GUILIELMUS REVEALED: THE COHERENCE, DATING, AND AUTHORSHIP
OF DE PRECEPTIS ARTIS MUSICE

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF MUSIC

By

David Hamrick, B.A.
Denton, Texas
December, 1992

*De preceptis* is considered a major source of information on the origins of fauxbourdon, despite its being regarded as a disorganized compilation of multiple authorship, uncertain date, and unknown provenance. Internal cross-reference and writing mannerisms, however, show it to be a compilation of a single author’s writings. Comparison of its pedagogical content to that of other theory treatises suggests that it was written c. 1500, not the accepted c. 1480. Evidence also indicates that Guillaume Garnier, a Flemish associate of Tinctoris and Gaffurius working in Italy, was its author.

*De preceptis* ought to be considered a source, not for the origins of fauxbourdon, but for its reception-history, evidenced by the centrality of the parallel-consonance duet in Guilielmus’s composition formulas, many of which resemble the frottola.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

No theoretical treatise dealing with fifteenth-century fauxbourdon receives more attention than De preceptis artis musice. Manfred Bukofzer, in Geschichte des englischen Diskants, gives more attention to this treatise than to any other. Heinrich Besseler likewise cites Guilielmus's work more than that of any other theorist in his classic Bourdon und Fauxbourdon. Ernst Apfel points to this work

---

1. De preceptis artis musice is known from only one source, Venezia, Biblioteca marciana, lat. 336 (coll. 1581). The manuscript contains 64 folios, with two foliations throughout. The newer foliation begins on fol. 1, a single leaf not associated with the following folios, while the older foliation begins on the next folio, the opening folio of De preceptis. The newer foliation is employed in Albert Seay's critical edition of the text of De preceptis, and will be followed hereinafter. The opening leaf, a fragment titled Quaedam notitiae de musica, and fols. 2-48v, De preceptis artis musice, are written in a North Italian hand on late fifteenth-century paper measuring 214 x 158 mm. Fols. 49-50 are blank. Fols. 50v-64, containing Regule de contrapuncto by Antonius de Leno, are fourteenth-century paper trimmed to the size of fols. 1-48. Cited in Joseph Smits van Waesberghe, ed., The Theory of Music from the Carolingian Era up to 1400, Répertoire Internationale des Sources Musicales (Munich: G. Henle Verlag, 1961- ), Ser. B, Pt. 3, II, 130.


as a significant source for understanding fifteenth-century "contrapuntal and composition theory . . . , especially with regard to contrapuntal and improvisatory practices." ⁴

Nonetheless, the treatise has thus far only been studied in piecemeal fashion, without consideration of its independence as an historical document; as a result, almost nothing is known of the purpose of its contents and organization, its dating and provenance, or its author. Bukofzer's opinion that the treatise is a disorganized compilation has been almost universally accepted, but it rests solely upon the ground that plainchant, mensural, and contrapuntal theory are not treated in independent sections.⁵ The commonly accepted date of writing, c. 1480-1490, was proposed because it was the decade in which Nicolaus Burtius, Johannes Tinctoris, Franchinus Gaffurius were also writing on fauxbourdon.⁶ The place of writing is assumed to be Italy, because of the copyist's early sixteenth-century Italian hand and the author's contrast of music "of the French and the English," and "among us."⁷

---


5. Bukofzer, op. cit., 60.


7. Ibid.
No more is presently known of the author's identity than may be deduced from his own introduction, on the second folio: "Guilielmus Monachus, cantoris interrigimus." Only one author, Ernest Trumble, expounds a compelling theory toward a more tangible identification. He cites certain terms and pedagogical aids used by Guilielmus as associated with northern Europe, and notes the use of some of Guilielmus's composition formulas in the writings of Tinctoris, certain music from the papal chapel, and the music of Serafino dall'Aquila. From such evidence, Trumble makes a composite biography of a Guilielmus who might have known Tinctoris and Serafino and who served in the papal chapel. His man is Guillaume Garnier, perhaps the "G. Guarnier" of the papal chapel from 1474-1482, whom he equates with "Guglielmo Fiammenga," one of Serafino's teachers in Naples in the 1480's.

Several factors call for a fresh evaluation of this treatise. A mannerism of the author's use of language, found throughout most of the treatise, may indicate single authorship rather than a compilation of the writings of

8. Ibid., 15. Hereinafter De preceptis artis musicae will be cited by folio number and the corresponding page number in Seay's edition. E.g.: [f. 2; Seay, 15].


10. Ibid., 158-163.

11. Ibid., 163-165.
others. Statements within the treatise referring to other portions of the work indicate that, contrary to popular opinion, the contents were purposely placed in their extant order. The issue of dating, which would help considerably in understanding the relationship between Guilielmus's fauxbourdon doctrines and those of other theorists, rests solely upon the general similarity between the contents of De preceptis and those of the writings of Tinctoris and Gaffurius—a tenuous and ill-defined connection at best. The accepted provenance rests on the hand of the copyist, which proves that the treatise was copied in Italy in the early sixteenth century but does not speak to its place of writing. Finally, Trumble's argument for Guarnier's authorship, although a thought-provoking essay toward a circumstantial identification, cannot be accepted without additional support. Other solutions must also be examined, such as Brian Trowell's suggestion of the obscure "Guglielmo Inglese," whom Bartolomeo di Fiandra attempted to recruit for the Ferrarese court of Duke Ercole d'Este.  

The first issue addressed in this study is the coherence and organization of the treatise. New evidence for single authorship is presented, followed by explanations of apparent inconsistencies, a comparison of the contents of De preceptis to those of other treatises c. 1450-1500, and a

new theory toward understanding the peculiar organization of the treatise: single-author compilation.

The provenance of the work is then examined by comparison of its contents to those of theoretical works c. 1450-1500, with the intent of establishing connections in regional schools of theoretical writings. The musical examples in the treatise are compared to contemporary music, in particular to the lauda and strambotto. The matter of terminology introduced by Trumble is reassessed, and possible clues from the history of the manuscript itself are examined, all of which lead to a reconsideration of the prevalent theory of provenance introduced by Bukofzer in 1936. A more refined theory of date and provenance is proposed in light of the new data, placing the writing of De preceptis in a rather different milieu than is currently assumed. Finally, the identity of Guilielmus is discussed in a reassessment and refinement of Trumble's original theory, which in the light of recent scholarship--and a long-overlooked reference concerning a lost manuscript--must be given a fresh evaluation.
CHAPTER II

THE ARGUMENT FOR SINGLE AUTHORSHIP

Review of Literature

De preceptis artis musicæ probably is accorded more negative descriptions than any other music theory treatise. Bukofzer's patronizing appraisal begins the tradition of denigrating the treatise and its author: "We have therefore a collection by the music-loving monk Guilielmus, who compiled the various musical issues without systematic ordering. The appearance of a notebook results . . . "¹ Albert Seay dismisses it with the following:

The overall organization is scrappy. There is no systematic approach in the sequence of topics nor is there any effort to eliminate repetitions. In certain cases, there seem to be omissions, made by either Guilielmus or by the scribe. The treatise was never thought through as a whole.²

---


Guilielmus fares little better in *The New Grove Dictionary*, his first appearance in an English-language encyclopedia. Andrew Hughes avers: "His treatise . . . seems to be a compilation, since its organization is unsystematic and repetitious, with examples misplaced or omitted and with inconsistencies between the examples and the text."³

Only a handful of scholars, however, attempt to divide the presumed compilation into its independent parts, or to describe its strategy of organization. Hugo Riemann suggests that the section titled "Tractatus de cantu organico" [f. 36; Seay, 44] is probably unrelated to the rest of the work.⁴ Carl Dahlhaus implies that the proportions chapter was borrowed by the compiler from another source.⁵ Bukofzer, however, offers one of the first theories of the compilation as a whole. He identifies three categories of treatises within the work, according to their subjects: plainchant theory, mensural theory, and counterpoint theory. He concludes, "We see that none of the

---


groups was written coherently. This also is a further argument for a compilation-like layout."\(^6\) This view seems to rest upon a basic assumption that if the treatise were the work of a single author (or even a reasonably orderly plagiarist), the chapters would appear in orderly groups arranged by subject. This attitude is echoed by Seay, who concludes that "A study of De preceptis . . . shows that it is a compilation of many sources, assembled as they were encountered."\(^7\) These presuppositions, however, ought to be reexamined carefully. Their acceptance has fostered a view of De preceptis as an unreliable source of uncertain origin—a conclusion relying on premises that seem to be in conflict with the evidence of the treatise itself.

**Internal Cross-Reference**

In all of these comments, the authors ignore critical internal evidence that confirms the treatise to be the work of a single author, despite its sometimes bewildering organization. For the sake of convenience in discussing the internal organization of the treatise, the chapter headings within the treatise and the contents of each chapter are listed in Figure 1, followed by the folio number in the

---


7. Seay, *loc. cit.*
Figure 1. Chapter Headings in *De preceptis artis musicæ*

1. **Guilielmi monaci . . .** [f. 2; Seay, 15]
   (note values, rests, ligature values, mensuration)

2. **Proportio est multiplex** [f. 5; Seay, 19]
   (mensural proportions)

3. **Ad habendam . . . cognitionem modi**
   *Anglicorum* [f. 19v; Seay, 29]
   (fauxbourdon, gymel, and another method)

4. **Circa cognitionem canti firmi** [f. 20v; Seay, 30]
   (the gamut, deduction, and mutation)

5. **Incipit tractatus circa cognitionem contrapuncti**
   [f. 24v; Seay, 33]
   (consonances, counterpoint, consonance tables)

6. **Incipit regule contrapuncti Anglicorum** [f. 27v; Seay, 38]
   (rules for fauxbourdon, gymel, and variants)

7. **Sequuntur alique regule circa compositione**
   [f. 32; Seay, 41]
   (schemes for three- and four-voice composition)

8. **Incipit tractatus de cantu organico**
   [f. 36; Seay, 44] (mensural signs, *modus longarum*
   and *modus maximarum*)

9. **Regula circa cognitionem syncoparum**
   [f. 42v; Seay, 53] (a single paragraph that may
   belong in chapter six)

10. **Sequitur de tonis** [f. 43; Seay, 54]
    (discussion of the properties of modes)

---


9. Although this section is a commentary on a series of rhymed memory aids, probably common property of the time, the outline of contents in the second paragraph indicates the work of a single author.
manuscript and the corresponding page number in Seay's critical edition of the text.

The first and most obvious indication of single authorship is found on the opening folio of the treatise, in the fourth paragraph:

Note that there are many other signs composed of these [the immediately preceding mensural signs] as well as the former [mensural signs], which we will discuss at length, below, in the treatise on polyphonic song [tractatu de cantu organico] . . .

Bukofzer observes this statement, but makes no mention of its implication.11 It is inescapable that the writer of the first folio is aware of a chapter heading that arrives some thirty folios later; although this fact alone does not prove single authorship of the two sections, it renders impossible Seay's concept of "sources assembled as they were encountered." The statement also implies that the Tractatus de cantu organico was already written when the opening folio was penned. If this is true, it implies compilation of a different order than that proposed by Bukofzer and other scholars; rather, it implies a purposeful organization of possibly interrelated materials.

10. "Nota quod sunt multa alia signa ex his composita tamquam ex principalioribus de quibus inferius in tractatu de cantu organico ad longum determinabimus . . . " [f. 2; Seay, 15]

Terminological and Stylistic Homogeneity

With such a link between the first and eighth chapters established, one might expect to find other connections between the two. In fact, a number of parallel statements occur, as seen in Figure 2. The statements from the first chapter, seen in the left column, are direct quotes or paraphrases of the corresponding quotations from the eighth chapter, seen in the right column.

Figure 2. Parallel Passages in Chapters One and Eight

Nota quod duplex est prolatio, scilicet major et minor. Major dividitur per perfectum et imperfectum; minor similiter per perfectum et imperfectum.

