1

INTRODUCTION

Celebrating Transgression and Excess: Busnoys and the Boundaries of Late Medieval Culture

PAULA HIGGINS

*J*e ne puis vivre ainsy tousjours
*A*u mains que j'aye en mes dolours
*Q*uelque confort
*U*ne seulle heure, ou mains ou fort;
*E*t tous les jours
*L*éaument serviray Amours
*J*usqu'a la mort . . .[1]

(I can't live like this any longer unless I have some comfort for my pain; just one hour, or less—or more; and every day I'll serve the god of love faithfully unto death.)

WHEN Antoine Busnoys penned the poem containing the lines above, he embedded in them an acrostic yielding the name of a woman: one 'Jaqueljne d'Aqvevjle' (Jacqueline d'Hacqueville).[2] In so doing he broke the cardinal rule of courtly love: a commitment to absolute secrecy. Beyond betraying the name of a lady in the kind of ludic *tour de force* typical of the composer's works, the poem itself transgresses the boundaries of

I wish to thank Rob Wegman for his thoughtful response to the penultimate draft of this essay.

[1] Antoine Busnoys, *Je ne puis vivre ainsi toujours*. For an edition see Leeman L. Perkins and Howard W. Garey (eds.), *The Mellon Chansonnier* (New Haven, 1979), no. 12.

[2] For editions of the texts of the four Hacqueville songs see Paula Higgins, 'Parisian Nobles, a Scottish Princess, and the Woman's Voice in Late Medieval Song', *EMH* 10 (1991), 145–200; and Leeman L. Perkins, 'Antoine Busnois and the d'Hacqueville Connection', in Mary Beth Winn (ed.), *Musique naturelle et musique artificielle: In memoriam Gustav Reese = Le Moyen français*, 5 (1979), 49–64.

polite courtly love discourse: the scarcely veiled sexual innuendo of the phrase 'just one hour—or less or more' and the obscene *double entendre* on the word 'confort' ('con fort'). Following a direct address to the lady, in which the male persona instructs her to 'pay close attention to this poem' (lest she miss the acrostic?), he reverts to his tortured, brooding *monologue intérieur*: because of the lady's indifference, he is 'wasting away', 'walking in a hundred circles', 'staying up all night', and 'drowning in tears'. The hyperbolic rhetoric of this poem portrays a compelling persona at once impatient, desperate, passionate, dramatic, and fraught with lovesickness, that is, 'somatic symptoms of psychological breakdown caused by intense, erotic passion'.[3] Blurring the boundaries between poet and persona, Busnoys himself seems to leap off the page.

The musical profile of *Je ne puis vivre* matches in every respect the clever skill with which Busnoys incorporated textual games into the poem. George Perle singled out the piece as 'a special repository for exceptional details, including a long sequence involving all the parts, *Stimmtausch*, and ostinato passage in the bass, and the clearly defined tonality of C major', and considered it typical of 'the wonderful subtlety and ingenuity of his rhythmic ideas, probably unsurpassed in the history of music'.[4] Busnoys wrote at least three other songs concealing the name of the same woman, one of them involving an even more blatant verbal pun on her name and ingenious musical puzzle wherein the superius functions simultaneously as a three-part canon at the unison and the independent upper voice of a conventional three-voice song.[5] As others have noted, the 'specificity, originality, and intensity' of literary and musical expression apparent in the Hacqueville songs suggests a preoccupation with the female subject that almost surely exceeded the bounds of literary convention.[6]

[3] The language of the poem bears striking similarities to somatic symptoms of lovesickness (wasting, confusion, insomnia, sighs, and tears) as understood by medieval medicine. See Mary Frances Wack, *Lovesickness in the Middle Ages: The* Viaticum *and its Commentaries* (Philadelphia, 1990), 146–62, esp. 151 and 158. Arguing that lovesickness was a 'social and psychological response to historical contradictions in aristocratic culture', Wack amasses substantial evidence from medieval medical treatises to show that lovesickness was not 'simply a literary posture, a game of poetic conventions', but 'as "real" for medieval physicians as melancholy, headache, baldness, and scalp lice' (p. 149).

[4] George Perle, 'The Chansons of Antoine Busnois', *Music Review*, 11 (1950), 89–97 at 94. For another discussion of the piece see Paula Marie Higgins, 'Antoine Busnois and Musical Culture in Late Fifteenth-Century France and Burgundy' (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1987), 35–43.

[5] *Ha que ville et abominable*. In Dijon 517, the earliest source of the song, two Latin rubrics draw attention to the dual function of the upper voice-part. Both versions of the song are edited in *A Florentine Chansonnier from the Time of Lorenzo the Magnificent: Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale MS Banco Rari 229*, ed. Howard Mayer Brown (Monuments of Renaissance Music, 7; Chicago, 1983), nos. 197 and 197a.

[6] Perkins, 'Antoine Busnois', was the first to pursue this line of thought with respect to the Hacqueville songs. In my 'Parisian Nobles', 147–8, I took it further in examining the problem that 'personal poetry' has traditionally posed to literary critics, who are generally inclined to dismiss it altogether as a category of literary analysis. I adopt the criteria of 'specificity, originality, and intensity' put forth by Edward Lowinsky who attempted to reconcile the divergent viewpoints on autobiographical readings of late medieval poetry in his article 'Jan van Eyck's *Tymotheus*: Sculptor or Musician? With an Investigation of the Autobiographic Strain in French Poetry from Rutebeuf to Villon', *Studi musicali*, 13 (1984), 33–105, esp. 68. See also below, n. 22.

In a sense, the creative 'attitude' of Busnoys's Hacqueville songs seems entirely consistent with that of the composer of the motet *Anthoni usque limina*, who concealed his own name in the text itself, wrote a clever verbal canon to ensure the reader would not miss it, and constructed the piece in symmetrical halves corresponding to the numerical cipher of his own name; and of the 'unworthy musician of the count of Charolais' who, while cloaking his name in the protective shroud of the conventional medieval humility topos, declared himself as the author of the ostentatiously virtuosic motet *In hydraulis* and as the musical 'offspring' (*propago*) of its dedicatee, Johannes Ockeghem, 'the reincarnation of Orpheus'.[7]

The unparalleled artistic self-consciousness manifested in each of these works compels one to ask, what kind of character was this Antoine de Busnes, *dit* Busnoys? First and foremost, perhaps, a man whose foregrounding of himself as the composer of *Anthoni* and *In hydraulis* betrays an overweening concern with constructing himself as an *auctor*; second, a man whose thematizing of creative genealogy and signs of an absolute past (Pythagoras, Orpheus, Greek-flavoured musical terms) manifests a certain anxiety about legitimation;[8] and third, a man whose description of himself as the metaphorical 'son' of a composer he allegorizes as the most gifted musician in Greek mythology clearly indicates that he had a fairly high opinion of himself. That is not, of course, to suggest that such a seemingly arrogant self-assessment was necessarily unwarranted. Indeed, everything we know about Busnoys, which is not a great deal, confirms that his contemporaries regarded him as a truly exceptional man and consistently invoked superlatives to describe him.[9] Tinctoris considered Busnoys and Ockeghem as 'the most outstanding and most famous professors of the art of music',[10] 'the most excellent of all the composers I have ever heard',[11] and whose music was 'worthy of the immortal gods'.[12] Adam of Fulda singled out Busnoys, along with Dufay, as 'the most learned' composers of his generation.[13] Pietro Aron called Busnoys 'a great man and an excellent musician'.[14] Even those, like Tinctoris and

[7] For editions of both pieces see *Busnoys LTW*, nos. 8 and 10.

