

RONALD WOODLEY
Birmingham Conservatoire, Birmingham City University

THE PRINTING AND SCOPE OF TINCTORIS'S FRAGMENTARY TREATISE
DE INVENTIONE ET VSV MVSICE

Originally published in:
Early Music History, 5 (1985), 239–68

Copyright © 1985 Cambridge University Press

Reproduced with permission of the Editor

NOTE: Some aspects of this article have now been superseded by information that has come to light since publication; cross-reference to other material within the Tinctoris online edition (www.stoa.org/tinctoris/tinctoris.html) is therefore advised.

You may also save the file to your local computer for study offline.

The author may be contacted at:

ronald.woodley@bcu.ac.uk

Research Department
Birmingham Conservatoire
Birmingham City University
Paradise Place
BIRMINGHAM
B3 3HG
UK

THE PRINTING AND SCOPE OF
TINCTORIS'S FRAGMENTARY
TREATISE *DE INVENTIONE ET VSV*
MVSICE

During the course of his thirty-year career in Italy between the early 1470s and the first years of the sixteenth century, Tinctoris witnessed the printing of only two of his own theoretical works. His glossary of musical terms, the *Terminorum musicae diffinitorium*, has been convincingly shown to have issued from the Treviso press of the author's compatriot and contemporary Gerardus de Lisa, around 1495, although the work had clearly been compiled in manuscript form some twenty years previously.¹ The *Diffinitorium* has, indeed, fared relatively well at the hands of modern scholarship, though one suspects that its generic significance as an early musical dictionary has occasionally clouded critical judgement on its actual content, and there still remain unanswered basic questions as to why, and for whom, the book was printed at all. By contrast, the other, fragmentary treatise of Tinctoris to be printed in his lifetime, *De inuentione et usu musice* – a work frankly more interesting by far than the *Diffinitorium* – has received surprisingly scant attention, and a reassessment of the place, date and circumstances of its publication is long overdue. In addition, it seems appropriate to take the opportunity of

¹ See the bibliographical essay by James Coover appended to C. Parrish, *Dictionary of Musical Terms by Johannes Tinctoris* (London, 1963), pp. 101–8. Some of Coover's observations on Tinctoris's biography must be read with caution; for his information on Gerardus's life, he is heavily dependent on V. Scholderer, 'A Fleming in Venice: Gerardus de Lisa, Printer, Bookseller, Schoolmaster, and Musician', *The Library*, ser. iv, 10 (1929), pp. 253–73. A facsimile of the Gotha copy of the *Diffinitorium* print is now available, along with Heinrich Bellerman's 1863 German translation (from *Jahrbuch für musikalische Wissenschaft*, 1 (1863), pp. 61–114), and a 'Nachwort' by Peter Gülke, as: Johannes Tinctoris, *Terminorum musicae diffinitorium*, Documenta Musicologica, ser. 1: Druckschriften-Faksimiles 37 (Leipzig, 1983).

presenting here some new fragments of the treatise which have recently come to light in north-east France.

The attention of modern musicology was first drawn at any length to the existence of *De inuentione* by Haberl,² who was unable to identify the work's printer, but suggested a date of 1484 on the (rather optimistic) basis of four puncti printed after the calendar date of the work's dedicatory letter to Iohannes Stokem.³ The eventual editor of *De inuentione*, Karl Weinmann, was the first to attach a specific printer's name to the book, that of Francesco del Tупpo,⁴ a suggestion later corroborated by Reese, who additionally claimed to have identified the typeface as Tупpo 85G by comparison with other known books of Del Tупpo in the British Library.⁵ Closer inspection, however, both of *De inuentione*⁶ and of the collection of British Library incunabula, reveals that both Weinmann and Reese have been deceived, for although the text types of *De inuentione* and Tупpo 85G share many characteristics, there are also several serious discrepancies in letter formation. In Tупpo 85G, for example,⁷ **d** has a large, rounded lobe comparable to that of **b**, whereas that of *De inuentione* is decidedly narrower and crushed slightly piriform from the top left. Again, **i** is stroked more or less above the minim in Tупpo 85G, but in *De inuentione* the stroke is sited much further to the right. In the formation of **h** a similar distinction exists to that of **d**, the limb being quite closely hooked in *De inuentione*, but much wider and more rounded in Tупpo 85G. Finally, the angled form of **C**

² F. X. Haberl, 'Ein unbekanntes Werk des Johannes Tinctoris', *Kirchenmusikalisches Jahrbuch*, 14 (1899), pp. 69–80; preceded only by the brief account in G. Gaspari, *Catalogo della biblioteca del Liceo musicale di Bologna*, 4 vols. (Bologna, 1890–1905), 1, pp. 260–1. For further bibliography, see K. Weinmann (with W. Fischer), *Johannes Tinctoris (1445–1511) und sein unbekannter Traktat 'De inuentione et usu musicae'*, 2nd edn (Tutzing, 1961), p. 6.

³ Haberl, 'Unbekanntes Werk', p. 72. The puncti are printed thus: 'Ex Parthenope: quinto Kalendas Februarii. . .' (Weinmann, '*De inuentione*', pp. 7 and 28).

⁴ Weinmann, '*De inuentione*', p. 8. For further on Del Tупpo and his position (particularly as partner to Sixtus Riessinger) in the early history of Neapolitan printing, see *Catalogue of Books printed in the Fifteenth Century now in the British Museum*, 10 vols. (and in progress) (London, 1908–) [hereinafter *BMC*], vi, pp. xl–xlii.

⁵ G. Reese, *Music in the Renaissance*, 2nd edn (London, 1959), p. 147, n. 232. All type sigla follow *BMC*, vi.

⁶ It should be noted that persistent efforts to obtain a microfilm copy of the *De inuentione* unicum (Regensburg, Proskesche Musikbibliothek, n 15) have been frustrated, and the present typographical study is reliant on the facsimile of fol. 2^r given as the frontispiece to Weinmann's edition. The evidence, therefore, particularly of type size, is necessarily limited, but has proved sufficient for the immediate purpose. A first-hand examination of the print will be a prerequisite for confirming the findings presented here.

⁷ For example, Ioannes Picus, *Apologia conclusionum suarum*, printed after 31 May 1487 (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. 2. q inf. 2.14(b)).

found in Tупpo 85G is not found in *De inuentione*, where the body of the letter is rounded and cut through with a single, inner shaft. Space here does not permit a more detailed typographical survey, but the above examples are sufficient to show that while 85G is undoubtedly the closest of Del Tупpo's types to *De inuentione*, it is by no means identical, and our attention must be turned elsewhere.

The search for the printer of the Tinctoris book need not carry us far, however, for an examination of Neapolitan incunabula in the Bodleian and British Libraries reveals only one plausible candidate: Mathias Moravus. Little is known of the life of this printer, and he has received only minimal attention from scholars of early typography. That he was a cleric, originally from Cetkovice (some forty kilometres south of Olomouc in modern Czechoslovakia), is shown from an inscription in an undated copy, in his own hand, of Cicero's *Rhetorica*, which may also suggest that he was a professional scribe before turning to the printing press.⁸ There is even some reason to believe that he had been employed as a scribe in Oxford,⁹ which, if true, provides valuable evidence indeed for a direct line of communication between England and the Neapolitan court. His first published work, the *Supplementum summae Pisanellae* of Nicolaus de Auxino, was printed at Genoa in 1474 (dated 22 June) with the collaboration of Michael de Monacho, but from there he was soon persuaded by Blasius Romerus, a Cistercian monk from Poblet, to move to Naples, where his press was steadily active from 1475 (Seneca, *Opera philosophica* and *Epistolae*, and Maius, *De priscorum proprietate uerborum*) to 1491 (Pontanus, *Dialogi qui Charon et Antonius inscribuntur*, dated 31 January). His last known work, produced after an apparent gap of a year, was an *Officia*, printed in at least one copy on parchment, dated 10 February 1492.¹⁰ It will be seen shortly that the connection between Moravus and *De inuentione* can be shown from purely typographical evidence, but some degree of personal acquaintance between him and Tinctoris can be inferred indirectly from the fact that Moravus collaborated on at least two projects with Tinctoris's friend and correspondent, the court scribe Joanmarco

⁸ This, and the following details of Moravus's life, from *BMC*, vi, pp. xlii–xliii.

⁹ See *Bodleian Library Record*, 4/v1 (December 1953), pp. 341–2; 5/v1 (October 1956), pp. 282–3; also *Notable Accessions [Bodleian Library]; Guide to an Exhibition held in 1958* (Oxford, 1958), p. 15, no. 21.

¹⁰ M. Fava and G. Bresciano, *La stampa a Napoli nel XV secolo*, Sammlung bibliothekswissenschaftlicher Arbeiten 32–4 (Leipzig, 1911–13), II, pp. 126–7.

Cinico,¹¹ together with the fellow scribe Pietro Molino (the 1489 editions of the Caraccioli *Sermones de laudibus sanctorum*¹² and a St Antoninus *Confessionale*,¹³ dedicated to Diomedes Carafa). This connection between Moravus and Cinico receives further confirmation from the fact that the latter also wrote the dedicatory letter to Beatrice, Queen of Hungary, in Carafa's own *Trattato dell'ottimo cortigiano*,¹⁴ printed by Moravus around the same time. One can suppose, then, that Moravus and Tinctoris were at least in some degree acquainted with each other's work, and it seems fairly likely that the choice of printer for *De inuentione* was made by Tinctoris himself. Indeed, it may be no coincidence that the typeface chosen for *De inuentione* resembles to some degree the hand of the scribe Wenceslaus Crispus, who made the de luxe copy of Tinctoris's other works for the Aragonese library in Naples between about 1485 and 1488 (Valencia, Biblioteca Universitaria, MS 835)¹⁵ and one other copy (Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, MS 2573), around 1490–5, possibly for Beatrice, Tinctoris's erstwhile royal pupil.¹⁶ The visual and aesthetic correspondence, therefore, between manuscript and print may well have been intentional.¹⁷

The identification of the precise fount used in *De inuentione* now becomes crucial to an accurate dating of the book. Of the eleven or so text and roman types employed by Moravus during the course of his

¹¹ The relationship between Tinctoris and Cinico, who was the recipient of the only surviving letter by the theorist (Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, MS XII.F.50, fols. 11–14), will be explored further in a forthcoming study of Tinctoris's Italian translation of the Articles of Constitution for the Order of the Golden Fleece, the surviving source of which (Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, MS XIV.D.20) was copied by Cinico himself. A somewhat defective text of the Tinctoris–Cinico letter is published in T. de Marinis, *La biblioteca napoletana dei re d'Aragona*, 4 vols. (Milan, 1947–52); 2 suppl. vols. (Verona, 1969), I, pp. 80–1.