[f. 2; Seay, 15]

Signum majoris perfecti in quo est numerus ternarius in semibrevibus . . .
[f. 2; Seay, 15]

Signum majoris imperfecti in quo est numerus binarius in semibrevibus . . .
[f. 2; Seay, 15]

Nota quod omnia signa reverse facta sunt per medium antecedentis . . .
[f. 2v; Seay, 16]

Nota quod duplex est prolatio, scilicet major et minor. Major dividitur per perfectum et imperfectum; et minor similiter per perfectum et imperfectum.

[f. 2; Seay, 15]

Signum majoris perfecti compositum cum puncto in quo est numerus ternarius in semibrevibus . . .
[f. 36; Seay, 44]

Signum majoris imperfecti in quo est numerus binarius in semibrevibus . . .
[f. 36v; Seay, 45]

Signum reverse factum est semper medium sui antecedentis . . .
[f. 36v; Seay, 46]
3 vero aliquotiens denotat ternalitatem minimarum et aliquotiens signat ternalitatem semibrevium . . .
[f. 3v; Seay, 17]

Et nota quod si in prolatione ternaria, scilicet: due semibreves ponantur absque puncto inter duas breves, secunda illarum alterat . . .
[f. 3v; Seay, 17]

Et in majoris perfecto et imperfecto, si due minime ponantur inter duas semibreves absque puncto, similiter illa secunda minima alterat, ut hic . . .
[ff. 3v-4; Seay, 17]

Et super hoc nota quod 3 aliquotiens dat ternalitatem semibrevium, aliquotiens vero ternalitatem minimarum . . .
[f. 38; Seay, 47-48]

Et nota quod si in ista prolatione due semibreves ponantur inter duas breves absque puncto, secunda illarum alterat . . .
[f. 37; Seay, 46]

. . . et si due minime ponantur inter duas semibreves absque puncto, secunda minima alterat, exemplum primi . . .
[f. 37; Seay 46]

Despite the common nature of much of the terminology, the frequency of identical phrasing makes coincidence improbable. Two alternatives appear: either both chapters are written by the same author, or the author of the first chapter materially borrows from the eighth chapter. In either case, the treatise may no longer be viewed as an accidental patchwork.

The balance tips even further in favor of single authorship, however, when the evidence of certain terms and patterns of speech is considered. The frequency of occurrence of certain terms in De preceptis has been compared to that of thirty-four other fifteenth-century treatises available through Thesaurus musicarum latinarum, a
database of Medieval and Renaissance music theory texts, maintained at Indiana University at Bloomington. The treatises search are listed in Figure 3.¹²

Figure 3. Fifteenth-Century Music Treatises in Thesaurus Musicarum Latinarum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Title</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angles Anonymous 1929</td>
<td>Tractatus de musica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Tractatus de musica figurata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf Anonymous 4</td>
<td>Tractatus de musica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous IV</td>
<td>Compendium artis mensurabilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous V</td>
<td>Ars cantus mensurabilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous VIII</td>
<td>Regulae de contrapuncto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous XI</td>
<td>Tractatus de musica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous XII</td>
<td>Tractatus de musica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonius de Luca</td>
<td>Ars cantus figurati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchinus Gaffurius</td>
<td>Practica musice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hothby</td>
<td>De cantu figurato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regulae supra contrapunctum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes Gallicus</td>
<td>Regulae super proportionem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liber notabilis musicae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolaus de Senis</td>
<td>Ritus canendi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosdocimus</td>
<td>De rito canendi secunda pars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tractatus brevissimus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadze de Flandria</td>
<td>Brevis summula proportionum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes Tinctoris</td>
<td>Contrapunctus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Libellus monocordi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paryus tractatulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tractatus de contrapuncto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tractatus praeclari de musice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tractatus modi, temporis et prolationis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicasius Weyts</td>
<td>Expositio manus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complexum effectuum musices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liber de arte contrapuncti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liber imperfectionum notarum musicalium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tractatus alterationum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tractatus de notis et pausis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tractatus super punctis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tractatus de regulari valore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹². I wish to thank Dr. Thomas Mathieson of Indiana University for his frequent assistance in utilizing the Thesaurus Musicarum Latinarum database.
Four musical terms found in *De preceptis* do not occur in any of the thirty-four fifteenth-century treatises surveyed above: "supranus," "ternalitas," "binalitas," and "riga." "Supranus" occurs twenty-four times in *De preceptis*, and is practically the only term used in the treatise for the upper voice of a composition (the author uses the term "cantus" twice in the same chapter, but side by side with the term "supranus"). Its occurrences are spread throughout the three main chapters on counterpoint, chapters three, six, and seven.

"Ternalitas" and "binalitas," synonyms for "perfection" and "imperfection" in mensural theory, are found twenty-five times in all. Most instances of the terms come in the first and eighth chapters, where--surprisingly--only six occurrences are found in parallel passages. "Ternalitas" is also used once in describing the mensuration for a composition method in chapter six.

"Riga," a synonym for "linea," appears four times in four chapters, chapters four, five, six, and ten. Therefore, terms fairly exclusive to *De preceptis* link chapters three, six, and seven, chapters one, six, and eight, and chapters four, five, six and ten. Each of the terms is found in chapter six, which thus provides a link between each chapter except chapter nine (which has very little text) and the proportions treatise, chapter two.
Although the proportions chapter is problematic (containing over thirty-five words that are not necessary technical terms, yet are foreign to the rest of the treatise), its use of a particular terminology for *modus longarum* links it to the writing of the rest of the treatise. The rather confusing nomenclature "majoris perfectus/imperfectus" and "minoris perfectus/imperfectus" for *modus maximarum* and *modus longarum*, respectively, occurs in only four treatises out of the thirty-four surveyed, two of which were by the same author. This terminology is employed in only one instance by Antonius de Luca, only four times by Gaffurius, and ten times by Tinctoris; although it was in use by other authors, it clearly was not universal. Such designation of mode and time is used twelve times in *De preceptis*, twice in the chapter on proportions. Once again, circumstantial evidence weighs heavily against coincidence.

Other less exclusive terms also tie together various sections of *De preceptis*. The term "cantu organico" appears in only one other treatise, Anonymous XI’s *Tractatus de musica plana et mensurabili*. This expression is explained in the introductory paragraph of chapter eight, *Tractatus de cantu organico*, as "cantus figuratus sive organisus." The same terms are quoted in chapter ten in reverse order: "cantu organico sive figurato." Besides musical terminology, in the various chapters of *De preceptis* figures of speech are employed that are unusual or occur with a
frequency not found in the thirty-four contemporary treatises surveyed above. The phrase "bene dico . . . " ("verily I say . . . ") has not been found in any of the fifteenth-century treatises surveyed, yet occurs thirteen times in De preceptis, in chapters five, eight, and ten. The most telling figure of speech in the treatise, however, is the ubiquitous expression "nota quod . . . " ("note that . . . "). This phrase occurs no fewer than sixty-four times, in even distribution among the sections, with the exception of the problematic second chapter. By comparison, it has been found only sixteen times in seven treatises from the entire control group of thirty-four. These phrases, although generic in content, are used to such an extent that they become mannerisms—a phenomenon that suggests a single author. Figure 4 visually represents the terminological links between the different chapters of De preceptis.

Figure 4. Terminological Relationships between Chapters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chs.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;nota quod&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;riga&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;supranus&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;ternalitas&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;majoris perfectus&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;organico&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In light of the information adduced above, the earlier question of single authorship or simple plagiarism between the first and eighth chapters may be more reasonably addressed. The evidence presented—peculiar terms, repeated statements, and pervasive writing mannerisms—indicates a single author.

**Apparent Contradictions Explained**

The chief examples of supposed contradictions within *De preceptis artis musicæ* are the multiple descriptions of fauxbourdon and gymel. The first practice described as fauxbourdon appears on folio 19v [Seay, 29], in a three-voice composition in which the cantus and contratenor parallel the tenor by means of sights in sixths and thirds above, expanding to octaves and fifths at cadences. The second fauxbourdon formula is found on ff. 27v-29 [Seay, 38ff.]. According to this method, the cantus sings an ornamented, measured version of the cantus firmus, sixths are maintained between soprano and tenor, and the contratenor follows the soprano in fourths below.

---


14. Although Andrew Hughes (*loc. cit.*) dismisses the statement "debet assumi supranum cantum firmum" in the second paragraph as a scribal error, its instruction that the "soprano ought to be taken as the cantus firmus" is demonstrated in the musical example on ff. 28-28v (Seay, 38-39).
Bukofzer provides a word of warning regarding the fauxbourdon instructions in *De preceptis*: "The fauxbourdon problem can not be solved solely on the basis of this single treatise." Indeed, scholarly reception of the treatise would have been more even-handed if this single issue had not dominated all discussion of the work. The first fauxbourdon practice described above was the foremost proof-text of Riemann and other scholars who believed fauxbourdon to carry the cantus firmus in the lowest voice. When this opinion was finally laid to rest and the modern definition (cantus firmus in soprano) was established from the practice in most fifteenth-century musical sources, the aforementioned fauxbourdon description was assailed as an ignorant mistake on the part of an author who was unwittingly describing English discant.

In recent years, however, not even "English discant" is a sufficient explanation. As Sylvia Kenney convincingly demonstrates, "discant" by nature of the word itself refers to a two-voice composition. Although the *De preceptis* technique employs the typically English system of "sights" (imaginary notes which parallel the written voice at fixed


17. Hughes, *op. cit.*, 815.
intervals), Kenney proposes that multiple sights are only optional paths between which a single discanting voice might alternate. The clear statement in De preceptis that three voices are involved immediately removes this practice from the realm of English discant.18 What, then, is the writer actually describing? Trumble offers a reasonable explanation, citing a fauxbourdon with cantus firmus in tenor included in Tinctoris's Liber de arte contrapuncti. Trumble believes that the author called the practice "fauxbourdon" because the determining factor of the practice is the interval structure, not the location of the cantus firmus.19 This opinion, though controversial, is borne out by Craig Wright's discovery of an alternative fauxbourdon practice in the environs of Cambrai in the late fifteenth century, in which the cantus firmus is written below the other voices.20 The further implications of these facts, and the possible relationship between Tinctoris, the author of De preceptis artis musicæ, and the Cambrai cathedral is discussed in the fourth chapter, where they play a key role in establishing the author's identity.


A "Cambrai tradition" of fauxbourdon, in which the cantus firmus is sung by the tenor, would solve the seemingly contradictory use of the term "faulx bourdon" in De preceptis; it is supported, moreover, by an often overlooked subtlety of the treatise's descriptions. In the summary of the second fauxbourdon description (the "true" fauxbourdon, with cantus firmus in soprano), the author states that "this manner, in fact, is the style which is generally called fauxbourdon." The author seems to purposely distinguish this "traditional" practice from the first fauxbourdon practice described ("Cambrai" fauxbourdon, with the cantus firmus in the tenor), which would have been a minority practice.

