a single opus number, became well established in the course of the seventeenth century and was still being followed in the eighteenth by composers such as Haydn, Mozart, and (early in his career) Beethoven. And while aesthetic sensibilities had undoubtedly begun to

undergo a significant change toward the end of the latter's life, attitudes toward the "work" of music, as reflected in the publication of the instrumental repertories of these two centuries, point to a good deal of continuity from the sixteenth century on.

The Work and the Reception of Music

One indication as to the ontological status of music during the earlier period may be seen in the manner in which musical compositions in notated form were "received" by other composers (and writers on music), beginning already in the fifteenth century. If it is possible to say that the writing of glosses was an activity inspired by, and largely limited to, authoritative literary works, then it is possible to suggest that certain pieces of music seem to have been regarded, and treated, in much the same way. This occurred to a modest degree even with pieces of very modest scope. Thus one finds *chansons* originally written for three parts to which a fourth has been added. There are three such songs in the Mellon Chansonnier,[55] for example, and another five in the first volume of music to come from Ottaviano Petrucci's Venetian Press, the *Odhecaton A*.[56] In all of these the added voice is identified by the tag *si placet* (meaning that it may or may not be used according to the pleasure of the performers), and in the latter source another four have survived in versions for both three and four voices, pointing to a similar process.[57]

It has been suggested that added parts were meant to "modernize" these pieces by providing for them the more up-to-date texture of four voices that would predominate later in the century.[58] That may be so, but I am inclined to believe that more is involved. In virtually every case the pieces in question are ascribed in some surviving source to one of the better-known composers of the day. In addition, all of them—with one notable exception—circulated widely on the continent; over a surprisingly extended period of time. This is clear from the array of sources in which they were included, manuscripts and prints from both sides of the Alps. Hayne's *De tous biens playne*, for example, is found in twenty-five surviving sources and was included as well in four (lute) tablatures of the period.[59] The exception to this wide dissemination is also exceptional: the setting of the widely-traveled secular tune, *L'homme armé*, which, although found as a *chanson* in only two manuscripts, came to be used in the composition of polyphonic Masses all over Europe for more than a century. These circumstances suggest to me that these particular songs had achieved a special status, that they were perceived, in a sense, as authoritative texts, integral compositions whose basic structure and substance were conceptually complete and notationally fixed even when the piece had been "glossed" by the addition of one or more newly composed voices.

Some of the chansons that circulated most widely took on, in fact, an even wider significance in that they became the starting point not only for a developing series of new compositions but also for a new genre, the instrumental *canzona.* Among the most striking examples of this sort of "reception" are Busnoys's *Fortuna desperata,* which gave rise to an additional twenty-nine pieces that incorporate, to a greater or lesser degree, the original musical material, Okeghem's *Fors seulement l'attente,* of which there are some thirty arrangements still in existence, Hayne's *De tous bien plaine,* which survives in twenty-eight different versions, and the anonymous *J'ay pris amours,* which is known in twenty-five separate pieces that derive in some sense from the earliest three-voice song.[60] In these instances as well, in my view, the perception of the identity of the starting composition as an object that would be recognized by performers and audiences alike is an indispensable component of the process.[61]

The elaboration of preexistent work is even more significant with regard to the Latin motet of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Beginning at the latest in the early 1500s with major figures such as Antoine de Févin (ca. 1470–1512) and Jean Mouton (ca. 1459–1522), motets were adopted as the model of choice for the composition of the polyphonic Mass. In this case it was not just a single voice from the piece selected for use, as in the earlier cantus firmus Masses, but the entire polyphonic complex that provided a basis for the new composition. Moreover, "imitation" Masses, as they have been rightly called, came to predominate in the period in question. Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina (1525–94), whose Masses display all of the compositional procedures used for the genre in the course of his century, based many of them on motets, his own, first of all, but also those credited to other composers. It is noteworthy that the composers whose pieces he selected for the purpose included some of the most highly regarded masters of previous generations, from Josquin and Andreas da Silva to Philippe Verdelot and Cristóbal de Morales. The prominence given to the earlier repertory suggests that the notated musical texts that were being memorialized in this way were beginning to take on a special aura due to their significant place in the motet tradition and the distinction of their authors, that they were viewed as *opera,* much as were literary texts being published in the same way.[62]

Yet another indication of the work-like status attained by the motet in the sixteenth century may be seen in the distinctive character of some of the sources in which they were gathered at the time, not only the luxurious manuscripts prepared as gifts, as mentioned earlier, but also a number of the printed collections. Stephanie Schlagel has drawn attention, in particular, to the impressive format and the elegant appearance of the *Liber selectarum cantionum quas vulgo mutetas appellant,* published in Augsburg by

Grimm and Wyrsung in 1520 (Schlagel 2002a).[63] Significant, from her perspective, is the pride of place given to the seven motets of Josquin included in the print, where they outweigh, in a sense, even the compositions by the regional masters, Ludwig Senfl (who edited the collection) and Heinrich Isaac.