[8] For an excellent study treating the thematizing of genealogy in the works of Rabelais see Carla Freccero, *Father Figures: Genealogy and Narrative Structure in Rabelais* (Ithaca, NY, and London, 1991).

[9] A summary of the following theoretical citations may be found in Higgins, 'Antoine Busnois', 13–21.

[10] 'Praestantissimis ac celeberrimis artis musicae professoribus'. Johannes Tinctoris, *Liber de natura et proprietate tonorum*, in *Opera theoretica*, ed. Albert Seay, 2 vols. (CSM 22; Rome, 1975), i. 65.

[11] 'Okeghem, Busnois, Regis, et Caron, omnium quos audiverim in compositione praestantissimi'. Tinctoris, *Proportionale*, ibid. iia. 10.

[12] 'Quorum omnium omnia fere opera tantam suavitudinem redolent ut, mea quidem sententia, non modo hominibus heroibusque verum etiam *Diis immortalibus dignissima censenda sint*' (emphasis added). Tinctoris, *Liber de arte contrapuncti*, ibid. ii. 12. For a recent interpretation of this passage in the context of late medieval aesthetics see Rob C. Wegman, 'Sense and Sensibility in Late Medieval Music: Thoughts on Aesthetics and "Authenticity" ', *Early Music*, 23 (1995), 299–312.

[13] Adam of Fulda, *Musica*, in *Scriptores ecclesiastici de musica sacra*, ed. Martin Gerbert, 3 vols. (St Blasien, 1784; repr. Hildesheim, 1963), iii. 341.

[14] Pietro Aaron, *Toscanello in Music*, trans. Peter Bergquist, 2 vols. (Colorado College Music Press Translations, 4; Colorado Springs, 1970), i. 55.

Adrian Petit Coclico, who occasionally felt moved to criticize rather than praise his musical practice, described it in terms of transgression and excess. Defending the logic behind a fine point of mensural notation, Tinctoris complains 'Busnoys *alone* disagrees'.[15] Consigning Busnoys to his pejorative category of musical 'mathematicians', Coclico laments 'when they hope to spread their invented art widely and make it more outstanding, they rather defile and obscure it. In teaching precepts and speculation they have specialized excessively and, in accumulating a multitude of symbols and other things, they have introduced many difficulties'.[16]

Equally compelling testimony to Busnoys's somewhat exceptional character is a contemporaneous document which described him in 1465 as a 'very serious and famous man', 'exceptionally expert in music and poetry' who would 'best teach the choirboys'.[17] More alarming, and even more suggestive of an extravagant personality prone to physical and emotional excess, is an earlier document of 1461 which recounts a rather ignominious incident in which Busnoys, together with a number of cohorts, allegedly beat up a priest to the point of bloodshed—not once, but on five separate occasions—actions for which he was subsequently excommunicated. To add insult to injury, he then proceeded, in open defiance of canon law, to celebrate Mass in his state of anathema.[18] Whatever the sordid circumstances and penal consequences of Busnoys's crime, they do not seem to have unduly impeded his subsequent career or tainted his posthumous reputation.[19] Thereafter he went on to become master of the choirboys at Saint-Martin of Tours and Saint-Hilaire-le-Grand in Poitiers, two of the most renowned churches in Christendom, and subsequently entered the service of the Burgundian court under Charles the Bold, then the most magnificant musical establishment in western Europe.[20] His music survives in more than fifty manuscripts and prints of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries whose provenances extend from England to Hungary. In 1494 an Italian trombone-player arranged a now-lost Busnoys motet, dedicated it to the doge of Venice, and dispatched it as a gift to the duke of Mantua, boasting that 'all of Venice wished to hear no other'.[21] Posthumous legend (whatever its truth value) acknowledged Busnoys

[15] On Tinctoris's criticisms of Busnoys's mensural practice see Rob C. Wegman, 'Mensural Intertextuality' (below, Ch. 8).

[16] Adrian Petit Coclico, *Musical Compendium (Compendium Musices)*, trans. Albert Seay (Colorado College Music Press Translations, 5; Colorado Springs, 1973), 8.

[17] See Paula Higgins, 'Musical Politics in Late Medieval Poitiers', (below, Ch. 7).

[18] Pamela F. Starr, 'Rome as the Centre of the Universe: Papal Grace and Musical Patronage', *EMH* 11 (1992), 223–62 at 249–56 and 260.

[19] See Higgins, 'Musical Politics'.

[20] For Busnoys as *magister puerorum* at Saint-Martin of Tours and Saint-Hilaire-le-Grand in Poitiers see Higgins, 'Musical Politics'; on Busnoys's career at the Burgundian court see ead., '*In hydraulis* Revisited: New Light on the Career of Antoine Busnois', *JAMS* 36 (1986), 36–86.

[21] For the text and translation of the document, as well as relevant bibliography, see Higgins, 'Antoine Busnois', 9–11 and n. 7.

as the progenitor of the *L'homme armé* mass tradition; and he was without question the composer most imitated and emulated by his younger contemporaries Josquin, Obrecht, Agricola, Isaac, and Ghiselin.

If music can be said to leave the imprint of its composer's personality—a debatable proposition, to be sure—Busnoys's gives the impression of an excessive, flamboyant character determined to experiment with his own way of doing things.[22] His works are rife with harmonic surprise, abrupt changes of tempo and texture, musical canons, extensive imitation, melodic sequences, and large-scale repetitions of motivic ideas and even of whole passages. He exceeded conventionally accepted limits of the gamut in cultivating wide-spanned melodic lines that prefigure those of Josquin and Obrecht.[23] And in extending the outer ranges of the upper and lower voices and enabling individual musical lines to operate unobstructed by interference with crossing parts,[24] Busnoys essentially reconfigured the existing boundaries of tonal space. Standing at the crossroads of an era that witnessed the ideological transformation of the composer from an able craftsman to an innately endowed creator, Busnoys emerges as a pivotal figure in a critical period of changing styles and one of the most powerful musical minds of the century.

Perhaps more than any other composer of the period, Busnoys seems almost obsessively preoccupied with transgressing accepted boundaries, resisting discursive containment, pushing the limits of musical expression, and flaunting accepted rules and practices when it suited his mode of musical expression. Even the admittedly fragmentary biographical evidence offers a tantalizing sketch of a

[22] Clearly, this somewhat psychologizing view of Busnoys cries out for further theoretical articulation with respect to poststructuralist debates on the author, particularly Roland Barthes, 'The Death of the Author,' in *Image–Music–Text*, trans. Stephen Heath (New York, 1977), 149–54, and Michel Foucault 'What Is An Author?' in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York, 1984), 101–20, which I am disinclined to pursue in this particular forum. Suffice it to say that I do not seek naïvely to perpetuate the time-worn, positivist model of 'man-and-his-work' criticism so vociferously decried by Barthes: 'the *explanation* of a work is always sought in the man or woman who produced it, as if it were always in the end, through the more or less transparent allegory of the fiction, the voice of a single person, the *author* "confiding" in us' (p. 143). But I do believe, however, that their formulations, centred primarily on 19th-c. authors (Proust, Mallarmé, etc.), are of questionable relevance to composers, and especially to the late medieval 'composer'. Busnoys himself lived precisely during the time when the notion of a 'composer' as 'author' was barely nascent, and he was, moreover, deeply implicated in its formal articulation. In this respect, I am much more sympathetic to the far more subtly historicizing formulation of Foucault, who notes that the rise of the author coincides with the period in which ownership for texts came into being, which he dates to the late 18th and early 19th c. For music, however, questions of creative property and ownership were fermenting already in Busnoys's day, and were fully articulated in the 16th c. I pursue these questions further in my forthcoming book *Parents and Preceptors: Authority, Lineage, and the Conception of the Composer in the Late Middle Ages* (Oxford University Press).