¹² Fava and Bresciano, *La stampa*, II, p. 117. Of the 2000 copies printed (see De Marinis, *Biblioteca*, I, p. 44), that sent to the work's dedicatee, Queen Beatrice, is now in the British Library (IB 29438).

¹³ Fava and Bresciano, *La stampa*, II, pp. 120–1.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

¹⁵ See L. Perkins and H. Garey, eds., *The Mellon Chansonier*, 2 vols. (New Haven and London, 1979), I, esp. pp. 22–6, and R. Woodley, 'The *Proportionale musices* of Iohannes Tinctoris: a Critical Edition, Translation and Study' (D.Phil. diss., University of Oxford, 1982), I, pp. 123–31.

¹⁶ On the Neapolitan provenance of this manuscript, see Woodley, 'Proportionale', I, pp. 132–8. De Marinis had already recognised the provenance of its binding in *La legatura artistica in Italia nei secoli XV e XVI*, 3 vols. (Florence, 1960), I, p. 24, no. 211.

¹⁷ On such correspondences in the fifteenth century, see O. Mazal, 'Paläographie und Paläotypie des 15. Jahrhunderts', in *Buch und Text im 15. Jahrhundert*, ed. L. Hellinga and H. Härtel, *Wolfenbüttler Abhandlungen zur Renaissanceforschung* 2 (Hamburg, 1981), pp. 59–78.

printing career,¹⁸ only three bear sufficient similarity to *De inuentione* to merit serious consideration, namely 83G, 84G and 87G.¹⁹ Of these three, 84G is the earliest, being very similar to that used for Moravus's first work in 1474, and employed only in the 1476 *Biblia latina* and in an Augustine *De ciuitate Dei* the following year, 1477. This type was superseded in 1478 by 87G, for use in the De Cambanis *Tractatus clausularum*, apparently taking over most of the capitals from its predecessor, but with a newly cut set of lower-case letters. The third type, 83G, which is found only in the 1479 Caracciolus *Quadragesimale*, seems to be a direct modification of its predecessor, 87G, perhaps incorporating some sorts from 84G.²⁰ But the changes involved in the modification from 87G to 83G (and this is the crucial factor) were evidently of a somewhat experimental nature, since Moravus returned thereafter to 87G for the *Missale Dominicanum* of 29 March 1483 (London, British Library, IB 29423). The variations between these types are often minute, but when some of the principal differences are collated, as in Table 1, alongside their equivalents in *De inuentione* and Tuppo 85G, it becomes clear that *De inuentione* has only one true typographical sibling, the 1479 Caracciolus. That is, *De inuentione* becomes only the second book known to be printed in Moravus 83G.

The implications of this identification for dating the Tinctoris book are interesting.²¹ It has long been acknowledged that the treatise must have been completed after the battle of Otranto in 1480, since this event is noted specifically in the text.²² The commonly accepted *terminus ante quem* of 1487, moreover, can also be upheld, since by that time the work's dedicatee Stokem had moved to Rome,²³ whereas Tinctoris, by transmitting in his letter to the

¹⁸ For the principal types, see *BMC*, vi, plates LXVI–LXVII. It should be stressed that the identifications of type by Fava and Bresciano (*La stampa*, II, pp. 92–127) are very unreliable.

¹⁹ Prints examined: 83G: Caracciolus, *Quadragesimale*, 10 April 1479 (British Library, IB 29415); 84G: *Biblia latina*, 1476 (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. m. 2. 2); 87G: De Cambanis, *Tractatus clausularum*, 9 April 1478 (British Library, IC 29412).

²⁰ *BMC*, vi, p. 861.

²¹ It should be noted in qualification that some of Moravus's type seems to have strayed to Hungary (Bratislava?) for the anonymous production of a St Antoninus *Confessionale* in 1477 and a blood-letting calendar in 1480 (C. Clair, *A History of European Printing* (London, 1976), p. 239). The likelihood, however, that *De inuentione* was published here rather than in Naples must be considered negligible.

²² Weinmann, '*De inuentione*', p. 46.

²³ Cf. R. Woodley, 'Iohannes Tinctoris: a Review of the Documentary Biographical Evidence', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 34 (1981), p. 235.

Table 1 *Type identification of printed 'De inuentione' extracts*

<i>De inuentione</i>	Tuppo 85G	Moravus 83G	Moravus 84G	Moravus 87G
C	round body; single inner shaft	round body; single inner shaft	angular body	round body; single inner shaft
E	three-limbed	three-limbed	epsilon form	three-limbed
I	below line	below line	on line	on line
P	below line; heavy left serif	below line; heavy left serif	below line; light left serif	on line; light left serif
b	large round lobe	mainly large round lobe; possibly same as Moravus 84G	smaller piriform lobe	large round lobe
d	smaller piriform lobe	smaller piriform lobe	smaller piriform lobe	possibly more rounded than 83G and 84G but less even than Tuppo 85G
h	closely hooked limb	wide rounded limb	closely hooked limb	possibly more rounded than 83G and 84G but less even than Tuppo 85G
i	stroke to right of minim	stroke above minim	stroke to right of minim	stroke to right of minim

musician his good wishes to the Hungarian queen, Beatrice,²⁴ is clearly implying that he (Stokem) is still in her service at Buda. So far, then, we have *termini* of 1480 and 1487. If Moravus 83G was indeed a short-lived, experimental modification of 87G, as has been proposed, then the typographical evidence strongly suggests a publication date before the reintroduction of 87G in the Dominican Missal of 1483. The *termini* are thus reduced to 1480 and 1483. Since it also appears that Moravus signed no book between the Pontanus *De aspiratione* (London, British Library, IB 29419) of 8 January 1481 and the Dominican Missal,²⁵ the lack of the printer's name in *De inuentione* probably enables us to narrow the gap further to a period of two or three years between 1481 and 1483.²⁶ Unlike the case of the *Diffinitorium*, then, where some twenty years separated the dates of composition and publication, it is clear that the fragments which form *De inuentione* were printed not more than three or four years (possibly much less) after the completion in manuscript of the whole, original treatise.

The *De inuentione* excerpts, which survive uniquely, it seems, in Regensburg, Proskesche Musikbibliothek, H 15, and which can now be firmly attributed to the Neapolitan press of Mathias Moravus, contain what is clearly only a tiny part of a very substantial work, now lost. It is evident from the dedicatory letter to Stokem, placed at the head of the printed extracts, that this original version of the treatise (hereinafter designated *De inuentione**) was indeed complete at the time of going to press (the letter carries the date 27 January, probably, as we have seen, 1481, 1482 or 1483), and that in its intact form it was divided into five books.²⁷ Of these, all or part (the text does not say which) of six chapters, taken from three of the five books, were printed by Moravus: Chapters 19 and 20 of Book II, in which Tinctoris discusses the human voice and its renowned exponents from the ancient world to his own day; Chapters 8 and 9 of Book III, on the *tibia*; and Chapters 4 and 5 of Book IV, on various members of the string family. Some small inkling can be gained of topics covered in the lost chapters. For example, the opening of II.19 refers back to a discussion, probably in the previous chapter, of the

²⁴ See also below, pp. 256–7. ²⁵ *BMC*, vi, p. xlili.

²⁶ Even the unreliable identifications of Fava and Bresciano reveal no volume in 83G (their 'type 1') printed after 1483, the latest being a Stefano Fieschi, *Varietates sententiarum seu Synonyma*, dated 8 July of that year (*La stampa*, II, pp. 111–12).

²⁷ Weinmann, '*De inuentione*', p. 27.

human voice, treated in some abstract way as the ‘supreme instrument of nature’ before the surviving Chapter 19 goes on to sketch a history of renowned individual singers.²⁸ Again, in II.20 Ockeghem is cited in terms of high praise for his singing abilities as *contratenorista bassus*, and Tinctoris notes that in some previous, now lost, section (‘supra’) Ockeghem has already been singled out for mention as an outstanding composer.²⁹ Finally, it is clear that the surviving, highly illuminating discussion of wind and string instruments and their playing techniques in III.8–9 and IV.4–5³⁰ was originally preceded by some additional treatment of brass instruments, particularly the ‘sacque-boute’.³¹ Apart from these pitifully fleeting glimpses, though, the contents of the remainder of *De inuentione** have been totally obscure.

A small part of this lacuna can now be filled. The manuscript Cambrai, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS A 416 is a late fifteenth-century miscellany of theological extracts and prayers, including selections from Jerome and Bede, and a large section of the *Summa* of St Antoninus.³² Between fols. 8^v and 12^v, however, the contents take a brief and unexpected musical turn, and we are presented with extracts and abridgements of a tract entitled expressly ‘de inuentione et usu musice’, and inscribed equally expressly as the work of ‘Iohannis tinctoris’ (Figure 1). The original capitular indications have, fortunately, been carefully retained, so that, although the excerpts are not presented in strict sequence, we can nevertheless be sure of the exact location of each in the original, complete work, which the scribe may well have had before him as exemplar.³³ A transcription of the text of these newly recovered fragments of *De inuentione** is given in the Appendix to this article.