She has also noted the unusual circumstances that surrounded the compilation and publication of the collection. An epilogue by the antiquarian scholar, Conrad Peutinger (1465–1547) places the preparation of the choirbook squarely in the humanist milieu of the city of Augsburg and may connect it with the activities of the *Sodalitas Litteraria Augustana,* the literary society that Peutinger helped to establish there in 1503. His special interest was German history, especially in its relationship to that of Rome. He copied inscriptions, collected antiquities and manuscripts, and published the important texts he had discovered and edited (including two medieval chronicles) in collections that were not dissimilar in appearance nor, it would appear, in purpose to the anthology of motets in which his reflections were included. Schlagel has drawn a parallel specifically between the *Liber Selectorum cantionum* and the *Romanae vetustatis fragmenta,* a compilation of Roman inscriptions found in the region around Augsburg that Peutinger had published in 1505 in a similarly luxurious edition (Schlagel 2002a). The analogous treatment given the volume of motets suggests to me, once again, that compositions of that sort had achieved by then a special status, that they were seen as major contributions to an important repertory of a prestigious musical genre in much the same way as we currently regard compositions that we perceive as works of music.

That the repertory in question and, in particular, the motets of Josquin were in fact often viewed in this way in the sixteenth century is further demonstrated by the impressive series of motet anthologies put out by printers in German-speaking centers from the 1530s on. One of the earliest, Hans Ott's two-volume collection of 1537–38—the *Novum et insigne opus musicum* and the *Secundus tomus novi operis musici*[64]—was typical in its anthologizing character and its tendency to memorialize the most celebrated composers of an earlier generation, especially Josquin. As in the *Liber selectarum cantionum* of 1520, which in Schlagel's view served Ott in significant ways as a model, the number of works ascribed to this master is substantial, amounting to about a quarter of its contents overall and including several motets that were already found in the print of 1520. The reason for this predilection, which was apparently shared by all of Ott's German competitors, is made perfectly clear in Ott's preface to the first of the two prints. He declares (giving the composer's name in elegant capitals to emphasize his point) that, "All will easily recognize JOSQUIN as the most celebrated hero of the art of music, for he possesses something that

is truly inimitable and divine."[65]

The surprisingly large place given in these publications to the compositions believed to be by Josquin so long after his death has caused scholars in the field not only to speak of a "German Josquin renaissance" but also to reflect upon the enormous problems raised in attempting to establish a canon of the composer's reliably attributed compositions. But in the present context it demonstrates once again the power of the notational process to capture the "complete and finished work" in all of its essentials and to transmit it in an intelligible written form to readers and performers all over Europe.

That these compositions were looked upon as important musical texts that could serve as models, not only to be admired but also emulated, is clear first of all from motets that imitated in significant details an earlier piece by Josquin and thereby came to be given his name in the surviving sources. Patrick Macey has discussed two such instances and raised the possibility that yet others may be uncovered in surviving sixteenth-century sources (1993).

Another aspect of the reception of Josquin's motets—and further evidence of their perceived existence as works of music—is to be seen in the invention of *si placet* parts to supplement those of the original composition. As Schlagel has shown, the practice of writing additional voices for existing pieces became common enough in the course of the sixteenth century so as to elicit instruction for doing so from no less a theorist than Gioseffo Zarlino, who also provided examples of his own making to illustrate the process (Schlagel 2002b).[66] Significantly, it is clear in the present connection from what he says that the original parts of the piece chosen for this sort of sonorous embellishment were not to be altered in any way to facilitate the compositional task.[67]

Although the compositions of other composers were also treated in this manner, well-known motets attributed to Josquin were apparently great favorites for the addition of one or more non-essential voices; it was in fact a duo from his *Benedecta es, caelorum regina* (à 6) that Zarlino chose to demonstrate the composition of an added part. Other examples are scattered through mid- to late-sixteenth-century sources, especially, as Schlagel has shown, those compiled in German-speaking areas.[68] The compositions singled out in this way include some of Josquin's most widely circulated and best-loved motets: *O bone et dulcissime Jhesu* and *Ave Maria . . . Virgo serena* (both with two added parts)[69]; and *Stabat mater dolorosa* (with an additional contratenor altus).[70] The most extravagant example is undoubtedly the arrangement credited to Guyot de Casteletti, who wrote six additional voices to be sung with Josquin's six-voice motet, *Benedicta es, caelorum regina,* which had obviously achieved a kind of classical status by the time

the expanded version was published in 1568.[71] Surely such surprising longevity as a revered musical text can only be explained by an attitude, both intellectual and aesthetic, towards the notated composition that is closely akin to that of our present day.

