A new facsimile of a half-millennium-old manuscript needs to know who its audience will be. Reproductions of stunningly beautiful sources, such as the Squarcialupi Codex or the newly available Chansonnier Cordiforme, need little justification, for they entice the scholar, student, and buyer with a sheer brilliance unknowable in modern transcription. But what of more mundane, everyday manuscripts of the Middle Ages and Renaissance? How do they justify their high price tags and large shelf spaces?

One recent facsimile edition has found the answers. The St. Emmeram codex is a decidedly unspectacular Germanic source from the mid-fifteenth century. Lacking even a single illumination, copied by scribes content to use just black and red inks, it is the type of source that in the past would have been studied only through modern editions and grainy microfilms. Yet opening the new facsimile makes the importance of the new publication obvious. Seeing the manuscript in facsimile is like beginning an archeological dig through layers upon layers of scribal decisions, reorganizations, and interpolations, none of which are apparent in a modern inventory or edition. One encounters black notation and pieces from the dawn of the fifteenth century next to more modern pieces in white notation sandwiched between chants written with German Hufnagel notation. The disordered look of the manuscript raises questions for the reader that the excellent commentary volume then helps to solve.1

The commentary begins with an extremely useful three-page introduction by Martin Staehelin describing the manuscript’s varied contents, current theories about the genesis of the manuscript—the personal collection of the clerk Hermann Pötzlinger (d. 1469)—its dating, its international and German repertories, and its significance despite the errors in many of its musical readings. Summary essays of this sort should be the standard for all commentaries; with this and the inventory alone, casual readers can effectively dive right into the facsimile. Ian Rumbold and Peter Wright’s commentary has a much more specialized audience, detailing the history of such items as strips of reused parchment removed from the bindings (which they use to connect this codex to other manuscripts from Pötzlinger’s donation to the monastery of St. Emmeram) and sixteen different bibliographical labels. The density of most (but not all) of their sectional discussions is mitigated by clear statements of what we expect to learn from study of, for instance, scribal changes or mensuration signa-

1 One can compare the St. Emmeram codex to another manuscript in facsimile whose disordered state also raises so many questions, Gilbert Reaney, The Manuscript London, British Museum, Additional 29987 (MSD 13) (Rome: American Institute of Musicology, 1965). But in every way in which the older facsimile fails to make sense of the source both in the quality of its reproduction and in its lack of commentary, the new facsimile succeeds.
tures. It also does not take much time wading through the footnotes to see the importance of bringing all this information together into a single commentary: several of the most significant publications about the manuscript appear in German language sources that only the most well-stocked libraries are likely to have. A serious omission in the commentary is the lack of an alphabetical index to the manuscript, a tool so useful that even the original compilers of the source made sure to include one. (The original index is transcribed, but that index lacks the pieces from the final stages of copying).

The most significant contributions of the commentary come from the datings based on paper types, descriptions of scribal activity, repertorial layers, and musical notation. This last section is also a masterful demonstration of the power of integrating musical examples with the main body of the text. Rhythms, ligatures (multiple notes written in one gesture), and even full musical lines appear as parts of sentences, obviating the need to consult figures elsewhere on the page or in the book. One hopes that after seeing their effectiveness here, more publishers and editors will drop their reluctance toward what is surely the most concise and simple way to discuss technical issues. However, some of the notational discussions overlook relevant literature. Following Tom R. Ward’s lead, the editors assert that the prolation signs $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{3}{2}$ are indigenous to Central European compositions and treatises. However, these signs have long been known from Italian trecento theoretical and practical sources, especially the Mancini codex (with which St. Emmeram shares repertory) and the Parma fragment.

In a discussion of notational anomalies, small errors can be devastating to the reader’s comprehension. Yet several seem to have crept into the discussions on pp. 96 and 98. The St. Emmeram codex occasionally uses the figure 2 (written after the note, not above it as the editors imply) to indicate alteration. The editor’s transcription of $\frac{2}{2}$ as $\frac{2}{2}$ is incorrect; it should be transcribed as $\frac{2}{2}$, but what is actually found in the manuscript is $\frac{2}{2}$, to be notated as $\frac{2}{2}$. The transcriptions of Pange lingua’s unusual $\frac{2}{2}$ need to either be $\frac{2}{2}$ or, more likely, $\frac{2}{2}$. Similarly, the “more usual” usage of $\frac{2}{2}$ from Martino should be $\frac{2}{2}$ and not $\frac{2}{2}$. The notational discussion is otherwise extremely compelling and should stimulate further interest in notational variety in the mid-fifteenth-century music for years to come.

