

## *Se la face ay pale* and the Loud Band of the Fifteenth Century

Kenneth Kreitner

for David Fallows at 65

*Se la face ay pale*, a through-composed chanson on a ballade text, written in the mid-1430s,<sup>1</sup> is Guillaume Dufay's number one song in polite musical society today. Admittedly its fame may depend less on its own particular merits than on its association with a mass that would turn out to be unusually easy and enjoyable to teach five or six hundred years later;<sup>2</sup> but its merits are still pretty considerable, and there is some comfort in knowing that *Se la face* was apparently a hit in its own time too. With twelve known sources, it ranks behind only two among his songs, *Le serviteur* (sixteen sources, and now Dufay's again after some time as an *opus dubium*) and *Par le regard* (fifteen), and a solid length ahead of the next competitor, *Vostre bruit* (eight).<sup>3</sup> Nor was it copied only for its poetry or symbolism or something; the music has been preserved in six distinct versions, sometimes with text, sometimes without, showing that this piece was in common enough circulation that musicians felt free to make it their own.<sup>4</sup>

This last point is not quite so routine as it may sound. We, the readers of this journal, have a special interest in one particular group of fifteenth-century musicians—the loud band of shawm and slide trumpet players, later with trombones, cornetts, and dulcians—who are much easier to conjure up visually than to attach to a musical repertoire. We know they improvised, and this side of their musical lives can be seen only in the shadows it has left in the written record, which are few and somewhat ambiguous.<sup>5</sup> And we know that they had some sort of confrontation with the written repertoire, particularly the chanson repertoire, but exactly how that worked—how they adapted the vocal compositions to their own needs, restrictions, and strengths—proves much harder to document. So any evidence of what musicians, especially instrumentalists, actually did with the music they saw, is rare and welcome; and as it happens, I believe the transmission history of *Se la face ay pale* gives us an early and significant example of precisely what we are looking for.

Two of the six versions of *Se la face ay pale* are keyboard intabulations in the *Buxheimer Orgelbuch*, copied somewhere in the German-speaking lands, probably around 1460.<sup>6</sup> Obviously they are better evidence of keyboard performance than of attention by the loud band, but they do at least show that the song was well known to one class of instrumentalists in Germany, and their level of ornamentation suggests quite a deep tradition around this song among organists. The other four versions are outlined in Example 1, with words, ficts, and other apparatus removed for visual clarity.

The image displays a musical score for the piece "Se la face ay pale" by Guillaume Dufay, presented in four different manuscript versions. The score is organized into three main systems, each consisting of two staves. The first system is labeled "Oxford 213", the second "Escorial B", and the third "Schedel (Munich 810)". A fourth system, labeled "Trent 89 (up a 4th)", is also included. The music is written in 3/4 time and features various rhythmic patterns and melodic lines across the staves. The notation includes notes, rests, and bar lines, with some measures containing multi-measure rests. The score is presented in a clear, legible format, suitable for study and performance.

**Example 1:** Dufay, *Se la face ay pale*, 4 versions  
(words, ficta, and apparatus omitted).

The top three staves are taken from Oxford 213, probably the earliest source (this section copied in the mid-1430s) and still the gold standard, which has been used for most modern editions, including the *Opera omnia*.<sup>7</sup> If you carry a version of the song around in your mind's eye and ear, this is probably it, and rightly so: it is doubtless the original, written, as I say, in the 1430s, and this form—with a few little variants of course—was evidently the most popular in the fifteenth century as well. We know it also from Stanley

Boorman's bifolium (Veneto, 1430s), from the burnt-up Strasbourg C.22 (Basel? after ca. 1435), from Vatican 1411 (Italy, 1440s, in black notation), from the Laborde and Wolfenbüttel chansonniers (Loire valley, ca. 1465 and ca. 1467), and from Pavia 362 (Italy, ca. 1474).<sup>8</sup> I have only one thing to add at this point, namely that the familiar textung, with the superius and tenor given full text, is found only in Oxford 213; in Strasbourg it evidently had incipits only, and in all others it is texted in just the top voice, as most chansons were in the middle and latter part of the century.<sup>9</sup> This, then, is the "real" *Se la face ay pale*.

