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Abstract

Surprisingly, indexes and tables of contents referring to music in manuscripts before c.1500 rarely contain musical notation. One remarkable and hitherto little-noticed example that uses musical notation throughout is the table of contents for thirty-four Credo melodies in the liturgical manuscript known as Pisa, Biblioteca Cateriniana, MS 219.

To contextualise this Pisan table of contents in depth, I have analysed common procedures in other contemporary navigational tools in musical manuscripts. My focus was on settings for the Mass Ordinary, whose identical text can lead to ambiguities in indexes and tables of contents. Based on this investigation, a possible relationship between manuscript types and the way indexes or tables of contents are composed is discussed.

Introduction

Shortly before the workshop called ‘Indices – Tables of Contents – Registers’ took place at the Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures (CSMC) in Hamburg, the UK-based Society of Indexers celebrated its sixtieth birthday, on 30 March 2017, ‘National Indexing Day’. While the Society’s primary focus is issues surrounding the creation of professional navigation tools for modern printed books, the workshop was designed to study the use of systems of reference in different manuscript cultures. This was not an easy task, since such items in manuscripts not only relate to highly diverse contexts of production and use, but also cover a long time frame – the last 3,000 years, in fact.5

One outcome of the CSMC workshop was the realisation that the uses and functions of indexes and tables of contents in many manuscript cultures have not received adequate scholarly attention yet. This marginalisation can also be seen in many manuscript catalogues that are not always specific about the existence of a system of reference in the manuscripts described. Fortunately, many valuable investigations of tables of contents and indexes in medieval music manuscripts have been published in the field of musicology in recent years.6

In this contribution I will analyse the so-called ‘special index’ from the manuscript known as Pisa, Biblioteca Cateriniana, MS 219 (Pisa 219), which has not previously been investigated in detail. This fifteenth-century manuscript begins with chants for the Mass Ordinary excluding the Credo, followed by a separate collection of thirty-four Credo melodies, including many unica; older melodies appear to be placed towards the end of the collection.

Music for the Mass Ordinary is typically part of the Kyriale in liturgical manuscripts. These volumes have a well-defined structure according to liturgical needs and were usually so consistent that indexes or tables of contents were unnecessary. However, when polyphonic Mass Ordinary settings were

---

1 The present article grew out of a research project called ‘Liturgical Books and Manuscripts of Music Containing Polyphonic Compilations of the Ordinarium missae in Cultural Practices’, conducted and carried out within the scope of the work conducted by SFB 950 ‘Manuskriptkulturen in Asien, Afrika und Europa’ at the Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures (CSMC), Universität Hamburg, and funded by the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, DFG). Parts of this contribution were presented at the International Medieval Congress in Leeds, UK, in 2018. I would like to thank the Biblioteca Cateriniana in Pisa and its extremely friendly and helpful staff (especially Maria de Vizia) for allowing me to investigate, photograph, and publish images of Pisa 219.


3 Duncan 2017.

4 Some of the articles in the Society’s journal The International Journal of Indexing (https://www.theindexer.org) deal with the history of indexes and also cover manuscripts. See Weinberg 2009, for example.

5 Humphreys 2011 claims that the 3,000-year-old I Ching, or Book of Changes, from China contains the oldest known table of contents and index.

6 For discussions, including examples from different manuscript sources, see Bent 2010; 2015, 636–637; and Lütteken 1998, 2005. For studies on specific manuscripts, see Bent 1990; 2008, 89–93; 2013; and 2017; Mráčková 2009; Rumbold and Wright 2006; and Welker 1993.

7 Répertoire International des Sources Musicales (RISM), Series B/IV/4, 1012.

Fig. 1: Table of contents in Besançon, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS I, 716 (Bes), p. 117.
collected in books of polyphony (or music manuscripts), especially in the fourteenth century, criteria other than liturgical designation determined a composition’s position within a manuscript. It is probably in this context that established navigational tools, such as tables of contents or a tabula alphabetica (index), were adapted from other manuscript cultures. As in collections of poetry, musical settings were referred to using their first line of text. While few incipits were identical in secular music, the opposite was regularly the case for recurring liturgical texts with different musical settings. Most of the examples can be found in settings of the Mass Ordinary that include the Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, and Agnus Dei, which were usually referred to using the first line written in the manuscripts: ‘Kyrie eleyson’, ‘Et in terra pax’, ‘Patrem omnipotentem’, ‘Sanctus’, and ‘Agnus Dei’.