In one sense, it is an unfortunate quirk of fate that the scribe’s interests here are still principally in the realms of theology, metaphysics and ethics. Any more ‘practical’ musical content of his exemplar (if it was intact) has been bypassed, and the light which the new extracts shed on Tinctoris’s musical thought lies mainly in the

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

³⁰ Cf. A. Baines, ‘Fifteenth-century Instruments in Tinctoris’s *De inuentione et usu musicae*’, *Galpin Society Journal*, 3 (1950), pp. 19–26.

³¹ Weinmann, ‘*De inuentione*’, p. 37.

³² Description in A. Molinier, *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France*, xvii: *Cambrai* (Paris, 1891), p. 155. I am grateful to Bonnie J. Blackburn for informing me of her independent discovery of this source.

³³ But see below, pp. 258–9.

The printing and scope of *De inuentione et usu musicae*

fields of metaphysics and aesthetics, which, while increasingly crucial to our intelligent reading of Renaissance music theory, must regrettably be considered outside the scope of the present investigation. The new source, indeed, will prove invaluable to any future study of the detailed literary and philosophical context in which Tinctoris was writing. Nevertheless, as a result of the discovery of the Cambrai extracts, some important conclusions can be drawn concerning the size and scope of *De inuentione**.

There is, interestingly though not entirely fortuitously, no overlap of contents whatever between the Moravus print and the Cambrai fragments. These latter present new excerpts from five chapters of *De inuentione**, namely I.5 and 11; II.7 and 12; and V.24. As is apparent from a conflation of the printed and manuscript sources (Table 2), something is now known to survive of all five books; and if the number of chapters in Books II and V (at least twenty and twenty-four respectively) is at all representative of the size of the remaining three books, some idea can be gained of the extent of the original compilation, that is, at least one hundred chapters.

The first two extracts which Cambrai 416 presents (Appendix, lines 1–44), from II.7 and 12, are in fact quotations by the author of poetical texts which have been transplanted *in vacuo* by the Cambrai scribe (or previous compiler). The exact source of the first of these texts, fourteen lines of (rather unusual) lesser asclepiadic metre beginning ‘Cantores quibus ars uox quoque dulcis est’ (lines 3–16),

Table 2

Book	Chapters represented in Moravus print	Chapters represented in Cambrai 416
I	—	5
		11
II		7
		12
	19	
	20	
III	8	—
	9	
IV	4	—
	5	
V	—	24

Ex libro 2^o Johannis hirtoris Aspiciam
Dictionem & Vsu musin. ca. 11.

Sanctores quibus arbor quoque dulcis est.
Ebur. tubum. tu qz huc frons
Celesti domno ramma paupis
Tellus ruis opus. pontus et ethera
Qui puro gemitus sanguinem virginis
Errantes docuit infirma viam
Humani generis qui qz viret dolens
Cormentum subit mortifera raris
Qua nos diuisant. pastor: ut optimus
Saluos ore lupi restituit deo
Vite tum qz sibi munera reddito.
Ad rli rudent fulgida sidera
Quo sublimis eum rura laudibus
Summis prosequitur mente pissima:

Ex xii. capitulo.

Judithi signum tellus sudra madefcit
Et celo rex aduenit per serla futurus
Soluet in rarmu pascens ut uidet orbem
Vnde dum rertent mterdubis atqz fidelis
Celsum cum sanctis. cui iam tremmo in ipso
Sic anime cum rone adruunt qz uidet ipse
Cu raret murtus densis mberibus orbis
Rerrent simularia bira rurtam qz gazam
Exuret terris igne. pontusqz polum qz
Inquiens. heta portas effringet aurum
Sanctorum sed vmm rurti lux libera rarm
Et aditur. fonte eterna flamma rarmabit
O multos artus reregens. tum quisqz loquutus
Seruata. atqz deus rereabit pirtora luy

Figure 1 Cambrai, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS A 416, fol. 8^r

Et nix erit et luctus. fridibunt dentibus omnes.
 Erupitur solubar. et rhodus intrat astus.
 Soluentur celum. lunaris pphendit obibat.
 In erret colles. vallis extollet ab imo
 Non erit in rebus hominum sublimis. uel altum
 Jam equantur rumpis motus. et azula ponti
 Omnia resabunt. tellus confecta peribit.
 Sic pariter fontes torretur fluminaq; igni.
 Sed tuba tunc sonitum demittit ab alto
 Orbe. gemenis famus miseru. banosq; labore.
 Tartarum q; chaos monstrabit terra desiciens
 Et rogam her dno re. et sustentur ad unum
 Pendet r. r. ignis q; et sulphuris amnis.

Ex libro quarto. ra. xxim.
 Cur ex sereno sublimis pphare q; musice usu ad releshen
 redamg. Emuero maldicti descendit ignis etim. q; uix
 ut itare paratq; e diabolo et angelis. ut musica exeret.
 ut ea dicitur. Cithara namq; rox. Et vbi bti Job vtar.
 Vt sa e m luctu. et organu i bon. flentiu. de q; ille ppha
 magna. Iparat eloquus ait. ressuat gaudiu tympanozion.
 quicunt somtu letantur. rotinut dulcedo cathare. Bndicti
 vo q; sancti. possidetis regnu sibi diuinitq; a qstitione
 mundi paratq; ut roxozul. ex utis. q; b; i tumultu tanq; i
 rubilib; suis qesentib; honor a rictis exhibit; us merito
 letare i au rox i manu dei existit; supra illa ruita
 te i htm itronent. de qdm suo i oportu angloz continuo
 psallit. Quod sane furu no solu mti. sed vna aliq bon
 tuq; istumentu pponale nobis ignotu est. ad maiore iorudi
 tate dim q; glorie manifestatoz quomodou supi de
 rorutu age loto i ralis dixim; per redenda opimamuz.

Figure 2 Cambrai, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS A 416, fol. 9 (The apparent cancellation at the beginning of line 4 is due to a photographic imperfection.)

has not as yet been traced. A pious exhortation to singers and instrumentalists to praise Christ, the poem carries clear (Christianised) reminiscences of Horace (particularly two lines of the *Ars poetica*, but also with several verbal allusions to the Odes), as well as the Scriptures.³⁴ Horace was a widely read author throughout the Middle Ages, and a highly prized source for emulation by the humanists.³⁵ Tinctoris himself, indeed, knew his works well, quoting from them several times in the printed excerpts of *De inuentione*; it is quite possible, then, that we need look no further than to the theorist himself for the author of this particular verse.³⁶

The second of the two verses (Appendix, lines 18–44) is much more easily identifiable as the prophecy of the Erythrean Sibyl ('Iudicii [*sic*] signum tellus sudore madescet'). This well-known text of twenty-seven hexameter lines, foretelling the coming of Christ, was incorporated into the Christmas Office in the eighth century, and, furnished at an early date with its own chant, was in wide circulation throughout the medieval Church.³⁷ It was also used in non- or para-liturgical dramatic contexts, and in the later Middle Ages was fostered particularly in Spain;³⁸ so, while the literary context in which Tinctoris is quoting the verse remains unclear, it is nevertheless possible that the Spanish connection may have resulted in a similar cultivation of the text at the Aragonese court in Naples.

The next extract, v.24 (or part thereof), which appears to be unadulterated Tinctoris, presents a compilation of biblical and patristic quotations supporting the author's belief in the actuality,

³⁴ See notes to the text, p. 259 below.

³⁵ See, for example, E. Schäfer, *Deutscher Horaz* (Wiesbaden, 1976); M. Manitius, *Analekten zur Geschichte des Horaz im Mittelalter (bis 1300)* (Göttingen, 1893); also L. P. Wilkinson, *Horace and his Lyric Poetry* (Cambridge, 1951), pp. 159–76. I am most grateful to Dr Duncan Kennedy, of the Department of Latin, University of Liverpool, for initially pointing out this stylistic association with Horace. One plausible candidate for authorship of this verse might be the German humanist poet Conrad Celtis, who displays a certain Horatian (though mainly unchristianised) bent; the verse in question, however, is not to be found in Celtis's extant poetry (*Conradus Celtis Protucius: Libri odarum quattuor; Liber Epodon; Carmen saeculare*, ed. F. Pindter, Leipzig, 1937).

³⁶ On a further Horatian allusion by Tinctoris, cf. also p. 256 below.

³⁷ J. Stevens, 'Sibyl, Song of the', *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. S. Sadie, 20 vols. (London, 1980), xvii, pp. 290–1; see also B. Bischoff, 'Die lateinischen Übersetzungen und Bearbeitungen aus den Oracula Sibyllina', *Mittelalterliche Studien*, 1 (Stuttgart, 1966), pp. 150–67, and S. Corbin, 'Le *Cantus Sibyllae*: origine et premiers textes', *Revue de Musicologie*, 34 (1952), pp. 1–10.

³⁸ J. Sage, 'Medieval Drama', iii, 3(v), *The New Grove Dictionary*, xii, pp. 51–3; I am also grateful to Dr Carolyn Lee, of the Department of Music, University College, Cork, for her comments in this regard.

rather than intellectuality, of celestial or angelic music (a common motif in late medieval literature),³⁹ and contrasting the musical joys of heaven with the deprivations of hell (Appendix, lines 45–117). The opening of this chapter, in a characteristic transitional passage, also provides evidence that the previous section concerned the earthly practice of music (line 46: ‘Nunc ex terreno . . . musicæ usu’), but one can only speculate on the exact contents of the missing v.23. Similarly, the use of the verb ‘redire’ here (line 47) might indicate that ‘heavenly’ music has also been dealt with previously, an interpretation confirmed by the subsequent ‘quemadmodum superius de concentu angelico in celis diximus’ (line 62).

