

are also on the Marco Polo label). Schwann's single CD of music by Schreker includes the Vorspiel to *Die Gezeichneten*, and it is most encouraging to hear that, following the important 1984 production (admittedly heavily cut) of *Die Gezeichneten* conducted by Gerd Albrecht, we shall shortly have a recording of this opera, arguably the composer's masterpiece. HNH International obviously intend to do for Schreker what RCA did for Korngold in the 1970s. Finally, as though to emphasize that we really are in a new era, Hamburg Opera's 1989 production of *Der Schatzgräber*—the subject of a review-article by Peter Franklin in the *Musical Times* (cxxx (1989), 730-31)—has also appeared on a CD, on the Capiccio label of Delta Music GmbH. The conductor, again, is Gerd Albrecht.

THE MISSA 'L'ARDANT DESIR'

Although they may not have done so in public or in print, scholars other than Rob Wegman have indeed 'seriously considered' Llorens's (or Feininger's) attractive ascription of the anonymous Mass on *L'Ardant desir* to Busnoys, his assertion to the contrary notwithstanding ('Another Mass by Busnoys?', *Music & Letters*, lxxi (1990), 1-19). In preparing my forthcoming (by now I hope imminent) edition of Busnoys's Latin-texted works I had a duty to consider it. Nor was I the first: Don Giller, whom Mr Wegman mentions in a footnote, had tested the attribution in a seminar paper written at Columbia University under Leeman Perkins around 1982. Neither of us was ultimately persuaded (though, no longer having access to Mr Giller's paper, I can give only my own reasons). Accordingly, I did not see fit to include the work in the edition, as a short paragraph there will explain. After reading Mr Wegman's article I am still unconvinced of the ascription. Anything is possible, but I do not think he has made a very strong case, for it seems he has not applied adequate controls.

Mr Wegman seems to have been strongly motivated to confirm. (So was I at first.) He cites any and all parallels in the Mass to Busnoys's practice yet does not look very hard for similar analogues in other composers (he prefers to cite anonymous works which he can then claim for Busnoys too). He also ignores any stylistic or technical feature in the Mass that might not resonate with Busnoys's known output. Due attention to such considerations might have led him in other directions, as it did me.

In order to keep this letter short I shall merely state my conclusion, so that those interested may test it against Mr Wegman's evidence. I find that Bertrandus Vaqueras, a somewhat shadowy younger contemporary of Busnoys whose handful of surviving works are mainly to be found in Sistine Chapel manuscripts—including MS 51, the source of the Mass *L'Ardant desir*—is a better prima facie candidate for its authorship. Like the anonymous author of the Mass in question (and like Busnoys), Vaqueras employed perfect *minor modus* and the signature $\text{O}2$ quite extensively (see, for example, his Mass *L'Homme armé* as printed by Feininger as the tenth such Mass in the series *Monumenta polyphoniae liturgicae sacrae ecclesiae romanae*, I/i, cited in Mr Wegman's note 9). Like the anonymous author (and like Busnoys), he was given to fancy cantus firmus manipulations and liked to show off his knowledge of Greek terms in the attendant rubrics. The cited Mass contains a number of recondite canons, all denoting imitative doubling of the tenor at the fifth: 'Que vox additur, in parypathe ex duabus semibrevis prior incipit', 'Altera vox priorem sequitur in mese' etc.

Like the anonymous author (and more than Busnoys) Vaqueras was given to Obrecht-like chains of sequences (see Ex. 1). Like the anonymous author (and more than Busnoys) he indulged in frequent, ostentatious mensuration changes (see Ex. 2). Like the anonymous author (and *unlike* Busnoys) he had a predilection for the sesquitertia proportion: compare Ex. 3 with Mr Wegman's Ex. 4 (I have chosen to render the proportion by the use of dotted values instead of the cumbersome gruppettos favoured by Mr Wegman).