Another point of heated controversy over the contents of De preceptis artis musice is found in the paragraph immediately following the second description of fauxbourdon, beginning "Modus autem istius faulxbordon aliter posset assumi . . . [f. 28; Seay, 38]." According to this paragraph, an alternate method of fauxbourdon exists "among us" which "does not hold to the rules above," but rather is constructed according to the following formula:

holding the cantus firmus as it stands, and holding to the same consonances stated above, in the soprano just as in the contratenor, it is possible to make syncopations by sixths and

21. "Iste enim modus communiter Faulx bordon appellatur." [f. 29; Seay, 39]
fifths, the penultimate being a sixth, and thus the contratenor ought to be made, as will be shown by an example.22

Jacques Handschin proposes that taking the cantus firmus "sicut stat" ("as it stands") means that the melody is not to be ornamented as it is in the usual fauxbourdon method.23 Besseler believes it means that the cantus firmus is not to be rhythmically altered in diminution.24 Bukofzer objects to both views in a review of Besseler's work, and insists that "sicut stat" means "untransposed," that is, the cantus firmus is at pitch in the lowest voice as in the first fauxbourdon description.25

What has been neglected previously, however, is the central role of syncopation—it appears, in fact, to be the main point of the author's excursus. The ninth chapter, "Regula circa cognitionem syncoparum [f. 42v; Seay, 53ff.],"

22. "Modus autem istius faucx bordon aliter posset assumi apud nos, non tenendo regulas supradictas, sed tenendo proprium cantum firmum sicut stat, et tenendo easdem consonantias superius dictas, tam in soprano quam in contratenore, possendo tamen facere sincopas per sextas et quintas, penultima vero existente sexta, et sic contratenor sic faciendo, ut patebit per exemplum." [f. 28; Seay, 38]


contains an example in which a voice sights a syncopated part beneath a cantus firmus, resulting in a chain of fifths and sixths above. Although little detail is given, this may be the example to which the author refers. Trowell objects to this view, insisting that a contratenor cannot be added to the two voices notated. He overlooks, nonetheless, the fact that the earlier passage specifically associates syncopation with the contratenor--"and thus the contratenor is to be made." The example given in the ninth chapter seems to have no other purpose than to illustrate how the contratenor singer should sight a syncopated part from the written cantus firmus. The supranus and tenor parts may be derived from the same cantus firmus in the usual manner: soprano singing the cantus firmus an octave higher than written, and tenor singing a third above the cantus firmus except at terminal points. As for "holding the cantus firmus as it stands," Besseler's opinion that this refers to rhythmic alteration and diminutions best fits the context. The cantus firmus in the prior description was taken by the supranus and sung in ternary rhythm with melodic alterations. In the manner under discussion the tenor is to be taken unaltered, in long notes, which better suits the syncopation technique as described and as seen in the example in the ninth chapter. A realization of the chapter

26. "... et sic contratenor sic faciendo ... " [f. 28; Seay, 38]
nine example according to the hypothesis stated above is provided in Figure 5.27

Figure 5. Chapter Nine Syncopation Example Realized

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure5}
\caption{Chapter Nine Syncopation Example Realized}
\end{figure}

Thus the mysterious paragraph is seen to refer, not to the immediately following example, but to a later discussion. The same may be said of the immediately following sentence, "In this same fauxbourdon, in fact, there can sometimes be made a contratenor bassus and altus,

27. The voices in Figure 5 are realized from the example [f. 42v; Seay, 53ff.] by the following principles: the supranus is "ruled by the cantus firmus," singing the cantus firmus an octave higher than written [f. 27v; Seay, 38], the contratenor altus sings its part an octave above its "sighted" notes below the cantus firmus, and the tenor, though not indicated in the example, is derived according to the usual formula, paralleling the supranus in sixths below [f. 27v; Seay, 38]. The first note of the cantus firmus is repeated in order that the tenor voice might shift from an octave below the supranus to a sixth below [f. 27v; Seay, 38]. Because the supranus and contratenor, rather than the supranus and tenor, fulfill the tenorizans and cantizans functions in the cadence, the tenor's cadence pattern has been realized according to the rules for contratenor bassus below the tenorizans voice, that is, with a fifth below the tenorizans on the penultimate note and an octave below on the final note [f. 32; Seay, 41].
as will be seen below."\(^{28}\) The contratenor bassus is first explained several paragraphs later. The example that follows these two parenthetical passages is simply a fauxbourdon in the usual definition, as promised at the close of the paragraph before the two controversial passages [ff. 28-28v; Seay, 38-39 Ex. 54].

The "Cambrai tradition" of fauxbourdon with cantus firmus in the tenor, taught by Guilielmus in his first fauxbourdon discussion and in Tinctoris's *Liber de arte contrapuncti*, would seem prone to rekindle the decades-old argument mentioned above, and therefore has been generally ignored by scholars since Besseler. The unnamed staff writer of the "fauxbourdon" entry in the *New Harvard Dictionary of Music*, however, proposes a challenging synthesis of the conflicting definitions:

> Although present knowledge of fauxbourdon necessarily rests in large part on written compositions, the technique was also used in extemporizing harmonizations of plainchant . . . In such improvisation, the preexisting melody is in the tenor, whereas in written fauxbourdon it is in the upper voice.\(^ {29} \)

\(^{28}\) "In isto enim faulx bordon potest aliquotiens fieri contratenor bassus et altus, ut inferius videbitur." [f. 28; Seay, 38]

This statement is called into question by the syncopated fauxbourdon example discussed above, because, contrary to Bukofzer's opinion, the cantus firmus must be transposed up and taken by the soprano to produce a satisfactory result for the following reason: although the contratenor of the syncopated example is derived by what appears to be a "sighting" technique, if the soprano is also "sighted" up from the cantus firmus, a chain of seconds resolving upward to unisons is created between the two voices--an obviously unacceptable combination. Thus, the theory of the author in The New Harvard Dictionary must be modified to describe improvised fauxbourdon with both options of cantus firmus placement.

The passages concerning gymel present no more contradiction than those on fauxbourdon, if one makes of them a composite description. The first description, found on f. 20r [Seay, 30], describes a simple duet in which an improvised voice harmonizes with a melody variously in thirds and unisons, both above and below the melody. In the second description, described on f. 29r [Seay, 39], the author merely expands on the original definition, including shifts to parallel sixths and tenths. An example of such a composition is found on ff. 30r-30v [Seay, 40 Ex. 56]. This practice bears a remarkable resemblance to English discant as defined by Kenney, although she does not discuss the
examples in this treatise.\textsuperscript{30} The author of \textit{De preceptis} further describes how a gymel or fauxbourdon might be expanded by the addition of a contratenor bassus, and in a few examples demonstrates gymels with contratenors. Kenney describes a similar development in English discant, which she connects to the genesis of the "discant-tenor" chanson, a genre based on close duets in imperfect intervals between the upper voices and a free tenor.\textsuperscript{31}

The heart of the controversy surrounding \textit{De preceptis} is the relationship of the techniques described to the larger question of fauxbourdon--not the integrity of the descriptions themselves. Trumble remarks that the treatise is "difficult to understand without outside help."\textsuperscript{32} Too much outside help, however, has only multiplied confusion.

\textbf{Repetitions Explained}

The second argument usually stated as proof of a disorganized compilation calls attention to apparent repetition of material within the treatise, chiefly between the first and eighth chapters. Proponents of this argument operate from the assumption that in a well-organized treatise by a single author no significant repetitions will

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{30} Kenney, \textit{op. cit.}, 26-48.
\item \textsuperscript{31} \textit{Ibid.}, 46ff.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Trumble, \textit{Early Renaissance Harmony}, 157.
\end{itemize}
occur. As is noted above, in the first chapter the author directly quotes or paraphrases a significant amount of material from the eighth chapter, and the author makes direct reference to the title of the eighth chapter; therefore, whatever the author's purpose might be in such an arrangement, these chapters lend no support to a theory of multiple authorship. In addition, it should be noted that the sections quoted from chapter eight comprise less than a quarter of the contents of chapter one. The first chapter includes a number of topics essential to an elementary understanding of mensural notation, such as ligature values, points of division and alteration, and coloration, which are not discussed in the eighth chapter at all. The sections borrowed from chapter eight deal with the most rudimentary aspects of mensuration, even listing the individual elements of mensuration signs. By comparison, the eighth chapter deals strictly with a complicated system of notating the modes of the maxim, long, breve, and semibreve, executing the discussion in a detailed, almost scholastic manner.

Organization Compared to Contemporary Treatises

The final argument for multiple authorship opens the door to a much more complex issue: the proper organization of a fifteenth-century theory treatise. It would seem logical for a treatise to begin with the barest rudiments of plainchant (perhaps the gamut and hexachord system, then the
modes), proceed to the notation issues of mensural music (for example, the note and rest values, the mensuration signs, and perhaps rhythmic proportions), and then conclude with a discussion of counterpoint and instruction in free composition. The organization of De preceptis does not conform to this modern pedagogical paradigm; rather, mensural notation and proportions come first, followed by rudimentary counterpoint, then the gamut (after two dozen folios of musical examples) followed by a lengthy counterpoint treatise, a further discussion of the mensural system, a paragraph on syncopation, and, finally, an exposition of the modes.

Twentieth-century norms of organization must not be the basis for judging the integrity of a fifteenth-century work. Although a full study of the question of pedagogical organization in Renaissance theory treatises is beyond the scope of the present study, four general treatises on music have been selected for comparison of organizational strategies. These roughly contemporary works show De preceptis to be well within the norms of its time.

The first treatise considered is the Tractatus de musica of Coussemaker's Anonymous XI, a late fifteenth-century compendium. Figure 6 outlines the work.

De preceptis and Tractatus de musica differ primarily in that De preceptis has an introductory chapter on the mensural system, and in that the chapter on modes is not grouped with the rest of the plainchant theory. The chapter on proportions is also introduced earlier in De preceptis, but contains very little mensural practice not covered in the first chapter.

The next treatise examined is the late fifteenth-century Tractatus de musica of Coussemaker's Anonymous XII, outlined in Figure 7.  

Figure 7. Outline of Anonymous XII, Tractatus de musica

I. Introduction
II. Mensural Theory
   A. Note Values
   B. Elements of Mensuration Signs
   C. Rests
   D. Imperfection

34. Ibid., III, 475-495.
De preceptis is not the only fifteenth-century treatise with organizational anomalies, judging from the mixture of contrapuntal and mensural theory in the last section of Anonymous XI. More importantly, the second division, a discussion of mensural theory, parallels the first two chapters of De preceptis. Clearly, the early introduction of proportions did not disturb these authors.

Figure 8 outlines the Practica musice of Gaffurius, a compilation of four separate treatises.

Figure 8. Outline of Franchinus Gaffurius, Practica Musice

I. Book One. Plainchant
   A. Definition of Music
   B. Gamut and Hexachords
   C. Ligatures (Pitch notation)
   D. Claves
   E. Mutation
   F. Interval Species
   G. Modes

II. Book Two. Mensural System

35. Franchinus Gaffurius, Practica musicae [sic], trans. by Clement Miller, Musicological Studies and Documents (Rome: American Institute of Musicology, 1968), XX.

Although Gaffurius's work is much more thorough than De preceptis, some insights are gained from a comparison. Like Anonymous XI, Gaffurius begins with the most venerable topic, plainchant, rather than with mensural theory. He also includes modal theory in the book on plainchant, a rule not observed in De preceptis. The fourth book, a massive exposition of proportions, is placed at the end, as seen in Anonymous XI, but without the latter's context. Gaffurius's book on proportions stands alone after a lengthy discussion of counterpoint, rather than in conjunction with other mensural theory. On this point, the placement of the corresponding section in De preceptis is just as logical if not more so.

One other factor of Gaffurius's arrangement supports the extant organization of De preceptis: the placement of syncopation under the heading of mensural theory. Gaffurius's decision to associate syncopation with mensural
theory rather than counterpoint suggests that the ninth chapter of *De preceptis*, also coming at the end of a discussion of the mensural system, has important precedent.

The fourth treatise considered is *De musica* of Adam von Fulda, written c. 1490. It is outlined in Figure 9. Although Adam first discusses plainchant theory, rather than the mensural system, his handling of the former category has some unusual features that are also found in *De preceptis*. After a discussion of the gamut and hexachords, he moves directly into counterpoint, just as is done in *De preceptis*. Further, his main discussion of modes (after an abortive beginning at the end of the plainchant section) comes after the counterpoint topics. Similarly,

---

the chapter on modes in *De preceptis* follows the counterpoint and mensural theory.

From the observations above it becomes apparent that the extant organization of *De preceptis*, however disjointed it may appear to the present-day reader, varies little from that of other treatises of the time—including those produced by single authors.