The Anecdotal Evidence

The respect, even reverence, shown for certain compositions—their status as works (as understood at the time)—helps to explain why a composer such as Josquin des Prez was so idolized by his contemporaries. Cosimo Bartoli compared him to Michelangelo, whose paintings and sculptures were so much admired, saying,

> . . . Josquin, a pupil of Okeghem, may be regarded in music as a prodigy of nature, just as was our Michelangelo Buonarroti in architecture, painting, and sculpture. Just as Josquin has so far had no one who could surpass him in composition, so Michelangelo, among all those who have cultivated these arts, stands alone and without peer.[72]

Glarean, who was both music theorist and humanist, saw in the music of Josquin and his generation an *ars perfecta*, and he compared the composer to Vergil, the quintessential poet of Roman antiquity. Speaking of Josquin's view of his own work, moreover, Glarean asserts that, "Those who knew him say that he published his works after much deliberation and manifold corrections; neither did he release a song to the public unless he had kept it to himself for some years" (1965, II:265).[73]

Whether or not the notated polyphony of the sixteenth century can be considered "serious" music in the same sense as that implied by Goehr's use of the term, it is clear from a statement such as this that Glarean took the creative act of composition very seriously and believed that Josquin did so as well. To judge, moreover, from the vast bibliography dealing with this master's compositions from every possible point of view, modern scholars clearly share Glarean's view in this regard.

That is also a fundamental meaning to be extracted from the earliest group of anecdotes concerning a composer, those centered, once again, on Josquin. The composer's concern not only for the correctness of his music, but also for its impact on the listener, is suggested by one of two incidents recounted by Johannes Manlius who was, like Glarean, a humanist educated in Basel under the influence of Erasmus. As he tells it, the composer tried out new compositions by giving them to the choir to sing. Then, if he heard something that did not satisfy him, he would stop them and say, "Be silent; I will change that" (1562:542).[74]

A second anecdote reflects what was apparently believed to be the composer's attitude toward his own creations, that the substantial integrity of a notated composition was not to be tampered with once he regarded it as "complete and finished." According to Manlius, Josquin was heard to berate a singer who took it upon himself to ornament one of the composer's contrapuntal lines in words such as these: "You donkey, why did you add embellishments? If I had wanted them, I would have written them myself. If you wish to add to compositions that have been correctly composed, then write your own, but leave mine unaltered" (1562:542).[75]

There is of course no way of verifying the accuracy of these reports.[76] But even if they are apocryphal, the attitude of the writer—and perhaps that of the composer as well—are clearly illuminated by them. Implicit in Manlius's view of music is the sense that a notated composition, especially one by a master of Josquin's stature, was a whole entity, complete in its artistic conception, and transmitted in its written form with all of its essential characteristics intact.

Conclusion

The question of a work-concept for music, as raised anew by Goehr, is clearly important not only for the period after 1800, where she sees such a significant cultural and intellectual watershed, but also for the study of the music of earlier periods, reaching back at least to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. One cannot assume that the music theorists of those times meant exactly what we might mean today when they speak of musical compositions as works; the term has become too fraught with multifarious functions and interpretations for that, all the more so because of the wide-ranging discussion that the term has inspired in the course of the twentieth century. It has become difficult, as a consequence, to step away from the ongoing (and sometimes contentious) debate far enough to frame the historical problem without yielding too much to the weight of the accumulated intellectual and cultural baggage.

I believe it is important to make the attempt, however, because the idea of a "work" appears to have been from very early on a significant component of the historical and intellectual context in which the mensural polyphony that characterizes the western musical tradition was brought into being. It would be much too easy to be seduced by a sense of cultural superiority and thus to conclude that earlier uses of the term are no longer relevant to the problem as it is currently articulated, that only with the philosophical sophistication of the nineteenth century has it become possible to fathom the significance of the fundamental issues involved. But the issues are not only intellecual and philosophical; they have far-reaching practical ramifications as well. The manner in which they are engaged,

and perhaps eventually decided, will inevitably impinge not only on our view of history but also on the attitudes that present-day editors and performers will bring to their musical activity. Ought we not, then, to examine carefully all of the evidence that bears on the issue and to seek in the process a clearer understanding of what constituted for the composers, theorists, performers, and listeners of earlier time a "work"?

Relevant, in my view, as I have attempted to demonstrate, are the statements of theorists and other writers of the period; the evidence of the sources; the development of new instrumental genres; the corrections of detail made in manuscripts of the period; the stop-press changes made by printers of music in the course of a run; and the anecdotal evidence we have cited concerning the attitudes of both the composer and contemporaneous commentators towards the music ascribed to Josquin. All of this, and more, would suggest that the status of "work" meant at the time that every detail that could be fixed notationally was considered an essential part of the piece, to be written as accurately and interpreted as scrupulously as possible. Little wonder that Glarean referred to the music of Josquin as an *ars perfecta* (1965:241), that composers of his stature—and their works—inspired such esteem, and that the art music of the time was disseminated in such quantities all over Europe from publishers in Venice, Rome, Paris, Antwerp, Nuremberg and yet other major centers. Clearly, a sound understanding of the work-concept for this period is a matter of no small import. It will inevitably shape our views and our working methods for a long time to come, especially as scholars and editors, as we continue to retrieve and to explore the musical treasures that have become so much a part of the rich history of western musical culture.

