Reconstructing a fragmentary Gloria
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The idea of reconstructing fragmentary polyphony has not really found a niche in mid-fifteenth-century studies. Whilst editors of Baroque music have become quite used to reconstructing string parts to ‘arie con tre violini’ in skeletal opera sources, and whilst sixteenth-century specialists have occasionally been brave enough to recompose the contents of a lost partbook, this sort of treatment has rarely been applied to fragmentary works of the Dufay and Ockeghem periods. There seem to be two reasons for this. Firstly, since many of the essentials of mid-fifteenth-century style are not based on imitative techniques or the realization of simple chord progressions, the random nature of what an incomplete piece of the period might contain can make plausible reconstruction very difficult. Even the most predictable-looking of complete mid-fifteenth-century works often have surprising rhythmic turns or unexpected progressions, simply because variety was an expected and prized aspect of the mastery of sophisticated polyphony as it was then understood. Secondly, even if an editor achieves what he considers to be a satisfactory reconstruction of such a work, there are few cases of such reconstructions in which there is an overall conjecture rate of less than 20 per cent. Nevertheless, there are exceptions to all generalizations and on the present occasion I believe I have found a movement from a fragmentary cyclic Mass that can be reconstructed with comparatively little conjectural material: the Gloria from the Missa Salve Regina in Munich 3154. This article describes how I became interested in the cycle and suggests how the missing material in its Gloria can be effectively realized.

1 The most satisfactory reconstructions tend to be those in which incomplete sources for a single piece are combined to realize the complete music. For an example see I. and M. Bent and B. Trowell, (eds.), John Dunstable, Complete Works, Musica Britannica 8 (revision of the 1953 edition by Manfred Bukofzer) (London 1970), no. 73 (Descendi in ortum meum).
2 The following sigla have been used in the course of the present article: CS 15: Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Capella Sistina MS 15 Munich 3154: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Mus. MS 3154 (Nicolaus Lepold Codex)
Speciálník: Hradec Králové, Krajske Muzeum, Knihovna, MS II. A. 7 (Speciálník Codex)
Trent 89: Trent, Castello del Buonconsiglio, MS 1376 (olim MS 89)
Trent 91: Trent, Castello del Buonconsiglio, MS 1378 (olim MS 91)
Verona 759: Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS 759
The *Missa Salve Regina* seems to consist of only three movements (Gloria, Credo and Sanctus), and it is possible that no matching Kyrie or Agnus ever existed. Since the tenor sings only the Marian cantus-firmus text, I think it improbable that a Kyrie along these lines would be thought liturgically proper. I was initially drawn to the Mass for reasons quite independent of reconstruction, chiefly the desire to compare it with vaguely similar-looking cantus firmus Masses in Trent 89 and 91. It shares a particularly sophisticated O mensuration rhythmic style with the Trent 91 *Missa Regina celii*, and that in turn is not stylistically too dissimilar from the *Cucu* and *Gentil madona* cycles in the same manuscript and the Missa *Groß seien* in Trent 89. At one time I thought that there might be a common and important link between all of these Masses.\(^3\) Further investigation has prompted me to reconsider this, and has also highlighted the relative rarity of the rhythmic style of the *Salve Regina* and *Regina celii* cycles. The outer voices in these works tend to be more rhythmically active than in the greater part of the Franco-Flemish repertoire, rather indiscriminately applying small rhythmic values throughout. This is in direct contrast to the occasional use of figurative passages by Ockeghem and Busnois to provide textural contrast.\(^4\) The dense part-writing of the *Salve Regina* Credo (which is the only complete movement of this cycle) illustrates this well (see Ex. 1).

The cantus firmus is short, and in its most basic form consists of fifteen notes forming the opening of the *Salve Regina* chant.\(^5\) In each full section that survives complete, three statements of this cantus firmus are given in the tenor, separated by rests. In the Credo’s full duple section and the Osanna, these statements are rhythmically identical. The outer statements always begin on A, and the middle statements on D above, introducing a temporary flat signature in the tenor. The disposition of the *Salve Regina* theme is therefore similar to that of the invented cantus firmus in Busnois’s *In hydraulis* (which repeats itself in rhythmically identical patterns separated by rests within a pitch scheme) and is not dissimilar either to compositions like Isaac’s fantasia *La Mi*, which also has an invented cantus firmus that repeats itself in successively diminished statements separated by rests (see Ex. 2).\(^6\)

\(^{3}\) Further, see R. J. Mitchell, ‘The Paleography and Repertory of Trent Codices 89 and 91, Together with Analyses and Editions of Six Mass Cycles by Franco-Flemish Composers from Trent Codex 89’, Ph. D. diss., 2 vols., Exeter University (1989), I, 73, 105–7, 109–10 and 118–20. I still consider it possible that this group of Trent Masses are linked somehow, excluding the *Salve Regina* cycle.