---


3 Further on these signs, see Pedro Memelsdorff, “‘Più chiar che ’l sol’: luce su un contratenor di Antonello da Caserta,” *Receercare* 4 (1992), pp. 8–10. An Italian source containing the same notational system has recently been acquired by Harvard’s Houghton library, further undermining the central European origin of the system and pushing further back in time its earliest appearance in Italy.
Some minor errors and confusing points have also crept into the inventory. Among them, the Brussels 5557 source for the tenor of no. 49 is omitted. Pad1225’s version of no. 62 is attributed in the manuscript to “Deus Çacharias,” which should have been expanded to “Dictus Çacharius” (“Anthony] called Zachara”). Calling the concordance of no. 97 “Pad1106 inside front cover and 1r,” implies that this source used two pages to transmit the piece; “Pad1106 1r (also offset onto the front cover),” would have been a more accurate description. For no. 100 it seems important to know which of the eight sources transmit Francesco (Landini)’s *Questa fanciull’ amor* in its original form, which source uses a different contrafact, and which sources use the same Kyrie contrafact found in St. Emmeram (only the lost Guardiarele codex). No. 146 is attributed to “Grossim de parisius” in Oxford 213, not “Grossim de P.” No. 240, is found on f. 65r of Paris4379, not f. 78r; furthermore, the composer’s attribution in Oxford 213 is “Arnoldus” not “Arn.” Dubious attributions, such as the single attribution to Wilhelmi de Maschaudio in Stras of *Jour a jour la vie*, are only identified as such in a separate table, not in the inventory where they would be more helpful. For the contrafacts, it would have been helpful to know the genre or form of the piece being retouched. We are also not told which foliation system of Bologna Q15 is being referenced (it is the roman numeral system).

One can also argue with the editors’ identification of repertorial “clusters” within the manuscript (p. 113). The smallest of the small-scale repertorial clusters are not statistically significant. With 24 hymns in the manuscript, it is not at all surprising that two hymns would be found adjacent (nos. 93–94); small clusters of two or sometimes three compositions by Binchois also do not imply intentional grouping. Listing so many small “clusters” hides the more significant clusters, such as the contrafacta section (nos. 26–37 with three exceptions) or the introit group (nos. 133–138). More seriously, the presence of the table obscures one of the main stories about the manuscript: that it is not a well-organized, systematically grouped collection.

The index of manuscripts is well done, and the sigla are well thought out. Most sigla will be immediately recognizable to all scholars in the field without needing to refer to index. But given that this facsimile is important enough that it may become a starting point into the field for students and young scholars of the future, some explanation could have been given for “obvious” sigla such as OH for London, British Library, Add. MS 57950 (formerly of Old Hall) or Mel for New Haven, Beinecke 91 (the Mellon Chansonier). Trent 93 never actually acquired the call number 93, as their inventory suggests. The Grottaferrata fragment is given by a call number last used over a decade ago; the correct number is 224.

The editors and publisher have solved one of the problems inherent in issuing a facsimile of a seemingly mundane manuscript by providing the entire product at a reasonable price ($350 at 1.4 dollars to the Euro); this is on the inexpensive end of high-quality color facsimiles of this size. We are

---

4 In fact, 89% of all random distributions of 24 hymns in a 255-piece manuscript have at least two hymns that are adjacent and a majority of random distributions have two or more such clusters.
informed that the manuscript was photographed digitally at 600dpi and that these digital images were used to make the facsimile we see today. The images are indeed quite good, and like the New Series of facsimiles by Liberia Musicale Italiana (LIM) such as Modena A, the improved results are clearly visible. Nonetheless, one must lament that the best images yet made of the manuscript did not make it into this edition: that is, the digital images themselves. These images could have been included on supplemental CD-ROMs or DVDs. Digital facsimiles are swiftly becoming the primary choice for serious scholarly work on manuscripts. Even when reduced to 300dpi jpeg images, the detail of digital images far exceeds even the best paper reproductions. One suspects that marketing considerations play much of a role here: not only would these discs increase the cost of the facsimile, but surely some potential buyers would forgo purchasing the paper version and keep only the disc instead. But these are discussions to raise with all publishers of facsimiles and not a criticism of this one in particular. The new facsimile of the St. Emmeram codex, with its extensive commentary, remains a significant achievement and will greatly enhance our understanding of music in the early Renaissance.
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