The intricate manipulations of the cantus firmus in the Mass *L'Ardant desir*—for explaining (most of) which so ingeniously in terms of *resolutiones* Mr Wegman deserves congratulations—go quite a bit beyond anything one finds in Busnoys and cannot be used as an argument for his authorship, though we may all agree that Busnoys had a propensity for such things. (That is what makes the Llorens/Feininger hypothesis attractive.) Similarly, the

Ex. 1

Vaqueras, *Missa 'L'Homme armé'*, Gloria: 'Qui sedes'

Musical score for Ex. 1, showing vocal parts S (Soprano) and A (Alto) with figured bass notation. The score is in 3/4 time and features a complex rhythmic pattern with many sixteenth and thirty-second notes. The figured bass notation includes figures such as (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), and (9). The piece concludes with the word "etc."

Ex. 2

Ibid., Credo: '... filium Dei unigenitum'

Musical score for Ex. 2, showing a bass line with figured bass notation. The score is in 3/4 time and features a complex rhythmic pattern with many sixteenth and thirty-second notes. The figured bass notation includes figures such as (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), and (9). The piece concludes with the word "etc."

Ex. 3

Ibid., '... sedet ad dexteram Patris'

Musical score for Ex. 3, showing vocal parts S (Soprano), A (Alto), and B (Bass) with figured bass notation. The score is in 3/4 time and features a complex rhythmic pattern with many sixteenth and thirty-second notes. The figured bass notation includes figures such as (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), and (9). The piece concludes with the word "etc."

textural features Mr Wegman cites in his Exx. 2, 3, 5 and 6, while they may be said to develop tendencies latent in Busnoys's style, cannot properly be said to represent that style. He is quite right to invoke Obrecht, and I wonder why he never entertains the possibility that the Mass *L'Ardant desir* might even be the work of that (young) master, whose very flamboyant Mass *Salve diva parens* is found in the same manuscript (albeit in the somewhat later last fascicle).

I don't necessarily put the youthful Obrecht forth as a serious contender (I've already named my man), but the Mass in question seems at least as close to him (on the other side, so to speak) as it does to Busnoys. Mr Wegman never really argues his case for a date 'from the

early 1470s, or perhaps even earlier', and the manuscript, even its main corpus, would support a date nearer the mid 1470s. By then, even the early Masses of Josquin (in which one also finds abstruse tenor manipulations and perfect *minor modus*) were in existence.

In any case, I'd prefer to think of the Mass *L'Ardant desir* as the work of a composer of the second rank or as the early effort of a master rather than the mature work of Busnoys, since it is not very impressive as music. (Have another look at Mr Wegman's more extended examples— or, better still, sing them through— and then see if Mr Wegman's brashly confident summation on page 19 still convinces.) The Mass *L'Ardant desir* is filled to overflowing with trumped-up notational complexities, but it does not show much real invention. It is indeed the work, as Mr Wegman says, of 'a composer eager to show his literacy and learning' but also of a composer with little else to show.

RICHARD F. TARUSKIN

Department of Music,
University of California,
Berkeley,
California 94720,
USA.

Rob C. Wegman replies:

The standard of proof, not only in the case of the Mass *L'Ardant desir* but with any ascription of anonymous compositions, must be the balance of probabilities. So long as there is no manuscript attribution (assuming it would settle the authorship question conclusively) there must remain a basic uncertainty, however theoretical, about Busnoys's authorship— as I admitted in my article. Richard Taruskin's claim that Bertrand Vaqueras is a more likely candidate than Busnoys therefore deserves careful consideration. First a few simple matters of fact.

(1) Professor Taruskin points out that the source of the *Missa 'L'Ardant desir'*, MS Cappella Sistina 51, contains some works by Vaqueras. The two Credos in question appear in a layer copied at Rome in the late 1480s; this is nearly fifteen years after the main corpus (including *L'Ardant desir*) was completed, presumably in Naples. The Credos are by some margin the earliest surviving works by Vaqueras, and much the simplest of his *oeuvre*.

(2) Taruskin describes Vaqueras as a man who 'indulged in frequent, ostentatious mensuration changes', citing a passage from the *L'Homme armé* Mass (his Ex. 2). This is in fact the only example in that Mass— and indeed in Vaqueras's entire output. Apart from this passage, Vaqueras never ventures beyond coloration and sesquialtera proportion.