The excerpts from 1.5 which follow yield some of the most thought-provoking questions of all the Cambrai fragments, although, paradoxically, the text as presented is clearly an editorial, and possibly scribal, abridgement of Tinctoris’s original. The chapter consists entirely of a reworked version of Tinctoris’s treatise on the effects of music, the *Complexus effectuum musicæ*, otherwise surviving in only two sources, Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, MS II 4147 (probably an authorial holograph)⁴⁰ and Ghent, Rijksuniversiteit, Centrale Bibliotheek, MS 70. The version of the text of the *Complexus*, as transmitted (in differing degrees of completeness) in these two sources, presents a total of twenty effects, preceded by a dedicatory prologue to Princess Beatrice.⁴¹ Although the Brussels manuscript is mutilated at the end, and transmits the text only as far as the ninth effect (fol. 126^v; some further fragments on fol. 127^{r-v}), and although the *conclusio* as given in Ghent 70 is probably corrupt, thus raising one’s suspicions about the completeness of the main text, this total of twenty (‘tantummodo uiginti’) is nevertheless clearly indicated as Tinctoris’s intention in the prologue.⁴² A glance at the Cambrai fragments, however (lines 118–224), reveals not only a discussion of seven additional effects, but also a restructuring of the existing twenty. The first six are presented in an order identical with that in Brussels and Ghent, but thereafter the sequence is altered, as shown in Table 3.

³⁹ Cf. J. L. Irwin, ‘The Mystical Music of Jean Gerson’, *Early Music History*, 1 (1981), pp. 187–201.

⁴⁰ See Woodley, ‘*Proportionale*’, I, pp. 93–122.

⁴¹ A. Seay, ed., *Johannis Tinctoris opera theoretica*, Corpus Scriptorum de Musica 22, 2 vols. (n.p., 1975; vol. IIa, 1978), II, pp. 165–77. See also L. Zanoncelli, *Sulla estetica di Johannes Tinctoris, con edizione critica, traduzione e commentario del Complexus effectuum musicæ* (n.p., n.d.).

⁴² Seay, ed., *Tinctoris opera*, II, p. 165.

Ronald Woodley

Table 3

	Brussels–Ghent	Cambrai 416
7	tristitiam depellit	*pueros et adolescentes ad uirtutem disponit ^a
8	duritiam cordis resoluit	terrenam mentem eleuat
9	diabolum fugat	homines letificat
10	extasim causat	amorem allicit
11	terrenam mentem eleuat	iocunditatem conuiuui augmentat
12	uoluntatem malam reuocat	*quietum ac lenem somnum prouocat
13	homines letificat	extasim causat
14	egrotos sanat	duritiam cordis resoluit
15	labores temperat	tristitiam depellit
16	animos ad prelium incitat	*infantum uagitus sedat
17	amorem allicit	*curas minuit
18	iocunditatem conuiuui augmentat	demonem fugat
19	peritos in ea glorificat	*iracundiam temperat
20	animas beatificat	malam uoluntatem reuocat
21	—	pugnantes animat
22	—	labores solatur et incitat
23	—	egrotos sanat
24	—	*plurima sapientum dicta exemplo sui comprobat
25	—	*pronuntationem modestam oratoribus administrat
26	—	peritos in ea glorificat
27	—	scientes eius beatificat

Note:

^a * indicates effects unique to Cambrai 416.

Again, the Cambrai version of ‘animos ad prelium incitat’ (Brussels–Ghent, no. 16), given as ‘pugnantes animat’ (Cambrai, no. 21), cannot derive exclusively from the Brussels–Ghent text, since a quotation from Juvenal appears here (lines 184–5) which is absent from the other version,⁴³ one of several such discrepancies to occur. More significantly, perhaps, the ordering of the effects in Cambrai 416 has in some ways a greater sense of logic and polish than in Brussels and Ghent, and a greater sense of continuity for the reader. All in all, therefore, there is at least *prima facie* evidence for considering the Cambrai text as an epitome of an enlarged and revised second recension made by the author himself. The fact that no trace

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 174.

of the revisions has otherwise filtered through in the more mainstream sources causes no surprise so far as the Brussels manuscript is concerned, since this source probably dates from the late 1470s in Naples,⁴⁴ that is, before the revision of the *Complexus* within *De inuentione* would have been accomplished. But Ghent 70 was copied in Ghent, for the library of Raphael de Marcatellis, in 1503–4,⁴⁵ and since Cambrai 416 itself was probably copied in the final years of the fifteenth century in north-east France,⁴⁶ it would appear that both the original and revised versions of Tinctoris's text were circulating in northern Europe at much the same time.

The final fragment presented in Cambrai 416, from 1.11 of *De inuentione**, takes over certain points from the previous discussion of the effects of music, this time in a context devoted to the nature and authority of divine inspiration (lines 225–73). An extensive list of *auctores*, cited in evidence from the Old Testament through to later medieval Christendom, leads up to a final assertion of Christ as the perfect musician, and of a kind of musical Apostolic Succession by which the eternal truths of the art were transmitted through the disciples.

Returning briefly to the Cambrai abridgement of the revised *Complexus*, one further question deserves an airing. If the whole, enlarged recension of this treatise formed but one single chapter out of the twenty-four (minimum) contained in Book 1 of *De inuentione**, and that book was but one of five, then, even allowing for certain disparities of chapter length, the complete *De inuentione** must have been a fairly enormous compilation. Is it possible, therefore, that not only the *Complexus*, but all the other known treatises were brought together between the covers of *De inuentione**, perhaps also in revised form (along with all the new material) in the early 1480s? There are certainly still enough gaps in our knowledge of the treatise's content to accommodate this, and such an incorporation could doubtless be viewed as contributing substantially to both the *inuentio* and the *usus* of the work's title.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Woodley, 'Proportionale', 1, pp. 93–122.

⁴⁵ A. Derolez, *The Library of Raphael de Marcatellis, Abbot of St Bavon's, Ghent, 1437–1508* (Ghent, 1979), pp. 227–34.

⁴⁶ See Appendix below, p. 258.

⁴⁷ It may be noted parenthetically that to construe the title of the treatise simply as 'On the Discovery and Practice of Music' does scant justice either to the work's scope or to its author's sensitivity to the nuances of the Latin language. 'Inuentio' carries additional connotations of 'composition', 'devising', 'identifying the character of', 'survey', etc.

This rather attractive proposal, however, wilts somewhat upon closer scrutiny. First, the two other Neapolitan manuscript copies of Tinctoris's works, Valencia 835 and Bologna 2573, were executed *after* the compilation of *De inuentione**, and, in the case of the Valencia codex at least, while the author was still in Naples;⁴⁸ but they nevertheless retain the original designations for the treatises. By itself, of course, this is far from watertight evidence. But, more significantly, there is no trace of either the *Complexus* or the *Difffinitorium* in these two sources. Clearly, the *Complexus* had already been revised and incorporated into *De inuentione**, and the *Difffinitorium* was about to be printed separately anyway; so Tinctoris (or someone else) preferred to omit both from subsequent copies of the canon.

There is yet a further twist. In the front of the Valencia codex (fol. 1^v) there is a short introductory note, entered in the principal scribal hand (that of Wenceslaus Crispus), which strongly implies that this manuscript was preceded by at least one other, companion volume (now lost), containing further works of Tinctoris: 'Ioannis Tinctoris clarissimi musicorum principis opus quod presens uolumen librorum complexus ordinatissime perficit'. Leeman Perkins, who erroneously reads 'perficit' and omits 'uolumen', interprets this note simply as evidence for Tinctoris's hand in the ordering and editing of the manuscript.⁴⁹ But, while such a reading may well lie behind the note, the weight of the sentence surely falls on 'presens uolumen', and on the normal significance of 'perficere', to indicate that this codex did not originally stand alone, but was the volume which *completed* the 'opus' of the theorist.

This rather startling conclusion in fact ties up rather well with a rough computation as to the size of *De inuentione**, based on an approximate number of chapters⁵⁰ and average length of each. This would enable us to hazard a (very approximate) guess that the length of the intact treatise was not far short of that of the whole of Tinctoris's known corpus of other writings. In other words, the missing companion volume to the Valencia codex, if it existed, would have been of comparable size to the surviving manuscript (i.e.

'Vsus', in turn, might imply discussion of the 'enjoyment', 'value', 'requirements', and 'experience' of music, as well as its current practice.

⁴⁸ Cf. p. 242 and nn. 14 and 15 above.

⁴⁹ Perkins and Garey, *Mellon Chansonnier*, 1, p. 22.

⁵⁰ Cf. p. 247 above.

very roughly 150 folios), possibly containing *De inuentione** in full, and rendering less idly rhetorical the author's claim that he completed the treatise 'peruigili labore'.⁵¹ Put yet another way: almost as much of Tinctoris's writings has been lost as has been preserved.

None of this, of course, is in the end of much help for ascertaining why the excerpts from *De inuentione** were taken by Tinctoris and printed separately. The question leads us inevitably towards a study of the whole literary context in which the treatise was conceived, and its relationship to the late fifteenth-century 'communications shift' from manuscript to print culture. The scale of such a study lies well beyond the limits of the present article, and merits separate, extended treatment at a later date. For the moment, however, may it suffice to suggest that a profitable line of inquiry will be in locating the printing of the *De inuentione* extracts within a humanist epistolary genre rather than in regarding it as the material of pure pedagogy.