Notes

An earlier, and much shorter, version of this essay was read at the 17th International Congress of the International Musicological Society held in Leuven, Belgium, August 1–7, 2002. I should like to extend my warmest thanks to those of my colleagues who graciously took the time to read subsequent drafts and to share with me their critical observations: Sean Gallagher, Anthony Newcomb, Stephanie Schlagel, Glenn Stanley, Philippe Vendrix, and, especially, Lydia Goehr.

1. Strohm also criticizes Goehr's approach (as I shall not) from a philosophical point of view, based in his own understanding of idealist German philosophy of the nineteenth century.

2. Loesch declares, for example, "Selbstverständlich wurde das musikalische Kunstwerk, wenn überhaupt, nicht vor dem 19. Jahrhundert" (2001:25).

3. These include not only Seidel and Wiora, mentioned above, but also Hermann Zenk, Wilibald Gurlitt, Hans Heinrich Eggebrecht, Carl Dahlhaus, Peter Cahn, Claus Wolfgang Niemöller, and Klaus-Jürgen Sachs. See Loesch (2001:2). See Loesch's bibliography for the studies in question.

4. "... der Werkbegriff des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts [war] gar kein Werkbegriff in unserem Sinne . . . ," (Loesch 2001:3, passim). The fundamental theses of Loesch's study are first stated succinctly (7–8) and then argued systematically and at length (with considerable redundancy) in the remainder of the book.

5. The Aristotelian classification of human activity as either knowing, doing, or making, had been proposed as a model for Listenius by both Wiora (1983:17), and Seidel (1987:2ff), and was adopted as well by Markus Bandur in his treatment of *Musica poetica.* See *Handwörterbuch der musikalische Terminologie,* 2000, s.v. "Musica poetica" (by Markus Bandur).

6. Loesch lays out this position in detail in the initial three chapters of his study (2001:1–25).

7. Loesch's terms in German are as follows: (a) *Mehrstimmigkeit;* (b) *Konsonanzbehandlung und Simultankonzeption;* (c) *Die Kategorie des Neuen;* (d) *Werkindividualität;* (e) *Ästhetische Autonomie;* (f) *Einheit und Form;* (g) *Zeitenthobenheit und zeitlose Gültigkeit* (2001:27–43).

8. Loesch also points to the inclusion, in later treatises, of improvisation (*sortisatio*) under the heading of composition, proving to him (but not to me) that *Musica poetica* should not be considered the same as composition since it is supposed to produce an *opus perfectum et absolutum,* whereas composition has been expanded to include the usually unnotated activity of improvisation.

9. The author elaborates each of his arguments from a variety of points of view.

10. Loesch does not examine the music of the period from this point of view but argues instead that there is no discussion of such conditions in connection with the terms *Musica poetica* or *opus perfectum et absolutum* either by Listenius or in the treatises of his successors; see his discussion (2001:28–50). The underlying assumption appears to be that anything not specifically mentioned by those writers cannot have found a place in the music of the period.

11. The interpretation of musica, in this context, as a treatise or manual of instruction on music; was first adopted by Loesch (1998), where he elaborates on a comment by Braun (1994:39f). He takes up the argument again in greater detail; see Loesch (2001:50–58, passim). As I have indicated, I do not believe that the multiple uses made of the term negate its most common meaning as a notated composition.

12. For the Latin, see (Listenius 1927). In providing an English translation for this lengthy passage, I have followed in some details that offered by Goehr in her study (1992:116). There is also an English translation of the treatise by Albert Seay (Listenius 1975), to be used with some caution.

13. The pattern appears, already fully developed, in the influential and widely disseminated treatises by Marchetto of Padua, *Lucidarium in arte musice plane,* and *Pomerium in arte musice mensurate.*

14. Cristle Collins Judd has explored in some detail the tradition in which Listenius was working against the background of sixteenth-century Nuremberg and the impact there of the Protestant Reformation; see her penetrating study (2000:82ff).

15. Facsimile editions of all three treatises have been published in recent years by Minkoff Reprints: the Wollick in 1972, and the Martin and Guilliaud (to-

gether with the *Nouvelle instruction familière* by Michel de Menehou) in 1981.

16. See *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians,* 2nd ed., s.v. "Gaffurius." (by Bonnie J. Blackburn).

17. The terminological and conceptual parallels between Tinctoris and Listenius have been noted by Bonnie Blackburn (1987:274f.).

18. This is Bandur's conclusion in his extensive and detailed entry on "Res facta/chose faite": ". . . Bezeichnung für ein mehrstimmiges, in allen Stimmen ausgearbeitetes and schriftlich fixiertes musikalisches Werk . . . " See *Handwörterbuch der musikalischen Terminologie,* 1996, s.v. "Res facta/chose faite" (by Markus Bandur). This is also Blackburn's view; see Blackburn (1987:248–60).

19. The possibility was raised early on by Ferand (1957:144); Blackburn discusses the problem at some length (1987:260–65); and Markus Bandur states definitively, "Trotz entgegengesetzter Beleglage ist wahrscheinlich die Prägung res facta bei Tinctoris als Übersetzung von chose faite ins Lateinische zu betrachten." See *Handwörterbuch der musikalischen Terminologie,* 1996, s.v. "Res facta/chose faite."