(3) Taruskin claims that Vaqueras had a predilection for sesquitertia proportion, but he cites a passage which is not in a proportion at all, let alone sesquitertia (his Ex. 3): the manuscript simply gives a series of ten dotted semibreves.¹ The written-out 'proportion' here is not sesquitertia but 2/3 (that is, two dotted semibreves are equivalent to three undotted ones). Vaqueras uses the sesquitertia sign C only once in his *oeuvre*, in the passage cited in Taruskin's Ex. 2. This 'predilection' is not 'unlike Busnoys' as Taruskin asserts: we find the signature C in Busnoys's 'Anima mea liquefacta est' and 'Regina celi I', and D in the same composer's *Missa 'L'Homme armé'*.

(4) Taruskin describes the *Missa 'L'Ardant desir'* as being 'filled to overflowing with trumped-up notational complexities'. This is in fact true only of the 'Confiteor' (Ex. 4 in my article), which is indeed quite ostentatious in its display of mensural complexities— for which reason I compared it with Busnoys's 'Conditor alme siderum'. Apart from this, the only mensural changes within Mass sections are two brief excursions to $\text{O}3$ and O , in the 'Domine Deus' and 'Patrem'. The composer was indeed eager to show his learning, as I have

¹ Thus it is not surprising that Taruskin should have 'chosen' to use dotted values in his transcription, for that is the way the rhythm was notated in the first place: to use my 'cumbersome gruppettos' would have been to misrepresent the original notation. The reason I used the 'gruppettos' in my Ex. 4 was to avoid such misrepresentation in the case of a *genuine* sesquitertia proportion.

argued, but it is incorrect to suggest that he overburdened the music with notational exercises. As for the tenor permutations, the point here is surely notational economy rather than ostentatious complexity. Since the different shapes of the tenor (see Ex. 1 of my article) must all go back to a single notational archetype, the presumed original notation had the beauty of the utmost concision.

Taruskin singles out one work by Vaqueras, the *Missa 'L'Homme armé'*, and describes it as though it were the epitome of the composer's style. Throughout his communication he ignores Vaqueras's six other sacred works, which happen to contradict every generalization he makes. He states that Vaqueras employed perfect *minor modus* and the signature $\text{O}2$ 'quite extensively' and gives the *L'Homme armé* Mass as an example. This is in fact the only example in Vaqueras's *oeuvre*: neither of the two mensural practices can be found in his other works. Taruskin argues that Vaqueras was 'given to fancy cantus firmus manipulations', and again he characterizes the composer by a feature unique to the *L'Homme armé* Mass. There is no trace of strict or canonic tenor treatment in any of Vaqueras's other works. In comparison with Busnoys and the composer of *L'Ardant desir*, moreover, 'fancy' seems a somewhat strong word: the only manipulations in *L'Homme armé* are transposition and augmentation. Taruskin typifies Vaqueras as a man who 'liked to show off his knowledge of Greek terms', and yet again his characterization is based only on the *L'Homme armé* Mass. This cycle contains a number of canonic instructions in straightforward Latin (described by Taruskin as 'recondite'). These incorporate commonly used Greek note-names such as *parhypate*, *mese* and *tychanos hypaton*, with which any contemporary musician was familiar. It is not really fair to relate this to the *L'Ardant desir* composer, who did actually write in (transliterated) Greek.

