

Rob C. Wegman

THE OTHER JOSQUIN*

When somebody is accused of a crime and is certain to be found guilty, no matter whether he committed the crime or not, an expression often used in Holland is: 'Barbertje must hang.' This expression goes back to a short dramatic sketch that served as prefatory matter in one of the most beloved works of literature in the Dutch language, Multatuli's *Max Havelaar* (1860). In the original sketch it wasn't actually the old woman Barbertje who was hanged, but a villain named Lothario who had killed her, cut her up into pieces, salted and pickled her, and then had the effrontery to call himself an honest man:¹

OFFICER. Lord Justice, there is the man who killed Barbertje.

JUDGE. That man must hang. How did he go about it?

OFFICER. He cut her up into small pieces, and pickled her.

JUDGE. He has acted most wickedly. He must hang.

LOTHARIO. Lord Justice, I did not kill Barbertje! I have fed her, and clothed her, and cared for her. There are witnesses who will testify that I am an honest man, and not a murderer.

JUDGE. Fellow, you must hang! You aggravate the crime with your conceitedness. It does not befit a man who ... who has been accused of something to imagine himself an honest man.

LOTHARIO. But Lord Justice, there are witnesses who will confirm this. And since I have been accused of murder ...

JUDGE. You must hang! You have cut up Barbertje, you have pickled her, *and* you are conceited ... three capital crimes! Who are you, old woman?

BARBERTJE. I am Barbertje.

LOTHARIO. Thank God! Lord Justice, don't you see that I didn't kill her?

JUDGE. Hm ... yes ... right! And the pickling?

BARBERTJE. No, Lord Justice, he did not pickle me. On the contrary, he has done many good things for me. He is a good human being!

LOTHARIO. There, Lord Justice, she says that I am a good human being.

* Paper presented at the Seminar in Medieval and Renaissance Music, All Souls' College, Oxford, on March 13, 2008. I am grateful to Dr Margaret Bent for her gracious invitation to speak in this seminar, and for giving me the opportunity to share work in progress with friends and colleagues at Oxford.

1 Multatuli [Eduard Douwes Dekker], *Max Havelaar, of de koffij-veilingen der Nederlandsche Handel-Maatschappij* (Amsterdam 1860), my trans.

JUDGE. Hm ... remains the third charge. Officer, take that man down, he must hang. He is guilty of conceitedness. Clerk, make sure to cite the jurisprudence of Lessing's patriarch.

The tale of Lothario and Barbertje illustrates a particularly insidious form of incrimination, which we can still witness occasionally in the media today. Serious criminal charges which in themselves require proof may engender a further charge that doesn't – a charge that has to do with the character of the accused. The original charges may have to be dropped when clear evidence to the contrary turns up, but character charges cannot be overturned and may well end up securing the conviction in the end.

I am reminded of this little courtroom scene whenever I reflect on the case of *Inter natos mulierum*, a six-part motet whose authorship by Josquin has been questioned, and questioned again, for fifty years (Appendix 1).² None of the evidence against it has held up, yet the piece still stands convicted of a character charge: its musical style is deemed uncharacteristic of Josquin. What remains also is the sentence. A conceited man must hang, an uncharacteristic piece must be barred from the Josquin canon. The charge has become its own proof, its own sentence: once questioned, *Inter natos mulierum* must remain spurious until proven authentic.

How did we get into this situation? That is a story worth retracing, and in the following pages I propose to do just that. My aim in doing so, however, is not to call for the reinstatement of *Inter natos mulierum*. Although the motet certainly deserves a retrial, it is unlikely to receive due process so long as we cannot find the musicological equivalent of a fresh jury, one whose impartiality is not already compromised by the history recounted in the following pages.

More importantly, the case of *Inter natos mulierum* does not stand alone. It is illustrative of a broader problem that would not go away just by addressing one individual case. There are numerous cases like *Inter natos mulierum*, all affected to a greater or lesser extent by the same problem. Rather than reopening those cases individually, it might be more productive to analyse the problem itself, and to look for a general remedy. To propose such a remedy is the central aim of the present essay. It may be too late to undo all the errors that have been made, but it can never be too late to stop persevering in them.

2 Edition in Josquin des Prez, *Werken*, Aflevering 4 (Motetten Bundel 23), 125-30 (see Appendix 1). Sound recording on *Josquin and His Contemporaries*, The Binchois Consort, dir. Andrew Kirkman, Hyperion compact disc CDA67183 (2001), track 1. The motet survives in the following sources: BolC R142, fols. 30^v-31^r (northern Italy, c.1530; 'Josquin'); FlorD 11, fols. 121^v-125^r (Florence, 1557; anon.); RomeV 35-40, 2nd ser., no. 6 (Florence, c.1530-31; 'Josquin'); VatS 38, fol. 129^v-133^r (Rome, c.1550-63; anon.).

The story of *Inter natos mulierum* begins fifty years ago, with Helmuth Osthoff's *MGG* article on Josquin, printed in 1958. The motet was mentioned here only in passing, in a list of twelve motets whose authenticity Osthoff called into question. What did these twelve settings have in common? At the beginning of the passage Osthoff explained that for each of them there is only one Italian source that ascribes it to Josquin. Their attestation, in other words, appears to be weak:³

The authenticity of the following motets, which carry once-only attributions to Josquin in Italian manuscripts, is open to question as well ... *Inter natos mulierum* a6, two sections ...

Since we will be concerned with questions of methodology, it is worth pausing for a moment to consider the criterion invoked here, that of transmission. If we were to take the most broadly inclusive view of Josquin's oeuvre – that is, if we included everything that was ever ascribed to him, no matter how implausibly – we would quickly find that the 'core' works are all transmitted in about five to ten sources (often many more than that) and that the majority of those sources carry ascriptions to Josquin. To say this, of course, is merely to state the tautological: it is their wide transmission that makes them core works. On the other hand, we would also find that there is scarcely a work that survives in only one or two sources or its authenticity has been questioned by some scholar.

Why, though? Why should numbers of sources, and numbers of attributions, make so much difference to the probability of Josquin's authorship? As far as I can tell, the underlying rationale seems to be this. Since Josquin's music was sought after everywhere, every genuine work by him must have travelled very widely. Consequently we should expect to find it in a fair number of sources. By the same token, a work that turns up in only one or two sources must have a relatively weak claim to his authorship – especially if those sources are late, or survive in out-of-the-way places.

There may be a certain logic to this argument, yet it is not without its problems. For one thing, suppose that a work by some other composer (say, young Adriaen Willaert) began to circulate under Josquin's name almost immediately after its composition. Just on account of being taken for a work by Josquin, it should have travelled as widely as a genuine Josquin piece, and show the same pattern of transmission as we would expect for an authentic piece. True, one would like to think that six-

3 H. Osthoff, 'Josquin des Prez', in *MGG*^I, vol. 7, cols. 190–214, at 203: 'Fraglich ist auch die Echtheit der folgenden, in ital. Hss. Josquin vereinzelt zugeschriebenen Motetten: ... *Inter natos mulierum*, 6st. 2 Tle.' For the sake of convenience, I will quote all German texts in English translation.

teenth-century musicians were able to tell the difference. But Josquin scholarship has by now overturned so many attributions to Josquin as to prove that they couldn't. So while firm attestation is always an encouraging sign, it is not, in itself, a watertight guarantee of Josquin's authorship. Nor, I would argue, is weak attestation necessarily an argument against it.

The truth is that patterns of transmission in this period, even within Josquin's own oeuvre, are so wildly erratic that the exercise may quickly become one of reading tea leaves. Consider Josquin's *Vultum tuum* cycle. Part five, the motet *Mente tota*, turns up in very many sources, frequently as a free-standing piece, and was clearly one of the best-known and most beloved settings of the era. By contrast, the first motet, *Vultum tuum* itself, survives in only a handful of sources, and so far as I know never appears on its own. There may be good reasons for the difference, but Josquin's authorship clearly cannot be one of them.

Or consider the case of *Illibata Dei Virgo nutrix*. This motet is ascribed to Josquin in one of its two sources (1508¹), and survives anonymously in the other (VatS 15). Without the acrostic that gives the composer's name, *Illibata* would technically have belonged in the same *MGG* list as *Inter natos mulierum*, as a work attributed to Josquin in only one Italian source. As far as *Inter natos* itself is concerned, there is one additional point to bear in mind. Six-part motets, even those composed by Josquin, may not always survive in large numbers of sources, since they could not be readily accommodated in sets of four or five partbooks. And sets of six partbooks are not especially common before the 1530s.

So this is really what it comes down to. While we can tell a lot of things from large numbers of sources and attributions, the same cannot be said of the opposite. Numerically weak transmission or attestation means that we have comparatively less evidence. But lack of evidence means exactly what it says: lack of evidence. It doesn't mean negative evidence. What are the implications of this for Osthoff's *MGG* list? It means that in these twelve cases, we have less than usual evidence attesting positively to Josquin's authorship. We do not, emphatically, have more evidence attesting positively against it. So even if *Inter natos mulierum* belonged to this list (which is not in fact the case, as we will see presently), all we would really be in a position to conclude is this: it is a case that will be more difficult to decide than the better-documented ones.

Except that *Inter natos mulierum* does not actually belong to the list: there are two sources, not one, that ascribe it to Josquin, and so its attestation is stronger even than that of *Illibata* – at least by the numerical criteria on which the *MGG* list was based. Osthoff must have known this, for Edward Lowinsky had reported the second attribution in an article printed some eight years before the *MGG* entry.⁴ Still, the oversight would be soon be rectified with the publication of *Inter natos mulierum* in the old

4 E.E. Lowinsky, 'A Newly Discovered Sixteenth-Century Motet Manuscript at the Biblioteca Vallicelliana in Rome', in *JAMS* 3 (1950), 173–232, at 199.

Werken edition, in 1964. The editor, Myroslaw Antonowycz, listed all three of the sources mentioned by Lowinsky, two of which were shown to carry the attribution 'Josquin.' With this, the motet's place in the Josquin canon seemed to become a little more secure.

