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ABSTRACT

*Più chiar che’l sol*: Reconsidering a Ballata by Anthonello de Caserta

A thesis presented to the department of music

Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Brandeis University
Waltham, Massachusetts

By Sebastien Jean

This study deals with the editorial problems inherent in the representation of late fourteenth century manuscripts. Anthonello de Caserta’s *ballata, Più chiar che’l sol*, first edited in the multi-volume series *Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century* (volume X) is an example of a late fourteenth century song extant in two partially damaged manuscript sources which, due to the large amount of music requiring transcription by the editor, did not receive the level of attention necessary for a correct rendition. Furthermore, the critical apparati appended to each volume of such series is – as in the case of the critical notes for *Più chiar che’l sol* – far from helpful in helping the reader understand editorial decisions made in the transcription process. Combined with the lack of critical information in the layout of the transcription in a series such as *Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century*, the critical apparatus can obscure rather than illuminate editorial solutions to transcription problems.

Creating a new transcription of *Più chiar che’l sol* for comparison with the 1977 edition by Thomas W. Marrocco in volume X of the *Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century* series reveals editorial decisions extracted form the critical apparatus which have resulted in substantial errors. Through a close examination of *Più chiar che’l sol’s*
manuscript sources, Marrocco’s readings of are corrected and reconstructions of trimmed manuscript sections are suggested.

As a response to the lack of editorial transparency inherent in the critical apparati found in series of medieval music such as *Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century*, a new transcription of *Più chiar che’l sol* offers a layout which includes manuscript variants parallel to the music, as well as transcription notes where clarification is needed for particular editorial features. Furthermore, more extensive variants are appended to the transcription reproducing original notation from both manuscript sources.
PREFACE

The initial impulses for transcribing Anthonello de caserta’s *ballata, Più chiar che’l sol*, were largely driven by the interaction late Fourteenth Century French and Italian systems of mensural notation presented by the piece’s two manuscript sources. The difficulties in transcribing this piece became quickly apparent: the Lucca Codex folios containing *Più chiar che’l sol*, represented in Italian Trecento notation, had at some point in the manuscript’s history, suffered from fading and trimming – most likely during rebinding. This left some sections of music, including a large portion of the contratenor voice, only partly legible; the Parma fragment which contains a version of *Più chiar che’l sol* in French *Ars Subtilior* notation is not only damaged in several areas, but contains a different contratenor written by Matheus de Perusio, one of Anthonello’s contemporaries. Thus, an irresistible puzzle presented itself.

Comparing Thomas W. Marrocco’s 1977 edition with my own transcription revealed several errors in Marrocco’s rendition. The attempts to uncover the motivation behind some of his editorial choices were laborious in part due to the lack of editorial information in the layout of the transcription. Extracting information from Marrocco’s critical apparatus as to editorial intent was difficult, largely due to long list of abbreviated variants and the lack of any prose commentary for clarification. The most obvious results of this editorial style are that 1.) the transcription – divorced from any signs of the manuscript source(s) or editorial markings (save *ficta*) can often be assumed to be correct and taken at face value resulting in inaccurate performances or misinformed analyses; 2.) few readers are likely to take the time to decipher the cryptic format of the critical
apparatus which in any case - due to the lack of prose clarification – is only slightly more informational than the transcription.

Thus in addition to solving the puzzles inherent in Più chiar che'l sol’s transmission as well as correcting and clarifying errors in Marrocco’s edition, this study has presented an opportunity to find a manner of representing music of the Fourteenth Century that keeps a connection to the manuscript sources while endeavoring to present the music with editorial transparency, making as explicit as possible my editorial decisions.

The final stages of my research have brought to my attention a 1992 study of Più chiar che'l sol by Pedro Memelsdorff. In this study, Memelsdorff addresses many of the same errors in Marrocco’s edition and, with the exception of a few instances my solutions to Marrocco’s errors are the same. Of note in Memelsdorff’s study, however, is the reconstruction of Più chiar che'l sol’s Lucca Codex contratenor which Marrocco described as missing. Although my own attempts to reconstruct this section of music were found to be inferior to Memelsdorff’s solution, and are thus deferred to in my transcription, I found it instructive to reverse transcribe his solution and superimpose it on the trimmed sections of the Lucca Codex folios where Più chiar che'l sol’s contratenor was originally inscribed. Thus, I have been able to offer a complete picture of the notation which may have existed on the trimmed folio sections.

Although my editorial approach calls for greater transparency in large editions of Fourteenth Century music by means of prose commentary (an idea in part inspired by Willi Apel’s French secular Music of the Late Fourteenth Century) I realize that due to factors such as cost and deadlines, this is only possible to a limited degree. Therefore, I
advocate for other editorial features to be included with the transcription, hopefully connecting it in some way to the manuscript sources. The more protracted studies of individual pieces in response to their editions in large series will hopefully continue to attract the interest of scholars. Even though the corpus of Fourteenth Century Ars Nova and Trecento music has been edited in many cases more that once throughout the Twentieth century, what this study of Anthonello de Caserta’s Più chiar che’l sol has shown, is that many pieces within that larger corpus are yet awaiting their own individual large scale investigations.
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**Luc**  Lucca, Archivio di Stato, MS 184/Perugia, Biblioteca Comunale


**Pad B**  Padua, Biblioteca Universitaria 1115. Brandeis University microfilm.


**Par**  Parma, Archivio di Stato, Frammenti musicali, Armadio B, busta No. 75. Brandeis University microfilm.

**Pist**  Pistoia, Archivio Capitolare, MS B 3n.5. Brandeis University Microfilm.

**Rei**  Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS n.a.fr. 6771 (“Reina Codex). Brandeis University microfilm.
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INTRODUCTION

Anthonello de Caserta’s Italian Ballata, _Più chiar che’l sol_, is representative of many late fourteenth century works in its presentation of editorial problems due in part to the often damaged condition of manuscripts from that period as well as an unusual transmission history. Two manuscripts from the beginning of the fifteenth century transmit _Più chiar che’l sol_, each presenting the editor with specific challenges.

_Lucca_ Codex (Luc)\(^1\) and the Parma Fragment (Par). _Luc_ is one of the many fourteenth century manuscripts which was, at some point in its existence, rebound — a process which typically involved marginal trimming to even out the edges rebound folios. As a result, many pieces contained within lost sections of music, as in the case of _Più chiar che’l sol_’s contratenor. Further more, at some point in time, the contents of _Luc_ were separated and were not reunited until 1988\(^2\), making correct foliation difficult.

_Par_ consists of several folios remaining from a larger manuscript, the remainder of which has been lost. The manuscript is damaged in many places, making reading difficult and in some cases impossible. Furthermore, the _Par_ transmission of _Più chiar che’l sol_ contains a different contratenor composed by one of Anthonello’s contemporaries, Matheus de perusio and is represented in French _Ars Subtilior_ notation - in contrast with the _Luc_ transmission rendered in Italian _Trecento_ notation.

---

1 Lucca, Archivio di Stato, MS 184/Perugia, Biblioteca Comunale “Augusta,” MS 3065 and Parma, Archivio di Stato, Frammenti musicali, Armadio B, busta No. 75, respectively.
2 The new leaves were discovered in 1988 by John Nàdas and Agostino Ziino. For a detailed discussion on the manuscript’s history, see their facsimile edition: _The Lucca Codex, Codice Mancini: Introductory Study and Facsimile Edition_. Lucca: Libreria Musicale Italiana Editrice, 1990.
This study of Anthonello de Caserta’s Italian *ballata*, *Più chiar che’l sol* draws on several lines of inquiry and research in an attempt to achieve a more reliable musical as well as editorial reading of this work and proceeds in three sections.

The first part places Anthonello and his *ballata* in an historical context by discussing biographical information and the relationship of *Luc* and *Par* to other generally contemporary manuscripts, through which a circle of composers contemporary with Anthonello can be inferred. At the forefront of this circle of contemporaries is Matheus de Perusio, whose contribution of newly composed of contratenors to other composers’ works besides Anthonello’s, adds to the interest of *Più chiar che’l sol*’s transmission history.

The second part which examines the notation of *Più chiar che’l sol* two sources begins a critical reading of Thomas W. Marrocco’s 1977 transcription\(^3\) which contains several significant errors and misapprehensions of the manuscript sources. In addition to offering corrected readings of Marocco’s work, sections of *Luc*’s trimmed contratenor are reconstructed, showing the original notation of the trimmed sections. This section also acknowledges the work of Pedro Memelsdorff who, in his 1992 study of *Più chiar che’l sol*,\(^4\) offered the completion of a large section of the *Luc* contratenor which Marocco stated was lost, and demonstrates the reconstructed manuscript notation based on his transcription.


The third and final section of this study deals with other transcription and editorial problems, specifically with regards to Marrocco and Memelsdorff’s handling of rests in two sections of *Più chiar che’l sol*, the interpretation of mensuration, and issues raised by the two differing contratenors.

As a conclusion to this study, I have included a new transcription of *Più chiar che’l sol* which attempts to address problems of editorial transparency by means of a visually clear system of source variants, transcription notes, a parallel reading of both the *Luc* and *Par* contratenors and the acknowledgement of Memelsdorff’s readings of some sections of *Più chiar che’l sol* (especially in the *Par* contratenor) in order to present a better rendition of the work itself.
I

Biography

*Più chiar che’l sol* is one of the few pieces of circumstantial evidence which have helped scholars in piecing together a scant biography of Anthonello. *Più chiar che’l sol*, the text of which celebrates a “Lucia”, is thought by Ann Stone, as well as John Nàdas and Agostino Ziino, to be a piece celebrating the 1399 wedding of Lucia Visconti, niece of Giangaleazzo Visconti, to Frederick of Thuringia. Another piece in *Luc, Del glorioso titolo*, has been interpreted by John Nàdas and Agostino Ziino as a madrigal honoring the coronation of Giangaleazzo Visconti as Duke of Milan in 1395. These two pieces place Anthonello in the Pavian vicinity of the Visconti court in the last years of the fourteenth century. Whether he was directly employed by Giangaleazzo or was just a recipient of individual commissions is not certain. Either is certainly plausible.