In the following, I will address some recurring problems affecting indexes and tables of contents, followed by a discussion of the Pisan ‘special index’. Appendix A provides sigla for all the manuscripts cited, most of which cannot be discussed in detail here, but links to online repositories have been provided whenever possible.

**Terminology**

The terminology used to describe modern indexes has been debated repeatedly in the past, but the most significant difficulties seem to have been resolved since c.1988 and today there is general agreement on the main terms. In this article, basic terms like ‘entry’, ‘header’ and ‘locator’ are used in the sense defined in The Chicago Manual of Style. Fig. 1 shows the manuscript Besançon, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS I, 716 (abbreviated as Bes), which includes a fourteenth-century list at the end written in two columns containing a total of fifty-seven entries, each consisting of a header and a locator, e.g. the first one, ‘Virgo gloriosa .i.’ Each header repeats the incipit of a respective composition (Latin or French in Bes). The locator gives the reader information as to where a specific piece of music can be found in the manuscript. Locators can indicate page numbers, folio numbers, piece numbers, or opening numbers; the latter is often the main unit on which polyphony is written in music manuscripts. It is usually difficult to determine whether the numbering system in a manuscript indicates folios or openings, since the numbers are usually found on the recto page. Only through the study of indexes is it possible to understand how contemporary users navigated their manuscripts. The finding that the opening played a bigger role in this than previously thought is a result of recent research on music indexes.

We can differentiate between two main navigation tools: tables of contents and indexes. A table of contents lists its entries in the order in which they appear in the manuscript, therefore the locators usually appear in ascending order, as is the case in Bes (Fig. 1). An index, however, arranges the contents of the manuscript in a different order, usually alphabetically, but not progressing beyond the first letter in most cases. Confusingly, the term ‘index’ is not always used consistently; it occurs both as a general term for reference tools – including tables of contents – and indexes in the narrow sense as described above. Since the header in tables of contents and indexes in music sources usually consists of incipits, I will subsume both terms under the label ‘table of incipits’. While the historical term tabula alphabetica refers to indexes only, we can actually find ‘tabula’ applied to tables of contents as well. This is the case, for example, in various poetry collections that, like tables for music collections, list the incipits of the respective poems in their headers. The Florentine Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana holds some interesting examples of this approach, two of which I would like to single out here: Pluteus 40.48 has a table of contents with the title ‘Tavola de sonetti del burchiello’ and Ashburnham 478 begins with an extensive index of the works of Petrarch contained therein, followed by more tables of incipits that were added later: first one index entitled ‘Tavola di XX Canzoni di Dante Aldighieri’, followed by three tables of contents for other poets, each

---

9 On the distinction between manuscripts with music and music manuscripts, see Huck 2020.
10 See the literature mentioned in note 6 regarding these manuscripts.
11 In general, see The Indexer.
14 For more on Bes, see Meyer 1890 and 1898 (including a transcription of the table of contents).
15 There are, however, other possibilities, as in the manuscript Eton, which includes locators referring to gatherings (Bent 2010, 203). The locators used in the table of contents in Modena, Biblioteca Estense e Universitaria, ModE includes Mass cycle numbers.
16 See Bent 2010.
17 On the history of the so-called ‘tabula alphabetica’, see Brincken 1972 and Berger 2006.
18 Not so in Bent 2013, 64, who is clear in defining her use of the term ‘index’ as a generic one used for tables of contents and classified indexes.
19 Brincken 1972.
starting with a title that repeats the word ‘tavola’. The term ‘table of incipits’, therefore, can be applied as a generic one to different types of navigational tools such as tables of contents and indexes which include incipits in their headers. Further, it is useful to describe lists that cannot be easily defined, since they do not contain any locators. This is the case in Seville\(^{20}\) and London, LoHa.\(^{21}\) In these manuscripts, the tables of incipits are the only witnesses to what may have been larger collections of music. It is also possible that these lists constitute tables of contents created before the respective music collection was copied and hence reflect an unrealised plan.\(^{22}\) Locators, on the other hand, would most likely have been added after completion of a music collection.\(^{23}\)

