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ABSTRACT

Matthaeus Pipelare was a composer from the southern Netherlands who flourished in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Except for the little more than two years he spent as choirmaster for the Confraternity associated with the Cathedral of St. John in ‘s Hertogenbosch, located in Northern Brabant, almost nothing is known of his professional or personal life. Yet writers of the period hailed his skill and placed him in the same company as such well-known composers as Josquin, la Rue, Brumel, and Isaac.

A small but excellent body of the composer’s works survive in manuscripts and early prints housed in libraries and archives of eleven countries throughout Europe, stretching from Russia to Spain, with 26 sources found in Italy. The surviving corpus consists of eight secular works (four Flemish songs and four French chansons, one doubtful), nine motets, nine Masses, and a Credo. From the large scale Masses to the exquisite gem of the Fors seulement (II) chanson, Pipelare’s music exhibits masterful design and an engaging quality for both performer and listener. He and his compositions deserve to be more widely known and performed.

Unfortunately, the only current editions of his works are available in scholarly editions, the main goal of which is study rather than performance, and which are usually larger and heavier than most performance editions. The primary purpose of this project is to produce modern-day performance editions of three related works by Pipelare: Fors seulement (II), Exortum est in tenebris, and Missa Fors seulement. Each of the editions is based on one of the surviving manuscripts. Copies of these manuscripts were obtained from libraries and archives in Florence, Segovia, and Jena. The editions are intended to be accurate transmissions of the source documents while presenting the music in a form which modern-day singers and conductors will find easy to use. A secondary purpose of the study is to provide adequate
background on Pipelare and his works, particularly those included in the editions, which will both create interest in this unfortunately obscure composer and provide the conductor with pertinent information for successful performance.
CHAPTER 1
PURPOSES AND OVERVIEW

INTRODUCTION

Purposes of the Project

Matthaeus Pipelare is one of the many fine composers from the southern Netherlands who flourished in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, but whose name and works are virtually unknown today.\(^1\) It is not known when or where he was born or died, but the dates of c.1450-c.1415 have been proposed.\(^2\) Doubt exists as to whether either of these names is correct as a Christian name or a family name.\(^3\) Yet a small, but excellent body of the composer’s work survives in manuscripts and early prints housed in libraries and archives of eleven countries throughout Europe, stretching from Russia to Spain, with 26 sources found in Italy.\(^4\)

Unfortunately, this music is not readily available for performance. Although over thirty-five years have passed since the publication of Pipelare’s Collected Works, edited by Ronald Cross, only three transcriptions of the composer’s works, all of the *Fors seulement (II)* chanson, have been located.\(^5\) However, all of these are included in scholarly collections, and like the

---


\(^4\) Ibid., ii.

transcriptions found in the Collected Works, are not practical for usual modern-day performance. All of these collections present several problems in adapting them for use for modern performance. The expense of purchasing multiple copies of any of the collections would be prohibitive. The large size of each volume would prove unwieldy for the singers. As it was typical in secular works of the period to underlay only the refrain of the poem, none of the transcriptions provide a workable method for singing the entire chanson text. In the Collected Works, Cross has used *Mensurstrichen* instead of modern barlines, which many singers find confusing. Finally, none of the transcriptions include a keyboard reduction of the vocal parts. While the absence of such a rehearsal aid is entirely appropriate for scholarly editions, many choral ensembles do not have regular access to accompanists adept at reading from the vocal parts. A keyboard reduction can be a welcome help in rehearsals.

The primary purpose of this project is to produce modern-day performance editions of three related works by Pipelare: *Fors seulement (II)*, *Exortum est in tenebris*, and *Missa Fors seulement*. Each of the editions is based on one of the surviving manuscripts. Copies of these manuscripts were obtained from libraries and archives in Florence, Segovia, and Jena. The editions are intended to be accurate transmissions of the source documents while presenting the music in a form which modern singers and conductors will find easy to use. A secondary purpose of the study is to provide adequate background on Pipelare and his works, particularly those included in the editions, which will both create interest in this unfortunately obscure composer and provide the conductor with pertinent information for successful performance.

__________________________

Chapter 1 surveys Pipelare’s musical significance and scant biography. An overview of his works is given, including a rationale for which works were selected for the editions. Concluding the chapter is a discussion of the extensive lineage of musical settings of the *Fors seulement* poem, highlighting Pipelare’s prominent role. Chapter 2 includes information on the manuscripts and their selection; a discussion of the various editing procedures followed, including specific problems and solutions; and an examination of each work with regards to its musical features and particular concerns involving modern performance. Chapter 3 offers conclusions about the results of the project and, finally, presents the editions.

**Musical Significance**

The surviving corpus, as included in *Matthaeus Pipelare: Opera Omnia* edited by Ronald Cross, consists of eight secular works (four Flemish songs and four French chansons), nine motets, nine Masses, and a Credo. The works are immediately accessible to the listener because of their appealing melodies and textural variety, yet they also evidence skillful design and inventiveness. In his dissertation, Cross catalogs forty-seven manuscripts and twelve early prints which contain music that can be attributed to Pipelare. In addition, several sixteenth century writers include Pipelare in lists of composers who merit highest praise. Pipelare was cited as one of the composers whose works “flow from the very fountaine of Art” by Andreas Ornithoparcus in his *Musice active Micrologus* (Leipzig 1517). Claudius Sebastiani, in his

6Ibid., 43-51.

7The quotation is from Book II, Chap. 8 (“Of Diminution”), pp. 49-50, of the English translation made by John Dowland, published in London in 1609 as *Andreas Ornithoparcus, His micrologus, or Introduction: Containing the Art of Singing*. Both Ornithoparcus’s and Dowland’s volumes are available in unaltered reproductions, along with an introduction, list of variant readings, and table of citations, edited by Gustave Reese and Steven Ledbetter, *Ornithoparchus/Dowland: A Compendium of Musical Practice* (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1973), 170.
Bellum musicale, inter plani et mensuralis cantus reges (War between the King of Plain Chant and the King of Measured Chant, 1563) includes Pipelare among the company of Josquin, Pierre de la Rue, Brumel, Isaac, and others whom he classifies as pratici, “the practical theorists, the Leaders of the others, who knew how to sing, and compose, and to judge compositions.”

In assessing the quality and importance of Pipelare’s compositions, Cross, the leading researcher on the composer, points to the wide variety of techniques, textures, and forms exhibited in the corpus. He finds in Pipelare a composer who produced works which range from large and complex to small and intimate and who was equally adept at crafting intricate polyphony and “lucid” homophony. He also notes that, despite the small number of surviving compositions, the works evidence an evolution of style which closely parallels the “general musical trends” of the period, thereby offering excellent material for study. Cross corroborates his analysis of Pipelare’s significance with a quote from a prominent twentieth-century musicologist, Charles van de Borren, who rates Pipelare as among the “first rank” of his peers and draws comparisons with the much better known Pierre de la Rue. Van de Borren, like Cross, sees Pipelare’s corpus as providing excellent material for gaining an overview of this musically fertile era.

**Biography**

Given the merit accorded him by sixteenth century writers and the dissemination of this works, it is somewhat surprising that so little biographical information about Pipelare is

---


9 Ibid., 97-98.

available. After extensive research in church and city archives and early historical references, Cross concludes that the only verifiable period in Pipelare’s life was the two plus years that he spent in ’s-Hertogenbosch in northern Brabant. Because of his work there and because four of the surviving chansons have Flemish texts, he assumes that the composer could have been Flemish.¹¹

Until the middle of the nineteenth century, no source gives any indication of Pipelare’s birthplace. However, after that time, the composer is often listed as being born in Leuven.¹² Cross credits this change to the historian Maldeghem who seems to be the first to name Leuven as Pipelare’s birthplace. Maldeghem’s attribution is made in Volume I of the Trésor musical, Musique profane, 1865, page 8, where he relates information about the composer while referring to one of the composer’s chansons contained in the volume.¹³ In his footnote concerning Maldeghem’s remarks, Cross points out that one of Pipelare’s manuscripts does contain a reference to Leuven and perhaps it is here that the connection is drawn.¹⁴ Cross admits that documents may been available to Maldeghem which are now lost. But, without any current documentation other than Maldeghem’s assertion and that of later writers who seemed to be relying on his information, Cross is unwilling to commit to a date or place of birth for Pipelare.¹⁵


¹³Ibid., 9. Cross notes that the chanson is identified in the volume as Quant vers le soir but is really Fors seulement. Also, Maldeghem says that the chanson was found in a private library in Rome. Cross says there are no known sources of this chanson in Rome or of Roman Origin.

¹⁴Ibid., 9

¹⁵Ibid., 10-11.
As the only documented period in Pipelare’s life, his work in ’s-Hertogenbosch is certainly worth examining. Even for this span, the sole source of information extant is a set of records of the Illustrious Confraternity of Our Lady at ’s-Hertogenbosch which was brought to light by the Dutch musicologist, Albert Smijers. His research on this organization has revealed a long and rich tradition of sacred music making. The Confraternity was established in 1318 at the cathedral of St. John. Its members consisted of clerics and scholars who were selected with great care and entrusted with providing the highest quality of music for the Cathedral. While Gregorian chant was sung for ordinary weekday services, polyphonic music was also used for all important feasts. A number of prominent singers and composers had some association with the Confraternity through the years. Jacob Barbireau visited in 1489; Pierre de la Rue was admitted as a member; and Jacob Clemens non Papa produced a Mass and a motet for the organization in 1550.

According to the Confraternity’s records Pipelare was in Antwerp during early 1498. Pouwels van Rode, a member of the Confraternity at ’s-Hertogenbosch, traveled to Antwerp in order to recruit a zangmeester (choir master) and high-voiced singer. He evidently returned with Pipelare and a singer called Chrispiaenen. From the accounts Cross surmises that the new employees arrived in ’s-Hertogenbosch in the second week of Lent, 1498. Pipelare’s work as director of the choir boys must have been satisfactory because when he threatened to leave if he

---


had to pay travel expenses from his salary, the members gave him the amount as a gift.\textsuperscript{18} Through their interpretation of the records, both Cross and Smijers place Pipelare’s departure from ’s-Hertogenbosch early in May of 1500.\textsuperscript{19} Where he went or what type of positions the composer may have held from this point are completely unknown.

The only clues as to a date for Pipelare’s death are deduced from the use of the sign of the cross “+” in several of the manuscripts at Jena. The symbol was placed beside a composer’s name who was dead at the time his work was copied into the manuscript. Cross reports that in Chorbuch 20 both Pipelare’s and Josquin’s names bear the sign of the cross which would mean that the manuscript was copied after 1521, the year of Josquin’s death. However, Karl Roediger has dated Chorbuch 2 as 1512 due to the cross placed by Antoine de Févin’s name.\textsuperscript{20} Févin’s death date is believed to be late 1511 or early 1512.\textsuperscript{21} Pipelare’s Missa Fors seulement is included in this manuscript and a cross is found beside his name, also. Another manuscript in Brussels includes Pipelare’s name with the sign of the cross, but the date of this document has not been ascertained. Therefore, Cross states that all one can surmise is that Pipelare was dead at least by early 1512.\textsuperscript{22} However, Herbert Kellman’s research on the set of manuscripts to

\textsuperscript{18}Cross, “M. P.: Historical and Stylistic, Pt.1,” 18-19.

\textsuperscript{19}Ibid., 18, 11, on the latter page Cross quotes Smijers from his “Meerstemmige Muziek van de Illustre Lieve Vrouwe Broederschap te ’s-Hertogenbosch,” Tijdschrift der Vereeniging voor Nederlandsche Muziekgeschiedenis, XVI (1940), 2, fn.4.

\textsuperscript{20}Ibid., 39 and footnote 27, Karl Roediger, Die geistliche Musikhanschriften der Universitäts-Bibliothek Jena, 1935, 61, fn.7.


\textsuperscript{22}Cross, “M. P.: Historical and Stylistic, Pt.1,” 39.
which Chorbuch 2 belongs has suggested other possible dates, first of c.1512-c.1525 and most recently of c.1512-c.1518. This, of course, raises the possibility that Pipelare lived past 1512.

Even the name Matthaeus Pipelare or one of its innumerable variants defies complete verification in relation to our elusive composer. The original spelling of Pipelare may have been closer to Pypelaere or Pypelaerts. In the confraternity’s accounts, seven different spellings of the name are used: Pippelaer, Pypeler, Pipelaer, Pipelaire, Pypelaer, Pipelaere, and Pypelaire. The origin of the word seems to be a Flemish term used during this period to denote an instrumentalist or, more specifically a *stadtpijper*, a piper (instrumentalist) for a city. Cross has not been able to find any evidence that this composer was employed as such. However, it is possible that a forbear could have been a *stadtpijper*. In fact, the preferred spelling in the manuscripts is Pipelare with the “la” and “re” sometimes musically notated as members of the hexachord (see Example 12). This raises the possibility that the composer adopted this version as a pen-name rather than it being his family name.

The first, or Christian name, of the composer is also in question. Of the seven entries in the Confraternity’s records which include a form of Matthaeus, four of them use a version which means “son of Matthew”: Matheeusz., Matheeussz. (twice), and Matheeussen. Therefore, although the use of numerous spellings for a person’s name was common at the time, the

---

23 The first dates are given in Jerry Call, Charles Hamm, and Herbert Kellman, eds., *Census-Catalogue of Manuscript Sources of Polyphonic Music 1400-1550*, University of Illinois Musicological Archives for Renaissance Manuscript Studies (American Institute of Musicology, 1979-88), Vol. 1, 288 and the second dates are given in Herbert Kellman, ed. *The Treasury of Petrus Alamire: Music and Art in Flemish Court Manuscripts 1500-1535* (Ludion, Ghent, Amsterdam: distributed by The University of Chicago Press, 1999), 84-85.


Confraternity’s records raise the possibility that Matthaeus was not Pipelare’s Christian name, but that he was often referred to as Matthew’s son. Cross admits that because of such conflicting and inconclusive data . . .

. . . we do not really know what our composer’s name is. What we do know, or do not know, however, may be summed up thus: “Matthaeus” may or may not have been the first name of our composer; “Matthaæuszone” (or “Matthaessen”) may have been either a patronymic or a family name; and “Pipelaer” may have been either a family name or a pseudonym.26

Since the accounts of the Confraternity indicate that Pipelare was recruited in Antwerp, Cross searched the state, city, and Cathedral archives there. Although he found numerous occurrences of various forms of “Pypelare” and some entries of “Mathyss” and “Mathyssoens,” he could document no definite connection with our composer. In fact, he found no entries for any version of “Matthaæus Pypelare” or “Mathaeussen Pypelare.”27

An entry in the Acta capitularia of the church of St. Donatian in Bruges lists a payment in 1493 to a tenor by the name of Johannes Pippelaere. The question arises as to whether this person was a relative of our composer, or even the composer himself - Matthew’s son.28 The records of the Papal Chapel in Rome list a Johannes Pippelart as a singer from October 1499 to April 1502. However, both Cross and Jennifer Bloxam agree it is unlikely that this person could be the Pipelare who worked in s’-Hertogenbosch. The Confraternity’s accounts indicate that Pipelare did not leave its service until the spring of 1500. Although Bloxam disputes Cross’s interpretation of the Confraternity’s pay records and presents the possibility that Pipelare may have taken a seven-week leave of absence from late 1499 to early 1500, she concedes that the

26Ibid., 24.
27Ibid., 25-30.
28Ibid., 32-33.
dates still show that the singer in Rome and the choir master in ’s-Hertogenbosch were not the same person.²⁹ Bloxom further proves that the Johannes in Bruges could not be the “Matthew’s son” of the Confraternity’s records as Matthaeus began his post in ’s-Hertogenbosch several months before Johannes left his in Bruges.³⁰

OVERVIEW OF WORKS

General Characteristics

Pipelare’s corpus includes works from most of the major genres of the period, and the evolution one may note in his style and technique reflects the prevailing trends.³¹ The eight secular songs (four Flemish and four French) are, for the most part, thoroughly contrapuntal, but some lovely homophonic and declamatory passages may be found as well. While four of the motets are impressive multi-sectional works, five are small gems. The scale of Pipelare’s Masses is also varied. Most of the nine are large, complex settings of the genre, suitable for feast days and other celebrations. However, Missa de Feria, Missa sine nomine (Segovia-Jena), and Missa Mi mi are skillfully compact renderings, more practical for ordinary use. The final surviving work in the corpus is an imposing setting of the Credo in four sections.

Consistent with the prevailing practice of the late fifteenth century, almost all of Pipelare’s compositions are set for a total of four voices. The exceptions range from the two-voice motet Virga tua et baculus tuus (possibly a contrafactum), to the seven-voice motet

---


Memorare Mater Christi. Settings for three voices include the song Mijns liefskins bruyn ooghen and the motet Sensus carnis mors est (actually a contrafactum from Missa Mi mi).\textsuperscript{32} Four works are set for five voices: motets Ave Maria...Virgo Serena and Salve Regina, Credo de Sancto Johanne Evangelista, and Missa Fors seulement.\textsuperscript{33}

Cross reports in his dissertation that he found evidence of three other sacred works attributed to Pipelare that are no longer extant: Missa Omnium carminum (a4), an unnamed Mass (a3) and another Magnificat.\textsuperscript{34} In the list of works given in his most recent New Grove article on the composer, he indicates that both the four-voice Mass and the unnamed Mass were lost in World War II. Curiously, he does not mention the second Magnificat in the New Grove list of works and the voicing of the unnamed Mass is increased from three to eight. This, evidently more current information, is offered without explanation.\textsuperscript{35}

The vocal ranges for Pipelare’s works reflect the fact that most of the music of this period, especially the sacred music, was intended to be sung by men and falsettists or boys, where available. Seventeen of the twenty-seven compositions included in the Collected Works have a top note well within the range of the modern-day alto, $e^2$ or below.\textsuperscript{36} Morkin ic hebbe

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{32}Two secular, three-part vocal works, Sur tous regretz and Hélas de vous, attributed to Pipelare, were published in Das Chorwek, Helft 3, Friedrich Blume, ed. “Josquin des Prés und andere Maister Weltliche Lieder (Wofenbüttel: Möseler Verlag, 1930), 23-26. Cross disputes these as Pipelare’s works: see “M. P.: Historical and Stylistic, Pt. 1,” 42.

\textsuperscript{33}Ibid., 293, 134.

\textsuperscript{34}Ibid., 59, 293.

\textsuperscript{35}Cross, “Pipeleare,” New Grove, 772.

\textsuperscript{36}The system of note identification wherein middle $c$ is designated as $c'$ will be used in this paper. A survey of the ranges of all of the works included in the Collected Works was undertaken by the author. Comparison of the transcription with their incipits from the sources indicated that none of the works have been transposed in Cross’s volumes.
and *Hic est vere martyr* have the highest vocal range requiring $a^2$ and $g^2$ respectively and eight other compositions have ranges that ascend to a top note of $f^2$. The total vocal span of fourteen of the works fall within the comfortable range of most modern basses (extending down to $F$), tenors, and altos. A typical problem associated with alto-like parts of this period is that, because they were sung by men falsettists, their tessitura often lies very low and includes many pitches (i.e. $g$ and $a$) on which it is difficult for female altos to project.\footnote{The issues of variable pitch and transposition will be discussed in Chapter 2.} This is true for many of Pipelare’s works and in the *Missa Sine nomine* (Segovia-Jena), the altus part is filled with $f$’s and, in the *Agnus Dei*, requires an $e$ twice (measures 19 and 20) and a $d$ once, also in measure 20. The top voice of *Missa Mi mi*, which generally is in the alto range, also extends down to an $e$ in measure 60 of the *Credo*. This last Mass and two others, *Missa L’Homme armé* and *Missa Fors seulement* definitely lie on the low end of vocal ranges and plunge well below the most common extensions to the Medieval *Gamut*.\footnote{Andrew Hughes, “Solmization, I,” In *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, Stanley Sadie, ed., 2nd ed., Vol. 23 (London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd., 2001), 645-646.} The lowest note in each of the three Masses is, in order listed above, $E$, $D$, and $C$. The highest note of each, in order is $c^2$, $a^1$, and $a^1$. Some implications of these low ranges and modern performance will be discussed in Chapter 2.