Another piece of evidence corroborates Anthonello’s proximity to the Pavian Visconti court: in the rubric of the Pavian Notary Alberto Griffi is found listed a *procura* dated 1402 for a “frater Antoniello” - the *procura* itself is missing, however. Stone is uncertain whether this is the same person as Anthonello de Caserta due to the religious affiliation imparted by the tilte “frater”. She correctly cites the common scribal practice of prefacing a composer attribution with his religious honorific or title, and the fact that none of Anthonello’s pieces in *ModA* include a religious affiliatory title before his name. The opposite, however, is true in the *Par* attribution for *Più chiar che’l sol*, which reads “A. marotus de Caserta abbas” – the “abbas” being a reference to a member

---

6 Anthonello’s only madrigal. Stone identifies this piece as a ballata in *The Manuscript Modena*... (p.79).
7 Nàdas/Ziino, p.38.
8 Stone, *The Manuscript*... p.79.
of a monastic community. As well, the spelling of names in this period varied widely due to local scribal spelling. A variety of name forms for Anthonello can be seen throughout the various manuscript sources in which his works have been preserved (see Table 1).

Clearly “frater” and “abbas” both imply a religious affiliation, suggesting that Anthonello was in fact a member of a monastic order.

There is little more information that has, to the present day, been discovered about Anthonello. He was probably a monk, working within or around the Pavian court of Giangaleazzo Visconti in the last decade of the fourteenth century and the early part of the fifteenth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript Source</th>
<th>Attribution Variants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luc</td>
<td>Antonellus Marot de Caserta; Antonellus Marot; Antonellus; Marot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModA</td>
<td>Anthonello de Caserta; Anthonellus; Anthonello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rei</td>
<td>A. da Caserta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par</td>
<td>A. Marotus de Caserta abbas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pist</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad B</td>
<td>[ ]tonelus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.III.2</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1. Ms attribution variants for Anthonello**

**Manuscript Sources**

The main body of Anthonello’s music resides primarily in two manuscripts of north-Italian provenance: *Luc* and the Modena codex (*ModA*)\(^9\). Of the fourteen pieces that survive (6 in *Luc* and 8 in *ModA*)\(^10\), ten are *unica* with the remaining four in concordance with north-Italian manuscripts\(^11\).

\(^9\) Modena, Biblioteca Estense Universitaria, MS α.M.5.24.

The distribution of Anthonello’s music is unusual in that his output is stylistically segregated: the 6 pieces in Luc are Italian in form and represented Italian Trecento notation while the 8 pieces in ModA are in French “formes fixes” and represented in French Ars Subtilior notation. While other composers during this period also wrote music in both French and Italian genres, Anthonello seems to be the only composer whose pieces were transmitted with style-specific manuscript segregation. This being the case, Più chiar che ’l sol’s concordance in the Parma fragment is unique because unlike other concordances of Anthonello’s pieces (see table 2), the Parma fragment represents this Italian ballata in entirely French Ars Nova notation with a newly composed contratenor by one of his contemporaries, Matheus de Perusio.

The segregated transmission of Anthonello’s music has prompted scholars such as Nigel Wilkins (1964) to suggest that Anthonello’s Luc and ModA repertoires were by two different composers – a view which is not currently shared by scholars. Wilkins’ assumption is however understandable since this stylistic segregation is unusual and

Anthonello as well. A. Bonaccorsi (Un nuovo Codice dell’“Ars Nova”: Il Codice Lucchese. Lincei – Mem. Scienze morali. Serie VIII, Vol. I, 12, 1948). attributed the ballata De, voglietemi oldire (f. LXIXv in Nàdas/Ziino) to Anthonello in his Luc inventory and suggested a possible attribution to the ballata De mia farina fo le mie lasagna in his anonymous column (f. LXVIIr in Nàdas/Ziino). In agreement with Bonaccorsi, Thomas W. Marrocco also attributes De, voglietemi oldire to Anthonello (Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century, Volume X, Les Remparts, Monaco: Éditions de L’oiseau Lyre, 1977). Although these attributions are not universally agreed upon, it should be noted that these two pieces read concurrently with the other 6 accepted pieces by Anthonello in Luc’s current state of reconstruction. For the purpose of this study, I will consider Luc to contain 6 pieces, and ModA 8.

11 These concordant sources for Anthonello’s music are mainly fragments: Par, Pad B (Padua, Biblioteca Universitaria 1115), and Pist (Pistoia, Archivio Capitolare, MS B 3n.5). The codex T.III.2, of the Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, Turin, is a reconstructed manuscript which, although in a more complete state than the Parma fragment, Pad B or Pist, is nonetheless in a somewhat fragmentary state. The only other complete manuscript besides Luc and Mod A which contains Anthonello’s music is the Reina Codex (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS n.a.fr. 6771).

Notational consistency in concordances of Anthonello’s pieces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Main Source</th>
<th>Style/Notation</th>
<th>Concordances</th>
<th>Concordance Transmission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A pianger l’occhi mey</td>
<td>Lucca, LXVIIv-LXVIIIr</td>
<td>Italian ballata a2/Italian Trecento notation</td>
<td>Pist. IIr (anon) Pad B, Bv (C only); [An]tonelus</td>
<td>Both retain Italian notation. Pist – no 1-pitch lig. In T. PadB – change to i’ not notated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Più chiar che’l sol</td>
<td>Lucca, LXVIIIv-LXIXr</td>
<td>Italian ballata a3/Italian Trecento notation.</td>
<td>Parma 1r</td>
<td>French Ars Nova notation. Coloration represented as void black. CT by MdP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauté parfaite, bonté souvrayne</td>
<td>ModA 13r</td>
<td>French ballade a3/Ars Subtilior notation.</td>
<td>Rei 46v (anon)</td>
<td>Retains French notation. Coloration represented as void black.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du val prilleus ou pourpris de jeunesse</td>
<td>ModA 12v</td>
<td>French ballade a3/Ars Subtilior notation. Passages with red minims.</td>
<td>Rei 47r T.III.2 4v-5r</td>
<td>Rei – Retains French notation. Minim coloration represented as void black. T.III.2 – Retains French Notation. Minim coloration both solid and void red.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

seems to be specific to Anthonello\textsuperscript{13}. Both Luc and ModA are however generally stylistically different manuscripts. Luc contains mostly Italian ballatas and madrigals while ModA strongly favors the French pieces in formes fixes, as shown in Table 3. It is not therefore surprising that Luc and ModA share few concordances (see Table 4 on pp. 5-6). Although both manuscripts are of north-Italian provenance, and have many composers in common between them, there is a difference in the regional patronage which may explain the differences in repertory style.

\textsuperscript{13} It should be noted that a larger study of the dissemination of music by Anthonello’s contemporaries – beyond the scope of this study – would be necessary to assert this claim with certainty.
Table 3
Distribution of French and Italian pieces in *Luc* and *ModA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Madrigal</th>
<th>Ballata</th>
<th>Caccia</th>
<th>Ballade</th>
<th>Rondeau</th>
<th>Virelai</th>
<th>Motet</th>
<th>Credo</th>
<th>Gloria</th>
<th>Canon</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Luc</em></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ModA</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nàdas and Ziino associate the repertory of *Luc* with the courts of Carrara at Padua and, in part due to their readings of *Del glorioso titolo* and *Più chiar che’l sol*, Visconti at Pavian/Milan\(^{14}\) and hypothesize that “the compilation of songs composed and otherwise known at the courts of Visconti and Carrara [occurred] during the years *ca.* 1390-1408”\(^{15}\).

They suggest that the compilation of *Luc* was mostly complete c. 1409 when the manuscript’s primary scribe traveled with it to its final destination of Milan, where in c.1410 the final pieces were added into it.

*ModA* is composed primarily of two layers with differing repertories, identified by Stone as layers II-IV and I-V. The repertory of the older layer, II-IV - which contains Anthonello’s French pieces – is almost devoid of Italian pieces. Stone suggests a purposeful exclusion of Italian pieces by the manuscript’s compiler and supports the hypothesis proposed by Reinhard Strohm that composers represented in this layer were active at the court of Giangaleazzo Visconti, who was interested in the *Ars Subtilior* style\(^{16}\).

This may explain, at least in part, why none of Anthonello’s Italian songs were included in *ModA*. The dating of this layer is uncertain: c.1400 for Nàdas/Ziino and not before 1409 for Stone.\(^{17}\)

---

\(^{14}\) Nàdas/Ziino, p.34.

\(^{15}\) Ibid, p.48


\(^{17}\) Stone (*The manuscript Modena*... pp.64-5) objects to 1400 as too early for *ModA* II-IV because of the presence, in that layer, of “Latin-texted ballades that are likely too have been composed for Pietro Filagros’ election as Pope in 1409.” See also Nàdas/Ziino, *The Lucca Codex*, pp. 35-6.
Table 4
Concordances of Anthonello’s works with Luc and ModA; contemporary composers sharing manuscript space with Anthonello.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Mod A</th>
<th>Lucca</th>
<th>T.III.2</th>
<th>Pist.</th>
<th>Pad B</th>
<th>Parma</th>
<th>Reina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthonello</td>
<td>Piu char que’l sol</td>
<td></td>
<td>LXXVIIv-LXIXr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A pianger l’occhi mey</td>
<td>12v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Du val prilleus</td>
<td>13r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beaute parfaite bonte sovrayne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacharias da Teramo</td>
<td>Plorans ploravi perché [D’amor languire, suspirare e] Deus deorum, Pluto, or ti rengratio [Patrem omnipotentum...] Et in spiritum... Sol me trafige</td>
<td>24v-26r</td>
<td>[LXI]v-[LXII]v</td>
<td>[LVII]v (only C)</td>
<td>LVIIIv-LIXr</td>
<td>9r [=6br] Incomplete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciconia ?</td>
<td>Merce o morte [Non credo, donna, che] la dolce fiamma Lizarda donna che’l mi cor contenti</td>
<td>13v-14r</td>
<td>LXIIIr (unique CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillipoctus</td>
<td>Par les bons Gedeon et Sanson En attendant soufrie mestuet En remirant vo douce pourtrayture</td>
<td>31r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 4 cont’d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Lucca</th>
<th>T.III.2</th>
<th>Pist.</th>
<th>Pad B</th>
<th>Parma</th>
<th>Reîna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartholini de Padua</td>
<td><em>Perche cangiato è l' mondo da l'antich</em> 9 other pieces <em>Imperiale, sedendo fra più stelle</em></td>
<td>Mod A</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>XXVIIr (C only)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17r (text corrupt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lucca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T.III.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22v-23r (anon.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selesses</td>
<td><em>En ce gracieux ta(m)ps joli</em></td>
<td>Mod A</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Fuion(s) de chi fuions prove compagne</em></td>
<td>Lucca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T.III.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenon</td>
<td><em>Jen e require de ma dame et ma mie</em> 3 other pieces*</td>
<td>Mod A</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lucca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontaine</td>
<td><em>Pour vous tenir en la grace amoureuse</em></td>
<td>Mod A</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mon coração pleure, mês des yeulx em fault rire</em></td>
<td>Lucca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td><em>Tu me solvi(or j), donna, tanto, caro</em></td>
<td>Mod A</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lucca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T.III.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pad B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reîna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Generally accepted as compiled somewhat later is layer I-V of *ModA*. This layer is the only source for the works of Matheus de Perusio (whose music dominates it) and has strong ties to *Par* due to the presence of 3 contratenors recomposed by de Perusio in that manuscript and 3 in *ModA* (see Table 5). The presence of Grenon and Fontaine who, according to Stone, are not known to have worked in Italy before 1420 suggests that layer I-V not only contains pieces by younger composers but that the compilation/copying of this layer must have been completed in the mid 1420s. The involvement of de Perusio in recomposing contratenors in both *ModA* and *Par* contributes to the notion that both *ModA* layer I-V and *Par* are contemporary.