The table of incipits in Bes (Fig. 1) is also missing its music collection but thanks to concordances, most of the music listed is known. Without the ability to compare the table with the contents to which it refers, we cannot tell whether the locators refer to folios, openings, or some other system. In three instances, two headers share one locator:

Table 1: Bes, p. 117.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[…]</th>
<th>XI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lis hec ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salve virgo rubens rosa</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[…]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crux forma penitentie</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In omni fratre</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[…]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunette cui j’ai mon</td>
<td>LII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sire Dex, li doux mas</td>
<td>LII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[…]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result, we can at least rule out the possibility that the locators indicate piece numbers because in that case presumably every composition would have been given a unique number.

**Ambiguity of entries**

Tables of incipits work well for medieval music manuscripts, since every composition typically has a unique text and therefore can be distinguished according to its first line\(^{24}\), this is especially true in the case of secular music collections.\(^{25}\) However, there are situations in which two entries show the same incipit. Take the text *Oselleto selvaggio per stagione*, for example, which was set to music twice by Jacopo da Bologna (fl. 1340–1360). In the index of the manuscript *FP*, the two musical settings are listed one after the other and include additional information to distinguish between them, as seen in Table 2:

Table 2: *FP*, fol. 3‘:

| *Oselleto selvaggio per stagione*.M: | LXVIII |
| *Oselleto selvaggio per stagione*.C: | LXXIII |

Even today’s guides for creating indexes recommend identical headers to be supplemented with identification tags\(^{26}\) so they can be distinguished from one another. Different terms for such identification tags in tables of incipits can be found in the secondary literature, e.g. descriptor,\(^{27}\) descriptive information,\(^{28}\) modifier, qualifier, or supplementary information.\(^{29}\) In the following, I will exclusively use the term ‘identifier’ to refer to such additions to the header, without intending to dismiss any of the other cited possibilities (in my examples the identifiers will be

---

\(^{20}\) This table of incipits was discussed by Michael Cuthbert in his paper ‘Trecento Theory in Italian and Italian Theorists as Composers’ at the Medieval and Renaissance Conference in Prague, 5 July 2017. I would like to thank Francesco Zimei for sharing images of Seville with me. See Zimei 2018 for the most recent investigation of the table of incipits in this source.

\(^{21}\) Lefferts 1983, 321–326.

\(^{22}\) Bent 2017, 25.

\(^{23}\) On such a possibility for Chantilly, see the convincing discussion in Bent 2017.

\(^{24}\) In the case of motets, typically only one of the possible text incipits is provided. This is the case in Bes where the headers only contain incipits of the motetus for the double motets, and the incipit of the tenor only for the triple motets (Ludwig 1923, 200).

\(^{25}\) For secular music from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in particular, we know that if a poem was set to music, the text and setting were then firmly linked. We have contemporary epistolary exchanges in which a poet sends his newly written poem to a composer and asks him to dress the ‘naked’ verses. Extrapolating from this image, the typical situation seems to have favoured only one musical ‘dress’ for each secular text. This suggests that the creator of a table, or its user, was able to recall not only the text but the associated music as well upon reading the incipit. One could add here that there was a convention that made use of this strong connection between the poem and its musical setting. In devotional contexts, the music of a secular song could be reused with a more appropriate text. There are quite a few manuscripts that contain these new devotional texts, but they never include the musical settings. A brief instruction tells the user to sing the text to the music of a specific secular song instead. For more on this so-called ‘Cantasi come’ tradition, see Wilson 2009.

\(^{26}\) E.g. *Chicago Manual of Style*, 16.45: ‘Indexing confusing names. When the same name is used of more than one entity, identifying tags should be provided’.

\(^{27}\) Bent 2010, 204.

\(^{28}\) Bent 2010, 201.