\(^{5}\) *Antiphonale Monasticum* (Tournai, 1934), 176–7. The composer may have inserted a couple of stepwise degrees in the chant or used a version in which these added notes were already present; in any case, the use of stepwise additions to chants used as cantus firmus was fairly common in the German-speaking world in the later fifteenth century.
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Ex. 1 Missa Salve Regina, Credo, bars 64–9

Ex. 2 Missa Salve Regina, Credo, tenor of main duple section

A second scribe has added cantus-firmus text to all of the surviving tenor sections; the additions look either late fifteenth or early sixteenth century, and at least suggest that this fascicle of the manuscript might have had some performance use.
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Within this relatively simple scheme, the composer manages to introduce an element of mathematical interest. The tenor's note values in the Credo's first section decrease and then increase correspondingly in mensural values, giving the following pattern (for present purposes, '8' = a maxima, '4' a long, etc.):

\[
8 \ 4 \ 2 \ 1 \ 0.5 \ 0.5 \ 1 \ 2 \ 4 \ 8 \ 8 \ 4 \ 2 \ 1 \ 0.5 \\
0.5 \ 1 \ 2 \ 4 \ 8 \ 8 \ 4 \ 2 \ 1 \ 0.5 \ 0.5 \ 1 \ 2 \ 4 \ 8 \\
8 \ 4 \ 2 \ 1 \ 0.5 \ 0.5 \ 1 \ 2 \ 4 \ 8 \ 8 \ 4 \ 2 \ 1 \ 0.5
\]

One other tenor section (the O mensuration Osanna) also displays a similar scheme, the figures 3, 2 and 1 in the following sequence referring to perfect breves, imperfect breves and semibreves:

\[
3 \ 2 \ 1 \ 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 3 \ 2 \ 1 \ 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 3 \ 2 \ 1 \\
3 \ 2 \ 1 \ 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 3 \ 2 \ 1 \ 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 3 \ 2 \ 1 \\
3 \ 2 \ 1 \ 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 3 \ 2 \ 1 \ 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 3 \ 2 \ 1
\]

The only other notable feature of the tenors is found in the Credo’s main duple section, which presents its three cantus-firmus statements monorhythmically. The first-section tenors of the Gloria and Sanctus do not appear to follow any scheme other than the transposition feature previously mentioned; their cantus-firmus statements are elaborated, and the elaborations also differ from one another. We are therefore dealing with a work that displays some interest in tenor organization, but does not extend this to an overall scheme.

The mutilated fascicle 39 of Munich 3154 in which the Mass survives looks distinctly out of place in its present manuscript position; it is both followed and preceded by works in obviously different hands, and which look more modern than this cycle. Using palaeographical techniques, Thomas Noblitt has established that the Salve Regina fascicle was probably copied between 1483 and 1509. The hand that copied the cycle is possibly the same one that copied the motets which now open this source – the first nineteen or twenty folios of the manuscript are now lost. Regarding the present state of the Gloria and Sanctus, the Gloria has a complete first section but only the contra altus survives complete for the second section; part of the contra bassus and all of the superius and tenor concerned are missing. The Sanctus is lacking the contra altus for its Osanna section, and also the two lower (contra altus and bassus) voices for the Benedictus trio. The Credo is therefore the best place to look for a general assessment of the cycle’s musical features, and the following series of points also takes into account previously mentioned similarities with Masses in Trent 89 and 91.

See T. Noblitt, ‘Die Datierung der Handschrift Mus. ms. 3154 der Staatsbibliothek München’, Die Musikforschung, 27 (1974), 36–56. I wish to thank Professor Noblitt here and Professor Sandon of Exeter University for their help in suggesting emendations to a previous draft of this article, and also the Musikabteilung of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek for its permission to publish.
(i) The tenor of the Missa Salve Regina is an internal voice, permitting (but not frequently using) fourths against the superius as in the Regina celi and Cucu Masses.