In his choice of mensuration, Pipelare generally is in line with contemporary practice. In regards to his Masses, Cross reports that, like most large-scale sacred works during this period, the individual “movements usually begin with *tempus perfectum* (O) and then progress to
tempus imperfectum, alla breve (¢).” 39 Of the Masses and Credo, only Missa Fors seulement solely utilizes duple meter.” 40

Because the use of duple meter was an emerging trend, it is not surprising that almost all of Pipelare’s secular works and motets are in duple meter. Of the secular songs, only Mijns liefskins bruyn ooghen is entirely in triple meter with Morkin ic hebbe, Vray dieu d’amours (Pernner Codex), and Vray dieu quel paine exhibiting only brief sections in triple meter. Although somewhat conservative methods were used for Mass composition, compositional techniques for motets of the period were more innovative. Consequently, Ave castissima is the only one of Pipelare’s motets set completely in triple meter. The first two of six sections of Ave Maria...Virgo serena and the first of four verses set polyphonically in Salve Regina are in triple meter. In a several of his Masses, Pipelare used two different mensurations simultaneously, reflecting older techniques. In some sections of Missa L’Homme armé, Missa Dicit Dominus: Nihil tutteritis in via and Missa sine nomine (Vienna) the cantus firmus is assigned a different mensuration from the other voice parts. A variation of this technique is found in Missa Joannes Christi care - Ecce puer meus where several sections have two different mensuration signs at the beginning of the cantus firmus bearing part. The resolution is obtained by the cantus firmus voice performing the notated pitches twice, once in each of the indicated mensurations. 41

According to Cross’s research, Pipelare, like many of his contemporaries, used pre-existent material in structuring almost all of his compositions. Typically, his sources for this

40Ibid., 281.
41Ibid.
material included numerous plainsongs and selected voice parts of motets and chansons.\textsuperscript{42} Pipelare utilized most of the current techniques for incorporation of the pre-existent material into his compositions. Although often setting the melody in long tones in a particular voice in strict cantus firmus technique, he also used canons and elements of paraphrase and parody technique. The voices most often used for the cantus firmus are, in order of frequency, tenor, superius, and bassus. \textit{Missa Fors seulement} is the only Mass that places the cantus firmus consistently in the second highest voice.\textsuperscript{43} However, as pertains to the discussion on the all male singers, the actual range of that voice part is that of a tenor and the designation on the Jena manuscript is “Tenor.” Another procedure used by Pipelare is to move the cantus firmus among the different voices within a Mass.\textsuperscript{44}

In his dissertation, Cross gives a detailed description of each of Pipelare’s compositions included in the Collected Works. After discussion of the individual pieces he provides a very thorough overview entitled “Summary of Technical and Stylistic Features.” At the end of this overview, Cross states that because Pipelare’s development and use of certain techniques mirrored that of the period, his research and study allowed him to propose a possible grouping of the compositions into early, middle, and late periods. A number of the features that he considers as indicative of works of the later, more mature composer are given. Some of these include: less use of verbal canon; shorter, more carefully shaped phrases rather than long rambling ones; use of more duple meter; greater use of imitation and sequence; more syllabic setting with declamatory passages; clearer structure and texture; more refined motivic development; and the

\textsuperscript{42}Ibid., 269.
\textsuperscript{43}Ibid., 272-273.
\textsuperscript{44}Ibid., 273.
appearance of elements of techniques such as paraphrase, parody, and saturation (prominence of cantus firmus material in all voices).\textsuperscript{45} He concludes Part I of the dissertation with a list of works, placing them into one of the three career period groupings.

However, when evaluating various criteria for the purpose of constructing a chronology of works, it is important to recognize that in their later works, many composers continued to use techniques and features of earlier works alongside the more current styles. \textit{Missa Fors seulement} is an excellent example. Cross places it in the late grouping of Pipelare’s compositions. It certainly exhibits many of the features Cross associates with the composer’s later works, such as carefully shaped phrases and increased use of imitation and sequence. But, it is also set with very strict cantus firmus technique. And while the \textit{Gloria} and \textit{Credo} are quite syllabic and declamatory, the other movements contain much melismatic writing.

To complete the overview of works, a very brief description of each of Pipelare’s compositions will be given, grouped by type of work. Within each grouping, the compositions will be given in the order of Cross’s chronology. His period grouping will be indicated in parentheses following the title of each work. Chapter 2, a discussion of the three edited works, will provide a more thorough coverage of Pipelare’s characteristic compositional features and techniques as they relate to the specific pieces. Other major technical or stylistic traits not demonstrated by these three works will be mentioned in the descriptions below.

\textbf{Secular Works}

\textit{Vray dieu quel paine} (early). Cross believes the attribution of this instrumental transcription to Pipelare as unlikely. Of the seven sources for the composition, only the Sicher

\textsuperscript{45}Ibid., 297.
Tablature ascribes it to Pipelare. Other sources are either anonymous or give Gaspart or Compère as the composer. The piece is quite contrapuntal with a canon, although not strict, between the soprano and tenor. The concluding section is in triple meter.

*Mijns liefskins bruyn ooghen* (early). Pipelare uses one of the variants of this tune, found in various other compositions, in the tenor of his three-voice work. The superius opens with an anticipatory imitation, or *vorimitation*, of the tenor. The borrowed melody appears in abaCC form, with the capital letters indicating that both the music and the text of the last section are repeated. With only a few changes, the other two voices feature repetition along with the tenor. Therefore there is very little material (only the “b” section) which is not subjected to repetition in this composition.

*Een vrolic wesen* (early). Pipelare uses the superius of Jacob Barbireau’s song as his own superius in this four-voice work. None of the sources include text underlay; however, the Basevi 2439 manuscript from Florence has text incipits. Cross has used these incipits and supplied the superius with a text drawn from a chanson on the same text from a Tournai manuscript. He believes that the lower parts exhibit instrumental characteristics and that it is

---


possible that only the superius was sung. In Pipelare’s works presumed to be early, direct imitation other than canon is uncommon. \textit{Een vrolic wesen} is no exception as there is no direct imitation present and only one instance of sequence. There are several examples of parallel melodic motion, including one involving three voices. Cross also includes a transcription of the version found in the Sicher Tablature entitled \textit{Frolich wessen}.

\textit{Ic weert een molenarinne} (early). Whereas most of the tunes Pipelare uses for his chansons have their origins in courtly song, a folk song is most likely the basis for this four-voice composition. Cross believes that Pipelare used the bassus of an anonymous three-voice work found in the British museum. He reports that, although elements of the borrowed music can be found in other voices, the tune is most evident in Pipelare’s tenor. Interestingly, the setting features imitation in all voices at its opening. This became a pattern for Pipelare in his early to middle works. Imitation, and especially three or more-voice imitation is most likely to be found at the beginning of a work or one of its major sections. Like \textit{Mijns liefskins}, the last section of the music and text are immediately repeated.

\textit{Fors seulement}, setting I (early). This four-voice chanson which utilizes Ockeghem’s superius in its altus voice will be discussed below.

\textit{Fors seulement}, setting II (middle). One of Pipelare’s most popular works, this four-voice chanson bearing a non-Ockeghem cantus firmus in the tenor voice will be discussed

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{49}For a discussion that challenges some of the assumptions about use of instruments with voices during this period see David Fallows, “Secular Polyphony,” In \textit{Performance Practice, Vol. 1: Music Before 1600}, Howard Mayer Brown and Stanley Sadie, eds. (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1989), 201-221.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{50}Ibid., 62, 64 and Cross, \textit{M. P.: Opera Omnia}, Vol. 1, xiii, 1-3.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{51}Cross, “M.P.: Historical and Stylistic, Pt. 1,” 269, 71-72, 278 and Cross, \textit{M. P.: Opera Omnia}, Vol. 1, xiii, 4-6.}
below. A transcription of the keyboard version as found in the Sicher Tablature is also included by Cross.\textsuperscript{52}

*Vray dieu d’amours* (late). This four-voice chanson exists in three versions, two vocal and one instrumental. Cross indicates that both the Pernner Codex and the arrangement of this vocal version found in the Sicher Tablature attribute these compositions to Pipelare. A similar version of the vocal composition is found as anonymous in a Verona source.\textsuperscript{53} Cross believes that the Pernner version is a later arrangement by Pipelare, whether Pipelare is the composer of the Verona version or not. Both works exhibit an aba’b’ce’ structure and homorhythmic texture (Cross calls it frottola-like) although the Pernner arrangement provides variety with some contrapuntal and duet texture and triple meter in the first c section.\textsuperscript{54}

*Morkin ic hebbe* (late). Four-part imitation at the beginning, along with motives based on repeated notes and a good bit of homorhythmic texture are possibly some of the traits that cause Cross to place this four-voice song among Pipelare’s late works. Cross also notes that the piece is in two sections with the second being essentially an altered repetition of the first. This delightful duple meter piece ends with a brief codetta in triple meter. The single source for this composition gives only the first phrase of text.\textsuperscript{55}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{52}Cross, M. P.: *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 1, xiv, 14-15.
\item \textsuperscript{53}Ibid., xv. Verona, Bibl. Capitolare, Cod. Mus. DCCLVII, fol. 63v-64r.
\end{itemize}
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Sacred Works - Motets

*Hic est vere matyr* (early). The tenor of the four-part motet is based on a responsory sung at the *Mass of One Martyr: In Pascal Time*. The bassus and tenor are in canon, although broken twice, while the two upper parts are composed in free counterpoint. The only surviving source of this work is a Sicher Tablature for keyboard, however Cross believes that it represents a simple intabulation of the vocal original.56

*Salve Regina* (early). Pipelare has set the even numbered verses of this antiphon and leaves the odd numbered verses for plainsong performance. The composition is preserved in a manuscript devoted solely to settings of the *Salve Regina*. All of the four composed verses result in five voice parts except for the second which is for four. Verses one and three have only four voices notated but the tenor part of each contains the instruction of *Fuga* indicating that a canon should be performed with that voice. Verse two (the first polyphonic section) is saturated with the plainsong melody as both the superius and tenor are paraphrases of the chant and the resolution of the canon on the tenor voice results in three of the five sounding voices incorporating the cantus firmus.57

*Ave Castissima* (early). Pipelare borrows the bassus part from an anonymous three-voice chanson with the incipit *Nu noch nummerine sal ick van ju scheyden* (Ulm manuscript) for his short (45 measures)58 four-voice motet. The work opens with four-part imitation, the three upper

---


58 The space occupied by a breve in the manuscripts will be designated as a modern measure to facilitate comparison with musical examples and the editions.
voices providing *vortiumation* of the cantus firmus in the bassus. In this thoroughly contrapuntal piece, another instance of four-part imitation begins in measure 32 with two of the voices anticipatory to the bassus. The majority of measures 6-10 are repeated just before the final cadence of the motet.59

*Ave maria...*Virgo Serena (early). One of the four longer motets, *Ave Maria* is divided into two parts with two sections in the first (triple meter) and four in the second (duple meter). All sections are set for five voices except for the first two in the second part which are duets. Cross notes that the model for the piece appears to be a sequence of the same title. He indicates that, while the motet as a whole shows influence of the plainsong melody, the tenor, seems to have been influenced by the overall shape of the sequence melody rather than by the exact pitch relationships. The tenor melody consists primarily of scale-like patterns and is set in long-note cantus firmus manner. Unfortunately, the only surviving source of the motet, a 1508 Petrucci print entitled *Motetti a cinque: Libro primo*, is missing the altus part. In the Collected Works Cross has endeavored to reconstruct a reasonable version of this part.60

*Exortum est in tenebris* (middle). This four-voice motet is simply a sacred *contrafactum* of the *Fors seulement* (II) chanson. It is found only in a Segovia manuscript and is supplied with the text of Psalm 112 (Latin Vulagate 111), verse 4. Further discussion of this work will be included below.61


Memorare Mater Christi (middle). The Latin text recalls the seven sorrows of the Virgin Mary in this remarkable motet lauded by both Cross and Paul Van Nevel of the Huelgas Ensemble. Like his Salve Regina, the composition is included in a thematic manuscript, this one containing only compositions on the seven sorrows theme. Appropriately, Pipelare has imbued this work with symbolism. Not only has he composed the motet for seven voices, rather than use standard voice labeling, Pipelare has named them (from top voice downward) primus dolor, secundus dolor, etc. Even his choice of a cantus firmus has symbolic significance. The tenor of a villancico by Johannes Wreede is placed in the tertius dolor of Pipelare’s motet. The text by the Duke of Alba begins “Nunca fué pena mayor” which Van Nevel translates as “Never was there such great suffering.”

The composition is filled with techniques characteristic of Pipelare’s later maturing style including syllabic text setting, homorhythmic texture (often featuring repeated notes), short imitative motives beginning with repeated notes, and pedal point. There are also some fine examples of four, five, and even six-voice imitation which opens the motet.

Sensus carnis mors est (late). The three-voice piece is a contrafactum of the Agnus Dei II from Pipelare’s Missa Mi mi. It was published by Georg Rhau in 1542 with the liturgical text replaced with a paraphrase from Romans, chapter 8, verse 6. The cantus firmus, placed in what Cross calls “chorale” fashion in the superius, is accompanied by the two lower voices. Parallel

motion between the two lower or the upper and lower voices is a prominent feature of this composition. 63

Virga tua et baculus tuus (not included in Cross’s chart). As no other two-part independent works by Pipelare are known, Cross may be correct in supposing that this small piece is, like the previous work, a contrafactum possibly drawn from a lost or undiscovered composition. It, too, was published by Georg Rhau, but in a 1545 collection. The text is of Psalm 23 (Latin Vulgate 22), verse 4. Cross notes that it is an excellent example of Pipelare’s two part writing with each phrase beginning with imitation. Even in such a small piece (65 measures) ABA’ structure is discernable. 64

Magnificat (late). Cross believes this to be one of Pipelare’s best and most mature works. In fact, he has placed it last in the proposed chronology. The composer chose the first form of the Magnificat plainsong, Tone 3, with the differentia ending on a rather than b on which to base this work. Typical of Magnificat settings and similarly to his Salve Regina, Pipelare has set the work in alternatim fashion with the unadorned plainsong sung on the odd numbered verses and the even numbered verses set polyphonically. The chant also serves as a cantus firmus in all but verse 8. The chant is placed in the superius in verses 2, 4, and 6 and in the tenor in verses 10 and 12. All of the verses are set for four voices with the exception of verse 4, in which the superius is silent, and verse 12, which adds a second tenor part. 65


Cross views this work as the culmination of Pipelare’s skill and inspiration, incorporating many of the composer’s characteristic features into a work of clear structure and harmony and finely crafted melodic phrases. Although, there are indeed numerous details about the Magnificat which merit discussion, a few examples will suffice to exhibit the composer’s skill and highlight several features which will be discussed later. Verse 8, the only one in polyphony without the chant as a cantus firmus, is a wonderful example of the composer’s delight in imitation, sequence, repeated motives, and pedal point. A series of duets comprises all but the last 11 measures of the verse. The upper two voices begin with seven measures of imitation followed by an extraordinary example of Pipelare’s fascination with parallelism and sequence. Here, the two voices gambol along with six measures of paired parallel sequences. The addition of a dotted rhythm in the superius against the straight quarter notes (minims) of the altus is an effective refinement. Several measures of repeated motives follow which return to parallel motion just before the cadence point which ushers in a duet by the two lower voices. This new duet begins in imitation with parallel motion (See Example 1 below).

In the verse’s conclusion, the only part with all four voices sounding, Pipelare uses one of his characteristic gestures: layered repeated figures placed against a pedal point. A similar passage will be examined in Missa Fors seulement (See Example 38). Canon, ostinato, and homorhythmic texture aligned with the cantus firmus are other typical Pipelare features present in this fine work.

Example 1: Verse 8, *Magnificat* (measures 8-20)\(^{67}\)

Sacred Works - Credo and Masses

*Missa Floruit egregius infans Livinus in actis* (early). Cross believes the Mass to be one of Pipelare’s earliest known compositions due to various practices and weaknesses he observes in the work. Among these are the sequence of mensurations used for sections within a movement, especially the use of  \( O \) at the beginning of each movement; long melismatic and

unfocused phrases; and the use of the same music to end a number of the movements.68  

Bloxam, in her study of the Mass believes that its composition dates from no later than the 1470's.69 However, there are some intriguing aspects to this Mass and its cantus firmus.  

Cross correctly ascertains that a cantus firmus is used in the Mass and that it frequently changes voice parts, even within a section. He had not discovered the source of the pre-existant material by the time he wrote his dissertation.70 Bloxam in her article, “In Praise of Spurious Saints: The Missae Floruit Egregiis by Pipelare and La Rue,” provides invaluable and fascinating insight into the Mass and its unusual cantus firmus. The Abbey of St. Bavo in Ghent claimed to house the relics of the martyred St. Livinus. Therefore, a complete liturgy and music was created for his celebrations. Bloxam has identified at least twenty chants or portions of chants which Pipelare selected from the Abbey’s or related institution’s service books. The texts from these chant extracts are retained in the Mass and tell the entire story of the saint’s life. Cross mentions Bloxam’s findings in his New Grove article. Surprisingly, it is now known that St. Livinus never existed and the entire life story and martyrdom was fabricated to add prestige and increase revenues for the abbey.71 Both Bloxam and Cross note the similarities between Pipelare’s cantus firmus and that of Pierre de la Rue’s Missa Job primum dives (also a saint not sanctioned by Rome).72


71 Bloxam, “In Praise,” 173.175, 177, 180, 184-187.  

Missa sine nomine (Vienna). (early) This work survives in only one source and there is no title given. It is evident that the composition is based upon a cantus firmus although the source of the melody has not been discovered. One wonders why Pipelare chose this particular tune for his cantus firmus, for it is quite long (56 measures) and features quite vigorous rhythmic motives. However, this Mass and the Missa Floruit are the only Masses Cross places in Pipelare’s early period. Therefore, after composing a Mass based on a cantus firmus fashioned out of at least twenty chants or chant fragments, it is possible that a long but melodious tune seemed not so daunting.73

The complete cantus firmus appears in the tenor at least once in all of the five major movements and a second time in the Credo and Sanctus. The superius carries a paraphrase of the cantus firmus in the middle section of the Gloria (Domine). The same paraphrase, transposed up a perfect fourth, is found in the superius of the Benedictus. The rhythmic vitality of the melody and the fact that Pipelare usually sets it in time values similar to the other voices helps the ear identify the cantus firmus. However, the composer uses verbal canons (inscriptions) and dual mensuration signs in several sections to transpose and augment the melody. Almost all of the imitation present in the Mass is due to vorimitation of a portion of the cantus firmus. In Kyrie I and the Confiteor all four voices participate in the imitation.74

Another unusual feature occurs in Agnus III. The altus part consists entirely of the pitch a¹ sung in long tones; the duration of each is indicated by numbers placed in the score. The


numbers are separated by rests. Cross discusses the possible numerical symbolism which may have been intended by the order and arrangement of the note durations and rests.  

*Missa L’Homme armé* (middle). Pipelare has utilized this popular tune as a cantus firmus in almost all sections of the Mass. With the exception of the *Hosanna* and *Agnus III*, he sets the tune, although ornamented, in integer valor (without rhythmic augmentation or diminution), allowing the melody to be more easily recognizable. The cantus firmus is placed in each of the voices in various sections, although the bassus carries it the most. In the *Hosanna*, it is found in canon between the bassus and superius in somewhat longer tones. For *Agnus III*, Pipelare adds a fifth voice in canon an octave above the bassus cantus firmus. This is indicated by an inscription in the score. Here, the composer assigns the two cantus firmus voices a mensuration sign different from that of the other three voices. This results in very long tones in the two bassus parts which sound only one measure for every three sounded by the upper voices. Pipelare provides only two sections of the *Agnus Dei*. In the Cambrai source, the texts for both *Agnus I* and *Agnus III* are underlaid in all voice parts of one section and in only the bassus part in the other, evidently to provide alternatives in performance order.