The cultivation of the letter and the letter collection as a literary genre and, as the fifteenth century progressed, as an increasingly valued means for a scholar to disseminate his ideas, is a well-recognised feature of the Renaissance literary landscape.⁵² The form clearly had its attractions for Tinctoris, as we know already from his correspondence with Joanmarco Cinico,⁵³ written perhaps under the influence of Cicero,⁵⁴ or, more cogently, Seneca's *Epistulae morales*, a celebrated edition of which had just been printed in Naples, by none other than Mathias Moravus, in 1475.⁵⁵ Moreover, the likelihood that this one surviving letter is but a paltry residue of the theorist's output is strengthened by the comment of Iohannes Trithemius, Tinctoris's early and generally reliable biographer, that 'Epistolæ ornatissimas complures dedit ad diuersos.'⁵⁶ Now, clearly the *De*

⁵¹ Weinmann, '*De inuentione*', p. 27.

⁵² See especially C. H. Clough, 'The Cult of Antiquity: Letters and Letter Collections', in *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance: Essays in Honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller*, ed. C. H. Clough (Manchester, 1976), pp. 33–67.

⁵³ See above, pp. 241–2 and n. 11.

⁵⁴ At least three copies of the Letters *Ad familiares* were in the Aragonese library in Naples (De Marinis, *Biblioteca*, II, pp. 45–6). The rhetorical emulation of Cicero by Tinctoris can, I believe, be demonstrated in at least one specific case, namely the modelling of the *Proportionale* prohemium on part of *De oratore*, I: see R. Woodley, 'Renaissance Music Theory as Literature: on Reading the *Proportionale musicæ* of Iohannes Tinctoris' (forthcoming).

⁵⁵ Cf. L. D. Reynolds, *The Medieval Tradition of Seneca's Letters* (Oxford, 1965), pp. 2–3. I am again grateful to Duncan Kennedy for pointing out this possible source. See also p. 241 above.

⁵⁶ Cf. Woodley, 'Review', p. 247.

inventione extracts do not correspond in content to the classically structured humanist letter in the same way that Tinctoris's Cinico letter does. But an associated genre, which one might term the 'letter-tract', flourished equally as a means of scholarly communication in the 1470s and 1480s.⁵⁷ Sometimes the form, interest in which was positively stimulated by the advent of printing, was employed consciously to cultivate rivalry, even acrimony, in intellectual circles; but the gentler, urbane, amusing, and in places spontaneously excited tone of the Tinctoris extracts is no less distinctive of the period and genre. The point is made with characteristic succinctness by the author himself, paraphrasing Horace (*Ars poetica*, 343): 'dulci utile miscui'.⁵⁸ The strictly didactic intent of his earlier treatises (except, pertinently, the *Complexus*) has become modified: precept gives way to anecdote.

It was common for such epistolary treatises to be sent to individual colleagues, as Cecil Clough has noted,⁵⁹ rather in the way that modern scholars, more informally, distribute offprints; and often a separate presentation letter to the recipient was sent and preserved with each copy. It is therefore of particular relevance that Tinctoris's letter to Iohannes Stokem, which opens the *De inventione* excerpts, was printed on a separate page, after which the *De inventione* material proper begins at the top of fol. 2^r.⁶⁰ The evidence seems strong to support the notion that originally a number of different dedicatory letters were written by Tinctoris, and sent with other, lost copies of the printed extracts, to various colleagues and acquaintances, perhaps all over Europe. (Let us not forget that Stokem was himself in Buda at the time. Is it conceivable, indeed, that the good wishes which Tinctoris relays in the letter to Queen Beatrice ['in qua musicorum unicum spem et rationem hucusque posui']⁶¹ contain a

⁵⁷ Clough, 'Cult of Antiquity', pp. 46ff.

⁵⁸ Weinmann, '*De inventione*', p. 27. On the influence of Horace, cf. p. 250 above.

⁵⁹ Clough, 'Cult of Antiquity', p. 46.

⁶⁰ Information from the facsimile frontispiece to Weinmann, '*De inventione*'; a detailed, first-hand examination of the print will doubtless enable further conclusions to be drawn. With a work of this period and genre, indeed, the whole print may well have remained unbound and been distributed in loose sheets (cf., for example, F. R. Goff, 'Characteristics of the Book of the Fifteenth Century', in *Buch und Text*, ed. Hellinga and Härtel, pp. 27–34, on p. 29), a fact which may explain the present binding of the Regensburg unicum with a copy of Gaffurius's *Practica musicae* (see Weinmann, '*De inventione*', p. 6).

⁶¹ Weinmann, '*De inventione*', p. 28. On the similarity between this phrase and part of the text of Tinctoris's motet *Virgo Dei throno digna* (which is inscribed at the front of Bologna 2573), see Perkins and Garey, *Mellon Chansonnier*, 1, p. 19.

veiled request for patronage at her Hungarian court?) This might, in turn, help to explain why no year was included in the calendar date printed at the end of the one surviving presentation letter:⁶² the context would have rendered it less necessary, and possibly obtrusive.

In the foregoing paragraphs the term 'humanism' has been struggling to surface a number of times, and it is increasingly apparent that any accurate and intelligent reading of Tinctoris's life and activity must take full account of his relationship to the humanist movement,⁶³ both in Italy, where he spent his most creative years, and in northern Europe, which provided the familial and educational roots on which he continued to draw throughout his career, and to which he may well have eventually returned.⁶⁴ In the theological and devotional elements of *De inuentione** which the Cambrai fragments emphasise, but which were already apparent in the Moravus print, we may perhaps perceive an aspect of that characteristically Netherlandish pietistic humanism which Josef Ijsewijn has so acutely outlined.⁶⁵ Where Italian humanists in the later fifteenth century were reaching ever towards the poetical and rhetorical, many writers from the Low Countries, even after exposure to, and initial enthusiasm for, the Italianate *humanae litterae*, returned to a more restrained, philosophical literature, to *sacrae litterae*. The trend was embodied, of course, in the career of Erasmus, in his shift of aspiration from youthful *poeta et orator* to *theologus*. It may not, in the end, be too rhetorical to view Tinctoris, in the early 1480s, as himself caught between these two strong poles of attraction, and to see his *De inuentione et usu musicae* as, in some respects, a literary expression of his own cultural ambivalence.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne

⁶² Cf. pp. 240 and 245 above.

⁶³ Cf., in this regard, E. E. Lowinsky, 'Music of the Renaissance as viewed by Renaissance Musicians', in *The Renaissance Image of Man and the World*, ed. B. O'Kelly (Columbus, Ohio, 1966), pp. 129–77, and *idem*, 'Renaissance Writings on Music Theory', *Renaissance News*, 18 (1965), pp. 358–70.

⁶⁴ Since the publication of Woodley, 'Review', Richard Sherr has demonstrated the likelihood of Tinctoris's having been in Rome in 1502, upon his resignation 'apud sedem' of a benefice at the parish church of St George 'ad Mercatum Veterem' in Naples; this event may well have immediately preceded Tinctoris's return north (R. Sherr, 'Notes on some Papal Documents in Paris', *Studi Musicali*, 12 (1983), pp. 5–16).

⁶⁵ J. Ijsewijn, 'The Coming of Humanism to the Low Countries', in *Itinerarium italicum: the Profile of the Italian Renaissance in the Mirror of its European Transformations*, ed. H. A. Oberman, with T. A. Brady, Jr, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought 14 (Leiden, 1975), pp. 193–301.

APPENDIX

Cambrai, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS A 416, fols. 8^v–12^v

The manuscript is discussed briefly on p. 246 above; for a description of its contents, see n. 32. Fols. 8^v–9 are reproduced as Figures 1–2.

The date of Cambrai 416 cannot be determined accurately at present from either its contents or other, codicological criteria. The script is a firm, late fifteenth-century 'French' bookhand, and the only watermark visible, a letter **P** surmounted by a quatrefoil petal linked by a single vertical wire (c. 70 × 23 mm), suggests a possible origin in north-east France, the Netherlands, or perhaps north-west Germany, some time in the 1480s or 1490s.⁶⁶ A note (s. xviii–xix?) on fol. 1^r ('Bibl. S. Sepul: Camer:') indicates that the manuscript was at one time in the possession of the church of St Sépulchre in Cambrai, and it may therefore not have strayed all that far since its compilation. The opening prayer to St Veronica, *Salve sancta facies* (fol. 1^r),⁶⁷ although widely propagated in this part of Europe, may perhaps yield some clues eventually to the manuscript's provenance.

The text of the *De inuentione* fragments is presented according to the following criteria. Original orthography is retained. Punctuation has been modernised, while adhering to the pause structure of the original wherever feasible. (The fifteenth-century punctuation is often more generous at the phrasal level than would be acceptable to more clause-orientated readers today.) Parentheses have been retained as in the manuscript. Capitalisation has been standardised. Abbreviations are expanded silently, and original lineation and word breaks (except over a change of folio) are not recorded. Tironian *et* is expanded, and paraph marks are reproduced thus: ¶. Underlining (of *auctores*, etc.) is indicated in **bold type**.

The curious 'Rapiamus' which appears after the first heading (line 2 below) is evidently a scribal addition, as is the final *versus* 'Quod caret . . . nouat' (lines 274–5). The 'Rapiamus' exhortation reappears in similar positions elsewhere in the manuscript, and may be derived from the sense of 'to plunder', hence 'to extract'; or from the meaning 'to range through', hence 'to paraphrase'; or it may be a corruption of the noun 'rapiarius' (i.e. a miscellany), in which case the scribe of Cambrai 416 may (though not necessarily) have been working from an intermediary, florilegium-type source, rather than the complete *De inuentione** itself. If this is so, the original

⁶⁶ Comparisons drawn from G. Piccard, *Wasserzeichen Buchstabe P*, 3 vols. (Stuttgart, 1977), II, viii. Beta-radiography has not yet been available, but Piccard nos. 415 (p. 289: Utrecht 1497) and 425 (p. 289: Condé 1497) appear closely to resemble the mark in Cambrai 416.

⁶⁷ See U. Chevalier, *Repertorium hymnologicum*, 6 vols. (Louvain, Paris and Brussels, 1892–1921), no. 18189 for further bibliography, where the presence of the text in Cambrai 416 is noted.