**A New Theory of Single-Author Compilation**

In light of the previously stated evidence in favor of single authorship and the inconsistencies found in the three major arguments for "disorganized compilation," it is proposed that *De preceptis artis musicæ* in its extant form is the work of a single author—an author named in the first paragraph as "Guilielmus Monachus." Following this hypothesis, a question raised several pages earlier may be better addressed: the relationship of chapter one to chapter eight, and its implications for the composition of the treatise.

As was mentioned above, the fourth paragraph of chapter one directly refers to chapter eight, by title and contents, and promises the reader that the discussion is yet to come. Does this mean that the eighth chapter had been drafted prior to the first? After reviewing the number of quotes and paraphrases from the eighth chapter found in the first, this seems highly probable. This being the case, how many
other chapters might already have been written? The second chapter, on proportions, shows enough distance from the others in vocabulary and style to suggest a different time of writing. Anna Berger comments that except for the use of inverse proportions, this chapter does not vary in the least from the norms of c. 1450. As is the case with the fourth book of Gaffurius's *Practica musice*, this chapter may have been written long before it was incorporated by the author into a general treatise on music.

Another section that may well have been written earlier is the counterpoint section that comprises chapters five, six, and seven. Apfel suggests a similar middle document, but includes chapter three, the first discussion of fauxbourdon and gymel, and chapter four, the exposition of the gamut and deductions. Although this makes a logical progression from the discussion of the gamut to the longer section on counterpoint, such a grouping results in a redundancy: the information on improvised counterpoint that begins Apfel's middle document is essentially repeated only a few folios later. While this alone is not proof of a break in continuity, a more distinct division is offered in the text. Chapter five, beginning the longer discussion of


counterpoint, starts with a majuscule heading that reads: "Here begins a treatise about the understanding of counterpoint, following the style of the French as well as the English, composed with two, three, and four voices." That this opening paragraph refers to a longer section than the immediately following discussion of intervals and rules of counterpoint is proven by its reference to composition in four voices, which is not examined until folio 29r [Seay, 39]. Compare this also to the heading of the previously written eighth chapter: "Here begins a treatise concerning polyphonic song."

Guilielmus's intent in the placement of the first faubbourdon/gymel discussion defies any simple explanation; it is no more logical as the beginning of the main counterpoint section than as the end of the introductory section. It may already have been connected with chapter four when it was copied: chapter three begins with a large and elaborate initial, making it a more impressive division than the beginning of chapter four. The two chapters may have been a small treatise on faubbourdon, gymel, and the music-reading system necessary to reading a cantus firmus.

40. "Incipit tractatus circa cognitionem contrapuncti, tam secundum modum Francigenorum quam Anglicorum, cum duabus et cum tribus vocibus et cum quatuor compositis." [f. 24v; Seay, 33]

41. "Incipit tractatus de cantu organico." [f. 36; Seay, 44]
The circumstances surrounding the single paragraph that comprises chapter nine make it appear likely that it was originally part of the main counterpoint treatise, which perhaps refers to the ninth chapter materially. Guilielmus may well have purposely moved it to its present position at the time of compilation, in keeping with the tradition (evidenced by Gaffurius) of treating syncopation as a notation, rather than composition, topic.

The remaining chapters, the first and last, may have been added at the time of compilation. When Guilielmus decided to compile his several short treatises into a general book on music, he apparently wrote the first chapter as an introduction to the essentials of musical notation necessary for understanding the following chapters. Not wishing to burden the novice with the cumbersome system expounded in chapter eight, he promises that the subject will be covered more thoroughly later in the treatise.

The tenth chapter, on the modes, may also have been written at the time of compilation. The unintroduced reference to "deductione secunda quadrata" [f. 44v; Seay, 56] seems to assume the reader's familiarity with the table of deductions in chapter four. The chapter differs from its predecessors significantly in its construction as a commentary on the opinions of others, and in having an introductory paragraph that outlines its contents. Its placement at the end of the treatise, far separated from
the chapters on the gamut and hexachords and on composition, is conceivable--remembering Adam von Fulda's late introduction of the subject--but nonetheless unusual. These facts lead one to believe that the chapter was written last, although, considering its thoroughness and neat organization, it must not be regarded as an afterthought.

Figure 10 shows the proposed preexistent documents within De preceptis and their final ordering in the compilation.

The time-honored opinion of De preceptis artis musicæ as a "compilation of many sources, assembled as they were encountered,"42 has proven to be founded more upon surface impressions than an even-handed consideration of the evidence. Compelling internal evidence--the first chapter's cross-reference to the eighth, the use of the unusual terms "riga" and "cantu organico," and the prevalence of the mannerism "nota quod--" suggest a single author for the entire contents. Further, the three arguments that have held up the traditional view have been shown to be untenable. The fauxbourdon instructions are complicated, but not contradictory; the repetition of material in the first and eighth chapters can be viewed as a deliberate decision of the author, and the overall organization, although puzzling, is well within contemporary--if not modern--norms.

42. Seay, op. cit., 7.
Figure 10. Proposed Process of Compilation of *De preceptis*

Previously Written Treatises

Proportio est multiplex
[ff. 5-19; Seay, 19-29]

Ad habendam . . . cognitionem modi anglicorum/
Circa cognitionem canti firmi
[ff. 19v-24; Seay, 29-33]

Tractatus circa cognitionem contrapuncti/
Regula circa cognitionem syncoparum
[ff. 24v-35v, 42v; Seay, 33-44, 53-54]

Tractatus de cantu organico
[ff. 36-42; Seay, 44-53]

*De preceptis artis musicae* in Received Form

Ch. 1: *Guilielmi monaci . . .* (written as introduction to treatise, quotes Ch. 8)
[ff. 2-4v; Seay, 15-19]

Ch. 2: Proportio est multiplex
[ff. 5-19; Seay, 19-29]

Ch. 3: Ad habendam . . . cognitionem modi anglicorum [ff. 19v-20; Seay, 29-30]

Ch. 4: Circa cognitionem canti firmi
ff. 20v-24; Seay, 30-33

Chs. 5-7: Tractatus circa cognitionem contrapuncti [ff. 24v-35v; Seay, 33-44]

Ch. 8: Tractatus de cantu organico
[ff. 36-42; Seay, 44-53]

Ch. 9: Regula circa cognitionem syncoparum [ff. 42v; Seay, 53-54]

Ch. 10: Sequitur de modis (refers to deductions of chapter four; probably written last)
[ff. 43-48v; Seay, 54-59]

The result of these reevaluations is a strikingly different view of the author and his work. Rather than
Bukofzer's "music-loving [and apparently simple-minded] monk" compiling a "notebook," Guilielmus appears to be a knowledgeable theorist who compiled separate, previously written treatises of his own authorship into a "compendiosus libellus" [f. 2; Seay, 15] on the art of music.

43. Manfred Bukofzer, Geschichte des englischen Diskants und des Fauxbourdons nach dem theoretischen Quellen (Strassburg: Heitz, 1936), 59.
CHAPTER III

THE ARGUMENT FOR A NEW DATING AND PROVENANCE

Review of Literature

As Hughes remarks in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, even the simplest facts such as date and place of writing prove evasive in the case of *De preceptis artis musicae*.¹ In the following chapter the various datings of the work by modern scholarship are recounted and then compared with new evidence from comparative studies of the contents of other theory treatises, parallels in contemporary music manuscripts, and peculiarities of terminology, all of which tend to support a new dating. The controversy over the place of origin of the work is then reviewed and a more satisfactory theory proposed.

Guilielmus’s treatise first came to the attention of modern scholars through Edmond de Coussemaker’s *Scriptorum de musica medii avii*, published between 1869 and 1876. Writing over a half a century before Bukofzer’s *Geschichte des englischen Diskants*, he had little upon which to base a date and assigns the treatise to the late fourteenth century

---

or early fifteenth, in keeping with current ideas about the
beginning of white-note notation.² Robert Eitner echoes
this opinion in his Quellen-Lexikon of 1898-1904.³ Writing
in 1914, Arnold Schering advances the date to c. 1440, in
keeping with the inroads in the study of notation made by
Wolf in his ground-breaking Geschichte der Mensuralnotation
of 1904.⁴ H.E. Woolridge, in the Oxford History of Music in
1929, assigns Guilielmus an unusual longevity. He first
associates him with Leonel Power, c. 1400,⁵ but later calls
him a contemporary of John Hothby (d. 1487).⁶ Writing in
the 1930's, Alfred Orel⁷ and Otto Ursprung⁸ date the
treatise c. 1450, contemporary with Dufay's mature years.

2. Edmond de Coussemaker, Scriptorum de musica medii aevi
nova seriem, 4 vols. (Paris: A. Durand & Pedone-Lauiel,
1869-1876), III, xxix-xxx.

3. Eitner, Biographisch-Bibliographisches Quellen-Lexikon
der Musiker und Musikgelehrten, 10 vols. (Leipzig:
Breitkopf & Härtel, 1898-1904; reprint New York: Musurgia,
1949) IV, 416.

4. Arnold Schering, Studien zur Musikgeschichte der
Frührenaissance (Leipzig: C.F. Kant Nachfolgen, 1914), 11.

5. H.E. Woolridge, The Polyphonic Period, 2 pts., vol. I of

6. Ibid., 318 n.1.

7. Alfred Orel, "Die mehrstimmige geistliche (Katholische)
Musik von 1430-1600," Handbuch der Musikgeschichte, 2 vols.,

8. Otto Ursprung, Die katholische Kirchenmusik, vol. X of
Handbuch der Musikwissenschaft, ed. Ernst Büeken, 13 vols.
(Potsdam: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaiion, 1927-
1934), 142.
With Bukofzer's *Geschichte des englischen Diskants* in 1936 comes the first approach to dating based on the entire contents of the treatise, rather than the fauxbourdon doctrines alone. Bukofzer reasons from the simple to the complex: because Guilielmus discusses the use of the contratenor bassus in four-part writing (associated with the second half of the fifteenth century) and describes a means of four-part accompaniment of chant which resembles falsobordone (a late fifteenth-century/early sixteenth-century invention), Guilielmus must have written in the second half of the fifteenth century. With this probability in mind, Bukofzer then explains the supposed difficulties of Guilielmus's fauxbourdon terminology as proof of a significant temporal separation from Dufay's generation, pushing the date of writing even further from the half-century mark. A convenient slot is found in the decade of the 1480's--between the writings of Tinctoris and Gaffurius, two other theorists who briefly discuss fauxbourdon. This dating has gone unchallenged (if sometimes ignored) for over a half century.

Although Bukofzer's reasoning is convincing regarding the earliest likely date of writing, he does not seem to

---


have considered the possibility of an even later date. Contrary to the dispute outlined above, more recent scholarship places Guilielmus not at the end, but at the beginning, of a theoretical tradition. Apfel places Guilielmus squarely within a school of "Italian counterpoint and composition teachers" beginning with Tinctoris and ending in the middle of the sixteenth century with Zarlino. A comparison of individual teachings in De preceptis with treatises of this school reveals, in fact, that Guilielmus may well belong rather later in Apfel's list. The following items have been compared with a broad range of treatises dating from 1450 to 1550: the "hand of counterpoint," the contrapuntal rules, composition theory, and mensural theory.

Comparison of Teachings to Theorists 1450-1550

Apfel found counterpoint tables (called "counterpoint hands" by Guilielmus [ff. 26v-27; Seay, 36-37]), in slightly different forms, in a number of early fifteenth-century treatises. Among late fifteenth-century treatises, however, another cluster of writings includes this device: the anonymous and undated Conscioscia cossa che el contrapuncto (Florence, Bibl. Medicea-Laurenzia, Conv. soppr. 388), the anonymous Ad evidentiam igitur manus contrapuncti

(Parma, Bibl. Palatina 1158, c. 1474), Bartolomeo Ramos de Pareja, *Musica practica* (Bologna, 1482), and Gaffurius, *Practica musice* (Milan, 1496). To Apfel's list must be added Domingo Duran's *Sumula del cantu de organico, contrapuncto y composicion* (Salamanca, c. 1507) and Giovanni Lanfranco's *Scintille di musica* (Brescia, 1533). Thus, the theoretical tradition of the counterpoint table is well represented from 1474-1533.