Although there are many splendid aspects about this Mass, one device is particularly creative and effective. Whereas Pipelare previously has used head motives or repeated sections of music to provide unity between movements, in *L’Homme armé*’s *Gloria* and *Credo* he has crafted something more creative and just as effective, a highly distinctive passage of paired

---


imitation. At “Cum Sancto Spiritu,” just before the “Amen” in the Gloria, Pipelare abruptly changes from a flowing duple meter to a rollicking triple, highlighting the lilt of the first four measures of the cantus firmus. The tenor states this phrase which is imitated down an octave by the bassus. To further emphasize these two statements of the cantus firmus melody, the superius, with a complimentary melody, is paired with the tenor. The altus imitates the superius melody being paired with the bassus. Tenor and bassus continue in imitation with the descending fifth motive. Imitation then ends and the movement concludes with a return to duple for a rousing “Amen.” The effect is quite noticeable even upon the first hearing (See Example 2).

Near the end of the Credo, at “Confiteor,” Pipelare provides a similar effect. The previous section again ends in flowing duple meter. After a section break, the “Confiteor” continues with the same rollicking treatment of the cantus firmus. Unlike, the brief cantus firmus imitation in the “Cum Sancto,” the bassus is in canon with the tenor for the entire section, this time at the fifth. The paired imitation is again present but the superius/altus melody has been simplified. Also, Pipelare continues the triple meter through the concluding “Amen” (See Example 3). Even though most of the music of these two sections are quite different, Pipelare’s superb crafting of their initial measures is immediately recognizable by the listener.  

78Cross mentions the similarity of the triple meter and the canon between the two sections, “M.P.: Historical and Stylistic, Pt. 1, 218.
Example 2: *Gloria, Missa L’Homme armé* (measures 113-122)\textsuperscript{79}

Example 3: *Credo, Missa L'Homme armé* (measures 202-211)\(^{80}\)

---

**Missa Dicit Dominus: Nihil tuleritis in via** (middle). There are several interesting features of this Mass. The cantus firmus was based on an unidentified tune copied on the opening following the Mass in the one source that survives. The source of the tune is not known but Cross states that the text is from the Gospel of St. Luke. Pipelare creates a cantus firmus from this melody and places it in the tenor voice throughout the Mass. The cantus firmus is

---

always underlaid with its original text rather than the Mass text. In fact, all voices are underlaid with that text at the beginning of the *Credo*.81

Pipelare uses several technical devices to provide unity to the large work. A paired head motive is used in the *Kyrie*, *Gloria*, and *Sanctus*. A different single head motive appears in each movement from *Hosanna I* to the end of the Mass. With the exception of the *Agnus II*, all movements from the *Sanctus* to the end of the work feature canonic writing. Several of these are verbal canons.

*Missa Joannes Christi Care - Ecce puer meus* (middle). Cross asserts that this Mass may have been composed at ’s-Hertogenbosch because of the of the two chants Pipelare used. For the cantus firmus, he chose the version of a popular medieval sequence with a text appointed for St John’s Day, *Johannes Jesu Christo multum delecte viro*. The final words of the text, *Joannes Christi care*, are underlaid to the appearances of the cantus firmus in the Mass. The Confraternity was associated with the Cathedral of St. John and the saint’s feast day, which occurs on December 27, was observed at the cathedral with large celebrations. Therefore, Pipelare may have written this Mass for such an event. If that is the case, then, according to the Confraternity’s pay records for Pipelare, it would have been performed in either 1498 or 1499.82

The cantus firmus occurs in all four-voice sections of the Mass. Pipelare places it in the tenor throughout, except for the *Kyrie* where it appears in the superius. After the *Kyrie*, the cantus firmus is performed twice in different mensurations in each movement in which it is present due to dual mensuration signs placed at the beginning of the sections. The second chant


used by Pipelare is *Ecce puer meus*, an antiphon for the Feast of St. John. Rather than adding a second cantus firmus, Pipelare adapts this tune as a head motive found in a number of the Mass movements. Unfortunately, the only source of this Mass is missing portions of the altus and bassus parts. Cross has reconstructed the lost parts in the Collected Works.  

*Credo de Sancto Johanne Evangelista* (Middle). This large, presumably independent work, is based on the plainsong of the antiphon *Occurrit beato Johanni ab exilio*. Cross reports that, although no longer included in the liturgy, the antiphon had been sung at Matins on St. John’s Day. Therefore, such an impressive work in honor of St. John could have, like the *Missa Joannes Christi Care*, been composed for the cathedral at s-Hertogenbosch.

The Credo is composed in four sections. The cantus firmus is placed in the tenor voice of the five-part work. It is sung through twice in the course of the entire piece, although it is absent in the second section which is set for only four parts.

*Missa Mi mi* (late). Pipelare’s is one of four known *Mi mi* Masses. Two of them are by Ockeghem and Marbriano de Orto and the final one is anonymous. The “*Mi mi*” refers to the interval of a descending fifth created by the solization syllable “*mi*” in both the hard (*g*) hexachord, which is *b*, and in the natural (*c*) hexachord, which is *e*. In all of these Masses the melodic figure is used as head motive in one or more of the voices at the very beginning of the work. Pipelare places the motive in all four voices to open the *Kyrie* and *Sanctus*. The Bassus

---


alone is given the motive at the beginning of both sections of the *Gloria* and the first sections of both the *Credo* and *Agnus Dei*. Cross includes a discussion on the possible connection between the “*Mi mi*” motive and a body of *Petite causette* chansons. He draws an additional motive from these pieces and highlights their inclusion by Pipelare. Cross also has identified Pipelare’s use of the plainsongs of *Credo IV* and the *Agnus Dei of Mass X* in his settings of those movements.⁸⁶

*Missa sine nomine* (Segovia-Jena) (late). Neither of the two sources for this Mass gives a title and there is no additional text underlay to the melody(ies) that Pipelare uses to offer clues. Cross has identified a five-phrase melody that occurs complete in the *Sanctus* and *Agnus I*.⁸⁷ Lines one and two appear in *Kyrie I* and lines three through five are found in *Kyrie II*. Various lines of this melody are also used in a variety of ways in other sections of the Mass. Cross has identified another short melody of only one line which is used extensively in sections of the Mass, usually alone. Because of its seeming isolation, Cross has labeled this melody phrase X and the five-line melody the cantus firmus. In his musical example of the two melodies he places phrase X after line two of the cantus firmus. The reason for this is that phrase X occurs in the *Christe*, after cantus firmus lines one and two in *Kyrie I* and before cantus firmus lines three through five in *Kyrie II*. Phrase X is alone in the second section of the *Gloria* following

---


⁸⁷There is confusion about the order in which the three surviving *Agnus* sections should be performed. References are to the order in which Cross places them in the Collected Works.
cantus firmus lines one and two in the first section. Cross cannot be sure of the source or relationship of either of the melodies.  

Upon study of the Mass, however, it is quite evident how inventively Pipelare has used these melodies to provide structure and continuity to this multi-movement work. Versions of one or more of the phrases appear in every section except the *Pleni sunt caeli* and are found in each of the voice parts, sometimes changing voices within a section. Ostinato and repetition of motives, favored techniques with Pipelare, are used extensively with phrase X. This melody is presented as an ostinato in the superius of the second section of the *Gloria* and in the bassus of *Agnus II*. In *Agnus I* it appears in the bassus as irregularly spaced repetitions (or sequences) at varying pitch levels. The entire cantus firmus is performed by the tenor, the first time the two elements are used together in the entire Mass.

Unlike *Missa L’Homme armé*, in which there appear to be only two composed sections for the *Agnus Dei*, three sections for this movement do exist in the sources. However, neither of the two sources include all three. Each of the manuscripts (Jena and Segovia) contain a four-voice movement and a three-voice movement. The three-voice movements are the same in both sources, but the four-voice movements are not. Because of conflicting text underlay in the sources, flexible performance options are again apparent. Cross discusses the options and gives his reasons for ordering them as he has in the Collected Works.


89 Cross, “M.P.: Historical and Stylistic, Pt. 1, 238-249, 251-252.

90 Ibid., 249-251.
**Missa Fors seulement** (late). Pipelare’s only five-voice Mass with a cantus firmus taken from the tenor of his second chanson setting of the *Fors seulement* text will be thoroughly discussed in Chapter 2.

**Missa de feria** (late). This Mass is the shortest of the genre in Pipelare’s corpus as it was meant for simple use on ordinary week-days rather than the more elaborate celebrations for Sundays and other feast days. Despite its brevity, Cross believes it to be one of Pipelare’s finest works and places it just before the *Magnificat* in his chronology. Prominent features include short alternating duets, increased imitation including paired imitation, and extensive use of multiple layers of repeated melodic and rhythmic motives.

Cross notes that the composer follows the established Plainsong Mass tradition in using certain Mass chants that were commonly associated with the various movements of ferial Masses. Whereas only possible reference is made to a plainsong in the *Kyrie*, the other movements make use of the various chants as cantus firmi. Pipelare places the borrowed material in the tenor for the *Gloria, Credo,* and *Sanctus,* whose altus has the melody in canon. He moves the chant material to the superius for the remainder of the work. Pipelare’s treatment of the cantus firmus in both sections of the *Credo* is quite unusual. It becomes almost like a reciting tone chant on “g,” which Cross asserts is very prominent in the *Credo I* plainsong. Neither of the two Mass sources contain any music for the *Agnus Dei.* It is not known whether it was lost or was never composed.

---

91Ibid., 150.

SELECTION OF WORKS FOR THE EDITIONS

The *Fors seulement (II)* chanson and the *Missa Fors seulement* hold important places in Pipelare’s corpus due to their quality, uniqueness, and inter-relationship. The chanson enjoyed a great deal of popularity and some influence during the Renaissance. As the only known five-voice Mass by Pipelare and the only one composed throughout in duple meter, *Missa Fors seulement* is unique in the body of Masses.\(^93\) The motet *Exortum est in tenebris* is directly related as a sacred *contrafacta* of the chanson. Together, the three works provide a range of study and performing options while featuring shared musical material.

In Cross’s judgement, Pipelare’s second chanson setting of the popular *Fors seulement* text

- probably the work primarily responsible for establishing his renown - is undoubtedly one of the most delightful of the smaller compositions that have come down to us from the master’s pen. The overwhelming popularity that the chanson enjoyed during the Renaissance is attested to by the fourteen manuscripts and early prints that preserve it. It is well known to modern writers also, having appeared ten times in modern editions.\(^94\)

The veracity of the chanson as Pipelare’s work is supported by the five manuscripts which attribute the chanson to him. Both editions of Petrucci’s famous *Canti B* attribute the piece to Pierre de la Rue. However, Helen Hewitt and Martin Picker, both of whom have written on the body of *Fors seulement*-related works, believe that the chanson is Pipelare’s.\(^95\) This chanson

\(^93\)Cross, “M. P.: Historical and Stylistic, Pt. 1,” 193.


influenced, either directly or indirectly, at least six other works, including Pipelare’s own Mass. If, Pipelare is the original creator of the tenor of his chanson, as Cross suggests as a possibility, then the realm of influence would extend to three more chansons and one motet.96 Hewitt and Picker, however, believe that Pipelare borrowed the tenor from an anonymous three-voice chanson.97 The works that have a possible relationship to Pipelare’s chanson and the conflicting views over the actual composer of the tenor will be examined below as part of the discussion on the remarkable lineage of settings of the Fors seulement text. The popularity of Pipelare’s chanson even transcended the vocal genre as it survives in a keyboard version in tablature (Sicher Tablature) and Attaingant published a transcription of the tablature in 1530.98

FORS SEULEMENT LINEAGE

The text of the rondeau Fors seulement and its first known musical setting by Johannes Ockegham were extremely popular with Renaissance composers, leaving an extraordinary family of works that can be considered as spanning two generations. Of course, such practices of various composers setting the same text or borrowing musical portions of pre-existing works to create new ones were quite pervasive. However, the breadth of the Fors seulement lineage and the interest it has spawned are indeed remarkable.


As early as 1545, groups of settings of the text began to be collected in manuscripts. Hewitt, Picker, and Cross all address this phenomenon with Hewitt listing six sources which include such groupings. August Wilhelm Ambros appears to be the first to make an attempt at cataloging this family of works. Indeed, Hewitt reports that in the third volume of his *Geschichte der Music* (1891), Ambros observed that “*Fors seulement* seemed to have served as a touchstone for the setting of a secular chanson as did *L’Homme armé* for the composition of a Mass.” Further research by Otto Kade and Otto Gombosi expanded the list of related works.

More recent studies concerning the extensive *Fors seulement* family have brought to light up to forty secular and sacred works that belong to this lineage. Cross includes a survey of a number of the settings as they relate to Pipelare’s two settings of the text. Thirty-five works, including two motets, are traced by Helen Hewitt. She gives an annotated concordance of all thirty-five, discusses many of works and highlights their relationship with the others, and attempts to construct a “chronology based on the dates of the sources in which they appear.” Martin Picker provides commentary and modern editions of thirty *Fors seulement* settings. The reason for the difference in number of compositions is that Picker excludes the two motets, two
incomplete pieces, and a work that he identifies as the *Benedictus* of Jacob Obrecht’s *Missa Fors seulement*, not an incomplete chanson, as Hewitt asserts. Both Hewitt and Picker note that there is written evidence of a setting by Constanzo Festa, which has not been discovered. Neither of these two researchers include in their discussions the five Masses which are part of the *Fors seulement* lineage but Picker does make note of them. In addition to the compositions by Pipelare and Obrecht, Masses based on *Fors seulement* material survive by Ockeghem, Nicolas Gombert, and Elzéar Genet (Carpentras). Picker’s referencing of Hewitt’s numbering is extremely helpful in comparing the two discussions of the works.

Although an exact date of composition for any of the works in this lineage has not been established, it is generally agreed that Ockeghem’s three-voice *rondeau* is the first known polyphonic work setting the popular text. Hewitt asserts that the text of the *rondeau* is first found in a Berlin manuscript which has been dated at 1470 and that Ockeghem’s musical setting was copied in the Dijon Codex around 1475. Picker, however, dates the composition at c.1460. Other than the fact that he seems to place the date of the Dijon Codex at c.1470, Picker does not state the basis for such a claim.

Before addressing the manner in which this seminal work of Ockeghem’s influenced later composers, a matter of terminology must be established concerning the labeling of the

106 Ibid., endnote 1, xxiii.
108 Hewitt, “*Fors seulement*,” 94.
109 Picker, *For seulement*, vii, x.
individual voice parts. There is confusion in identifying which voices Ockeghem meant as the superius and tenor, as three of the six surviving sources place them in one order and the other three in the reverse. The contratenor retains the same place in all of the manuscripts. In Renaissance practice the superius of a three-voice work was usually placed on the left side of the opening and the tenor and the contratenor on the right side. Both Hewitt and Picker point out that in three of the sources, including the earliest, the Dijon, the voice part that lies generally higher of the two upper voices is placed on the right side of the opening in the typical place of the tenor. The cadence patterns of the two voices also seem to indicate that the voices have been copied in reverse order. The somewhat higher voice closes with a cadence characteristic of a superius, leading-tone to tonic, and the other voice cadences supertonic to tonic which was more commonplace for the tenor. Neither of the voices in the Dijon Codex are labeled. For these reasons, both Hewitt and Picker designate the higher ranging voice as the superius.110 Wexler and Plamenac, the editors of Ockeghem’s Collected Works, also discuss this problem and allude to Hewitt’s assessment. However, because they based their transcription primarily on the Dijon Codex, they retained the order from that source with the tenor-like part placed in the position of the superius.111 For this discussion, the parts will be labeled as Hewitt and Picker suggest, with the higher voice designated as the superius. Example 4 shows the final cadence of the chanson with the voice designations that will be used for discussion in this study.

110Hewitt, “Fors seulement,” 94-95, setting number 1 in her listing and Picker, For seulement, x-xi, setting numbers 1a and 1b in his listing.

Example 4: *Fors seulement*, Ockeghem (measures 66-70)\textsuperscript{112}  

Although each of the three voices of Ockeghem’s chanson have been used in the works of others, the part designated here as the superius, is overwhelmingly the most frequently borrowed voice.\textsuperscript{113} In fact, of the twenty-six works which Hewitt lists as directly using a voice from the Ockeghem chanson as a cantus firmus, eighteen borrow the superius and one employs half of the superius and half of the tenor. Pipelare’s first *Fors seulement* setting belongs to this group of chansons borrowing Ockeghem’s superius, as do the settings of such well known composers as Jacob Obrecht, Pierre de la Rue (two settings), and Josquin Desprez.\textsuperscript{114} Although, the attribution has been disputed, Ockeghem may have even composed a second chanson using the superius of the original setting as a cantus firmus in the contratenor.\textsuperscript{115}

\textsuperscript{112} Excerpted from Johannes Ockeghem, Collected Works, Vol. 3: Motets and Chansons, Richard Wexler, ed. with Dragan Plamenac (Philadelphia: Copyright © 1992 by the American Musicological Society, Inc. All rights reserved. Used by permission), 63.

\textsuperscript{113} Hewitt, “*Fors seulement*,” 120-121 and Wexler with Plamenac, *Ockeghem, Vol. 3*, lxvi.

\textsuperscript{114} Hewitt, “*Fors seulement*,” 120-121.

\textsuperscript{115} Hewitt, “*Fors seulement*,” 111-112, 120 and Picker, *Fors seulement*, xi-xii.
Several other features of Ockeghem’s original setting of the *Fors seulement* text seem to have influenced subsequent compositions. The most prominent of these is the nine measure opening duet between the tenor and contratenor before the superius entrance in measure 10. A number of the later settings make use of this device or at least the delayed entrance of the cantus firmus (See Example 5). Hewitt also makes note of the ascending triad which begins Ockeghem’s contratenor. She points out several settings which utilize this motive.

Example 5: *Fors seulement*, Ockeghem (measures 1-14)

---


117 Hewitt, “*Fors seulement,*” 122-123.

Although Pipelare’s first setting, which is for four voices, does not include the triad motive it does borrow several features other than the cantus firmus from Ockeghem.119 Two such prominent features are an opening duet and the imitation of a melodic phrase. When Ockeghem’s superius enters, its first four and a half measures are an exact imitation of the those of the tenor at the beginning of the chanson. Pipelare’s chanson also opens with a duet, this time between the tenor and contratenor bassus (henceforth referred to as simply bassus). The first four and a half measures of the tenor are the same as Ockeghem’s, transposed down an octave. This is the same phrase which initiates Ockeghem’s superius, now the cantus firmus (See Example 6). Pipelare further reinforces this opening melody of the cantus firmus, by placing the

Example 6: *Fors seulement (I)*, Pipelare (measures 1-14)120

---

119 Hewitt’s setting number 8 and Picker’s setting number 5.

first four measures of it in imitation at the octave in the other duet voice, the bassus, at the space of a half note. In the tenth measure, the superius enters with the same melody followed by the cantus firmus in the altus in the eleventh measure. As the superius enters one measure before the altus it provides a kind of vorimitation of the cantus firmus. Therefore all four voices of Pipelare’s setting begin with the melody drawn from the beginning of the cantus firmus.

Immediately after the imitation of the opening tenor phrase in the superius of Ockeghem’s setting, an ascending fourth (\(\text{a}'\) to \(\text{d}\)) is first found. Several measures later, the same four-note motive is used in canonic imitation at the octave by all three voices, beginning with the tenor, followed by the superius and then the contratenor. Therefore, the motive appears twice in what will become the cantus firmus used in most subsequent settings. The motive is marked by asterisks in Example 7. Pipelare also included a brief imitation of this motive in his chanson. Two half notes after the second appearance of the rising fourth in the cantus firmus, it appears in imitation at the octave in the bassus. The motive is again marked by asterisks in

\[121\] A modern half notes represents a semibreve in the examples and editions.

\[122\] Two half notes (semibreves) is the same distance of imitation as Ockeghem used.
Example 8. Clearly, Pipelare’s first setting of *Fors seulement* is quite indebted to Ockeghem’s original (See Examples 7 and 8).