Tinctoris work may well have reached northern Europe at an even earlier date than the Cambrai manuscript immediately suggests.

The sources of Tinctoris's direct citations have been noted here wherever possible, but it has been considered impractical to attempt to trace all of the more indirect verbal allusions to *auctores*, except in a few cases with the opening, unidentified 'Cantores, quibus ars . . .' verse. A number of these citations display interesting variants from the received texts, often attested elsewhere in the textual tradition of the works in question. Such citations will eventually provide valuable evidence for a study of Tinctoris's precise source material, and of the fifteenth-century transmission of the authors concerned, but it has been decided not to inflate the footnotes here with such complicated data. A simple record of the existence of such variants must for the time being suffice. Titles of classical texts and biblical books are accorded their standard English abbreviations. (Note that 1 K and 2 K are the modern equivalents of the Vulgate III Rg and IV Rg.)

¶ **Ex libro 2° Iohannis Tinctoris de inuentione et usu musice:
capitulum vii. Rapiamus.**

- ¶ Cantores quibus ars uox quoque dulcis est,
Tibicen, tubicen, tuque lyre sciens,
5 Celesti Domino carmina pangite,
Tellus cuius opus pontus et ethera;
Qui puro genitus sanguine uirginis
Errantes docuit iusticie uiam,
Humani generis quique uices dolens
10 Tormentum subiit mortifere crucis;
Qua nos uiuificans, pastor ut optimus
Saluos ore lupi restituit Deo,
Vite tumque sibi munere reddito,
Ad celi rediit fulgida sidera;
15 Quo sublimis eum curia laudibus
Summis prosequitur mente piissima.
- 3–16 See pp. 247–50 and nn. 35–6 above. The anonymous author clearly displays some awareness of the four-line groupings normal in Horace's Odes (cf. R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book I* (Oxford, 1970), p. xlvi).
- 3–4 Cantores . . . sciens: cf. Horace, *Ars poet.* 407–8, 415; *Carm.* 3.9.10.
5 carmina pangite: cf. Horace, *Ars poet.* 416; *Epist.* 1.18.40.
8 Errantes . . . uiam: cf. Ps (Hebr.) 118.26; Sir 17.20; 36.19; Hos 10.12.
11–12 pastor . . . Deo: cf. Jer 31.10; Jn 10.11; 10.14; He 13.20; Mt 10.16; Lk 10.3.
14–16 Ad . . . piissima: cf. Horace, *Carm.* 1.1.36; He 11.12; 2 Mac 9.10; Gn 31.27.

¶ **Ex xii capitulo.**

- ¶ Iuditii signum tellus sudore madescet.
E celo rex adueniet per secla futurus,
20 Scilicet in carnem presens ut iudicet orbem.
Vnde Deum cernent incredulus atque fidelis
Celsum cum sanctis eui iam termino in ipso.
Sic anime cum carne aderunt, quas iudicet ipse,
Cum iacet incultus densis in uepribus orbis.
25 Reiiicient simulachra uiri, cunctam quoque gazam,
Exuret terras ignis, pontumque polumque
Inquirens, tetri portas effringet Auerni.
Sanctorum sed enim cuncte lux libera carni
Tradetur, sontes eterna flamma cremabit.
30 Occultos actus retgens tunc quisque loquetur
Secreta, atque Deus reserabit pectora luci. [fol. 9]
Tunc erit et luctus, stridebunt dentibus omnes.
Eripitur soli iubar, et chorus interit astris.
Soluatur [MS: Soluentur] celum, lunaris splendor obibit;
35 Deiciet colles, ualles extollet ab imo.
Non erit in rebus hominum sublime uel altum.
Iam equantur campis montes, et cerula ponti.
Omnia cessabunt, tellus confracta peribit:
Sic pariter fontes torrentur fluminaque igni.
40 Sed tuba tunc sonitum 〈tristem *om.*〉 demittet ab alto
Orbe, gemens facinus miserum uanosque labores,
Tartareumque chaos monstrabit terra dehiscens.
Et coram hic Domino reges sistentur ad unum.
Recidet e celis ignisque et sulphuris amnis.

45 ¶ **Ex libro quinto capitulum xxiii.**

- ¶ Nunc ex terreno sublimis preclareque musice usu ad celestem redeamus. Enimuero maledicti descendentes in ignem eternum, qui (iuxta ueritatem) preparatus est diabolo et angelis eius, nec

18–44 See p. 250 and nn. 37–8 above. This Sibylline prophecy is quoted by Augustine (*De civ. Dei*, 18.23), who may conceivably be Tinctoris's direct source, judging from the number of subsequent citations from him. This Latin version attempts to retain acrostic of the original Greek, IESOUS CHREISTOS THEON UIOS SOTER (Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour) as well as was possible without the letter *upsilon* (see Augustine, *ibid.*).

The printing and scope of *De inuentione et usu musicae*

50 musicam exercent, nec ea delectantur. Cithara namque eorum (ut
 uerbis beati Iob utar) uersa est in luctum, et organum in uocem
 flencium. De quibus et ille propheta magnus **Isaias** eloquens ait:
 Cessauit gaudium tympanorum, quieuit sonitus letancium, conti-
 55 cuit dulcedo cithare. Benedicti uos qui et sancti, possidentes
 regnum sibi diuinitus a constitutione mundi preparatum, ut (cor-
 poribus exutis, quibus in tumulis tamquam in cubilibus suis
 quiescentibus, honor a cunctis exhibitus eis merito leticie est)
 anime eorum in manu Dei existentes, supernam illam ciuitatem
 Iherusalem introierunt, Deo quidem suo in conspectu angelorum
 continuo psallunt. Quod sane fieri non solum mente, sed eciam
 60 aliqua uoce cuius instrumentum spirituale nobis ignotum est, ad
 maiorem iocunditatem, diuine quoque glorie manifestationem
 (quemadmodum superius de concentu angelico in celis diximus)
 pie credendum opinamur. [fol. 9^v] **Vnde Ioannes in apocalipsi**
 65 de centum et quadragintaquatuor milibus uirginum, de terra
 emptorum animis, ante sedem Dei canticum quasi nouum cantan-
 tibus ait: Et uocem quam audiui, sicut citharedorum
 citharizantium in citharis suis. Quibus uerbis sacramento plen-
 issimis alma innitens ecclesia sepenumero in missarum solemnibus
 70 concinit: ¶ Quam felix illa ciuitas in qua iugis solemnitas; et quam
 iocunda curia que prorsus cure nescia. Nec languor hic nec
 senium, nec fraus nec terror hostium; sed una uox letancium, et
 unus ardor cordium. ¶ Palam autem est, quom ipse beatorum
 anime sua resumpserint corpora, et ita sancti in anima et corpore
 glorificati fuerint, quod in Dei laudibus summo cum gaudio
 75 propria uoce exultabunt. Quocirca, postquam prophetarum
 eximius Dauid cecinerat: Exultabunt sancti in gloria, letabuntur
 in cubilibus suis, mox subiunxit: Exultationes Dei in gutture
 eorum. In illa quippe felicissima patria lectiones, predicationes
 iurium ac philosophie disceptationes, discipline militares, omnes
 80 terrene ciuitatis actiones, preter melodiosissimam Dei laudem,
 omnino cessabunt. **Vnde Augustinus:** Quanta erit illa felicitas
 ubi nullum erit malum, nullum latebit bonum, uacabitur Dei

- 49–51 Cithara . . . flencium: Job 30.31.
 52–3 Cessauit . . . cithare: Is 24.8.
 53–4 Benedicti . . . preparatum: cf. Mt 25.34.
 64–7 centum . . . suis: Rev 14.1–4 (partly paraphrased).
 69–72 Quam . . . cordium: cf. Chevalier, *Repertorium hymnologicum*, no. 32178.
 76–7 Exaltabunt . . . suis: Ps (Sept.) 149.5.
 77–8 Exultationes . . . eorum: Ps (Sept.) 149.6.
 81–3 Quanta . . . omnibus: Augustine, *De civ. Dei*, 22.30 (some addition and para-
 phrase).

- laudibus qui erit omnia in omnibus. Et pergit auctor eminentis-
 85 simus: Nam quid aliud agetur, ubi neque ulla indigentia
 laborabitur? Nescio. Admoneor eciam sancto cantico, ubi lego uel
 audio: Beati qui habitant in domo tua Domine; in secula
 seculorum laudabunt te Domine. Que quidem laus animis ex
 90 diuersis diuerse premiatis, nullatenus tamen aduersis, concordan-
 tissime progrediens sonorum melodiis, que in cor hominis non
 ascenderunt, nec aures audierunt, iocunda erit atque decora. Et
 quamuis (ut sacri theologi docent) habitus sciencie hic acquisite in
 patria remaneat, dicente **Ieronimo**: Discamus in terris quorum
 nobis sciencia perseueret in celo. Vsus tamen musice in ipsa celesti
 95 patria non modo ab his qui hic in ea minime sunt eruditi, uerum
 eciam ab edoctis erit multo dulcior, multo elegantior, multoque
 subtilior, quam hac in terrestri uita. [fol. 10] Omnes etenim in
 lumine Dei uidebunt lumen, ac per influentiam substantiarum
 superiorum, uel Dei uel angelorum, apprehendent singularia,
 potissimum autem, que ad ipsius etiam Dei laudem pertinent. Que
 100 uel eo erit perfectior, quo qui laudabitur omnis perfectionis est
 uberior. Et ut paucis absoluam, Maria uirgo beatissima, super
 omnes choros angelorum exaltata, ipsi denique angeli, patriarche,
 apostoli, martires, confessores, uirgines, ceterique electi ac electe
 Dei, cantica Domini, hoc est laudes diuinas, non in terra quidem
 105 aliena sed propria, quom sint facti coheredes Christi (resumptis
 eorum organis) cum ipso dulcissimo Ihesu Christo, ad dexteram
 Dei patris sedente, ac eum ut homine filio semper glorificante,
 piissime concinent [*emendatum ab MS*: concine ut]; haud solum
 enim uisio dilectioque Dei, sed eciam (ut scribit **Augustinus**)
 110 laudatio erit omnibus sicut uita eterna communis. Quam quidem
 uitam summe ille institutor eius ac rector Deus optimus maximus
 cunctis fidelibus, in primis autem nobis musicis, elargiri dignatur,
 ut, qui suam excellentissimam maiestatem, in ecclesia militante
 laudibus amenissimis pre ceteris hostibus temporaliter pro-
 115 sequimur, in triumphante ad sacratissimum idem officium
 perpetuo exequendum, si non super ceteros, saltem inter primos
 exaltemur.
- 84-7 Nam . . . Domine: Augustine, *ibid.*
 86-7 Beati . . . Domine: Ps 83.5 (minor variants).
 88 For a similar juxtaposition of 'diuersis' and 'aduersis', see *Proportionale*, prohemium
 (Seay, ed., *Tinctoris opera*, II, p. 10).
 90 iocunda . . . decora: cf. Ps (Sept.) 146.1.
 92-3 Discamus . . . celo: Jerome, Ep. LIII 'ad Paulinum presbyterum' (*Saint-Jérôme: Lettres*, ed. J. Labourt, Collection des Universités de France, 8 vols. (Paris, 1949-63), III, p. 23).
 110 erit . . . communis: Augustine, *De civ. Dei*, 22.30 (slightly paraphrased).