Granted that *L'Homme armé* and the *Missa 'L'Ardant desir'* have features in common, it takes a certain amount of good will to believe that they might be by the same composer. In my article I pointed out that the *L'Ardant desir* composer employed stylistic procedures that are exceptionally progressive for a work predating the mid 1470s. Taruskin reasons that any composer who used these same procedures after they had become commonplace (i.e., after about 1480) has therefore a legitimate claim to authorship of that Mass. He points out that Vaqueras, in his *L'Homme armé* Mass, was 'given to Obrecht-like chains of sequences'. This comes as no surprise, since the unique source for the cycle was copied in 1503–7, and the presence of *semifusae* suggests a date close to the turn of the century. It takes a substantial leap of faith to believe that Vaqueras could have been a trend-setter in the early 1470s just because he was a trend-follower in a much later work (and everything else in Vaqueras's work suggests that he was a trend-follower). A similar point could be made about Vaqueras's biography. The composer is not documented until 1483, when he joined the Papal chapel (to disappear from its records in 1507). His birthdate is unknown. Taruskin's claim rests on the speculative assumption that Vaqueras was born early enough to have produced a work of unique inventiveness and learning before the mid 1470s. This is not impossible, but it is more than a decade before the composer is documented at all and nearly fifteen years before his first Credos turn up, and thus it would seem to qualify Taruskin's designation 'prima facie candidate'. Perhaps partly for that reason, Taruskin questions my dating of the *Missa 'L'Ardant desir'* in the early 1470s or earlier. He argues that the Sistine Chapel MS 51 'would support a date nearer the mid 1470s'. There is no basis for this assumption, however, for the twin manuscripts 14 and 51 of the Sistine Chapel (copied by the same scribe in the mid 1470s) contain several Masses that must go back as early as the 1450s and '60s. As Taruskin has expressed it elsewhere, 'there is really no reason . . . to assume that the date of a manuscript is that of its contents; our usual experience is quite the contrary' (*Journal of the American Musicological Society*, xxxix (1986), 258). None of the speculative assumptions that Taruskin's case presupposes is by itself impossible, but it is difficult to see how they might add up to a prima facie case—let alone a balance of probabilities.

As for Busnoys, Taruskin claims that the manipulations in the *Missa 'L'Ardant desir'* 'go quite a bit beyond anything one finds in [his music] and cannot be used as an argument for his authorship'. But in fact these manipulations are firmly rooted in Busnoys's two Masses, as I have shown in my article. Of the fourteen sections that incorporate the tenor, nine

employ mensural transformation. This is an exceedingly rare technique, which is not found in any of Vaqueras's works; it is the predominant type of treatment in Busnoys's *Missa* 'O *crux lignum triumphale*'. We find transposition down a fourth and inversion in the Credo and Agnus Dei of *L'Ardant desir*; these same techniques appear in the very same movements of Busnoys's *Missa* 'L'Homme armé'. Only in five sections does the anonymous composer go 'quite a bit' beyond Busnoys (and more than a *bit* beyond Vaqueras's transposition and augmentation), but even here he combines his manipulations with Busnoys's technique of mensural transformation. It hardly needs arguing which of the two composers is the more likely to have experimented with these techniques before the mid 1470s.

Taruskin points out that the progressive stylistic features of *L'Ardant desir*, 'while they may be said to develop tendencies latent in Busnoys's style, cannot properly be said to represent that style'. The features in question are indeed uniquely innovative for a Mass predating the mid 1470s, so properly speaking they cannot be said to represent any composer's style at that time. But the point I made in my article was that the development of the tendencies in *L'Ardant desir* is consistent with Busnoys's known reputation as an experimenter. The tendencies were not only latent in Busnoys's style but were in fact developed in that style, as Edgar Sparks has shown (see n. 2 in my article). I argued on these grounds that before the mid 1470s no composer is *prima facie* more likely to have proceeded on Busnoys's path than Busnoys himself. To credit a minor figure of the next generation with these innovations—just because he took them for granted in a much later work—is anachronistic reasoning.

A final note: Professor Taruskin's communication has prompted me to look afresh at the *Missa* 'L'Ardant desir' after nearly two years, and in so doing I was able to solve, at last, the puzzle of the Agnus Dei I. The tenor of this section appears to have been derived from the notational archetype through performance in \ominus with the instruction 'crescit in duplum' and omission of every note that is followed by one higher in pitch than itself. Since the remaining notes are to keep the relative durations they had in the original, full context (these are given in Fig. 4a of my article), it is now easy to understand why the Agnus Dei I contains several shifts of the metrical pattern, as I observed in note 27: the singers are to cut out 'random' bits from the tenor statement in \ominus and to paste the remaining stretches together, without reinterpreting the new tenor mensurally. Also, it now emerges that the manuscript resolution—although plainly identical with the deduced tenor—has been affected by scribal corruption (cf. Fig. 8 of my article). The deduced tenor not only fits the music of the Agnus Dei I, but arguably makes better counterpoint with it.²