[23] For a discussion of Busnoys as an innovator in the use of wide-spanned lines, hitherto regarded as one of the important style contributions of Josquin, see Higgins, 'Antoine Busnois', 55–9.

[24] Higgins, 'Antoine Busnois', 41–2, discussing Lynn M. Trowbridge, 'Style Change in the Fifteenth-Century Chanson: A Comparative Study of Compositional Detail', *Journal of Musicology*, 4 (1985), 146–70. Trowbridge suggests that Busnoys, 'more than any other composer studied achieved a texture in which the individual voices participate on an equal and independent footing. This arrangement, often attributed both to Ockeghem and Busnois, appears on the basis of the evidence gathered in the course of this study to be considerably more characteristic of Busnois than Ockeghem' (p. 162).

somewhat marginal, Villonesque character, headstrong and independent, 'living on the edge', defying ecclesiastical authority. This nascent if incomplete picture of Busnoys as a musical and social renegade may account in part for the irresistible attraction his life and music holds for us today, or at least helps to explain why some hundred scholars from six countries would choose to spend three days in collective isolation in a remote Midwestern enclave discussing it. Most of the twenty essays in this volume began life as papers presented at the 1992 Busnoys conference,[25] an event motivated not by sheer excess of commemorative fervour for the 500th anniversary of his death in 1492, but rather by the fortuitous coincidence of that occasion with an explosion of new historical interest in the composer and his music. Indeed, few musical personalities of the late Middle Ages have aroused an intensity of intellectual inquiry matching that currently surrounding Busnoys. The decade preceding the conference had witnessed the publication of the first complete critical edition of his Latin-texted works, more than a dozen articles and several lively exchanges in international journals, two doctoral dissertations, numerous conference papers, and several recordings.[26] Since then there have been additional articles, a monograph, new recordings, and a full-page story in the Sunday edition of the *New York Times* that spawned several weeks' worth of Internet threads.[27]

Such a remarkable turn of events could scarcely have been predicted, given how little attention Busnoys had received up until the mid-1980s. In that sense, the unexpected growth and dynamism of recent Busnoys studies does in itself represent a transgression of existing musicological boundaries, since the historical role carved out for the composer by traditional scholarship had been relatively modest. That Busnoys has never enjoyed canonical status within early music scholarship and the very reasons behind the belated and long-overdue attention to his music resonate somewhat uncannily with current postmodern concerns about the historical construction of scholarly canons: How is it that certain composers come to be privileged over others? How have historically constructed hierarchies of genre and their valorization informed assessments of musical significance? How have ideological blinkers, chronologically shifting aesthetic values, and tacit personal agendas resulted in the promulgation of the musics of certain cultural groups over those of others?

[25] Continuities and Transformations in Musical Culture, 1450–1500: Assessing the Legacy of Antoine Busnoys, held at the University of Notre Dame, 8–11 November 1992. Besides the present essay, the only one not presented at the conference itself is that of Honey Meconi (Ch. 19).

[26] For a summary of the most important developments in Busnoys scholarship antedating the conference see David Fallows's essay in this volume (Ch. 2).

[27] Paula Higgins, 'Love and Death in the Fifteenth-Century Motet: A Reading of Busnoys's *Anima mea liquefacta est/Stirps Jesse*', in Dolores Pesce (ed.), *Hearing the Motet* (New York, 1997), 142–68; Rob C. Wegman, ' "For Whom the Bell Tolls": Reading and Hearing Antoine Busnoys's *Anthoni usque limina*', ibid, 122–41; *Antoine Busnoys (d. 1492): In hydraulis and Other Works* (Pomerium; Alexander Blachly, director) (Dorian Recordings, 1993: DOR-90184); Richard Taruskin, 'The Trouble with Classics: They are only Human', *The New York Times*, Sunday, 14 Aug. 1994.

Much of the prior inattention to Busnoys has to do with the previous unavailability of his music: the complete edition of his Latin-texted music appeared only in 1990, and there is to this day no complete edition of his songs.[28] Moreover, and somewhat paradoxically, a long-standing historiographical tradition has cast Busnoys in the shadow of Ockeghem, a composer with whom he invariably shared equal billing in the eyes of his contemporaries. The historical construct of the 'Netherlands schools' as first promulgated by Raphael Georg Kiesewetter emerged in response to a patently nationalist cultural propaganda campaign: a prize competition launched by the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences for the best essay on the subject: What were the contributions of the Netherlanders to Music? Kiesewetter took the gold medal. Imbued with a kind of cultural chauvinism gone awry, his essay sought not only to establish the innate musical supremacy of composers from the Low Countries but also to prove that polyphony could not have flourished elsewhere.[29] It is thus probably no innocent accident of history that Ockeghem, with his patently Flemish surname, was proclaimed the head of the 'First Netherlandish School' at the expense of Busnoys, a French composer born within barely 100 kilometres from what is now modern-day Belgium. The role of bourgeois, Austrian-Catholic scholars in setting agendas that have laid the bedrock of early music scholarship would seem worthy of further investigation.[30] Tacit valorization of genres has also informed twentieth-century scholarly perceptions of Busnoys as a musical lightweight—a 'miniaturist'—known mainly for his courtly love songs, while Ockeghem, who left a more imposing and certainly more respectable body of masses, emerged as the more significant musical heavyweight.[31] Without wishing to endorse the

[28] See *Busnoys LTW*; Leeman L. Perkins is currently completing a critical edition of Busnoys's songs (originally begun by Catherine V. Brooks in the 1950s) for the Masters and Monuments of the Renaissance series, published by The Broude Trust.

[29] Raphael Georg Kiesewetter, 'Die Verdienste der Niederländer um die Tonkunst'. The silver medal in the competition was awarded to François-Joseph Fétis, 'Mémoire sur cette question: "Quels ont été les mérites des Néerlandais dans la musique, principalement aux 14e, 15e, et 16e siècles?" '. Both essays were published in *Verhandelingen over de Vraag: Welke Verdiensten hebben zich de Nederlanders vooral in de 14e, 15e en 16e Eeuw in het vak der Toonkunst verworven* (Amsterdam, 1829).