\(^{29}\) Bent 2013, 66.
presented in plain text, whereas incipits will be in italics). There is a whole range of different types of identifiers, e.g. composer name, genre, part(s), vocal scoring,\(^{30}\) mode, mensural characteristics,\(^{31}\) liturgical designation,\(^{32}\) musical incipit, and characterising adjectives.\(^{33}\)

In the example cited above, the identifiers ‘M’ and ‘C’ refer to different genres (madrigal and caccia). It should be emphasised that in FP signs are used to distinguish between the different parts of the header, the incipit, and the identifier, separated from each other by dots. This feature cannot be found in all tables of incipits, however; some quite regularly alternate between dots as separators (e.g. Ox 213) or other signs. In manuscript Q15 we find many entries for settings of the Mass Ordinary, such as ‘Et in terra / gullemi dufay’, here again with a separator between the incipit and identifier. Another entry in the same index contains two identifiers, each separated by a dot: ‘Et in terra .Z. micinella’.\(^{34}\) Some indexes alternate the use of black and red inks to visually differentiate between elements.\(^{35}\)

It is generally accepted that the main function of identifiers is to distinguish between different settings with like incipits, and that this phenomenon is specifically connected to the settings of the Mass Ordinary, which differ musically but not textually.

There are many ambiguities to be found in entries, however, since identifiers have not been added to all the incipits and some identifiers cannot resolve all the ambiguities. Figure 2a and Table 3 show part of the index of codex Emmeram, which includes incipits with ‘P’ as the initial letter, separated into two sections: first, items not belonging to the Mass Ordinary and second, grouped Credo settings. There is already some ambiguity in the first section in the entries for the hymn Pange lingua, especially in the fourth entry, which contains three locators (‘32’, ‘60’, and the later addition ‘88’), referring to three different musical settings in the manuscript – no identifiers have been applied here, although there is ample space.

\(^{30}\) Bent 2010, 204.

\(^{31}\) Bent 2010, 204.

\(^{32}\) Bent 2010, 204.


\(^{34}\) A transcription of this poorly legible index can be found in Bent 2008, 92–94.

\(^{35}\) This is the case in Eton; see Bent 2010, 203.

\(^{36}\) A transcription of the index is is in Rumbold and Wright 2006, 102–103.
Fig. 2b: Index in Emmeram, fol. 159r.
The six Credo settings are all introduced with the same incipit (Patrem), and five of them also include an identifier. The identifiers differ in type: first the composer’s name, then musical incipits, and, finally, a liturgical designation (see Fig. 2a and Table 3). The final Credo in this table has no identifier, however, which makes resolution of this header’s ambiguity difficult. This situation can be found in most tables of incipits with settings for the Mass Ordinary as in the now-lost manuscript Str (only its Credo settings are provided; see Table 4).

Table 4: Index in Str.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrem omnipotentem Prunet.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrem quatuor temporum</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrem cum fuga vel ibi</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrem aliud</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrem fuga cum 4 pausis</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrem aliud</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrem Cameraco.</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrem</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrem Lampens.</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see from this that identifiers were not usually applied with enough consistency to avoid ambiguity. There are even cases in which like incipits in different entries have been supplemented with the same identifier, as in Aosta, which contains two different Gloria settings by the composer, Leonel, shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Aosta, fol. 3v.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Et in terra Leonel</td>
<td>CLVIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et in terra Leonel</td>
<td>CLXVII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identifiers can also be found in tables of incipits that do not contain any ambiguities. The entry for a composite Mass Ordinary cycle in Pit is one such example. In this case, only one musical setting for each of the respective texts was copied into the manuscript, as shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Pit, fols A⁺, D⁺, G⁺, H⁺.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incipit</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agnus dei di Ser Gherardello</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[…]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedicamus Paulus</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[…]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria di Ser Gherardello</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[…]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrem di Bartolo</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[…]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctus di Ser Lorenço</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 3 to 6 would be enough to demonstrate how inconsistent – or even impractical – these tables of incipits are. While this might be true from a modern perspective and especially from the perspective of someone – contemporary or not – who is not familiar with the manuscript collection, in the cases described we are dealing principally with collections compiled or owned by individuals. In some instances, we even know who created the table of incipits. The index for Emmeram (Fig. 2b), for example, was created by Hermann Pötzlinger, the scribe who wrote that manuscript. The individual character of this index can be understood immediately when one takes into account the many filters applied when Pötzlinger prepared the index: the strongest filter was applied to the monophonic music, which was excluded completely. Many other items from the manuscript were also excluded from the index, which is hard to explain today. It has been suggested that some items were simply overlooked during the hasty drafting of the index. Additionally, one should consider the possibility that Pötzlinger made personal choices in the omission of repertory. The question of whether an item has been omitted from an index intentionally or by chance is never easy to answer. Another manuscript, Q15, has a partial index created by Guillaume Musart from Brussels. He was not the scribe who wrote that collection of songs down, but a later user. He applied a very strong filter to create an index according to his needs, listing only settings for the Mass Ordinary but omitting all the manuscript’s Credos.