20. "[De musique] sont deux especes, c'est à sçavoir la simple, autrement appellée plain chant . . . & la figurée, que le vulgaire appelle chose faite" (Chap. 1); for the citations from all three treatises, see *Handwörterbuch der musikalischen Terminologie,* 1996, s.v. "Res facta/chose faite" (by Markus Bandur).

21. The reference is to the definition given by Tinctoris in the *Terminorum musicae diffinitorium* (ca. 1472): "Cantus compositus est ille qui per relationem notarum unius partis ad alteram multipliciter est editus, qui resfacta vulgariter appellatur."

22. "Omnis itaque res facta pro qualitate et quantitate eius diversificanda est prout infinita docent opera, non solum a me verum etiam ab innumeris compositoribus aevo praesenti florentibus edita." The English version given here has been adapted from the translation by Seay (Tinctoris 1961:139f).

23. "Quorum . . . omnia fere opera tantam suavitudinem redolent ut mea quidem sententia non modo hominibus herroibusque verum etiam diis immortalibus dignissima censenda sint. Ea quoque profecto nunquam audio, nunquam considero quin laetior ac doctior evadam, unde quemadmodum Vergilius in illo opere divino Eneidos Homero, ita iis Hercule, in meis opusculis utor archetypis. [Praesertim in hoc, in quo concordantias ordinando approbabilem eorum componendi stilum plane imitatus sum]" (ff. 80f., Valencia MS.).

24. See *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* 2nd ed., s.v. "Chantilly" (by Ursula Günther).

25. "Musica peritos in ea glorificat"; see the discussion in Cahn (1989:17).

26. For information on sources and publication practices, see *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians,* 2nd ed., "Sources" (by Stanley Boorman). For information on Palestrina, see id., s.v. "Palestrina" (by Lewis Lockwood, Noel O'Regan and Jessie-Ann Owens). For information on Lassus, see id., s.v. "Lassus" (by James Haar).

27. For the Mellon Chansonnier, see Garey and Perkins (1979). For the Newberry Part Books, see Slim (1972). For the Medici Codex, see Lowinsky (1968). For the numerous manuscripts prepared in the Alamire workshop, see Kellman (1999).

28. A comparison of any of the collections mentioned with important vol-

umes in the library of the Aragonese kings of Naples will amply the illustrate the point; see Marini (1947–52).

29. For a useful survey of music publishing in the sixteenth century, see *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd ed., s.v. "Printing and Publishing of Music" (by Donald Krummel). This essay does not, however, refer to the growing scholarly literature concerning individual printers, which must be sought in the articles concerning the persons and printing establishment in question.

30. In a paper read at the meeting of the American Musicological Society in Toronto (2000), Gallagher made the point convincingly with the *cantus* of Okeghem's *D'un autre amer*, showing that the readings in the sixteen known sources differ only in minor details, a circumstance that is all the more compelling since the manuscripts in question were both French and Italian in their provenance and spanned more than four decades from the earliest to the most recent.

31. See, for example, the *Liber de arte contrapuncti*, ch. 32, "De ordinatione cuiuslibet discordantie," or ch. 8, "De octava et ultima generali regula," concerning the use of counterpoint, or *Proportionales musices*, ch. 3, "Divisio proportionum," regarding a mensural problem in this connection (Strunk 1998:374–76).

32. See also Judd (2000:69,73) for other observations concerning the use of notated polyphony as a means of authoritative reference.

33. See Judd's discussion of the commonplace book and its role in the humanistic scholarship of the period (2000:117–76).

34. See Blackburn et al. (1991:101–26). The assertion that "composers must be born, just as poets are born" is quoted on p. 104.

35. Hence the commission given to Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina and Annibale Zoilo in 1577 to revise the plainsongs of the Roman Gradual and Antiphoner; see the brief written by Pope Gregory XIII in this connection in Strunk (1998:374–76).

36. For a brief survey of instrumental genres that became current in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, see Perkins (1999:789–866).

37. The term refers to the adaptation of mensural notation to the specialized notational systems designed specifically for lute and keyboard.

38. Strohm emphasizes the leading role of vocal music over the centuries in developing the expressive possibilities that came to be associated with instrumental music in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, observing that, "although instrumental music, in the shape of musical works, became more 'emancipated' over the generations, this meant only that it caught up with vocal music in this respect" (2000:139).

39. Both collections were published in Venice by Petrucci: Spinacino's *Intabolatura de lauto libro primo* and *libro secondo* (1507), and Dalza's *Intabolatura de lauto libro quarto* (1508).

40. See *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd ed., s.v. "Cavazzoni, Giromalo" (by Colin H. Slim).

41. A thoughtful discussion of these issues as they pertain to instrumental music, especially that of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, "Notions of Notation around 1600," was presented by Anthony Newcomb at the 2003 annual meeting of the American Musicological Society in Houston as an initial installment of what is to be a more detailed study, currently underway, that will be

published in due course. I should like to thank Professor Newcomb for sharing some of his insights with me in private communication.