**Table 5**

New contratenors by Matheus de Perusio in *ModA* and *Par*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece with New contratenor</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th><em>ModA</em></th>
<th><em>Par</em></th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Più chiar che’l sol</em></td>
<td>Anthonello</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td></td>
<td>“MdP” in margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pour vous tenir en la grace amoureuse</em></td>
<td>Fontaine</td>
<td>1v</td>
<td></td>
<td>“MdP” in margin. Concordance in <em>O 219.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>El non me zova ne val donna fuzire</em></td>
<td>Bartolino de Padova</td>
<td>3v-4r</td>
<td></td>
<td>“probably” MdP in Stone. Concordances in <em>Rei</em> and <em>Sq.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Se vous nestes par mon guerredon</em></td>
<td>Machaut</td>
<td>5v</td>
<td></td>
<td>“probably” MdP in Stone. Other 2 voices found on f. 34r. See Stone, <em>The Manuscript Modena...</em>, for extensive list of concordances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Je ne require de ma dame et ma mie</em></td>
<td>Grenon</td>
<td>45v-46r</td>
<td>1v</td>
<td><em>ModA</em>: “contratenorum mathey de P(er)usio”. Text residuum only in <em>Par</em>. See Stone for other concordances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, Stone suggests a personal connection between de Perusio and Pierre Fontaine, for whose *rondeau*, *Pour vous tenir en la grace amoureuse*, de Perusio recomposed the contratenor in *Par*, and Beltrame Ferragut whose *rondeau*, *De yre et de dueyl*, is also included in *Par*. The other de Perusio contratenor in *Par* is for Ciconia’s

---

late work, *Lizarda donna*. The exclusion of *Lizarda donna* from *Luc*, which has an entire section devoted to Ciconia supports its status as a late Ciconia work and sets *Luc* apart from *ModA I-V* as an older source.

*Par* has been shown to have been a large collection of works before its pages were separated. Heinrich Besseler notes in his 1925 study of fourteenth and fifteenth century music sources that the original foliation numbers of *Par* were still visible on the remaining folios, specifically describing f. 233 (*Più chiar che ’l sol*) and f. 242 (*Lizarda donna*) as “still legible.” *Par* was apparently a large anthology in similar scope as *Luc* and *ModA*, being compiled at around the same time as *ModA I-V*. It is tempting to speculate as to whether de Perusio’s *ModA unica* pieces were planned for inclusion in *Par*, along with perhaps other pieces by Anthonello. Based on *ModA*, de Perusio’s recomposition of contratenors – perhaps pieces that were his personal favorites – seems to take place alongside the copying of his own works.

A further connection between *ModA*, *Par* and Matheus de Perusio is the issue of scribal relationship – an issue which has not yet reached scholarly consensus. Nino Pirrotta was of the opinion that *ModA I-V* and *Par* share the same scribal hand. Stone lists the following apparent similarities:

---


20 Stone, *The manuscript Modena*…, p. 108.


22 Ibid. p. 231. “Da alten foliozahlen 233 und 242 lesbar sind…”

Both hands slant to the right, they share style of initial letters (the Ls of *Ligiarda donna*\(^{24}\) and *Laurea martirii/Conlauda est/Proba me Domine*\(^{25}\), for example are virtually identical), custod, and the formation of the abbreviated name Matteo de Perugia (MdP).\(^{26}\)

Although this passage from Stone’s *ModA* study is meant to acknowledge the valid points of Pirrotta’s hypothesis, she is not convinced based on differences she has observed in the musical script and what she terms “textual habits” citing the inconsistency of abbreviations for the labeling of tenor parts as well as spelling variants in the word “tenor”. Although she does not generally accept the shared scribe hypothesis, she acknowledges that there is still “room for doubt”\(^{27}\).

My own view is limited by working with facsimilies and microfilm (in the case of Par). I cannot, therefore formulate an opinion about the finer points of paleography. However, at few things seem certain:

1. It is a well established fact – one cited in fact in Stone’s study – that in many cases, text and music are written into music manuscripts separately. Thus, it is not impossible that separate scribes copied text and music into Par: a single scribe need not be held responsible for both.

2. On the issue of abbreviations and spelling variants, issues of time or available manuscript space could easily affect a scribe’s decisions to use an abbreviation or not. Spelling could change based on an exemplar with such a variant in the text which the


\(^{25}\)Found in *ModA*.


\(^{27}\) Ibid., p. 60.
scribe chose to transmit verbatim – although admittedly, the scribal process of copying of music in the fourteenth century seems to often be an editorial one.

3. One of the few benefits of working with microfilm is that sometimes the inferior format reveals the obvious in unmistakable ways, as in the case of the abbreviation “MdP”.

Matheus de Perusio’s initials are found at the beginning of the 3 new contratenors in Par and in ModA at the top of f. 46r – de Perusio’s own rondeau, *Trover ne puis aucunement confort*. The abbreviation - in lower-case letters - includes the last letter of Perusio (“o”) placed directly above “p”, the tail of which is crossed over by a looping flourish, as seen below:

![Fig. 1](image)

“MdP”, *ModA* f. 46r, top of folio.

Even through the inferior microfilm reproduction of *Par*, the identical abbreviation can be found preceding the contratenors of *Lizadra donna* and *Pour vous tenir en la grace amoureuse*:

![Fig. 2a](image)  
“MdP”  
*Lizadra donna* contratenor. *Par*, f. 2r  

![Fig. 2b](image)  
“MdP”  
*Pour vous tenir en la grace amoureuse*, contratenor. *Par*, f. 1v
In this case, where a clear example of the manuscript is not necessary to see that the abbreviations are identical in both *Par* and *ModA*, it can be said with some amount of certainty that, all paleographic details aside, the same hand – whether that of a scribe common to both manuscripts or perhaps that of the composer himself – entered de Perusio’s initials in both sources.

*Transmission*

The *Par* concordance of *Più chiar che’l sol* offers an unusual transmission history and raises many questions. The most notable points of interest in the *Par* transmission are the French notation and the contratenor newly composed by Matheus de Perusio. The *Luc* transmission was chosen as a primary source for this study not because it is a more complete transmission than *Par*, but because *Luc* contains the body of Anthonello’s Italian works. In fact, although damaged and illegible in a few places, *Par* is the source which provides a more complete reading since the unfortunate trimming of the *Luc* contratenor leaves that version incomplete.

Although both the French and Italian mensural systems are today well understood, it is instructive to find an instance of a piece existing in both notations. The basis of comparison between the notation in *Luc* and *Par* presupposes that *Luc* is an older source and that the copying of *Più chiar che’l sol* into *Par* involved a scribal decision to convert it from Italian notation to French. In his 1986 dissertation on Trecento scribal practices, John Nàdas has noted that within sources of fourteenth century Italian music, a tendency can be seen in scribal practices of introducing French aspects of notation in pieces
otherwise notated in a fundamentally Italian style\textsuperscript{28}. The dating of \textit{ModA I-V} and \textit{Par} c.1420’s puts them at the end of the \textit{Trecento} and \textit{Ars Nova} periods. The transition to the fundamentally French white mensural notation which was to become the norm for the greater part of the Renaissance was certainly in progress at that time. As Willi Apel pointed out some time ago, the state of notation during the period around 1400 was somewhat varied with French, Italian and hybrid notation co-existing, not just according to local practice, but often within the same manuscript\textsuperscript{29}. This is certainly the case in \textit{Luc} and \textit{ModA}. However, what remains of \textit{Par} seems to be deliberately oriented towards French notation.

Since the dating of \textit{Par} can be tied to \textit{ModA I-V} in the 1420s, we can infer that the move away from the Italian system of \textit{divisiones} expressed by the regular grouping of \textit{breve} values through the \textit{punctus divisionis} was already well under way and moving towards the simplified white notation system as seen in the music of Binchoys and Dufay. A comparison of the notation of \textit{Più chiar che’l sol} in \textit{Luc} and \textit{Par} shows that the scribe understood the Italian system perfectly well as evidenced by the treatment of one-pitch ligatures (see the discussion on notation below) found in the \textit{Luc} transmission of \textit{Più chiar che’l sol} (as well as throughout the Italian pieces in that manuscript). It is possible that \textit{Par} reflects a “modernizing” trend in notation and copying, reinterpreting older works such as \textit{Più chiar che’l sol} in a more up-to-date way while incorporating newer pieces by composers such as Grenon and Fontaine who worked in a simpler Dufay-era French notational idiom – composers whose works are also represented in the Dufay-era


\textsuperscript{29} Willi Apel. \textit{The Notation of Polyphonic Music 900-1600}. 5\textsuperscript{th} ed.. Cambridge, MA: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1953, pp.385-6; 403-4
section of the Reina Codex\textsuperscript{30}. The involvement of Matheus de Perusio in \textit{Par} is telling in this respect.

