

INTRODUCTION TO INSTALMENT 6

This instalment of the Trent 89 edition presents most of the Magnificat settings from the manuscript, and also the remaining pieces therein apart from secular works and likely contrafacta of secular pieces. Most of the works following the Magnificats here are therefore miscellaneous chant settings and Vespers hymn settings.

Out of the fifteen Magnificats in Trent 89, four particularly stand out as examples of high quality work. Firstly, the Tone I Magnificat on ff. 394v-396r is significant in view of its modern-looking four-voice texture and likely quotation of a little secular material. However, this piece is given in the Trent 91 edition since it seems to be part of an anonymous composer group which is largely contained in that manuscript.¹ Secondly, the Tone IV setting no. 62 is equally noteworthy since it abounds in imitative invention, melodic sequence and detailed rhythmic work. This could well be a work of Touront in view of similarities to other works that are attributable to him.² Thirdly, I cite the Touront Tone VI setting (no. 75) which is only represented in Trent 89 by a small phrase copied at the end of the manuscript. This too is full of imitative and sequential devices, and it may have spawned imitations. Fourth, the well-distributed Dufay Tone III/IV setting no. 67 is outstanding because of its clear harmonies and elegant trio sections.

The remainder of the Trent 89 Magnificats have been individually if briefly described in my article ‘Regional styles and works...’, in which I also argued that the Touront Tone VI setting (or at least something quite like it) may have set off a series of imitations that are mostly in Trent 89. I will return to these pieces shortly, because one barrier to investigation of them is the non-standardisation of their parent material. In the fifteenth-century Empire there were two sets of Magnificat Tones in use: the normal ‘Roman’ ones and a second set of Germanic-variant Tones. These were described by Carl-Heinz Illing in his 1936 book and given in tabular form, but unfortunately Illing’s examples did not give individual variant tone terminations.³ His set of Roman formulas is extremely useful though, because this deviates in detail from the sanitised Solesmes Magnificat Tones - which often do not compare well with fifteenth- and sixteenth-century settings using the same basic material. This is not the place to revise or to attempt to improve upon Illing’s work, nor to attempt complete coverage of the Germanic-variant Tones. Suffice it to say that some of the settings in the following pages seem to call for variants of the Germanic-variant Tones, so a comprehensive study of how this parent material originated will have to wait. Details of the Tone of each individual setting are given in the critical commentary.

Typical Superius-paraphrase Magnificat settings by Dufay, Binchois, Anthonius Janue and others in the 1430-1455 period tend to move within restricted stylistic means. Generally the Trent 89 settings show something of a departure from previous restrictions by relying more on free invention than older settings. In fact, a few of the Trent 89 settings hardly refer to their parent material at all (see nos 64, 73 and 74) while verse 4 of no. 74 has upper parts which invert the F A C opening of Tone V. For the sake of conciseness here I confine myself to the outstanding features of particular pieces in the following pages. Touront’s Tone VI setting has a clear imitation in the Tone VI setting that follows it in Strahov (ff. 296v-298v) which is a decidedly clumsy

¹ See Instalment 6 of the Trent 91 edition, no. 118 (pp. 820-826).

² The ‘Sicut locutus’ opening resembles the ‘Cum sancto’ from the Gloria of Touront’s *Missa Sine nomine II*. Also, the imitative duet passage on the ‘Sicut erat ad placitum’ (measures 170-179) has a counterpart in the Credo of the abovementioned Mass at 59-64. The small values in imitation at 51-54 in the ‘Fecit potentiam’ are similar to imitative small-value passages in *O dulcis Jhesu memoria*, which is probably Touront’s work. Lastly, the syncopated passage in the ‘ad placitum’ verse at 161-164 perhaps finds a parallel in Touront’s *Sine nomine II* Kyrie at 73-78. Given these detailed resemblances it is hard to avoid the conclusion that points to a common composer, although the irregular pre-cadential measures in this Magnificat (i.e. at 31-33 and at the end) are not typical of Touront.