(ii) The tenor has only cantus-firmus material throughout, and does not participate in any free sections.

(iii) The tenor has cantus-firmus text throughout, as in the latter pair of Masses.

(iv) The Missa Salve Regina has a rather low level of dissonance because of the meticulous nature of much of its part-writing.

(v) The contra bassus is a real bass part, using (but arguably not over-using) the device of running in consecutive tenths with the Superius.

(vi) The composer of the Missa Salve Regina permitted occasional consecutive fifths between upper voices – certainly not a rare feature by the general standards of mid-fifteenth-century Mass and motet composition. The best point of reference here seems to be Martini’s Tone 4 Magnificat setting in the same manuscript, which contains progressions using consecutive fifths.9

(vii) The composer also shows some interest in sequential writing (see Gloria, superius, bars 54–5 and contra altus, bars 159–63). The superius to the Credo’s ‘Amen’ and the Benedictus also makes use of sequential devices, though certainly not as interestingly or excessively as Obrecht does. In addition, the composer is fond of closely worked imitation at the unison, fourth or fifth and also of partial or hidden imitation. His use of sequential material even leads him to begin the Credo’s Crucifixus section with the contra altus and bassus successively repeating the superius’s initial cantus firmus-based passage, a fifth lower and an octave lower respectively. However, sequential writing and imitation are not really structural devices throughout; rather they constitute a means to unify the outer voices, and to extend outer-voice motivic material in reduced-voice passages.

Therefore, in general terms the cycle is close in style to works of Martini and anonymous imitators of him. This makes it relatively easy for us tentatively to realize much of the outer-voice material – I say ‘tentatively’ because the latter points seem to tell us that nothing really unpredictable in the context of what we know about mid-fifteenth-century style seems to occur throughout the surviving music. There are no indications of missing passages involving complex proportions, highly accidentalized progressions or any other features which might single this cycle out as either remarkable or particularly unorthodox. However, that is not to say that reconstructing the missing outer-voice material is a mere matter of note-spinning. As we shall see, the cantus firmus seems to have a vital role in helping to provide the editorial insertions necessary in order to realize the Gloria.

Before proceeding to explain the premises of the reconstruction, a little must

9 Munich 3154, fols. 118v–120v (no. 68); also found in CS 15, fols. 100v–107r. The version of tone IV used in this setting may imply that it was written either at (or for?) a south-German centre.
be said about the cycle’s probable provenance. Its Credo (which contains several text excisions) also uses the insertions ‘Et in unum Dominum nostrum’ and ‘Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria Virgine’. I have only seen the second of these additions in other central European sources such as Specílník, so the cycle was probably not originally written for a Franco-Flemish or Italian centre. Its uniqueness to Munich 3154 also tends to suggest that it originated in the German-speaking world. Because of the similarities with works by Busnois and Isaac previously mentioned, it is likely that the composer was familiar with the latest developments of his day. However, it is premature to guess at his nationality; he could equally well have been a Franco-Fleming or a native musician imitating current Franco-Flemish idioms. I also consider it premature to make any tentative attributions to known composers; despite the connections mentioned with works by Martini and Isaac, it would be hard to make out a convincing case in favour of either man. Like the quodlibet Salve Regina setting in Munich 3154 attributed to ‘Ar. Fer’ (until recently thought to be by Isaac), the Isaac-like features of this Mass may eventually turn out to be deceptive. 10

I have provided a complete transcription of the reconstructed Gloria at the end of this article, and suggest that readers examine the music in connection with the following explanatory points. This is because the actual process of realizing the Gloria is five-fold, involving the following stages: (i) providing the missing tenor material in accordance with details of the tenors previously discussed; (ii) deciding as far as is possible how the movement was internally scored; (iii) providing as much superius and contra bassus material as is possible from the tenor cantus firmus; (iv) realizing possible imitative points between the outer voices; (v) providing any other material which might not be catered for in the previous categories. It will be noted that only the material in this last category is completely conjectural; all of the other stages involve some element of referral to what remains of the cycle. The reconstruction process will be described exactly in the order of priorities given above.