In addition to the possibility of applying filters, one can recognise tables of incipits as individual navigation tools based on the choice of identifiers, which do not follow a specific pattern in many cases.

---

38 Regarding this index, see Nádas 1985 as well, especially 236–261.
39 See Rumbold and Wright 2006, 104.
40 Rumbold and Wright 2006, 104.
41 See Bent 2008, 89–92.
42 However, there are some tables of incipits in which the use of composer names is preferred as identifiers, as in Tr92 (Bent 2013, 66).
It has been suggested that the use of musical notation as an identifier in *Emmeram* is the result of a lack of other available identifiers. However, this cannot be applied to the *Credos* in Fig. 2a. The first *Credo* that includes musical notation in the index (with the locator 43) refers to a two-part setting on fols 42v–43r that includes a composer attribution (‘Dufay’) in the upper margin. The scribe and indexer could choose between the two identifiers here. The same can be said about the *Credo* with the locator 104. The liturgical designation ‘dominicale’ is found in the manuscript (fols 103v–104r), but side by side with an abbreviated composer attribution. Another individual trait can be recognised when investigating the sketchy musical incipits. All three refer to polyphonic settings, but with only one melody fragment each. Two of them repeat the beginning of the cantus (the *Credos* with locators 43 and 50), and one refers to the tenor (see the entry with locator 45). Again, no systematic pattern seems to have been applied here.

The identifiers that were chosen can probably be best understood as an aid to recalling a musical setting. It might be possible to explain the ambiguities in Tables 3 to 6 this way. The two entries in *Aosta*, each with a *Gloria* incipit and the repeated identifier, ‘Leonel’, (Table 5), differ in one significant point: the locator. I suggest that the locator itself could have served as an identifier in such cases. The manuscript comes into play here as a three-dimensional object, since the user of the index will most likely remember which of the two musical setting appears first in the manuscript and which follows. In the case of *Pit* (Table 6), the identifiers are certainly not needed within the manuscript, although they might be useful to refresh the memory of the indexers, who certainly knew more settings of the Mass Ordinary than the few found in this collection. We also find the entry ‘*Oselletto selvaggio* caccia 44’ as a memory aid in the *Pit* index. Although the manuscript only contains the *caccia* setting, not the *madrigal* (see above), an identifier has been applied nonetheless.

The table of contents in *Pisa 219*

The manuscript *Pisa 219* seems to be the only choirbook belonging to the Dominican convent of Santa Cateriniana in Pisa not to have been destroyed in the huge fire on the night of All Saints in 1651. Because the fire started in the choir, it is assumed that this manuscript had not been stored in its accustomed location. The manuscript, which lacks its first thirty-six folios, measures 480 × 323 mm and contains a *Kyriale*, followed by an enormous collection of *Credo* chants (see Appendix B). Bruno Stäblein dated the manuscript to the fifteenth century, with which Tadeusz Miazga and others concurred. The dating was discussed in greater detail in the 1993 catalogue by Paola Raffaelli focusing on the library’s manuscripts with musical notation. A more general exhibition catalogue was published less than a year later. Raffaelli’s catalogue entry for *Pisa 219* was repeated here, but with the manuscript now dated to the second half of the seventeenth century. No reason for this sudden change was given other than the suggestion that *Pisa 219* might be one of the thirteen choirbooks copied by Giovanni Battista Castrucci between 1652 and 1690. His task was to replace the manuscripts lost in the fire. Fortunately, he left a relatively precise list of the manuscripts he produced, including the contents and costs. Castrucci’s list confirms that none of the manuscripts described can be connected even tentatively with *Pisa 219*. Therefore such a late date for *Pisa 219* is implausible.