² I would like to use this opportunity to add a brief postscript to note 15 of my article. There is a possibility that Busnoys's lost motet 'Animadvertere', mentioned by Tinctoris in his *Proportionale*, has survived as a contrafactum. Tinctoris quotes a two-bar passage for 'tenor secundus' and 'contratenor' from the motet, to illustrate Busnoys's pleonastic habit of indicating *minor color* by coloration as well as a figure 3 underneath the notes. The quoted passage turns out to be identical with bars 71–72 (contratenor and bass) of the first part of the anonymous motet 'Gaude celestis Domina' (MS Cappella Sistina 15, ff. 242^v–246^r). This motet is copied directly after Busnoys's 'Anima mea liquefacta est' in the Sistine Chapel manuscript. I will discuss the possibility of Busnoys's authorship of 'Gaude celestis Domina' and of 'Incomprehensibilia firme'/'Preter rerum ordinem' (see my n. 15) in a study of the notational feature to which Tinctoris drew attention.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of 'Music & Letters'

L'ARDANT REDUX

Rob Wegman (*Music & Letters*, lxxi (1990), 633-5) has effectively refuted my suggestion that Bertrand Vaqueras is the most plausible composer of the anonymous Mass *L'Ardant desir*, and I happily (well, I hope gracefully at any rate) withdraw his name from contention. But the issue was Mr Wegman's attribution of the Mass to Busnoys, and while I readily concede that it is a tempting prospect, I still think it must be resisted. The reason has not changed: the Mass, though good enough for Vaqueras, is not good enough for Busnoys. I'd better be very specific about this, since qualitative judgements do not easily stand up in the face of facts, however circumstantial. I'll do what I can.

But first, let me address the matter, heavily stressed as a Busnoys fingerprint in Mr Wegman's original article, of the mensuration signature $\text{O}2$ and its equivalence, as he contends, to C (i.e., *integer valor*) rather than ♩ (i.e., *tempus diminutum*). Mr Wegman stakes this interpretation on just two works by Busnoys: the motet 'Anthoni usque limina' and the Mass *L'Homme armé*. Its basis is the absence of an augmentation in the notated durations under $\text{O}2$ to compensate for a proportional diminution. The underlying assumption here—to put it bluntly, that everything is meant to go at one tempo—makes no sense to me, despite the wide-ranging psychological and anthropological data Mr Wegman has marshalled in ostensible support of it ('Concerning Tempo in the English Polyphonic Mass, c.1420-70', *Acta musicologica*, lxi (1989), 40-65).

If actual tempo were meant to be unchanging, why were proportional signatures ever used at all? Between the two halves of 'Anthoni usque limina' there would be no audible evidence of a proportion if, as Mr Wegman contends, $\text{O}2$ equates with *integer valor* (the more so since, as he points out, both halves of the motet are organized in perfect *minor modus* according to a ternary division of the long). True, that background long would shrink from nine semibreves in length to six under Mr Wegman's dispensation, but the note-values on the musical surface would not betray this alteration. In the Mass, the audible evidence would be truly anomalous: an apparent (unsigned) *augmentation* of values in the tenor, which would have to slow down radically in mid-cursus in order to accommodate the durations in the surrounding voices. The tenor is thus required to make a change of speed without any notational signal, while the other voices are given such a signal only to neutralize it. This, being counter-intuitive, requires a higher standard of proof than the commonsensical alternative (viz., that the tenor is constant and the other voices speed up), especially if that alternative has a historical pedigree as distinguished as that of the isorhythmic motet to support it.

Such proof as Mr Wegman offers involves the variant readings of the tenorless 'Christe' and Benedictus in the various sources of the Mass *L'Homme armé*, some (the majority) giving $\text{O}2$ and others—including the one I adopted as primary source for my edition—giving C . Yet it is precisely the 'Christe' in that source (Vatican Library, MS Chigiana C.VIII.234) that forms an apparent exception to Mr Wegman's generalization that 'the entire Mass *L'Homme armé* is almost certainly composed in perfect *minor modus*', since the breve rests are grouped there by twos, not threes. From this one can infer either that the Chigi scribe was not familiar with the tradition Mr Wegman has discovered, or that Mr Wegman may not have discovered a tradition at all.