(i) Missing tenor material11

From the previous description of the Credo and fragmentary Sanctus, it is reasonable to assume that the missing tenor to the end of the Gloria used the same cantus firmus with the same transposition scheme. However, matters are made a little difficult by the presence of sesquialtera signs in the surviving voices (contra altus and bassus). This makes it likely that the movement ended with a sesquialtera ‘drive’ section; it is rather rare in post-1470 Masses and

10 ‘Ar. Fer.’ is perhaps more likely to indicate the Liégeois imperial chaplain Arnold Fléron rather than ‘Arrigo Ferrarese’. See also R. Strohm, The Rise of European Music 1380-1500 (Cambridge, 1993), 518, 531.

11 Throughout this discussion, bar numbers are followed by superscript note numbers (e.g. 1301 refers to the first note of the bar even if it is tied over from the previous bar in the transcription).
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motets to find drive sections in which there are audible conflicts between duple and sesquialtera rhythms. If we choose the former alternative (i.e. that sesquialtera in all voices was involved), it then becomes possible that not one but two tenor panels are necessary; one for the main duple section, and another for the concluding sesquialtera section. This is the basis on which I have provided the final stretch of the tenor from bar 208 – the point where the sesquialtera in the surviving voices begins. Using the principle of consonance with the surviving voices as a guide, I have realized a three-statement, transposing tenor here as in the Credo, and have managed to make the first and third of these statements identical. The middle statement is not too different, but the possibility of dissonance at bar 231 prevents this statement from being absolutely identical to those preceding and following it. I have also provided a final tenor D at the conclusion of the movement outside the transposition scheme – this is more for the sake of finality than anything else. A similar concluding tenor note occurs at the end of the Osanna, so perhaps there is some justification for the same device in the Gloria. Whilst it might seem odd to some readers that the realized tenor statements here are not all identical, the surviving voices seem to prevent more consistent realizations.

Realizing the tenor in the main duple section is more problematic for two reasons. Firstly, the surviving contra altus seems to be divided into what constitute several smaller internal panels, probably indicating some variation of scoring throughout the section. Because of this, the tenor could begin virtually anywhere at either the start or the conclusion of one of these subsections. Secondly, the duple section (excluding its sesquialtera ending) is quite extended. Did the tenor sound for all of this passage, or only for part of it? One significant feature of the contra altus (the congruent sign at bar 82) seems to be misleading in this respect; I have tried several times to realize a schematic and transposing Salve Regina tenor starting at this point, and have failed. Possibly the sign refers to an entry by a voice other than the tenor. I shall return to this point later on – for now it is merely necessary to note that the sign occurs and is probably not an error.

A gradual process of exclusion has led me to believe that it is possible to reconstruct a schematic tenor starting at only one point in this section, that is at bar 108, where the contra altus finishes what seems to be its second internal panel. The required rhythmic form of the three Salve Regina statements necessary has a reference point in the surviving contra altus at bars 156–79. Here the contra altus is given over a largely silent contra bassus. With this voice resting and the role of the missing superius here unclear, it is at least likely that the tenor sounded at this point. Consequently it is possible to place a tentative, single cantus-firmus statement starting at bar 156 on A under the contra altus. Conveniently, the same statement will also fit twice (the second time transposed) into the Gloria’s largest ‘tenorless’ passage at bars 108–55. All three editorially added statements are therefore identical and transpose according to the cycle’s general scheme. The only trouble with this approach to tenor reconstruction is
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that it leaves quite a long spell of tenor rests following the editorial statements (from bars 179 to 207). However, it is difficult to envisage a different and equally satisfying solution to the problem, chiefly because no other editorially provided schematic tenor will fulfil the two requirements of remaining consonant with the surviving voices and repeating satisfactorily according to the general transposition scheme. One could of course attempt to provide a freer sort of Salve Regina tenor as in the Gloria's first section, but that would arguably be taking the line of least resistance. In addition, there seems to be one very good reason why the tenor should rest from bars 179 to 207, and that will be explained with the rest of the material given under category (iii) below. To summarize, the efforts at reconstruction described so far have resulted in the provision of two complete tenor statements for the Gloria's duple section which arguably match the features of the other movements' tenors in a satisfying manner.

(ii) Internal scoring

Having realized the missing portions of the tenor, it becomes a little easier to explain previously noted features such as the congruent sign in the contra altus at bar 82. Surely this implies that one voice or other entered at this point. If our reconstructed tenor was silent here, then the sign should imply that another voice was involved. Logically it also follows that only two (or one?) of the four voices sounded in the bars leading up to the congruent sign. So the congruent sign probably implies that either the superius or contra bassus opened the section in a duet with the contra altus, and equally that the other one of these two voices entered at the point where the sign is given.