Lists of counterpoint rules are a common feature among the theorists in the tradition of Tinctoris; they do not, however, entirely coincide in their contents. Beyond the first two rules, in fact, diversity is more the rule than the exception. The treatises listed in Figure 11 contain rules of counterpoint that coincide with those of Guilielmus in at least four of ten precepts [ff. 25-26; Seay, 34-35]. A range of general correspondence is thus established from 1475 to 1545. This field, however, may be further narrowed.

Figure 11. Treatises with at Least Four Counterpoint Rules Coinciding with Those of *De preceptis*

Tinctoris, *Liber de arte contrapuncti* (Naples, 1475)
Gaffurius, *Practica musice* (Milan, 1496)
Florentius de Faxolis, *Liber musices* (Ferrara, 1494)
Domingo Duran, *Sumula* (Salamanca, c. 1507)
Johannes Cochlaeus, *Tetrachordum musices* (Nuremberg, 1511)
Giovanni Lanfranco, *Scintille di musica* (Brescia, 1533)

Stephano Vanneo, *Recanetum de musica aurea* (Rome, 1533)
Giovanni del Lago, *Breve introduzione* (Venice, 1540)
Fra Mauro, *Utriusque musices epitome* (Florence, 1541)
Pietro Aaron, *Compendiolo* (Milan, 1545)

Although most of the rule-lists in the treatises above begin with the same two rules (begin and end in perfect consonances, no parallel perfect consonances), only a few contain the same sequence as *De preceptis* in the first three rules (the third rule in Guilielmus’s list being a concession to successive dissimilar perfect consonances). Other treatises may list the same three rules in different orders, but the treatises in Figure 12 present them in identical sequence.

Figure 12. Treatises Containing Lists of Counterpoint Rules Identical to That of *De preceptis* in the First Three Rules

Giovanni Lanfranco, *Scintille di musica* (Brescia, 1533)
Stephano Vanneo, *Recanetum de musica aurea* (Rome, 1533)
Fra Mauro, *Utriusque musices epitome* (Florence, 1541)
Pietro Aaron, *Compendiolo* (Milan, 1545)

The findings above suggest a dating between 1475 and 1545, tending toward the period from 1512 to 1545.

A distinct feature of *De preceptis artis musice* is the attention given to composition theory; Apfel has in fact called Guilielmus’s teaching unique in its extensiveness.13 Certain elements, however, may be compared to other

treatises. Contratenor theory, cited by Bukofzer as support for a late fifteenth-century dating of *De preceptis*, is found in five other treatises listed by Apfel (Figure 13).

Figure 13. Other Treatises Containing Contratenor Theory

- Tinctoris, *Liber de arte contrapuncti* (Naples, 1475)
- Nicolaus Burtius, *Musices opusculum* (Bologna, 1487)
- Adam von Fulda, *De musica* (Vormbach, 1490)
- Gaffurius, *Practica musice* (Milan, 1496)
- Florentius de Faxolins, *Liber musices* (Ferrara, 1494-6)

Other composition methods in *De preceptis* are associated more exclusively with the sixteenth century. A practice mentioned in the third chapter calling for "voces non mutatis" [f. 20; Seay, 30] is related by Bukofzer to the sixteenth-century rubric "voces aequales," calling for voices to sing in the same range. Duran parallels Guilielmus's term in his instructions in the *Sumula* (Salamanca, c. 1507) for composing with boys' voices and "changed voices" together. The four-voice chant accompaniment is identical to early falsobordone, a practice that originated in the last decade of the fifteenth century. Some concern may arise over the presence of fauxbourdon theory and three-voice counterpoint in a possibly sixteenth-

14. Ibid., 119-121.


century treatise. Fauxbourdon, however, continued to be a theoretical issue long after its heyday in actual practice; Trumble’s survey of fauxbourdon theory includes Ottomar Luscinius’s Musurgia (Strassburg, 1536) and Zarlino’s Le istitutioni harmoniche (Venice, 1558). Further, Guilielmus’s division of attention between three- and four-voice composition does not necessarily place him in the fifteenth century; Florentius de Faxolis did the same in the late 1490’s. The composition theory found in De preceptis therefore allows a dating between 1475 and 1507, favoring the later end of the range.

Another issue of late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century theory is the discussion of the tactus, which Guilielmus treats in his second chapter under the nomenclature of "ictus" [ff. 7-13; Seay, 21-25]. J. Annie Banks credits Guilielmus with the first discussion of tactus in a theory treatise. Banks, however, accepts an obsolete "c. 1460" dating of De preceptis. The earliest treatise of verifiable date that discusses the tactus is Adam von Fulda’s De Musica (Vornbach, 1490), followed by Gaffurius

19. J. Annie Banks, Tactus, Tempo, and Notation in Mensural Music from the 13th to the 17th Century (Amsterdam: pub. by author, 1972), 163.
20. Ibid.
in *Practica musice* (Milan, 1496). Once again, the last decade of the fifteenth century is the earliest possible date of writing suggested by the evidence.

Thus far a comparison of the contents of *De preceptis* to other fifteenth- and sixteenth-century treatises has tended to open the door to a much later date of composition than previously expected. One witness from the contents, however, places a limit on the terminal point of the dating range. The notation that Guilielmus expounds in his eighth chapter, at times employing the circle for the modus maximarum, the point for the modus longarum, and two following numbers to indicate time and prolation, was a cumbersome and confusing system that Tinctoris and his followers replaced with a simpler combination of rests. Although the older practice naturally continued for some time among more conservative theorists and those geographically farther from the Tinctorian sphere of influence, it appears to have rapidly declined in Italian circles. The only Italian treatise to recommend the full system in the old notation after Tinctoris was in fact Hothby’s *De cantu figurato* (Lucca, c. 1480). Following this writing, mention of the practice is always somewhat qualified; Glarean stated his preference for it in his *Dodecachordon* (Basel, 1547), proving that the system was still in at least limited use at mid-century, but acknowledged that it was out of fashion. Both Spataro’s
Tractato di musica (Venice, 1531) and Lanfranco's Scintille de musica (Brescia, 1533) call this notation a practice of "il antiqui" (though Spataro may have had ulterior motives for the statement, because the practice was favored by his arch-rival Hothby). This particular aspect of Guilielmus's treatise therefore tends to indicate an earlier date than the evidence above, perhaps in the 1490's or in the first decade of the following century.

The comparison of individual theoretical elements within De preceptis artis musice to treatises written between 1450 and 1550 calls for a later date than hitherto assigned to Guilielmus's work. The counterpoint table dates the work between 1474 and 1533. The contrapuntal theory dates it between 1475 and 1507, favoring the latter decade of that range. The presence of tactus theory indicates a date around 1490. The use of the pre-Tinctoris notation of modus longarum and modus maximarum suggests a date very near the turn of the century. The cumulative effect of this evidence, therefore, is a dating ranging roughly from 1490 to 1510--placing Guilielmus's writing as much as thirty years later than that of Tinctoris, with which it is usually associated.

Evidence from Specific Terminology

Two sixteenth-century terms used in De preceptis artis musice are further evidence for a later dating: "supranus"
and "solfizare." According to Kurt Gudewill, "soprano" was used in the isolated instance of Antonius de Leno's *Regule de contrapuncto* (c. 1430), then picked up again by the Italian vernacular writers of the sixteenth century beginning with Pietro Aaron's *Toschanello in musica* (Milan, 1523), after which it became increasingly common.\(^2\)

Guilielmus's use of the direct Latin cognate "supranus" [f. 19v; Seay, 29] seems to be a trademark of a sixteenth-century writer. "Solfizare" [f. 22; Seay, 32] is an invention of the same era, a curious cross between the Italian words "solmisatio" and the onomatopoeic "solfeggio."\(^2\) *De preceptis artis musice* is therefore seen to be an early-sixteenth century treatise by its terminology as well as contents.

**Relationship of Musical Examples to Sacred and Secular Italian Music, 1450-1550**

The musical examples found in *De preceptis* prove very little with regard to the date of writing, despite the claims of some scholars. Many, for example, have compared the musical examples of the proportions chapter with the


fifteenth-century polyphonic lauda, but without citing specific lauda examples.\textsuperscript{23} It is evident that these contrapuntal exercises resemble some laudi (for example, the c. 1430 collection published in modern edition by Giulio Cattin\textsuperscript{24}) in phrasing, use of contrasting hemiola rhythms, and use of elaborate coloration in upper voice. Lauda repertories, however, were extremely long-lived, as evidenced by the inclusion of c. 1450 works in a 1563 collection published by Serafino Razzi in Venice.\textsuperscript{25} Guilielmus’s examples, therefore, are part of a style that was viable far into the sixteenth century. It is interesting to note as well the revival of the lauda in Florence c. 1480 to 1520 under the influence of Savanarola; clearly, a general connection with the lauda may be as easily reconciled with a turn-of-the-century dating as with an earlier.

Trumble makes much of Guilielmus’s musical examples in his 1956 dissertation, which contains the first attempt to link De preceptis with a known historical figure. Trumble does not, however, seem to question the provenance proposed

\textsuperscript{23} Hughes, op. cit.

\textsuperscript{24} Giulio Cattin, Laudi quattrocentesche (Bologna: Biblioteca di quadrivium, 1958).

by Bukofzer—though in fact some of his own evidence regarding the musical examples leans toward a later dating.

Trumble cites the use of Guilielmus’s bassus formula (thirds and fifths beneath the tenor [f. 27v; Seay, 38]) in the liturgical manuscripts Modena, Biblioteca estense, α.M.1.11-12 (lat. 454-5 olim V.H.11 & 9); Rome, Biblioteca vaticana, Cappella sistina Ms. 15; and Milan, Biblioteca trivulziana (Archivio storico civico), Ms. no. 55 (I 107), which he describes as “roughly contemporary with Guilielmus.” 26 The currently accepted dates of these manuscripts as catalogued in the RISM project are c. 1470-1490, 27 c. 1503-1513, 28 and c. 1500 29 respectively—well in keeping with the tentative new dating of c. 1490-1510.

Trumble also emphasizes the similarity between some of Guilielmus’s composition strategies and certain strambotti of Serafino from the 1480’s. 30 These three- and four-voiced works fit within Guilielmus’s formulas in that the upper voices are formed of alternating parallel imperfect consonances, and that the bassus is made by alternating

28. Ibid., 358.
29. Ibid., 253.
30. Trumble, op. cit., 159ff.
fifths and sixths beneath the upper voices. The four-voiced works, however, do not follow Guilielmus's rule for formation of the contratenor altus, and thus do not exactly correspond to the formula given in De preceptis.

Though Serafino's compositions do bear a close enough resemblance to give credence to Trumble's argument regarding the authorship of the work--to be discussed in chapter four--one must not assume that the improvisatory tradition in De preceptis is linked only to Neapolitan circles of the 1480's. Figure 14 compares the openings of Guilielmus's Ex. 59, Serafino's "Ahy lasso quante fiere," and Sebastiano Festa's "Amor se vuoi ch'i torni," No. 24 from Florence, Biblioteca nazionale centrale, Mss. Magl. XIX, 164-167 (Florence, c. 1520). Although Trumble's assertion of direct connection between Guilielmus and Serafino may be true, the former's rule for writing a bassus is seen to be a common trick of the frottola genre as late as the 1520's. Also, an anonymous strambotto from the 1490's has been discovered that executes the four-voice Gymel rules of De preceptis to the very letter, suggesting a closer relationship to Guilielmus's descriptions than is found in

31. Seay, op. cit., 41.
32. Trumble, op. cit., 161.
any work of Serafino. Modena, Biblioteca estense, Ms. a.F.9.9, a 1496 anthology of strambotti, contains a work titled "Sel lume al focho" (ff. 9v-10r) that follows precisely the rules given by Guilielmus for the contratenors.

