

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Faculty Publications: School of Music

Music, School of

2003

Review of Gareth Curtis, ed. *Fifteenth-Century Liturgical Music, IV: Early Masses and Mass-Pairs*

Peter M. Lefferts

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, plefferts1@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/musicfacpub>



Part of the [Music Commons](#)

Lefferts, Peter M., "Review of Gareth Curtis, ed. *Fifteenth-Century Liturgical Music, IV: Early Masses and Mass-Pairs*" (2003). *Faculty Publications: School of Music*. 26.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/musicfacpub/26>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Music, School of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications: School of Music by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Reviews

DOI:10.1017/S0961137103213103

Gareth Curtis, ed. *Fifteenth-Century Liturgical Music, IV: Early Masses and Mass-Pairs*. Early English Church Music 42. London: Published for the British Academy by Stainer and Bell Ltd., 2001. ISBN 0 85249 846 2

The volume under review is the latest entry in a slowly unfolding series, entitled *Fifteenth-Century Liturgical Music*, within the larger Early English Church Music (EECM) enterprise. It follows three previous volumes, namely *I: Antiphons and Music for Holy Week and Easter* (EECM 8, 1969, ed. Andrew Hughes), *II: Four Anonymous Masses* (EECM 22, 1979, ed. Margaret Bent) and *III: The Brussels Masses* (EECM 34, 1989, ed. Gareth Curtis). However, in his Foreword to the present volume, John Caldwell, General Editor of the Early English Church Music Committee of the British Academy, announces that this book heralds a new initiative, inaugurating ‘a project to complete the publication in modern editions of the surviving English liturgical music of the fifteenth century’ (p. v). So EECM 42 is at the same time both a continuation and a new beginning.

The sense of a fresh start is most apparent in the presentation of the modern score, for which the series adopts a radically new appearance, one that will be employed in all subsequent volumes. Voices are put into score and aligned, of course, but ‘in these new editions, note-values will be unreduced, the bar-line will be replaced by a short vertical stroke beneath the staff (eliminating the need for the tie), and key-signatures will retain their medieval configuration and significance’ (p. v). Ligatures are also retained. The notation – black void with black full coloration employing rhomboid semibreves, square breves, and so forth – has been rendered in a handsome, legible typeface approximating an idealized fifteenth-century hand.¹ No initial incipit is thus necessary. Clefs, however, are modernized and standardized (principally to G2/G2tr/G2tr or G2tr/F4/F4), and so the original initial clef is reported at the outset. Further, the

¹ The Sanctus and Agnus from a Benet mass (this edition, no. 1) survive only in black full notation with red coloration, which has been editorially translated into black void with black coloration.

ambitus of each voice-part is reported between the modern clef and the original mensuration sign for each individual movement. In a concession to make the edition more user friendly, editor Curtis provides certain additional symbols, including a dot above the staff to indicate a *punctus divisionis*, a haček placed above a notehead to indicate alteration, and ties to connect the two parts of half-colored single notes. Curtis also provides a few brief words on note-values in various mensurations, and on the normal realization of *minor color* (pp. xi–xii).

The transcription method was initially a shock to me, but with some experience of the volume it ceased to be an impediment, and over time I have come to like it. I would be highly concerned to send a student untutored in mensural notation to this book; the learning curve would be formidably steep. But, to turn my observation around, a student could well use this volume precisely to learn how to read the notation. Retention of original note-values along with the idiosyncrasies of fifteenth-century mensuration practice in black void notation means that the modern score-reader will have to be more than usually alert, especially for such standard pitfalls as coloration, alteration and tenor augmentation. The augmented tenors are, of course, not delineated with bar-line strokes as frequently as the other parts, and when coloration is ‘across the bar-line’, that particular bar-line stroke is omitted. Moreover, the occasional odd extra semibreve in all parts is accepted editorially into a bar so that cadences always fall at the beginning of a bar. As a result, very careful attention must be given to counting mensural units, whether, for example, one is interested to locate a reported variant or is looking on a larger scale for proportional relationships between the durations of sections or movements.