³ Illing, Carl-Heinz, Zur Technik der Magnificat-Komposition des 16. Jahrhundert (Kieler Beiträge zur Musikwissenschaft 3, Kallmeyer, Wolfenbüttel, 1936) p. 22.

piece of mimicry.⁴ Likewise, the Tone I setting no. 63 and the possibly incomplete no. 64 in this instalment seem to take the Touront Tone VI setting as a cue for further sequential and asymmetrical musical experiments. Both of these probably had German-variant formulas as their basis, and neither of these settings are distinguished pieces although the Tone I setting has some interesting textures.⁵ Both nos 63 and 64 may be the work of a single composer, and both are entered next to each other in Trent 89 by one of the subsidiary scribes. The Tone VI setting no. 66 also seems to be a fairly feeble imitation of the Touront Tone VI setting's sequential and imitative style. The first half of its *Superius* verse has a *Superius* based on a single and repeated ascending musical idea. The Tone VIII setting no. 68, in contrast, is a much cleaner-sounding piece and may be another Touront setting in view of its stylistic resemblances to no. 62 and because of its bass-like *Contra*.⁶

Now I come to the more independently written settings. The Tone VI setting no. 65 is decidedly individual since its six verses are made up as follows. The *Superius* is the same in the second set of three verses as it is for the first three, but the lower parts differ. This is not accomplished without some awkward writing, particularly in the four-part verses since two inner voices double a suspension at 185-186. The *Superius* also makes internal cadence-points at pitches which are not part of the parent material, and in general the melodic style of this setting is similar to the *Sendliche pein* Tenorlied which precedes it in Trent 89. Both works could possibly be the work of a single composer.

A different varied-repeat scheme is used by the Tone V setting no. 69, in which verses 2 / 8 and 6 / 12 largely use the same music. This is a modern-sounding setting with a bass-like *Contra* and an equal second *Discantus* in the four-part verses and verse 10. It is also unusual in that its verse 4 is set as a *Duo* for the two outermost voices. While it is not free of contrapuntal slips, this is an attractive setting and differences from the works discussed so far may indicate that it is the work of another westerner who was resident in the German lands. A fragment of what may be a Tone VI setting in a similar style (no. 70) could be the work of the same anonymous composer.

I have already mentioned that there appear to be a master and pupil (or master and imitator) situation regarding Touront's Tone VI setting and the following *Magnificat* in Strahov. Perhaps the same applies to the two Tone VIII settings nos 71 and 72, since they are copied together and the second setting here is short and undistinguished. The first of these two settings is not unlike the Tone VI setting no. 65 due to its slightly dissonant partwriting. Both of these Tone VIII *Magnificats* have hybrid cadences in their four-part verses.

Two further *Magnificats* here are both Tone V settings, but these are very different from each other. The three-part setting no. 73 hardly uses its parent material at all, and extends the verse 10 text slightly ('Abraham, *Isaac et Jacob* et semini eius') probably for musical reasons in order to text some unison imitation. This shortwinded setting seems to have something of a popular and cheerful tone. In contrast, the five-voice setting no. 74 is another *Magnificat* that uses varied repeats. Once more the first three even-numbered verses strongly influence the music of the second three (verses 2/8 and 4/10 are almost the same, but the first halves of verses 6 and 12 differ). Full of archaic cadences, unison imitation and also with occasional consecutive octaves, this setting

⁴ Published in van Benthem, J. (ed), Johannes Touront vol. 4. Ascribed and attributable compositions in 15th-century sources from Central Europe (Utrecht, 2019) pp. 9-13. The editor's foreword outlines the main faults in this setting.

⁵ No. 63 here is quite similar to the Trent 91 Tone I *Magnificat* published in Trent 91 Instalment 1, no. 7, which also has just one metrically irregular cadence. But even here two different variants of Germanic-version Tone I may be in use. In the latter setting, ascent to B in the first half of the tone formula rather than C is clearly in use since an extended-value *cantus firmus* passage gives its parent material with B. In no. 63, five out of six *Superius* openings begin with ascents to C soon after their openings (implying that a Tone I formula with a first-half ascent to C may have been paraphrased). Similarly, the Tone V setting no. 69 seems to call for a Roman-version Tone V formula that uses B flats. This too is non-standard.

⁶ See the critical commentary to nos 62 and 68 for details of resemblances between these works and also the Touront setting no. 75.

may not be as old as its motet-like texture suggests. It may have some connection with the similar-sounding canonic and six part *Benedicta sit* published in Instalment 5.⁷

Apart from this last piece, the Tone V setting no. 69 and the works which might be by Touront, most of these Magnificat settings may be central-European or Germanic. Strahov is the only source which gives concordances for some of them, and many of its readings seem to be unreliable. I do urge that Teutonic Latin pronunciation should be used in performance of most of these settings; one thing that I have particularly noticed is that Trent 89 tends to spell 'e-ius' as 'ei-us'. Consequently, pronunciation here would probably differ from Latin as it is taught today.