Figure 14. Comparison of Guilielmus’s Theory of Four-Voice Composition to Works of Serfaino dall’Aquila and Sebastiano Festa

De preceptis artis musicae, Guilielmus Monachus f. XX [Seay, 41, Ex. 59]

"Ahy lasso quante fiere" Serafino dall’Aquila, c. 1475

"Amor se vuoi ch' i torno"  
Sebastiano Festa, c. 1520

Figure 15.Anonymous, "Sel lume al focho," c. 1496

The musical examples in De preceptis artis musice support a later dating than that given by Bukofzer. The similarities to the polyphonic lauda are inconclusive, because early fifteenth-century styles of the genre continued in use down into the sixteenth-century. 

The parallels to the music of certain Italian liturgical
manuscripts, pointed out by Trumble, actually support a date near the turn of the century. Trumble's suggestion that Guilielmus's practice is contemporary with that found in 1480's works by Serafino, although useful, must be extended to several later decades in light of equally viable parallels to works of the early sixteenth century. Finally, the exact correspondence of Guilielmus's contratenor altus and bassus rules to the practice found in a four-voice strambotto in the 1496 Modena manuscript leads to a date within the previously proposed 1490-1510 range. One further unusual fact offers a useful explanation of Guilielmus's oddly generic composition theory, uniting the lauda and strambotto, the sacred and secular elements: during the aforementioned renewal of popularity of the lauda in Florence, from c. 1480 to 1520, lauda texts occasionally appeared without music under the rubric "sung according to the strambotti."^35

History of the Source Manuscript

Before this new date may be accepted, however, one frequently neglected area of the study of De preceptis must be addressed: the history of the manuscript itself, the only known source of the work. As noted in the introduction, this manuscript is a copy of an unknown

35. Prizer, op. cit., 540.
earlier source, on late fifteenth-century paper. According to Seay, it was once in the library of Cardinal Gasparo Contarini.\textsuperscript{36} This fact creates a problem for accepting a later dating, for it implies that a treatise written as late as c. 1510 was copied on late fifteenth-century paper, which copy made its way into the library of the cardinal before his death in 1542. That the extant manuscript is a copy is not to be denied; as is often pointed out, the scribe copied one side of a folio twice, as seen on ff. 15r and 16r.

The age of the paper, date of copying, and identity of the original owner are nonetheless matters of dispute.

\textit{De preceptis} is found in the first half of the codex Venice, Biblioteca nazionale marciana, lat. 336 (coll. 1581), the second half of which contains the \textit{Regule de contrapuncto} of Antonius de Leno. In the most thorough study of the codex to date, Don Harran asserts that the copies of the two treatises were bound together in the "late fifteenth century or early sixteenth century."\textsuperscript{37} He also states that ". . . it seems probable that they were copied at nearly the same time by their future owner, a member . . . of the Contarini family [one of the leading

\textsuperscript{36} Seay, op. cit., 7.

\textsuperscript{37} Don Harran, "Intorno a un codice veneziano quattrocento," \textit{Studi musicali} VIII (1979), 44.
families of Venice]." Although Harran's article is more concerned with establishing the integrity of the treatise of Antonius, the sum of his statements and inferences regarding that of Guilielmus suggests that it was copied in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth centuries, perhaps at the direction of the person who caused the two treatises to be bound together, most likely a Contarini. No evidence has been put forward, in fact, by any author, for a fifteenth-century date of copying; no watermark studies have been undertaken, nor has the scribe been linked to a fifteenth-century source. Incidentally, Harran finds no historical support for Seay's assertion that the codex belonged to Gasparo Contarini. The codex may be traced no earlier than the library of Giacomo (Jacopo) Contarini, in whose library it was first listed at his death in 1595.39

The evidence or lack thereof regarding the copying and final destination of the manuscript that is the sole source of De preceptis artis musice presents no difficulties to accepting a 1490-1510 dating. Because the treatise is probably compiled from the author's earlier writings, it is conceivable that the extant manuscript is the original copy of the treatise in its final form.

38. Ibid., 49. "... pare probabile che fossero copiati press'a poco allo stesso tempo per il loro futuro proprietario, un membro, come si vedrà più avanti, della famiglia Contarini."

39. Ibid., 53.
A New Date

It must be remembered that prior to Bukofzer's dating of c. 1480-1490, Guilielmus's treatise was considered to be several decades older, and that Bukofzer's chief goal was to remove *De preceptis* from the company of mid-century fauxbourdon treatises by establishing a *terminus post quem*. Bukofzer's dating is rejected here, not because his conclusions were false, as far as they went—for the treatise was certainly not written before his proposed earlier limit of 1480—but rather because he does not appear to consider the possibility of a later dating. We have seen in the preceding, however, that *De preceptis artis musicæ* is more likely a product of the years 1490 to 1510.

A comparison of such doctrines as counterpoint tables, the rules of counterpoint, contratenor and falsobordone theory, tactus and modus longarum and maximarum leads to the conclusion that the theoretical background of all may be found in those years. The term "supranus" is found in only one treatise before the second quarter of the sixteenth century, and "solfizatio" is first found in an early sixteenth-century treatise. The musical examples in the treatise also support a turn-of-the-century dating. Finally, the history of the larger manuscript in which the treatise is found is entirely compatible with this later dating. On these grounds, therefore, it is proposed that
Guilielmus's treatise be redated to c. 1490-1510--nearly one hundred years later than the date proposed by Coussemaker over a century ago.

The Evidence Regarding Provenance

In stark contrast to the wide range of dates assigned to De preceptis by modern scholarship, its point of origin is relatively undisputed. Although controversy has surrounded Guilielmus's nationality, Coussemaker's opinion that the treatise was written in Italy\textsuperscript{40} is still accepted by Hughes in The New Grove Dictionary,\textsuperscript{41} on the grounds that the treatise addresses concerns similar to Italian theory of the time, shows some relationship to native Italian music in its examples, and is found in a manuscript written in an Italian humanistic hand and collected by an Italian library. After gathering the foregoing data concerning the date of the manuscript, however, it is opportune to consider the geographical, political, and professional connections of the persons and places that may be associated with De preceptis. Although such an approach relies entirely on circumstantial evidence, with little means to negate other possibilities, it is the only method available at present. If a majority of the supposed contacts may be shown to have a unified

\textsuperscript{40} Coussemaker, \textit{op. cit.}, III, xxix-xxx.

\textsuperscript{41} Hughes, \textit{op. cit.}
geographical center, we may at least construct a more specific answer to the problem of geographical locus than "Northern Italy."

From the comparative studies above, certain similarities to the teaching of other theorists can be determined. The theorists who utilize the "counterpoint hand" are the anonymous author of Conscioscia cosa che el contrapuncto (Florence, Bibl. Medicea-Laurenzia, Conv. soppr. 388), the anonymous author of Ad evidentiam igitur manus contrapuncti (Parma, Bibl. Palatina 1158, c. 1474), Ramos, Gaffurius, Duran, and Lanfranco. The theorists whose rules of counterpoint have the greatest similarity to those of Guilielmus are Nicolas Wollick, Lanfranco, Stephano Vanneo, Fra Mauro, and Aaron. Those who wrote similar contratenor theory are Tinctoris, Burtius, Adam von Fulda, Gaffurius, and Florentius. Hothby must also be mentioned as one of the last champions of the modus maximarum notation taught by Guilielmus. Figure 16 lists the Italian and Italian-employed theorists from the list above under the geographical centers in which they worked or had other influence. It is noteworthy that Lucca and Florence are less than fifty miles apart, and that Florence, Parma, and Milan were connected through Bologna by centuries-old trade routes.42

Figure 16. Italian Musical Centers and Associated Theorists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Theorists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Milan  | Franchinus Gaffurius, 1483-1522<sup>43</sup>  
           | Florentius de Faxolis, c. 1480-1496<sup>44</sup> |
| Parma  | Anon. of *Ad evidentiam igitur manus*, c.1475  
           | Nicolaus Burtius, 1503-1518<sup>45</sup> |
| Bologna| John Hothby, 1480's  
           | Bartolomeo Ramos de Pareja, 1480's  
           | Nicolaus Burtius, 1480's<sup>46</sup> |
| Lucca  | John Hothby, 1467-1486<sup>47</sup> |
| Florence| Anon. of *Consciencia cossa che el contrapuncto*  
           | Fra Mauro, c. 1510-1556<sup>48</sup> |
| Rome   | Bartolomeo Ramos de Pareja, 1484-1491<sup>49</sup>  
           | Johannes Tinctoris, 1490's<sup>50</sup> |
| Naples | Johannes Tinctoris, c. 1470-1490  
           | Franchinus Gaffurius, c. 1478-1483<sup>51</sup> |

---


44. Clement Miller, "Florentius de Faxolis," NGD, VI, 654.


46. Clement Miller, *loc. cit.*


Rome, of course, was the hub of liturgical music and haven to many theorists and performers, and thus is to be expected in such a list. Naples was also a major musical center in the 1470's and 1480's, although it seems to have declined rapidly during the political unrest of the early 1490's.52

The possible connections of musical examples in De preceptis to contemporary collections may also be used to define a probable place of writing. The popularity of the lauda in Florence c. 1480-1520 has already been noted. Four specific manuscripts have also been mentioned in connection with the musical practice of Guilielmus: Modena, Biblioteca estense, Ms. α.F.9.9 and α.M.1.11-12 (lat. 454-5 olim V.H.11 & 9), Rome, Biblioteca vaticana, Cappella sistina Ms. 15, and Milan, Biblioteca trivulziana (Archivio storico civico), Ms. no. 55 (I 107). The first was penned c. 1470-1490, probably in Ferrara,53 and the second in 1496, probably in Padua;54 it is unknown when they reached Modena, but the Ferrarese manuscript could easily have been transported there in the fifteenth or sixteenth century as Modena was also under the rule of the d'Este family.55 The

54. Ibid., 271.
55. Matthew, op. cit., 212.
latter two manuscripts are believed to have been copied in the cities wherein they still reside, in c. 1503-1512\textsuperscript{56} and c. 1500 respectively.\textsuperscript{57} Because Modena is less than thirty miles from Parma,\textsuperscript{58} the musical examples support the Milan-Parma-Bologna-Florence-Rome-Naples circuit, with possible new ties to Padua and Ferrara. A Paduan link is supported also by the fact that \textit{De preceptis} ended up in nearby Venice, long the hegemon of the region.

\textbf{A New Provenance}

The evidence thus far presented shows \textit{De preceptis} to be a treatise tenuously but consistently connected with the theory and practice of late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century Naples, Rome, Florence, Lucca, Bologna, Modena, Parma, and Milan, with possible links to Padua and Ferrara, and coming to rest in Venice in the early or middle sixteenth century. The weight of evidence points to a place of origin in the environs of Milan (near Gaffurius at the right time), Parma (near the point of origin of the related musical sources), or Bologna (a crossroads satisfying several of the connections mentioned above).

\textsuperscript{56} Nanie Bridgman, \textit{op. cit.}, 358.

\textsuperscript{57} \textit{Ibid.}, 253.