The sense of a fresh start is also visually communicated by the generous editorial apparatus, which, rather than being relegated to fine print at the end of the volume, is laid out in double columns of full-size type preceding each item. The apparatus includes a report of Sources, Cantus Firmus and Critical Notes. The critical notes include data under the headings Mensuration, Texting and Underlay, Rejected Readings and Other Texting Problems, Placing of Accidentals and Signatures, Errors, and Other Purely Notational Features. Furthermore, variants judged by the editor to be substantive are recorded in small type at the foot of each page under the score itself, where they are unobtrusive but close to hand.

The apparatus is particularly rich in information about texting, a subject which above all concerns the text-heavy Gloria and Credo movements. Whether free or cantus-firmus based, Glorias and Credos were often composed under constructivist compositional constraints that prevent the full declaiming of the text in a single voice. English solutions to this dilemma involve either truncating the text or else telescoping it so that different phrases are presented simultaneously in two or more voices. Scribes, especially continental scribes, often made a hash out of text underlay when they were confronted with these English texting practices. Curtis, who has made the study of these procedures a particular specialty over his career, has exercised great care in reporting and analyzing the

surviving underlay and arriving at a justifiable and workable solution for underlay in each individual movement.

The volume begins with an editor's Introduction that presents an overview of the edition's contents, observing principal features of style in each cycle and pair in turn so as to emphasize both the variety found amongst works of generally similar age and the implications these features bear for a chronology of stylistic change. This relatively brief but insightful discussion is followed by a more mundane but necessary report devoted to Editorial Methods and Notes on Performance. The Introduction is the only source of information about plainsong intonations,² the rationale for pairing movements, cantus-firmus layout and formal ground-plans, and proportional techniques. All of these topics deserve to be revisited in some form in the later commentary on each individual item. Repetition of this sort of data is no sin, and there is plenty of blank space on the pages devoted to editorial apparatus that could have been put to use. Minor redundancies of this sort only would have enhanced the independence and usefulness of the separate prefatory comments for each score.

Missing from the Introduction is any spelling-out of the process of selection of repertory for EECM 42, but the logic behind the process is not hard to deduce. For a start, it is necessary to adopt a pretty wide perspective and observe that whatever may lurk in the computers or card files of individual scholars, a publicly available classified inventory of all extant fifteenth-century northern European music is still a musicological pipedream even after well over a century of vigorous research. Happily, however, one subset of the fifteenth-century material, the surviving liturgical music of England from this era, recently has come to be more exhaustively catalogued than that of any other country. This positive state of affairs is due to the labours of Gareth Curtis and Andrew Wathey. Standing on the shoulders of a very considerable number of giants who over the course of the twentieth century have explored issues of English style and authorship in a host of attributed and anonymous compositions, Curtis and Wathey made an admirable attempt at full comprehensiveness in a published list they brought out in 1994 (hereafter C-W).³ The C-W list forms the basis of the new EECM initiative, whose extent will be defined by it, and 'publication will proceed, of the Mass-music in the first instance, in roughly chronological order' (p. v). Lists like this can never be declared closed, permanent and immutable. Indeed, the present edition emends certain decisions enshrined in

² Curtis gives four paragraphs (pp. xii–xiii) to the intonations, and speaks of the 'solutions adopted in this volume', but in fact, except for the Benet cycle, no. 1 in the edition, which survives with unique intonations in the sources, Curtis provides the same chant intonations for five of seven Glorias, all Credos, all Sanctus, and all Agnus, respectively.

³ Gareth Curtis and Andrew Wathey, 'Fifteenth-Century English Liturgical Music: A List of the Surviving Repertory', *Research Chronicle*, 27 (1994), 1–69. To the useful bibliography provided by Curtis and Wathey, I would add just three more recent, valuable contributions: Margaret Bent, 'A New Canonic Gloria and the Changing Profile of Dunstaple', *Plainsong and Medieval Music*, 5 (1996), 45–67; Andrew Kirkman, *The Three-Voice Mass in the Later Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries: Style, Distribution and Case Studies* (New York, 1995); and Andrew Kirkman and Dennis Slavin, eds., *Binchois Studies* (Oxford, 2000).

the C-W list, and Caldwell remarks in his Foreword that it is hoped some day to maintain an up-dated version of the C-W list online. By some curious decision, both information about previous editions and reference to the C-W list's repertory number for each item have been squirreled away in the footnotes to the Introduction. Here is more helpful information that could have been repeated with each set of individual commentary.