II. JUST VERSUS ANTONOWYCZ

But not for long. Shortly after the appearance of the *Werken* instalment, a review of it appeared in *Die Musikforschung*. The author of the review, Martin Just, mentioned *Inter natos mulierum* only once, and then only in the final sentence: 'It should be noted', he remarked almost as an afterthought, 'that ... *Inter natos mulierum* (No. 84) is reckoned among the doubtful [motets] by H. Osthoff (MGG article 'Josquin', col. 203).'⁵ This was true enough. What Just failed to mention is that Osthoff had questioned the motet for the wrong reasons – as he could have told from the very edition he was reviewing.

The consequences of this omission would prove to be unfortunate. The remark about *Inter natos mulierum* may sound perfectly neutral in itself, but it came at the end of a review that can only be described as fault-finding and censorious. Just had made much, for example, of three apparent misprints which he took to be indicative of the editor's 'unbefitting carelessness' (*unangemessene Sorglosigkeit*). Two incomplete references in the critical apparatus aggravated his concerns. From here, Just went on to raise the more serious question whether all the works in the instalment were actually even by Josquin.

Just was especially troubled by the motet *Absolve quaesumus*, which survives with an ascription to Josquin in only one source, ToleBC 21. His misgivings about its authenticity were confirmed by the style of the motet. 'Contrary to editor', he remarked, 'in whom the stylistic findings evidently failed to inspire doubt, it seems to us that the authenticity of [*Absolve*] is open to question.'⁶ What were those stylistic findings? Here is how Just continued:

5 For this and the following citations, see M. Just, review of *Werken van Josquin des Prez*, Aflevering 4 (Motetten Bundel 23), in *Mf* 18 (1965), 109–10, at 110: 'Es sei noch erwähnt, daß 'O virgo virginum' (Nr. 83) und 'Responsum acceperat Simeon' (Nr. 85) – dies trotz singularer Überlieferung – zu den allgemein anerkannten Werken Josquins zählen, während *Inter natos mulierum* (Nr. 84) von H. Osthoff (MGG-Artikel *Josquin*, Sp. 203) zu den zweifelhaften gerechnet wird.'

6 'Im Gegensatz zum Herausgeber, dem der stilistische Befund offenbar keine Zweifel erregt hat, scheint uns die Echtheit der Motette Nr. 82 fraglich ... das schärfere Wort-Ton-Verhältnis leidet unter einer kraft- und planlosen Stimmführung, von den wenigen synkopischen Wendungen verlaufen die meisten konsonant, der Kadenzplan ist farblos, selbst wenn man die Bindung an den Kanon berücksichtigt, Stimmgruppierungen oder sonstige klare Dispositionen fehlen.'

Ibid.

... the sharper relationship between text and sound suffers from feeble and aimless voice-leading, most of the few syncopated turns proceed consonantly, the cadential plan is colorless, even if one takes into account that it is tied to the canon, voice-groupings or other kinds of clear layouts are lacking.

Should the editor of the *Werken* edition have acted on a stylistic assessment like this, and have rejected *Absolve*? That might be a matter of debate: John Milsom, for example, has made a compelling case that the motet is much closer to Josquin than scholars have recognized.⁷ Yet the problem with Just's comments is that they left so little room for debate. Qualifications like 'feeble', 'aimless', or 'colorless' may well have seemed justified to him, yet it is hard to respond to them so long as underlying questions remain unanswered: by what criteria is the work being evaluated here, what other settings by Josquin has it been compared to, and what particular passages exhibit the alleged shortcomings?

This is a more general problem in Josquin scholarship. It has often struck me that when specialists come to a determination that a given work 'cannot' be by Josquin, they typically overstate the stylistic side of the case to the point of caricature, with qualifications that are far more peremptory and dismissive than they need to be. It seems as if no composition could be more glaringly incompetent than the one whose claim to Josquin's authorship is otherwise quite credible.⁸ The effect of this has been to raise the stakes needlessly and unproductively – as it certainly did in the case of Just and Antonowycz. The element of censure in the review was unmistakable: the more patently *Absolve* was not a motet by Josquin, the more patently Antonowycz had blundered in accepting it as one. Moving on in this vein, Just felt called upon to spell out the editor's responsibilities as he saw them:⁹

7 J. Milsom, 'Motets for Five or More Voices', in *The Josquin Companion*, ed. R. Sherr (Oxford 2000), 281–320, at 303. Additional support for Milsom's argument is presented by W. Elders, 'Josquin in the Sources of Spain. An Evaluation of Two Unique Attributions', in *Recevez ce mien petit labeur*. *Studies in Renaissance Music in Honour of Ignace Bossuyt*, edd. P. Bergé & M. De-laere (Leuven 2008), 61–70, at 65–67.

8 I am reminded, for example, of the negative stylistic assessments of *Missa Une mousse de Biscaye* made by Jeremy Noble in the 1980 edition of the *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, and Jaap van Benthem in his article 'Was "Une mousse de Biscaye" Really Appreciated by "L'Ami Baudichon"?', in *Muziek & Wetenschap* 1 (1991), 175–94, and the suggestion that this work somehow bears the signs of artistic or technical incompetence. A composition does not have to be this bad to not be by Josquin – in fact, few Masses in this period truly are, in my experience. Even if *Missa Une mousse* is not by Josquin, I would still rank it among the most interesting and original Mass settings of the 1480s and 1490s, uneven in its brilliance, perhaps, but consistently creative, bold, and resourceful.

9 'Grundsätzlich scheint für die Herausgabe Josquinscher Werke eine größere Skepsis angebracht, kann es doch nicht die Aufgabe sein, ein irgendwo und irgendwann Josquin zugeschriebenes

When it comes to the task of editing works by Josquin, it seems to us, as a matter of principle, that greater scepticism is in order [i.e., than exercised by Antonowycz], for surely it cannot be our mission to ‘rescue’ for the complete edition just any work ascribed to Josquin anywhere and anytime. The guiding thought ought rather be that the circle of authentic works be protected as rigorously as possible from the dubious ones, in order thereby to counteract that tendency of Josquin’s successors to assign compositions to the acknowledged master light-heartedly or out of improper motives.

Antonowycz responded with a furious article in *TVNM* in which he set out to defend the authenticity of both *Absolve quaesumus* and *Inter natos mulierum*. Why the latter work, one might ask? Just had made an issue over *Absolve*, but in the case of *Inter natos* he merely reported Osthoff’s comment, which had in any case proved groundless. Yet Antonowycz seems to have taken even this as a personal attack, and launched into an elaborate justification of his decision to publish the motet:¹⁰

If, in spite of the doubt concerning Josquin’s authorship expressed in the *MGG* article, I nevertheless included the motet *Inter natos mulierum* in the collected works edition, then this was the case because, on the one hand, I could find no convincing arguments against Josquin’s authorship, and on the other because I found a sufficient number of elements that clearly testify to Josquin’s authorship.

On the one hand, and on the other: it is the all-important question of the burden of proof. Should we insist that there be a sufficient number of stylistic elements to confirm Josquin’s authorship? In that case, it would be up to the editor to justify his decision to print it. Conversely, should the editor go ahead and publish a work when there are no convincing arguments against Josquin’s authorship? Then it would be up to others to prove that it was not by Josquin. This is a question not just of the burden of proof (i.e. the presumption of ‘innocence’ or ‘guilt’), but also about the standard of proof. We would get very different editions depending on which standard we adopted: reasonable suspicion, balance of probabilities, beyond reasonable doubt, clear and convincing proof, and so on. Different not only in terms of the repertoire

Werk für die Gesamtausgabe zu “retten”. Es sollte vielmehr der Gedanke vorherrschen, den Kreis der authentischen Werke vor dubiosen so streng wie möglich zu schützen, um damit jener Neigung der Nachfahren Josquins entgegenzuwirken, dem anerkannten Meister leichtfertig oder aus unedlen Motiven Kompositionen zuzuweisen.’ *Ibid.*

10 M. Antonowycz, ‘Zur Autorschaftsfrage der Motetten *Absolve*, *quaesumus*, *Domine* und *Inter natos mulierum*’, in *TVNM* 20 (1966), 143-69, at 161: ‘Wenn ich die Motette *Inter natos mulierum* trotz des im *MGG*-Artikel ausgesprochenen Zweifels an der Autorschaft Josquins dennoch in die Gesamtausgabe aufgenommen habe, dann geschah dies, weil ich einerseits keine überzeugenden Argumente gegen Josquins Autorschaft finden konnte, andererseits weil ich genügend Elemente gefunden habe, die deutlich Josquins Autorschaft bezeugen.’

those editions made available, but also in terms of the scholarly claims they could make for themselves.

It is important to raise these questions, for there is a marked asymmetry in the assignment of the burden of proof: it strongly favors de-attribution. No scholar risks credibility for declaring a certain work to be ‘not good enough’ for Josquin. At worst, he may prove to have erred on the side of caution, which is not a great scholarly vice in any circumstances. Besides, he can still accept Josquin’s authorship at a later point, when new evidence may have come to light, while still saving face by maintaining that the work is perhaps not among the composer’s best efforts.

On the other hand, when a scholar accepts the burden to prove the exact opposite, that the work is good enough for Josquin, he is at a rhetorical disadvantage. There is almost nothing he can argue or it will seem that he wants the work too badly to be by Josquin, that he is too personally invested to exercise proper critical rigor. Opponents are bound to wonder: how can he be so blind to the contrapuntal flaws noted by other scholars? Doesn’t his argument amount to special pleading, by selectively invoking only those features that happen not to contradict Josquin’s authorship? Should the subjective tastes and private convictions of individual scholars be allowed to compromise more objective standards?