\textsuperscript{58} Matthew, \textit{loc. cit.}
The new dating (c. 1490-1510) of *De preceptis artis musice* seeks not to overthrow, but rather to complement, the *terminus post quem* proposed by Bukofzer, by investigating whether the treatise might be dated even later than he proposes. In the same manner, the foregoing essay on the point of origin of the treatise is intended to provide a starting point for a more refined statement than "North Italian." The identification of a theorist named Guilielmus in Milan, Parma, or Bologna between 1490 and 1510 would contribute significantly to the coherence of the entire theory of provenance here proposed; this in fact is the task of the following chapter.
CHAPTER IV

THE ARGUMENT FOR THE AUTHOR'S IDENTIFICATION

Review of Proposed Solutions

In 1956 Trumble raised the justified complaint that Guilielmus's treatise would be better understood without the anonymity with which it is shrouded. In the preceding chapters the haze has been gradually lifted with the proposal of compilation from the works of a single author and a new dating in the environs of central Northern Italy c. 1490-1510. Clarification remains incomplete, however, so long as the author remains a generic "William the Monk," whose identification so far has been attempted only by Trowell and Trumble. The following chapter considers the direct testimony of the treatise regarding the author, and assesses the implications of the contents for the author's associations with other theorists and musical centers. With this information, the hypotheses of Trowell and Trumble are supplemented with new information that leads to a surprising conclusion regarding the identity of "Guilielmus Monachus."

To begin at the beginning, Guilielmus identifies himself as "William the monk, a most illustrious cantor and erudite man" [f. 2; Seay, 15]. He claims to have a "true
and complete understanding of the style of the English" [f. 19v; Seay, 29], particularly fauxbourdon and gymel (though he may obviously be mistaken about their origin). He knows something of composing for "unchanged voices," apparently boys's voices [f. 20; Seay, 30]. Because he titles the chapter on the gamut "Circa cognitionem cantus firmi" [f. 20v; Seay, 30], one may assume that he wrote the treatise with sacred music foremost in mind. In addition to "English" styles, Guilielmus was also familiar with the more traditional "French" counterpoint [f. 24v; Seay, 33].

As for the oft-quoted statement in which Guilielmus describes a fauxbourdon variant "apud nos" [f. 28; Seay, 38], that is, "among us," although it seems highly likely that he is referring to "us in Italy," this can hardly be taken as proof of Italian nationality. Trumble has cited the use of the term "riga" for a line of the staff as a habit of Northern European Latin,¹ but it may also be found in any standard Italian dictionary. The counterpoint table, likewise cited by Trumble as a mark of Northern writers,² has been seen above to be equally characteristic of Italians, even appearing in Italian-language treatises. Trumble is correct, however, in his identification of the term "gymel" as a Northern term, although it is so uncommon

---

2. Ibid., 160.
that it cannot be said to be characteristic of any particular school. As seen above, the style of the musical examples in the treatise is similar to certain Italian genres, both sacred and secular, improvised and written. It seems unavoidable that Guilielmus was either Italian or an immigrant who had lived in Italy long enough to have assimilated Italian culture.

Finally, the chapter on modes introduces several traditional memory aids called "versus de discipulis," perhaps implying (along with the very existence of the treatise itself) that Guilielmus was a music teacher (a teacher of mere neophytes, to judge from the elementary nature of the first chapter). Therefore, the direct evidence of De preceptis indicates that the author Guilielmus was a monk, cantor, and scholar, either Italian or a long-time resident of that country, a teacher of sacred music who worked with students on the most basic level, and a composer who sometimes wrote for boys's voices and was familiar with improvisatory "English" styles of fauxbourdon and gymel as well as the traditional counterpoint of the French.

From the data gathered in the second chapter, it is proposed that Guilielmus was connected with the environs of Milan, Parma, Bologna, Florence, Rome, and Naples, and

3. Ibid., 159.
perhaps associated with the theorists Hothby, Ramos, Tinctoris, Gaffurius, Florentius, and Burtius. It is noteworthy that Bologna, at a juncture of the roads between the aforementioned cities, was the scene of a famous dispute during the 1480's between the aforementioned Hothby, Ramos, and Burtius, which dispute was continued into the 1490's by Gaffurius after his move to Milan. One must also note the importance of Naples at a slightly earlier date, c. 1475-1485, when Tinctoris was writing his summa and reportedly engaged in more friendly theoretical debates with Gaffurius and other local musicians. From these facts one may suppose that Guilielmus might have been in contact with one or both of these centers of theory discussion, as well as several of the aforementioned cities and persons.

It now remains to examine the merits of the only two hypotheses to date regarding the identity of Guilielmus. Trowell suggests that Guilielmus was the "Guglielmo Inglese" heard by Bartolomeo di Fiandra, a cantor of Duke Ercole d'Este, on a recruiting trip in Antwerp. This man is said to have been a contralto, and chaplain of the English


merchants's guild in that city. Edmond vander Straeten confirms that Bartolomeo recruited this man and others for Ferrara in 1503--well within the limits of the new provenance established in this thesis. This argument, however, rests on two shaky assumptions: first, that Guilielmus Monachus was English, and second, that Guglielmo Inglese came to Ferrara at the beginning of the sixteenth century and wrote De preceptis within a couple of years of his arrival. On the contrary, it cannot be proven that Guilielmus was English, even despite his claim to knowledge of English music, and it seems at least likely that Guilielmus Monachus had been a resident of Italy long enough before the writing of the treatise to have absorbed much of the local styles and terminology. An even more convincing argument against Trowell's supposition is the fact that Lewis Lockwood's thorough study of Ferrarese music and musicians shows no record of a Guilielmus on the d'Este payroll from 1500 to 1505 with the exception of "Guglielmo tamburino," who can hardly be identified with the singing-teacher author of De preceptis. It is purely speculation, therefore, to suggest that Guglielmo Inglese ever came to Italy in the first place.


Trumble, however, suggests that Guilielmus Monachus was in fact the obscure fifteenth-century musician Guillaume Garnier. Gaffurius said that Garnier was a music teacher and composer in Naples at the end of the 1470’s; this placed him in contact with Tinctoris, whose fauxbourdon example in *Liber de arte contrapuncti* (Naples, 1475) has the cantus firmus in the tenor, an uncommon practice identical to the first fauxbourdon method of *De preceptis*.

Serafino, whose contratenor practice is similar to that of Guilielmus, said that he studied in Naples under "Guglielmo Fiammenga," generally identified with Garnier because of the latter’s French or Flemish surname. Noting Serafino’s name for his teacher, Trumble also equates Garnier with "Guglielmo de Fiandra," a cantor at Ferrara in 1475, which would place him in the vicinity of the Bolognese and Parmesan musicians for a few years. Trumble muddies the waters, however, by also locating Garnier at Rome in the


papal chapel from 1474-1475 and 1479-1483. If this is the case, Garnier was employed simultaneously by institutions separated by a considerable distance.

Although Trumble’s hypothesis was insightful, it was severely limited by the lack of published data about Garnier. Trumble was not unaware of this paucity of information, but chose not to pursue what was, after all, an issue only incidental to his topic. He concluded his discussion with the questions, "Is there any evidence that Garnier was a monk? or is there any music composed by him which might show a definite relationship with Guilielmus Monachus?" With the benefit of the last twenty years of scholarship (and an often-overlooked reference in a much older source), these questions may be answered in the affirmative. The remainder of the chapter outlines a new biography of Guillaume Garnier that lends support to Trumble’s theory that Garnier was the author of De preceptis artis musice.

Supplementary Evidence to Trumble’s Hypothesis

François-Joseph Fétis inadvertently confused Garnier’s biography by not realizing the connection between two entries in his own Biographie universelle des musiciens.

14. Ibid.
15. Ibid.
under the names "Garnier" and "Guarnerius." Under the "Garnier" entry, Fetis recited the usual information about Garnier's association with Gaffurius and Tinctoris in Naples and his teaching of Serafino, and suggests (without documentation) that he had previously been in Milan.\footnote{16} Under the entry "Guarnerius," however, he describes a late fifteenth-century composer of Belgian birth whose extant works--several fauxbourdons, two hymns, and various pieces for four voices--are found in Cambrai, Bibliothèque municipale, MSS 9.\footnote{17} This manuscript, unfortunately, appears to have been lost; Eitner was not able to locate it for his Quellen-Lexikon.\footnote{18} This second-hand information, however, is doubled in importance by the extant contemporary manuscripts at Cambrai. As mentioned above in regard to Guilielmus's seemingly contradictory fauxbourdon doctrines, Wright has discovered fauxbourdons in Cambrai, Bibliothèque municipale, MSS 29, that carry the cantus firmus in the lowest voice just as described by Guilielmus and also Tinctoris, who was a vicar at Cambrai c. 1460. The same

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
17. Ibid., IV, 436.
\end{flushright}
manuscript contains falsobordone pieces identical to those of Guilielmus, and dating from the same period. From the above we may place Garnier in Cambrai around the time of Tinctoris's residence in the 1460's, and observe that he is reputed to have composed in two of the methods specifically described in De preceptis.

Fétis's assertion that Garnier went to Milan is not proven by extant records. The "Guglielmo" mentioned in a June 1473 Milanese letter is probably the "Guglielmo Pergier" listed in the payrolls of the preceding years; besides, Garnier's whereabouts immediately prior to June 1473 are known from another source.

Turin, Archivio di stato, Sez. Riunite, Inv. 39.c9.mazzo 3, describes a recruiting trip to Turin made by the new singing-master of the Collegio degli Innocenti of Chambery, in the Duchy of Savoy.

Note: an account of the order of the aforementioned Lady [Princess Jolanda of Savoy], the first day of March 1473 to M. Guillaume Garnier, a black monk [i.e. a Benedictine], master of the newly-constituted aforementioned children in the art of music, in place of Paquet Busquet, four florins as written below.

And this for the expenses of himself and his horse to go to Turin to bring back a young boy,


so that he may complete the number of the aforementioned children in place of Louis Genost, whose voice changed. Also for the securing of a horse on which the said little boy is to return, and for the expenses of all—four florins. 21

The Collegio, usually comprised of six to eight boys, employed a Latin teacher and a music teacher, and supplemented the court chapel choir. 22 Guillaume Garnier began work with the Collegio on February 1, 1473, and held the post until June 1st of the same year. 23

In the years immediately following, Garnier’s biography becomes strangely confused; he seems, in fact, to have been in two places at once. As has been noted earlier, a cantor named "Guglielmo de Fiandra" (cf. "Guglielmo fiammenga," Serafino’s appellation for Garnier) worked in the d’Este court in Ferrara from 1475 to 1479. 24 In 1474, however, a "G. Garnier" appears on the roll of the papal chapel in


22. Ibid., 261.

23. Ibid., 266.

Rome, and is found without fail until late 1483 (with the exception of 1476-79, the records of which are missing). Because G. Garnier's whereabouts cannot be proven between 1476 and 1479, either might have been in Naples during the time in which Gaffurius and Serafino were present. Judgement of this dilemma must be suspended, however, until the remaining biographical data has been presented.

Guillaume Garnier is believed to have been in Naples during Gaffurius's sojourn in that city c. 1478-1480, on the testimony of a contemporary witness, Pantaleone Meleguli, who named "Guilielmo Guarnerii" along with Tinctoris and Bernardo Ycart as a music theorist and close associate of the young Gaffurius. This account is supported by Gaffurius's mention of Garnier in his Tractatus practicabilium proportionum, c. 1482. Serafino's study with Garnier in Naples could only have taken place between 1478-1481, when the former was a page in the Neapolitan court of the Count of Potenza.


Garnier's trail seems to end at Naples, although it is seen to have spanned perhaps only twenty years. It is seems likely, however, that he was not much older than Gaffurius and was still alive when he was listed by the latter in the *Practica musice* of 1496 among a group of composers of the generation born c. 1450 and later, all of whom were still living. One expects, therefore, that Guillaume found work elsewhere, perhaps in Northern Italy, where the formulaic strambotto style of Serafino is found in manuscripts of the 1490's and later.