[30] For a discussion of the role of Kiesewetter and his nephew August Wilhelm Ambros in the promulgation of the 'myth of the Netherlands schools' and the centrality of Ockeghem to the historical constructions of their subjects see Higgins, 'Antoine Busnois', 32–3 and 216–26. Although Ockeghem was by far the linchpin in both scholars' efforts to demonstrate the musical supremacy of the 'Netherlanders', it is only fair to note that Kiesewetter published transcriptions of three Busnoys songs in an appendix to his 'Die Verdienste der Niederländer um die Tonkunst', in *Verhandelingen over de Vraag*. See also Higgins, 'Antoine Busnois', 218.

[31] 'It was in the field of secular music, however, that Busnois's talent was greatest, and in which his chief contribution was made' (Catherine V. Brooks, 'Antoine Busnois as a Composer of Chansons', 2 vols. (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1951), i. 20); 'It is probably the small gem-like chansons that form Busnois's most significant contribution to music' (ead., 'Antoine Busnois, Chanson Composer', *JAMS* 6 (1953), 111–35 at 111); 'Busnois's mastery of small form and his refined treatment of detail appear to advantage in his secular music' (Gustave Reese, *Music in the Renaissance* (2nd rev. edn.; New York, 1959), 102); 'The sacred music of Busnois exhibits the same delicacy, refinement and great melodic gifts that mark his chansons. But his few motets and single Mass [*sic*] cannot compare in breadth of conception or depth of realization with Ockeghem's great achievement in this field' (Howard M. Brown, *Music in the Renaissance* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1976), 88); 'Il n'est pas difficile de comprendre que ce qui classe Busnois au rang des

aesthetic hierarchies uncritically erected by earlier generations of scholars, it seems nevertheless important to point out that, in Busnoys's case, the survival pattern of sacred versus secular music is pure happenstance, and that what has come down to us—particularly in the realm of sacred music—is probably far less than what Busnoys actually wrote.[32] Moreover, it now appears that Busnoys, even more so than Ockeghem, had the most clearly discernible stylistic impact on the music of his younger contemporaries Josquin, Obrecht, and Isaac. With the wider diffusion of his music, Busnoys emerges ever more sharply as a pivotal figure in the histories of imitative counterpoint, melodic and harmonic sequence, and fifteenth-century tonality, and as the 'missing link' that helps bridge the stylistic chasm separating the musical styles of the Dufay and Josquin generations.[33]

Antoine Busnoys: Method, Meaning, and Context in Late Medieval Music brings together twenty original essays by some of the most distinguished and gifted scholars working in the field of early music today. All the articles have been revised, amplified, and in some cases transformed beyond recognition from their earlier incarnations as conference papers. While 'Antoine Busnoys', the catalyst for the original occasion, provides the title and thematic focus of the volume, the essays treat many of his contemporaries as well: Binchois, Dufay, Ockeghem, Obrecht, Tinctoris, Japart, Isaac, and others. The subtitle, 'Method, Meaning, and Context in Late Medieval Music', refers to the principal approaches exemplified in the essays rather than to discrete categories organizing the contents of the volume. Few of the essays, in fact, could adequately be described as exclusively methodological, critical, or contextual; some of them blend all three approaches; and all of them share the distinction of having responded to the problematic of the research situation itself, rather than to abstract paradigms or metanarratives arbitrarily imposed on the subject-matter. It is thus an essentially eclectic and pragmatist collection that resists neat, taxonomic labelling in terms of critical dispensations either 'new' or 'old'. Driven first and foremost by deep intellectual commitment to the study of late medieval musical culture, the contributors, like

petits maîtres de la musique religieuse, fait précisément de lui un grand maître de la musique profane' (Charles van den Borren, *Études sur le quinzième siècle musical* (Antwerp, 1941), 279). See also Higgins, 'Antoine Busnois', 25–34.

[32] Ibid. 30–3. As David Fallows has also noted, eight new masses had been attributed to Busnoys in the years immediately preceding the Busnoys conference (see Ch. 2). Moreover, felicitous references in random historical documents and theoretical works allude to the existence of at least five previously lost works, one of which, *Gaude caelestis Domina*, was recently rediscovered by Rob Wegman (Ch. 8).

[33] Higgins, 'Antoine Busnois', 45–54, summarizing the pioneering work of Edgar Sparks who was the first to draw attention to Busnoys's decisive and largely unrecognized contribution to the development of 15th-c. sacred styles. See *Cantus Firmus in Mass and Motet, 1420–1520* (Berkeley, 1963; repr. New York, 1975), esp. ch. 7, 212–18, and ch. 8. Earlier studies by Wolfgang Stephan, *Die burgundisch-niederländische Motette* (Heidelberger Studien zur Musikwissenschaft, 6; Kassel, 1937; repr. 1973) and van den Borren, *Études sur le quinzième siècle musical*, contained important discussions of Busnoys's motets. Both studies, however, concluded with the period of Ockeghem and Busnoys, and therefore did not explore the obvious stylistic ramifications of Busnoys's works for the next generation of composers.

Busnoys himself, have sought to experiment with their own way of doing things.[34] That such committed and passionate allegiance will inevitably change paradigms, transgress traditional disciplinary boundaries, and even lead to occasional excesses of interpretive zeal is obvious, and can be witnessed, if anywhere, in this volume itself. The reader will find a wealth of innovative methodologies for the study of late medieval music, novel interpretations of the music, theoretical treatises, and archival documents of the period, and virgin explorations into largely uncharted terrain impinging on the social, cultural, intellectual, devotional, and hermeneutic contexts of late medieval music. If any one all-encompassing theme does seem to emerge forcefully from virtually all the essays, it is that historical documents, theoretical treatises, and musical works can no longer be seen as isolated objects of specialized study but rather as colourful threads inextricably woven into the kaleidoscopic tapestry of late medieval culture. In the summaries that follow, I claim no role as ventriloquist for the authors (who may not necessarily agree with my formulations of their work), but seek rather to set the essays within a broader contextual framework to facilitate their reading and interpretation and to identify what I consider to be some of the key issues and shared resonances among them.

'You are trained and immersed in all musical delights', wrote Jean Molinet to Busnoys in a twenty-six-line letter of homage alternating the end-rhymes 'bus' and 'noys'.[35] As Busnoys's sometime pen-pal and one-time colleague at the

[34] In the past decade the field of musicology has undergone a dramatic paradigm shift that has provoked heated critical debates over the 'new musicology' and has singled out early music scholarship as the principal scapegoat in an increasingly vocal anti-positivist discourse. Inevitably, persistent assaults on early music fall squarely upon the shoulders of its practitioners and the curious silence from all but a few critical voices in its defence and the apparent lack of infiltration of the new trends into the discipline at large has perhaps unwittingly fostered the impression of a kind of collective indifference or complacency with the 'good old ways'. Viewed within the currently volatile political climate in the field, the publication of a hefty volume of essays paying homage to the creative legacy of a dead, white, European male composer and celebrating the élite musical culture of his day might even risk interpretation as a 'political act', and a rather retrogressive one at that: a last-ditch attempt to buttress a sagging field, a heroic effort to reassert the hegemony of a once-dominant but now moribund canonical tradition, and above all a flagrant violation of political correctness in seeming to advocate the enshrinement of yet another overlooked and undervalued male genius in the pantheon of musical greatness. The editor hopes that the present collection implicitly answers such charges, patiently and eloquently, with the only sensible answer that a constantly developing yet radically sceptical and questioning field can give: we are changing our paradigms from within and in response to a constantly shifting understanding of medieval musical culture itself, rather than out of a perceived historical necessity of methodological innovation for its own sake, or for musicology's sake.