42. Concerning this tradition, see *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd ed., s.v. "Sources of Instrumental Ensemble Music to 1630"(by Warwick Edwards).

43. See *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd ed., s.v. "Lauda sion" (by John Caldwell).

44. Both are readily accessible in Maitland and Squire (1963, 1:427–36 and 2:1–11).

45. Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, MS 9085, ed. in facsimile by E. Closson, *Le manuscrit dit des basses danses de la Bibliothèque de Bourgogne* (Brussels, 1912/R); for an overview of this type of courtly dance and relevant bibliography, see *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd ed., s.v. "Hoftanz"(by Daniel Heartz and Patricia Rader).

46. Among the most important are the *Libro del arte de danzare*, 1455 (in manuscript) of Antonio Cornazano (for Italy), and the *Orchésographie.* (Langres, 1588 and 1589), of Thoinot Arbeau (for France), which is available in a modern facsimile published by Editions Minkoff in Geneva in 1972.

47. See the inventories of Attaingnant's prints compiled by Heartz (1969: nos. 16,17,20). The pieces for lute have all been edited in modern score by Heartz (1964); the others have been published only in part, as Heartz's catalogue indicates.

48. Not all seven of the collections have been preserved, but, judging from the systematic manner in which Attaingnant numbered his prints, they must have all been published, some of them clearly in more than one edition.

49. See *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd ed., s.v. "Fantasia-suite" (by Christopher D. S. Field); the Coprario suites have been edited by Richard Charteris for Musica Britannica (vol. 46, 1980).

50. It is Loesch's contention (with which I disagree) that the use of the word to designate the print as such argues against the existence of a work-concept before 1800; see Loesch (2001:58–60, passim); he cites as an example Georg Rhau's *Postremum Vespertini Officii Opus* of 1544. There are other, similar instances, including not only German prints such as the *Novum et insigne opus musicum* of 1537–38 (a collection of motets), but also Italian collections such as Zarlino's *Musici quinque vocum moduli, motecta vulgo nuncupata, opus nunquam alias typis excusum ac nuper accuratissime in lucem aeditum, Liber primus*, printed in Venice by Gardano in 1549. See Judd (2000: 201ff).

51. Marini, for example, published between 1617 and 1655 twenty-two collections (some of which have been lost), each with its own opus number, the last of which, *Per ogni sorte di strumento musicale diversi generi di sonate, da chiesa, e da camera*, a 2–4, bc, was printed in Venice; see Dunn (2001, 15:863).

52. Most instructive in this connection is the survey of the repertory in question by William S. Newman (1971:128–62, passim).

53. See the study by Marc Pincherle (1956), which continues to be informative and useful.

54. Note that Corelli was exceptional in the narrow focus of his compositional activity. Contrary to the assertion of Michael Talbot that, "Prior to 1800 the great

majority of composers, even the most highly admired, were specialists," quite the opposite was most often the case (2000b:181). From at least the fifteenth century on the composers best known to history cultivated all of the genres then current—Du Fay, for example, Josquin, Lassus, or Monteverdi, to mention only a few —and the same sort of quasi-universal competence continued to be expected from the professional musicians of the following centuries as well as the careers and works of figures such as Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven clearly show.

55. Busnoys's *Quant ce viendra,* Morton's *N'aray je jamais mieulx,* and the setting of the much used monophonic song, *Il sera pour vous conbatu/L'homme armé,* whose authorship is in doubt; see Garey and Perkins (1979: nos. 16, 24, 34; 2:248, 280, 330). The version à 4 of *Il sera pour vous* is included in Atlas (1981: no. 3b).

56. *Je ne fay plus,* ascribed to both Busnoys and Mureau, Hayne's *Amours, Amours, trop me fiers,* Agricola's *C'est mal cherché,* Caron's *Helas, que pourra devenir,* and Hayne's *De tous biens playne;* see Hewitt and Pope (1942: nos. 8,9,12,13,20).

57. *Je cuide se ce temps me dure,* ascribed to both Japart and Congiet, Juan Urrede's *Nunqua fue pena maior, Tmeiskin,* with attributions to Isaac, Obrecht, and Japart, and perhaps Hayne's *A l'audience;* see Hewitt and Pope (1942: nos. 2,4,27,93).

58. See Hewitt and Pope (1942:58–60).

59. See Fallows (1999:129ff).

60. For Busnoys's *Fortuna desperata,* see Meconi (2001). For Okeghem's *Fors seulement l'attente,* see Picker (1981). For Hayne's *De tous bien plaine,* see Cyrus (2000). And for *J'ay pris amours,* see Taruskin (1983:RS 6).

61. For additional examples, see Perkins (1999:763–75).

62. See the work list compiled by Lockwood et al. in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians,* 2nd ed., s.v. "Palestrina."

63. I should like to thank Prof. Schlagel for her kindness in making her typescript available to me prior to publication.