Below it is a version that is preserved only in Escorial B, copied in Italy, possibly in the 1450s.<sup>10</sup> The superius and tenor of this version are trivially different from those in Oxford 213, but the bass (as I shall call it—strictly speaking, the contratenor bassus) is new, or somewhat new. The Escorial and Oxford basses are very different at the beginning, but they come together in bar 3, then drift apart again in bar 6, then back together, sort of, at bar 11, and apart at bar 13, and continuing basically apart for the rest of the piece, but with frequent little references to the original; clearly whoever made up the new voice knew the old one. I see three patterns: first, that the Escorial B version tends to paper over some of the emptier cadences of the original, for example in bars 6 and 10; second, that it is in general more ornamented and rhythmically active (see for example mm. 11–13 and 19ff—Oxford 213 doesn't have a single semiminim [= sixteenth note as edited] in the entire thirty bars); and third, that Escorial compacts the range of the part considerably. The Oxford version, as you know if you have tried to sing it, goes up to a high A and down to a low C; the Escorial, from the same A down only to a G. This bass appears, as I say, only in this one source, and all three voices have text incipits only—a state of affairs unusual (though not unprecedented) in Escorial B and thereby possibly significant.<sup>11</sup>

The third version is from the Schedel Liederbuch, copied by Dr. Hartmann Schedel in Germany in the 1450s and early 1460s.<sup>12</sup> Here, the superius and tenor are again quite close to the original (apart from a little ornamental orgy in mm. 2–5), but the bass is completely new. Its tessitura, like Escorial's, is more compact than that of Dufay's original bass, but is squashed down rather than up: it goes basically from middle C down to the octave below, with one short excursion (starting in m. 11) up to an F. This version, too, is essentially textless—the superius has an incipit and the other lines, nothing—which may be less diagnostic since this is a German quasi-pedagogical source and just about all its French music is presented that way,<sup>13</sup> but I do notice one little detail: the first note in the tenor (and the bass too for that matter) is a dotted half, not a half followed by a quarter, and thus was not meant to be sung on the words "Se la."<sup>14</sup>

And our bottom specimen is the last item in Trent 89, copied in the early 1460s, probably in Trent;<sup>15</sup> it was edited separately among the *opera dubia* in the collected works.<sup>16</sup> It is in four voices, not three, and is written a fourth below all the others, with a very unusual sharp in the key signature; I have transposed it back up in the example for ease of comparison. It too has incipits only.

The tenor of the Trent version is, apart from the rhythm of the first note, all but identical to that of the original. The superius looks quite different from Oxford's at first,

but a moment's study shows that it is really not: for the first six bars it is a more or less heavily ornamented version of the original, then for 7 through 10 a little less, and from 11 on the differences are trivial. The bass in Trent is derived from, not the Oxford bass, but the Schedel bass: they start out alike, drift apart around m. 12, and come back together four bars later. And Trent has a new alto, very active and jazzy, and especially so when the other voices are still, as at the beginning and at the seams between phrases (m. 10). It several times (e.g., mm. 4–6) rises above the superius, confounding our figure-ground perception and seeming to become the melody for awhile before darting back under cover.

David Fallows has called the new voice(s) “magnificent,”<sup>17</sup> and many early brass enthusiasts who have heard, for example, David Munrow's recording from 1974 will sympathize.<sup>18</sup> I love this piece too, but more to the point for the present, it is actually something extremely valuable. The Trent 89 version of *Se la face ay pale* is, I submit, an unambiguous case of an artistically-conceived arrangement, in our modern sense, of a courtly song for instrumental ensemble, played well before the composer's death and within the geographical mainstream. I say it is instrumental because it is not only textless but, at least for the first few bars, unsingable on the text, and because someone has been at pains to adjust its written pitch level very precisely indeed: transposition down to F instead of G, with a *b* in the signature rather than a *♯*, would surely have accomplished the same purpose for singers and would have been more acceptable under the rules of *musica ficta*. (More on this presently.) And I call it an arrangement because you really can feel it pulling at your expectations and knowledge of the song. The changes of rhythm at the beginning mean that it takes several seconds, and a pleasurable gradual dawning, before you recognize it as *Se la face* at all; the ornamentation of the superius, plus the altus rising above it every so often and sinking back down, creates a sort of alternation, in the first half, between Dufay's old vision and the new one (an effect that could be underlined by the use of different instruments for these crossing voices); both of the new voices tend to soften the phrasey homophony of the original in favor of a more seamless texture; and the welter of broken triads at the end, impressive enough in three parts, is even more spectacular in four.