¶ **Ex capitulo v primi libri: De effectu.**

- 120 ¶ Primo itaque: Musice usus Deum delectat. Vnde ad sponsam eius ecclesiam **in canticis canticorum ait**: Sonet uox tua in auribus meis; uox enim tua dulcis. Non autem Deus ipse suauius dulcedinem uocis in ecclesia resonantis audire peroptaret, nisi hec illum miro quidem modo delectaret. ¶ Secundo: Diuinam laudem decorat. Verba namque quibus Deus laudatur, modulatis uocibus
- 125 in celo ac in terra maiorem ad decorem [*sic*] pronunciantur. ¶ Tertio: Gaudia beatorum amplificat. Quom enim beatitudo nullius rei honeste ac delectabilis sit expers, ut musica, que (**teste philosopho**) delectabilissimorum ac honesta est, beati delectentur, piissime credimus. ¶ Quarto: Ecclesiam [*sic*] militantem triumphanti assimilat, **dicente Bernardo**: Nichil in terris ita representat quendam celestis habitationis statum, quam alacritas laudantium Deum. ¶ Quinto: Ad susceptionem benedictionis diuine preparat. In quarto enim libro regum legitur quod quom caneret psaltes, facta est super [fol. 10^v] heliseum manus Domini.
- 135 ¶ Sexto: Animos ad pietatem excitat. **Vnde Augustinus**: Adducor canendi consuetudinem approbare in ecclesia, ut per oblectamenta aurium animus infirmior ad affectum pietatis assurgat. ¶ Septimo: Pueros et adolescentes ad uirtutem disponit. **Eusebius** post Platonem: Quoniam animi temeriores rationem uirtutis non suscipiunt, ludo atque cantu preparantur. ¶ Octauo: Terrenam mentem eleuat. **Bernardus**: Oculos cordis attolit [*sic*] iubilus laudis. ¶ Nono: Homines letificat. Vt enim **Museus ait**, hominibus cantare delectabilissimum est, propter quod in conuentus ac deductiones rationabiliter ipsam assumunt musicam, tamquam
- 140 potentem letificare. ¶ Decimo: Amorem allicit. **Ouidius**: Res est blanda canor: discant cantare puelle (pro facie multis uox sua lena fuit). ¶ Vndecimo: Iocunditatem conuiuui augmentat. In
- 145

- 120-1 Sonet . . . dulcis: Ca 2.14. For all references between lines 118 and 225, see also Seay, ed., *Tinctoris opera*, II, pp. 163-77, and Zanoncelli, *Estetica*.
- 128 delectabilissimorum . . . est: cf. Aristotle, *Pol.* 8.5 (ff.).
- 130-2 Nichil . . . Deum: Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones super cantica canticorum*, XI (partly paraphrased).
- 133-4 quom . . . Domini: 2 K 3.15 (slightly paraphrased).
- 135-7 Adducor . . . assurgat: Augustine, *Conf.* 10.33.
- 139-40 Quoniam . . . preparantur: Eusebius: untraced.
- 141-2 Oculos . . . laudis: Bernard of Clairvaux: untraced.
- 142-5 Vt . . . letificare: Aristotle, *Pol.* 8.5.2 (close translation).
- 146-7 Res . . . fuit: Ovid, *Ars amat.* 3.315-16 (punctuation from E. J. Kenney, ed. (Oxford, 1961); parentheses not in MS).

- ecclesiastico quippe scriptum est: Gemma carbunculi in
 ornamento auri, et comparatio musicorum in conuiuio uini.
 150 **Glosa:** Carbunculum comparat [MS: comperat] auro, et musicum
 melos conuiuio; sicut enim carbunculus duplicat splendorem auri,
 ita melodia iocunditatem conuiuuii. ¶ Duodecimo: Quietum ac
 lenem somnum prouocat, et rursus stuporem ipsius et confu-
 sionem purgat. **Boetius:** In tantum prisce philosophie studiosis
 155 uis musice artis innotuit, **ut Pythagorici**, quom diurnas insomnos
 resolverent curas, quibusdam cantilenis uterentur, ut quietus ac
 lenis sopor irreparet. Itaque experrecti aliis quibusdam modis
 stuporem somni confusionemque purgabant. ¶ Terciodecimo:
 Extasim causat. **Vnde postquam David in psalmo lxxvii^o**
 160 **cecinit:** Preuenerunt principes coniuncti psallentibus in medio
 iuencularum tympanistriarum, **paulo post subdidit:** Ibi
 Benjamin in mentis excessu. Pro quo facit illud philosophi in
 octauo Politicorum: Melodie Olympi faciunt animas raptas.
 ¶ Quartodecimo: Duritiam cordis resoluit. **Augustinus:** O
 quantum fleui in hymnis et canticis tuis, suaue sonantis ecclesie
 165 tue uocibus conmotus acriter. ¶ Quintodecimo: Tristitiam depel-
 lit. **Iacobus:** Tristatur aliquis uestrum; oret equo animo et psallat.
 Hinc **Augustino teste:** Hymni et psalmi ut canerentur secundum
 morem [fol. 11] orientalium partium (ne populus meroris tedio
 170 contabesceret) ab occidentalibus institutum est. ¶ Sextodecimo:
 Infantum uagitus sedat. Quapropter et chysippum [*sic*], nutri-
 cibus que ablactationi adhibentur infantibus, proprium quoddam
 [MS: quddam] carmine assignasse legimus. ¶ Decimo septimo:
 Curas minuit. **Vnde Horatius:** Condisce modos, amanda uoce
 175 quos reddas: minuentur atre carmine cure. ¶ Decimooctauo:
 Demonem fugat. Enimuero (ut in primo regum legitur) quom
 Dauid citharam percutiebat, spiritus malus a Saul recedebat.

- 148-9 Gemma . . . uini: Sir 32.7 (minor variants).
 150-2 Carbunculum . . . conuiuuii: untraced (not Glossa ordinaria).
 154-8 In . . . purgabant: Boethius, *Inst. mus.* 1.1 (minor variants: cf. apparatus criticus in
 G. Friedlein, ed. (Leipzig, 1967), pp. 185-6).
 160-1 Preuenerunt . . . tympanistriarum: Ps (Sept.) 67.26.
 161-2 Ibi . . . excessu: Ps (Sept.) 67.28 (slightly abbreviated).
 163 Melodie . . . raptas: Aristotle, *Pol.* 8.4.5 (slightly abbreviated).
 164-6 O . . . acriter: Augustine, *Conf.* 9.6 (initial 'O' added).
 167 Tristatur . . . psallat: Ja 5.13.
 168-70 Hymni . . . est: Augustine: untraced.
 174-5 Condisce . . . cure: Horace, *Carm.* 4.11.34-6 (punctuation from F. Klingner, ed.,
 Leipzig, 1970).
 176-7 quom . . . recedebat: 1 S 16.23 (paraphrased).