The scoring of what seem to be following internal panels in the contra altus (bars 82–108 and 109–78) must remain uncertain for the present, because all we have mentioned for them so far is our ability to fit a suitable tenor to them. However, what happens in the following panel (bars 179–208) is clearer, since the two surviving voices do not seem to make a self-sufficient duet by themselves. The contra bassus has dominant–tonic leaps (at bars 192–95 and 200–1), and the two voices considered by themselves have adjacent contrary-motion progressions leading outwards from thirds to fifths (bars 183–7). It is therefore most unlikely that this passage was a self-sufficient altus–bassus duet, and probable that a higher voice sounded above. In view of the editorial tenor being silent here, we can assume that bars 179–208 must have involved the missing superius.

I hint at the slight possibility of monophonic 'introitus' here because this technique occasionally survives in fifteenth-century sequence settings. The anonymous three-voice Lauda Syon salvatorem (Trent 91, fols. 164v–166r) uses this technique internally. Another possible example, Regis's Ave Maria . . . virgo serena, published in C. Lindenburg (ed.), Johannis Regis Opera Omnia, Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae 9, 2 vols. (Amsterdam, 1956), II, 42–9, may prove misleading, however; this is because the piece lacks a fifth voice due to the incompleteness of its only source (Petrucci's Motetti a 5 of 1508). See also E. Sparks, Cantus Firmus in Mass and Motet, 1420–1520 (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963), 198–9, and Strohm, The Rise of European Music 1380–1500, 482.
The sesquialtera signs at bar 208 and re-entry of the editorial tenor also make it likely that the superius participated in these final bars (as in the Credo), but the precise nature of its participation is best left to a little later in our explanations. To summarize, my investigations here make it likely that the Gloria’s second section opened with some sort of duet, which was followed at bars 82–178 by one or more temporary changes of texture. In addition a trio excluding the tenor seems to have been present at bars 179–208, followed by the sesquialtera panel in which all voices probably participated.

(iii) Provision of outer-voice material using the cantus firmus

At this point, the unique opportunities of this Gloria become clear because some of the uncertain passages described above can be realized with reference to the tenor. The Et in terra superius and the superius voices of the two main Credo sections all begin with brief quotations of the cantus firmus, and it is therefore not improbable that the same opening gambit serves for the Gloria’s second section. Consequently my editorial superius at bars 66–72 has the first nine notes of the cantus firmus, rhythmically altered to effect both consonance and imitation with the existing contra altus. This decision also solves the problem of the mysterious opening duet mentioned in the previous paragraphs – if this is actually the most convincing way to reconstruct the section’s opening, then the congruent sign in the contra altus at bar 82 should serve for the entry of the contra bassus.

A similar but longer rhythmic adaption of the cantus firmus will also fit in the superius above the contra altus at bars 86–100, and this also serves to clarify the probable role of the contra bassus, since the two upper voices run in consecutive fourths at bars 96–7. It is likely therefore that a lower voice was also present here. This can only have been the contra bassus, which therefore ran from bar 82 to at least bar 100, a solution that supports the reconstructed superius and contra altus. Owing to the ending of the rhythmically adapted superius cantus-firmus statement at bar 100, we are left with two possibilities here. Did the superius or the contra bassus continue with free writing, or did either (or both) continue to quote cantus-firmus material? This question seems to be best resolved by placing yet another rhythmically adapted cantus-firmus quotation against the contra altus. This time the voice that seems the most appropriate on the grounds of consonance is the contra bassus, beginning the statement at bar 102 (starting on E) and continuing until bar 108 – which is where the reconstructed cantus-firmus tenor enters. The resulting contra altus-bassus duet seems to be self-sufficient, so we may also reasonably suppose that the superius rested from bar 100 until the entry of the tenor.

Because of the presence of the reconstructed tenor cantus firmus in bars 108–78, it seems unlikely that any upper-voice quotations of the same material would coincide with the tenor. Therefore perhaps it is safe to suppose that the outer voices here are free. Another opportunity to insert more cantus-firmus material
comes at bar 179; one would assume that the superius enters here rather than in the preceding bar because the contra altus and reconstructed tenor finish what is probably a self-sufficient duet passage with the musical ‘full stop’ of an imperfect long. From bars 179 to 201 it appears to be possible to fit two consecutive, different rhythmic configurations of the cantus firmus into the superius, with the second one (beginning at bar 193) being transposed to E from the initial pitch of A. Not only does this mirror the transposition scheme of the cantus firmus, but it also seems to create self-sufficient three-voice writing for the bars in question. I say ‘seems to create’ because the result creates momentary consecutive octaves at bar 182, an unusual 2–1 suspension in the contra altus at bar 186, and momentary fifths at bar 200. There seems to be no way round the second of these problems, and the octaves and fifths seem preferable to tampering with the existing voices in an effort to conceal shortcomings which, after all, occasionally appear in several cyclic Masses of otherwise high quality.