Chronology evidently was the next crucial element in the selection process for EECM 42. In the C-W list, drawing on a variety of biographical, source-critical and stylistic criteria, compositions are designated as belonging within one of three broad chronological 'bands'.⁴ Band I consists of those works judged to have been written anywhere from the beginning of the fifteenth century up to the end of the careers of John Dunstaple (*d.* 1453) and his younger contemporaries active into the mid-century, encompassing the music of the Old Hall manuscript, Leonel Power (*d.* 1445), John Benet (?*d.* 1458), lesser figures such as Blome (Bloym) and Driffelde, and anonymous works. Band II comprises the music of a younger mid-century generation, among whom the most representative figures we know by name include John Plummer, John Bedyngham, Richard Cox and Walter Frye. Band III, finally, incorporates the repertory of the Eton Choirbook and other sources of the last third of the century.

Given this picture, the best way to describe the ten items (comprising twenty-five individual movements) selected for EECM 42 is to say that these consist of the relevant Band I mass pairs and cycles of the C-W list not previously edited or else available only in rare, obscure, or older and less reliable editions. This immediately sets aside anything already published in the editions of the Old Hall manuscript or the complete works of Dunstaple and Power, as well as earlier volumes in the EECM series. What results is publication here from C-W Band I of five out of its eleven mass cycles and cycle fragments,⁵ two out of its nine Gloria-Credo pairs plus an additional composite pair,⁶ and two out of

⁴ Curtis elsewhere has done particularly valuable work in clarifying the various stylistic layers co-existing in the English mass music up to mid-century and assessing their chronological relationships. See his 'Stylistic Layers in the English Mass Repertory, c.1400-1450', *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, 109 (1982-83), 23-38.

⁵ Only the Credo of the anonymous 'Missing Choirbook' (or H6) cyclic mass fragments (C-W, M23 = Gloria, Credo, Sanctus) is sufficiently complete for inclusion. The remaining masses from Band I that one would like to see re-edited some day in a companion volume to EECM 42 in the same format, are the *Missa Rex seculorum* (C-W, M3 = Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, Agnus) attributed to Dunstaple and Leonel, the *Missa sine nomine* (C-W, M4 = Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, Agnus) attributed to Dunstaple, Leonel and Benet, and the *Missa Da gaudiorum premia* (C-W, M5 = Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus) attributed to Dunstaple, as well as the anonymous masses *Fuit homo* (C-W, M56 = Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, Agnus) and *Salve sancta parens* (C-W, M21 = Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, Agnus).

⁶ Curtis omits four Gloria-Credo pairs composited from movements in Old Hall, and two attributed to Dunstaple; he also omits the anonymous Band I Gloria-Credo pair *Herdo, Herdo* (C-W, GC13), presumably reflecting a rethinking either about its Englishness or about its style and age.

After the official lists of Gloria-Credo and Sanctus-Agnus pairs in C-W that are sanctified with a C-W list number, the authors provide additional lists of possible pairs (Curtis and Wathey, 49), proposing in this more tentative way the association of single movements given individual C-W numbers elsewhere in the list. Without exception these tentative pairs are all from Band I. Aside from the movements from the Old Hall manuscript, there are four additional Gloria-Credo pairs. Of these, Curtis has ended up editing all but three of their eight movements.

its five Sanctus-Agnus pairs.⁷ Five of these ten items have never previously been published, while three have been published only in part and two in full. The composers represented are Leonel Power, John Benet, Driffelde, Bloym, and anonymous. This is music primarily of the later 1420s and 1430s, spanning a stylistic range from works not far removed from the mainstream repertory of the Old Hall manuscript to those approaching the style of the post-Dunstaple generation. The order of presentation within EECM 42, with the cycles and the pairs in separate series, is itself chronological, following the more subtle criteria that Curtis articulates in the Introduction. This allows at least partial comparability with chronologically organized lists of early cantus-firmus masses published by Hamm and Strohm, which mostly agree with the broad Band I/Band II division proposed by Curtis and Wathey but differ in many particulars from the specific order of cycles found here.⁸