Matheus de Perusio – an Italian – was certainly of a younger generation than Ciconia who is known to have died in 1412. In a revision of a previously held view that de Perusio died in 1418, Stone has suggested that based on a reading of his ballade \textit{Pres du soloil}, de Perusio may have well been alive past 1425 when she posits his pieces, \textit{Pres du soloil} and \textit{Dame d’honour} were entered as the final pieces in the compilation of \textit{ModA}\textsuperscript{31}. Apel has noted that de Perusio belonged to a group of composers who worked in a post \textit{Ars Subtilior} “modern style” which moved away from complexity and towards an increased musical clarity\textsuperscript{32}. Fontaine and Grenon would most likely be included within this “modern style” group as evidenced by their presence, along with de Perusio, in \textit{Par}. Since de Perusio’s works are only transmitted in \textit{ModA}, and have no circulation in any of the manuscript sources of the time, his career was perhaps at an early stage with his involvement in \textit{Par} possibly being the first source to intend inclusion of his works besides \textit{ModA}. Although what survives are only contratenors to other composers’ songs, it is not impossible that the lost remainder of \textit{Par} contained his works, perhaps pieces from \textit{ModA}.


\textsuperscript{31} See Stone, \textit{The Manuscript…} pp.103-107 for a more detailed discussion concerning de Perusio’s \textit{Pres du soloil} and possible revisions to his death date.

II

Notation of *Più chiar che’l sol*

*Più chiar che’l sol* is notated in the Italian *mensura senaria* perfecta, or “...p.”
resulting in a perfect tempus represented as groups of three imperfect *semibreves* marked
off by *puncti*—the *divisio* for this mensuration. As typical in many manuscripts in this
period, pieces are often devoid of mensural symbols. Although in some pieces these
signs are included to indicate a change of mensuration, they rarely appear at the
beginning of a piece, leaving context as the main identifier of mensuration. This can be
said of French as well as Italian pieces. Even within Anthonello’s Italian pieces in *Luc,*
the use of Italian *divisione* signs is inconsistent in proportion to the rest of the codex. The
French equivalent, *tempus perfectum cum prolatione imperfecta* or ♩ is found in the *Par*
transmission of *Più chiar che’l sol* without the mensuration sign included at the
beginning of the piece. It is a three-voiced piece (cantus, tenor, contratenor as ordered
in both manuscripts), unique among Anthonello’s otherwise two-voiced Italian pieces, and
less common in the Trecento ballata in general. The inclusion of a third voice within a
usually two-voiced form is perhaps a sign of the increasing influence of three-voiced
French forms upon late fourteenth century Italian music.

*Mensuration*

An interesting feature of this piece is the brief menuration change in the latter half
of the *secunda pars,* or *B* section. The mensural shift is notated in *Par* in the typical
French manner: at m.59, the cantus changes to the sign ♩, indicating diminution of

---

33 The Italian equivalent to French mensuration signs.
34 “*Divisio*” refers to the value of a perfect *breve* in *sineria perfecta* (in this case) and its equivalent in
smaller values marked off as rhythmic units by *puncti.*
tempus imperfectum cum prolatione imperfecta or \( \frac{2}{4} \) reduced by half so that the
semibreve has the value of a minim. The tenor changes to the sign \( \odot \) indicating tempus
imperfectum cum prolatione prefecta, thus changing the modern meter from 3/4 to 6/8.
De Perusio’s contratenor follows the tenor with the same mensuration change (see
reproduction of Par in appendix, boxes labeled A, B and C).

The Luc notation of this mensuration change, when compared with Par is unusual.
The Luc mensuration change is not notated – as would be expected – by the usual
divisiones abbreviations but by a rarely used system of symbols: \( \| \) and \( \| \) (see Luc
reproductions in appendix: f. LXVIIIv, boxes A and B, cantus and tenor. Box C found
on f. LXIXr in the contratenor will be discussed later). These signs, not mentioned in
Apel, are found described by Prosdocimus de Beldemandis in his treatise, Tractus
practicae cantus mensurabilis ad modum Ytalorum (c.1412\(^{35}\)):

…to indicate perfection a bar is sometimes drawn through the staff with three dots after it,
denoting the number 3, in which perfection consists, thus: \( \| \) And for imperfection, the same
with two dots, in which imperfection consists, thus: \( \| \) \(^{36}\)

Anna Maria Busse Berger briefly discusses this set of signs in the introductory chapter of
her exhaustive 1993 study Mensuration and Proportion signs\(^{37}\). She touches on systems
of indicating modus, tempus and prolation which include two or three dots within and
without boxes and cites historical sources such as Prosdocimo’s Tractus practicae be
musica mensurabili, and the Florence Manuscript\(^{38}\), none of which list the exact
menuration signs found in the Tractatus pratiue cantus mensurabilis ad modum

\(^{35}\) According to Susanne Clercx, “Propos sur L’ars Nova” in Revue belge de Musicologie, vol. 10 No.3/4, pp.154-160.
\(^{38}\) Florence, Biblioteca Medica Laurenziana, MS Redi 71.
Ytalicorum. Busse Berger cites the treatise of Anonymous XI and XII, in which both “listed ‘old-fashioned’ mensuration signs related to the system of the Florence manuscript and Prosdocimus”\(^{39}\). The list reproduced by Busse Berger has a pair of signs which are similar to those being currently discussed with the exception of diagonal lines matching the number of dots for each sign slanting off from the left side of the line:  \(\overline{\text{\(\frac{1}{3}\)}}\overline{\text{\(\frac{1}{3}\)}}\overline{\text{\(\frac{1}{3}\)}}\). Although these signs are not exactly the same, Busse Berger raises an interesting question: do the three dots (in the signs of her list) refer to perfect mode or perfect prolation? And do the boxes indicate modus and the lines (slanted to the left side of the line) tempus?

Interesting as these questions may be, they do not address the specific signs described by Prosdocimo in *Tractus pratice cantus mensurabilis ad modum Ytalicorum* which are used in Anthonello’s *Più chiar che’l sol*. What relates to Busse Berger’s questions pertaining to the signs listed by Anonymous XI and XII is that the passage quoted above from *Tractus pratice cantus mensurabilis ad modum Ytalicorum* is all that Prosdocimus says on these specific signs, leaving us with a question similar to Busse Berger’s: perfection and imperfection of what? Modus? Tempus? Semibreves?\(^{40}\)

One of the fortunate aspects of having *Più chiar che’l sol* copied in French notation in *Par* is that these questions are answered. The mensurations desired by the *Par* scribe are clear, as discussed above. To review, these are *tempus imperfectum con prolacione imperfecta* with diminution for the cantus and *tempus imperfectum cum prolacione perfecta* for both the tenor and contratenor. These mensuration changes affect

\(^{39}\) *Mensuration and Proportion Signs*, pp. 24-25. The treatise in question are Anonymous XI: *Tractus de musica plana et mensurabili* and Anonymous XII: *Tractus et compendium cantus figurati*.

\(^{40}\) I replace the concept of prolation which normally follows *modus* and *tempus* when dealing the perfection or imperfection of mensural constituents with *semibreve* since in the Italian system, prolation (as conceived in the French system) has no equivalent function.
the cantus by changing both the breve and semibreve into binary values into two groups of four semibreves reduced to the value of minims. Although the corresponding section of Luc is faded, enlargement reveals two divisiones consisting of four semibreves each (the punctus belonging in between each group is obliterated by a tear in the manuscript) framed by Prosdocsimos’ imperfection and perfection signs (appendix: f. LXVIIIv, box A). The tenor (appendix: f. LXVIIIv box B) shows these signs more clearly with the imperfection sign first. Below are reproduced enlargements of the sections at hand:

In the Italian divisiones system, the mensuration octonaria (‘o’) is part of a group of two mensurations belonging to divisio tertia\textsuperscript{41}. Octonaria is based on the imperfect breve but functions on two levels of rhythmic subdivision depending on whether or not the rhythm of a slower previous divisio is to be expressed\textsuperscript{42}. In the case of octonaria, two degrees of slower rhythms result:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Divisio tertia:} & \quad 8 \text{ minim} = 8 \text{ 16}^{\text{th}} \text{ notes} \\
\text{Divisio secunda:} & \quad 4 \text{ semibreves} = 4 \text{ 8}^{\text{th}} \text{ notes} \\
\text{Divisio prima:} & \quad 2 \text{ semibreves} = 2 \text{ quarter-notes}
\end{align*}
\]

\textsuperscript{41} The other behind duodenaria (‘d’).
\textsuperscript{42} For a more complete discussion see Apel in The Notation...pp.396-71. For the mathematical underpinnings of the Italian divisiones see Busse Berger in Mensuration and Proportion Signs, chapter 2.
Figure 3a above shows two groups of four *semibreves* which, according to the sign $\breve{\|}$ are to be interpreted within the context of imperfection - in this case the binary *breve* subdivided at the *divisio secunda* level in *octonaria*, resulting in a faster rhythm, or diminution, as in *Par.*

In the case of the tenor shown in figure 3b, the instruction given by $\breve{\|}$ functions on a *divisio* with only two *semibreves*. The two SS ligatures which, in *sineria perfecta*, would have expressed two *divisones* in *via naturae* rhythm are reinterpreted into two *divisiones* of *quaternaria* ($\breve{q}$), or the modern equivalent, 2/4. However, with *breve* equivalence, this tenor passage could also be interpreted as *sinaria imperfecta* ($\breve{i}$) – 6/8 in modern meter - which, like *quaternaria*, belongs to the same *divisio secunda*. The *Par* scribe seems to have preferred this interpretation for he uses the equivalent French sign $\breve{c}$ instead of $\breve{q}$, the equivalent of *$\breve{i}$*. Under *breve* equivalence, two *semibreves* in *$\breve{q}$* or $\breve{c}$ occupy the same rhythmic space as two *semibreves* in *$\breve{i}$* or $\breve{c}$, allowing the eight *semibreves* of the cantus to work above the lower voices. Since the *Luc* contratenor is trimmed at the mensuration change, the *Par* contratenor’s notation, along with its scribal interpretation of $\breve{c}$ has been adopted in my transcription which notates this section in the contratenor - and for uniformity, the tenor - in 6/8.

What becomes evident is that these signs assume *breve* equivalence – that is, any mensuration changes function within the context of the same *tempus* – and that the signs do not in and of themselves deal with either the quality (perfect or imperfect) of the *breve* or *semibreve* in a specific way, but affect whatever note value is expressed within a

---

particular *divisio*. Thus two semibreves in the tenor must occupy the same rhythmic space as four semibreves in the cantus. The line-and-dot signs, through *breve* equivalence thus resolve the problem of a cantus with a *breve* worth four *minims* superimposed over a tenor with a *breve* worth six *minims* in the case of *Par*.