To repeat, and perhaps to belabor the obvious: the presence of text in this piece in Oxford 213 etc. shows that *Se la face ay pale* was written to be sung, but the eccentric transposition and the untextability of the opening in the Trent 89 version are all the proof I need to say that that particular version is an instrumental ensemble arrangement, made during Dufay's lifetime. And if you accept this, then it is fair to wonder about the Escorial B and Schedel versions too. Neither one, remember, is texted in its source, which proves nothing by itself but at least sets them further apart from the tradition of the original. Both do register as somewhat fancier versions of the original, with more notes overall and lots of little changes that have the look of performerly embellishments (see, for example, mm 2–6 of the superius of Schedel, or mm. 11–12 of the Escorial bass). Now I realize performerly does not automatically equal instrumental: there are plenty of reasons why singers too might want to dress a piece up a little as fashion moved forward over the years, and

plenty of evidence that they did.<sup>19</sup> And some of the changes can indeed be well understood as adaptations to a newer style, for instance in m. 6, where all the later versions work to propel the music forward rather than letting it bog down a bit at the end of a phrase. Yet I do, in the end, believe that both of these versions also originated among instrumental musicians, and what convinces me is their bass lines. In the case of Escorial, the bass is not altogether new but adapts Dufay's original in a way that deliberately narrows its range—a more urgent concern for wind players, especially shawm players, than for singers<sup>20</sup>—and in the bass of Schedel, not only is the range truncated, but the new part is shared with the version in Trent that we know was instrumental.

Saying that these three versions of *Se la face* were made for, or by, an instrumental ensemble is one thing; stating unequivocally that it was a loud band is another step altogether, and one that is currently impossible to take. Much less is known about the soft band in Dufay's time, and the number of variables, uncertainties, and imponderables is at the moment staggering.<sup>21</sup> It is a fascinating question, but need not detain us here; if our immediate interest is in what loud bands did when confronted with a courtly chanson, then we care what any band did with *Se la face ay pale*. And I believe the arrangements, if I may call them that, of this song allow a few observations.

First, that the pitch level was negotiable. This might seem to stand to reason, but there is a bit more to it than that. The relationship of written and performing pitch in centuries past is a matter of perpetual debate,<sup>22</sup> but here, in the case of the four-part version, we are talking about an alteration of the written pitch itself, and a very strange one from (in our terms) C major down to G major. I may not have sufficiently emphasized the rarity of sharp key signatures in the fifteenth century; but for example, among the almost 1600 items in Trent 87–92, this is the only such signature to be found.<sup>23</sup> So clearly there was some practical need to violate the strong customs of notation, and it must have had something to do with the technique of some instrument or other, or of some player's habits of fingering—or more neutrally, somebody's habits of translating written music into manipulation of an instrument. And here again we dash up to the edge of an abyss of ignorance; it is hard enough to establish the relation of notation and instrumental behavior for the sixteenth century, when we do have a few fingering charts and so forth to go on,<sup>24</sup> and all the worse here.<sup>25</sup> But the central point remains: pitch was negotiable, and even written pitch seems to have been worth overcoming some difficulties to negotiate.