For selected responses to the charges against early music with respect to the new trends see Margaret Bent, 'Fact and Value in Contemporary Scholarship', *Musical Times*, 127 (1986), 85–9; Lewis Lockwood, 'Communicating Musicology: A Personal View', *College Music Symposium*, 28 (1988), 1–9; Sandra Pinegar, 'The Seeds of Notation and Music Paleography', in Edmund Goehring (ed.), *Approaches to the Discipline: Current Musicology*, 53 (1993), 99–108; Paula Higgins, 'From the Ivory Tower to the Marketplace: Early Music, Musicology, and the Mass Media', ibid. 109–23 at 109–14; see also the exchanges between Pinegar and Higgins in *Current Musicology*, 55 (1993) and 56 (1994), 175–85; and Rob Wegman's numerous spirited postings on the amslist in September 1994.

[35] 'Je te rens honneur et tri*bus* | Sus tous aultres, car je cog*nois* | Que tu es instruis et im*bus* | En tous musicaulx esba*nois* . . .'. See the poetic exchange between Molinet and Busnoys in *Les Faictz et dictz de Jean Molinet*, ed. Noël Dupire, 3 vols. (Paris, 1936–9), ii. 795–801.

Burgundian court, Molinet undoubtedly spoke from a first-hand knowledge of Busnoys's songs, if the numerous allusions to them peppered throughout his poems is any indication. Taking up Molinet's epithet as the title of his essay, David Fallows conducts a magisterial survey and critical assessment of recent developments in Busnoys studies, and in the process adds several recommendations and major discoveries of his own.[36] 'Busnoys', he reminds us, 'was the most prolific song composer between Dufay and Claudin de Sermisy' and his song production warrants more serious critical attention. According to Fallows's tentative chronology of the songs, nearly two-thirds of Busnoys's songs must pre-date 1467, a revelation of rather startling proportions which will necessitate some serious rethinking of fifteenth-century style chronology. Similarly in need of greater study, according to Fallows, is the poetry manuscript Paris 9223, preserving a poem attributed to Busnoys as well as texts by a large number of poets associated with the court of Brittany, which he identifies as a hypothetical locus for an earlier and as yet undocumented phase of Busnoys's career in the 1450s.[37] And with his eagle eye for cryptograms, Fallows detects an acrostic formed by the initial letters of the first twelve songs in the Wolfenbüttel manuscript, thus identifying what is in all probability the first known owner of a major fifteenth-century songbook. The resulting name, 'Estiene Petit', corresponds to that of two officers in the French court—a father and son—and virtually clinches the case already constructed by others that Wolfenbüttel and its related manuscripts emanate from cultural circles surrounding the French royal court.[38]

The task of reconstructing the cultural, social, and devotional contexts for the production and diffusion of fifteenth-century musical works remains a central priority of early music scholarship. The first group of essays in the volume focus their attention on sacred music apparently written for performance within late medieval liturgical ceremony and ritual and explore methodologies for gaining deeper insights into its meaning and function. Howard Mayer Brown, comparing two versions of extant ordinances from the Burgundian court under Charles the Bold, illuminates the probable uses of and devotional contexts for Busnoys's music that survives in the court choirbook Brussels 5557, a manuscript containing what are thought to be Busnoys autographs. Documents like the Burgundian chapel ordinances, according to Brown, 'help us to understand better just what

[36] Fallows's article is a revised and expanded version of his Keynote Address that launched the Busnoys conference.

[37] Higgins, 'Parisian Nobles', 171–2 and 182–4 also treats Paris 9223 from the perspective of poets associated in the mid-1440s with the court of the dauphine of France, Margaret of Scotland, and raises the possibility of a redating of Busnoys's compositional activities to the 1450s (ibid. 190 and n. 133). A direct link of Margaret's court with that of Brittany, of course, comes by way of her sister Isabel, who, in the aftermath of Margaret's death in 1445, married Francis I, duke of Brittany.

[38] An extensive case amassing biographical, codicological, textual, and art historical evidence for the origins of the chansonniers Dijon, Laborde, Wolfenbüttel, Copenhagen, and Nivelle in French court circles in the Loire Valley in the 1460s is outlined in Higgins, 'Antoine Busnois', 234–96.

priests and singers did every day, what their responsibilities were in celebrating the Mass and Office, and what place music, whether chant or polyphony, had in the continuous celebration of the Christian faith'. Identifying those liturgical occasions which prescribed polyphony enables Brown to correlate many of the masses, motets, hymns, and antiphons of the Brussels 5557 repertory with the liturgical and paraliturgical services at which they may have been heard. More elusive to liturgical assignment are masses based on secular cantus firmi, like Heyns's *Missa Pour quelque paine*, which prompts Brown's concluding exhortation that music historians turn their attention to the more broadly hermeneutical question: why, given the vast body of plainsong available to them, did composers in the years around 1460 begin to base their masses on secular cantus firmi, particularly those derived from courtly love songs?

Of all the secular cantus firmi employed in polyphonic masses none captivated the musical imaginations of composers more than the *L'homme armé* tune. Despite the considerable attention devoted to the subject over the past fifty years, no one has yet succeeded in explaining the tune's extraordinary popularity and why more than thirty composers over the course of 150 years chose to base at least one and in some cases two masses on it. Flynn Warmington's perspicacious reading of Giovanni Rucellai's *Zibaldone quaresimale* of 1457 unearthed an intriguing reference to an ancient papal ritual—the 'Mass of the Armed Man'—that may bear on the origins of the tradition. Known for centuries to historians but entirely overlooked by musicologists, the Mass itself involved an elaborate ceremonial ritual during which powerful magnates received a papal sword and hat directly from the hands of the pope, or by proxy through an embassy dispatched to their own courts. Providing a hitherto unforeseen hypothetical context for the composition of these masses, Warmington isolates individual potentates, including the dukes of Burgundy and the kings of France, whose conferral ceremonies might well have prompted the commissioning of some of the earliest *L'homme armé* masses.

The long-standing music historiographical preoccupation with late medieval polyphony has tended to obscure the fact that plainsong remained a vibrant, living tradition throughout the late Middle Ages. Indeed, the centrality of plainsong in the daily lives of late medieval musicians whom we now regard exclusively as composers of polyphony can scarcely be overestimated. 'These men', as Jennifer Bloxam reminds us, 'sang and taught the plainsong dialect of the institutions they served; some supervised the preparation of new chant books, rendered judgements on analytic debates pertaining to plainsong, and even authored original texts and melodies for newly created feasts.'[39] The plainsong cantus firmi

[39] M. Jennifer Bloxam, 'Sacred Polyphony and Local Traditions of Liturgy and Plainsong: Reflections on Music by Jacob Obrecht', in Thomas Forrest Kelly (ed.), *Plainsong in the Age of Polyphony* (Cambridge Studies in Performance Practice, 2; Cambridge, 1992), 140–77 at 143.

adopted by composers of polyphonic masses like those in Brussels 5557 often reflected the local idioms of the regions and institutions in which peripatetic medieval musicians momentarily found themselves working. Bloxam's pioneering work in this fledgling field of early music scholarship has unearthed multiple layers of biographical, religious, and symbolic intertextuality embedded in composers' seemingly arbitrary choices of chant melodies.[40] In her essay here, she stresses the importance of these frequently significant divergences in plainchant practices and outlines a methodology for localizing, by means of contemporaneous service-books, the particular variants used by composers in their polyphonic compositions. Once linked to a specific liturgy, the cantus firmus adopted by a composer can not only yield unexpected insights into the initial performance context of a piece and sharper focus on matters of musical style and chronology, but can also raise more difficult hermeneutical questions: why did the composer select this particular cantus firmus? What did the quotation of the plainsong signify to the composer, the singers, and the listeners?