The sign \( \text{\textsuperscript{1}} \) has a much simpler function than \( \text{\textsuperscript{2}} \) in *Più chiar che'l sol* for it signals the end of the mensural shift and re-perfects what had previously been imperfected, effectively canceling out any changes made to *sineria perfecta* brought about by \( \text{\textsuperscript{2}} \). *Par* returns to its previous mensuration, *tempus perfectum cum prolacione imperfecta* with the sign \( \text{\textsuperscript{0}} \) which, as is often the case in manuscripts of this period, also confirms the initial unmarked mensuration of the piece.

A clue in the *Par* transmission of *Più chiar che'l sol* confirms the *Par* scribe’s understanding of *breve* equivalence built into the line-and-dot mensuration signs in *Luc*. Transcribing *Più chiar che'l sol* into modern notation reveals that in *Par*, the mensuration change in the tenor and contratenor to \( \text{\textsuperscript{c}} \) occurs one measure *before* the cantus (see m. 58 of my transcripton in the appendix). Taking place on a *breve* in both voices, the indication of this change seems unnecessary here since the *breve* in the main mensuration \( \text{\textsuperscript{0}} \) is worth the same six *minims* as in the new mensuration \( \text{\textsuperscript{c}} \). The only reason to notate the mensuration shift in this way is to acknowledge *breve* equivalence in the next measure, perhaps as a means of clarifying the reading.

*One-pitch ligatures*

Introduced at the end of the first section of the current discussion (see *Transmission*, above) the one-pitch ligature is a distinct aspect of Italian notation converted into French notation by the *Par* scribe. The one-pitch ligature - notated as two
note-heads touching, but not overlapping with a *punctus divisionis* above the juncture (see figure 4 below) has several functions, as explained by John Nàdas: to note elisions in the text; to create syncopated rhythms; and to express larger note values otherwise not possible.\(^\text{44}\)

**Fig. 4**
One-pitch ligatures found in *Luc*.  

A key difference between French and Italian notation is embodied in the one-pitch ligature: a different conception of the organization of musical time. The one-pitch ligatures, as notated within the context of regularly occurring *divisiones* highlight the Italian concept of recurring regular tempus – in the case of *Più chiar che’l sol*, the perfect breve. The adjacency of note heads at the *punctus divisionis* shows a consciousness of metrical boundary which requires a note to be physically linked to another on the other side of the boundary to create a continuous sound over and through it in order to syncopate. It is difficult to separate this from the modern concept of tying over the barline which is exactly how the one-pitch ligature is transcribed in modern notation (see figures 5 a, b and c below below).

The French adaptation of the one-pitch ligature in *Par* shows a very different organization of metrical space, representing syncopation with imperfect breves by means of coloration (void black in this instance), imperfection or alteration. In passages with more extensive use of one-pitch ligatures, the French requires a combination of

---

\(^{44}\)Nàdas, *The Transmission*…pp.100.
coloration - locally switching from perfect to imperfect tempus to accommodate the breve-level syncopation – and imperfection, as in the excerpt represented below:

**Fig. 5a**
*Più chiar che'l sol in Luc: one-pitch ligatures in cantus, B section.*

**Fig. 5b**
*Più chiar che'l sol in Par: cantus, B section. French interpretation of one-pitch ligatures.*

*Note: The void semibreve in brackets should be black. The dotted quarter note which the void form suggests is not possible since no minim or minim rest is nearby to complete the syncopation which would result.*

**Fig. 5c.** *Più chiar che'l sol: cantus, B section. Transcription of one-pitch ligatures above. (see full transcription in appendix, mm. 51-58)*

The one-pitch ligatures in the *Luc* excerpt using the *semibreve major* (with the downward tail) represent the Italian practice of *via artis*, that is, with the longer note value in the beginning position of the *divisio*. Literally meaning “in the artificial way”, this practice is analogous to the French practice of imperfection *a parte post*, where a note is imperfected by a preceding one of smaller value. The one-pitch ligatures consisting of 2 semibreves per *divisio* are examples of the Italian *via naturae* practice, literally “in the natural way”. The function of *via naturae* is similar to alteration in the French system where “[i]f in any divisio S [ie. semibreves] are used in smaller number than that of the normal groupings,…the last of these S will be lengthened.”French alteration stipulates

---

45 Apel. *The Notation…*p.372. In his chapter on Italian notation, Apel sums up the general rules of the Italian *divisiones* system given by Marchett da Padua in the *Pomerium musicae mensuratae* (c.1325)
that a note value is doubled before one of greater value, generally at the end of a group of similar note values which would otherwise be too short to complete a perfection. In many cases, this results in the same rhythm created by *via naturae*. However, it should be noted that *via naturae* can also be compared with imperfection *a parte ante* in the French system where a note value is imperfected by a smaller value following it. The above excerpt shows that the one-pitch ligatures connecting groups of three *semibreves* per *divisio* beginning on F are represented in *Par* by means of imperfection *a parte ante* in a way which ignores the rhythmic boundary of the *diviso*. Thus the French system represents the resulting syncopation more faithfully for its own sake.

What is clear from the discussion above is that in some ways, the Italian system is more transparent while at the same time constricted by the *divisio*. The rules for representing the metric pulses short-long and long-short are standardized and generally invariable, often as a result of notation with one meaning, such as the *semibreve major* which stands for a value of 2 *semibreves*. The French mensuration system largely depends on context and the placement of the *punctus divisionis* which is used to prevent alteration and imperfection. In some cases, the *punctus divisionis* can have multiple functions, as in cases where its prevention of alteration or imperfection results in a syncopated passage, thus making the *punctus* a *punctus syncopationis* at the same time. The *punctus additionis* in imperfect mensurations, used to perfect imperfect note values also often results in syncopation, thus giving that *punctus* a double function as well.

It is thus the *punctus* that clarifies the Italian *divisio*, which also necessitates the standardization of note values as expressed in various note shapes which, if crossing the rhythmic boundary of the *punctus divisionis*, must be expressed through means such as
the one-pitch ligature, retaining the representation of the divisio. Conceptually, this is a limitation on the complexity of rhythm available to the system of divisiones. The French use of the punctus, with all its ambiguities (and increased potential for scribal error) is nonetheless a flexible tool with which composers could conceive more complex rhythms without the concern that perfections occur at regularly prescribed intervals.
III

Transcription Issues

Following the completion of my transcription, I cross-referenced my work with Thomas W. Marrocco’s 1977 transcription. Although Marrocco’s transcription shares many conclusions about the correct interpretation of *Più chiar che’l sol* with my own, there are several points on which I cannot agree with Marrocco, most notably his omission of clearly notated rests and his misinterpretation of the only mensuration change in the piece.

Rests

The first issue between Marrocco’s transcription and the manuscript sources deal with rests. Although transcribing mensural music, especially *French Ars Nova/Subtilior* notation necessarily involves some amount of interpretation due to inherent flexibilities and complexities (the former which is meant to accommodate the latter), there are occasions when manuscripts agree in very clear ways. *Più chiar che’l sol* is constructed in the Italian *ballata* form consisting of 2 sections: *A* (*prima pars*) and *B* (*secunda pars*), with eight stanzas of poetry, setting 2 lines each, arranged *AbbabbaA*:

A. 1.8. *Più chiar che’l sol in lo mio cor Lucia//*
    Liçadra figura de vuy, Madonna mia.
B.  2.  *Con tanta beltà vey pose natura//*
    Che’l mio core e tuto sfamicato.
  3.  *Et arde çorno e notte e mia fortuna//*
    Non vol ch’ûn po da vuy io sia aittato.
A.  4.  *Ma sempre el vostro cor crudo e spietato//*
    Sta inverso mi, non ça per mia folia.
B.  5.  *Pero prego che umile e graciosa, //*
    Vuy siate al quanto poiche’l vero Dio.
  6.  *V’a fatta tanto bella e vertuosa//*

---

Che al mondo non a par’ quel volto pio.
A. 7. Se non che inverso mi troppo e cudio/
    In darme pena con fortuna ria.

In both manuscripts, each line of the cantus and tenor - A and B sections - is divided with clearly notated with breve rests. Although both untexted, The Par and Luc contratenors are also notated with rests which correspond to the text break – breve rests in Par, exactly lining up with the cantus and tenors of both parts and longa rests in Luc. Furthermore, the text underlay for the cantus and tenor in Luc marks off each of the two lines of poetry with the sign // (See appendix: the black arrows and black circles in the reproduction of the Luc manuscript facsimile shows the rests and text breaks in question). These rests appear to be designed to create a dramatic pause in the music and are omitted altogether in Marrocco’s transcription. The reasons for these omissions are not entirely clear. A reading of the critical apparatus in PMFC X shows that he was aware of the rests as they are noted in the list of source variants. There is, however, no clue as to why he chose to leave them out – neither in the critical apparatus, introductory notes, nor anywhere else in the volume. I can only therefore speculate as to what may have guided Marrocco’s decision in this matter.

There seem to be separate issues with regards to these rests between the A and B sections. The main problem with transcribing the A section was that the line of the contratenor ended up to be a measure too long. As a matter of principle, I give scribes the benefit of the doubt in the area of scribal errors, until all other possibilities seem exhausted. In this case, I was left with two choices with which to reduce the A section by one measure in the contratenor: the first was to assume a scribal error with regards to the ascending SSB ligature near the beginning of the second contratenor staff (eighth down from the top of fol. LXIXr) where the scribe may have mistakenly penned a breve instead of a semibreve. The other solution was
to interpret the *longa* rest on the same staff as a scribal error, which is what Marrocco seems to have done. The ligature is, however correct. Groups of three semibreves in this piece (and in *sineria perfecta* in general) are always expressed without ligature and between *puncti*. This leaves the *longa* rest as the only possible scribal error in this section of the contratenor.

The problem with treating this *longa* rest as a scribal error is that it is worth two breves (or two measures of 3/4 transcription), leaving the line one measure short – unless, as done by Marrocco, the corresponding *breve* rests in the cantus and tenor are also removed. My solution to this problem is perhaps a compromise. My view is that if scribal error is ascribed to *longa* rest, it is that the rest should have been a *breve* rest, as in the other parts. This allows the pause which is clearly desired by the composer to remain as well as making the contratenor line end together at the final A section cadence. Furthermore, the *Par* contratenor, although differently composed by de Perusio, has a *breve* rest which corresponds with the pause in the A section in the other voices of both manuscripts.