Second, that there was a hierarchy among the voices of the original song. The tenor seems to have been all but untouchable: the only real variant I can see is Schedel's and Trent's change in the first measure from half-quarter to a dotted half, which, as I say, I take to be simply an artifact of not singing that part on the words "Se la." This stability supports what we already know about the priority of the tenor in fifteenth-century counterpoint generally; on a more immediate practical level, it may also reflect an ensemble practice born of years of improvising around a solid long-note tenor in, for example, a *basse danse*—it may have been important, or simply habitual, to preserve the tenor in unchanging, reliable form. The superius of the song is next in line: it is never altogether abandoned in any of these instrumental-ensemble settings, though it is freely ornamented

in fairly elementary ways. Rhythmic figures originally built around text are simplified (e.g. m. 5, Escorial vs. Oxford); straight eighth-note figures are swung and syncopated (m. 9, Trent vs. Oxford); little *passaggi* are added in stereotyped situations (m. 5, Schedel vs. Oxford)—nothing dramatic, the sorts of things that musicians do all the time and that pepper the critical notes to editions of fifteenth-century music.<sup>26</sup> Certainly none of these ensemble versions comes anywhere near the extravagant level of ornamentation seen in the Buxheimer intabulations.<sup>27</sup> The contratenor bassus, as we have seen, is the most variable of all: in Escorial it is modified quite a bit, at least in part for reasons of range; in Schedel and Trent it is replaced wholesale. And of course in Trent that bass appears with a new alto—an early instance of a *si placet* part, though not marked as such.<sup>28</sup> One thing we don't see is one voice (say, the tenor) used as cantus firmus to build essentially a new composition on, as Dufay himself does in the mass and as would become a flourishing art form nearer the end of the century.<sup>29</sup> Such cantus-firmus resettings are not unknown at this time, indeed can be found in some of the same manuscripts;<sup>30</sup> but whether *Se la face* was never used that way, or whether this is just a random gap in the fossil record, I shall not venture.

Third, that here, as just about always, it would be good to have a more precise sense of chronology and geography. I arranged Example 1 from top to bottom in a sort of rhetorical order—moving from Oxford 213 to Escorial B to the Schedel Liederbuch to Trent 89 seemed like the easiest way to explain what I thought was going on—and only later did I realize that, at least within the degrees of precision that we can assign to some of these manuscripts, they turn out to be probably in chronological order as well. Again it is hard to be dogmatic in view of all the confounding factors of geography and manuscript assembly: none of these instrumental versions of *Se la face* is really typical of its source, and the sources are scattered rather widely. But such evidence as there is, suggests that the tradition of playing this song developed over time and kept up in little ways with changing styles in the 1450s and 1460s—which on reflection is no more than we should expect.

And fourth, a familiar but still necessary caution: that it is very hard to be sure when we are seeing polyphonic music arranged for instrumental ensemble. We all know that textless does not automatically mean instrumental, especially in chansons copied outside the French linguistic boundary; and as Lloyd Hibberd so elegantly showed more than sixty years ago, there is no reliable stylistic way to distinguish vocal from instrumental writing.<sup>31</sup> Were it not for the unusual transposition in Trent tipping me off, I might never have been started on this path, and it is fair then to wonder how many other specimens of instrumental arrangements are out there unrecognized. For a little later in the fifteenth century there are many more clues pointing to musical literacy among loud bands: if, for starters, the 123 compositions in Casanatense 2856 were indeed copied ca. 1480 for the *pifferi* of the Ferrarese court,<sup>32</sup> then we begin to be on solid ground—not to mention the other Italian sources of the 1480s and 1490s that Louise Litterick has suggested were copied for instrumentalists too,<sup>33</sup> or for that matter perhaps even the *Odhecaton* and the rest of Petrucci's alphabet series of the early 1500s.<sup>34</sup> The various instrumental versions of *Se la face ay pale* give us a rare and fugitive glimpse of what was happening in the decades

before; and they seem to show a well-known song entering from the written tradition into the unwritten, surging around in there pretty freely for awhile, and coming back up into writing again in artistically different form—a process that involved literacy at both ends, and almost certainly concealed a lot of activity that didn't make it back out. And Fallows is right that the result in this case is pretty magnificent.

*Kenneth Kreitner is Benjamin W. Rawlins Professor of Musicology at the University of Memphis. He is the author of Discoursing Sweet Music: Town Bands and Community Life in Turn-of-the-Century Pennsylvania (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990), The Church Music of Fifteenth-Century Spain (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004), and articles in Early Music, Early Music History, Revista de Musicología, and the Journal of the Royal Musicological Association. He has been known to play the baritone, alto horn, cornett, sackbut, and serpent.*

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> See for example David Fallows, *Dufay*, rev. edn. (London: Dent, 1987), 194–96.