The criteria for inclusion, as I have discerned them, obviously are not guaranteed to result in a representative cross-section of styles and procedures. Nonetheless, the fact that nine of the ten items of EECM 42 are for three voices, and that five out of ten are based on cantus firmi, correlates well with the broader repertory. Moreover, the amount of free material in three voices reminds us that our standard textbook narratives are too often in a hurry to get to four-voice textures and to describe cantus-firmus procedures, or what in tandem we might call the 'Caput Mass syndrome', to the neglect of other possibilities. Further, the predominance here of strict cantus-firmus treatment (four out of five of the chant settings), where the same tenor, identical in melodic/rhythmic shape, appears in each movement, closely matches its prevalence among C-W Band I works as a whole. On the other hand, almost all but the most fragmentary cycles of Bands I and II have Kyries, while only one survives amongst the five cycle fragments of this volume.⁹ Most to be regretted is the fact that Leonel's *Alma redemptoris mater* mass, the most complete cycle fragment edited here and arguably the best music, lacks its Kyrie.¹⁰ As a final comment on representativeness I will observe that while recent discoveries of English sources have significantly enriched the

⁷ Curtis omits four Sanctus-Agnus pairs composited from movements in the Old Hall manuscript; he also omits the Band I Sanctus-Agnus pair attributed to Soursby (C-W, SA5), presumably again reflecting a rethinking either about its Englishness or about its style and age. Among the tentative pairs (see n. 6, above), and again setting aside Old Hall movements, there are an additional four possible Band I Sanctus-Agnus pairs (eight movements) not edited at this time.

⁸ Charles Hamm, 'A Catalogue of Anonymous English Music in Fifteenth-Century Continental Manuscripts', *Musica disciplina*, 22 (1968), 47-76 at 70-3; and Reinhard Strohm, *The Rise of European Music 1380-1500* (Cambridge, 1993), 230.

⁹ All three cycles attributed to Dunstaple have Kyries, as do the four masses of EECM 22 (ed. Bent) and as do three or possibly four out of the five masses of EECM 34 (ed. Curtis). See also Kirkman, *Three-Voice Mass*, 152-62, on Kyries in fifteenth-century English cyclic masses.

¹⁰ This circumstance is made up for in part by the one surviving Kyrie, which belongs to another cycle, on *Alma redemptoris mater* (this edition, no. 5). The two cycles have an interesting kinship based on their shared cantus firmus. The masses use different rhythmicizations of the antiphon, but both use only the first half of the plainchant (up through the word 'populo'), and both divide the melody in half again with a strong point of articulation on the first syllable of 'porta'.

repertory of Dunstaple and his generation, only one English source, and that not a 'new' one, contributes to the repertory of EECM 42. This is the luck of the draw, so to speak, but it should alert users of this volume to the danger of over-generalizing from its small sample.

Given that Curtis has edited relatively little-known works, I am troubled that he not only downplays their previous editions, but also foregoes mentioning the existence of any other relevant secondary literature, to the detriment of our (and sometimes his) understanding of how some pieces operate. I will cite two instances from the cyclic tenor masses. In this edition, item no. 4 consists of two movements (Gloria and Sanctus) of a mass based on a cantus firmus that employs both the respond and the verse of *Jacet granum*, a Matins and processional responsory from the rhymed office for St Thomas of Canterbury.¹¹ The Sanctus bears an attribution to 'Bonnet' or possibly 'Bonnum' in the index to the Aosta manuscript, and Trowell's cautious attribution of this mass to John Benet has been taken up by scholars including Reinhard Strohm, John Caldwell and Jean-Marc Evans.¹² The volume under review already has two items by Benet (nos. 1 and 7). Furthermore, another independent mass movement attributed to Benet, a Sanctus (C-W, S59), is built on *Jacet granum*. Under the circumstances, silence on the possibility of this additional attribution is puzzling. The mass is interesting for its use of both respond and verse as cantus firmus, rather than just one or the other,¹³ and it is important as an early example (the only instance in EECM 42) of that kind of cantus-firmus usage in the cyclic mass where the chant is lightly paraphrased and differently rhythmicized in each statement.