To date, musicological interest in this manuscript has resided primarily in the fact that two of the thirty-four *Credos* are two-part settings – they can be found on fols 86r–93v and 114r–121v. Less attention has been given to the aforementioned statement in *RISM* that the manuscript contains a ‘special index’, published here for the first time (see Figs 3–6).

---

43 Lütteken 1998, 30 (discussing the entries for the Kyrie settings).
44 Interestingly, the composite Mass cycle in *Pit* is not indicated as such in the index. This is, however, the case with the Machaut Mass in *Mach* (see Huck 2020, 29) and also the table of incipits in *ModE*, which only lists Mass cycles. The locators indicate Mass cycle numbers.
Fig. 3: Table of contents in *Pisa 219*, fol. 53r.
Fig. 4: Table of contents in *Pisa 219*, fol. 53v.
Fig. 5: Table of contents in *Pisa 219*, fol. 54r.
Fig. 6: Table of contents in Pisa 219, fol. 54v.
What makes the table of incipits in *Pisa 219* ‘special’ is, most importantly, its inclusion of musical notation throughout. In this respect it differs considerably from other tables of incipits in general, but also from *Emmeram*, with its sporadic inclusion of musical incipits as identifiers. Only one other table of content with a complete set of musical incipits is known from that period: Modena, Biblioteca Estense e Universitaria, α.X.1.11 (*ModB*), although its musical incipits serve no identifying function, as Margaret Bent has stated.\(^{55}\)

The list in *Pisa 219* is a table of incipits in a double sense: each entry contains a text incipit and a musical incipit. Each header includes the first two words as the text incipit, ‘Patrem omnipotentem’, and its seven syllables underlie the respective notes of the identifier (the musical incipit). Only the two polyphonic settings are presented with just the first word, ‘Patrem’ – surely due to space limitations – and, since this is a two-syllable word, the first two notes (see the first and the eighth entry in Fig. 4). The most significant difference to *Emmeram* and *ModB* is that the incipits for both voices are given. In both cases the additional identifier ‘contrap:’ marks the two settings as polyphonic. All monophonic Credos are written down over a seven-page span, whereas the two-part settings occupy twice as much space. Great care was taken during the manuscript’s copying to arrange the polyphonic setting across openings: the word ‘contrapunto’, spread across the first opening of each setting, signals both the difference in layout and the fact that the two voices belong together. One of the two settings is only partially polyphonic, so parts of some staves have been left empty (see Fig. 7).

The locators are in manuscript order (with one exception, to which I will return), which suggests that we are dealing with a table of contents; the locators refer to folios. It is difficult to determine just when this table of contents was made, but its position between the *Kyriale* and before the *Credo* collection makes it likely that it was planned from the beginning. Additionally, its appearance matches that of the rest of the *Credo* collection. Based on Xeroxes,

\[^{55}\text{Bent 2010, 202.}\]
The final longa in the musical incipit is a semibreve in the Credo on fol. 76r.

The musical incipit begins with an F2 clef, but the Credo on fol. 79v contains a F3 clef.

This is the tenth entry in the table of contents and the only one that is not in manuscript order (see Fig. 3). As can be seen from the high number of the locator, it is the final Credo in the collection. Besides this, there is an error in this identifier; a c2 clef is notated, but the Credo on fol. 178r begins with an F2 clef.

This locator should be the Roman numeral for 86 (not 87) because the two-part Credo begins on fol. 86v.

The second note was corrected from a longa to a semibreve to accord with fol. 104r.

This identifier differs in a small detail from the Credo on fol. 147r: there is no sharp sign in front of the second note of the musical incipit, but the Credo does in fact contain one.

The musical incipit begins with an F2 clef, but the Credo on fol. 175r contains a F3 clef.

Laurenz Lütteken noted that the table was inserted into the manuscript and indeed, looking at the microfilm available in the Biblioteca Cateriniana, the table of incipits seems to be a separate unit, consisting of four folios. This gathering must have been created at an early stage because the folios of the table are part of the manuscript’s original foliation. Today, the original manuscript is of little help in further investigation of this question, since it is extremely tightly bound following a recent substantial restoration in which the manuscript was completely dismantled and rebound with a new leather spine.

In most cases the entries in the table of contents accord with the respective passages in the Credo collection; even the use of the b-flat sign is consistent. There are some differences, however, which are summarised in Table 7.