Similar questions of meaning and historical context inform the second group of essays, which encompass a more diverse group of topics relating to late medieval traditions of allegory, music pedagogy, mensural theory, and numerical exegesis. Michael Long subjects the *L'homme armé* question to more rigorous scrutiny by interrogating why the musical tradition of cantus-firmus masses seems to have arisen precisely in the years around 1460. With breathtaking interdisciplinary virtuosity, he weaves together disparate threads of mathematical, cosmological, literary, liturgical, mythological, and theological evidence suggesting that the earliest *L'homme armé* masses grew out of a direct response to the propaganda campaign launched by Pius II in support of the idea of a new crusade against the infidel Turks following the Fall of Constantinople in 1453. His argument hinges on Christian appropriations of pagan mythology through Virgil's vision of the lost Saturnian Golden Age and the allegorization of Pius II (Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini) as Virgil's 'Aeneas', providing a motivation for the quotation of the 'Virgilian catchword' *Arma virumque cano* at the opening of the canon of the sixth Naples *L'homme armé* mass. In support of this hypothesis he underscores the 'readiness of medieval writers to appropriate non-Christian texts, characters, or topoi for allegorization and exegesis' and particularly 'the network of texts implicitly equating the literature and mythography of Imperial Rome with the fundamental precepts of the Roman Church and of her faithful warriors'.

A panorama of insights into several other of the more decisive social and cultural changes fermenting in the years around 1460 can be gleaned from sensitively contextual readings of archival documents. One momentous ideological shift during this period involved the increasing tendency to view the composer as

[40] M. Jennifer Bloxam, ' "In Praise of Spurious Saints": The *Missae Floruit Egregiis* by Pipelare and La Rue', *JAMS* 44 (1991), 163–220.

a creatively endowed individual. Paula Higgins sees the phenomenon as 'inextricably bound up with the evolving status of the *magister puerorum* from that of skilled pedagogue to creative mentor . . . a gradual shift in mentality that can be traced . . . in the patterns of recruitment and hiring of musical personnel in collegiate churches and cathedrals'. The focus of her essay centres on an unusual document of 1465 from Saint-Hilaire-le-Grand in Poitiers which recounts with rare precision the details of a heated debate among its canons over two candidates vying for the position of *magister puerorum*, Busnoys being one of them. What plainly emerges from between the lines of the rather remarkable discussion is that Busnoys, in probable complicity with the chapter's Dean, instigated a calculated (if not ruthless) and ultimately successful political move to usurp the position of the incumbent master. Contextualizing the incident with respect to roughly contemporaneous institutional hirings in nearby Bourges and elsewhere, she traces the emergence of the exceptionally competent master as a highly marketable commodity who, by the end of the century, seems invariably to have been a composer of complex mensural polyphony. The simultaneously evolving musical and theoretical discourse manifests a growing concern on the part of composers with acknowledging their masters, thereby implicitly legitimating their creative authority by situating themselves within a musical genealogy or lineage.

Busnoys as a composer benignly neglectful or (more likely) deliberately transgressive of received theoretical doctrine emerges forcefully in Rob Wegman's article, which scrutinizes Busnoys's 'single-minded adherence to notational practices that were edited out of his music almost everywhere else'. Tinctoris, the consummate *musicus*, consistently found fault with Busnoys's mensural usage and defended his own theoretical authority by underscoring that 'Busnoys *alone* disagrees . . .'. Seeking to explain Busnoys's persistence in perpetuating what many regarded as confusing mensural idiosyncrasies, Wegman develops the metaphor of 'mensural practice as language' and examines Busnoys's music as a means of understanding 'the way notational devices acquired meanings in history'. He observes that Busnoys's mensural usage hints at a personal allegiance to his own compositional training (possibly at the hands of Petrus de Domarto) and bears a curious resemblance to English practices of mid-century. Corroborating what we have already seen with respect to his music, his poetry, biographical documents, and contemporaneous assessments, Wegman suggests that even Busnoys's mensural profile can be read 'as an autobiographical text, tracing back its various strands to a range of historical intertexts'. Far from being of purely hermeneutical interest, this entirely original and unprecedented study of Busnoys's 'mensural intertextuality', as Wegman dubs it, leads him to identify the motet *Gaude caelestis Domina* in Cappella Sistina 15 with the purportedly 'lost' (but simply mistitled, through editorial error) motet *Animadvertere* attributed to Busnoys in Tinctoris's *Proportionale*.

The same 'single-minded persistence' typical of Busnoys's notational profile is also manifested, as we have seen earlier, by his interest in the hermeneutical and occult dimensions of late medieval thought, which seems to have exceeded by a long shot that of his contemporaries. This peculiar facet of his creative personality marks Busnoys as the virtually unrivalled *magister ludi* of late fifteenth-century music. Jaap van Benthem explores the possibility that an esoteric architectonic framework, obscured by faulty transmission in the manuscript sources, may have figured centrally in Busnoys's conception of *In hydraulis*, a piece that held undeniably personal meaning for him. In the light of Busnoys's penchant for cryptic and recondite canons, van Benthem demonstrates the probability that Busnoys originally wrote the ostinato tenor as a canonic entity (notated but once with instructions for resolving the mensuration of its successive statements) and proposes emendations necessary to effect a correct transcription of *In hydraulis* from its two relatively corrupt sources. From there he proceeds to explore a complex nexus of numerically significant textual and musical relationships that may represent an exegesis in 'sounding number' of Busnoys's identity and his relationship to Ockeghem.

Questions of authorship and attribution, particularly as they relate to edition-making, have long exercised the minds of musicologists. Some have objected to the seemingly disproportionate amount of time scholars of early music have devoted to these 'positivist' questions of establishing texts, rather than to their critical interpretation.[41] And yet it is difficult to devote serious critical thought to a body of music, like that of Busnoys, which has yet to become available in a standard 'text' that the complete critical edition represents. The methods of inquiry that characterize the third group of essays proceed from more broadly contextualized repertorial perspectives and focus attention on problems posed by conflicting attributions and anonymous works in late medieval music. In her survey of the vast repertory of fifteenth-century Magnificats, Mary Natvig draws attention to the anomalous and in some respects unique formal and stylistic features of Busnoys's single attributed Magnificat surviving in Brussels 5557 and in the light of these anomalies examines four anonymous Magnificats that scholars have linked with Busnoys. Several pressing questions come to the fore: How are we to develop sufficiently distinctive musical criteria for assessing questions of authorship? How much weight should be accorded to author attributions in the face of contradictory stylistic evidence? Having addressed these and other questions about the pieces under discussion, she concludes with some compelling thoughts about the possibility of a hitherto unexplored influence of Busnoys on the late works of Guillaume Dufay.