.....

A second set of pieces in this instalment (nos 76-88 and the Appendix items 127-135) makes up a set of Magnificat antiphons and *suffragia* suitable for various feasts and occasions. All are duple-meter Superius paraphrases and a study of SP B80 by Christopher Reynolds suggested that the Trento copies may descend from copies brought back from Rome after Friedrich III's Imperial coronation.⁸ Neither Trent 89 nor SP B80 gives the complete set of these little pieces, and is it at least as likely that the Trento copies emanate from an earlier exemplar passing through from the north on its way to Italy. Perhaps the original set of pieces was expanded at some point by the addition of a *Da pacem* setting with an embellished Superius (see Appendix no. 131) and also by the SP B80 items *Veni sponsa Christi* no. 128 (which appears to be quite an inept piece), *O doctor optime* no. 129 (which has a different range from the rest of these settings) plus *O quam metuendus* no. 132 (which is the only one of these settings that ends with a cadential drive). I also suspect that maybe only the grandest of musical centres could afford to have polyphony sung for Magnificat antiphons as well as Magnificats, but questions remain about where the original nucleus of this set of works came from. Firstly, they do not appear to follow the text variations nor the local variants of either the Cambrai or Ferrara usages, and several of the parent chants simply do not appear in the 1519 Passau Antiphonal print. Secondly, it is also unlikely that the chant models for most of them were local to Rome since most of the reasonably close versions to their chants that I cite in the critical commentary are from northern chant sources. It is also of interest that both readings for no. 87 (*Prudentes virgines*) give different endings. The SP B80 ending is shorter than the Trento version, which - despite its garbled state - may be closer to the original. It is highly likely that many of these short settings are the work of a single anonymous, perhaps working in the 1440s or early 1450s since the filler-part textures of these works are quite developed (see *Petrus apostolus* no. 76, measures 14-21 for some accidentalism). The multiplication of these short settings could also equally well result from pupils learning to imitate their teacher(s).

.....

Nos 89 (*Salve festa dies*) and 90 (*Asperges*) and the two *Novus annus hodie* settings that follow in this instalment are like so many other short pieces in the Trent Codices, being either copied as mere page-fillers or as part of a small nest of hymns and cantiones between more extended works.⁹ Similarly, nos 93-95 are

⁷ Instalment 5, no. 56. In fact, some of the upper-voice writing in this Tone V Magnificat could be described as pseudo-canonic.

⁸ Reynolds, C., 'The Origins of San Pietro B 80 and the Development of a Roman Sacred Repertory' in *EMH* 1 (1981) pp. 257-304.

⁹ *Asperges* no. 90 and *O gloriosa et laudabilis* no. 97 are the only works in this instalment with likely links to secular repertory. No. 90 may have been written by somebody who knew one of the versions of the Binchois *Asperges* settings, and its opening Superius motive may allude to the start of Binchois's *Comme femme*. Likewise, the first six measures of the Superius of no. 97 seem to give a reference to the start of Frye's famous *Ave Regina celorum*.

found within a group of hymns in Trent 89 (at 177r-184r) but no. 93 is a short Sequence setting, 94 is a Latinised leise, and 95 seems to be paraliturgical. No. 94 (*Christus surrexit*) is merely a very extended duet with a few four-part progressions at the end, and may be the work of the ‘Philippus’ who composed the *Missa Hilf und gib rat* in view of the extended and imitative duet work involved. The same sort of duet writing is found in the latter Mass. No. 95 (*Ecce panis angelorum*) is an isolated verse from the Sequence *Lauda Syon Salvatorem*, and this since isolated verse also occurs in the Neumarkt Cationale (on f. 156v) it may have been used for Elevation of the Host at Mass. There is another setting of this text in Trent 89 (no. 103 in the Trent 91 edition) which is for three equal voices. This appears in the Trent 91 edition because it is very similar to a three-voice *Benedicamus* setting in Trent 91.