64. Note the use of the word *opus* in the title of the print, which was cited earlier, (see p. 45, n. 50).

65. As quoted by Schlagel (2002a:590); [JOSQUINUM celeberrimum huius artis Heroem facile agnoscent omnes, habet enim vere divinum et inimitabile quiddam . . . .] Talbot, who accepts Goehr's basic premises, adds to them the notion that, "between 1780 and 1820, approximately, a genre-centred and performer-centred practice became a composer-centred one" (2000b:172), apparently has not considered the extent to which composers such as Josquin have loomed large in earlier periods.

66. I should like to thank Professor Schlagel for making a copy of her paper available to me.

67. "It will be noted that the added parts often have leaping movements. This is acceptable because of the great difficulty met in trying to adjust a new voice to the composition's continuous lines. For it is one thing to write three parts at one time, another to add a third to two given parts. The latter is a far more difficult task, one for a consummate musician and deserving of high praise when successfully carried out." The passage, as quoted in translation by Schlagel (2002b) is taken from Zarlino's *Le istitutioni harmoniche* (1558), Terza Parte, Cap. 64, p. 260.

68. See Schlagel (1996).

69. The added voices are found in Munich, Bavarian State Library, MS 41; see

Schlagel (2002a).

70. The added part is found in Rokycany, Czech Republic, Archiv Dekanství v Rokycanech, MS A V 22; see Schlagel (2002a).

71. The composition was included in the *Novi atque catholici thesauri musici, Liber quartus . . . Petri Ioannelli de Gandino bergomensis collectae* (Venice, A. Gardano, 1568); see Schlagel (2002a).

72. The excerpt is from the *Ragionamenti accademici* of 1567: "Josquino, discepolo di Ocghem, si puo dire que quello alla musica fusse un mostro della natura, si come è stato nella Architettura, Pittura & Scultura il nostro Michelagnolo Buonarotti; per che si come Josquino non hà però ancora avuto alcuno che lo arrivi nelle composizione, cosi Michelagnolo . . . è solo & senza compagno," as given in English by Macey. See *The New Grove Dictionary of Music,* 2nd ed., s.v. "Josquin des Prez" (by Patrick Macey).

73. "Aiunt enim qui noverunt, multa cunctatione, multifariaque correctione sua edidisse, nec, nisi aliquot annis apud se detinuisset, ullum in publicum emisisse cantum." Note that the attitude imputed to Josquin regarding his compositions is much like that found more than a century later with Corelli; see note 53.

74. The full passage reads as follows: "Quoties novam cantilenam composuerat, dedit eam cantoribus canendam, et interea ipse circumambulabat, attente audiens, an harmonia congueret. Si non placeret, ingressus, 'Tacete,' inquit, 'ego mutabo'."

75. The full passage reads as follows: "Tu asine, quare addis coloraturam? Si mihi ea placuisset, inseruissem ipse. Si tu velis corrigere cantilenas recte compositas, facias tibi proprium cantum, sinas mihi meum incorrectum."

76. See the broad-ranging discussion of the issues involved by Rob Wegman (1999).

References

Atlas, Allan, ed. 1981. *Robert Morton, The Collected Works.* New York: Broude Brothers Limited.

Bent, Margaret. 1983. *Resfacta* and *Cantare Super Librum. Journal of the American Musicological Society* 36 (3): 371–91.

Blackburn, Bonnie J. 1987. On Compositional Process in the Fifteenth Century. *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 40 (2): 210–84.

Blackburn, Bonnie J., Edward E. Lowinsky, and Clement A. Miller, eds. 1991. *A Correspondence of Renaissance Musicians.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Braun, W. 1994. *Deutsche Musiktheorie des 15. bis 17. Jahrhunderts, II: Von Calvisius bis Mattheson,* Geschichte der Musiktheorie 8. Darmstadt.

Cahn, Peter. 1989. Zur Vorgeschichte des 'Opus perfectum et absolutum'. In *Zeichen und Struktur in der Musik der Renaissance, Ein Symposium aus Anlass der Jahrestagung der Gesellschaft für Musikforschung, Münster (Westfalen), 1987,* 11–26. Kassel: Bärenreiter.

Cyrus, Cynthia J., ed. 2000. *De tous biens plaine: Twenty-eight Settings of Hayne van Ghizeghem's chanson,* Recent Researches in the Music of the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance 36. Middleton, WI: A–R Editions.

Fallows, David. 1999. *A Catalogue of Polyphonic Songs, 1415–1480.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ferand, Ernest T. 1957. What Is *Res Facta*? *Journal of the American Musicological Soci-*

ety 10 (3): 141–50.

Gallagher, Sean. 2000. *Doublets, Multiforms, and the Work-Concept in Fifteenth-Century Song Repertories.* Paper delivered at American Musicological Society Conference, Toronto.

Garey, Howard and Leeman L. Perkins, eds. 1979. *The Mellon Chansonnier,* 2 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Glarean, Henricus. 1965. *Dodecachordon,* translation by Clement A. Miller, 2 vols. American Institute of Musicology.