An overriding historiographical tendency for scholars to privilege works of

[41] Joseph Kerman, *Contemplating Music: Challenges to Musicology* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985), 48.

known authorship has consigned many outstanding anonymous works to historical oblivion. Andrea Lindmayr explores this time-honoured dilemma with respect to the anonymous song-motet *Resjois toi terre de France/Rex pacificus*, whose text links it to the coronation of Louis XI in July 1461. Previously attributed on the basis of circumstantial evidence to Ockeghem, the piece in actuality bears a now fragmentary ascription to Busnoys in the Pixérécourt manuscript. The question of Busnoys's authorship is of no minor import, providing as it would a second securely datable piece with which to anchor a chronology of his works (the only other being *In hydraulis*); it would also further corroborate his interaction with musical circles of the French royal court. Ultimately, Lindmayr sidesteps the question of authorship in favour of advocating greater attention to the vast body of anonymous works of the period whose authorship can never be known and without which we can never formulate a complete picture of the music of the period.

Questions of authorship and authenticity assume more urgent practical concern for editors pressed to make hard-and-fast decisions about which works of a composer to include or exclude from a definitive critical edition. Such decisions are fraught with difficulties even in the relatively rare cases for which we have more or less complete information about a composer's biography, firm datings of the surviving manuscripts, and a number of securely datable pieces from which to establish a chronology. As the editor of the complete edition of Busnoys's songs, Leeman Perkins is forced to confront a woefully incomplete state of basic biographical and chronological information, large numbers of conflicting attributions, and the fragility even of those attributions that in the past scholars might have considered relatively secure. Moreover, since Busnoys lived at a time when author attributions were only beginning to become the norm, rather than the exception, what does the editor of his music do about the large numbers of anonymous works in those manuscripts emanating from cultural circles in which he is known to have flourished and whose style suggests a connection with Busnoys? The statistical predominance of combinative songs and virelais in Busnoys's output leads Perkins to explore the possibility that a significant number of the anonymous songs in those genres transmitted in the central Busnoys sources could be his, particularly those betraying what he has identified as a sufficiently idiosyncratic musical 'signature'. In conclusion, Perkins urges that musicologists unabashedly solicit the help of specialized computer technology to assess questions of style as they impinge on conflicting attributions and anonymous works.

If such questions are already complex when only incomplete information about a composer survives, they become all but insurmountable when nothing at all is known about him—not even his first name. In these particularly murky cases of composer identity, scholars have often turned to archival sources as a method

of last resort. In her essay here, Barbara Haggh tackles one of the thorniest biographical problems of the fifteenth century: the identity of the composer 'Caron', several of whose works bear conflicting attributions to Busnoys. Combing a vast array of primary sources, she attempts to sort out the various personages by that name, and isolates musicians named Jean and Philippe as possible candidates for the composer. In the process she brings to light hitherto unknown information about Busnoys's curious beneficial career in Brussels churches—in one case the renunciation of a benefice after only four days of tenure.

Few topics impinging on the performance and study of early music have the capacity to cause scholarly tempers to flare more than interpreting the theorists on matters of *musica ficta*, compositional process, and mensurations and proportions. The three essays in the fourth section of the volume involve close readings of musical theorists towards a greater elucidation of the meanings of problematic and in some cases highly controversial passages dealing with these specific aspects of compositional procedure and performance practice in the music of Busnoys and his contemporaries. In the light of Tinctoris's apparent disapproval of allowing diminished fifths to stand without correction, Peter Urquhart undertakes a comprehensive study of the use of diminished fifths in Busnoys's song production, identifying some eighty-four places where a diminished fifth was found, and offering compelling reasons why in some thirty-one instances the troublesome interval would probably not have been altered. Busnoys, so it seems, emerges once again as the trangressor of higher theoretical authority. Urquhart's conclusions have far-reaching practical implications not only for the performance of the repertory, but especially for a reassessment of current editorial policies with regard to the introduction of accidentals.

Turning to the didactic treatises of Pietro Aaron, Richard Wexler attempts to tease out the intended meaning behind the controversial passage where Aaron asserts that the 'moderns' of his day 'considered all of the parts together' as they composed. He concludes that the passage refers to the need for compositional planning, not simultaneous conception of all the parts, and that the significant change in compositional method resulted from a growing tendency towards melodic assimilation of the individual parts, linked to the treatment of cantus firmi in paraphrase rather than in extended values, and the increasing prevalence of pervasive imitation as a compositional procedure in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

Closely reading Tinctoris's treatises on mensuration and proportion, Alexander Blachly surveys a broad slice of contemporaneous music with the purpose of determining whether the proportions introduced in the linear progression of a composition were the same as those introduced in simultaneous juxtaposition with the mensuration of other parts. Tinctoris, he observes, says nothing categorical about the stroke of diminution in his four statements on the

subject, and from these Blachly extracts twelve axioms broadly applicable to the musical practice of the period and to modern-day performance of the repertory. With specific reference to Busnoys's individual mensural practice, Blachly, like Wegman earlier, notes that 'Busnoys's music occasionally breaks Tinctoris's rules'. As Blachly understands it, the crux of Tinctoris's message suggests 'that vertical and horizontal mensural relationships differed in kind' and that the context and the nature of the piece 'contribute to determining the degree of differentiation'. In other words, we must assess the significance of the difference 'on the merits of the piece in which it is found'.

The essays in the fifth and final section of the volume all relate to Busnoys's legacy and the reception of his works. Two particularly puzzling aspects of Busnoys reception are the predominance of his songs in manuscripts of Italian provenance, even though he has no known biographical connections with Italy, and his setting of two songs with Italian texts: *Con tutta gentileça* and *Fortuna desperata*. The papers by Picker, Meconi, and Rifkin all address aspects of the *Fortuna* problem, particularly as it impinges on the question of Busnoys's authorship. Martin Picker surveys Heinrich Isaac's involvement in the perpetuation and propagation of the *Fortuna desperata* tradition throughout Germany and identifies his six settings of the tune as an important secondary branch in the tradition's history which Ludwig Senfl and others clearly took as their point of departure. Picker himself considers the question of Busnoys's authorship unresolved, but concludes that its resolution probably has little bearing on the subsequent promulgation of the song in German spheres.

The essays by Honey Meconi and Joshua Rifkin should be read in tandem, representing as they do the scholarly analogue of two different 'art-song reworkings' of the same tune. Meconi takes on the *Fortuna* question from the hitherto unexplored angle of its Italian text. Through a study of its intertextual resonances with poetry lamenting the deaths of various Italian ladies of distinction, she links the text directly to the city of Florence and specifically to the circle of Lorenzo de' Medici and Angelo Poliziano. She then effectively contests the arguments against Busnoys's authorship and marshals substantial musical evidence from a wide variety of Busnoys's works to counter claims of *Fortuna*'s alleged contrapuntal flaws and stylistic deviations from Busnoys's normal practice. She raises the possibility of the song's authorship by lesser known Florentine musicians, including the 'Ser Felice' to whom a five-voice version of *Fortuna* bears ascription in Cappella Giulia XIII. 27. But in the virtual absence of other extant pieces by these native Florentines, 'opening the field to a new composer provides no more certainty than before . . . we may never be able to state definitively who wrote *Fortuna desperata*.' Thus consigned to the realm of the epistemological, the authorship question takes a back seat to the larger question that concludes her essay: 'If the original author were a nonentity or if later composers had no idea who wrote

Fortuna desperata, why rework this piece more than virtually any other fifteenth-century polyphonic model?'