- ¶ Decimonono: Iracundiam temperat. **Boetius**: Empedocles quom eius hospitem quidam gladio furibundus inuaderet, quod
 180 eius ille patrem accusatione damnasset, inflexisse dicitur modum canendi, atque adolescentis iracundiam temperasse. ¶ Vigesimo: Malam uoluntatem reuocat. Nam et Pithagoram accepimus concitatos ad uim pudice domui inferendam iuuenes, iussa mutare in spondeum modos tibicina composuisse. Hec **Quintilianus**.
 185 ¶ Primo et uigesimo: Pugnantes animat. **Iuuenalis**: Animante tuba galeatum sepe duelli penitet. ¶ Secundo et uigesimo: Labores solatur et incitat. **Virgilius in Georgicis**: Interea longum cantu solata laborem, arguto coniunx percurrit pectine telas. Hinc (**ut Quintilianus ait**) natura ipsa uidetur nobis ad tollerandos facilius labores musicam uelut muneri dedisse, siquidem et remiges cantus hortatur; nec solum in his operibus, in quibus plurium conatus preeunte aliqua iocunditate conspirat, sed etiam singulorum fatigatio qualibet se rudi modulatione solatur. ¶ Tertio et uigesimo: Egrotos sanat. Vt enim in libro etymologiarum **Isidorus asserit**:
 190 Asclepiades medicus quendam freneticum arte modulationis pristinae sanitati restituit. Terpander itidem et Arion Lesbos atque Iones grauissimis morbis cantus eripere presidio. **Ismenius** quoque Thebanus Boetiorum pluribus, quos sciatici doloris tormenta uexabant, modis cunctas fertur abstersisse molestias. **Hec Boetius**. ¶ Quarto et uigesimo: Plurima sapientum dicta exemplo sui comprobat. **Philosophus** enim in secundo Ethicorum libro scientissime probans omnem uirtutem ac artem ex [fol. 11^v] iisdem ac per eadem fieri atque corrumpi, citharedos in exemplum adducit, qui ex pulsatione cithare boni ac mali fiunt.
 200 **Augustinusque in sextodecimo De ciuitate Dei** probat aliqua in historia prophetica dici que nichil significant, sed quibus adhereant que significant et quodam modo religuntur. Exemplo itidem usus cithare atque usus uasorum huiusmodi musicorum, in quibus soli nerui aptantur ad cantum, sed ut aptari possint, insunt
 205
- 178–80 Empedocles . . . temperasse: Boethius, *Inst. mus.* 1.1 (minor variants: cf. Friedlein, ed., p. 185).
 182–4 Nam . . . composuisse: Quintilian, *Inst. or.* 1.10.32 (minor variants).
 185–6 Animante . . . penitet: Juvenal, *Sat.* 1.169 ('Animante tuba' is an attested variant from the accepted 'animo ante tubas').
 187–8 Interea . . . telas: Vergil, *Georg.* 1.293–4.
 189–93 natura . . . solatur: Quintilian, *Inst. or.* 1.10.16 (minor variants).
 195–6 Asclepiades . . . restituit: Isidore of Seville, *Etymol.* 4.13 (paraphrased).
 196–9 Terpander . . . molestias: Boethius, *Inst. mus.* 1.1. (minor variants).
 203–4 citharedos . . . fiunt: Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 2.1.6 (paraphrased).
 205–11 aliqua . . . connectuntur: Augustine, *De civ. Dei*, 16.2 (some paraphrase).

- 210 et cetera in compaginibus organorum, que non percutiuntur a
 canentibus, sed ea que percussa resonant hiis connectuntur.
 ¶ Quinto et uigesimo: Pronuntiationem modestam oratoribus
 administrat. Enimuero, quotiens apud populum (**ut Valerius**
Maximus scribit) **Gaius Gracchus adolescens**, flagratissimi
 215 ingenii orator, apud populum concionatus est, seruum post se artis
 musice peritum habuit, qui occulte eburnea fistula pronuntiationis
 modos formabat, aut nimis remissos excitando, aut plus iusto
 concitatos reuocando, quia ipsum calor atque impetus actionis
 attentum huiusce temperamenti estimatorem esse non patiebatur.
 220 ¶ Sexto et uigesimo: Peritos [MS: Peritor] in ea glorificat. **Vnde**
Sapiens: Homines in peritia sua requirentes modos musicos in
 generationibus gentis sue gloriam adepti sunt, et in diebus suis
 habentur in laudibus. ¶ Septimo et uigesimo: Scientes eius beatif-
 cat, siquidem (ut propheta cecinit) beatus populus qui scit iubilati-
 225 tionem.

¶ **Capitulum xi primi libri.**

- ¶ Hominum denique nonnullos artem musicam per species a Deo
 infusas adeptos firmissime credimus. Secundum enim theolo-
 gorum sententiam prothoparens noster ille Adam, quemad-
 230 modum ab eius plasmatore, hoc est Deo opifice maximo, cuius
 perfecta sunt opera, fuit quantum ad corpus in statu perfecto (ut
 statim generaret) formatus, sic eciam quantum ad animam (ut
 quos generaret facultatem gubernandi ac instruendi haberent
 [MS: habere] perfecte fuit institutus. Quo effectum est ut omnium
 235 rerum natura cognoscibilium, et sic ad musicam pertinentium, ab
 ipso Deo perfectam acceperit noticiam. Et quom in sudore uultus
 sui propter inobedienciam pane suo uesci eum oportuerit, arbitrator
 [fol. 12] quod ad tolerandos facilius labores, ob quod (teste
 Quintiliano) musica nobis data uidetur, nonnumquam ipse
 240 cecinerit. Nec alienum a fide recta est opinari nostram maiorem
 Euam (quom iuxta Boetium experientieque documentum infantes
 dulcis cantilena delectet) infantum eius aut Deo inspirante, aut
 marito doctore, aut natura duce, cantu dulcissimo et planctus

213–19 quotiens . . . patiebatur: Valerius Maximus, *Facta et dicta memorabilia*, 8.10.1 (some paraphrase).

221–3 Homines . . . laudibus: Sir 44.5–7 (most texts read ‘pueritia’ for ‘peritia’, but the latter has some medieval witnesses).

224–5 beatus . . . iubilationem: Ps (Sept.) 88.16.

238–9 ad . . . uidetur: Quintilian, *Inst. or.* 1.10.16 (cf. lines 189–93 above).

241–2 infantes . . . delectet: cf. Boethius, *Inst. mus.* 1.1.

The printing and scope of *De inuentione et usu musicæ*

- sedasse et ad exultationem animos emouisse. Preterea (si Eusebio
 245 credimus) sanctissimi prophete hymnos et odas inspiratione
 diuina composuerunt, **ut Moyses cantica hec**: Cantemus
 Domino, et Audite celi que loquar; **Delbora et Barach**: Que
 sponte obtulistis; **Iudith**: Incipite Domino; **Anna Samuelis**
 250 **mater**: Exultauit cor meum; **Dauid**: Psalmos; **Salomon**: Cantica
 Canticorum; cuius et carmina quinque milia fuisse in 3^o libro
 regum legimus; **Isayas** cantica hec: Confitebor, et Ego dixi;
Hieremias: Threnos; Tres pueri **Sidrac Misac et Abdenago**
 255 **canticum illud**: Benedicite omnia opera Domini Domino; **Abacuc**:
 Domine audiui; **Zacharias**: Benedictus Dominus Deus Israel;
Maria uirgo: Magnificat anima mea Dominum; **Simeon**: Nunc
 dimittis. Neque silencio [MS: *silencia*] transeundum est ipsam
 uirginem intemeratam almam Mariam (ut Albertus Magnus
 piissime scientissimeque scribit) inter cetera gratiarum dona
 260 musicam habuisse diuinitus infusam. Qua scilicet carissimum eius
 infantem Ihesum humanitus uagientem mellifluis cantibus et a
 fletu temperaret et ad gaudium prouocaret. Cui quidem Ihesu
 unico saluatori nostro, super quem (iuxta uaticinium **Isaie**)
 requieuit spiritus sapientie, intellectus ac sciencie, fuit musica
 (quemadmodum et relique sciencie) ab instanti sue conceptionis
 265 infusa. Hinc ubi scribitur in apocalypsi Dignus est agnus qui
 occisus est accipere uirtutem et diuinitatem et sapientiam, **Glosa**
dicit: Omnium rerum cognitionem, sicut uerbum sibi unitum.
- 245–6 sanctissimi . . . composuerunt: Eusebius: untraced, but cf. the opening paragraphs
 of his *Commentaria in Psalmos* (*Patrologia graeca*, ed. J.-P. Migne, xxiii, cols. 71–5).
 246–7 Cantemus . . . loquar: Ex 15.1 and Dt 32.1 (Moses was traditionally held to have
 been the author of the Pentateuch).
 247–8 Que . . . obtulistis: Jg 5.2 (ff.).
 248 Incipite Domino: Jth 16.2 (ff.).
 249 Exultauit . . . meum: 1 S 2.1 (ff.).
 250 carmina . . . milia: 1 K 4.32 ('quinque milia' is a recorded variant of the accepted
 'quinque et mille').
 251 Confitebor . . . dixi: Is 12.1 and 38.10 (49.4).
 252 'Threni' = Lamentations of Jeremiah.
 253 Benedicite . . . Domino: Dt 3.57 (ff.): 'Song of the Three Children', an insertion of
 68 verses in the Septuagint and Vulgate after Dt 3.23.
 254 Domine audiui: Hab 3.2 (ff.).
 254 Benedictus . . . Israel: Lk 1.68 (ff.). The insertion of 'Dominus' is not in the
 accepted text, but is a recorded variant.
 255 Magnificat . . . Dominum: Lk 1.46 (ff.).
 255–6 Nunc dimittis: Lk 2.29 (ff.).
 257ff. Albertus Magnus: untraced.
 262–3 super . . . sciencie: Is 11.2 (abbreviated paraphrase).
 265–6 Dignus . . . sapientiam: Rev 5.12.
 267 Omnium . . . unitum: cf. *Glossa ordinaria* (*Patrologia latina*, ed. J.-P. Migne, cxiv,
 col. 721: minor variants).

270 **Vnde et Ricardus** eum asserit omnia scire que Deus scit. Deus autem (ut ex iis patet que supra scripsimus) musice perfectissimam scientiam [fol. 12^v] habere perhibetur; ergo nichil ignorare Christum posse uerissime concluditur. Ipsius quoque dulcissimi Ihesu Christi discipulos (si Paraclitus eos, iuxta promissum patris, omnem docuit ueritatem) ueritate artis musice per inspirationem arbitror imbutos extitisse.

**Versus: Quod caret alterna requie durable non est;
Hec reparat uires, membraque fessa nouat.**

268 Untraced: perhaps paraphrasing Richard of St Victor, *De Trinitate*, 6.23 (*Patrologia latina*, cxcvi, cols. 988–9), or part of the *Beniamin maior* (*ibid.*, cols. 63–202). ‘Dignus est agnus’ is cited in *In Apocalypsim libri septem*, 2.3 (*ibid.*, col. 759), but not with this gloss.