Example 7: *Fors seulement*, Ockeghem (measures 14-24)\textsuperscript{123}

\textsuperscript{123}Excerpted from Johannes Ockeghem, *Collected Works, Vol. 3: Motets and Chansons*, Richard Wexler, ed. with Dragan Plamenac (Philadelphia: Copyright © 1992 by the American Musicological Society, Inc. All rights reserved. Used by permission), 62.
At some point, composers, while continuing their fascination with the *Fors seulement* text, began to free themselves from the reliance on Ockeghem’s musical material. While a few of the progeny of this second generation of *Fors seulement* settings retain some motivic reference to Ockeghm’s original, the distinguishing feature of these compositions is a “new” cantus firmus. Pipelare’s second setting belongs to this small but fascinating group.

---


125 As both Hewitt and Picker use quotation marks on the word “new”, the practice will be followed here.
It is not known which chanson was the first to utilize this “new” cantus firmus, although each of the three main researchers have made some conjectures based on their examination of the works. However, all seem to agree on the four chansons that appear to be the earliest of the group. Two of these exhibit obvious connections to the Ockeghem chanson as well as bearing the “new” cantus firmus, thereby providing a bridge between the two generations.

An anonymous four-voice chanson found in a Bologna manuscript, which Picker indicates is dated 1518, is one of these transitional chansons. A fifth voice is included in a St. Gall manuscript, but Picker believes that this voice was a later and poorly composed addition. He notes a number of measures that he sees as “contradictory” to the harmony of the four-voice work. The chanson uses the “new” cantus firmus, with the exception of one measure, in its superius. Although this work does not begin with a duet per se, it does exhibit the pervasive delayed entrance of the cantus firmus, which places the altus in a prominent position. Here is found the connection with tradition as the altus quotes the beginning of Ockeghem’s superius while the lower voices accompany it with an active motive which may have been derived from the triad figure of Ockeghem’s contratenor. If one disregards the lowest voice, as Picker advises, then the tenor and contratenor could be considered an accompanying duet to the altus melody. Neither Hewitt, Picker, or Cross consider this work to be the likely origin of the “new” cantus firmus. Hewitt, in fact, states that it appears to be an arrangement.

126 Picker, Fors seulement, xx. Bologna, Civico Museo Bibliografico Musicale, MS Q 19, fols. 3’-4.


128 Picker, Fors seulement, xx.

The second of the transitional chansons is a three-voice anonymous work that is found in two versions in three sources. Although listing two early prints, *Chansons a troys* (Venice, 1520) and *Trium vocum carmina* (Nuremberg, 1538), both Hewitt and Picker base their arguments on the London manuscript housed in the British museum.\(^{130}\) Picker states that this source is an early sixteenth-century *chansonier* which, because of the presence of a number of Flemish songs, could have been copied in Flanders.\(^{131}\) Cross views the Nuremberg print (by Formschneider) as primary even though the cantus firmus has been transposed down from the pitch level of the Bologna chanson, the other two sources, and that of Pipelare’s chanson. He indicates that it would be easy to mistake the London version for a new work because of its high level of ornamentation. He even suggests that Hewitt may view the two as separate works, but that is clearly not the case.\(^{132}\)

At issue is whether one of the versions of this anonymous chanson or the setting by Pipelare is the origin of the “new” cantus firmus. Hewitt and Picker believe that there are strong indications that this chanson may be the original source on which all of the other second generation works were based. As in the Bologna chanson, the primary link to Ockeghem is found at the very beginning and in some possible derivative motives. The work begins with a duet between the superius and the contratenor. The superius either quotes or paraphrases Ockeghem’s contratenor for its first nine measures. The contratenor enters in measure two with 1,” 100.


a brief imitation of the superius. These two voices form a strong cadence as the tenor, bearing the “new” cantus firmus, enters in measure nine. Picker states that the “. . . new melody is so well integrated into this setting that we may suspect it to be the original . . . .” Hewitt notes the skillful structure of the work as well as pointing out several instances of two- and three-voice imitation. These factors lead her to the assessment that “. . . the whole seems so homogeneous that one is inclined to believe that this work may be the source of the ‘new’ cantus firmus—an original work prefaced by a duet that acknowledges Ockeghem’s work as the original setting of Fors seulement.” Cross admits that because two of Pipelare’s Flemish songs were based on works found in the London source, it may seem “logical” that Pipelare modeled his chanson after this three-voice setting in the same manuscript. However, he points to the late date of the Formschneider print (1538) and the seeming popularity of the Pipelare’s setting as evidence that it might have been the source on which the others were based. Picker, referring again to the London version, believes that the chanson fits stylistically into a late fifteenth century time frame.

One oddity about the chanson in the London manuscript is reported by Picker: there are not enough notes in the tenor part to carry the full text. It is difficult to reconcile this problem because each voice of the London version carries only an incipit of the first line and a half of the text. Although the full chanson text is set in the Chansons a troys print, the tenor part is missing, rendering a potential solution elusive. Picker does not mention the version in the

133Picker, Fors seulement, xx.
135Cross, “Chansons,” 516.
136Picker, Fors seulement, xx.
Tricum vocum carmina (Formschneider) print in reference to this problem. Hewitt reports that the Jena copy of this print contains only the incipit Fors seulement handwritten in the tenor part-book. In Picker’s edition, based on the London manuscript, he omitted the second line of the chanson refrain in his underlay of the tenor part.  

In his second setting of the Fors seulement text, Pipelare creates a chanson based on the “new” cantus firmus, which is again placed in the tenor, but with essentially no utilization of Ockeghem’s melodic materials. The strongest structural link is that it too begins with a duet which, as in the previous chanson, is between the superius and contratenor. Hewitt sees some connection to Ockeghem in the opening of this duet through the London chanson’s contratenor. Such a link is viewed as quite weak by this writer and may not have been intentional. Picker cites only the existence of the duet as any reference to Ockeghem’s setting, although he notes that several prominent musicologists have tried to prove a strong connection between the two. Cross notes only that the “new” cantus firmus bears some resemblance to Ockeghem’s superius in its first few notes. The similarity appears to be primarily that each melody begins with repeated notes.

A much stronger relationship exists between the London chanson and Pipelare’s which makes the quest for primacy more compelling, yet more difficult to prove. Both Hewitt and Picker notes that there similarities in structure, harmony, texture, and melody between the

137 Ibid., xx, 84.


139 Picker, Fors seulement, xx, setting number 26 and Martin Picker, ed., Chanson Albums, 74, 108.

two. ♪ Picker also cites common cadence points in the cantus firmus. In fact, he points out that Pipelare’s three lower voices are exactly the same as the three voices of the anonymous work at the cadence which occurs at the conclusion of the first line of text in the tenor. ♪ Examples 9 and 10 show the similarities.

Example 9: Fors seulement, Anonymous (measures 17-19)

Example 10: Fors seulement (II), Pipelare (measures 21-23)

---


142 Martin Picker, Chanson Albums, 74.

More telling is his observation that the close texture of Pipelare’s chanson may have resulted from his possible reliance on the three-voice work which, in modern terms, translates to soprano, soprano, tenor. Pipelare’s voice parts could be labeled soprano, soprano, alto, tenor.144 The similarity between the ranges of the parts can be seen in the example below. With the exception of a one note upward extension in the superius of the anonymous work, the ranges of Pipelare’s superius, tenor, and contratenor exactly match those of the three-voice chanson (See Example 11). The fact that the range of Pipelare’s altus is almost identical to that of the superius may indeed indicate that he was creating a fourth voice within a predetermined range.

Example 11: Ranges for Fors seulement (II), Pipelare and Fors seulement, Anonymous

![Example 11: Ranges for Fors seulement (II), Pipelare and Fors seulement, Anonymous](image)

The fourth and final of this early group of chansons based on the “new” cantus firmus is an anonymous four-voice work found in a Cambrai manuscript.145 It is the longest of the four and the reasons for this extension and the insertion of a phrase not found in other settings may account for fact that neither Hewitt, Picker, nor Cross mention this as a possibility as the source of the “new” cantus firmus. The composer has increased the measures of rests between phrases and sub-phrases of the cantus firmus146 by two to four measures, and by six and one-half

---

144Ibid., 74-75. Picker lists the voice parts of the anonymous work as TrST and those of Pipelare’s as SSST.

145Picker, Fors seulement, xxi. Cambrai, Bibliothèque de Ville, MS 124, fol. 144’.

146Hewitt, “Fors seulement,” 101, setting number 33, Picker, Fors seulement, xxi, setting number 27, and “Chansons,” 517 and “M.P.: Historical and Stylistic, Pt. 1,” 100. Cross
measures before the last phrase. However, the rests before the phrase that bears the second line of text are marginally reduced. Hewitt reveals the reason for these extra rests when she notes that “Anticipatory imitations of the cantus firmus by the superius are introduced fairly regularly, although usually during rests in the cantus firmus, so that a kind of dialogue results.”147 In fact, every single phrase or sub-phrase of the cantus firmus receives vorimitation of some kind. Even the second full phrase which is preceded by shortened rests receives a brief imitative motive in rhythmic diminution. All of the anticipations occur in the superius except for the one before the fourth full phrase of the tenor melody. As Hewitt notes, the altus imitates this phrase in its entirety while the tenor performs the music which is not a part of the cantus firmus and which she characterizes as an accompaniment to the altus.148 Even this new tenor melody receives a brief vorimitation of its ascending motive by the superius. All of these anticipations occur one octave above the tenor except for the last. The last phrase, which is the longest of the melody, is anticipated by the superius a fifth higher. Thus, it seems likely that the composer of this chanson used the “new” cantus firmus as a starting point, but expanded its scope with a creative design that introduced a great deal of carefully wrought imitation. This work also begins with a duet, here between the bassus and the altus. Cross states that the duet is a paraphrase of the bassus and superius duet of Pipelare’s chanson.149 A clear connection between the melodic design of the two duets does not seem strong. Neither Hewitt nor Picker note such a link.

________________________

mentions only the insertion, not the added rests.


148 Ibid.

These four chansons form the foundation of the second generation of *Fors seulement* settings. Two of them, the Bologna/St. Gall and the London/Chansons/Trium, act as bridges between the generations by the inclusion of obvious references to Ockeghem’s original setting. The other two, Pipelare’s and the Cambrai, bear no obvious allusions to Ockeghem other than the opening duet and the delayed entrance of the cantus firmus. All four settings largely present the cantus firmus in remarkably similar form with minor rhythmic and melodic modifications. The most obvious exceptions, of course, are the deletion of one measure of the cantus firmus in the Bologna/St. Gall and the addition of rests and melodic material to the cantus firmus in the Cambrai. Because of the deletion/additions to an otherwise stable cantus firmus, it is highly unlikely that either of these two chansons are the original source of the “new” cantus firmus. That leaves only the London/Chansons/Trium and Pipelare settings as strong possibilities. While Pipelare’s chanson certainly can be considered a masterful composition with its cantus firmus just as well “integrated” as that of the London/Chansons/Trium setting, Picker’s comparison of the ranges of the two works does give credence to the theory that Pipelare based his song on one of the versions of the three-voice anonymous work.

Even if credit for the creation of the “new” cantus firmus cannot be claimed for Pipelare, that does not diminish the skill with which he wrought this stunning work nor its influence on other compositions. If he did use another chanson as his model, he evidently recognized the inherent musical qualities and fashioned a new composition which, most likely, became his best-known work, both during his life and after.¹⁵⁰ In addition, his setting was used as a model for a three-voice chanson by Antoine Févin whose setting influenced two other works.

Hewitt, Picker, and Cross all state that Févin’s chanson is built on ornamented motives drawn from Pipelare’s, with Hewitt and Picker actually labeling the Févin piece a parody.\footnote{Hewitt, “Fors seulement,” 100, setting number 31, Picker, Fors seulement, xxii, setting number 28, and Cross, “Chansons,” 517 and “M. P.: Historical and Stylistic, Pt. 1,” 101.} Févin begins his chanson with a duet between the tenor and contraternor. The tenor part is comprised of an ornamented version of Pipelare’s opening duet. This phrase is immediately imitated at the octave by the superius as the tenor continues with a phrase drawn from Pipelare’s superius in measures 19-23. This is also immediately imitated by the superius. From measure 19 to the end of the piece Févin incorporates ornamented versions of all phrases of the “new” cantus firmus starting with the phrase that sets the second line of text in Pipelare’s chanson. The first half of this phrase is first stated in the superius and is imitated in the other two voices. All other phrases are found most clearly in Févin’s tenor, although the other voices draw upon motives from the borrowed material through imitation and sequence.\footnote{Cross, “Chansons,” 517 and “M. P.: Historical and Stylistic, Pt. 1,” 101 and Hewitt, “Fors seulement,” 100, 125. Hewitt has a most informative musical example on page 125 which compares the musical material drawn from Pipelare and Févin’s versions of them. In her discussion on page 100, the adapted portion of Pipelare’s superius is incorrectly given as occurring in measures 15-18, however the musical example on page 125 correctly shows the measures as 19-23.} Although he cites Pipelare’s work as the primary model, Picker believes that Févin may have also used motives from the London et al, chanson. He correctly points out that the opening motive of Févin’s work is found in the anonymous chanson’s contratenor, measures 45-47.\footnote{Picker, Fors seulement, xxii.}

Two other chansons draw on Févin’s work, thereby being influenced indirectly by Pipelare’s chanson. The first is by Jörg Blanckenmüller, a little-known German composer. Hewitt and Picker note that the second half of the piece is based on a dotted motive found in
Févin’s version of the last phrase of Pipelare’s tenor. Févin immediately develops that motive in all voices through imitation and sequence in measures 49-54. It is this portion of the chanson which Blanckenmüller uses. The final chanson was composed by the venerable Adrian Willaert. In his five-voice work for low voices, Févin’s tenor, transposed down a fifth, is placed in the superius as a cantus firmus. He also uses a transposed version of the first four measures of the earlier contratenor in the quinta vox or second tenor part.

Of the five Fors seulement Masses, the ones by Ockeghem and Obrecht are based on Ockeghem’s original chanson. The other three are associated with the second generation of settings. Pipelare’s Mass utilizes the tenor of his second chanson as a cantus firmus. The final two have direct and indirect links to Pipelare as Gombert’s Mass draws from the chansons of both Pipelare and Févin and the Carpentras Mass is based on Févin’s.

A motet by Phillipe Verdelot, Infirmitatem nostram, uses the “new” cantus firmus as its altus and completes the compositions belonging to the second generation. In such a work, the Fors seulement relationship is present only in the music and not the text. Such is the case with the sacred contrafacta of Pipelare’s second chanson underlaid with the psalm verse beginning

154 Picker, Fors seulement, xxii, setting number 29 and Hewitt, “Fors seulement,” 101, setting number 33. Hewitt lists the influential measures as 50-55, however, we find Picker’s assertion of measures 49-54 to be more credible.


157 Picker, Fors seulement, xxiii.

Exortum est in tenebris. In fact, it is interesting to note that, while the rondeau text of Ockeghem’s original chanson is used most frequently, and the one used by Pipelare in his two chansons, there are three other poems that appear among the secular compositions in the Fors seulement music or music/text lineage.\textsuperscript{159}

The Fors seulement text and Ockeghem’s original setting of it, inspired a remarkable body of secular and sacred music created over six or seven decades\textsuperscript{160} which includes contributions by some of the most distinguished composers of the middle Renaissance. Pipelare, with his two settings of the text holds a place in both generations of the lineage. It has been shown that a prominent and influential role can be claimed for his second setting in the creation of the second generation, in addition to it being, ostensibly, his most popular work. The Missa Fors seulement takes the “new” cantus firmus and uses it as a foundation for what Cross calls one of Pipelare’s last and finest works.\textsuperscript{161} Surely, these works are worthy of being made more widely available for performance and study.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[159] Hewitt, “Fors seulement,” 100-101 and Picker, Fors seulement, viii-ix, xxvii-xxx. On the latter pages can be found the texts of all of the poems along with English translations.
\item[160] Picker, Fors seulement, vii.
\end{footnotes}
CHAPTER 2
EDITING AND PERFORMANCE ISSUES
EDITING PROCEDURES

Sources

From the surviving manuscripts, one manuscript was chosen as the source for the performance editions and a photocopy or microfilm was obtained of the manuscripts. With only one source for each work, the choices naturally had both advantages and limitations. In the case of the motet, there was no choice as it survives only in one source: *Exortum est in tenebris*, fol. 92r, housed in the Santa Iglesia Catedral, Archivo Capitular de la Catedral, unnumbered, Segovia. Fortunately, there are no real problems with the photocopy. Interestingly, it contains the solmization version of Pipelare’s name which was sometimes used in the sources. Example 12 shows the “la” and “re” noted on a musical staff. Because Picker indicated that the Florence manuscript (F) contains the most careful text underlay of the chanson sources, it was chosen for Example 12: Pipelare’s name in solmization syllables (Segovia Manuscript)

![Example 12: Pipelare’s name in solmization syllables (Segovia Manuscript)](image)

*Fors seulement* (Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, MS Magl. XIX. 164-167, no. LXI, anon.). Although, evidently better than other sources, there are still mistakes in the text and it is one of the manuscripts that gives the chanson as anonymous. These textual problems will be discussed

---

162 Picker, *Fors seulement*, xxi.
below. Cross lists the Jena manuscripts as among the most authoritative for Pipelare’s works.\textsuperscript{163} Therefore, a copy of the manuscript for Missa Fors seulement was obtained from the Universitäts-Bibliothek (Chorbuch 2, fol. 66v-79v). Indeed, Cross lists very few variants for the Mass in this manuscript, all are minor but one. The most frequent variant found in the Jena manuscript is the evidently common practice of avoiding placing a dotted note at the end of a line. Instead of a dotted minim at the end of a line of music, a minim would be written and a semi-minim of the same pitch on the next line.\textsuperscript{164} This occurs a number of times. In each instance, it is obvious from Cross’s Critical Notes that other sources have the two notes written as a dotted minim. Therefore, that is the way it has been interpreted in the edition of the Mass. The one significant problem with this source is that it omits the Agnus II. In fact, six of the eight sources are missing all or portions of one or two sections of the Agnus Dei. Only Marburg/Lahn (B) and Roma (S) seem to contain the complete movement, with the latter having fewer variants.\textsuperscript{165} Given this unfortunate limitation of the source, performance options will be discussed below.

**General Procedures**

The motet and the Mass both bear the mensuration sign of \( \Slant \) and the chanson that of \( C_2 \). Both of these signs could be used in the same manner.\textsuperscript{166} In fact, editions of the chanson by

\textsuperscript{163}Cross, “M. P.: Opera Omnia, Vol. 1, xi.


\textsuperscript{165}Cross, “M. P.: Opera Omnia, Vol. 2, x-xii.

Cross, Hewitt, and Picker indicate that the work usually bore the \( \checkmark \) mensuration sign.\(^{167}\) None of the works exhibit a change in mensuration. For the editions, the note values have been halved resulting in a breve equaling a modern whole note. The modern time signature of 2/2 has been used for each of the works. Final longas at the ends of the works and at the ends of major sections and movements are shown as whole notes with fermatas.

For the chanson and motet, the voice parts for the highest to the lowest parts have been designated as superius, altus, tenor, and bassus. No voice designations are shown on the copy of the motet and only the tenor part receives a name in the microfilm of the Florence source for the chanson. The Jena manuscript for the Mass does contain designations for all parts except the superius, which has an illumination of the first letter of the text. Each of the two tenor parts are labeled simply “tenor.” The part with the higher range, which carries the cantus firmus, will be called tenor I and the other tenor II. The middle voice is given as contratenor on the first folio, and thereafter abbreviated as “Contra.” Although the bassus part is usually labeled as such, the terms barriton and barricanor are also used. On the editions, all voice parts have been indicated as described above. Names that do not appear in the sources are placed in parentheses. Underneath these designations are included the modern voice parts which best correspond to the range and tessitura of each part. These, also, are placed in parentheses.