<sup>2</sup> Though on the possibility that the *Missa Se la face ay pale* was not all that popular in the fifteenth century, see Richard Sherr, “Thoughts on Some of the Masses in Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Cappella Sistina 14 and Its Concordant Sources (or, Things Bonnie Wouldn't Let Me Publish),” in *Uno gentile et subtile ingenio: Studies in Renaissance Music in Honour of Bonnie J. Blackburn*, ed. M. Jennifer Bloxam, Gioia Filocamo, and Leo Franc Holford-Strevens (Tournhout: Brepols, 2009), 319–33, especially 322–24.

<sup>3</sup> Data assembled from David Fallows, *A Catalogue of Polyphonic Songs, 1415–1480* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); the numbers include duplicate copies in one manuscript, but exclude purely literary sources. I omit *Mon seul plaisir*, with fourteen sources, which is still in the Dufay collected works but is almost certainly by John Bedyngham; see David Fallows, “Words and Music in Two English Songs of the Mid-15th Century,” *Early Music* 5 (1977): 38–43.

<sup>4</sup> For details on the sources, see especially Fallows, *Catalogue of Polyphonic Songs*, 362–63, and idem, *The Songs of Guillaume Dufay: Critical Commentary to the Revision of Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae*, ser. 1, vol. VI, Musicological Studies and Documents 47 (Neuhausen-Stuttgart: American Institute of Musicology and Hänssler-Verlag, 1995), 78–81.

<sup>5</sup> The classic effort is Keith Polk, “Flemish Wind Bands in the Late Middle Ages: A Study of Improvisatory Instrumental Practices” (PhD diss., University of California at Berkeley, 1969); some of this discussion has been updated in idem, *German Instrumental Music of the Late Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), ch. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Bertha Antonia Wallner, ed., *Das Buxheimer Orgelbuch*, 3 vols., *Das Erbe Deutscher Musik* 37–39 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1958–59), nos. 83 and 255. On the date, see for example Fallows, *Catalogue of Polyphonic Songs*, 9.

<sup>7</sup> Heinrich Besseler, ed., *Guillaume Dufay: Collected Works*; VI: *Cantiones*, rev. David Fallows, *Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae* I: 6 (Middleton, WI: American Institute of Musicology, 2006), 38 (no. 19). My edition is made from David Fallows, ed., *Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Canon. Misc. 213*, *Late Medieval and Early Renaissance Music in Facsimile* 1 (Chicago: University of

Chicago Press, 1995), ff. 53v–54. I say “probably” the earliest after the assertion in Fallows, *Songs of Guillaume Dufay*, 79, that the Boorman bifolium may predate Oxford 213. On the dates of Oxford 213, see Fallows’s facsimile edition and Fallows, *Catalogue of Polyphonic Songs*, 31; *Se la face* (ibid., 362–63) is in section III.

<sup>8</sup> Manuscript dates and provenances summarized in Fallows, *Catalogue of Polyphonic Songs*, 30 (Boorman), 45 (Strasbourg), 42 (Vatican), 22 (Laborde), 51 (Wolfenbüttel), and 36 (Pavia); for these and all his manuscript descriptions, Fallows gives explanation and bibliography, which see for more details. The Strasbourg manuscript, as he explains, was inventoried and partially copied by Charles-Edmond-Henri de Coussemaker before the fire of 1870, so that we have a reasonable idea of its contents.

<sup>9</sup> I have not yet seen a film of the Boorman fragment; Fallows’s descriptions imply that it too has text only in the top voice.

<sup>10</sup> On the date, see Fallows, *Catalogue of Polyphonic Songs*, 15–16. My edition is made from a film at the University of Illinois music library, aided by the edition in Martha K. Hanen, *The Chansonnier El Escorial IV.a.24*, 3 vols., Musicological Studies 36 (Henryville: Institute for Mediaeval Music, 1983), III: 469–71, commentary I: 60–61. The contratenor bassus is also published in the notes to the original *Opera omnia* edition, Besseler, ed., *Guillaume Dufay: Collected Works VI: Cantiones*, xxiv. See also Martin Kirnbauer’s notes on the contra in *Hartmann Schedel und sein “Liederbuch”: Studien zu einer Spätmittelalterlichen Musikhandschrift (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München, Cgm 810) und ihrem Kontext* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2001), 173–79.