Goehr, Lydia. 1992. *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

———. 2000. 'On the Problems of Dating' or 'Looking Backward and Forward with Strohm'. In Talbot 2000a, 231–46.

Heartz, Daniel. 1964. *Preludes, Chansons, and Dances for Lute.* Neuilly-sur-Seine: Société de musique d'autrefois.

———. 1969. *Pierre Attaingnant, Royal Printer of Music.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hewitt, Helen and Isabel Pope, eds. 1942. *Harmonic musices Odhecaton A.* Cambridge, MA: The Mediaeval Academy of America.

Judd, Cristle Collins. 2000. *Reading Renaissance Music Theory: Hearing with the Eyes,* Cambridge Studies in Music Theory and Analysis 14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kellman, Herbert, ed. 1999. *The Treasury of Petrus Alamire: Music and Art in Flemish Court Manuscripts, 1500–1535.* Ludion, Ghent, Amsterdam: University of Chicago Press.

Listenius, Nicholas. 1927. *Musica,* edited by Georg Schünemann. Veröffentlichungen der Musik-Bibliothek Paul Hirsch 8. Berlin: Martin Breslauer.

———. 1975. *Musica,* translated by Albert Seay. Colorado Springs: Colorado College Music Press.

Loesch, Heinz von. 1998. 'Musica' und 'opus musicum': Zur Frügeschichte der musikalischen Werkbegriffs. In *Musikwissenschaft zwischen Kunst, Asthetik und Experiment: Festschrift Helga de la Motte-Haber zum 60. Geburtstag,* 337–42. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.

———. 2001. *Der Werkbegriff in der protestantischen Musiktheorie des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts: Ein Missverständnis,* Veröffentlichungen des Staatlichen Instituts für Musikforschung 11: Studien zur Geschichte der Musiktheorie 1. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag.

Lowinsky, Edward E. 1969. *The Medici Codex of 1518,* 3 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Macey, Patrick. 1993. Josquin as Classic: *Qui habitat, Memor esto,* and Two Imitations Unmasked. *Journal of the Royal Music Association* 118: 1–43.

Maitland, J.A. Fuller and W. Barclay Squire, eds. 1963. *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book,* 2 vols. New York: Dover Publications.

Manlius, Johannes. 1562. *Locorum communium collectanae.* Basel.

Marinis, Tamaro de. 1947–52. *La Biblioteca Napolitana dei Re d'Aragona,* 4 vols. Milan: Ulrico Hoepli.

Meconi, Honey, ed. 2001. *Fortuna desperata: Thirty-six settings of an Italian Song,* Recent Researches in the Music of the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance 37.

Middleton, WI: A–R Editions.

Newman, William S. 1971. *The Sonata in the Baroque Era.* New York: W.W. Norton.

Perkins, Leeman L. 1999. *Music in the Age of the Renaissance.* New York: W.W. Norton.

Picker, Martin, ed. 1981. *Fors seulement: Thirty Compositions for Three and Five Voices or Instruments from the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries.* Middleton, WI: A–R Editions.

Pincherle, Marc. 1956. *Corelli: His Life and Works.* New York: W.W. Norton.

Schlagel, Stephanie P. 1996. *Josquin des Prez and His Motets: A Case Study in Sixteenth-Century Reception History.* PhD diss., University of North Carolina.

———. 2002a. The *Liber selectarum cantionum* and the German Josquin Renaissance. *The Journal of Musicology* 19 (4): 564–615.

———. 2002b. *Gilding the Lily: Si placet parts of Josquin's Motets.* Columbus, OH: Lecture-Recital for the Annual Meeting of the American Musicological Society.

Seidel, Wilhelm. 1987. *Werk und Werkbegriff in der Musikgeschichte,* Erträge der Forschung, Band 246. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Slim, H. Colin. 1972. *A Gift of Madrigals and Motets,* 2 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Strohm, Reinhardt. 2000. Looking Back at Ourselves: The Problem with the Musical Work-Concept. In Talbot 2000a, 128–52.

Strunk, Oliver, ed. 1950. *Source Readings in Music History.* New York: W.W. Norton.

———. 1998. *Strunk's Source Readings in Music History,* edited by Leo Treitler, 2nd ed. New York: W.W. Norton.

Talbot, Michael, ed. 2000a. *The Musical Work: Reality or Invention?* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

———. 2000b. The Work-Concept and Composer-Centredness. In Talbot 2000a, 168–86.

Taruskin, Richard, ed. 1983. *J'ay pris amours.* Miami: Ogni Sorte Editions.

Tinctoris, Johannes. 1961. *The Art of Counterpoint,* translated and edited by Albert Seay. American Institute of Musicology.

Wegman, Rob. 1999. 'And Josquin Laughed'. . . Josquin and the Composer's Anecdote in the Sixteenth Century. *The Journal of Musicology* 17 (3): 150–56.

Wiora, Walther. 1983. *Das Musikalische Kunstwerk.* Tutzing: Hans Schneider.