Incipits have been placed before the first modern measure of the each voice part in the chanson and motet and at the beginning of each of the Mass movements. These show the original clef, mensuration sign, and first few notes and rests as indicated by the sources.

---

Ligatures in the editions are indicated by closed brackets and coloration by open brackets. Both are placed over the notes in the score.

Any musical instruction, whether it be a suggested tactus range, section letter, or indication of a repeat are all editorial. A keyboard reduction of the vocal parts has been provided as a rehearsal aid. Obviously, it is an editorial addition and no further indication as such has been noted.

**Barring**

Although the original vocal parts have no vertical marks of division creating measurement units, current musicians have all learned to read notation based on regular metrical groupings divided by barlines into measures. Since the contemporary approach to such an arrangement is to attach a regularly recurring system of strong and weak beats, which was not a part of the earlier notation, many have eschewed the use of barlines. Aside from simply eliminating any vertical division, several systems have been developed as alternatives to barlines drawn through the staves. One of the two primary methods is called *Mesurstrichen* developed by Heinrich Besseler.\(^{168}\) This system draws vertical lines between the staves where modern barlines would be found in the staves. The result is that measures are marked but the music flows unimpeded on the staves. The actual result with any choral group, other than one schooled in reading such notation, is a great deal of lost rehearsal time while the choristers try to figure out the rhythms involving such unfamiliar occurrences as whole notes extending across a measure or even from one line to the next. The other of the main alternatives, favored by Otto Gombosi, is to use barlines, but divide each voice part according to the continually changing rhythmic

\(^{168}\)Atlas, *Renaissance*, 475.
groupings implied by musical flow. This method may result in an individual part frequently changing meters (e.g. 2/2—3/2—2/2—6/4, etc.). Besides the difficulty in identifying starting places in rehearsals, such an approach puts into print yet another of the editor’s own musical decisions, one with which the conductor may or may not agree.

As it is the primary purpose of this study to produce editions which, while remaining faithful to the original musical intent, will be practical enough to encourage wide use by choral ensembles, barlines are drawn through the staves creating regular modern measures. Experience has shown that vocalists can be taught to follow musical line and textual accentuation in a way which neutralizes the inappropriate metrical stress, while retaining the system of interpreting rhythms with which they are most comfortable. In this interpretation, re-creation of the proper articulation of each individual line is a rehearsal, not an editorial, issue. The use of regular barlines necessitates dividing notes that should continue across the lines and rejoining them with ties. All such cases are editorial.

Musica Ficta

Consistent with normal editorial procedure, the accidentals found in the manuscripts have been placed in the score to the left of the affected note. All of these were B flats which are actually part of the recta system. Any editorial additions, whether further recta B flats or musica ficta sharps have been placed above the affected note. A flat or sharp, whether placed in the score or above, is meant to inflect only the note with which it is immediately associated. Since the keyboard reduction is entirely editorial and its inclusion is intended for the aid of an accompanist, all accidentals have been placed in the score. However, each accidental still inflects only the note to its right. Decisions about needed musica ficta were based on the primary

\[\text{\textsuperscript{169}}\text{Ibid.}\]
guidelines set forth by period theorists. *Ficta* was added to correct both harmonic and melodic tritones; follow other melodic guidelines; and to create the closest approach desired for imperfect consonances moving to perfect consonances at cadence points.170 When applying rules and guidelines to any situation, there always arise conflicting situations in which one has to make choices of one prescribed practice over another. Several examples from the chanson and Mass will demonstrate some of the problems encountered and how they were resolved. In all such cases where one’s judgement has to be exercised, alternate viable solutions could often be found.171

All of the works in these performance editions are in the un-transposed Dorian mode. The most obvious difference between this mode and the tonal key of D natural minor is the presence of B natural in Dorian. Five of the seven cantus firmus phrases (shown below in Example 27) contain at least one B, which, when unaltered, gives the melody a very characteristic Dorian sound. Their presence also accounts for all of the difficulties with non-cadence harmonic discords. There are three instances in the chanson where an F occurs vertically with a B in the canus firmus. The first of these is found in measure 21 between the tenor B and the F in both the altus and superius. Berger reports that after the 1470's, flat rather than sharp solutions were preferred to correct harmonic *mi-fa* discords. The fact that the F is doubled could also be an indication not to sharp those pitches.172 The next decision is how to create a minor third leading into an octave between the bassus and tenor from measure 22-23.


The most obvious solution is to place a B flat in the bassus. However, there seems to have been some controversy over cadences on A and musical context appears to have been the deciding factor. Because there is a strong cadence on A, the fifth degree of the chanson’s mode, a stronger leading tone G sharp could have been preferred over the weaker B flat. That is the choice that has been made here. Such an inflection creates a tritone of G sharp to D. This was allowed at cadences where the harmonic discord resolves correctly (See Example 13). As a general editorial guideline in closest approach cadences, sharp solutions have been preferred over flat ones, both to take advantage of the leading-tone quality of the sharps and to avoid B flats which weaken the characteristic sound of the Dorian mode.

Example 13: *Fors seulement (II)* (measures 21-23)

In examining the Mass, it appeared that Piplelare may have been interested in retaining the Dorian flavor of the cantus firmus as much as possible. At most occurrences of B’s in the

---

173Ibid., 117-118. Atlas also states that in some similar cases the use of B flat could imply the Phrygian mode and weaken the modal integrity, *Renaissance*, 242.
cantus firmus, the vertical relationships with other parts do not involve F’s in a structural way. Also, in five of the seven instances where there is mi-fa conflict, Pipelare has made it difficult to rectify. Example 14 illustrates ones of these problems. In measure 157, the cantus firmus (tenor I) has a B which extends into measure 158 where the contratenor moves to an F. If the B were to be flatted, it would produce a tritone with the tenor II’s E. If the E were also to be flatted, a melodic tritone with the A preceding the E would occur. Flattening the A would then create another harmonic discord the contratenor’s E (See Example 14). Rather than set off a “chain reaction” of one inflection causing another and causing another, it seems that one harmonic discord could be tolerated.\(^{174}\) Therefore, in these five cases, the B to F tritone has been left unaltered.

Example 14: *Credo, Missa Fors seulement* (measures 157-158)

Melodic semi-tones or cross relations, both simultaneously and in close proximity, were prohibited.\(^{175}\) In the Florence chanson source, a flat is placed in the superius before the B in

\(^{174}\)Ibid. and Berger, “Musica Ficta,” 113.

\(^{175}\)Ibid., 112 and Atlas, Renaissance, 240.
measure 8. Therefore, because there is a B in the previous measure (close proximity) it is flatted as well (See Example 15). This also works well with the bassus in the same measure as it has a melodic tritone resulting from F descending to B, to which a flat has been added to correct the discord. One of the exceptions to the melodic tritone prohibition is also shown in Example 15. In measures 8 and 9 of the superius, the descending diminished fifth of B flat to E is allowed because it returns up the semitone to F. The reverse would also be acceptable (E to B flat returning to A).\textsuperscript{176}

Example 15: \textit{Fors seulement (II), Superius and Bassus (measures 6-10)}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{example15.png}
\end{figure}

There were a number of occasions in these editions where the melodic semitone was allowed in the proximity of a half note, or even a quarter note, if it seemed to be the best melodic and harmonic solution. The least satisfactory of such instances occurs in \textit{Agnus III}. In order to create the closest approach for the cantus firmus’s cadence on D, the final C of the superius in measure 89 was sharped (See Example 16). Normally, the C in the preceding eighth note run would be sharped as well. To do so, however, would create a vertical cross relation with the C in the tenor II part. Rather than insert another sharp, it was decided that the brief, but very close cross relation, was the least disruptive to the overall musical flow.

\footnote{\textit{Atlas, Renaissance}, 241.}
Example 16: *Agnus III, Missa Fors seulement* (measures 88-90)

\[\text{Text Underlay}\]

If *musica ficta* in music of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century presents conflicting choices, many difficult decisions also must be made in regards to text underlay in music of the same period. What is one to do when the earliest known writer on the subject of text underlay, possibly Antonius de Leno (ca. 1440), urges the singer to “deliver the syllable on the note with which it is aligned”\(^{177}\) when, in the manuscripts, whole words or phrases are simply written all together near the beginning of a section of music. Although the situation was

improving by Pipelare’s time, nothing close to the ideal that Zarlino sets forth in his 1558 *Le istitutioni harmoniche* had been attained.

Much excellent research has been done on the earliest writings on text underlay by Edward Lowinsky, Don Harrán and others. Gary Towne has brought together an extremely helpful two-part article which brings together the teachings of the major Renaissance writers on the subject: Antonius de Leno (ca.1440), Giovanni Maria Lanfranco (1533), Nicola Vicentino (1555), Gioseffo Zarlino (1558), Gaspar Stoquerus or Stocker (ca. 1570), and Paolo Luchini (p. 1588). He also includes information from Don Harrán’s *Word-Tone Relations in Musical Thought* (1986). Towne’s work was immensely helpful in assembling a set of guidelines by which to underlay the text in the editions.

All writers on text underlay set forth several general, seemingly very simple, principles: the first syllable is sung to the first note of a section; the last syllable is sung to the last note of a section; repeated notes get new syllables; and a syllable should be sung on only the first syllable of a ligature. However, other rules and guidelines impact those simple dictums and often the reality presented by the music necessitates that one or more must be broken. Examples of some of the more specific rules and some of the exceptions as were encountered in the music will be given below.

One subject should be addressed before preceding. While not in Latin, it is acceptable to elide syllables in Greek as in “*Kyrie eleison.*” Most transcriptions found in the Collected


180 Ibid., 285-286.
Works of composers of this period do not individually underlay the “e” and “i” in the middle of “eleison.” It is either to be elided or the singer is to decide the placement of the “i.” As the editions prepared for this study are intended to be as practical as they are accurate, the “i” has been placed in parentheses and set with a note or notes when it was found to be appropriate. If the (i) has not been inserted, it was felt that, in the musical context, the two syllables should be elided. One may certainly elide all of the “eleisons” and ignore the placement of (i). This is for the conductor to decide.

One generally agreed upon rule is that notes of a semiminim (eighth notes in the editions) or smaller should not receive a syllable, nor should the larger note following such smaller notes. However a run of semiminims may carry a syllable and Stocker even advises that, in older music, groups of two semiminims may carry a syllable if necessary.181 Example 17 shows a portion of the superius in the Kyrie. Because of the number of syllables and the number of eighth notes, it is impossible to completely avoid placing a syllable on a longer note which follows eighths. In the example, one can also see the placement of (i) under a grouping of two eighth notes.

Example 17: *Kyrie, Missa Fors seulement*, Superius (measures 13-18)

---

181Ibid., 268, 271-272.
There are also several situations where the last syllable cannot be placed on the last note, the prime one being a ligature on the final note (See Example 18). \(^{182}\)

Example 18: *Gloria, Missa Fors seulement*, Contratenor (measures 146-148)

![Example 18: Gloria, Missa Fors seulement, Contratenor (measures 146-148)](image)

When dealing with setting melismatic passages toward the end of a passage, Lanfranco advises the penultimate syllable to placed on a melisma leading to the last syllable on the final note. Later writers, such as Zarlino and Stocker allow that only if the syllable is a strong one. However, Lanfranco is writing much closer to the period in which Pipelare was composing. \(^{183}\) At the end of the first section of the *Credo*, the superius has just such a situation. The penultimate syllable of the phrase, the last syllable of “*sepultus,*” is set to the melisma leading into the final note and syllable of the section, even though “-tus” is a weak syllable (See Example 19).

Example 19: *Credo, Missa Fors seulement*, Superius (measures 101-105)

![Example 19: Credo, Missa Fors seulement, Superius (measures 101-105)](image)

In dealing with the rhythmic pattern of a dotted minim followed by a semiminim and a regular minim, there are three options for text underlay (See Example 20). The first choice follows the rule stated previously and only the first note receives a syllable. However, if needed,

\(^{182}\)Ibid., 268.

\(^{183}\)Ibid., 271
the first and last notes in the pattern may carry a syllable. As a last resort, all notes may carry a syllable.\textsuperscript{184} It has been necessary to utilize all of these options in providing text underlay.

Example 20: Dotted Rhythmic Motive

\begin{music}
\newclef{c'5}
\newtie \\
\dot{\cdot} \quad \dot{\cdot} \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \\
\end{music}

Another prescription concerns syllable placement following a large leap, particularly an octave. It is advised that the upper note of the leap receive a new syllable only if it is the beginning of a word.\textsuperscript{185} In Example 21, one might place the second syllable of “\textit{excelsis}” on the upper note since it is the accented syllable. However, in order not to contradict the rule, it has been placed on the lower note and carried through the leap.

Example 21: \textit{Hosanna, Missa Fors seulement}, Contratenor (measures 132-134)

\begin{music}
\newclef{c'5}
\newtie \\
\cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \\
\textit{ex - cel - - -} \\
\end{music}

If a scribal error has been made and there is nothing else to do, then rules may be broken.\textsuperscript{186} Example 22 shows an instance where the bassus must sing two syllables on a ligature in order to get all of the text in the phrase. One may divide a note if there are not enough notes

\textsuperscript{184}Ibid., 277-278.

\textsuperscript{185}Ibid., 273.

\textsuperscript{186}Ibid., 267-269.
Example 22: *Kyrie, Missa Fors seulement*, Bassus (measures 9-14)

The manuscript provides two breves (whole notes) for a three- or four-syllable word. In the edition, the first whole note has been split into two half notes. The word “*eleison*” should be sung elided with two syllables. The *Christe* ends with a situation in which the contratenor must split the word “*eleison*” over a rest (See Example 24). Repeated notes should be given new syllables except in the case of ornaments, such as the anticipations frequently found in compositions of this period. Example 25 shows such an instance.

---

187Ibid., 265.

Example 25: *Credo, Missa Fors seulement*, Tenor II (measures 5-7)

In the largely syllabic movements of the *Gloria* and *Credo* there are fewer difficult decisions to be made as one is often simply matching syllables with the available notes. Although, sometimes the textual accents of the words fit well with the musical flow, there are many instances where they are at odds, yet there is no other choice. Pipelare’s frequent use of repeated notes, and the need to place new syllables on each of them, further restricts options. The passage given in Example 26 is such an instance. Although there are more notes than syllables in the phrase, the repeated notes at the beginning force the singer to place syllables in awkward places in the music.

Example 26: *Gloria, Missa Fors seulement*, Superius (measures 80-84)

At all times in making underlay decisions, the scribal placement of text was scrutinized to see if it could offer insight into what was intended. Underlay was set as closely as possible to the original clues whenever feasible. The *Sanctus* is a good example of this. Towne states that when single words of a text are spread throughout sections of a piece, it may be a clue that phrases of the text may be repeated in each of those sections. The text of the *Sanctus* is underlaid exactly

---

189Ibid., 152.
as Towne described: one word per section of the music. In each musical section, there are quite enough notes to accommodate a short phrase of text. However, the word “Sanctus” is set in three successive sections in all voices (except the cantus firmus of tenor I) before proceeding with the rest of the phrase, “Dominus Deus Sabaoth.” Given the tradition of reciting the Sanctus three times, it seems clear that Pipelare desires the first three sections to be sung only to the word “Sanctus” before moving to the next words of the text. Therefore, each section has been set to only one word of text. The only exception to this is where a repeated-note figure (in four-voice imitation) begins the section for Dominus. Beginning that section with a repetition of the word “Sanctus” helps provide enough syllables for the music (See Example 27).

Example 27: Sanctus, Missa Fors seulement (measures 45-50)

![Sheet Music]

The goals in providing text underlay to the editions have been to try to stay as true to the music and the period as possible while producing a musically satisfying result. Frequently, the addition of words and phrases seemed necessary, but there was a deliberate attempt to hold such
additions to a minimum. Except for the long-texted Gloria and Credo, which are set essentially syllabically, the other movements of this Mass seem to have been conceived, for the most part, in melismatic lines. The experience of singing long melodic phrases to one or few words may be an unfamiliar one to many singers and audience members, but such a performance may provide a tonal connection with a still valid sound concept of the middle Renaissance. Throughout the editions, any text added by the editor is placed in italics.

The Texts

In early music one always encounters various versions of individual words and phrases, including abbreviations; variant spellings or forms; and changes in the nature of omissions, additions, or replacements. The form of the texts used in the editions is intended to be true to the sources while seeking consistency with other editions or common usage. As there are fewer variants, the Latin and Greek texts will be considered first.

At two places in the Mass, the tenor I does not contain the liturgical text. At the very beginning of the its first phrase in the Kyrie (measure 9), the first line of the chanson is inscribed to identify the origin of the cantus firmus: “Fors seulement l’atente que je meure.” This could also indicate that the tenor I should sing the chanson text at this point. When the tenor I enters in the Credo (measure 35), only the chanson’s first two words, “Fors seulement,” are underlaid. In both places, the liturgical text has been underlaid to the music and the original chanson text placed under that, but not set to the music. A small portion of the Credo text is totally omitted from the underlay. The text reading, “Et in unum Dominum Jesum Christum, Filium Dei unigenitum.” never appears in any of the voices. For the bassus phrase beginning in measure 17, the missing text has been placed underneath the text as given in the manuscript. This gives the
conductor a choice of singing the original text underlay or having the entire liturgical text presented by at least one voice.\textsuperscript{190}

The text for the motet is verse 4 of Psalm 112 (Latin Vulgate 111). The version used in the source is from the Greek translation of the Psalm. The Hebrew original does not contain the word “\textit{Dominus}” (the Lord).\textsuperscript{191} No changes have been made to Latin or Greek texts except to spell out abbreviations and to standardize to modern usage. Translations for the texts are given in Appendix A.

The poem of the chanson is a \textit{rondeau}, one of the three Medieval \textit{formes fixes}. Whereas, in the later fifteenth century, the \textit{ballade} fell into disuse and the \textit{virelai} transformed into the \textit{bergerette}, a large percentage of secular polyphonic music was composed in \textit{rondeau} form.\textsuperscript{192} The form of the \textit{rondeau} consisted of a two-part refrain which was set to two sections of music (AB). After the entire refrain was sung, two other strophes or verses (one short and one long) were sung to the A and AB portions of the music, with a short refrain (sung to A) intervening between the strophes. The performance ended with a repetition of the entire refrain sung to the AB music. The text as it is used in the \textit{Fors seulement} edition is given below in Example 28. It is a \textit{rondeau cinquain}, one which features a refrain of five lines, rather than the more common four lines. The refrain is usually divided into three lines for the A section and two lines for the B section. The poetic section is labeled and rhyme scheme and musical/poetic form are shown to

\textsuperscript{190}Cross, M. P.: \textit{Opera Omnia}, Vol. 2, 93. Cross reports that the text is missing from all sources. The above is his solution and was deemed practical for this edition.


the right of each line of text. The musical parts of the refrain are designated as A and B in capital letters. Lower case letters are used to identify where music is repeated but the text is new. When capital letters are used again, it indicates that both the music and the text have returned.