The sharp sign at the beginning of fol. 147r is certainly a later addition and in fact, this manuscript shows many traces of use over a period of at least 200 years, including erasures and rewriting of passages, and even the restoration of faded ink (the quality of inks and colours does not seem to be very high in general).

Two of the errors lead me to the hypothesis that we are dealing with a pre-existing table of incipits here, first prepared from the exemplars, which received its locators after the copying of the thirty-four Credos and probably after the manuscript was bound. This would explain why the final Credo in the collection is placed in tenth position in the table of contents, but with the correct foliation number. This Credo was probably omitted in the copying process and then added at the very end of the manuscript, starting on fol. 178r.

The mistaken locator ‘LXXXVII’ was probably thought to be correct when – in the process of adding the locators to the header – the scribe worked quickly through the manuscript looking for the starting page of a Credo and, in this case, failed to notice that this two-part setting begins on the verso of folio 86.

Another feature that makes this table of contents ‘special’ is the fact that we are dealing with a particularly consistent layout and use of identifiers – that is, the musical incipits. No other types of identifiers have been used, and we know that for at least for some of the settings alternative identifiers existed, e.g. ‘tedesco’ or ‘cardinalis’. This might suggest that the musical incipits were not used because there were no other possibilities, but rather because the alternatives may have implied personal choices.

It is plausible, then, to assume that such a manuscript could have been in regular use by multiple singers and, therefore,

---

Table 7: Differences between the table of incipits in Pisa 219 compared to the Credo collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry with locator</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LXXVI</td>
<td>The final longa in the musical incipit is a semibreve in the Credo on fol. 76r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXVIII</td>
<td>The musical incipit begins with an F2 clef, but the Credo on fol. 79v contains a F3 clef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLXXVIII</td>
<td>This is the tenth entry in the table of contents and the only one that is not in manuscript order (see Fig. 3). As can be seen from the high number of the locator, it is the final Credo in the collection. Besides this, there is an error in this identifier; a c2 clef is notated, but the Credo on fol. 178r begins with an F2 clef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXXVII</td>
<td>This locator should be the Roman numeral for 86 (not 87) because the two-part Credo begins on fol. 86v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIIII</td>
<td>The second note was corrected from a longa to a semibreve to accord with fol. 104r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLVII</td>
<td>This identifier differs in a small detail from the Credo on fol. 147r: there is no sharp sign in front of the second note of the musical incipit, but the Credo does in fact contain one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLXXV</td>
<td>The musical incipit begins with an F2 clef, but the Credo on fol. 175r contains a F3 clef.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

57 This restoration was done in 2009 in Florence, as is explained in a note glued at the end of the manuscript.
58 With the exception of the aformentioned ‘contrap’:
59 Ciliberti 1990, 78.
60 Gozzi 2006 and 2007.
the use of musical incipits as identifiers was the best system because they were common knowledge for a group belonging to the convent and the most systematic approach enabling everyone to quickly find the desired work, especially in this thick, large, and heavy book.

What makes the table of contents in *Pisa 219* special is, therefore, not only the use of musical incipits, but the fact that it was not used by an individual, but by a group of singers belonging to an institution. Although it is risky to extrapolate a general rule from a single example, the very consistency of this table of contents renders it unusual compared to the other table of incipits discussed above. I suggest that the scribe of this table of incipits was more exacting than others because this is an institutional manuscript that many singers used, and over a long period of time.

It seems that the table of incipits discussed here was not the only one in use at the Dominican convent of Santa Cateriniana. In the list of Giovanni Battista Castrucci’s manuscripts that were newly written in the seventeenth century, there is a note on a manuscript that contained a table of incipits for *Glorias*:

Libro deceto Graduale delle Messe de Santi, con la tavola delle Glorie a parte ed uno Salterio di carta pecora rihauosto, ch’è avanzato dall’incendio di nostra Chiesa seguito l’anno 1652 Pisano et è di carte 165.  

A book called *Gradual of the Masses of the Saints*, with the table of the Glorias on the side and a Psalter, made of recycled sheep’s parchment, which was left over from the fire in our Church which occurred in the year 1652, and it is made from 165 folios.