After 201 it does not seem possible to add any more cantus-firmus material to the superius – the passage from here up to bar 208 seems to serve as an introduction to the final sesquialtera panel, and since the tenor cantus firmus is present in the latter it again seems probable that no additional cantus-firmus material coincides in the outer voices. To summarize, experiments at adding extra quotations of cantus-firmus material in the outer voices seem to confirm the following suggestions:

(a) that the duet opening the section was for the superius and contra altus;
(b) that the passage from bars 86 to 100 was a trio;
(c) that the passage from bars 102 to 108 was a duet for the two contras;
(d) that the passage from bar 179 to at least bar 201 was a trio.

The resulting texture and casual use of cantus-firmus material here compares quite well with the main duple section of the Credo, with its introductory cantus-firmus-based theme being allotted to the voices in their descending order. Therefore the occurrence of a similar (if less systematic) method should not necessarily be considered unusual in the Gloria.

(iv) Realizing imitative points between the outer voices

At this point readers may be forgiven for thinking that the corpse is about to revive. If what I have suggested in the previous sections is accepted as part of a reasonable method of reconstruction, then there appears to be little left that can be added without resort to absolute conjecture. However, the still incomplete reconstruction offers several more convincing possibilities owing to the presence of passages which look as though they are incomplete but conventional imitative tags. Continuing where we last left off the opening duet at bar 73, experiment shows that the imitative duet with the contra altus can be continued in strict
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fashion up to superius, bar 79. Similar opportunities also occurs at superius, 201–202 and 204–205 (where short motifs in the contra altus can be expanded imitatively) and at bars 211–12, where the superius is possibly the initiator for short imitative motifs in the two contras.

A short piece of triadic imitation between the two contras at bars 242–3 also seems to offer imitative superius possibilities, as does the movement of the same pair of voices at bars 248–54. Therefore the repeated and transposed motif I have added in the superius at bars 247–52 reflects not only the existing parts but also the scheme of the cantus-firmus tenor. Again, at bar 254 the contra bassus seems to provide the opportunity to see that the final superius phrase at bar 253–256 probably begins on A, and ends the movement with a simple descent to a cadence formula. The conclusion that I suggest for the superius from bar 247 onwards is also similar to the ending of the Credo superius.

It is at this point (according to certain schools of thought) that the reconstruction process should end, because there is probably nothing more that can be added except through the use of absolute conjecture. I have been able to show that the second section of the Gloria possibly involved at least as much casual use of the cantus firmus in the outer voices as the Credo, and that what we can ascertain about its textural contrasts is fairly clear. The investigation also shows that the Gloria was indeed akin to the Trent 91 Missa Cucu in its repeated use of a short theme, and some of the slightly risky progressions which we have suggested in earlier sections also connect the cycle well with what we know about Martini and his imitators. Notwithstanding the skill evident in what are arguably amongst Martini’s best efforts (such as the Masses on La Martinella and lo ne tengo), the level of his output does not seem consistent; some of his shorter works contain progressions that tend towards dissonance. However, this is not to suggest that the Missa Salve Regina is attributable to Martini, nor is it an attempt to use Martini’s occasional musical shortcomings to justify what might seem weak in my reconstruction. I merely wish to illustrate that the sort of writing and structure realized in this reconstruction have counterparts in the works of a well-known composer, some of whose work was available to the compilers and users of Munich 3154.

(v) Totally conjectural material

The urge to add further to the reconstruction was prompted by two considerations; firstly, there is little left to add to make the Gloria complete, and secondly, the majority of the necessary additions are fairly clear from textural and harmonic

13 His four-part setting of Fortuna desperata seems to be a fairly clumsy piece. For this and other Martini secular works, see E. Evans (ed.), Johannes Martini, Secular Pieces, A-R Editions. (Madison, Wisc., 1975). In addition, his brief three-voice Missa In feuers hitz (Verona 759 fols. 15v–20r, unpublished) contains some undistinguished writing, notably at ‘passus et sepultus est’ and ‘... seculi. Amen’ in its Credo.
viewpoints. I shall go through these conjectural additions as separate points to show readers where I doubt my own judgement and where musical alternatives seem possible.