Example 28: Fors seulement text - poetic and musical chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poetic section</th>
<th>Rhyme</th>
<th>Music</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fors seulement l’atente que je meure,</strong></td>
<td>refrain</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En mon las cueur [nul espoir] ne demeure,</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car mon malheur si fort me tourmente</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Qui n’est] douleur que par vous je ne sente</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pource que suis de vous perdre bien seure.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vostre riger tellement me court seure</td>
<td>short strophe</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qu’en ce parti il fault que je m’asseure</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t je n’ay bien qui en riens me contente.</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fors seulement l’atente que je meure,</td>
<td>short refrain</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En mon las cueur nul espoir ne demeure,</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car mon malheur si fort me tourmente</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon desconfort toute seule je pleure,</td>
<td>long strophe</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En maudissant, sur ma foy, a toute heure,</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma leauté qui tant m’a fait dolente.</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las, que je suis de vivre mal contente,</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quant de par vous n’ay riens qui me demeure.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fors seulement l’atente que je meure,</td>
<td>refrain</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En mon las cueur nul espoir ne demeure,</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car mon malheur si fort me tourmente</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qui n’est douleur que pour vous je ne sente</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pource que suis de vous perdre bien seure.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike the fairly standard Latin text of the motet and Mass, the chanson text exists in a number of versions with each containing different spellings and, in some cases, completely different phrases. As the Florence manuscript includes only the refrain, the complete poem has
been drawn from two versions of Ockeghem’s original musical setting. These are reprinted with translations in Appendix A by permission from Fors seulement: Thirty Compositions for Three to Five Voices or Instruments from the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries edited by Martin Picker. The “1a” text is from Ockeghem’s original setting and the “2a” from a later arrangement of the original, probably by Ockeghem himself. One will note that the two versions are essentially the same, with a few changed spellings. The main difference is that the second lines of the short strophe are completely different in the two versions. Also, the final word of the long strophe is changed from “demeure” in the first to “sequeure” in the second.

The edition is based primarily on version “1a.” A few words are used in the form in which they appear in “1b.” These are marked above at their first occurrence in italics. The versions of “l’atente,” “malheur,” and “Qui” are found in the Florence source although “l’atente” is missing the final “e.” The word “tourmente” is missing the letter “n.” The forms, “me court” and “mauldisant,” find concordance in the text that Cross gives. “Par” is used for “pour” in the Florence manuscript as it is in the poem Cross gives. Changes made from the underlay found in the Florence source are marked at their first occurrence in bold. The forms of “Fors seulement,” “cueur,” “si,” “douleur,” and “suis” were used because they are the most common found in other editions of Pipelare’s chanson surveyed. The abbreviated form “fort” for “tresfort” was retained from the manuscript because it is a better fit for the text underlay. There are two mistakes in the source [set off in brackets] which have been corrected to conform with other editions. Beginning in measure 26, all voices have “my lespoir” rather than “nul espoir.”

---

193 Picker, Fors seulement, viii.
194 Ibid., x-xi.
In measures 44-45, the Tenor part has “Pource” instead of “Qui n’est” to begin line four of the refrain, a simple miscopying from the beginning of line five.

PERFORMANCE ISSUES

Purpose

The purpose of the following discussion is to give the conductor pertinent information to aid in successful performance of these editions. Areas to be covered will include formal and structural features as well as some features characteristic of Pipelare’s style that may need to be highlighted or handled in a special way. Details about editorial additions that impact performance will be discussed as will the issues of range and tessitura found in the works. While a suggested tactus range is given on the editions, other markings such as articulation, phrasing, or dynamics have not been placed in the scores. These simply clutter the score with musical choices that are best left to an informed conductor and a wealth of resources are available to this end. It is not the intent of this study to set forth guidelines for Renaissance performance style and practice, but to provide reliable and usesable editions, along with enough background information on the works and their composer, as to encourage and enable increased performances of these works.

Fors seulement (II)

Pipelare places his version of the “new” cantus firmus in the tenor of this second setting of the Fors seulement text. As the melody serves as a primary structural device in both the chanson and Mass, the conductor should be well aware of its characteristics and implications. Example 28 presents the “new” cantus firmus as it is found in the Florence manuscript on which this edition is based (the 12 measures of rests at the beginning have been omitted). This tenor is quite consistent in all versions examined, with only minor melodic and rhythmic variances. It is
almost identical to the version Pipelare used in the Mass. In the example, the points at which the tenor begins each of the lines of the *rondeau* is indicated. Also, shown are the musical phrases as designated for this study. As one can readily see, there are brief rests dividing the music for text lines one and two. On purely melodic/poetic grounds, one should view the music for each of these lines as one complete phrase. However, the two lines have been divided into four phrases to aid in the later discussion of the Mass (See Example 29).

Example 29: *Fors seulement (II)*, Tenor (measures 13-58)

Upon examination of the melody, it is evident that all of the phrases but number seven begin with repeated notes and all but number four and five begin with longer tones, whole and
All rhythmic activity and most of the melodic contour is confined to the music for the ends of textual lines. Pipelare uses these characteristics in shaping both his chanson and Mass.

An imitative and melismatic duet between the bassus and superius opens the chanson. A striking feature of the duet, characteristic of Pipelare, is the use of parallelism (See Example 30).

Example 30: *Fors seulement* (II) (measures 1-15)

\[\text{(Example continued)}\]

\[^{196}\text{In several sources, phrase seven begins with a breve and two semibreves (whole note and two half notes) just as do phrases one, two, three, and six.}\]
It first appears in measures five through seven, after the imitative entrances, and again in measures ten through eleven leading into the cadence that concludes as the cantus firmus bearing tenor and altus enter in measure 13. Simultaneously, the rhythmic pace slows to match the long tones of the tenor.

From measure 13 on, the three lower voices often provide a harmonic foundation for the superius melody. The instances of increased counterpoint and melodic interest in the supporting voices occur at cadence points devised at the ends of the each of the tenor’s text lines. Even the superius joins in the slower melodic pace at the beginning of phrases one, two, five, and seven creating almost homorhythmic movement. At a few places, particularly measures 45-46, the superius soars melodically over a homorhythmic foundation. Thus, it can be seen that the cantus firmus, far from remaining aloof from the other voices as is the case in some works, actually dictates the texture and rhythmic flow of the altus and bassus much of the time, and even the superius at the points indicated above.

What, then, are the implications of these observations for performance? Most importantly, all members of the ensemble should be familiar with the cantus firmus and be able to sing it. Moreover, they should be aware of its structural importance to the texture of the
chanson and be aware of how their individual part relates to the cantus firmus. The singers on the superius and bassus parts should be made aware of the parallelism and be especially careful in the precision and tuning at these points.

The ranges for the voice parts are shown in Example 31. As indicated on the edition, the vocal ranges fit most comfortably with the modern soprano I, soprano II, alto, and tenor parts. While the tessitura of the soprano I part is higher than that of the soprano II, both ascend to $f^2$. However, since the soprano I part descends briefly to $a$ in the duet, it may be advisable for the conductor to have a few first altos join that part until their own entrance. The tenor part could be bolstered by light baritones if needed, provided they can sing freely (or in falsetto) on the upper notes.

The text of the poem begins “Except waiting for death, There dwells in my faint heart no hope.” Courtly, unrequited love was a pervasive subject for such poems and the resulting mood is dark and somewhat fatalistic. A tactus range of half note equals 60-66 is suggested. If the abilities of the singers and the acoustics of the performance space allow, the lower end of the range will better convey the mood. Singers should be asked to use a dark vocal timbre without resorting to a heavy Romantic quality to help communicate the poem. An overall dynamic range of piano to less than mezzo forte would be very effective with this chanson.

---

197 Atlas, Renaissance, 61.
One of the most difficult tasks of this edition was to provide a method of singing the entire poem in a way that would make sense to the singers without unnecessary reprinting of the A section. As to whether more than the refrain was intended to be sung is a matter of dispute. It was standard procedure for only the refrain to be underlaid to one or more of the voice parts, generally the superius if only one. If the complete poem were included it would be inscribed below the superius part and left to the singers to fit with the appropriate musical sections. Only two manuscripts of Pipelare’s chanson are underlaid with the refrain in all four voices. None of them include the remaining poem. As this poem, and musical settings of it, were extremely popular in French-speaking areas, this would not definitively suggest that only performance of the refrain was intended as many musicians would be familiar with the poem. It is interesting that one of the two manuscripts underlaid with the complete refrain in all voices is an Italian source. Louise Litterick reports that most late fifteenth century Italian manuscripts containing settings of French \textit{forme fixe} pieces have text in only the superius. By the end of the century manuscripts usually contained only incipits which she believes indicates instrumental performance.

The most important structural necessity in order to sing the complete poem is the presence of a medial cadence which distinguishes the A section (first three lines) from the B section (two lines) of the refrain and long strophe. Herein lies the problem of this setting by Pipelare. In the best case, Pipelare’s chanson makes it possible for only the superius to sing all

---


three lines in the A section. The other three voices sing lines one and two in the A section and
lines three through five in the B section. This is the manner in which the Florence source
underlays the text. A copy of the Paris manuscript was also obtained.\textsuperscript{201} Only the superius is
underlaid with the refrain, the other voices bearing an incipit. Although the superius is the
definitive voice in the AB division, the Paris version is not very helpful. It manages to compress
four lines of text into the A section and includes a great deal of text repetition. The Brussel 228
manuscript (The Chanson Albums of Marguerite of Austria) underlays all voices with an AB
division of two lines and three lines respectively.\textsuperscript{202} With such a division only the refrain is
possible because line three would be left out in the short strophe and short refrain, thus
destroying the sense of the poem. Because of such textual problems and because only three
voices come to a complete pause at the end of the A section, Picker and Van Nevel believe that
only the refrain was intended for performance.\textsuperscript{203}

In the Collected Works, however, Cross asserts the possibility of performing the entire
poem by inserting an extra measure at the end of the A section, excluding the alto entrance.
This creates first and second endings and facilitates the repeats to the A section.\textsuperscript{204} One cannot
know for certain whether the entire poem was meant to be sung, or if it was, how singers of the
day would have handled the medial cadence. However, in order to provide singers with the
option of performing the entire poem, Cross’s added measure seemed reasonable and has been
adopted in this edition (See Example 32). At the beginning of the edition of Fors seulement,

\textsuperscript{201} Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, fonds français, MS 1597, fols. lx’-lxi, anon. (P).
\textsuperscript{202} Picker, Chanson Albums, 233-236.
\textsuperscript{203} Ibid., 74 and Van Nevel, Matthaeus Pipelare, 9.
information on the *rondeau* form and instructions for singing either the refrain alone or the entire poem are given.

Example 32: *Fors seulement (II)* (measures 32-35)

Since this motet is a *contrafacta* of the *Fors seulement* chanson, there are only minor melodic and rhythmic differences between the two. The melodic differences are generally due to more or less ornamentation and the rhythmic changes are required in order to underlay the new text. The new psalm text,\(^{205}\) however, completely changes the spirit of the piece. The fatalism of the chanson gives way to the hopeful faith of “A light has risen in the darkness for the upright.” Such a dramatic change in mood should be reflected in the performance. Therefore, a slightly

\(^{205}\)Psalm 112 (Latin Vulgate 111), verse 4.
faster tactus range of half note equals 68-72 is suggested. A lighter, somewhat brighter vocal timbre would suit this text well and the dynamics should be more than that of the chanson, in the *mezzo forte* range.

**Missa Fors seulement**

The Mass is a mature work in which Pipelare’s skill in structuring large compositions is evident. The work is a cyclical cantus firmus Mass in which the melody borrowed from the chanson is transposed down an octave. This transposition, and the fact that the voice bearing the cantus firmus is the second highest, accounts for the extremely low range of the work. The cantus firmus is presented at least once in every movement. Example 33 shows how the cantus firmus is divided among the various sections of the movements. The cantus firmus placed in the tenor I voice is presented in double augmentation except as noted. The three sections which are set for only four voices are also indicated (See Example 33). The phrase numbers correspond to those described in the earlier discussion of the chanson (See Example 29).

Example 33: Cantus firmus use in the Mass

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kyrie</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Kyrie I</td>
<td>phrases 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Christe</td>
<td>phrases 3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Kyrie II</td>
<td>phrases 6-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloria</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Et in terra</td>
<td>phrases 1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Qui tollis</td>
<td>phrases 5-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credo</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Patrem</td>
<td>phrases 1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Et resurrexit</td>
<td>phrases 5-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanctus</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Pleni</td>
<td>none (a 4, Tenor I Tacit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Hosanna</td>
<td>phrases 5-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*phrase 7 in integer valor (without augmentation)*

*phrase 5 in integer valor

*phrases 6 and 7 begin in augmentation and end in integer valor* (Example continued)
Although the scale and complexity of the Mass are enormous compared with the chanson, one will note that Pipelare has the cantus firmus influence the other voices in some of the same ways in both works. It also becomes obvious that he wishes the chanson tune to be heard and eventually identified. For these reasons, it is extremely important that there be enough voices assigned the tenor I part to steadily sustain the long tones. Since it is the least interesting of any of the parts to sing, one might experiment using fewer voices and adding an instrument to supplement the sound. However, because of the skillful manner in which Pipelare has allowed the cantus firmus to be highlighted, one can not be sure a different timbre is needed or even desirable. The conductor might experiment with a sacbut or viola da gamba (cello).

As in the chanson, Pipelare often has the other voices join the tenor I’s long tones upon its entrance. In many cases, this follows much more active melodic motion making the change in pace more noticeable. The opening of the Mass is the first such case, shown in Example 34.

Example 34: Kyrie, Missa Fors seulement (measures 7-10)
Another excellent example is found in the *Credo*. After contrapuntal motion in all other voices, the tenor I enters with a longa (double whole note). Immediately all voices join the cantus firmus in this long note. As the tenor I continues with its long repeated notes, the four other voices provide a chordal accompaniment consisting of three different variations of a repeated note rhythmic figure (See Example 35). Such a use of layered repeated note rhythmic motives in both augmentation and diminution is found frequently in the Mass and, indeed, in other Masses presumed to be among his later works. Such figures should always be performed with slight articulation to highlight the varied rhythmic levels.

**Example 35: Credo, Missa Fors seulement** (measures 132-138)

Pipelare also exposes the cantus firmus by making it the highest sounding voice for brief periods, usually at or near the beginning of one of its phrases. Since the tenor I is generally the second highest sounding voice, only the superius must be silent to leave the cantus firmus on top. This occurs for two measures just after the very first cantus firmus entrance in the *Kyrie* (See Example 36). At the end of the *Gloria’s* first section, the cantus firmus remains the highest
voice for almost the entire phrase with the contratenor leaping above it and the superius entering as the tenor I reaches its final two notes (See Example 37). Another commonly used method of

Example 36: *Kyrie, Missa Fors seulement* (measures 9-13)

Example 37: *Gloria, Missa Fors seulement* (measures 72-79)

making the borrowed tune more recognizable is to present it in integer valor (original time values). As shown in Example 33 above, Pipelare uses the technique in the *Hosanna* in alternation with augmentation. The movement’s first phrase of the cantus firmus (phrase five) is
presented in integer valor. Phrases six and seven both begin in augmentation but end in integer valor. Using this technique on the ends of the phrases is the most effective because that is where most of the melodic and rhythmic activity occurs in the cantus firmus (see Example 29 above). As the *Hosanna* is performed twice, once before and after the *Benedictus*, the listener has two chances to notice the changing time values.

The *Benedictus*, which falls between the *Hosanna* repetition, features parody elements of the chanson to further strengthen the Mass’s connection to the chanson. The tenor I voice is silent but the contratenor’s first phrase is an abbreviated version of the first phrase of the cantus firmus. The tenor II voice states the first phrase of the chanson’s altus. The section even begins with a twelve measure bassus and superius duet as in the chanson. Although only the bassus’s first four measures are the same as the chanson, the superius quotes its chanson counterpart for the entire *Benedictus*. Anyone familiar with Pipelare’s chanson would recognize this melody. There are a few other fragments of the cantus firmus which appear and the bassus quotes the chanson bassus in several other places.

In *Agnus II*, phrases one through four are presented in integer valor as the highest sounding voice since the superius is *tacit* for the 31 measure section. In the final movement of the Mass, *Agnus III*, the entire seven phrases of the cantus firmus are presented in integer valor. This is the only time in the Mass that the complete cantus firmus appears in one section.

In another reference to the chanson, Pipelare creates a new imitative duet with which to open the *Kyrie*. Although quite different from the chanson duet, this one does also contain brief parallel motion just before the cadence. This duet leads into the first entrance of the cantus firmus shown in Example 36 above. Pipelare develops this duet as a head motive to provide
further unity to the Mass. Example 38 shows the transformation of the duet in the various movements.

Example 38: *Missa Fors seulement*, Head Motive Duet Transformation

*Kyrie*, Superius and Contratenor (measures 1-9)

*Gloria*, Superius and Tenor II (measures 1-6)

*Sanctus*, Superius and Contratenor (measures 1-13)

(Example continued)
The term “flourish” will be used. Because of the way in which the text has been underlaid in the edition, the term “melisma” is not technically correct.

One may notice that the first seven measures of the head motive in the Sanctus and Agnus I are identical to the original in Kyrie I. The five measure extension to the Sanctus version is present, but altered in the Agnus I. Obviously, it is important for the those singing the superius and contratenor parts to be aware of the returning and altered material of the head motive. It is also important for the tenor II voices to recognize the head motive when they get a portion of it at the beginning of the Gloria.

Pipelare devised another way to provide aural connection between sections of the Mass, this time focusing on the conclusion of the various sections. At the end of the Credo, the tenor II begins a concluding melisma just as all of the other voices reach and hold their last note. A variation of this melodic flourish\textsuperscript{206} also occurs at the end of the Sanctus, Hosanna, Benedictus, Agnus I, and Agnus III. This technique is even more interesting as no other Mass by Pipelare

\textsuperscript{206}The term “flourish” will be used. Because of the way in which the text has been underlaid in the edition, the term “melisma” is not technically correct.
exhibits such extensive development of a concluding flourish. Example 39 shows the
transformation of this melodic device. The tenor II melody has little more than its first few notes
in common with the others, but it does introduce the idea. All of the other flourishes are placed
in the contratenor and the melodic similarities are readily seen. At the conclusion of Agnus III,
Pipelare brings back the tenor II voice to initiate the flourish. The contratenor immediately
imitates the motive adding a double flourish to finalize the work (See Example 39).

Example 39: Missa Fors seulement, Concluding Flourish Transformation

Credo, Tenor II (measures 201-204)

Sanctus, Contratenor (measures 72-75)

Hosanna, Contratenor (measures 136-138)

(Example continued)
Identification of connections such as the head motives and concluding flourishes should help the singers better understand the organization of the whole Mass; learn the music quicker; and convey these unifying features to the listeners.

Several other features of the Mass should be identified, both for the light they shed on Pipelare’s style and their implications for performance. Pipelare’s fondness for repeated notes has already been noted. His use of ostinato and repeated figures was included in the discussion of Missa sine nomine (Segovia-Jena). A further level of using repeated motives is found frequently in Pipelare’s larger works. Example 40, from the Christe illustrates how the composer has juxtaposed three layers of repeated motives, one of which is ornamented with each
repetition. (See Example 40). Pairing the repeated motives with a pedal note, in this case the superius, is also quite typical. As the repetitions end, the cantus firmus enters. The distinctive layered motives have therefore served to build tension leading into the final cantus firmus phrase of the section. One will also notice that the superius is silent for the cantus firmus’s entrance. The repeated motives, as with repeated-notes passages, must be articulated to clearly differentiate the three motives. A hard “k” sound followed by a flipped or slightly rolled “r” to begin each iteration of “Christe” will help each layer to be distinguished. “Lifting” slightly on each dotted or tied note will also help define the motives. Of course, rhythmic precision is of utmost importance.

Example 40: *Christe, Missa Fors seulement* (measures 69-74)

Four-voice imitation does not occur frequently in Pipelare’s compositions but when he does use the device, it is almost always at a structurally important point: the beginning of a
The seven-voice motet, *Memorare Mater Christi*, begins with six-voice imitation - all but the cantus firmus. \(^{207}\) Just after the beginning of the “*Et resurrexit*” section of the Credo, Pipelare uses four-voice imitation in a manner rarely found in his music - text painting (See Example 41). One can see that “*Et ascendit*” has been set to a rising stepwise motive which “ascends” from the bassus through each succeeding voice until it reaches the superius. Only the cantus firmus, which has not yet entered in this section, does not participate. Although such devices were frequently used by composers to highlight this portion of the text, the use of an ascending motive in the bassus which is imitated by all other participating voices is unique among Pipelare’s *Credo* settings.