<sup>11</sup> Of the 122 pieces inventoried by Hanen in *Chansonnier El Escorial IV.a.24*, I: 163–70, only nine are textless (plus five others for which the superius part is lost or absent).

<sup>12</sup> On the date and history of the manuscript, see Fallows, *Catalogue of Polyphonic Songs*, 42–43, and since then, Kirnbauer, *Hartmann Schedel und sein “Liederbuch.”* The edition here is made after Bettina Wackernagel, ed., *Das Liederbuch des Dr. Hartmann Schedel: Faksimile*, Das Erbe Deutscher Musik 84 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1978), ff. 69v–70, incorporating corrections suggested by Fallows in *Songs of Guillaume Dufay*, 242; for another interpretation, differing in a few particulars, see Kirnbauer, *Hartmann Schedel und sein “Liederbuch,”* 311–13. (Kirnbauer also includes the Oxford 213 and EscB versions on pp. 307–10 and 314–16.)

<sup>13</sup> On the meaning of textless pieces (including this one) in Schedel, see Polk, *German Instrumental Music*, 144–45.

<sup>14</sup> See also Kirnbauer, *Hartmann Schedel und sein “Liederbuch,”* 164–79.

<sup>15</sup> On the date, see Fallows, *Catalogue of Polyphonic Songs*, 47.

<sup>16</sup> It is number 87 in the edition (both Besseler’s original and Fallows’s revision). My edition is from the facsimile in *Codex Tridentinus 87–[93]*, 7 vols. (Rome: Bibliopola, 1969–70), 2:424v–425, in consultation with the *Opera omnia*.

<sup>17</sup> Fallows, *Songs of Guillaume Dufay*, 241.

<sup>18</sup> Early Music Consort of London, dir. David Munrow, *Music of Guillaume Dufay*, Seraphim S-60267 (1974).

<sup>19</sup> See for example Howard Mayer Brown, “Improvised Ornamentation in the Fifteenth-Century Chanson,” *Quadrievium* 12 (1971): 238–58; and David Fallows, “Embellishment and Urtext in the Fifteenth-Century Song Repertories,” *Basler Jahrbuch für historische Musikpraxis* 14 (1990): 59–85.

<sup>20</sup> Truncations of range have often been adduced as evidence of wind-instrument adaptation, notably in the literature surrounding Casanatense 2856: see Lewis Lockwood, *Music in Renaissance Ferrara, 1400–1415: The Creation of a Musical Center in the Fifteenth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984), 270–71. For a more recent view, also incorporating Segovia s.s., Augsburg 142a, and the Glogauer Liederbuch, see Jon Banks, *The Instrumental Consort Repertory of the Late Fifteenth*



*Century* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), especially 39–40 and 148–55.

<sup>21</sup> See for example Polk, *German Instrumental Music*, ch. 2; for my own previous discussion, see Kenneth Kreitner, “Bad News, or Not: Thoughts on Renaissance Performance Practice,” *Early Music* 26 (1998): 323–33, especially 329–30.

<sup>22</sup> The most recent and comprehensive survey of this issue through the centuries is Bruce Haynes, *A History of Performing Pitch: The Story of “A”* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 2002); my previous essay on the subject for the Renaissance in particular is Kenneth Kreitner, “Renaissance Pitch,” in *Companion to Medieval and Renaissance Music*, ed. Tess Knighton and David Fallows (London: Dent, 1992), 275–83.

<sup>23</sup> See the thematic catalogue in Guido Adler and Oswald Koller, eds., *Sechs Trienter Codices: Geistliche und weltliche Kompositionen des XV. Jhs.*, Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich 15–16 (Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1959, originally published in Vienna in 1900), 31–80; *Se la face* is number 778. Number 1070, an anonymous textless 3-ex-2 canon, appears to have a G# in the signature, but this is part of the canon and not a genuine #.