In the B section, the same *longa* rest is found at the line break, with *breve* rests in the other parts. In this case, however, I do not have reason to believe that the scribe was in error. The *longa* rest can be kept in the contratenor without arriving at an incorrect line length. It does, however cause the pause in the B section to be a variant of the A section pause in that the contratenor drops from the musical texture on measure before the other voices. All voices are then resting in the following measure and re-enter together. Perhaps the scribe assumed that the rests in both sections should be the same, as in the other parts. I suspect that along similar lines, Marrocco omitted the rests in the B section as well to stay consistent with his solution to the A section *longa* rest. However, this would have left him one measure
Although perhaps not a solution-oriented decision, it is the misreading of another rest in the contratenor’s B section which allowed Marrocco to reclaim his lost measure.

The rest in question is on the last staff of Luc fol. LXIXr, after the fourth breve in the B section (see appendix: the rest is circled in red with a red arrow). Marrocco interpreted this as a breve rest. It is actually a semibreve rest. The scribe who copied this section of the manuscript tends to write semibreve and minim rests rather close to the staff line opposite their starting points, but never actually touching the opposite line. Breve rests penned by this scribe are in every case in contact with both staff lines bordering the space which these rests occupy. Admittedly, the difference can in some instances be subtle. Be that as it may, there is another example of an almost identical semibreve rest after the longa rest in the Luc contratenor’s B section which Marrocco does not read as a breve rest (see appendix: the rest is circled in blue with a blue arrow). The result is that Marrocco is forced to transcribe the arrival to the cadence at the now omitted longa rest with an inaccurate representation of the contratenor’s rhythm which is otherwise perfectly clear in spite of the manuscript having been trimmed in that particular area.

Below is a reproduction of the B section of the Luc contratenor:

![Fig. 6. Luc f. LXIXr. Contratenor, bottom staff.](image)

The red circled rest is the semibreve rest mistaken for a longa rest by Marrocco, and the blue circled rest, nearly identical, is correctly interpreted by Marrocco as a semibreve rest. Note that the above excerpt is in tenor clef (C-clef on the middle staff line), with a B-flat in the signature.

Marrocco’s reading of the above section, beginning from the breve preceding the red circled rest and ending at the succeeding the B-natural breve, runs thus:
Having omitted the rest assumed to be a breve rest, Marrocco is forced to begin a new divisio with the following semibreve pitch A. Due to trimming, some interpretation is called for.

Marrocco interprets the first two-note divisio (between the rest and the punctus) as semibreve major – semibreve, using via arte to make the perfection. It is difficult to interpret Marrocco’s treatment of the next divisio though not because of the trimming. There is only one possible reading of the line and note-head since both are between puncti: semibreve rest – semibreve major. Since each divisio in this mensuration must add up to three semibreves, the interpretation of the line as a minim stem is impossible; neither can the line be a breve rest for the divisio would have four semibreves. Since the rest must be a semibreve rest, a downward tail for the B-flat note-head must be inferred. Marrocco’s transcription drastically departs from here: in addition to an incorrect rhythmic rendering, there are pitches which are not present in the manuscript, including one A too many. I will let the reader assess these differences for him or herself, rather than offering an overlong explanation which can only be based on conjecture. Instead, I offer below a suggestion for the reconstruction of the trimmed area of this section of the manuscript:

---

47 Via naturae (SS between puncti) is an equally valid possibility which reverses the positions of the half-note and quarter-note for the measure. This alternative takes for granted the misinterpreted rest in question.
My reading is as follows, interpreting Marrocco’s misinterpreted rest as a *semibreve* rest (see also my complete transcription, mm.46-50, in the appendix. Of note is the unresolved/avoided cadence at m.50-51 created by withdrawing the contratenor’s resolution of B-natural at the cadential point – a device which relies on the *longa* rest):

Fig. 9. CT mm. 46-50 of my transcription (see appendix for the complete transcription)

In his 1992 transcription, Pedro Memelsdorff⁴⁸ makes similar decisions regarding the rests discussed above. Since his study does not delve into any specific notational issues, it is again difficult to ascertain what drove his decision to omit them. However, since his study also critically examines Marrocco’s edition and corrects misreadings of *Più chiar che l’ sol*, it may be that he found Marrocco’s solution to the rests satisfactory. One slight but perhaps revealing difference however, sheds some light on how Memelsdorff perceived the functions of these rests: in his transcription, he adds a breath mark (‘’) above all the staves acknowledging a pause. However, a breathing pause is somewhat different that measured rests, as found with consistency in both manuscript sources. Moreover, Memelsdorff falls into the same error as Marrocco regarding the trimmed portion on the contratenor at the bottom of *Luc* f. LXIXr shown in figs. 6 and 8. His transcription of this section⁴⁹ reads as follows:

---

⁴⁸ “*Più chiar che l’ sol...*” Appendix, pp. 16-21.
⁴⁹ Ibid, p. 20, mm. 45-50.
As can be observed in the reconstruction in fig. 8, this reading, though close, is incorrect as it extends the value of two outer semibreves in the divisio preceding the B-natural breve to the value of. As can be easily seen, two semibeves major cannot fit together within a divisio in seneria perfecta, much less with a semibreve in the middle. The effect of this interpretation, however, is that Memelsdorff is able to do away with the metric value of the of the breve rest which brings lines up all the voices at the breath mark by increasing the length of the line.

But the manuscript evidence does not support this manipulation of the rhythmic design of the line.

To conclude the issue of omitted rests which, I believe was an unnecessary editorial choice on both Marrocco’s and Memelsdorff’s parts, I offer an observation made some time ago by A. Bonaccorsi, concerning the musical function of the pauses in Più chiar che’l sol:

Here we have a sober continuous line which is interrupted by lively rests, though not dramatically so; a natural way for the melody to be prolonged, which introduces to it motion and propulsion but also new and varied elements between lively rests. This is a feature not found in the Gregorian manner which breathes only at the end of a phrase, almost, we might say, physically. Neither [is it to be found] in lauda of the trovatori nor in the Minnaesänger which feature rests that are strophic but not dynamic. We can say that the Trecento used this style in melodies for the first time, this particular kind of expression, we are trying to say, that is derived from the Ars antigue where, however, the rest is represented by a state of “indifference” (see for instance the motet of Perotin, Alleluja Pascha nostrum). This detail is somewhat important and we believe it has not been singled out before.

It is important to note, however, that in some instances, especially those dealing with imperfection in French notation, a certain amount of interpretation in often warranted and at time necessary to make sense of a particular passage. Longer passages which depend on imperfection to achieve rhythmic variety are sometimes ambiguously notated without consistent use of the punctus divisionis to clarify perfections.

Un nuovo Codice dell’“Ars Nova”: Il Codice Lucchese, p.591: Qui si ha una linea sobriamente contenuta, che le pause vive interrompono, per quanto non ancora dramaticamente: un’istintiva risorsa della melodia per prolungarsi, che immete, oltre che il moto, la propulsione, fra pause vive e pause vive, fra elementi nuovi e variati.

Questo modo non si trovava nel gregoriano, che respira a fin di frase e quasi, diremo, fisicamente, ne nelle lauda e nemmeno nei trovatori e nei Minnaesänger, nei cui canti si notano pause stropiche ma non dinamiche; e si può dire che fu il trecento ad impiegare nella monodia, per la prima volta, questo stilema, questa singola espressione; ad impiegare questo stilema, vogliamo dire, come derivato dall’Ars antiqua, dove però il riposo e rappresentato da uno stato “indifferente” (si veda il motetto di Perotin su Alleluja Pascha nostrum). Il rilievo ha qualche importanza e non crediamo sia stato fatto da altri.

The responsibility for the translation is mine. I am indebted to Michele Zaccagnini at Brandeis University for his assistance in translating this passage.
Clearly, Bonaccorsi shows an appreciation for Anthonello’s novelty, writing out breaths into the music but emphasizing a dramatic function, certainly more that a breathing point for the singers. Thus an interesting characteristic of *Più chiar che’il sol* is missed by both editors through the omission of these “breaths” from their transcription and removing an otherwise authentic performance aspect.

As is now plainly apparent, the trimming of *Luc* is a hindrance in rendering an accurate reading of the contratenor. However a plausible reconstruction is not impossible. Having proposed above a reconstruction of the contratenor as it pertained to the issue of rests, I will now look at the other trimmed contratenor portions at the bottom of *Luc* fol. LXIXr and suggest a possible reconstruction which again differs from Marrocco’s transcription. Below are reproduced the end of the seventh staff of folio and the beginning of the eighth staff (see appendix: Blue boxes labeled A and B, respectively, in the reproduction of fol.LXIXr):

![Fig. 11a](image-a) ![Fig. 11b](image-b)

Figure 11a shows the beginning of a *divisio*, starting with a *minim* G and continuing with the trimmed pitch A. This *divisio* continues in figure 11b with the note-head B-flat. Measure 30 in my transcription (see appendix), beginning with the bracket, corresponds to the beginning of the *divisio* at the end of staff 7 of the manuscript. Marrocco’s transcription shares the beginning point at m.30, but with brackets in a different place in the measure. As can be seen from both transcriptions, 3 measures are required in order for the contratenor to
end together with the other two voices. Marrocco’s transcription unfolds as follows, beginning with the minim at the edge of the manuscript in figure 11a above:

This reading suggests the following notation:

This rendition, although fulfilling the 3-measure requirement for the completion of the A section, does not conform to what is present in the manuscript. Upon interpreting the trimmed note-head in figure 11a as a semibreve, Marrocco must add another minim and semibreve to complete the group. The bracketed section of his transcription suggests this as a solution but nowhere in figure 11b can a minim or semibreve rest be found. The minim and semibreve rest suggested by figure 12a cannot exist as a reconstructive feature of figure 11b, even realizing that the notation below the trim line can be hypothesized: the B-flat minim in figure 12b corresponds to the initial B-flat note-head figure 11b which clearly cannot have a minim stem, as all minims have upward stems, regardless of staff position, well into the fifteenth century. The following minim rest in figure 12b (quarter rest in figure 12a) is also impossible since there is a note-head G immediately following the B-flat note head (see figure 11b). In accordance with the scribe in this layer of Luc, semibreve rests follow or precede a note on the same or closest staff line (see Luc fols. LXIXr and LXVIIIv in appendix: the green circles mark off some examples of semibreve rest placements). Not
only are the two note-heads too close together to fit a rest, but the *semibreve* rest in question would be assumed to be below the trim line – too low in relationship to the note-heads assumably on either side of it. If such a rest were to exist, it would most appropriately have a starting point downward on the A staff line.