Antonowycz faced exactly this problem. Having accepted the burden of proof, he spent several pages trying to make his case, by identifying a dozen or so melodic motives and phrases in *Inter natos mulierum* that could be found also in other works by Josquin. But what did he prove? If anything, Antonowycz set himself up for the easiest imaginable counterproof: the very real possibility that similar phrases could be found, say, in Isaac or Mouton.¹¹ And that was not the only problem. When the entire case for Josquin’s authorship is staked on one argument, then the refutation of that one argument will seem sufficient to defeat the case as a whole – no matter how many other arguments might have been invoked in addition. Worse still, by responding at such considerable length, Antonowycz made the issue appear far more contentious than it actually was. There ought to have been no issue about *Inter natos mulierum*: there had been no good reason for Osthoff to question the work, and there had been no good reason for Just to quote Osthoff regardless.

III. THE SATZFEHLER

Ironically, Osthoff himself had meanwhile changed his mind. In his two-volume monograph on Josquin des Prez, published in 1965, he accepted *Inter natos mulierum* as unquestionably a work by Josquin. What had inspired this about-turn?

11 See, for example, E.H. Sparks, ‘Problems of Authenticity in Josquin’s Motets’, in *Josquin des Prez. Proceedings of the International Josquin Festival-Conference*, edd. E.E. Lowinsky & B.J. Blackburn (London 1976), 345–59, at 356 n. 22

At this point the story takes a truly bizarre turn. Osthoff had identified an error of part-writing that he took to be distinctive of Josquin – a kind of fingerprint, one might say – and which he saw as characteristic of the composer’s early years, when he would supposedly have been too inexperienced to rectify it. The fingerprint identified by Osthoff has become known by the term he used for it, the *Satzfehler*. Here is how he explained its significance as a criterion of authenticity:¹²

However, unequivocal proof of Josquin’s authorship [of *Victimae paschali laudes*] is provided by an inconspicuous clue, namely the twofold occurrence of an error of partwriting [*Satzfehler*] that is characteristic of an entire group of five- and six-part motets: the dominant cadence with leading tone sounding simultaneously with its own suspension in different voices ...



Similar cadential formulas can be found in *Nesciens mater virgo* (five times), *Inter natos mulierum* (four times), *Ave verum Corpus*, *Responsum acceperat Simeon*, and *In illo tempore stetit Jesus*. The sources for these motets are Italian manuscripts from around 1530, later German prints, and one Spanish choirbook, so they testify to wide distribution. With the exception of one manuscript, whose conflicting ascription must be called into ques-

12 H. Osthoff, *Josquin des Prez*, 2 vols. (Tutzing 1962–65), vol. 2, 27–28: ‘Den eindeutigen Beweis für Josquins Autorschaft erbringt aber ein unscheinbares Indiz, nämlich das zweimalige Vorkommen eines Satzfehlers, der für eine ganze Gruppe fünf- und sechsstimmiger Motetten charakteristisch ist: die Dominantkadenz mit simultan erklingendem Leitton und Leittonvorhalt in verschiedenen Stimmen ... Entsprechende Klauseln finden sich in “Nesciens mater virgo” (fünffinal), “Inter natos mulierum” (viermal), “Ave verum Corpus”, “Responsum acceperat Simeon” und “In illo tempore stetit Jesus”. Die Quellen für diese Motetten sind italienische Handschriften aus der Zeit um 1530, spätere deutsche Drücke und ein spanisches Chorbuch, zeigen also eine weite Streuung. Abgesehen von einer einzigen Handschrift, deren abweichende Angabe bezweifelt werden muß, wird überall Josquin als Komponist genannt. Der alttümliche Stil ist weitgehend konform und weist in Verbindung mit den stereotypen Satzfehlern auf dieselbe Hand. Offenbar handelt es sich um frühe Arbeiten, die Josquin, wenn überhaupt, sicher erst nach Korrektur der fraglichen Stellen veröffentlicht haben würde. Denn alle anderen Motetten sowie seine zahlreichen fünf- und sechsstimmigen Chansons sind frei von solchen klanglichen Kruditäten.’

tion, Josquin is named everywhere as the composer. There is considerable conformity [between the motets] in the old-fashioned style, which, together with the stereotypical errors of part-writing, points to the same authorial hand. Evidently we are dealing here with early efforts, which Josquin would surely not have published without correction of the questionable spots, if indeed at all. For all other motets as well as countless five- and six-part chansons are free from such crudities of sound.

Since Osthoff had discovered this fingerprint in *Inter natos mulierum*, he was convinced of two things: first, that the motet was by Josquin, and second, that it was early:¹³

Three Italian manuscripts transmit Josquin's six-part, bipartite motet *Inter natos mulierum non surrexit major Johanne Baptista* (F Ionian mode; *Werken*, Motet 84). The text is a compilation of Matt. 11: 10-11 as well as John 1: 6; it is concerned with St John the Baptist as Precursor of Christ, was demonstrably in use as a Responsoy in Germany around 1500, and is found, with a similar melodic nucleus, in settings by Balthasar Resinarius and Thomas Stoltzer. Josquin's motet is made up of a triple-meter first section, which is contrapuntally extremely dense and has a strongly 'instrumental' character, and a duple-meter second section, which is more vocal in conception. To judge from its overall style, the composition belongs to those early and as yet very uneven motets whose hallmark is the dominant cadence in which the leading tone sounds simultaneously with its own suspension. In this connection we remind the reader of the motets *Victimae paschali laudes* (a6) and *Nesciens mater virgo*, already discussed. There is as little reason to doubt the authenticity of the piece as there is to doubt that the mature Josquin would never have published it in the version as transmitted.

13 'Drei italienische Handschriften haben Josquins sechsstimmige, zweiteilige Motette "Inter natos mulierum non surrexit major Johanne Baptista" (f-jonisch; G.A., Mot. 84) überliefert. Der Text ist eine Kompilation aus Matthäus 11, V. 11 und 10 sowie Johannes 1, V. 6; er bezieht sich auf Johannes den Täufer als Wegbereiter Christi, wurde nachweislich um 1500 in Deutschland als Responsorium gebraucht und begegnet mit übereinstimmendem melodischem Kern in Vertonungen von Balthasar Resinarius und Thomas Stoltzer. Josquins Motette zerfällt in einen kontrapunktisch äußerst dichten, tripeltaktigen ersten Teil von stark "instrumentalem" Charakter und einen zweiten, mehr vokal geprägten Abschnitt im geraden Zeitmaß. Nach ihrem ganzen Stil gehört die Komposition zu jenen frühen, noch sehr unausgeglichenen Motetten, deren Indiz die Dominantkadenz mit gleichzeitigem Erklingen von Leitton und Leittonvorhalt bildet. Wir erinnern dazu an die schon besprochenen Motetten "Victimae paschali laudes" (6st.) und "Nesciens mater virgo". An der Echtheit des Stückes ist ebensowenig zu zweifeln wie daran, daß der reife Josquin es niemals in der überlieferten Fassung veröffentlicht haben würde.' Osthoff, *Josquin des Prez*, vol. 2, 52-53.

And so Osthoff included *Inter natos mulierum* in a group of early motets that exhibited this same feature, a group that would soon become known as ‘The *Satzfehler* Motets.’ Nowadays, ‘early’ for Josquin would probably mean about 1475–1485. But when Osthoff published his monograph it could conceivably have meant as early as the 1460s. With such a presumed date of composition, attributions in two sources copied around 1530 or later were unlikely to carry a great deal of weight. So the weight of the evidence in Josquin’s favor shifted to the *Satzfehler*. From now on, the fortunes of *Inter natos mulierum* would be bound up not only with this fingerprint, but also with the small group of motets that were known to exhibit it.

The next chapter in this story takes place at the Josquin Festival-Conference at New York in 1971. One of the contributors at this historic event, Edgar Sparks, devoted a paper to the ‘problem’ of the *Satzfehler* motets, that is, the question whether they were actually even by Josquin.¹⁴ Sparks quickly proved that Osthoff had been mistaken about one point. The *Satzfehler* which he had regarded as unique to Josquin could be found in the works of numerous other composers, including Mouton, L’Héritier, Lupus Hellinck, Clemens non Papa, Gombert, and Willaert. In fact it was to become almost universal in the decades after Josquin’s death.

Contrary to what Osthoff had argued, then, the *Satzfehler* was not distinctive at all, and the motets that shared this feature had no particular claim to Josquin’s authorship. In fact, they were not even early. Sparks demonstrated that the *Satzfehler* was almost unknown before about 1500, and did not become truly widespread until much later, in the 1520s and 1530s. Osthoff had been able to account for this contrapuntal ‘error’ by associating it with the young and presumably inexperienced Josquin. Now that it had to be associated with the old Josquin, perhaps it was better not to associate it with the composer at all.

At this point, therefore, any other feature that pointed away from Josquin’s authorship was likely to attract special notice, and the stylistic side of the case was bound to gain correspondingly in importance. Sparks discussed each of the *Satzfehler* motets in turn, yet he found little to praise and much to fault. More than that, he judged the style of most of these pieces far too late to be plausibly dated within Josquin’s lifetime.

The one work that gave him pause, however, was *Inter natos mulierum*. He left it to the last and discussed the problem of its authorship in far more cautious and circumspect terms than he had done in the other cases. Sparks began with the back-handed compliment that the motet was ‘least easy to fault’, and even admitted that the smoothness of the writing indicated a musically gifted composer:¹⁵

The work least easy to fault, it seems, is ‘Inter natos mulierum’, which Osthoff at one time considered spurious, although he now accepts it as authentic. Here, the irregular-

14 For this and what follows, see Sparks, ‘Problems of Authenticity in Josquin’s Motets’.

15 For this and the following quotation, see Sparks, ‘Problems of Authenticity’, 356–57.

ity of the points of imitation, when they occur, the constant use of hemiola in triple metre, and other features make a date of the latter half of the fifteenth century plausible. The smoothness of the writing indicates a musically gifted composer, although he apparently liked the dubious cadential suspension very much, for all four appearances are repetitions of one another.

Still, Sparks found the motet unusual for Josquin, and for this he gave three reasons:

... the thick scoring of the *prima pars*, the numerous suspensions with resolution and dissonance sounding simultaneously, and the lack, despite the great amount of repetition, of symmetrically balanced pairs of phrases (29 out of the 88 measures of the work are repetitions) make the work sound unusual for Josquin. Furthermore, Osthoff's primary evidence for accepting the motet as genuine (the *Satzfehler*) is now shown to be valueless, so that his former rejection of the work takes on renewed importance. I am inclined to agree with his first reaction, and to suggest that it belongs among the *opera dubia*...