One obscure reference suggests both an answer to Guillaume Garnier's later whereabouts and a solution to his double biography from 1474 to 1483. At the cathedral of Bergamo in 1483, Gaffurius finished his tenure as maestro di cappella and moved to nearby Milan. His immediate successor was Antonio de la Valle, the length of whose tenure is unfortunately unknown. Following Antonio's departure (perhaps in the 1490's?) two men shared the duties of maestro--Guilielmo and Giovanni di Burgundia. This may explain the double life of Guillaume Garnier, for because

---


the Garnier in the papal chapel is only identified as "G. Garnier," never with a full Christian name, it may as easily have been Giovanni Garnier, perhaps a relative of Guillaume who crossed the Alps at the same time c. 1474-75 and pursued a similar career. While Guillaume took employment with the d'Este court, Giovanni (or Johannes) won a position in the papal chapel. Guillaume then moved to Naples c. 1479 and may have remained there until the late 1480's or early 1490's. Giovanni appears to have lost his job in a reorganization of the papal chapel in 1483, and may have joined Guillaume in Naples or pursued employment elsewhere. Finally, in the late 1480's or early 1490's, the two musicians left Naples and secured the maestro di cappella position in Bergamo, perhaps with the aid of Gaffurius in nearby Milan, who had a high regard for Guillaume. It is noteworthy that Tinctoris also found it necessary to leave Naples around the same time because of growing political instability. Both Garniers probably supplemented their divided income in Bergamo with private teaching as Guillaume had done in Naples.

One may wonder at the propriety of naming two Flemings "di Burgundia;" it must be remembered, however, that this


name probably came from a Bergamascan payroll clerk whose geopolitical knowledge may have been imprecise. Besides, Flanders had been under at least nominal Burgundian control for nearly a hundred years, and with the consolidation of power under Charles the Bold in the 1470's the Duke of Burgundy had sufficient control of Flanders to appoint bishops in the in the key cities of Tournai and Therouanne, as well as neighboring Cambrai. Thus a Fleming might be loosely described as "di Burgundia," although not necessarily with a favorable reaction. Conclusive evidence for the equivalence of Guillaume Garnier and Guilielmo di Burgundia will, however, only come from future archival studies of Bergamascan musicians and their music, with specific attention to the tenures of the maestri di capella.

It must be noted that Fétis ascribed a small number of chansons to Garnier, the style of which is completely unlike the musical examples found within De preceptis artis musicae. Upon closer examination, however, it appears likely that these chansons are the works of another composer of the same name. The four works cited by Fétis appear under the name "Garnier" in four prints of Parisian chansons published

by Attaingnant between 1538 and 1542. The Garnier known to Gaffurius in 1496, however, is described as a composer especially known for his use of a two-voice duet in tenths as the framework for four-voice composition—hardly a technique of the Parisian chanson, but identical to the composition theory of Guilielmus Monachus. Frank Dobbins concludes, "it is unlikely that he [Garnier of the Attaingnant prints] was the Guillaume Garnier who was a music teacher in Naples around 1480 . . . "

With the biographical data above, a tentative chronology of the two Garniers may be established, as seen in Figure 17.

Figure 17. Tentative Chronology of the Garniers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Guillaume Garnier</th>
<th>Johannes Garnier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1450?</td>
<td>born in Flanders</td>
<td>born in Flanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1460-</td>
<td>educated in Cambrai;</td>
<td>educated in Cambrai?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1470?</td>
<td>associated with Tinctoris; wrote fauxbourdon and falsobordone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473</td>
<td>singing-master of Collegio degli Innocenti in Chambery, Duchy of Savoy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


35. Gaffurius, op. cit., 144.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1475</td>
<td>cantor for d'Este chapel in Ferrara</td>
<td>1474</td>
<td>cantor for papal chapel in Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479</td>
<td>private teacher in Naples; taught Serafino; associated with Gaffurius and Tinctoris</td>
<td>1483</td>
<td>leaves papal chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1490?</td>
<td>in Naples; taught Serafino; associated with Gaffurius and Tinctoris</td>
<td>1490?</td>
<td>maestro di cappella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500?</td>
<td>in Bergamo, close to Gaffurius and Florentius in Milan; writes De preceptis?</td>
<td>1500?</td>
<td>in Bergamo?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Case for Guillaume Guarnier as Author

From the preceding paragraphs, Trumble's early hypothesis regarding the identity of the author of De preceptis artis musice appears to be correct. Guillaume Garnier was a monk, a cantor, a teacher of very young students, and was an official maestro at least in Savoy and perhaps in Bergamo. He was a composer of fauxbourdons with the cantus firmus in the lowest voice, and of falsobordone. Because his position in Savoy placed a number of boys' voices at his disposal, he very likely would have written music for several voices of an equally high range. He would have been responsible for teaching these boys, as well as the twelve-year-old Serafino, the identifying features of the eight modes. He kept company at various times with the notable theorists Tinctoris and Gaffurius, and doubtless others. Finally, he is described by Gaffurius as a composer.
who wrote with a framework of two voices in parallel imperfect consonances--the gymel that is the basis of the composition formulas described in *De preceptis*. All of the available information about Guillaume Garnier leads to the conclusion that he was in fact Guilielmus Monachus, the author of *De preceptis artis musice*. 
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The old judgment of De preceptis artis musice as a disorganized compilation of anonymous authors falls far short of explaining the available facts. This opinion seems to result from the piecemeal treatment of the treatise in the major studies on fauxbourdon, in which the treatise as an historical document is largely ignored. In addition, all too many authors are content to repeat the opinions of earlier scholars (especially Bukofzer) who, despite the outstanding quality of their work, do not always spare time to address the real issues of De preceptis as an independent treatise.

In the second chapter it is demonstrated that De preceptis contains unmistakable internal references between its constituent chapters, and bears the stamp of single authorship in the repeated use of unusual musical terms such as "supranus" and "riga" as well as the writing mannerisms "nota quod" and "bene dico." The oft-repeated charge of contradictory teachings is seen to be founded only upon preconceived notions of what Guilielmus should have said. The charge of repetition is likewise found to be exaggerated. Finally, the problem of the treatise's organization is resolved by reference to the arrangement of
contemporary treatises, which shows *De preceptis* to be well within the parameters of customary organization for a theory treatise of the end of the fifteenth century. The conclusion is drawn that Guilielmus composed various sections of the treatise at different times, much in the manner in which we have received the works of Hothby and Tinctoris, and later compiled them into a "compendious little book," in his own words [f. 2; Seay, 15].

In the third chapter it is observed that the date of *De preceptis* has been reassigned several times--in fact, it has become almost one hundred years younger during the twentieth century. Bukofzer's theory is seen to be the most definitive of the datings proffered until this time, but it is noted that his aim is (rightly) to prove that the treatise was not contemporary to the mid-century fauxbourdon theorists and therefore ought not to be brought into play in discussion of fauxbourdon origins. As a result, Bukofzer establishes a *terminus post quem* but does not investigate the possibility of an even later dating. By comparison of individual elements of Guilielmus's teachings to those of other theorists, and from the evidence of forward-looking terminology such as "supranus" and "solfizatio," it is determined that *De preceptis* was actually written as much as thirty years later than Bukofzer's dating--placing it firmly between the years 1490 and 1510. The issue of the place of writing is seen to be far less controversial, but it is
nonetheless possible to refine the traditional approach by the data gathered concerning Guilielmus's resemblance to other theorists and the similarity of his musical examples to the lauda and strambotti of contemporary sources. The result is a dating near the turn of the century, and a place of writing within the circuit of musical centers comprised by Milan, Parma, Bologna, Florence, Rome, and Naples, leaning in the direction of one of the northern cities.

In the fourth chapter, Trumble's theory of Guillaume Garnier's authorship of *De preceptis*, first expressed in 1956, is reevaluated in light of recent scholarship and proven to be well-founded. An often-overlooked passage in Fétis demonstrates that Garnier was a composer of fauxbourdon and falsobordone at Cambrai, where surviving manuscripts show evidence of the same unusual fauxbourdon practice found in *De preceptis*. Most importantly, a recently published document from Turin proves that Guillaume Garnier was indeed a monk and a music teacher for the Collegio degli Innocenti in Chambery during the spring of 1473. It is proposed that Guillaume Garnier is the Guglielmo di Fiandra found in Ferrara from the same period might be another Garnier with the same first initial. Guillaume Garnier is shown to have been in Naples during the tenure of Tinctoris and Gaffurius, some of whose teachings are paralleled in *De preceptis*. Several scholars agree that
Garnier taught the young Serafino, whose strambotti use a formulaic contratenor theory similar to that found in Guilielmus's treatise. Finally, it is proposed that the two Garniers are the Guilielmo and Giovanni di Burgundia who took over the maestro di cappella duties in Bergamo c. 1490, in close proximity to Gaffurius's sphere of influence in Milan, and that this was in fact the place in which Guillaume Garnier wrote *De preceptis artis musice*.

It is stated in the first chapter that no other theory treatise is so often quoted in the major works on fauxbourdon as *De preceptis artis musice*, despite the unresolved issues of its authorship, coherence, date and provenance. Because of this ambiguity, however, many of the authors of these major works have treated *De preceptis* as a poor relation to less obscure sources such as the writings of Tinctoris and Gaffurius, and have been rather selective in their use, misuse, and omission of its contents. The study now completed requires that this past treatment be reappraised in light of the probability of single authorship, later dating, and the Flemish background of the proposed author. Although a later dating of *De preceptis* removes it from its former place as a source of explanations of the origins of fauxbourdon, the treatise nonetheless provides unique insight into the reception history of fauxbourdon.
The study now completed also provides further support to the proposition of Ernest Trumble and the author of the "fauxbourdon" article in The New Harvard Dictionary of Music that the definition of fauxbourdon, rarely challenged since Besseler's landmark work Bourdon und Fauxbourdon, must be expanded to include improvisatory practices that placed the cantus firmus in the tenor voice. Although Guilielmus's description of this seemingly contradictory fauxbourdon practice has been often dismissed as an ignorant mistake in terminology, the existence of such fauxbourdon in extant manuscripts from Cambrai, the description of the practice in the writings of Tinctoris, a former resident of Cambrai, the description of the practice in De preceptis, and the fact that the likely author of De preceptis, Guillaume Garnier, is attributed by Fétis with the composition of fauxbourdons found in a Cambrai manuscript, lead to the conclusion that the improvisation of fauxbourdon with the cantus firmus in the tenor was a legitimate regional practice and not an individual aberration. In contrast to the position taken by the New Harvard Dictionary of Music writer, however, the improvised, syncopated fauxbourdon described by Guilielmus indicates that improvised fauxbourdon could also carry the cantus firmus in the highest voice, just as was done in the traditional written fauxbourdon.

Finally, this study indicates that in addition to the well-documented influence of fauxbourdon on French and
Flemish composers of the Dufay generation, fauxbourdon appears also to have influenced Italian music of the succeeding generation, as seen in the previously cited works in Figures 14 and 15. Although fauxbourdon in the strictest sense is not usually associated with Italy, the structural principle of melody harmonized in parallel imperfect consonances lent itself to the new homophonic style emerging in the frottola and related Italian genres. This technique of composition relied less on the contrapuntal rules descended from discant, as seen in the "rules of the French" in *De preceptis* or in the famous eight rules of Tinctoris, than on vertical combinations of intervals, as seen in the several composition formulas in *De preceptis artis musice*. Although previous studies concentrating on other treatises have established the two-voice discant framework that informed fifteenth- and sixteenth-century counterpoint,¹ only *De preceptis* documents the manner in which the two-voice duet in parallel consonances—Guilielmus’s gymel, the essential element of fauxbourdon—was synthesized into new composition techniques in the frottola and falsobordone.

Far from being a haphazard and eclectic conflation of contradictory sources, *De preceptis artis musice* appears to be a well-planned collection of the writings of a well-traveled and knowledgeable theorist, offering yet another

---

side to the fauxbourdon issue, a rare glimpse into the ever-present undercurrent of improvised music, and insight into the development of early sixteenth-century native Italian genres. Only when the treatise is exhaustively studied in the context of its true provenance and its still-obsolete author's career will all of its secrets be fully revealed.
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