(a) I last left the opening duet in mid-air where it finished its strict imitation at bar 79. All that seems to be needed to complete the duet is a short cadential formula at bars 79–82. I have filled this in with two considerations in mind; firstly that the superius at bars 81–2 should have a long rather than a semibreve for its final note here, since the opening duet seems to move in regular ‘greater measures’ of two bars of Ċ. Secondly, I remain unsure whether the A in my added cadence at bar 80 is appropriate. Perhaps C is equally viable here.

(b) The course of the contra bassus at bars 82–102 is only partly determined by conjecture, since from bars 86 to 100 it must provide an essential-voice support for the two upper voices. The progressions used here must therefore be partly predetermined, and all that seems to be needed at bars 100–2 is a simple cadential formula. Bars 82–6 are more of a problem, since whatever one puts in the contra bassus here must link two panels and also be consonant with the repeated A’s of the contra altus. Perhaps the only practical choice is something like the non-anticipatory animated passage that I have provided.

(c) At bars 108–30 some kind of superius addition seems to be needed to fill out the top voice of a temporary trio with the tenor cantus firmus as its middle voice. Some of the superius here can run in tenths against the contra bassus, and I have tried to keep up the momentum of preceding animated passages by concluding the trio with an imitative sequential motif at 120–30. I have already noted earlier that similar (if less extended) sequences occur elsewhere in the Gloria and Credo, so perhaps this particular type of addition is justified.

(d) What happens at bars 131–50 is still uncertain (the fragmentary contra bassus begins halfway through the last bar). However, in view of the animated nature of its first few surviving notes, I would surmise that these are the end of a passage in which a fast-moving bassus duetted against the slower-moving tenor. The movement of the contra bassus at bars 150–3 makes the participation of a third voice here unlikely, so I have provided what I consider to be an appropriate contra bassus part at bars 131–50 in accordance with this idea, again making its movement as sequential as seems possible.

(e) The small gaps still left in the trio at bars 202–8 can be satisfyingly filled in with cadential formulas.

(f) The necessary superius additions in the final sesquialtera panel are problematic, because little can be deduced from surviving and already reconstructed voices apart from likely points where thirds in progressions occur in the missing voice. Nevertheless, I consider that the editorial superius should begin at bar 210 rather than 209, because the opening two bars of the panel possibly serve

14 Regarding my theory of ‘greater measures’ (which I consider applicable to the greater part of fifteenth-century polyphony, and admittedly is only partly mine) see Mitchell, ‘The Paleography and Repertory’ I, 301–5.
as some sort of introduction that indicates the change of rhythm. This is exactly what happens at the same point in the Credo. Bars 210–14 are relatively easy to deal with, since I have already indicated that some sort of imitation is probably involved here.

(g) The following passage (bars 215–242) has been realized by looking at the end of the Salve Regina Credo, and also at a similar place in a similarly constructed composition – Busnois’s In hydraulis. Like the Gloria in question, this motet ends with short tenor phrases overlapping with imitative phrases in the outer voices. Therefore it is not impossible that much the same sort of technique occurred in this Gloria, and I have written in a superius from bars 215 to 225 with this in mind. In partial support of this idea, the sesquialtera passage that ends the Credo also breaks its superius into two distinct phrases. Bars 226–42 are more difficult to deal with, because no clear phrase divisions are apparent in the reconstructed lower voices. Here, I have tried to emulate the fastidious rhythms of the Gloria’s first (triple) section, with the intention that the resultingly agile superius should furnish a brief imitative motif (at bars 234–5) and also fill out progressions which seem to be implied in the lower voices. This is perhaps the weakest of the conjectural additions made so far, but at least something has to be done here since the lower voices do not make a self-sufficient trio by themselves. Following the imitation at bars 242–3 already mentioned, all that is needed to complete the Gloria is a cadential formula at superius, bars 244–6. The type of cadential decoration I have chosen is probably a little risky, but under the circumstances it provides an arguably satisfying melodic descent from A to the cadential F and maintains the rhythmic momentum of the previous phrases.