The Driffelde Sanctus-Agnus pair is another instance where the secondary literature has a contribution to make that Curtis does not take into account. Concerning the cantus firmus, he says in the Introduction that the two movements 'incorporate, between them, various parts of the responsory *Regnum mundi*' (p. x), and he describes the cantus firmus as 'considerably modified and cut'

¹¹ The only previous editions of this mass to my knowledge, neither of which I have actually seen, are found in Brian Trowell, 'Music under the Later Plantagenets', Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge (1960); and Jean-Marc Evans, 'The Mass Music of John Benet: a Transcription and Critical Appraisal', M.A. diss., University of London (1994). For further bibliography, see n. 12, below.

¹² See Brian Trowell, 'Some English Contemporaries of Dunstable', *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, 81 (1954-5), 77-92; *idem*, 'Benet, John', *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (1980), 2:481-2; *idem*, 'Benet, John', *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, rev. edn, *Personenteil 2* (1999), 1096-9; *idem*, 'Benet, John', *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, rev. edn (2001), 3:250; John Caldwell, *The Oxford History of English Music, I: From the Beginnings to c. 1715* (Oxford, 1991), 145, n. 79; Strohm, *Rise of European Music*, 230; Evans, 'A Unique Cantus Firmus Usage in a 15th-Century English Mass Movement', *Early Music*, 26 (1998), 469-77 at 470, 473-4 and n. 5. Evans, in fact, announces his forthcoming edition of these movements as part of a complete works edition of Benet for Antico Edition.

¹³ In a slight slip, Curtis (p. 57) describes the Sanctus as using only the respond, but in fact it uses the verse as well. Elsewhere, Evans has discovered the treble paraphrase of the respond and verse of *Jacet granum*, laid out twice in full, in an anonymous Gloria edited in Dunstaple's complete works. Contrary to Evans ('Unique Cantus Firmus Usage', 473), I do not find the EECM 42 movements' version of the cantus firmus to be the same as in the anonymous Gloria, or that the EECM 42 settings state the cantus firmus twice in full.

(p. 132) by comparison with the reading in the *Antiphonale sarisburiense*. In fact, the situation is much simpler than that. What put me on the scent is that I edited an earlier discant setting of this responsory in which the verse, *Eructavit cor meum*, is set in polyphony, but not the respond.¹⁴ That proves to be the case here as well. In fact, there is a widely known Agnus composition based on the *Eructavit* melody, and Driffelde's setting is surely a deliberate nod to it.¹⁵ (In Trent 92, the first twenty bars of the Agnus tenor are even underlaid with the text of the verse, 'Eructavit cor meum' etc.) There is a much less widely distributed monophonic Sanctus 'super Regnum mundi',¹⁶ and although it is virtually unknown from British sources, the possibility remains that Driffelde, or who ever confected the Sanctus, had in mind this fact. Nonetheless, the cantus firmus is *Eructavit*. In the responsory chant, the incipits of the respond and verse are identical, but the continuation of the cantus firmus follows the contours of the verse, not the respond, and that having been recognized, Driffelde's cantus firmus corresponds very well with versions in Sarum chant sources. Curtis may have been misled (by a textual incipit for the tenor in both sources of the Sanctus, where it is labelled 'Regnum mundi') to expect the use of the melody of the respond, but that is not the case. The cantus firmus is laid out twice in each movement, a standard double cursus in triple and duple time, with the perfectly normal omission of the cantus firmus from the Pleni and the second Agnus, and with the block repetition of the first Osanna for the second. It is further the case that the two movements share identical polyphony in the sections based on the cantus firmus. In all likelihood the Agnus setting was made first, and the Sanctus was derived from it. We do not have in this instance a linked pair where Sanctus sets the respond and Agnus sets the corresponding verse.¹⁷

In his Introduction to EECM 42 Curtis devotes more space to numerical planning and proportional techniques than to any other single issue, confronting us directly with the 'bewildering array of evidence [for] the ingenious constructivism which lay at the intellectual and aesthetic heart of [this] music' (p. xi). Cantus-firmus settings of the strict type most readily invite exploration of their design, because so much will be stable from movement to movement, and this reviewer succumbed to the inevitable temptation to do a little counting, restricting himself to the anonymous *Requiem eternam* and *Alma redemptoris mater* masses. Not unex-

¹⁴ See Frank Ll. Harrison, Ernest H. Sanders, and Peter M. Lefferts, eds. *English Music for Mass and Offices*, Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century, XVI (Paris and Monaco, 1983), no. 87. In this piece, the doxology is also set in English discant.