But back to the Mass *L'Ardant desir*, and on to the schematic notation of its tenor, for reconstructing which (now completely) I renew my congratulations to Mr Wegman.

Whether to call such a thing a 'trumped-up notational complexity' or 'the beauty of the utmost concision' is not a point worthy of debate. I enjoy puzzles as much as the next person, but I am disinclined to judge the worth of a composition—or even the ingenuity of a composer—on the basis of their intricacy. That 'utmost concision' Mr Wegman so admires, after all, is not the composer's accomplishment. It is his starting-point. Having gone through the arduous process of deducing the concise notation from all the outlandish *resolutiones* in the one surviving practical source, and having solved the problem with brilliant success, Mr Wegman is well entitled to a heady sense of achievement. But though it is endearingly human of Mr Wegman to want to give the composer credit, the achievement is all his.

The lovely thing about a rebus like this is that it is so much easier to contrive than to solve. Anyone, even a lowly Vaqueras, can cut up a cantus firmus, invert it, convert its note-values into their reciprocals, sample its pitches or rhythms according to any eccentric criterion (and the one Mr Wegman has finally doped out for the Agnus I in the Mass *L'Ardant desir* is nothing if not eccentric)—and then compose, or get a friend who is 'pre-eminent in Latinity' (or Hellenity) to compose, cryptograms to 'assist' in its reconstruction. The permutations of the cantus firmus are simply new tenors as far as the composer is concerned. They are no more difficult to compose over than the original one. The difficulties—and I believe it is fair to call them 'trumped-up'—fall entirely to the poor performer or analyst for whom the composer's starting-point is the finishing line, to be reached only after running an arbitrary obstacle course.

So, although Mr Wegman seems to think that we are dealing here with 'das Erzeugnis höchster Intelligenz und Phantasie', in fact it is only a slick packaging job. Moreover, the fact that the game in the Mass *L'Ardant desir* goes so much further than Busnoys is known to have gone into that penumbra where scholastic artifice shades over into frivolity (good heavens! do I sound like Dr Burney?) could as easily be adduced against his authorship as in favour of it—if that, as we say in California, is where one is coming from. The schematic cantus firmus treatment in Busnoys's Mass *O crux lignum triumphale*, while full of art, is sober; like so much in his Mass and motet practice, it announces kinship with the older traditions of isorhythm.

While Busnoys did indulge in schematic tenor manipulations more often than most of his contemporaries, with one exception they are not at all arcane. In most cases they have some poetic relationship to the piece at hand (e.g., in the chanson 'J'ay pris amours tout à rebours', or the Naples *L'Homme armé* Masses, if—as I know Mr Wegman doubts—they are by Busnoys). I should also point out that at least one instance of 'inversion and retrograde inversion' by Busnoys in the list by R. Larry Todd that Mr Wegman cites in his original article—the famous mensural farrago on the hymn 'Conditor alme siderum'—is listed there only because a fanciful analysis by Albert Seay was uncritically accepted. The exceptional work is the bergerette 'Maintes femmes', a really tough nut to crack (for its solution, see Helen Hewitt, 'The Two Puzzle Canons in Busnoys's *Maintes femmes*', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, x (1957), 104–10), which is so similar to the puzzle tenor in Ockeghem's 'Ut heremita solus' that it may have been part of the same emulatory exchange that seems to have begun with Busnoys's 'In hydraulis'.

So that is why I reject the notion that the schematic tenor in the Mass *L'Ardant desir* is *prima facie* evidence of Busnoys's authorship. We have to go back to style—to 'connoisseurship', to cite an approach Mr Wegman has elsewhere endorsed—to evaluate the proposed attribution. And here is where things become riskiest, because everything depends on one's criteria. Mr Wegman's criteria are (i) imitation followed by repeated rhythmic patterns and sequences, ultimately arriving at motivic integration; (ii) playful indulgence in mensural arcana; (iii) strict, 'relatively simple' imitative canons (introduced in the case of the Mass *L'Ardant desir* by 'rather forbidding' performance instructions in 'transliterated Greek').