In the brief *Pleni sunt caeli* (25 measures), Pipelare has skillfully and creatively combined a number of imitative and motivic techniques. The tenor I is silent and there is no

---

cantus firmus material present. Until the last two measures, the section consists entirely of duets shifting between the upper and lower pairs of voices. Interestingly, text painting is again found. The movement opens with the superius and contratenor in a long imitative duet on the subject of heaven (“caeli”). On the text “Et terra” (“and earth”), the lower pair, tenor II and bassus, enter with a descending motive that is both sequenced and imitated (See Example 42). Sequence is used extensively to wonderful effect by Pipelare and should always be highlighted.

Example 42: *Pleni sunt caeli, Missa Fors Seulement* (measures 86-100)
The motive which is sequenced consists primarily of a dotted quarter note (or a quarter note tied to an eighth note) followed by three eighth notes. It is shown in the first two measures of Example 42. Admittedly, this figure was one of the stock motives of the period, but it is quite pervasive in Pipelare’s music in both ascending and descending forms. Depending on the prevailing tactus, some degree of vocal agility is required to execute the motive cleanly, especially when used in succession. A warm-up exercise built upon this motive would be excellent preparation for the singing of Pipelare’s music.

The word “gloria” is sung on a repeated note motive by the contratenor and imitated by the superius. This imitation is followed by the lower pair for another example of four-voice imitation at an important structural point. The bassus and tenor II duet continues followed by the upper duet ascending to the climax as all four voices join to end the section. The last two duets are remarkable because they consist of paired imitation, rare for the period. The bassus has one melodic phrase and is paired with the tenor II which has a different melodic phrase. This pair of melodies is immediately imitated by the contratenor and superius. If the ensemble performing this work is of moderate size and the conductor would like to feature soloists or a smaller ensemble, the *Pleni sunt caeli* is the best section for such treatment in this Mass.

The *Pleni sunt caeli* and *Agnus III* provide excellent models on which to base the upper tactus range for the Mass as they require some of the most vocal agility. The tempo should not be so quick that the favored dotted motive highlighted above, which is also used extensively in *Agnus III*, cannot be executed cleanly. This is particularly crucial given the low range of the Mass. Care should also be taken that the tactus not be so slow that, at the places where all voices have long tones with the cantus firmus, the musical pace is not suspended for too long.
Most ensembles should be able to find a pace that will suit them in a tactus range of half note equals 64-70.

In a liturgical performance of the \textit{Agnus Dei}, the text contained in \textit{Agnus I} is presented twice, before proceeding to the concluding section of text. Many musical settings of the Mass, including \textit{Missa Fors seulement}, divide these three textual sections into three different musical sections. However, performance of the textual repetitions with identical music was not uncommon during the Renaissance, nor is it today.\textsuperscript{208} Since the Jena manuscript did not contain the setting of \textit{Agnus II} it is not included in the present edition. Therefore, a repetition of \textit{Agnus I} in place of \textit{Agnus II} would be an acceptable, if not ideal solution.

\textit{Missa Fors seulement} is a wonderful work for a small to medium-sized male chorus except for two problems: the low range of the bassus part and the high tessitura of the superius. These present the greatest impediment to wider performance. The ranges of all voices is shown in Example 43 along with the suggested modern voice designation.

Example 43: \textit{Missa Fors seulement}, Original Ranges and Modern Voice Parts

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{cccccc}
\textbf{Superius} & \textbf{Tenor I} & \textbf{Contratenor} & \textbf{Tenor II} & \textbf{Bassus} \\
\includegraphics[width=0.2\textwidth]{example43}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

While there are certainly choral singers who can sing \textit{C} and \textit{D}, there are not many choral ensembles who for are fortunate enough to have one of these, much less several. The bass II

\textsuperscript{208}Refer to the discussions above of \textit{Missa L’Homme armé} and \textit{Missa Sine nomine} (Segovia-Jena) for cases where sources for Pipelare’s works contain only two settings for the \textit{Agnus Dei}.
part\textsuperscript{209} frequently descends to low $D$ and low $C$ occurs several times. In most occurrences, the melodic context does not lend itself to “jumping the octave.” On the other end of the spectrum is what has been designated an alto part. One could make a very good case for calling this a tenor I part as it extends downward to $d$ in the \textit{Credo} and even $A$ in the \textit{Benedictus}. As the top note of the part is $a'$, a designation of tenor I would seems the logical choice. However, the tessitura of the part for the bulk of the Mass is $a$ to $a'$, with frequent and prominent use of $a'$. Over the course of a work as long as this, such a tessitura would be extremely wearing on tenors.

The perfect solution to both of these problems, of course, is a choral ensemble whose membership includes low basses and countertenors. As the number of such ensembles is even fewer than the number simply requiring low basses, one might consider if transposition could be a viable and even musically acceptable solution. Each of these issues will be considered in turn.

If the Mass is transposed up by a minor third, the result is a total range of $E$ flat to $c^2$ and the voice parts of bass, baritone, tenor II, tenor I, and alto. Therefore, the bass range ceases to be as major a problem but countertenors would still be required. Otherwise, a male choral ensemble would have to incorporate female altos. With four male voice-parts and only one female voice-part, achieving a unified timbre would be extremely difficult.

Transposing the work up a perfect fifth results in the ranges and voice parts shown in Example 44. Such a transposition moves the Mass into the realm of possibility for a standard mixed chorus. While the tenor I range still extends to $a'$, it is quite manageable in this part. The soprano part presents the greater difficulty as its tessitura is low for modern female sopranos. Adding some altos to the part would be helpful. There is, however, still the issue of what was originally an $A$ and now is an $e$. Fortunately, the one occurrence of this note is in the opening

\textsuperscript{209}Modern designations will generally be used in this discussion.
Example 44: *Missa Fors seulement*, Transposed Ranges and Modern Voice Parts

![Musical notation diagram](https://example.com/musical-diagram)

duet of the *Benedictus*. Both tenor parts have rests at this point and some could be used to complete the lower notes. The altos are *tacit* for this section so a blending of sopranos, altos, and tenors could accomplish the line. Obviously, a great deal of experimentation and practice would be required to make the delivery seamless. Therefore, with a transposition up a perfect fifth, performance by a good number of mixed choral ensembles would at least be feasible. But, is such a transposition a musically acceptable solution for music of this period?

It is common knowledge that a pitch standard, such as we observe today, did not exist in the Renaissance. It was standard practice for a cantor or other designated leader to judge the best pitch range for the available singers and base the beginning pitches of a particular piece on that knowledge. Such flexibility was most possible when instruments were not involved. Therefore, the transposition suggested above should seem to be quite appropriate for the period. The writings of several authors consulted on the subject agree with that conclusion. John Caldwell, states that pitch should be considered “relative” except in organ music. Although he feels that transposed editions compromise the adaptability of early music, he suggests that if one must transpose, “the primary intervals—the 4th and the 5th—” should be used.\(^{210}\) Alejandro Planchart asserts that transposition of vocal works by a fourth or fifth was

---

quite “common.” Herbert Myers states that with unaccompanied vocal music, the pitch was simply selected to conform to the available singers.

However, if the pitch was entirely subjective, why then, would composers, such as Pipelare, choose clefs that would necessitate notating the music in such a low range? Kenneth Kreitner explored this dilemma through the study of four works with low ranges: Missa trium vocum by Tinctoris and Missa Fors seulement, Missa sine nomine a5, and Intemerata Dei mater by Ockeghem. In addition to these works he explored the theoretical writings of Tinctoris. In the writings, Kreitner found discussions of irregular modes which may have been a method of transposing the regular modes downward, thereby extending the gamut of available notes downward. Tinctoris’s Mass seems to fit these irregular modes.

Ockeghem’s Missa Fors seulement seems to present special problems as one of the movements is notated in a higher range than the others. The other Mass and the motet, Intemerata Dei mater, exhibit no such inconsistencies. The Mass has a total range of C to c² and the motet a range of C to a¹. As Kreitner asserts, both, like Pipelare’s Missa Fors seulement, could be transposed upward without any problem other than the loss of the low timbre. He believes that they were notated in a low range to be performed that way, even if not at the exact pitch we adhere to today. Kreitner admits that if the pieces exhibited a wide range, both low and high, prohibiting transposition, it would strengthen his conclusions. It is not


known why Tinctoris and Ockeghem chose to notate these works in such a low range. Since three of the compositions are Mass settings, only the motet supports the idea that the low range was to reflect the mood of the text. He does mention other compositions whose low range could help convey the text: Josquin’s *De profundis a 4* and *Absalon, fili mi* and la Rue’s *Requiem.* Kreitner suggests that the Ockeghem pieces may have been written for a specific choir which included low basses and no high sopranos.\footnote{Ibid., 474-478.}

Although Kreitner believes there is evidence to support the composer’s intention of performance in a lower than normal range, he does recognize the need for versatility, both in the Renaissance and today. He suggests that the ranges Ockeghem selected for *Missa sine nomine* and the motet may have had a two-fold purpose. The low notated range was the composer’s ideal but the fact that they could be transposed up to a normal range also made them practical.\footnote{Ibid., 478.} When editions of earlier music began appearing more frequently in the early twentieth century, the music was commonly transposed to suit the modern mixed choir. Kreitner, speaking of such editions, states that “if the editions resulted in more performances of the music, did much good, and probably no real harm as long as the editors indicated the original pitch level somewhere.”\footnote{Kenneth Kreitner, “Renaissance Pitch” In *Companion to Medieval and Renaissance Music,* Tess Knighton and David Fallows, eds. (New York: Schirmer Books, 1992), 281.}

Such an approach, that considers both the ideal and the practical aspects of performing Renaissance music, coincides with the present and future goals of this project. This edition of *Missa Fors seulement* is presented in its ideal version, at the pitch notated by the composer. It is hoped that choral ensembles which can accommodate the special requirements will bring this
music to the public. However, the prospect has at least been broached for further examination into a possible transposition that would facilitate the performance of such glorious music by a much larger number of choirs.
CHAPTER 3

CONCLUSIONS AND EDITIONS

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the primary purpose of this project are presented in this chapter: the editions. It is to this end that the research concerning the composer, his works, notation, musica ficta, and text underlay were undertaken. It is hoped that the editions will enable more musicians to experience and enjoy the music of Matthaeus Pipelare. As performing editions, the music has been presented in a format that will be familiar to today’s singers. On the other hand, every effort has been made to make it clear to the conductor that which is directly from the source manuscripts and that which is editorial. In order to keep the pages of the music as clean as possible, only the items necessary for directional purposes (such as the markings to aid in singing the entire rondeau) have been placed in the score. With the assistance of these editions and the background information presented in this study, conductors and singers should have all of the tools needed to perform the music.

The relationship between the three works included in the editions provide many programming options. Until such time as a workable transposition for the Mass is achieved, Missa Fors seulement may have to stand on its own as it requires a choral ensemble vastly different from that for the chanson or motet. Although, presenting the cantus firmus before its performance would be very enlightening for the audience. The chanson and the motet, however, work well together. They are extremely practical, because once a chorus has learned one, they have essentially learned the other. Rehearsal time is saved and the ensemble has music prepared for either sacred or secular repertoire requirements. Of course, the two are a natural programming pair for concert performance.
THE EDITIONS

Fors seulement (II) Introduction

The poem of the chanson is a rondeau, one of the three Medieval formes fixes. The form of the rondeau consisted of a two-part refrain which was set to two sections of music (AB). After the entire refrain was sung, two other strophes or verses (one short and one long) were sung to the A and AB portions of the music, with a short refrain (sung to A) intervening between the strophes. The performance ended with a repetition of the entire refrain sung to the AB music. The text as it is used in the Fors seulement edition is given below. It is a rondeau cinquain, one which features a refrain of five lines, rather than the more common four lines. The refrain is usually divided into three lines for the A section and two lines for the B section. The poetic section is labeled and rhyme scheme and musical/poetic form are shown to the right of each line of text. The musical parts of the refrain are designated as A and B in capital letters. Lower case letters are used to identify where music is repeated but the text is new. When capital letters are used again, it indicates that both the music and the text have returned. The French poem appears in bold type and the translation* in plain type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poetic section</th>
<th>Rhyme</th>
<th>Music</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fors seulement l’atente que je meure,</td>
<td>full refrain</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Except waiting for death,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En mon las cueur nul espoir ne demeure,</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There dwells in my faint heart no hope,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car mon malheur si fort me tourmente</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For my misfortune torments me so greatly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qui n’est douleur que par vous je ne sente
That there is no pain I do not feel on your account
Pource que suis de vous perdre bien seure.
Because I am quite certain to lose you.

Vostre rigeur tellement me court seure
Your severity does so surely pursue me,

Qu’en ce parti il faut que je m’asseure
That I must assure myself in this state

Don’t je n’ay bien qui en rien me contente.
Nothing can content me.

Fors seulement l’atente que je meure,
Except waiting for death,

En mon las cœur nul espoir ne demeure,
There dwells in my faint heart no hope,

Car mon malheur si fort me tourmente
For my misfortune torments me so greatly.

Mon desconfort toute seule je pleure,
Alone I lament my distress,

En mauldisant, sur ma foy, a toute heure,
In cursing, on my honor, at all times,

Ma leauté qui tant m’a fait dolente.
My loyaly which has made me so sorrowful.

Las, que je suis de vivre mal contente,
Alas, I am little content to live,

Quant de par vous n’ay rien qui me demeure.
Since I am left with nothing from you.

Fors seulement l’atente que je meure,
Except waiting for death,

En mon las cœur nul espoir ne demeure,
There dwells in my faint heart no hope,

Car mon malheur si fort me tourmente
For my misfortune torments me so greatly

Qui n’est douleur que pour vous je ne sente
That there is no pain I do not feel on your account
Pource que suis de vous perdre bien seure.
Because I am quite certain to lose you.

It is not known whether Pipelare intended the entire poem to be sung to the music he composed. Because there are some difficulties in accomplishing the repeats, some researchers
have concluded that only the refrain was intended for performance. Ronald Cross first offered a method of singing the entire poem in his 1966 *Matthaeus Pipelare: Opera Omnia*, Volume 1. His solution of adding a second ending has been adopted in this edition. For those wishing to sing only the refrain, sing sections A and B through once, taking the first ending. If the entire poem is to be performed, the following instructions will illustrate the performance order.

The parts of the poem are labeled in the music as:

- Refrain (both full and short) - Ref.
- Short verse - 1.
- Long verse - 2.

The order of performance including the musical section(s) performed, first or second ending, and *del segno* or *da capo* are as follows:

Fors seulement (II)

Matthaeus Pipelare
c.1450-c.1515
Edited by George Black

\( \text{\textbullet} = 60-66 \)

(Superius)
(Soprano I)

(Altus)
(Soprano II)

Tenor
(Alto)

(Bassus)
(Tenor)

Ref.
1.
2.

Ref.
1.
2.

Ref.
1. \( Vos \)
2.

Ref. Fors

Keyboard Reduction
Ref. Fors seul-ment
1. Vos tre ri-geur
2. Mon des-con-fort

l'a-ten-
tel-le-
tou-te
re, Fors seul-lement
re, Vos tre ri-geur
re, Mon des-con-fort

Ref. Fors seul-ement
1. Vos tre ri-geur
2. Mon des-con-fort

Ref. Fors seul-ement, fors seul-ement
1. Vos tre ri-geur, vos tre ri-geur
2. Mon des-con-fort, mon des-con-fort

re, Fors seul-ement
re, Vos tre ri-geur
re, Mon des-con-fort
En mon cœur nul e-
re, Qu'en ce pari-
ti il fault
re, En maul-di-
sant, sur ma
re, En mon las
re, Qu'en ce pari-
ti
re, En maul-di-
sant,
re, En mon las
cœur
re, Que'n ce pari-
ti
re, En maul-di-
sant,
spoir ne de meu - re, Car mon mal -
que je m'as - seu - re, Dont je n'ay
foy, a toute heu - re, Ma leu - te

nul e - spoir ne de meu -
il fault que je m'as - seu -
sur ma foy, a toute heu -
mon las cueur nul e - spoir
ce par - ti il fault que
maul - di - sant, sur ma foy,

nul e - spoir ne de -
il fault que je m'as -
sur ma foy, a toute
heur si fort me tour - men -
bi en qui en ri ens me con - ten -
qu i tant m'a fait do - len -
t e.

re, re,
re, Car

ne de - meu - re, je m'as - seu - re,
a toute heu - re.

meu - re ne de - meu - re, seu - re je m'as - seu - re, heu - re, a toute heu - re,
te. Qui n'est dou - leur que

Las, que je suis de

mon mal - heur si fort me

leu - te qui tant m'a fait

re. Car mon mal - heur si fort me

Ma leu - te qui tant m'a fait

re. 2. Mon Car mon mal - heur si fort me

Ma leu - te qui tant m'a fait
par vous je ne sens-te,
que
vivre mal contente,
de
tourmente Qui n'est dou-

do-lente. Las, que je

tourmente

do-lente.
dou-
do-lente. Las, que je
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par vous je ne sens - - te,

vi - vre mal con - ten - - te,

leur que par vous je ne sen - -
suis de vi - vre mal con - ten - -

Qui n'est dou - leur que par vous je ne sen -

Las, que je suis de vi - vre mal con - ten - -

leur que par vous je ne sen - -
suis de vi - vre mal con - ten - -
Pour - - ce que suis de vous perdre bien

Quant de par vous n'ay rien qui me déte,

Pour - - ce que suis de
te, Quant de par vous n'ay

te

Pour - - ce que suis
te Quant de par vous

te, Pour - - ce que suis de vous perdre bien

te, Quant de par vous n'ay rien qui
Da Capo

seu - re, bien seu - re.

meu - re, de - meu - re.

vous per - dre bien seu - re.

riens qui me de - meu - re.

de vous per - dre bien seu - re.

n'ay riens qui me de - meu - re.

dre bien seu - re.

me de - meu - re.
Exortum est in tenebris

Matthaeus Pipelare
c.1450-c.1515
Edited by George Black

\( \breve{\mathcal{f}} = 68-72 \)
Ex - or - tum est in te -
or - tum est
rec·tis cor·d·de,

men,

lu·men
rec - - - tis cor - de, cor - de,
recurrentis corde: miseri
cor---
recurrentis corde,
de, rec - tis cor -
cors, mis - ri - cors,
cor - de, rec - tis cor -
ri - cors et mi - ra -
de: mi - se - ri - cors et mi - se - ri - cors, mi - se - ri - cors,

de: mi - se - ri - cors, mi - se - ri - cors,

tor, et jus - tus, et

mi - se - ra - tor, et
ri - - cors et mi - se - ra - -
se - - ri - - cors,
jus - - tus Do - - - mi - -
mi - se - rra - tor,

tor et jus - tus, et jus - -

mi - se - ri - cors et mi - se - ra -

nus, et jus - tus Do - - mi -
et justus, et justus Dominus,
tor, et justus, et justus
nus, et justus Dominus,
Fors seulement l'atente que je meure.
lei - (i) - son.

(i) - son.

- - - - - son.
Christe eleison.

Christe eleison.
- - - - lei - - (i) - son.

- - - - - - - - son.

e - lei - - - - son.

- - lei - - - - son.

e - lei - son.
Gloria
Et in terrapax ho-mi-ni-bus.

Ho-mi-ni-bus.

in terra pax bo-nae vo-lun-ta-tis.

Bo-nae vo-lun-ta-tis.
Gra-ti-as a-gi-mus ti-bi pro-pter
Gra-ti-as a-gi-mus ti-bi pro-pter.
Gra-ti-as a-gi-mus ti-bi pro-pter.
ma·gnam glo·ri·am tu·am. Do·mi·ne De·

gi·mu·sis ti·bi.

pter ma·gnam glo·ri·am tu·am. Do·mi·ne

pter ma·gnam glo·ri·am tu·am. Do·mi·ne De·
Deus, Rex caelestis,
De us Pa-ter omni-po-tens.

De us Pa-ter omni-to-tens.

De us Pa-ter omni-po-tens.
Do - mi - ne Fi - li u - po - tions.