Working with a virtually identical body of evidence, Joshua Rifkin arrives at conclusions diametrically opposed to those of Meconi.[42] Outlining the problems of Busnoys's presumed 'Italian period', Rifkin focuses on the two songs with Italian text. He ingeniously employs codicological evidence to demonstrate conclusively that *Con tutta gentileça* must be a contrafact and proceeds from there to undermine the reliability of the sole attribution of *Fortuna desperata* to Busnoys in the Segovia manuscript. In a virtuosic demonstration of positivist scholarship at its best, he exhaustively explores every conceivable codicological, repertorial, scribal, and musical piece of evidence remotely impinging on the question. On the weight of the evidence amassed, he categorically rules out Busnoys as the composer of *Fortuna desperata* and reassigns the work to the *piccolo maestro fiorentino*, Ser Felice.

Still, one feels compelled to ask whether the frequency with which Busnoys's music was emulated by and served as models for other composers (and whether or not he composed *Fortuna desperata* hardly contradicts the overwhelming evidence of his influence) may represent some tacit and otherwise undocumented evidence of the high regard in which he was held as a teacher, as an outstanding model to be emulated.[43] The advice of Hermann Finck and others that an aspiring student 'use an experienced teacher and devote himself totally to imitating him'[44] was already more or less formulated nearly a century earlier in Tinctoris's famous passage in his counterpoint treatise: 'just as Virgil took Homer as his model in his divine work, the Aeneid, so by Hercules, do I use these as models for my own small productions'.[45] That Busnoys served as master of the choirboys in at least two of the most renowned churches in western Christendom would undoubtedly have provided him with some of the finest raw musical talent around; yet the identities of his students will probably be for ever shrouded in anonymity. In the absence of known biographical links between composers, then, can one nevertheless find sufficiently compelling musical evidence to support the likelihood of such a pedagogical connection? Struck by the numerous similarities between the music of Busnoys and the little-known composer Jean Japart, Allan Atlas outlines a tentative methodology for exploring this intriguing

[42] Because Rifkin's essay arrived after editing of the volume was completed, it is published here virtually as received from the author.

[43] See in particular Stephan, *Die burgundisch-niederländische Motette*; Sparks, *Cantus Firmus*; van den Borren, *Études*; Higgins, 'Antoine Busnois', 21–5; ead., '*In hydraulis*', 76–82; Richard Taruskin, 'Antoine Busnoys and the *L'Homme armé* Tradition', *JAMS* 39 (1986), 255–93, esp. 262–7; Richard Sherr, '*Illibata Dei virgo nutrix* and Josquin's Roman Style', *JAMS* 41 (1988), 434–64 at 439–42 and 434; Thomas Brothers, 'Vestiges of the Isorhythmic Tradition in Mass and Motet, ca. 1450–1475', *JAMS* 44 (1991), 1–56 at 15–34, 38–49, and 56; Rob C. Wegman, 'Another Mass by Busnoys?', *ML* 71 (1990), 1–19; id., *Born for the Muses: The Life and Masses of Jacob Obrecht* (Oxford, 1994), 86–100, 213–17.

[44] Hermann Finck, *Musica Practica* (Wittenberg, 1556), beginning of Liber Quintus.

[45] Tinctoris, *The Art of Counterpoint*, trans. Albert Seay (MSD 5; [Rome], 1961), 15.

theoretical question. Identifying what he calls 'internal intersections' between the music of Busnoys and Japart—shared use of well-known tunes, combinative songs, and techniques of contrapuntal manipulation—as well as 'external intersections'—similar source transmission of the works of both composers—Atlas concludes on strength of the cumulative evidence that there may indeed have been a direct line of pedagogical influence from Busnoys to Japart.[46]

Jacob Obrecht, whose indebtedness to Busnoys is abundantly manifest in his direct imitation of Busnoys's *L'homme armé* mass, deployment of Busnoys's songs in his masses, and emulation of Busnoys's musical style, represents the unrivalled heir-apparent to Busnoys's musical legacy. Though the locus of personal contact between the two composers has long been thought to be Bruges, where both were working during the 1480s, Obrecht was already a mature composer by this time, as Rob Wegman showed in his second contribution to the conference proceedings.[47] Wegman sketches a scenario for a hitherto unforeseen context for their interaction during Obrecht's formative years: the late 1460s at the court of Burgundy where his father, Willem Obrecht, worked as a trumpeter. In the light of Obrecht's demonstrable musical indebtedness to Busnoys, Wegman concluded by reflecting on what Busnoy's death might have meant to the younger composer.

One wonders too what the prospect of his own imminent departure from life might have meant to Busnoys himself. As he soberly reflected on his life's transgressions and excesses on his deathbed in 1492, which of the two late medieval responses to his own mortality would have occupied his thoughts: 'to defy death, to prolong fame by deeds, to yearn for immortal glory'? Or would he have instead simply 'accepted death, fixed his hopes on eternal salvation', and found solace in the idea that his pre-established 'bonds of social and professional solidarity would ensure that [he] would always be remembered in the intercessions of the living'?[48] However grandiose his hopes for posthumous renown, even Busnoys could scarcely have conjured up a futuristic scenario five hundred years hence, where, in a strange New World discovered barely a month before he died, a group of scholars would convene in a peculiarly medieval spirit of community to commemorate the anniversary of his death, to perform his music, to discuss his

[46] Rob Wegman, noting the striking stylistic and mensural features shared by Petrus de Domarto's *Missa Spiritus almus* and Busnoys's *Anima mea liquefacta est* and *Missa O crux lignum triumphale*, has similarly suggested a pedagogical link between these two composers. See his 'Petrus de Domarto's *Missa Spiritus almus* and the Early History of the Four-Voice Mass in the Fifteenth Century', *EMH* 10 (1991), 235–303 at 240–4 and 261–71, and 'Mensural Intertextuality' (Ch. 8).

[47] 'Busnoys and Obrecht.' The material has since been published in full in Wegman, *Born for the Muses*, 86–100.

[48] See Rob C. Wegman, 'Singers and Composers in Flemish Urban Centres: A Social Context for Busnoys and Obecht', paper given at the Univeristy of Chicago, Musicology Colloquium Series, 3 March 1995.

life and works, and to engage in open dialogue about the directions for future studies of his work.

Taken together, the twenty essays in this volume powerfully reaffirm that early music scholarship is alive and well and continues to offer a virtually inexhaustible array of perspectives and approaches broadly applicable to the study of music of all periods. Challenging the stereotypes habitually coined for their work, the scholars whose essays appear here are working on retrieving historial evidence overlooked by earlier scholarship, on developing new methods for its evaluation, on bringing new critical insights and interpretations to time-honoured music-historical problems, and rethinking from more fully contextual historical and repertorial perspectives a century-long accumulation of received wisdom about late medieval music. These largely unprecedented discussions of the musical culture of Busnoys and his contemporaries lay the foundation of a new sub-discipline in music scholarship and open up vast, uncharted horizons for critical work yet to be done that will eventually reshape the discipline and study of early music for many years to come.