Regarding the various reconstruction processes involved, I consider categories (i) to (iii) to be fairly definite; it is hard to realize any solutions other than the ones suggested. Category (iv) is a little less solid, but nevertheless is not absolute conjecture since it involves the realization of probable imitative material which it would be reckless to ignore. That leaves us to calculate the percentage of material involved in the ‘absolute conjecture’ category (v).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of notes in reconstructed Gloria</td>
<td>2,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of superius notes added in category (v)</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of contra altus notes added in category (v)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of tenor notes added in category (v)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of contra bassus notes added in category (v)</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added superius notes as a percentage of 2,031</td>
<td>7.9 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added contra bassus notes as a percentage of 2,031</td>
<td>8.6 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall amount of totally conjectural material</td>
<td>16.5 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are such exercises worth the work? The answer seems to be two-fold. Firstly, the structural aspect of the realization helps us to envisage almost exactly what sort of piece this Gloria was. Secondly, the actual filling in of notes in category
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(v) is greatly helped in this particular piece by the amount of material that seems to be already predetermined at previous stages of the reconstruction. This is a fairly unusual case, too, since relatively few cycles of the period quote cantus-firmus material in outer voices as methodically as this one seems to. I would also suggest that the same technique is not applicable even to the fragmentary Sanctus of the same Mass. As I indicated earlier, it requires a contra altus for its first section and the two supporting voices for its Benedictus trio. Of course it is perfectly possible to ‘recompose’ the missing material, and I have attempted to do so merely out of curiosity. However, that exercise arguably cannot be regarded as a valid reconstruction because the structural and melodic clues given in the Gloria are largely lacking. At the start of this article I argued that the same problem affects the greater part of attempts to reconstruct fragmentary fifteenth-century music, and in most cases there is no way round it except the occasional appearance of newly discovered concordant sources.

In conclusion, my advice to readers interested in fifteenth-century reconstructions is not so much total discouragement as a warning that the opportunity of achieving a reconstruction that is only 15–20 per cent editorial conjecture will remain rare. Perhaps such exercises are futile if the ratio of conjecture is any higher, although I am sure that there are plenty of people who would disagree. It would be unwise to clutter up the world of fifteenth-century studies with complete (as opposed to structural) reconstructions that are more the brainchilds of their realizers than the logical outcome of deductive analysis. In addition, I hope I have illustrated here that what might seem ‘logical’ in a fifteenth-century Mass does not always necessarily apply in the reconstruction process. The finished reconstruction of the Gloria leaves us with a movement that is rather sparse in comparison with the accompanying Credo, tending to confirm the point made earlier that this seems to be a cycle in which overall schematic considerations are secondary to musical invention. Nevertheless, perhaps this internal sparseness is aptly mirrored by the Credo’s use of a self-sufficient duet between the two main sections. Finally, as a result of these investigations it now seems that we can perform the greater part of this incomplete cycle, and

The missing contra altus of the Sanctus can be tentatively filled in quite easily by realizing imitative material, but the Benedictus lower voices seem to have been part of a trio that divided into two smaller panels. In the first panel, the cantus firmus was probably run through the voices in descending order as in the introduction to Credo’s main second section. However, the second panel seems to have been free, and looks suspiciously as though it was one of those examples that attempted to exhaust all of the clichés of fifteenth-century three-voice writing (rapid imitation, fauxbourdonesques, doubled harmonic pace, etc.) within its few bars. In addition, this is not the only incomplete piece in Munich 3154 with a possible Isaac connection; another might be the textless four-voice piece no. 65. This appears to be the first half of a motet (with an incomplete bassus) which has lost its text in the process of copying. The tenor looks like a chant cantus firmus, and might have been the respond Speciosa facta es or a variant of it (Antiphonale Monasticum, 1077). Fitting the first half of the respond text to the music seems satisfying, and the missing portion of the bassus can be reconstructed easily due to many of its progressions seeming predetermined. The resulting short reconstruction is similar in style to the first section of Isaac’s Hora e di Maggio.
possibly hear it in something approaching its original guise. Being a near-relative of the Franco-Flemish *Misse de Salve* as well as musically impressive, it certainly deserves the attention which has been previously denied it because of its poorly preserved state.

*Sudbury, Suffolk*
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Contra Bassus

Et in terra pax

ho
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bus bone voluntatis

bus bone voluntatis

Laudamus te, Be-
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