¹⁵ David Hiley, 'Ordinary of Mass Chants in English, North French and Sicilian Manuscripts', *Journal of the Plainsong & Mediaeval Music Society*, 9 (1986), 1–128 at 115 (Vatican IX = Schildbach 114). An earlier setting of this plainchant in English discant is Harrison, Sanders and Lefferts, *English Music for Mass and Offices*, no. 66.

¹⁶ Hiley, 'Ordinary of Mass Chants', 102 (Thannabauer 99).

¹⁷ See also Brian Trowell, 'Driffelde', *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (1980), 5:635; Peter Wright, 'Driffelde', *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, rev. edn, *Personenteil* 5 (2001), 1430; and Roger Bowers, 'Driffelde', *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, rev. edn (2001), 7:595, who all identify the tenor as the responsory verse only. Wright observes that the contrafaction of the Agnus into the Sanctus might have been undertaken by a continental musician.

pectedly, small discrepancies emerged between my numbers and those of the editor. In the fully scored sections of *Requiem eternam* (alternating *tempus perfectum* and *tempus imperfectum* as O, C, O) Curtis records lengths of 160, 120 and 48 semibreves (p. x), where I find lengths of 160, 118 and 49 semibreves. (Both of us omit the final long but count the first note of bar 54 of each extant movement.) I trust my numbers but recognize that they do not parse into neat proportions. By making slight adjustments to them of one or two semibreves, one can arrive at Curtis's 160, 120 and 48 (total: 328), which relate as $8 \times (20:15:6)$, or $8 \times (4:3) + 8 \times (5:2)$. By a slightly different tweaking of the numbers through addition of a single semibreve, however, one can also come up with 161, 119, 49 (total: 329) semibreves, representing $7 \times (23:17:7)$. The latter set, not further reducible to small whole number ratios, is less attractive to Pythagoreans, I suppose, but it nonetheless offers a provocative further list of numbers to check for in the details of the designs of *Requiem eternam*.

In the fully scored sections of the anonymous *Alma redemptoris mater* movements (O, C), Curtis records lengths of 64 and 112 semibreves (p. x). He means 'breves', but in any case the numbers are 64 and 104. (Here, I concur with Curtis in including notes at the ends of sections and also final longs.) This recounting forces replacement of Curtis's ratio $16 \times 4:7$ with something not necessarily any more attractive, namely $8 \times (8:13)$, but note that a conversion to semibreves ($3 \times 64 + 2 \times 104 = 192 + 208 = 400$ semibreves) ultimately gives a satisfactory square number total ($20 \times 20 = 400$) in the fully scored bars. Bewildering? Yes. Ingenious? Yes. Definitive? Not yet. But we cannot expand our sense of the possible and probable in numerical and proportional design without having beautifully edited scores to pore over, such as those in EECM 42, which I am sure have more than a few more constructivist secrets to yield up.

As the last topic of this review, I will briefly survey the five edited mass pairs, which offer the whole gamut of problems raised by such couplings, whether conjoined in the original sources or only in modern editions. One, item no. 8 (Driffelde's Sanctus-Agnus, discussed above), nowhere survives in a fifteenth-century source as a pair, but its movements are decisively linked by a cantus firmus and shared counterpoint. On the other hand, items no. 6 (Bloym, Gloria-Credo) and no. 9 (anonymous, Sanctus-Agnus) are pairs that were scribally joined, but they are musically unconvincing as a pair in each instance (p. x); Curtis generously edits them together anyway. John Benet's Gloria, no. 7, has an embarrassment of riches, with two musically related Credos. It is scribally paired with one of these (call it Credo I) in both a continental and an English source. Credo II, nowhere scribally paired with this Gloria, nonetheless starts with the same head-motif and has the same modality, but is notated up a fifth, with a final on G rather than on C. Further, it survives immediately before Credo I in Trent 93/90. Curtis, appropriately and again generously, edits both Credos.