It is hard not to wonder, however, if all this wasn't simply a foregone conclusion. Consider the second of the three reasons given by Sparks: 'the numerous suspensions with resolution and dissonance sounding simultaneously', that is, the numerous occurrences of the *Satzfehler*. The argument here is obviously circular: it already presupposes a negative answer to the question Sparks was yet to decide, namely, whether motets containing the *Satzfehler* are, or could be, by Josquin.

Did the motet ever stand a realistic chance? Not if we are to infer the object of Sparks' enquiry from his remark that this work was 'least easy to fault.' Least easy, perhaps, but never impossibly so. Besides the *Satzfehler*, Sparks drew attention to the 'thick scoring' of the *prima pars*, and the 'lack of balanced pairs of phrases', both of which he regarded as unusual for Josquin. It is these two features, along with the *Satzfehler*, that inclined him 'to agree with [Osthoff's] first reaction' – which of course had not been a reaction so much as an oversight.

An *opus dubium* still has a chance: doubts can be dispelled. Any hope of this, however, vanished with the final paragraph. Arriving now at a blanket assessment, Sparks concluded:¹⁶

I am inclined to reject every one of the '*Satzfehler* motets'. I do not find them musically convincing, nor the arguments in their behalf persuasive. True, one can hardly expect Josquin to write a masterpiece every time he sets pen to paper; nor can one expect him to write without stylistic variation. But how dull a work, and how much variation from the norm can one accept?

16 Sparks, 'Problems of Authenticity', 359.

By virtue of its membership in this group, then, *Inter natos mulierum* acquired three damning qualifications. Along with the other motets, it was now judged to be a dull work, not musically convincing, and exhibiting more than acceptable variation from the norm. To all intents and purposes the case was decided. After Sparks, whose article was published in 1976, I don't know of any Josquin scholar – with the possible exception of myself – who has been willing to risk his credibility on the authenticity of *Inter natos mulierum*. Nor is that surprising. The asymmetry noted before ensures that few if any works can ever make it back into the canon. As I know from my own experience, nothing is easier than to make a Josquin scholar lose interest in a work that can be made to look dubious, and nothing harder than to rekindle that interest once it is lost.¹⁷

This asymmetry appears to be unique to Josquin scholarship, and accounts for many of its problems. It is the asymmetry, for example, that allows minor oversights, such as we may all commit from time to time, to cause irreversible miscarriages of scholarship. Is this what happened in the case of *Inter natos mulierum*? All because Osthoff happened to have overlooked Lowinsky's article, and because he mistook the *Satzfehler* for a distinctively Josquinian fingerprint? I would argue yes. For, as it would soon turn out, it was not just Osthoff who had been mistaken about the *Satzfehler*, but Sparks as well.

Fourteen years after the latter's article, there appeared a little-noted essay by Stanley Boorman entitled 'False Relations and the Cadence'.¹⁸ A large part of the essay was devoted to the *Satzfehler*, examined now in the context of a general predilection for dissonant clashes and false relations in the early sixteenth century. Since Boorman was not directly concerned with the question of authenticity, he made no particular fuss over the bombshell he nevertheless landed on Josquin scholarship.

The evidence he presented came down to this. There is no such thing as 'the *Satzfehler* motets', there never was – unless we are prepared to include not just the original six identified by Osthoff, but at least eight more works, all of them with the strongest imaginable attestation of Josquin's authorship. Consider the list printed in Table 1. All of these pieces exhibit the *Satzfehler*, and they include some of the core works of the Josquin canon: settings like *Ave nobilissima*, *Benedicta es*, *Miserere*, *O vir-*

17 Consider, in this connection, the case of *Absalon fili mi*. Its expulsion from the Josquin canon, as called for by Joshua Rifkin and Jaap van Benthem, has been hailed as a victory of critical rigor over naïve credulity. Who is going to think now that Josquin might have composed it? And yet, while *Absalon* may not have as strong a case as other works, the fact remains that it is ascribed to him and no one else. We cannot definitively rule out the possibility that it is a work by Josquin, or even dismiss that possibility as merely hypothetical. In fact why should we have a stake in doing either of these things? Despite these considerable odds, *Absalon* did end up being published in *NJE*.

18 S. Boorman, 'False Relations and the Cadence', in *Altro polo. Essays on Italian Music in the Cinquecento*, ed. R. Charteris (Sydney 1990), 221–64.

go prudentissima, and *Praeter rerum seriem*. With the exception of the six-part *Baisez moy*, none of these works survives in sources predating the 1510s. The conclusion is inescapable: Josquin was quite capable of composing *Satzfehler* motets (if that is how we must continue to call them), and in fact he wrote quite a few towards the end of his career.

Table 1. Examples of the ‘*Satzfehler*’ in works ascribed to Josquin, as identified by S. Boorman (see note 18). Earliest known sources indicated in right-hand column.

<i>Ave nobilissima creatura</i>	1519 ² (‘Josquin’); BolC R142 (‘Josquin’)
<i>Benedicta es celorum regina</i>	1520 ⁴ (‘Josquin’); BolC R142 (‘Josquin’)
<i>Miserere mei Deus</i>	Medici Codex (‘Josquin’); 1519 ² 1520 ⁴ (‘Josquin’)
<i>Missa de beata virgine</i>	J1514, 1516 ¹ , VatS 23 and 45 (‘Josquin des Prez’)
<i>O virgo prudentissima</i>	1520 ⁴ (‘Josquin’)
<i>Praeter rerum seriem</i>	UppsU 76b (‘Josquin’); 1519 ² 1520 ⁴ (‘Josquin’); BolC R142 (‘Josquin’); RomeV 35–40 (‘Josquin’)
<i>Baisez moy</i> a6	1502 ¹
<i>Faulte d’argent</i>	AugsS 142a (‘Josquinn’)
<i>Je ne me puis tenir</i>	transmission wholly after c.1540
<i>Mi lares vous tousjours languir</i>	transmitted uniquely in 1540 ⁷
<i>Vous l’arez s’il vous plaist</i> , a6	transmission wholly after 1545

Osthoff had expressly denied that *Satzfehler* could be found in any Josquin setting other than the six motets he had singled out: ‘all other motets as well as countless five- and six-part chansons are free from such crudities of sound.’¹⁹ One can only assume that it was another oversight that caused him to miss the instances cited by Boorman, and sheer coincidence that he did happen to spot the *Satzfehler* in *Inter natos mulierum* and five other motets. However that may be, the oversight and the coincidence had had far-reaching consequences. Without them, there would never have been a ‘problem’ of the *Satzfehler* motets, nor any basis for Sparks to accept or reject those motets as a group. Nor could Sparks have questioned *Inter natos mulierum*, circularly, on the *a priori* assumption that the *Satzfehler* was uncharacteristic of Josquin. As we will see on more than one occasion, what is unusual today may have to be accepted as normal tomorrow.

¹⁹ Osthoff, *Josquin des Prez*, vol. 2, 28.

If we were dealing with cancer research, one imagines that scientists made sure to rectify such errors and undo their consequences: no one, after all, wants to miss a cure for cancer. Yet this is unnecessary in the case of *Inter natos mulierum* since it is not in the canon anyway. Why should we care more about this piece than about the properly accredited works of Josquin? It is true that all evidence against Josquin's authorship has had to be thrown out of court. It is equally true that *Inter natos* ought never have been expelled from the canon in the first place. But that doesn't mean it isn't spurious. For decades it has been agreed that the two manuscript attributions must be false. Why should we suddenly put blind faith in those same attributions? Consider the parallel case of Lothario. It is true that he did not kill Barbertje, that he did not cut her up into pieces, nor even salted and pickled her. But he did call himself an honest man when these very charges showed that he wasn't. Not even the subsequent dismissal of those charges can excuse the insolence to which that amounted at the time.

Still, if we could retrace our steps and reexamine the two attributions, would that really change the picture significantly? How trustworthy are those sources anyway? Caution may well be in order: according to Martin Just, in Volume 19 of the *New Josquin Edition*, '[t]he reliability of the ascription [of *Inter natos*] in both early sources is weakened by some doubtful works in each.'²⁰ If that is indeed the case, then clearly it is important to establish how much store we can really set by the ascriptions.

The case does not begin too promisingly. One of the two sources is RomeV 35–40, a set of six partbooks copied in Florence around 1530–31. It is filled almost wholly with works by Willaert, Verdelot, Arcadelt, Jachet of Mantua, Gombert, and others, and contains only six works that are ascribed here to Josquin. One of these is *Inter natos mulierum*. Two others have conflicting attributions elsewhere, which is not an encouraging sign. The other three settings are core works of Josquin's later years: *Praeter rerum seriem*, *Pater noster*, and the latter's companion piece *Ave Maria*. *Inter natos mulierum* is found next to the first of these. The overall picture is inconclusive. With RomeV 35–40 we are effectively caught in a hermeneutic circle: if we are to accept it as a reliable source, we need to be sure that all its ascriptions to Josquin are correct, but if we are to establish that all works are indeed by Josquin, we need to know that their ascriptions occur in a reliable source. For the purposes of our enquiry, the reliability of RomeV 35–40 as a Josquin source must stand or fall with the two motets that have conflicting attributions elsewhere. Unfortunately, both of these cases are in their own way as undecided (*pace NJE*) as *Inter natos mulierum*, except that the latter

20 M. Just, ed., *Motets on Texts from the New Testament*, vol. 19 of Josquin des Prez, *The New Josquin Edition*, Critical Commentary (Utrecht 1998), 109–13, at 111.

motet has no conflicting attributions.²¹ At the present state of knowledge we are not in a position to say much with confidence about RomeV 35–40 as a Josquin source.