The central *divisio* of figure 12b is plausible as a *semibreve major – semibreve*, inferring the downward tail of the former and hypothesizing the latter below the trim line. The B-flat is incorrect however (figure 11b). As for the penultimate *divisio* before the *longa*, Marrocco approaches the pre-*longa* pitch, G, from above, demanding not only a pitch which does not exist in that place in the manuscript (the pitch A which would be above the trim line) but infers a descending SS ligature, *via naturae*. As is evident from the last *punctus* in figure 11b and the G note head which leads to the A *longa*, the missing pitch must be an F from below. *Via naturae* is not possible here since the G note-head is not in ligature form and an ascending tail is not present above the trim line.

My solution to the trimmed areas discussed above as figures 11a and 11b are shown in the reconstructions below:

These suggested reconstructions infer what may have originally been below the trim line using what is left above it as clues. The second-to-last pitch must come from below but cannot be an ascending SS ligature due to the lack of an ascending tail, part of which would
remain visible above the trim line. Thus, *via naturae* or *via artis* remains the only option. Since a similar situation presents itself in the middle *divisio* of figure 10b, the use of a *one-pitch* ligature seemed an appropriate way to satisfy the need for *via artis* in both *divisiones*. The decision of whether the note-heads above the trim line or the hypothesized ones below received a *semibreve major* tail was made by examining the use of the *one-pitch* ligature in the rest of *Più chiar che’l sol*. The form suggested in the reconstruction of figure 11b is used with consistency in every voice of the piece⁵³. My transcription of the reconstructions presented above reads thus:

\[\text{Fig. 13c. CT mm. 31-33 of my transcription (see appendix for the complete transcription)}\]

Although Memelsdorff also arrived at the conclusion presented above, he does not take into account the possibility of a one-pitch ligature which ties the beat 3 F in m. 32 to the beat one F in m. 33 and represents these pitches as unconnected. As noted above, the use of a one-pitch ligature is notationally consistent within the context of *Più chiar che’l sol*.

**Mensuration**

Another oversight by Marrocco, and a rather important one, concerns the mensuration change discussed above. As mentioned previously, this is the only change of mensuration in

---

⁵² It is not impossible to infer a representation of *via naturae* without ligature, consisting of 2 separate *semibreves* between *puncti*. However, this is not consistent with the notation in this and many other Italian pieces in *Luc* which represent *via artis* in *sineria perfecta* with ligature.

⁵³ Another one-pitch ligature possibility, found in *A Pianger l’occhi mey*, for instance, is the non-ligated *semibreve* form which represents 2 *divisios* in *via naturae* rhythm (with the second *semibreve* having the value of an imperfect *breve*), resulting in the modern rhythm: \[\text{\underline{1} \underline{1} \underline{1}}\]. This form, however, is not used anywhere else in *Più chiar che’l sol*. 
*Più chiar che'l sol*, thus making it an important musical moment. The mensuration change occurs at m. 57 of Marrocco’s transcriprion but is unmarked in his layout. His tenor reads as it should – two measures of dotted-quarter note rhythm - but in the wrong meter (3/4 instead of 6/8 – see above, pp. 17-18). The cantus, however, continues to read in 3/4 with three quarter-notes per measure, implying that there has been no mensuration change, and especially not one which calls for diminution (see figure 14 below).

![Fig. 14. Marrocco transcription, mm.57-8, Cantus and tenor. PMFC X, p.69.](image)

It is difficult at this point to guess at his thinking. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that Marrocco failed to recognize or understand the line-and-dot signs in *Luc* - whether this was due to the fading in the cantus or the trimming of the contratenor - he certainly must have understood the fairly common mensuration signs in *Par*, as evidenced by his rendering of the tenor. If this is in fact the case, the inference which follows is that Marrocco chose to ignore the very clear mensural instructions for the cantus of *Par*. Marrocco’s critical apparatus lists the *Par* variant “[m.]58 C reads sCDBCDCCB” with the small “s” before the string of pitch designations identifying *semibreves*. From this it is plain that Marrocco was aware of the notation of the cantus. I can offer at least two conjectures for his editorial choice with regards to the cantus at the mensuration change:

54 The line-and-dot signs in the *Luc* tenor *are,* however, quite legible.

55 PMFC X, p.150.
1. Item No.2 in Marrocco’s critical apparatus for *Più chiar che’l sol* identifies the piece’s mensuration as “In {s.p.} throughout”\(^{56}\). In this case, he assumed *sineria perfecta* for the entire piece and passed over the faded section of the *Luc* cantus, assuming that what he lists in the critical apparatus as a *Par* variant was in error. This does not, of course, explain his correct reading of the tenor. On the faded section of the *Luc* cantus (figure 3a above), it should be mentioned that there are two other instances in *Luc* where the line-and-dot system is used in the exact same way as in *Più chiar che’l sol*: Bartholini de Padua’s *ballata*, *Non chorrer troppo e tien la mano al freno* (f. XXXIv) and Ciconia’s *madrigal*, *I cani sono fuora per le mosse* (f. LXXXv – LXXXIv). The cantus in both pieces confirms the faded portion of *Luc* under discussion – figure 3a above – showing two *divisiones* of four *semibreves* between the signs † and †, respectively.

2. Marrocco understood the reading in *Par*, but did not take into account *breve* equivalence, giving him a nonsensical reading, as shown below:

![Fig. 15](image)

From a rhythmic standpoint, the two lower staves of figure 15 – the tenor in *tempus imperfectum cum prolatione perfecta* with the cantus in *tempus imperfectum cum prolatione imperfecta* without diminution – seem to be Marrocco’s general interpretation, minus the two

\(^{56}\) *Ibid.*
extra quarter-notes (*semibreves*) which exceed the two measures of the tenor (compare with figure 14).

As it stands, Marrocco’s transcription suggests *some* level of extra rhythmic interest in the tenor which is, however, quite different from the piece shifting entirely to a binary pulse which heightens the suspense of the musical texture. Perhaps he favored the hemiola created between the cantus and tenor in his rendering. Unfortunately, the critical apparatus is not particularly forthcoming as to what guided Marrocco’s choices. Be that as it may, his transcription misses an important musical moment which, in his rendition, is passed by almost unnoticed.

Marrocco’s contratenor also reads strangely from the mensuration change onward. The *Luc* contratenor ends at the mensuration change, where the manuscript is trimmed. In his critical apparatus, Marroco states that the *Luc* “CT is mutilated and incomplete, ending at m.56” of his transcription. This measure number corresponds to the bottom right hand corner of *Luc* fol. LXIXr (see *Luc* fol. LXIXr in appendix in the box labeled “C”). Accordingly, the assumption is that Marrocco continued the contratenor from *Par* - at least in part - perhaps filling in some spots himself. He comments to that effect in his critical apparatus: “Missing m [ie. measures] in *Man* [ie. *Luc*] partially reconstructed from *Parma.*” This perhaps explains the lack of relationship between Marrocco’s mm.57-8 and the manuscript sources. However, the mensuration change in the *Par* contratenor is not so illegible as to prevent a transcription. Below is an enlargement of the *Par* contratenor at the mensuration change (see appendix, *Par* reproduction box “C”):

\[\text{\textit{Ibid.}}\]
Figure 16 is rather clear, and should yield the following transcription:

![Figure 16](image)

Compare figure 16 with figure 17 below, Marrocco’s rendering of the two measures of the contratenor mensuration change:

![Figure 17](image)

Although Marrocco specifies that the Par contratenor can be “partially reconstructed from Parma”, implying that he will fill in some of the gaps, figure 16 clearly shows that Par is not in need of conjecture in this particular section. I offer what I believe is the correct reading of the mensuration change for comparison with figure 13 above:

![Figure 18](image)

![Figure 19](image)
The *Luc* contratenor, however, does not end at “m. 56”. The clues which point to the rest of the *Luc* contratenor involve the “line and dot” mensuration signs which Marrocco misunderstood, and as a result, may have caused him to miss them. Below (fig. 20) is the end of the trimmed contratenor on the bottom staff of f. LXIXr, (see fig. 6 above). The enlargement reveals the upper portion of the sign $\frac{\overline{\underline{\text{}}}}{\underline{\text{}}}$, the lower portion of which is reconstructed. Following the sign the faded remains of a *breve* and ascending SS ligature can be seen. These form the two measure mensuration change discussed above. This sign is an important clue for on the bottom of f. LXVIIIv, the partially ledgible but badly trimmed section of music which Marrocco must have written off as unrelated begins with the upper portion of the sign $\frac{\overline{\underline{\text{}}}}{\underline{\text{}}}$, clearly showing the return to ternary mensuration for the contratenor line (see fig. 21).

![Fig. 20. Mensuration sign, f. LXIXr, lower right corner of folio.](image)

Recognizing these features, Memelsdorff inferred the notation from the fragmented section of f. LXVIIIv and was able to complete the *Luc* contratenor. I have included this completion
in my transcription (see appendix). Based on Memelsdorff’s transcription\(^{58}\), fig. 22 suggest a reconstruction of the trimmed section in question. Areas where the ink is severely faded have been outlined for clarity.

Fig. 22. Reconstruction of Luc CT, f. LXVIIIv. Based on Memelsdorff’s transcription.

Contratenor transmission: Luc and Matheus de Perusio

One major issue remains, brought up once more by Marrocco’s critical apparatus concerning Matheus de Perusio’s contratenor in Par. Marrocco states that “[w]hat is legible appears to have little in common with Man [ie. Luc] CT, therefore a collation of the CT would be of no value.”\(^{59}\) This statement prompted me to separately transcribe the entire Par contratenor which is mostly legible, even on microfilm. I was not entirely surprised to find that the extant part of the Luc and Par contratenors have very much in common. I refer the reader to my transcription in the appendix which includes the Par contratenor transcribed directly below the Luc contratenor. Although forced to leave some blank sections in brackets where the reading was impossible, the Par contratenor is almost entirely complete. What is evident up to the point where the Luc contratenor leaves off and is replaced by Par, is the connectedness of both versions. When composing his contratenor, de Perusio was certainly aware of the Luc version if it was not in fact his exemplar.

