Neither scholarly, nor artistic?  
The Janus-faced task of reconstructing Antoine Brumel’s motet *Philippe, qui videt me*.

Everybody who regularly reconstructs fragmentary compositions of the renaissance comes to a point where the distinction between the work of a scholar and that of a composer becomes irritatingly blurred. Certainly every reconstruction has to be based first on virtually the entirety of technical and stylistic knowledge of the respective time and region, and second on the intimate knowledge of the composer’s œuvre and his stylistic peculiarities. But the less a particular composition makes use of common models and clichés and the more original it is, the more likely at certain points we will be forced to make artistic rather than scholarly decisions. I will talk about concrete problems which came up in the process of reconstructing the altus voice of Antoine Brumel’s motet *Philippe, qui videt me*. On the one hand I will discuss phrases with apparently more than one viable solution and no strong criteria to decide which one to choose. On the other hand there are situations with no satisfying solution at all, in which case one has to manoeuvre between two possible breaches of rules like between Scylla and Charybdis. I will use my observations to draw conclusions about inherent limits that we should accept before even starting the quest for the *one* original version of a work. Last but not least, I will discuss different positions about how to adequately reconstruct renaissance music.