The other source offers a much clearer picture. It is BolC R142, a single tenor partbook of what was originally a set of six. It transmits twenty works with ascriptions to Josquin, and an additional six that are dubiously ascribed to Josquin elsewhere but not here (see Table 2). Josquin is the single most important composer in the set. Three other composers, represented with only a handful of works each, are Mouton, Verdelot, and Jachet of Mantua. And there are one or two settings by the frottolists Tromboncino and Cara. All this is consistent with the dates proposed by Helmuth Osthoff (c.1515–30), Knud Jeppesen (some time after 1523), and Bonnie Blackburn (not before the 1530s).²²

BolC R142 gives a reliable impression. Of the twenty attributions to Josquin, only one – for *Salva nos Domine* – seems wide of the mark, being contradicted by all other sources.²³ Less serious is the case of *Veni sancte spiritus*, for even if we accept this as a work by Forestier, Bologna’s ascription to Josquin is at least shared by three German manuscripts and Ott’s *Novum et insigne opus musicum* (1537¹). However that may be, the point is this: the attribution of *Inter natos mulierum* in BolC R142 is not only unconflicted, but positively supported by RomeV 35–40, being anonymous in two other sources. Not that this necessarily proves Josquin’s authorship. But neither does it support a *prima facie* case against it. If *Inter natos mulierum* was written by Josquin in his final years, Bologna is exactly the source where one would expect it to turn up.²⁴

21 *Victimae paschali laudes* a6 is one of the *Satzfehler* motets: it is ascribed to Josquin both here and in ToleBC 10 (Toledo, mid-1540s), appears anonymously in FlorBN Magl. 125bis (Florence, early 1530s), and is ascribed to ‘Jo. Brunet’ in VatS 24 (copied in Rome, c.1545). The source situation favors Josquin, not only because there are two independent attributions to him, in manuscripts copied as far apart as Italy and Spain, but because there is not a single work by Brunet that is known to survive in places other than Rome: *Victimae paschali* would be his first known setting to have been copied in northern Italy and Spain. The style of the motet is vintage Josquin: one is reminded especially of *O virgo virginum*. I will return to the interesting case of *Victimae paschali laudes* a6 in another context.

Confitemini Domino a6 is a more difficult case, since it survives in only two sources. The motet is ascribed to Josquin in RomeV 35–40, but attributed to Mouton in VatS 38 (copied in Rome, c.1550–63). The source situation might seem slightly to favor Josquin, given that the ascription to Mouton does not turn up until more than thirty years after the death of both composers. Yet there is too little evidence to be sure either way.

22 See the extensive discussion in B.J. Blackburn, ‘Josquin’s Chansons. Ignored and Lost Sources’, in *JAMS* 29 (1976), 30–76, at 50–54, and the literature cited there.

23 *Salva nos* is ascribed to Mouton in nine sources, and to Willaert in one. See A.M. Cummings, ‘Giulio de’ Medici’s Music Books’, in *Early Music History* 10 (1991), 65–122, at 118.

24 This, obviously, is far from the last word on BolC R142 as a whole. Although the partbook was apparently made entirely from one type of paper, Blackburn has identified no fewer than six

Table 2. BolC R142, a single tenor partbook copied in northern Italy *c.*1530, as a source for works ascribed to Josquin. Works marked * are ascribed to Josquin only in the second index.

<i>Ave Maria ... virgo serena</i>	Josquin	
<i>Ave Maria ... benedicta*</i>	Jo. Monton	attr. to Mouton also in BolC Q19 and 1521 ⁴
<i>Ave Maria ... benedicta</i>	Brumel	Josquin in 1504 ¹
<i>Ave nobilissima creatura</i>	Josquin	
<i>Benedicta es celorum regina</i>	Josquin	
<i>Ecce tu pulchra es</i>	Josquin	
<i>Fors seulement a6</i>	Josquin	anon. in all other sources
<i>Huc me sydereo</i>	Josquin	
<i>In illo tempore stetit Jesus</i>	Josquin	attr. to Josquin in five other sources after 1540
<i>Iniquos odio habui</i>	Josquin	no other source known
<i>In nomine Jhesu</i>	Jo. Monton	attr. Josquin in late 16th-c. sources only
<i>Inter natos mulierum</i>	Josquin	attr. Josquin also in RomeV 35-40; anon. elsewhere
<i>Memor esto</i>	Josquin	
<i>Missa Hercules, Agnus III</i>	Josquin	
<i>Missus est angelus Gabriel</i>	Josquin	
<i>Nymphes nappes</i>	Josquin	
<i>O virgo virginum</i>	Josquin	
<i>Petite camusette</i>	Josquin	
<i>Praeter rerum seriem</i>	Josquin	
<i>Plus nulz regretz</i>	Josquin	
<i>Quam pulchra es</i>	Jo. Mo.	attr. to Josquin in 1537 ¹
<i>Salva nos, Domine</i>	Josquin	Mouton in ModD 9 and 1521 ⁶ ; Willaert in 1542 ¹⁰
<i>Salve regina*</i>	Jachet	Jacquet in VatS 24; Verdelot in RomeV 35-40
<i>Se congié prens</i>	Josquin	
<i>Tenez moy</i>	Josquin	
<i>Veni sancte spiritus</i>	Josquin	Forestier in UppsU 76b; Josquin in 1537 ¹ and elsewhere

scribal hands, whose activities may have extended from *c.*1530 to as late as *c.*1550. The two main scribes were responsible for most of Josquin's music. One of them appears to have copied a handful of six-part songs directly from the print 1544¹³, after which he supplied these pieces with Latin texts. Pending a detailed palaeographical study, to determine, amongst other things, which scribe was responsible for *Inter natos mulierum*, the motet's ascription in BolC R142 carries less weight, in itself, than the fact that the ascription is corroborated by another contemporary source.

Certainly this is not a novel conclusion. John Milsom and Ludwig Finscher have independently emphasized that *Inter natos mulierum* survives in relatively good sources, sources of reasonable authority.²⁵ Lawrence Bernstein has likewise argued that BolC R142 is ‘quite reliable with respect to its Josquin attributions.’²⁶ Yet the point bears underlining nevertheless, because transmission is the only hard evidence left in this case, and it happens to favor Josquin’s authorship. We will soon face the critical question how much store we are actually prepared to set by hard evidence.

V. END OF STORY

What better hope of a fair and definitive resolution of the story of *Inter natos mulierum* than the *New Josquin Edition*, a project whose very *raison d’être* has been to sort wheat from chaff? Ten years ago, in 1998, *NJE* did indeed write the final chapter of the story. The editorial board had grouped the piece among the motets based on New Testament texts, scheduled to appear in Volume 19. The editor responsible for that volume, as it turns out, was no stranger to *Inter natos mulierum*: the task fell to Martin Just, the very scholar who had once provoked Myroslaw Antonowycz into defending its authenticity.

Building on the conclusions drawn by Sparks (see above, pp. 44–45), but carefully avoiding to invoke the *Satzfehler* as an argument either for or against, Just came to a new determination based on details of musical style. The verdict he returned was an unqualified no: *Inter natos mulierum* could not be admitted even to the middle category of doubtful works, but was definitely spurious and therefore to be excluded from the edition altogether.

What was it about the musical style that made it possible to reach so firm a conclusion in so brief a commentary? To answer that question, we must examine the one paragraph in which Just had motivated his conclusion. In the following quotation of that paragraph, I have taken the liberty of itemizing the statements by number, and offering my own conjectures as to what they can be taken to mean (see Appendix 1 for an edition of the motet):²⁷

- 1 Certain other details strengthen Sparks’s arguments. If one looks at Josquin’s other, thus far unquestioned, six-part motets (e.g. *O virgo virginum*), even the densely scored sections are more clearly and rationally constructed.

25 Milsom, ‘Motets for Five or More Voices’, 313; L. Finscher, ‘Josquin des Prez’, in *MGG*², Personenteil 9, cols. 1210–82, at col. 1228.

26 L.F. Bernstein, ‘*Ma bouche rit et mon cœur pleure*. A Chanson a 5 Attributed to Josquin des Prez’, in *Journal of Musicology* 12 (1994), 253–86, at 254.

27 Just, *Motets on Texts from the New Testament* (*NJE* 19), Critical Commentary 113.

The editor invokes a comparison with other six-part motets by Josquin, citing *O virgo virginum* specifically. Either this work, or *Inter natos* itself, is judged to be ‘more clearly and rationally constructed’, and this ‘even in the more densely scored sections.’ One would assume that clear and rational construction were thought to be the hallmarks of Josquin, but the wording is ambiguous.

- 2 *Inter natos mulierum* evidently uses no *cantus prius factus*; at least, the melody of the responsory with that text, which is in the first mode, cannot be traced in the motet (5th/6th mode). At mm. 18–25 T2 presents the text as if on the percussion-tone *c*’.

This does not appear to be an argument for or against Josquin’s authorship, since the editor merely addresses the question of whether there is a *cantus prius factus*.

- 3 There is hardly any motivic knitting-together of the voices, even with improvements to the text-underlay in the *Werken* (e.g. S 65–67 and 73–75 ‘erat Johannes’ or 81 ff. A ‘alleluia’).

The editor notes the virtual lack of ‘motivic knitting-together of the voices’, a lack that would not be remedied even if motives were more consistently underlaid with the same words in all voices. At the risk of misreading this comment, I assume that the editor would have expected Josquin to create a tighter and more coherent musical fabric, one whose coherence derived from motives in all voices being kept as closely together as stitches in knitting work.

- 4 The repetitions specified by Sparks on the one hand establish connections between the ends of the two *partes*; on the other, they obscure this intention with different codas and incidental repetitions.

Repetitions of groups of measures within the motet establish connections between the endings of the two sections. This is deemed consistent with Josquin’s *modus operandi*. However, the two sections have different ‘codas’ (by which the editor presumably means that the final chords are elaborated in slightly different ways) and there are incidental repetitions elsewhere, all of which is seen to obscure the apparent intention to link the endings musically – this being less consistent with Josquin, or perhaps not consistent with at Josquin all.

- 5 An attempt is made to mark the beginning of the second section of the *prima pars* (mm. 17 ff.) by reducing the texture to three low voices, but in spite of the cadential progression this produces no clear caesura, since B1 and B2 disengage themselves only gradually from the cadencing upper voices.