In the case of the fifth and final pair (Gloria-Credo), a pair of disputed authorship and nationality and therefore relegated to an unnumbered Appendix, Curtis

not only rejects outright the witness of a scribal pairing of the Credo with another Gloria (in manuscript BL) but also declines to include the editorially rejected Gloria movement, C-W G73, which is likely to be English (and so we have an instance where I wish he had been more generous).¹⁸ Instead, he makes an association that the extant fifteenth-century codices do not, bringing the Credo together in an entirely convincing match with a Gloria that is its stylistic twin. Whether these two movements are English is open to dispute. The Gloria is credited to Binchois,¹⁹ and the musically related Credo is multiply attributed to Anglicus and J. Bodoil. Harmonically and contrapuntally, their language is English, rich in parallel motion and imperfect consonances, but the repetition of rhythmic-melodic motifs, the scoring (two high voices of equal range over an equally active tenor whose register is a fifth below), the unusual texture (in short phrases *a 2* or *a 3* alternating blocks of homo-declamation with strict or nearly identical canonic entrances driving to cadences), and the resultant spacing of the voices, are all *sui generis*. If English, these two movements would virtually have to be a unique stylistic experiment in writing for the mass from around the time of the repertory of the main body of Old Hall, and no later. Or, they could embody a continental interpretation of English style. Curtis's assignment of the works to an appendix seems perfectly justifiable.

This volume is, for all my small quibbles, an auspicious start to a very desirable project. It is, after all, the leading historiographical paradigm for music in fifteenth-century northern Europe that there was a rebirth of music in the 1430s and 1440s, centred in mass and motet, taking place under English leadership, and moving towards a stylistic fusion of continental elements with a novel English language in new English genres (antiphon-motet and cyclic tenor mass). Rebirth or no, English music swept through Europe, and because very few sources of music survive from England, France and the Low Countries from this era, many hundreds of English compositions are known primarily or exclusively on account of their survival in clusters of English works in manuscript collections assembled in Central Europe and Italy. Most of this enormous body of material has never been published, and we have long needed a boost of many orders of magnitude in accessibility to it. In the late 1980s and 1990s, a particularly apt model for what is needed was provided by Garland Publishing in their sets of full scores of sixteenth-century Italian madrigals, French chansons and Latin motets, each appearing in a projected thirty-volume series.²⁰ Early English Church Music, known over the decades as a primary venue for editions of sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century polyphony, is a natural home for a project of

¹⁸ Moreover, one learns this from the Introduction (p. xi), but not from the critical apparatus (p. 161).

¹⁹ Binchois is identified as the composer in BL. Peter Wright describes this as a 'dubious' Binchois attribution in his 'Binchois and England: Some Questions of Style, Influence, and Attribution in his Sacred Works', in Kirkman and Slavin, eds., *Binchois Studies*, 87–118 at 104.

²⁰ Jessie Ann Owens, *The Italian Madrigal in the Sixteenth Century*, 30 vols. (New York, 1987–); Jane A. Bernstein, *The Sixteenth-Century Chanson*, 30 vols. (New York, 1987–); Richard Sherr, ed., *The Sixteenth-Century Motet*, 30 vols. (New York, 1987–).

earlier focus that will be of a size comparable to one of the Garland sets.²¹ When this project reaches fruition, scholars and performers will finally be in a position to reliably assay the repertory and take the full measure of English accomplishments in sacred polyphony in the 1400s.

PETER M. LEFFERTS

²¹ Twenty-five mass movements were edited in EECM 42, and I estimate in round numbers that there are an additional 150 single movements to edit from C-W, Band I (among which those least known are some forty-five Kyries) and 300 individual movements and movements from cycles to edit from Bands II and III. In addition to polyphony for the Mass Ordinary, the C-W list itemizes over 600 other settings of liturgical texts.