The second and third points, I would suggest, are not properly style characteristics at all. They are, again, packaging tricks that Mr Wegman is taking far too seriously as evidence of the composer's 'bold and innovative mind'. (Nor, come to think of it, are there any strict canons in Busnoys's attributed sacred works.) As to the first criterion, taking a good hard look at Mr Wegman's examples (or at the rest of the Mass, for that matter), can one really call these mechanical schemata proof of the 'extraordinary inventiveness' Mr Wegman is

claiming for them—and, ultimately, for Busnoys? The kind of dogged, panting, redundantly cadential motivic work shown in his Ex. 3 has 'Kleinmeister' written all over it. I cannot think it the work of any more major a master than, say, Basiron (also represented in the main corpus of Cappella Sistina 51), whose name I throw out not as a candidate (since he was not an O2 adept), but because in the light of Paula Higgins's recent research he is emerging as a kind of poor man's Busnoys (see 'Tracing the Careers of Late Medieval Composers: the Case of Philippe Basiron of Bourges', *Acta musicologica*, lxii (1990), 1–28).

But, it is high time to ask, why were these particular criteria the ones chosen? Precisely, it seems, for the impression of novelty they create, for their connotation—to Mr Wegman—of that 'bold and innovative mind'. The latter adjective is the real operator, I think. Our historiographical prejudices are symptomatic of the times in which we live; twentieth-century music aesthetics has always overrated conspicuous technical innovation as an earnest of authenticity (and what a price we've paid!). The most innovative composers are typically touted as the best composers, and if a composer is thought good he must be shown, like Busnoys the Progressive, to be innovative as well. Ostensible innovation carrying such a seductive nuance: that is what clinches the matter for Busnoys in Mr Wegman's exposition. But innovation as such is no criterion of style (as indeed it cannot be), or even of value. Having studied the Mass *L'Ardant desir* even harder now than I had before, I am less impressed with it than ever. There is an unbridgeable gap between its ostentatious presentation and its mediocre musical content.

Meanwhile, there are any number of equally relevant style criteria that Mr Wegman, pursuing evidence of innovation, never considers. One is the handling of the Mass as a genre, that is, a 'form'. To judge by the evidence of his two securely attributed Masses, Busnoys had a quite definite idea of how a polyphonic Ordinary ought to proceed. To pick one example: in the longest sections, the Glorias and Credos, he begins with superius/altus duos that enunciate the head-motif; next the bassus enters and continues with the altus for another duo (here there is likely to be some motivic imitation); then the superius joins in so that there is a trio to complete the 'introitus' preparing the tenor entrance—the whole plan again harking back in characteristically conservative Busnoys fashion to the procedures of the old isorhythmic motet. (There are variations on the scheme that distinguish the four movements in question from one another, but the three main events do not vary.)

Now compare the Mass *L'Ardant desir*. Its Gloria begins with a superius/altus duet that enunciates the head-motif, all right, but then the tenor and bassus enter together, just as they do in the shorter movements, which (unlike Busnoys, so far as we can tell) the anonymous composer does not distinguish in shape from the central, grander pair—or is this further evidence of innovative integration? In the Credo, the tenor, bearing the cantus firmus, enters before the bassus (a good nine breves before it!), something you never once find in the attributed cantus-firmus works of Busnoys (the one apparent exception being the 'Regina coeli I', in which the cantus firmus is in the so-called 'Theumatenor', a voice of lower range than the one labelled 'tenor', but 'tenorizing' nonetheless, and therefore entering last).

It would be tedious to go through the whole Mass *L'Ardant desir* to cite every divergence from the procedures one finds in the two attributed—formally very similar—Busnoys Masses. Nor is there space for such an undertaking in a communication that is already getting long. I will mention the 'Osanna', though, with its very unusual beginning in longs and maximas, because if Mr Wegman is correct about the tempo implied by the signature O2, this has got to be the most dejected 'Osanna' on record. (Did Busnoys have a reputation for irony?)