The cadence about halfway through the *prima pars*, in measure 17, seems to mark the

beginning of a new musical section, because of the reduction of texture. The editor might have considered this consistent with Josquin's style if there had been a clear caesura at this point. However, the cadencing upper voices keep going for an additional measure, thereby blurring the caesura – this being untypical of Josquin.

- 6 At the beginning of the *secunda pars* the contrast of low and high three-part textures, each with its upper voice in long notes, suggests a rationally organized dialogue, but the correspondence turns out to be only approximate.

The beginning of the *secunda pars* features a contrast between two different textures, for high voices and low voices, respectively. Insofar as this suggests 'a rationally organized dialogue' the editor might have regarded it as consistent with Josquin's style. But since the correspondence between the two differently-textured stretches is 'only approximate' (which I take to mean that there is no repetition of musical material), the passage is deemed unusual for Josquin.

- 7 Considered as a whole the work does not match our conception of one of Josquin's six-part works.

This item can be set aside, as well as item 11, below, which duplicates it.

- 8 It is precisely the 'Satzfehler' and the attempts at a rational organization of the texture which make one doubt whether this can be a work of the 15th century that somehow survived in secret until the 1530s, before turning up in Italian manuscripts.

The editor seems to argue that *Inter natos mulierum* cannot be an early setting, because it features the *Satzfehler* and makes 'attempts at rational organisation' – by which I assume he means that the attempts are unsuccessful. This seems to be a point about chronology, not authorship.

- 9 The dense texture, quite lacking in correspondences and symmetries, also excludes the possibility that it could be a late work of Josquin's.

Inter natos mulierum cannot be a late work by Josquin because of its 'dense texture' which is said to be 'lacking in correspondences and symmetries.' My best guess is that the editor means motivic correspondences and formal symmetries, though *Inter natos mulierum* does not appear to show a significant lack in either of these respects. In any case, the point is once again about chronology, not authorship per se.

- 10 The fact that it is transmitted in two sources from the 1530s tallies much more convincingly with the spread of the characteristic cadence-form and the stylistic shift to more than four voices and their freer interrelationship.

Transmission in sources from the 1530s is seen to tally less convincingly with Josquin's later years than it does with style changes presumed to have evolved after the composer's lifetime. If the latter is the point here, then the date of the sources cannot really be said to make much difference. After all, one of those sources, BolC R142, is almost wholly devoted to works by Josquin, and contains several settings that confirm the composer's use of the 'characteristic cadence form' as well as the shift to five- and six-part writing in his output.

11 The work is therefore excluded as spurious.

As far as *Inter natos mulierum* is concerned, this does indeed seem to have been the final curtain. All there remains for us to do is to find out why the ending remains so unsatisfactory, why it somehow feels inconclusive. Part of that impression, probably, is to do with a lingering sense that the motet was not, in the end, given the careful and dispassionate re-examination it had deserved all along, that it should have been given more of a chance.

And yet, that does not explain everything. Even if *NJE* had offered a more considered argument based on musical style, one wonders how conclusively that could have settled the matter. This is not because of what we can, or cannot, tell about stylistic features in themselves. Rather, it seems, it is because there is a fundamental groundrule that has not been agreed upon. The critical issue, not only about *Inter natos mulierum* but also about other works, is this: if a work is unanimously ascribed to Josquin in two or more independent and relatively trustworthy sources, are we able to accept that evidence – *even* when it tells us something that we didn't expect to hear? It is this question to which we must now turn.

VI THE OTHER JOSQUIN

There are two possible responses to the question. One is that we start by giving hard evidence the benefit of the doubt. The other is that we set the evidence aside whenever our doubt seems to justify that. These two responses are bound to lead to very different images of Josquin, neither necessarily wrong, except of course in terms of each other. The case of *Inter natos mulierum* illustrates the dilemma.

As we can tell from the different opinions about this motet, the image of Josquin has been constantly evolving in the last few decades. If we consider this a positive thing, then one possible response to *Inter natos mulierum* might be this: the motet is not quite like other works by Josquin, but for that very reason it has the potential to refine or correct our image of the composer. In that case, we would put our trust in the attributions, and accommodate any apparent stylistic anomalies by broadening our image of Josquin, accepting historical possibilities that we had not previously en-

visaged. (A good example is the *Satzfehler*, which Sparks once took to be unusual, but must now be accepted as quite normal for Josquin.) There is nothing revolutionary about this, of course. It is what evidence asks us to do all the time: revise scenarios, entertain possibilities, be prepared to be proved wrong.

Another response may be equally viable, however: since *Inter natos* is not quite like other works by Josquin, we may have no choice but to reject it. In that case, we would put our trust in the image of Josquin that already exists, and decline to be at the mercy of evidence that can be shown, on the strength of that very image, to be unreliable. From this perspective, the first of the two responses must seem naively trusting, uncritical, perhaps even unscholarly. Conversely, from the perspective of the first response, it could be dangerous to put one's trust in a fixed image, because there might be nothing to correct that image if it happened to be false. In other words, we might end up rejecting the very evidence that we stood most to learn from. So really it can go either way. Either *Inter natos mulierum* has something to tell us about Josquin that few other settings could have told us, or it cannot be trusted precisely because we didn't expect to hear what it says.

There is good news about this situation, and bad news. To begin with the good news, the marvelous thing about the dilemma is that whichever alternative we choose, it will always seem the right one in hindsight – such is the comforting reality of the circular. The bad news is that there is nothing to help us decide which path to choose. Stylistic evidence alone cannot tell us whether to accept or reject *Inter natos mulierum*, for the question is precisely *how* that evidence should be evaluated. So, depending on what choice we make, one could say that there are really two Josquins – both equally hypothetical, both equally likely to be either true or false.

First, there is the figure we shall call Josquin β , the man who could not possibly have written a motet like *Inter natos mulierum*. Him we know only too well: he has a fairly consistent stylistic profile, and is known for his disinclination to depart from a clearly-defined set of compositional habits. Much less known is the other Josquin, Josquin γ as I will call him. He was a man capable not only of conceiving a motet like *Inter natos mulierum*, but several other works that are as characteristic of him as they would have been uncharacteristic of Josquin β . We know Josquin γ less well than Josquin β , but there is far more evidence attesting to his stylistic versatility and prolificacy.

Like textual versions in a stemma, Josquin β and Josquin γ are *versions* of the 'real' Josquin – of Josquin α , as only God the Searcher of Hearts knew him, better even than he knew himself. Josquin α we can never claim to know except indirectly, through versions based on historical evidence. The 'disjunctive variant' in the stemma is *Inter natos mulierum*: it appears in one branch but not the other.

With this in mind, let us return to the *New Josquin Edition*, and reconsider one of its conclusions about *Inter natos mulierum*: 'Considered as a whole the work does not match our conception of one of Josquin's six-part works'. For the purposes of our enquiry we may translate this as follows: considered as a whole the work does not match the stylistic profile of Josquin β . To which we may reasonably add: given its

transmission in reliable sources, however, there would be no problem about accepting it as a work by Josquin γ .

Why is it useful to live with these two alternatives? The answer is twofold. First, why rule out a historical possibility that may very well be true? For all we know, the real Josquin – Josquin α – did in fact compose *Inter natos mulierum*, exactly as the evidence tells us. Why, then, should we put all our money on the exclusive possibility of a Josquin β who did not compose it? Certainly it is not the musical style of the motet that compels to do so. Rather, it is something else: the assumption that Josquin α , the real Josquin, would never have departed from a relatively circumscribed range of stylistic choices. Yet we do not, and cannot ever know Josquin α . The assumption applies at best only to Josquin β , who does indeed seem to have been something of a musical conservative. But Josquin γ was quite different, perfectly prepared to engage with styles beyond the experience of Josquin β , as we can tell from many of the works ascribed to him.

Second, if we can live with two equally viable working hypotheses, Josquin scholarship would be far less hampered by methodological problems than it has been in the past. For one thing, there would be no asymmetry in the burden of proof. In fact there would be nothing to prove. From the viewpoint of methodology, Josquin's authorship is not a truth-claim to be proved or disproved, but a working hypothesis to be explored. There is no area of scholarly enquiry or it will benefit from allowing, indeed positively encouraging, alternative working hypotheses to compete side by side. No scholar could ever be at a rhetorical disadvantage simply for pursuing a plausible scenario, or for arguing its merits. The situation would rather be like that which prevailed among scientists in pre-war Göttingen: 'The quip among professors was ... that on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays the electron would behave like a particle; on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays it would behave like a wave.'²⁸

And yet, if there are two alternative hypotheses, and if neither can be proved wrong on the terms of the other, then how are we to proceed? How are we to evaluate their relative merits? Here, again, the answer seems straightforward. There may be two hypotheses, but there is only one body of evidence. A hypothesis may account for some of the evidence, but it will inevitably have to explain away or ignore other evidence. Its relative strength comes from the amount of evidence it can plausibly explain, and its relative weakness from the amount of evidence it has to explain away.

From this perspective, paradoxically, the rejection of *Inter natos mulierum* does not actually strengthen the image of Josquin β , but weaken it: it leaves two manuscript attributions to be accounted for – two loose ends that would be tied up by the image of Josquin γ . Nor would the offhand dismissal of Josquin γ , even just as a hypothetical possibility, strengthen Josquin β , on the contrary.²⁹ It would merely make it eas-

28 J. Bronowski, *The Ascent of Man* (London 1973), 364.

29 In public presentations of this paper I have been surprised by the determination even of senior scholars to prove that Josquin γ cannot have existed because *Inter natos mulierum* is too 'unusual'

ier not to notice the one major problem about the latter: the fact that this image has been progressively weakening, losing evidentiary support, with every de-attribution that has seemed to delineate its contours more sharply.