<sup>24</sup> See for example Howard Mayer Brown, “Notes (and Transposing Notes) on the Transverse Flute in the Early Sixteenth Century,” *Journal of the American Musical Instrument Society* 12 (1986): 5–39.

<sup>25</sup> My thinking on this subject has been much enriched by a long correspondence with Herbert Myers, whose own thoughts on the various versions of *Se la face* and their possible instrumentations well deserve an article of their own; for now, suffice it to say that he finds loud bands or recorder ensembles a possibility for all four, but believes the Trent version would require two treble shawms, tenor (in modern terms, alto) shawm, and trombone, which does seem to have been a common, even if perhaps non-standard, loud-band instrumentation by the time it was written: see for example Patrick Tröster, *Das Alta-Ensemble und seine Instrumente von der Spätgotik bis zur Hochrenaissance (1300–1550)* (Tübingen: Medien Verlag Köhler, 2001). But Myers also points out (a) that the exact ranges of the various shawms in Dufay’s time are not now and probably never will be known; (b) that the disposition of those sizes in the *alta cappella* was presumably somewhat variable; (c) that our understanding of their conventions of (in our terms) transposition is very imperfect; and (d) that the capabilities of the slide trumpet, and later (but when exactly?) the early trombone, are understood no better—all of which nurtures my natural reluctance to pontificate.

<sup>26</sup> For a useful comparison, see the versions of Binchois’s *Jamais tant* in Fallows, “Embellishment and Urtext,” 63–66, which is, however, texted in both of the sources (and in which, Fallows shows, the ornaments appear to be Binchois’s own).

<sup>27</sup> See note 6 above.

<sup>28</sup> *Se la face* is mentioned in Stephen Daniel Self, “The *Si placet* Voice: An Historical and Analytical Study” (Ph.D. diss., Ohio State University, 1990), 158–59, in a table of “Works Created Before 1470 Transmitted in Variant Voices,” but is not otherwise identified as part of the *si placet* repertoire; see also the introduction to Stephen Self, ed., *The Si placet Repertoire of 1480–1530*, Recent Researches in the Music of the Renaissance 106 (Madison: A-R Editions, 1996).

<sup>29</sup> See for example Honey Meconi, “Art-Song Reworkings: An Overview,” *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 119 (1994): 1–42.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, especially 6–16.

<sup>31</sup> Lloyd Hibberd, “On ‘Instrumental Style’ in Early Melody,” *Musical Quarterly* 32 (1946): 107–30.

<sup>32</sup> Fallows, *Catalogue of Polyphonic Songs*, 39–40; Lockwood, *Music in Renaissance Ferrara*, ch. 26; *idem*, ed., *A Ferrarese Chansonnier: Roma, Biblioteca Casanatense 2856: “Canzoniere di Isabella d’Este”* (Lucca: Lim, 2002). For recent dissenting views, see Joshua Rifkin, “Munich, Milan, and a Marian

Motet: Dating Josquin's *Ave Maria ... virgo serena*," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 56 (2003): 239–350, especially 314–22, and Banks, *Instrumental Consort Repertory*, 110–14.

<sup>33</sup> Louise Litterick, "Performing Franco-Netherlandish Secular Music of the Late 15th Century: Texted and Untexted Parts in the Sources," *Early Music* 8 (1980): 474–85. Banks, in *Instrumental Consort Repertory*, especially ch. 4, continues this argument in some detail, leaning it naturally and reasonably toward his hypothesis that much of the repertoire was written for lute ensembles, but by no means excludes the possibility that loud bands played from such sources as well.

<sup>34</sup> See for example David Fallows, "Petrucci's *Canti* Volumes: Scope and Repertory," *Basler Jahrbuch für historische Musikpraxis* 25 (2001): 39–52, especially pp. 48–49. John Kmetz, in "Petrucci's Alphabet Series: The ABC's of Music, Memory, and Marketing," *Basler Jahrbuch für historische Musikpraxis* 25 (2001): 127–41, provides an intriguing alternative view in the same issue of the journal.