De - us Pa - ter o - mni - po - tions.

Do - mi - ne Fi - li
Jesus Christ
Chri - - ste. Do -

ste.

ste.
Do - mi - ne De - us, A - gnus De - mi - ne De - us, A - gnus De -
Domine Deus, Agnus
Qui tollis pecca ta

 Qui tollis pecca ta
Mundus, mundi, Miserere mei, Deus.
Qui tollis peccata mundi, su-

Qui tollis peccata mundi, su-

bis.

bis.

mass.
pre-cati-o-nem

Qui

stram.
nem nostram.

se des ad dexteram

Qui se des ad dexteram
Miserere nobis.

Quo -

Pa-tris.

Quo -
Quoniam tu solus Sanctus.

Quoniam tu solus Sanctus.

Quoniam tu solus Sanctus.

Tu solus Sanctus.
Sancto Spiritu, in gloria
De - - - i Pa - tris.

in
glo - ri - a

De - - -

a
De - - - i
Pa - - -

a
De - - - i
Pa - tris.

a
De - - - i
Pa - - -
Et ex Patre natum

Et in unam Dominum Je-

visibilibium.

ilium.
tum ante omnia saeculum
sum Filium Dei unigeniti
De - um de De - o

De - um de De - o,

Lu - men de lu - mi - ne,
De-um verum de De-o ve-
e, de De-o ve-
Genitum, non factum, consubstantiellement.
stan-ti-a-lem Patri: per quem

stan-ti-a-lem Patri:
per quem omnia facta

per quem omnia facta

quem omnia facta
Vota sunt.

 Qui propter nos homi-

 Vota sunt. Qui propter nos homi-

 Vota sunt. Qui propter nos homi-

 Vota sunt. Qui propter nos homi-
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descendit de caelestibus et propter nostram salutem descendit

...
Et in - car - na -

Et in - cae -

Et in - car - na -

Et in - cae -

Et in - car -

Et in - cae -

Et in - car -

Et in - cae -

Et in - car -
**V**

65

8

na - tus est,

De Spi - ri - tu San - "

De Spi - ri - tu San - "

206
fa - c - tus est.
am pro nobis: sub Pon - ti - o Pi - la -
Pon-ti-o Pil-a-to pas-sus, et se-pul-to
sub Pon-ti-o Pil-a-to
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sus, et se - pul - tus est.

- tus est.

pas - sus, et se - pul - tus est.

- to pas - sus, et se - pul - tus est.

pas - sus, et se - pul - tus est.
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lum se-det ad dexteram Patris. Et iterum
rum ven-tu-rus est cum glo-ri-a, judi-ca-re vi-vo-s et mor-
ven-tu-rus est cum glo-ri-a, judi-ca-re vi-vo-s et mor-
Cu - jus re - gni non e -

tu - os: cu - jus re - gni non e -

tu - - os: cu - jus re - gni non e -
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Et in spiritum Sanctum, Dominum, et
et vi-vi-ficantem:
et vi-vi-ficantem: qui
et vi-vi-ficantem: qui
et vi-vi-ficantem: qui
qui ex Patre Filioque

ex Patre

ex Patre

ex PatreFilioque

ex Patre

ex PatreFilioque
pro - ce - dit.

li - o - que pro - ce - dit. Qui cum Pa -

li - o - que pro - ce - dit.
simul adoravit.

tre et Filius simul adoravit.
lo - cu - tus est per Pro - phe - tas. ca -

u - nam san - ctam

Et u - nam San - ctam

---
tholî-cam Eclesi-âm. Confí-
et a-postolî-cam Confíte-or
et a-postolî-cam Confíte-or
fi-te-or un-num bap-ti-sma in re-mis-si-

un-num bap-ti-sma
o - nem

Et ex - pe - cto

pec - ca - to - rum.

re - sur -

pec - ca - to - rum.

re - sur -
mor-tu-o-rum.

Et

mor-tu-o-rum.  Et

re-cti-o-nem  Et  vi-

re-cti-o-nem  Et
Et vitam venturi

vitam venturi saeculi

tam venturi

vitam venturi

vitam venturi
Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus,
Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus,
Sanctus,
Sanctus, Sanctus Dominus,
Dominus, Dominus

Deus

Dominus

Deus
Ple - - - - - ni sunt

(Tacit until Hosanna)
Ho - - - - - - - - san - - - -

Ho - - - - san - na, ho - - - -

Ho - - - - - - - - san - - - -

Ho - - - - - - - sa - - - -
excellsis,
in
Hosannas,
excellsis,
in ex-cel-
in ex-cel-
in ex-cel-
Benedictus, Benedictus, Benedictus, Benedictus...
bene - di - c
tus, be -
nit in nomine,
(Repeat Hosanna)

Do - mi - ni.

(Repeat Hosanna)

(Repeat Hosanna)

(Repeat Hosanna)
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\[
\sum_{i} \text{agnus} \quad \text{De} \quad \text{i,}
\]

qui tol

\text{agnus} \quad \text{De} \quad \text{i,}


qui,

lis,
tol -

qui,

1,
mun - - - di, mun -
pec - - - ca - -
pec - - - ca - -
pec - - - ca - -
pec - - - ca - -
pec - - - ca - -
pec - - - ca - -
pec - - - ca - -
V 

w

re

mun -

di: mun -

mori

mi -

se -

re -

re

re

re

mun -

mori

mi -

se -

re -

no -

mun -

di:
( * Agnus II missing in source - Agnus I may be repeated in its place.)
V

do

pec - ca - ta pec - ca - ta,

pec - ca - ta mun - di:

pec - ca - ta mun - di:
mun - - - - - - - di:  
do - - - - - - - - -

mun - - - - - - - di:  
do - - - - - - -

mun - - - - - - di:  
do - - - - - - -
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APPENDIX A

TRANSLATIONS*

Fors seulement

[1a] (after Dijon MS 517 and Washington MS Laborde)

Fors seulement l’actente que je meure, En mon las cueur nul espoir ne demeure, Car mon maleur si tresfort me tourmente Qu’il n’est douleur que pour vous je ne sente Pource que suis de vous perdre bien seure.

Fors seulement l’actente que je meure, En mon las cueur nul espoir ne demeure, Car mon maleur si tresfort me tourmente.

Vostre rigeur tellement m’y queurt seure, Qu’en ce parti il fault que je m’asseure Dont je n’ay bien qui en riens me contente.

Vostre rigeur tellement m’y queurt seure, Qu’en ce parti il fault que je m’asseure.

Fors seulement l’actente que je meure, En mon las cueur nul espoir ne demeure, Car mon maleur si tresfort me tourmente.

Fors seulement l’actente que je meure, En mon las cueur nul espoir ne demeure, Car mon maleur si tresfort me tourmente.

Mon desconfort toute seule je pleure, En maudisant, sur ma foy, a toute heure, Ma leauté qui tant m’a fait dolente.

Mon desconfort toute seule je pleure, En maudisant, sur ma foy, a toute heure, Ma leauté qui tant m’a fait dolente.

Las, que je suis de vivre mal contente, Quant de par vous n’ay riens qui me demeure.

Las, que je suis de vivre mal contente, Quant de par vous n’ay riens qui me demeure.

Fors seulement l’actente que je meure, En mon las cueur nul espoir ne demeure, Car mon maleur si tresfort me tourmente.

Fors seulement l’actente que je meure, En mon las cueur nul espoir ne demeure, Car mon maleur si tresfort me tourmente.

Except waiting for death, There dwells in my faint heart no hope, For my misfortune torments me so greatly That there is no pain I do not feel on your account Because I am quite certain to lose you.

Your severity does so surely pursue me, That I must assure myself in this state Nothing can content me.

Except waiting for death, There dwells in my faint heart no hope, For my misfortune torments me so greatly.

Alone I lament my distress, In cursing, on my honor, at all times, My loyalty which has made me so sorrowful.

Alas, I am little content to live, Since I am left with nothing from you.

Except waiting for death, There dwells in my faint heart no hope, For my misfortune torments me so greatly

Qu’il n’est douleur que pour vous je ne sente
Pource que suis de vous perdre bien seure.

That there is no pain I do not feel on your account
Because I am quite certain to lose you.

[1b] (after Wolfenbüttel MS 287)

Fors seulement l’atente que je meure,
En mon las cuer nul espoir ne demeure,
Car mon malheur si tresfort me tourmente
Qui n’est douleur que par vous je ne sente,

Except waiting for death,
There dwells in my faint heart no hope,
For my misfortune torments me so greatly
That there is no pain I do not feel on your account,
Because I am quite certain to lose you.

Pource que suis de vous perdre bien seure.

Your severity does so surely pursue me,
That filled with grief I must die;
Nothing can content me.

Vostre rigeur tellement me court seure,
Qu’il fault qu’aïnsy comblé de dueil je meure,
Dont je n’ay bien qui en rien me contente.

Except waiting for death,
There dwells in my faint heart no hope,
For my misfortune torments me so greatly.

Porce que suis de vous perdre bien seure.

Your severity does so surely pursue me,
That filled with grief I must die;
Nothing can content me.

Fors seulement l’atente que je meure,
En mon las cuer nul espoir ne demeure,
Car mon malheur si tresfort me tourmente.

Except waiting for death,
There dwells in my faint heart no hope,
For my misfortune torments me so greatly.

Mon desconfort toute seule je pleure,
En maudisant, sur ma foy, a toute heure,
Ma loyaulté qui tant me fait dolente.

Alone I lament my distress,
In cursing, on my honor, at all times,
My loyalty which has made me so sorrowful.

Las, que je suis de vivre mal contente,
Quant de par vous n’est riens qui me sequeure.

Alas, I am little content to live,
Since there is no succour from you.

Fors seulement l’atente que je meure,
En mon las cuer nul espoir ne demeure,
Car mon malheur si tresfort me tourmente
Qui n’est douleur que pour vous je ne sente,

Except waiting for death,
There dwells in my faint heart no hope,
For my misfortune torments me so greatly
That there is no pain I do not feel on your account,
Because I am quite certain to lose you.

Pource que suis de vous perdre bien seure.

Your severity does so surely pursue me,
That filled with grief I must die;
Nothing can content me.

Exortum est in tenebris

Exortum est in tenebris lumen rectis,
mericors et miserat et justus.

A light has risen in the darkness
for the upright: one who is merciful,
compassionate, and just.
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Kyrie

Kyrie eleison,  Lord have mercy,
Christe eleison,  Christ have Mercy,
Kyrie eleison,  Lord have mercy,

Gloria

Gloria in excelsis Deo.  Glory to God in the highest.
Et in terra pax  And on earth peace
hominibus bonae voluntatis.  to all those of good will.
Laudamus te.  Benedicimus te.  We praise thee.  We bless thee.
Benedicamus te.  Adoramus te.  We worship thee.  We glorify thee.
Glorificamus te.  Gratias agimus tibi  We give thanks to thee
propter magnam gloriam tuam.  according to thy great glory.

Domine Deus, Rex coelestis,  Lord God, Heavenly King,
Deus Pater omnipotens.  God the Father almighty.
Domine Fili unigenite, Jesu Christe.  Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten son.
Domine Deus, Agnus Dei,  Lord God, Lamb of God,
Filius Patris.  Son of the Father.

Qui tollis peccata mundi,  Thou who takest away the sins of the world,
miserere nobis.  have mercy upon us.
Qui tollis peccata mundi,  Thou who takest away the sins of the world,
suscipe deprecationem nostram.  receive our prayer.

Qui sedes ad dexteram Patris,  Thou who sittest at the right hand of the
miserere nobis.  Father, have mercy upon us.

Quoniam tu solus sanctus.  For Thou alone art holy.
Tu solus Dominus.  Thou alone art the lord.
Tu solus Altissimus, Jesu Christe.  Thou alone art the most high, Jesus
Christ.

Cum Sancto Spiritu  With the Holy Spirit
Credo

I believe in one God,
The Father Almighty,
maker of heaven and earth,
and of all things visible and invisible.

And I believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ,
the only begotten Son of God,
born of the Father before all ages.
God from God, Light from Light,
True God from true God.
Begotten, not made,
of one substance with the Father
by whom all things were made.
Who for us
and for our salvation
came down from heaven.

And was incarnate by the Holy Spirit
of the Virgin Mary. And was made man.

Crucified also for us under Pontius
Pilate,
he suffered, and was buried.

And on the third day he rose again,
according to the Scriptures.
He ascended into heaven and
he sits at the right hand of the Father.
He shall come again with glory
to judge the living and the dead;
and of his kingdom there will be no
end.

And I believe in the Holy Spirit,
the Lord and Giver of life,
who proceeds from the Father and the Son
who together with the Father and the Son
is adored and glorified,
who spoke to us through the Prophets.
And I believe in one, holy, catholic
and Apostolic Church.
Confiteor unum baptisma
in remissionem peccatorum.

I confess one baptism
for the remission of sins.

Et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum.
Et vitam venturi saeculi. Amen.

I await the resurrection of the dead,
and the life of the world to come. Amen.

Sanctus
Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus,
Dominus Deus Sabaoth.
Pleni sunt coeli et terra gloria tua.
Hosanna in excelsis.

Holy, Holy, Holy,
Lord God of Hosts.
Heaven and earth are full of thy glory.
Hosanna in the highest.

Benedictus
Benedictus qui venit
in nomine Domini.
Hosanna in excelsis.

Blessed is He who comes
in the name of the Lord.
Hosanna in the highest.

Agnus Dei
Agnus Dei,
qui tollis peccata mundi:
miserere nobis.

Lamb of God,
who takest away the sins of the world,
have mercy upon us.

Agnus Dei,
qui tollis peccata mundi:
miserere nobis.

Lamb of God,
who takest away the sins of the world,
have mercy upon us.

Agnus Dei,
qui tollis peccata mundi:
dona nobis pacem.

Lamb of God,
who takest away the sins of the world,
grant us peace.
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To: "Rosella Pecchioli"
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Dear Ms. Pecchioli,
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Please tell me what I need to do to apply for permission to use the microfilm in this manner. I also need your mailing address because there is a letter of permission that the university requires that I will need to send to you for a signature.

Thank you for your assistance. I need to have this resolved by the end of July.

Sincerely,

George Black

8/18/2003
Sehr geehrter Herr Black,

(Translation: In this message you have permission to reproduce...)
in der Anlage erhalten Sie die Reproduktionserlaubnis fuer
Blatt 66v bis 79r aus unserem Chorbuch 2.

Mit freundlichen Gruessen

im Auftrag

Achim Blankenburg
George Black

From: "George Black" <georgeblack@att.net>
To: <f8blac@thulb.uni-jena.de>
Sent: Sunday, June 15, 2003 8:46 PM
Subject: Permission Information

Dear Mr. Blackenburg,

Several months ago you sent me a copy of Matthaeus Pipelare's Missa Fors seulement (Chorbuch 2, Bl.66v-79r.) I am making a performance edition of this work as part of a monograph to complete my doctoral studies at Louisiana State University in the USA. The title of the monograph is "Matthaeus Pipelare's Fors seulement (II) Chanson and its related Motet and Mass: Performance Editions and Commentary." The university will store the monograph electronically and it will be available on-line through their library. It will also be filed with the University of Michigan (UMI) which catalogs all university theses, monographs, and dissertations. No other publishing is planned at this time.

Please tell me what I need to do to apply for permission to use the microfilm in this manner. I also need your mailing address because I need to return the form that you included with the copy of the Mass. Also, there is a letter of permission that the university requires that I will need to send to you for a signature.

Thank you for your assistance. I need to have this resolved by the end of July.

Sincerely,

George Black
George Black

From: "Robert Judd" <rjudd@sas.upenn.edu>
To: "George Black" <georgeblack@iname.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 2003 11:18 AM
Subject: Re: Permission Questions

Dear Mr. Black,

Thank you for your note. The AMS grants permission for this with no charge. Please include acknowledgment as follows:

"Excerpted from [full citation as you give below]. Copyright © 1992 by the American Musicological Society, Inc. All rights reserved. Used by permission."

(NB do please check the spelling of "Dragan"!)

Regards,
Robert Judd

At 01:42 PM 8/4/2003 -0400, you wrote:
>Dear Dr. Robert Judd,
>
>  I am completing my Doctor of Musical Arts degree at Louisiana State University. In my monograph, "Matthaeus Pipelare's Fors seulement (II) Chanson and Its Related Motet and Mass: Performance Editions and Commentary," I would like to use three musical examples drawn from Ockeghem's Collected Works. The information on your publication and the examples is as follows.
>  
>  
>  The examples are drawn from #4, Fors seulement l'actente.
>  1. measures 66-70, page 63
>  2. measures 1-14, page 62
>  3. measures 14-24, page 62
>
>  I would like to receive permission to use these examples in my monograph. The document will be published by Louisiana State University on the web, with free access to everyone. It will also be registered with UMI for prospective publication. No commercial use is planned at this time.
>
>  Please tell me how I may receive the needed permission.
>
>Thank you for your assistance.
>
>George Black

8/5/2003
George Black

From: "Zychowicz, James"
To: "George Black" <georgeblack@iname.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 2003 3:19 PM
Subject: RE: Permission Questions

Dear George,

Thank you for your e-mail and the kind words from Sarah Dorsey. Sarah is a fantastically knowledgeable and helpful person.

As to the reference, I agree that it would fall under fair use, and it should be no problem for you to quote it. Please do give proper citation, as with the other material. Also, you may wish to check the spelling and capitalization for your document.

In the meantime, I wish you the best as you finish your work on this stage of your career!

Best,

Jim

James L. Zychowicz

A-R Editions, Inc.
8551 Research Way, Suite 180
Middleton, WI 53562

Phone: 608-836-9000, extension 14
FAX: 608-831-8200
E-mail: James.Zychowicz@areditions.com

-----Original Message-----
From: George Black [mailto:georgeblack@att.net]
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2003 10:56 AM
To: Zychowicz, James
Subject: Permission Questions

James,

Now that we completed the permissions for the translations I used in my monograph, I have a few more questions. I successfully defended my monograph "Matthaeus Pipelare's Fors seulement (II) Chanson and its Related Motet and Mass: Performance Editions and Commentary." However, my committee had some questions about whether I needed permission to use some musical examples. From reading the Chicago Manual of Style, I felt like they fell under the "Fair Use" provisions. But, the committee felt that I should check to be sure.

One of the examples is from the same publication as the translations I used:


I am using measures 17-19 from page 84 (an anonymous 3-voice setting, Picker's number 24).

I don't think we have to go through the signed official letter again. I think that an official e-mail from you will suffice.

8/6/2003
19 August 2003

Dear George H. Black, Jr.:

Thank you for your application for permission to reproduce excerpts or whole works from the publications of the American Institute of Musicology, Inc. in your forthcoming article/publication.


Item(s): CMM 34.1, pp. 9 (mm. 1–25) and 40–41 (mm. 8–20); CMM 34.3, pp. 31 (mm. 113–22) and 38 (mm. 202–11).

The American Institute of Musicology wishes to support scholarly publication and does not object to reproduction of the above-mentioned materials for this purpose and in the way that you have proposed in your correspondence. Unless otherwise stated below, this permission does not allow the use of AIM material in any other edition or by any additional means of reproduction including (by way of example) motion pictures, sound tapes, electronic formats, and the Internet; nor does this permission cover any publication, which may be derived from the original reproduction. No subsequent use may be made without additional approval. This permission is contingent upon the observance of the following conditions, namely:

1. The permission is for a non-exclusive, one-time, one edition only, world distribution, and English-language publication.
2. A copy of the final publication should be presented to the AIM for its records.
3. The material shall not be used for any purpose other than that specified above.
4. A new application shall be made in the event of a subsequent edition or reprint of this publication.
5. The publication shall include acknowledgment as follows: "Reproduced by permission of the American Institute of Musicology, Inc., Middleton, Wisc." and shall include a reference to the original series, volume, and page of the original publication.
6. This permission is provided gratis.

Sincerely,

Paul L. Ranzini
Director and CEO
ranzini@corpusmusicae.com
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