Here, then, is what it comes down to. There is no compelling case against Josquin's authorship of *Inter natos mulierum*, there never was. All that remains, after a trail of oversights, errors, and rushes to judgement, is a lingering prejudice that the motet is somehow unusual for Josquin. Even that doesn't amount to a credible case. There is nothing to compel us to deny 'the unusual' to Josquin, not on principle. Reject the motet and it will forever seem unusual for the Josquin β you have thereby created. Accept it, and it will be worthy of the Josquin γ whose existence you have thereby admitted to the realm of possibility.

VII TOWARDS AN IMAGE OF JOSQUIN γ

There are several important points to emerge from the story of *Inter natos mulierum*, two of which are of particular relevance to Josquin γ , the 'other' Josquin. The first has already been underlined earlier: a work that is ascribed to Josquin but survives in only one or two sources is not, on that account, any less likely to be by him (above, pp. 35–36). To rephrase this as a more general observation, there is no simple or necessary correlation between the number of sources that ascribe a work to Josquin and the relative probability that he wrote it.

When it comes to Josquin γ , therefore, we will have to take into consideration many works that have fallen by the wayside over the last fifty or so years. In the first instance this must include *Inter natos mulierum* itself, the motet that has served as our disjunctive variant in defining Josquin γ as distinct from Josquin β . It must also include some of the *Satzfehler* motets, notably the six-part *In illo tempore stetit Jesus*. The latter is unanimously ascribed to Josquin in six sources, copied or printed as far apart as Denmark, Poland, Germany, and Italy, without a conflicting attribution anywhere. Yet the editors of *NJE* – consistent with the general observation stated a moment ago – have rejected the work.³⁰ One of the motet's sources, interestingly, is BolC R142, which looks increasingly as if it may be central to our understanding of Josquin's last years.

With the consistent stylistic profile that emerges from these and other late motets,

to allow that even as a possibility. In terms of the case put forward in the present essay, such arguments obviously beg the question.

30 It could be objected that only two of these ascriptions may be genuinely independent. However, this objection would be valid only if there were a conflicting attribution – in which case one would have to establish the relative authority of the two attributions. Yet there is no conflicting attribution in the case *In illo tempore*. If the motet was by Josquin, therefore, all attributions would by definition be dependent on source α , and thus it would be unrealistic to expect attributions to be independent.

other works are bound to take on new significance. For example, *Victimae paschali laudes* a6 is a strong candidate even for the authorship of Josquin β (above n. 21), though it has been rejected by the editors of *NJE*. The motet would be an even stronger candidate for Josquin γ , and would render this hypothesis not just plausible but attractive: it shares all the musical qualities that make *O virgo virginum* a work of such haunting beauty.³¹ The same is true of the extraordinary *Missa Quem dicunt homines*, whose style suggests a date in the mid-1510s or later.³² It survives with an ascription to Josquin in its only source (MilA 46), and this has made it an easy target for scholars committed to preserving the integrity of Josquin β 's oeuvre. Yet unless one shares that commitment, it is hard to agree with the editors of *NJE* that the Mass cannot possibly have been composed by the historical Josquin – and the working hypothesis of Josquin γ allows us to explore the attractive possibility that he did.

It will be noted that what seems to be unusual for Josquin β is not necessarily unusual for Josquin γ , the author of *Inter natos mulierum*. As a criterion of authorship, 'the unusual' is indeed necessarily an artefact of whatever image it helps to define: it will vary according to which image we choose to explore, and to how that image changes over time.

So the first point, about the number of sources and the probability of Josquin's authorship, allows us to develop a picture that may be more complicated and less easy to pare down, but also in closer agreement with what the sources tell us. Still, it may be objected, are we not leaving the door wide open for spurious works to distort the image of Josquin γ and to diminish its value to modern scholarship? Is the image not rapidly inflating beyond all control? This brings us to the second important point to emerge from the story of *Inter natos mulierum*. Josquin's authorship, as I have emphasized before, is not a truth-claim to be proved or disproved, but a working hypothesis to be explored.³³

31 The de-attribution of *Victimae paschali laudes* a6 must inevitably weaken the image of Josquin β , inasmuch as its close stylistic resemblance to *O virgo virginum* is a strong argument in favor of Josquin's authorship, and must therefore be accounted for. (Remember that *Inter natos mulierum* has been questioned precisely because of its apparent lack of resemblance with *O virgo virginum*; above, p. 50–51.) This has been done by putting forward the following auxiliary assumption: the work is not by Josquin, and its resemblance to *O virgo virginum*, far from telling us otherwise, may explain why scribes made the mistake of ascribing it to him. (Cf. 'Josquin des Prez', in *NGD*², §13, under doubtful and misattributed works: motets.)

32 For this work, see Johannes Richafort, *Opera omnia*, ed. H. Elzinga, 4 vols. to date, CMM 81, vol. 4, 1–34. For the de-attribution, see H. Elzinga, 'Josquin's *Missa Quem dicunt homines*. A Re-examination', in *TVNM* 43 (1993), 87–104.

33 The aim of the *New Josquin Edition*, according to the General Introduction printed in every volume, is 'to distinguish the authentic works from the spurious ones and from those whose authorship is in doubt'. However, a distinction is made between *opera dubia* and *opera spuria*, in order to 'encourage a continuing scholarly dialogue on questions of authorship' at least about the *opera dubia*.

Entertaining a hypothesis – say, that Josquin composed *Inter natos mulierum* – is not the same as accepting it as an incontrovertible fact. We can never be absolutely certain that Josquin wrote *Inter natos mulierum*, *In illo tempore stetit Jesus*, or *Missa Quem dicunt homines*, any more than the editors of *NJE* can be absolutely certain they were written by somebody else. Yet we can provisionally admit these and many other settings as possible works by Josquin, and bracket the resulting hypothesis by speaking cautiously of Josquin γ . What is expanding out of control, then, is not the worklist, for we are not concerned to establish a definitive canon of certified authentic works. Rather, what we are witnessing is the mass of historical evidence that comes flooding back into the picture once we lift the Procrustean boundaries imposed by Josquin β .

This methodological distinction is crucial, not only as a matter of principle, but also in practical terms. It is the undue pressure to decide questions of authorship that has caused scholars to rush to judgement, to commit errors and oversights whose consequences have been hard to undo, and to close the file forever on works that have scarcely begun to receive serious consideration. That pressure is not only unproductive, but it sets an unrealistic task. Like all human knowledge, every image of Josquin – whether Josquin β or γ or otherwise – must be a work in progress, an ongoing endeavor to find the most plausible explanation for the greatest amount of evidence. The possibility of human error is inherent in every step we take. So it is no more than prudent to consider all of our conclusions as provisional by definition, subject to review at any time. On the other hand, if we regard a case as definitively settled, we must become the prisoners of our own conclusions, in the sense that we have foregone all future opportunities to reconsider them. This is the story of *Inter natos mulierum* in a nutshell. To all intents and purposes it is now taken as certain that Josquin did not compose the motet – otherwise the music would surely have been printed in *NJE*. Yet certainty of this kind is not only illusory, but keeps us from finding out what errors may have crept in along the way.

There is a third and final point to emerge from the story of *Inter natos mulierum*. It has to do with the basis for stylistic comparison. Underlying the image of Josquin β is one fundamental premise: that there are certain compositional qualities and stylistic features that can be recognized, to a greater or lesser degree, in all of the composer's music, and that are unique to him. *Inter natos mulierum* is seen not to exhibit these, and hence it cannot be the work of Josquin β . This underlying premise serves as a methodological control: it allows us to identify spurious works and forgeries, and ensures that none of these will infiltrate the canon.

Provided that one subscribes to this premise, the logic is flawless. Yet there are several practical problems, of which I will highlight two here. First, there is as yet no agreement, nor even an ongoing discussion, as to what, exactly, are supposed to be the constant elements in Josquin β 's oeuvre. Few scholars take the trouble to identify specific 'Josquinian' features – except on an *ad hoc* basis, when there is a work to be de-attributed, and then only in the vaguest of terms. In the case of *Inter natos*

mulierum, for example, even if we can guess what is meant by such criteria as ‘motivic knitting-together of the voices’, ‘correspondences and symmetries’, ‘rational organisation’, and so on (see above, pp. 51–52), we are still not in a position to know why it is these and not other criteria that have been selected to decide the case. Nor is there a clear indication how many authenticated works of Josquin β fail to meet these criteria, or how many works by other composers happen to satisfy them.

Second, there is an auxiliary premise that is quite different from the first, and vastly more problematic, which is based on the inversion of the argument: it defines negatively what the first defined positively. According to this premise, there are compositional qualities and stylistic features that *no authentic work* by Josquin could possibly exhibit. In practice, this is usually taken to mean that Josquin β is unlikely to have done something that we haven’t seen him do before. There is no compositional choice, in other words, or he made it in at least two settings, one of which we must already know to be his. Now, it may be readily granted that this is a reasonable assumption, say, for technical faults such as parallel fifths or octaves – though there are plenty of exceptions even to this rule, even in Josquin’s oeuvre. But, returning to the case of *Inter natos mulierum*, at what point did we agree with the editors of *NJE* on the following criteria: that Josquin would have avoided writing motets with a dense texture, that he would typically have established a more than approximate correspondence when setting up a rationally-organized dialogue between groups of voices, or that he would always have preferred a clear caesura over a more gradual change in texture (above, pp. 50–52)? This is in fact a recurring problem with the second premise: the *ad hoc* nature of the criteria, the fact that they can change almost on a case-by-case basis. Under this premise, everything that strikes one as unusual is worth reporting if the case demands it, without any obligation to maintain methodological consistency across the board.

This is not the only problem. No less troubling is the virtual absence of a qualifying historical dimension. So long as we insist that no work by Josquin may depart too far from the norm established by his other works, attributive research will inevitably gravitate towards a middle ground, where works are closest to the norm, and will thereby downplay historical change. It is probably no coincidence that even when scholars are in full agreement that a given work must be by Josquin, they can still disagree about the approximate date of composition, sometimes offering hypotheses that are twenty years or more apart. There is a certain timelessness about the authenticated works of Josquin β that makes this possible. Josquin scholars, almost by reflex, are suspicious of pieces whose style is so clearly early, or so clearly late, that even they cannot shift them back and forth along the timeline – Masses like *Di dadi*, *Une mousse de Biscaye*, *Pange lingua*, and *Quem dicunt homines*, and above all, of course, a motet like *Inter natos mulierum*. Josquin β , one might say, is *all* middle period, from youth to old age.