But then, I sense a note of somewhat greater caution in Mr Wegman's communication than in the original article. Where he was at first ready to claim that not even an ascription to another composer would shake his faith in Busnoys's authorship of the Mass *L'Ardant desir*, he now admits that 'there must remain a basic uncertainty' about it. Perhaps he has noticed now implausible it is to argue simultaneously for the earliest possible date for the Mass and also for its unique progressivism. In any case I welcome and admire the admission, because I think it potentially very dangerous to make wishful attributions to our favourite composers. That is how style history becomes skewed and circular. None of us wants to see

the Busnoys canon rival the Josquin for bloat. (On the other hand, Mr Wegman's discovery linking the 'lost' 'Animadvertere' with the extant 'Gaude celestis Domina' seems very promising. I not only wish him well with it, I wish I had learnt of his finding in time to report it, and possibly include the work, in the Appendix to my edition.)

RICHARD F. TARUSKIN

Department of Music,
University of California,
Berkeley,
California 94720,
USA.

Rob C. Wegman replies:

Appreciative though I am of Professor Taruskin's kind words, I feel the discussion may be in danger of going round in circles. I shall therefore confine myself to a few points.

(1) My article 'Concerning Tempo' does not advance the thesis 'that everything is meant to go at one tempo' as Professor Taruskin appears to recollect. My aim was to test the assumption — adopted by many scholars, of whom I quote here Charles Hamm — that 'a [fifteenth-century] composer changing to a mensuration moving faster than the one he has been using will tend to use larger notes' (*A Chronology of the Works of Guillaume Dufay Based on a Study of Mensural Practice*, Princeton, 1964, p. 39). The empirical and theoretical evidence for that assumption is overwhelming. Taruskin does not mention any of that evidence but refers to 'wide-ranging psychological and anthropological data'. These were in fact advanced in a footnote, in relation to a subsidiary point.

(2) The problem with $\text{O}2$ in 'Anthoni usque limina' and the Mass *L'Homme armé* is that Busnoys fails to shift to larger note-values in this mensuration, even though the sign calls for a tempo increase. What this means is a separate issue, which is not essential to my attribution of the *L'Ardant desir* Mass but to the alleged 'Pythagorean' floor-plan of Busnoys's *Missa 'L'Homme armé'*. In that context, Professor Taruskin and I have both expressed our views on this matter (Communications, *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, xlii (1989), 438–41, 447–9); other scholars, notably Richard Sherr, have studied the issue from other angles. The crucial point, which Taruskin ignores, is that Busnoys is the only known composer of his generation not to shift to larger note-values in $\text{O}2$. This exceedingly rare habit is shared only by the *L'Ardant desir* composer. (The first 'Osanna' is no exception: Taruskin fails to point out that this section continues, after its 'dejected' opening, with music written in semibreves, minims and semiminims.)

(3) One of Professor Taruskin's objections against my attribution of *L'Ardant desir* is the intricacy of the Mass's five most complicated tenor permutations: for these he can find no parallel in Busnoys. Ignoring the nine other permutations, he concludes (for the second time) that the cycle is far removed from anything Busnoys ever did. As I pointed out in my previous reply, the nine permutations not mentioned by Taruskin (and several elements in the more complicated ones as well) happen to link the Mass firmly and uniquely to Busnoys's two cycles, and were among the main arguments for attributing the work to him.

(4) The point that certain stylistic features are 'innovative' for a Mass from the early 1470s has to do with the historical development of fifteenth-century style: it can be tested in the contemporary Mass repertory. Professor Taruskin takes my qualification 'innovative' to be an aesthetic value-judgement, and refutes what he consequently perceives as my 'prejudice' by advancing his aesthetic value-judgements. These are not relevant to the point I made.

Two final points. First, 'basic uncertainty' is of course inherent in all scholarly work. I stressed this in the penultimate sentence of my article ('This is not to assert absolute certainty about the work's authorship', p. 19), and repeated it in my previous reply — where Professor Taruskin takes it to be a volte-face and a virtual confirmation that he has been right all along. Second, my identification of the 'lost' 'Animadvertere' was made in May 1990, when Taruskin's edition was already in the press.

This correspondence is now closed (Eds.)