**Conclusion**

In this article, general phenomena in tables of incipits for music in manuscripts, such as ambiguous headers, were studied to be able to analyse and contextualise the table of contents of *Pisa 219* for the first time. It will be interesting to further explore the differences between personal and institutional tables of incipits in future research. *ModB* and *Eton* are good candidates for the study of institutional tables of incipits based on the consistency applied.

---

61 Pisa, Archivio Arcivescovile, Fondo Seminario Santa Caterina, Entrata e uscita di denari della Sacrestia (1678–1711), n. 490. Cited from Raffaelli 1993, 77. Unfortunately the whereabouts of most manuscripts described by Castrucci in the seventeenth century are unknown.
APPENDIX A: MANUSCRIPTS CITED THAT CONTAIN TABLES OF INCIPITS FOR MUSIC

Links are provided for all the manuscripts that are available online.\(^2\)

**Aosta**
Aosta, Seminario Maggiore, MS 15
https://www.diamm.ac.uk/sources/112/#/

**Bes**
Besançon, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS I, 716
http://memoirevive.besancon.fr/ark:/48565a011324049265nh50Yo/1/120

**Chantilly**
Chantilly, Bibliothèque du Musée Condé, MS 564

**Emmeram**
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14274
http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/bsb00001643images/index.html?id=00001643&groesser=&fip=193.74.98.30&no=&seite=321

**Eton**
Eton, Eton College Library, MS 178
https://www.diamm.ac.uk/sources/202/#/

**FP**
Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, MS Panciatichiano 26\(^3\)

**LoHa**
London, British Library, Harley MS 978
http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Harley_MS_978

**MachA**
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fr. 1584
https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b84490444/f10.item.zoom

**ModB**
Modena, Biblioteca Estense e Universitaria, a.X.1.11
http://bibliotecaestense.beniculturali.it/info/img/mus/i-mo-beu-alfa.x.1.11.pdf

**ModE**
Modena, Biblioteca Estense e Universitaria, MS a.M.1.13
http://bibliotecaestense.beniculturali.it/info/img/mus/i-mo-beu-alfa.m.1.13.pdf

**Ox 213**
Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Canon. Misc. 213
https://digital.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/inquire/p/afad6535-f141-404e-a497-207530420221

**Pisa 219**
Pisa, Biblioteca Cateriniana, MS 219

**Pit**
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, f. it. 568
https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b84490281/f11.image

**PR**
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, n. a. fr. 6771
https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8449045j

**Q15**
Bologna, Museo Internazionale e Biblioteca della Musica di Bologna, MS Q.15
https://www.diamm.ac.uk/sources/117/#/

**Speciálník**
Hradec Králové, Krajske Muzeum, Knihovna, MS Hr-7 (II A 7)

**Str**
Strasbourg, Bibliothèque Municipale (olim Bibliothèque de la Ville), MS 222 C.22 (destroyed)

\(^2\) All accessed on 30 June 2020.
\(^3\) Gallo 1981.
APPENDIX B: CREDO COLLECTION IN PISA 219

Paola Raffaelli provided the first overview of the contents of Pisa 219, including references to Miazga’s melody catalogue, but unfortunately her list is incomplete. The following table includes all thirty-four Credo settings from Pisa 219 in manuscript order and provides their melody numbers according to Miazga.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folios</th>
<th>Remark</th>
<th>Melody number according to Miazga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58r–61r</td>
<td>302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62r–65r</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65r–68r</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69r–72r</td>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72r–75r</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76r–79r</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79r–82r</td>
<td>637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83r–86r</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86r–93r</td>
<td>two-part setting 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93r–96r</td>
<td>272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97r–100r</td>
<td>373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100r–103r</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104r–107r</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107r–110r</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111r–114r</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114r–121r</td>
<td>two-part setting 456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121r–125r</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126r–129r</td>
<td>496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129r–132r</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133r–136r</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136r–139r</td>
<td>661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140r–143r</td>
<td>528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143r–146r</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147r–150r</td>
<td>342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150r–153r</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154r–157r</td>
<td>435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157r–160r</td>
<td>667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161r–164r</td>
<td>653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164r–167r</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168r–171r</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171r–174r</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175r–178r</td>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178r–181r</td>
<td>441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

64 Miazga 1976. See also Baroffio and Kim 1999.
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