\(^{58}\) Mendesdorff”, “Più chiar che’l sol…” p. 21, mm. 60-70.

\(^{59}\) Ibid.
The *Par* contratenor shows an awareness of key harmonic moments, rhythm and notation. There are many examples, which the reader can easily find in my transcription. I will, however, mention a few notable areas, the most striking of which involves the reconstruction of the *prima pars* (A section) final cadence, discussed at length above (see pp.21-24). In that discussion, I proposed a reading of the trimmed sections of the *Luc* contratenor involving a one-pitch ligature (see figures 12a-c above). It happens that the corresponding *Par* section of the contratenor confirms not only the rhythmic reading, but some of the pitches as well:

Many of the differences in the two contratenors result from the increase of rhythmic activity given by de Perusio in *Par*. In sections such as mm. 23-24 and m.45, we can see the rhythmic interest added to the line while respecting the main pitches of the *Luc* version. In instances such as m.5 and m. 43, de Perusio adds chromatically inflected pitches which are based on the corresponding Luc pitches so that in m.5 G becomes G-sharp and in m.43, C becomes C-sharp. A final important feature which follows *Luc* rather faithfully is the inclusion in the *Par* contratenor of the “breath” breve pauses which I discussed at length above.

Marrocco’s claim that the *Luc* and *Par* contratenors are unrelated refers to the impossibility of listing variants between manuscripts since they contain music which is not generally identical. An unfortunate aspect of the style of critical apparatus which he uses is
that the statement, “[w]hat is legible appears to have little in common with Man [ie. Luc] CT, therefore a collation of the CT would be of no value”\textsuperscript{60}, can be misinterpreted as “the contratenors have nothing to do with each other”. And while it is certainly true that there are no variants, \textit{per se}, to comment on between de Perusio’s contratenor and Anthonello’s, I have found the side-by-side comparison instructive. Matheus de Perusio’s treatment is that of embellishment, not replacement or revision. I would therefore suggest that the \textit{Par} contratenor is a valid complete substitute for performances of \textit{Più chiar che’l sol}, owing to its connectedness to the \textit{Luc} exemplar\textsuperscript{61}. The final issue, then, is that of which contratenor to include in an edition. Marrocco opted for a 50/50 hybrid, using \textit{Luc} until m. 56 of his transcription and switching to a “partial reconstruction” of \textit{Par}, most likely filling in blanks himself. However, with Memelsdorff’s reconstruction, this is no longer necessary and both versions may stand individually. However, Matheus de Perusio’s contratenor, with its close relationship to Anthonello’s is certainly a valid choice for performance based on performer choice, especially since the cantus and tenors of \textit{Luc} and \textit{Par} only deviate from each other in minimal ways, and then mostly in matters of contrasting notational styles.

\textsuperscript{60} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{61} We obviously cannot know if other heretofore unknown fourteenth century manuscripts may have contained their own copies of \textit{Più chiar che’l sol}. Other fragmentary manuscripts such as \textit{Pist} and \textit{pad B} which both transmit Anthonello’s \textit{A pianger l’occhi mey} can reasonably be assumed to have been large collections similar to \textit{Par} and could have contained other works by Anthonello. For the moment, however, although only \textit{Luc}, and \textit{Par} are available, we can at least be certain that \textit{Più chiar che’l sol} was transmitted in \textit{Luc} as much as ten years prior to the compilation of \textit{ModA} layer I-V and \textit{Par}.
EDITORIAL PRINCIPLES/LAYOUT

1. Although I generally believe that barlines are best left as suggestive between staves when representing measureless mensural music, I make an exception in this case. The Italian divisiones system is much more preoccupied with organizing musical time in regularly recurring rhythmic patterns as discussed above under the heading “One-pitch ligatures”. The one-pitch ligatures, suggestive of the tie across the modern barline have also contributed to my decision to include barlines in my transcription.

2. I find the critical apparatus as formatted by Thomas W. Marrocco and others to be lacking in transparency in part because it is tedious to read, and also because it is disembodied from any musical representation – whether it be the manuscript or the transcription. It lacks justification in prose, leaving the reader to take the editor at his word. In some cases, it can be misleading as in the case of the mensuration change in Più chiar che’l sol. Without any markings on the transcription and a close reading of the critical apparatus, a reader without a manuscript reproduction could take an erroneous reading at face value. The listing of a significant variant such as, in the case of Più chiar che’l sol, the eight semibreve pitches in the Par cantus without prose to explain the transcribed reading which varies considerably raises questions as to editorial intent.

The solution to this sort of critical apparatus problem is in part inspired by the layout of Wili Apel’s French Secular Music of the Late Fourteenth Century. In this edition, Apel discards the critical apparatus in favor of listing variants and other clarifications such as manuscript mensuration signs within the body of his transcriptions. In addition, Apel included some amount
of prose commentary for each of the 81 pieces included. In the case of more complex pieces, Apel also included several manuscript reproductions.

My approach is along similar lines. My transcription includes mensuration signs as found in both manuscripts above the staff of each voice. Accidental variants are also labeled as such above the appropriate staff as are any pitch variants which may occur. Generally, I hold the view that including more manuscript information within the transcription can only contribute to increased editorial transparency. Since this study only deals with one piece of music, I have the luxury of having its main body function as commentary.

3. Ligatures are indicated by brackets in the usual manner. For the most part, these brackets will appear above the relevant section of music. In some instances, spacing will require ligature brackets to appear below sections of music.

4. Comments on certain readings or sections will be announced by numbers with parentheses, 1), 2), etc… These notes will be directly following the transcription in the “Transcription Notes” section.

5. Simple manuscript variants will appear above the staff in each voice with a manuscript designation with the primary manuscript notation above the staff and the variant superimposed. In most cases the designation “Par:” will be in the upper position since Luc is the primary source used for the transcription. For the most part, these variants are binary semibreve ligatures in Par which stand for non-ligated semibreves in Luc and instances where Luc binary semibreve
ligatures (*via naturae*) are interpreted in *Par* using imperfection *a parte ante*– quarter-note – half-note in modern transcription. Instances of *via artis* rhythms which use the semibreve major can be assumed to be represented by the half-note – quarter-note measure in modern transcription, notated as *breve-semibreve* in *Par*, using imperfection *a parte post*. These notational comparisons are not included in the transcription due to spacing concerns but can be understood as suggested above. See also pp. 18-20 above under “One-Pitch Ligatures”.

6. Other significant variants which bear on the interaction of the Italian and French systems are announced in the transcription by “V.” followed by a dotted line which shows the extent of the relevant section. These variants will be reproduced in a notationally superimposed fashion, *Luc* above *Par*, with corresponding measure numbers and will be found in the section of the appendix titled “Variants”.

7. *Musica ficta* is placed in the usual manner above the staff. For the most part, these are B-flats which avoid tritones of direct flat/natural clashes. My approach is to use these *ficta* flats only when absolutely necessary.

8. Bracketed sections of music reflect a suggested reading of trimmed, faded, or mutilated portions of both manuscripts. In instances where a section from *Par* must be imported into *Luc*, due to a more reliable reading, a bracket will appear above the staff with the label “*Parma*”. 
9. The complete Par contratenor is included below the Luc contratenor, to facilitate a running comparison between both contratenors.

11. Finally, as it is beyond the scope of the present study, I have deferred to Pedro Memelsdorff in matters of the text-setting layout on p. 18. Since I have not at this time examined the text and form of Più chiar che’l sol in any detailed manner, it has been left out of the transcription and the reader is referred, at this time, Memelsdorff’s transcription in “Più chiar che’l sol...”
TRANSCRIPTION NOTES

1) M. 3. of the transcription is owed to Memelsdorff. It was not legible in the Par microfilm.
2) Although the cantus rhythm in mm. 7-8 suggests a one-pitch ligature as in the tenor, it is not notated as such: the two semibreves do not join at the punctus. It is difficult to tell if this is a scribal error or an intentional differentiation between the cantus and tenor.
3) Mm. 9-14. Memelsdorff’s interpretation of imperfection proved to give a more sensible reading and is used in these measures.
4) Mm. 27-28. Not legible in microfilm. Memelsdorff’s transcription is used here.
6) Mm. 37-40. Memelsdorff’s transcription, beginning in m. 37 is one beat earlier than mine due to a difference in the interpretation of imperfection. The pitches noted in the transcription appear on m. 38 of Memelsdorff’s transcription and are not correct.
7) Mm. 45-46. Preference given to Memelsdorff’s reading.
8) Mm. 46-47. See “Rests”, pp. 31-34.
9) M. 53-54. I differ with Memelsdorff in the matter of a semibreve (quarter-note) G which precedes a half-note B-natural in m. 53. In his transcription notes, he reports the ms. to have been spotted. I have not noticed this as a hindrance in y transcription and thus have only transcribed the doted-quarted B-natural in m. 53 (breve in ms.).
10) M. 59-end. Here, Memelsdorff’s contatenor reconstruction is included.
11) M. 62. The ms. has the rhythm SMMM. Memelsdorff adds an editorial punctus divisionis to the S in his transcription resulting in a dotted rhythm which suggest a local change to tempus imperfectum, prolatio major. This is however uncharacteristic of Più chiar che’l sol in general. A more likely reading is to “alter” the last M. The rules of alteration stipulate that groups of the same repeated value must have the last value in the group doubled before a note of greater value to complete a perfection. In the case of major prolaction, this would operate in binary groups of notes while in minor prolaction – which is the case in this piece – alteration would apply to the last note of a ternary group. This is the case in m. 62.
12) Mm. 71-72. In his study, Memelsdorff justifies the final cadence of fourth and octave as an archaism (Più chiar che’l sol… p. 9). I have provided in parenthetical stem-less note-heads the more traditional cadence to fifth and octave.
VARIANTS

**Cantus, mm. 53-58**

Luc

Par

*Par, last S. See note to fig.5b, p.25.*

**Tenor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mm.7-8</th>
<th>mm. 17-19</th>
<th>mm.23-24</th>
<th>mm.32-33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Par corrupt Suggested notation.*

Apparenty, de Par scribe chooses the rhythm of the Italian one-pitch ligature over what is written in Luc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mm.45-56</th>
<th>mm.60-61</th>
<th>mm.70-71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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