From all of this it is not hard to predict what are going to be the greatest differences between Josquin β and Josquin γ : the latter may well end up retaining several

dozen works that the former has long since lost. The difference will be most pronounced in the last years of the composer's life. It is here that Josquin γ emerges as far more closely in touch with the music of Mouton, Richafort, Divitis, Févin, and other musicians in the orbit of the French royal court, than his counterpart Josquin β , who, by sheer disinclination to move with the times, had turned into a living anachronism by the mid-1510s.

It is indeed a general characteristic of Josquin γ , the 'other' Josquin, that his music was deeply embedded in its own time, and may in some cases be hard to distinguish from what composers around him were doing. To understand works like *Inter natos mulierum*, or *Missa Quem dicunt homines*, it is far more important to compare them with other works written in the mid-1510s than with Josquin settings composed ten or twenty years previously. It is a sobering thought that in fifty years, there has been very little effort to understand *Inter natos mulierum* in its proper stylistic context, or to address questions other than authorship. The only criterion by which scholars can hear it and read it, it seems, is its conformity (or lack of it) to some hazily-defined, largely subconscious idea of what is typical of Josquin – an idea that is equally likely to reflect his music from the 1480s as the 1510s, and is in that respect unhelpfully ahistoric.

The 'gamma hypothesis', then, may be useful for several reasons. It is the only hypothesis under which *Inter natos mulierum*, and many other works that have shared its fate, is likely to receive the serious scholarly consideration it has deserved all along. It offers plausible alternatives to several of the problematic axioms that have gone into making the image of Josquin β . It is less likely to reject works prematurely, and more inclined to take source evidence at face value, however provisionally. It allows us to contemplate a Josquin for whom radical stylistic change might have been more important, at certain points in his life, than apparent continuity. It does justice to the very real possibility that Josquin had something of a 'late period', during which he participated actively in the creation of a new style, the style of Mouton and young Willaert that would come to dominate the European musical landscape for decades to come.

When it comes to this, the image would also solve one of the central paradoxes about Josquin β : the fact that his style, while consistent in itself, seems to have had very little or no influence on composers working after his death. It is Mouton who appears to have been the historically most influential figure of his generation. This appearance may well be deceptive however. Josquin β is the product, at least in part, of a wedge that modern scholars have driven ever more deeply between him and the new stylistic trends of the 1510s. He is assumed to have remained aloof from those trends, largely, I think, because they brought a much more liberal attitude to dissonance treatment – as exemplified, for instance, in the *Satzfehler*. Unsurprisingly, scholars have not been able to find clear precedents for that attitude in Josquin's oeuvre as a whole. Nor have they been inclined to accept that the new trends, rather than resulting from carelessness or incompetence, reflected a positive *taste* for disso-

nance, a new delight in saturating counterpoint (especially in five or six parts) with as many dissonant clashes as the rules of counterpoint let them get away with. There is no self-evident reason why Josquin could not have shared that taste. If anything, he may well have sought to excel in what many now considered a positive musical virtue.

This wedge may be much older than we have realized. An effort to ‘classicize’ Josquin, to delimit his profile to what could be seen to be timeless and uniquely personal, seems to have been under way already in the decades after the composer’s death. It is quite striking how often Josquin would be characterized by later writers in terms of a perceived *contrast* with what composers had been doing after him. Such a contrast is implied positively in the following well-known remark of Hermann Finck:³⁴

At that time flourished Josquin des Prez, who can truly be said to be the Father of Musicians, and to whom much is to be credited: for he exceeded many in subtlety and sweetness, though in the art of composition he was more meager, that is, although he was most astute in finding imitations, he did nevertheless use many rests... . In our own time there are many inventors, among whom there is Nicolas Gombert, the pupil of Josquin, of blessed memory, who shows the path to all musicians, nay rather, the road to pursuing imitations and subtlety, and he is the inventor of works of music quite different from the man mentioned above. For he avoids rests, and his composition is full of both consonance and imitation.

Finck wrote in the mid-1550s, and it is hard to know what music by Josquin he was thinking of in particular. Yet it is obvious from his comment that he would not have drawn attention to, and might well have doubted the authenticity of, Josquin settings that resembled Gombert’s too closely.

The same contrast is implied negatively in Georg Forster’s well-known remark, in the preface to *Selectissimarum mutetarum* (1540): ‘I recall that a certain famous man said that Josquin wrote more compositions after his death than during his life’. Forster may well have been suspicious about growing numbers of attributions, yet it is worth asking how he could have known that many of these were forged. The implication of his comment is that Josquin could not be seen, and perhaps ought not be seen, to have been too deeply implicated in stylistic trends that were current in Forster’s own time. To the latter, it seems, there was a clear distinction between motets that Josquin wrote during his lifetime, and those that were ascribed to him after his death. What seems to have concerned him is the false image resulting from the blurring of that distinction.

Then, of course, there is Heinrich Glarean, for whom the music of his own time (the 1530s and 1540s) had so obviously degenerated into ‘unrestraint’, ‘distortion’,

³⁴ H. Finck, *Practica musica* (Wittenberg 1556), fol. Aijr.

and ‘final debility’, that he could not bring himself to mention Gombert or Willaert even once in his *Dodekachordon* of 1547. He projected the nostalgic image of an *ars perfecta* of which Josquin was seen to be the perfect embodiment. Like Forster, I assume, he would have immediately questioned the authorship of Josquin settings that resembled those of later composers too closely. Josquin was held up as a classic model, yet in order to serve that function in the most conveniently unambiguous way, the model had to be defined in terms of the very contrast it was invoked to sustain. The Josquin who was *all* middle period, the Josquin who became a classic, the author of the archetypal ‘core works’ in the canon, the one who wrote fewer compositions after his death than during his life, seems to have been born in German-speaking countries in the early sixteenth century.

With this conclusion, I hope, the story of *Inter natos mulierum* may have a happy ending after all – happy not because it has found a place in the canon of Josquin γ , but because we have been able to propose a broader remedy for the problems that have haunted it for so long. I have chosen to recount the story of this motet, but I could just as easily have chosen other works: the archives of Josquin scholarship are full of files waiting to be reopened. In this as in every other realm of scholarship, free and unfettered enquiry may well bring more benefits than we could envisage even now.

Appendix 1. Josquin des Prez [γ], *Inter natos mulierum* a6. Reproduction of the edition in Josquin des Prez, *Werken*, Afleraving 4 (Motetten Bundel 23), 125-30.

84. Inter natos mulierum.

Superius
Inter natos In - ter na - tos mu - li - e -

Altus
Inter natos In - ter na - tos mu - li - e - rum

Tenor I
Inter natos In - ter na - tos mu - li - e -

Tenor II
Inter natos In - ter na - tos mu - li - e - rum, in - ter na - tos

Bassus I
Inter natos In - ter

Bassus II
Inter natos In - ter na - tos mu - li - e

5
rum non sur - re - xit ma - jor Jo - an - ne, non sur - re -
non sur - re - xit ma - jor Jo - an - ne Bap - ti - sta
rum, mu - li - e - rum non sur - re - xit ma - jor Jo -
mu - li - e - rum non sur - re - xit,
na - tos mu - li - e - rum non sur - re -
rum non

10
- xit ma - jor Jo - an - ne, Jo -
ma - jor Jo - an - ne Bap - ti - sta, Jo - an - ne Bap - ti -
- an - ne, Jo - an - ne Bap - ti - sta, Jo - an - ne Bap - ti -
non sur - re - xit Jo - an - ne Bap - ti - sta, Bap - ti - sta
- xit ma - jor Jo - an - ne ma - jor Jo - an - ne, Jo - an - ne
sur - re - xit ma - jor Jo - an - ne, ma - jor Jo - an -

15

an - ne Bap - ti - sta.
 sta, Jo - an - ne Bap - ti - sta.
 sta, Jo - an - ne Bap - ti - sta, Bap - ti - sta.
 Jo - an - ne Bap - ti - sta. Qui vi - am Do - mi -
 Bap - ti - sta, Bap - ti - sta, Jo - an - ne Bap - ti - sta. Qui
 ne, Jo - an - ne Bap - ti - sta, Qui vi - am Do - mi - no prae - pa - ra -

20

Qui vi - am Do - mi - no, prae pa - ra - vit, prae -
 Qui vi - am Do - mi - no prae - pa - ra - vit, qui vi - am Do - mi -
 Qui vi - am Do - mi - no,
 - no prae - pa - ra - vit in
 vi - am Do - mi - no prae - pa - ra - vit in he - re -
 vit in he - re - mo, prae - pa - ra -

25

- pa - ra - vit in he - re - mo. Al - le -
 no prae - pa - ra - vit in he - re - mo, qui
 qui vi - am Do - mi - no
 he - re mo, in he - re - mo, in
 mo, pre - pa - ra - vit in
 vit in he - re - mo, in he - re - mo.

SECUNDA PARS

45

Fu - it ho - mo mis - sus a

50

De - o, mis - sus a De - o

55

it ho - mo mis - sus a De -

75

- men. e - rat Jo - an nes. Al - le - lu -
 nes, e - rat Jo - an nes, Jo - an nes,
 cu - i no - men e - rat Jo - an nes, Al -
 e - rat Jo - an nes.
 nes. Al - le - lu ia, al - le - lu

80

ia, al - le - lu - ia, al - le -
 cu - i no - men e -
 le - lu ia, al - le - lu ia, al -
 rat Jo - an nes.
 Al - le - lu ia, al - le - lu

85

- lu - ia. Al - le - lu - ia. Al - le - lu - ia. al - le - lu - ia.
 rat Jo an nes. Al - le - lu ia.
 le - lu ia.
 Al - le - lu - ia, al - le - lu - ia, al - le - lu - ia.
 ia, al - le - lu - ia, al - le - lu - ia.