Regarding the two Aspersion antiphon settings which occur together in Trent 89 (*Vidi aquam* nos 98 and 99) these seem to characterise a trait which I have found elsewhere in this repertory. Namely that the three-voice setting with filler Contra (no. 99) is a more self-assured and competent piece than its four-voice counterpart. This is probably because three parts with a filler Contratenor was a stylistic norm by 1450 whereas some four-part exercises up to that date (and perhaps beyond) seem a little halting and tentative. But it seems that in the German-speaking world some composers even had difficulties with standard three-voice texture. Hence perhaps the rather awkward writing in Sequence settings nos 102 and 103. In contrast, the Sequence setting no. 101 (*Victime paschali*) is a rather homophonic setting which does not follow alternatim order properly. While this is a charming and effective piece, this too contains hybrid cadences in four-part texture and halts in one voice to avoid consecutive octaves. I suspect that all of the Sequence settings nos 101-103 are non-western in origin.

The hymn settings in Trent 89 have largely remained unexplored territory for three reasons. Firstly, study of their parent chants has been impeded until recent years by a prejudice that fourteenth- and fifteenth-century versions of well-known hymn melodies are somewhat inferior merely because they sometimes contain a few extra notes compared with earlier medieval originals. The old Solesmes call “ad fontes!” - let us remember - tended to apply to the earliest reformed versions of chants available, with the antiquarian conviction that such examples were somehow ‘pure’ and ‘Gregorian’ when compared with developed plainsongs. Secondly, hymn settings are very much a forgotten part of fifteenth-century studies because close study of them remains uncommon.¹⁰ The third reason for lack of attention to the Trent 89 hymns is that the variants of chants which they use are sometimes rather hard to find, tending to be present in central European sources that were not well-explored until the start of the internet era. Sometimes not even the versions in Bruno Stäblein’s extensive hymn chant catalogue match the Trent paraphrases convincingly. Therefore, to complete this instalment I have had at my fingertips readily available sources from Poland, Germany, the Netherlands, Austria and Denmark - something which no previous generation of English or U.S. musicologists could easily achieve.

Before I embark on descriptions of these hymn settings, I list another impediment here in that performers have only rarely recorded any full hymn setting in alternatim performance. In recent years it has been more common to record a ‘kaleidoscopic’ version of chant settings like those of *Pange lingua* with different settings used for each verse of text. This seems unhistorical, although authoritative sources like ModB and CS 15 present scoring schemes for Dufay hymns involving either the alternation of fauxbourdon and three normal parts, or the alternation of those two elements plus chant verses. I also note from the way that some of the Trent 89 hymns are copied that consistent alternatim performance with polyphony following chant or vice versa may

¹⁰ Apart from the notable and well-used publications by Kanazawa and Ward cited frequently in the critical commentary here, I also wish to draw attention to the following studies. Robb, S., To Begin, Continue and Complete: Music in the Wider Context of Artistic Patronage by Pope Alexander VI (1492-1503) and the Hymn Cycle on CS 15 (Ph. D. dissertation, Manchester, 2011). Phelps, M. A Repertory in Exile: Pope Eugene IV and the ms Modena, Biblioteca Estense Universitaria, a.X.1.11 (Ph. D. dissertation, New York University, 2008), and ‘Du Fay’s Hymn Cycle and Papal Liturgy during the Pontificate of Eugene IV’ in MD LIV (2009) pp. 75-118. Dean, J., The Scribes of the Sistine Chapel, 1501-1527 (Ph. D. dissertation, Chicago University, 1984).

not have been universal. For example, in *Aurea luce* on f. 175v (no. 106) parts of verses 1 and 6 are underlaid to the Superius. Likewise in *Ave maris stella* no. 126 one scribe has written extra text despite the original scribe giving Superius underlay. Such alterations mean that sometimes we simply cannot be sure what was originally intended.

All scores of hymn settings in this instalment have been given full text underlay. While there are examples of quite careful three- or four- line Superius texting in hymns Strahov and Berlin 40021, I am not aware of any earlier fifteenth-century examples where the same amount of text has been carefully applied to lower voices. In one or two settings with non-imitative lower voices, perhaps such lower voices could easily be vocalised. But in settings where there is a moderate amount of imitation and some use of same-pitch repeated values I think it likely that lower voices in such settings were sung with text. Perhaps not as fastidiously as in some of my editorial underlay, but the intention to text all voices in imitative and syllabic music was probably present. At the same time I find it quite easy to envisage performances of one or two of the lesser-known hymns in this instalment where the singers perhaps did not know the text properly or discreetly ad-libbed their way through lower parts. My versions try to give an ideal rendering of each setting from which performers may take elements away...if they dare to. Perhaps the composers of some of these settings left it for arrangers to develop the lower parts for singing with text if this was desired.

There are of course several ways to look at these pieces, and to attempt to answer the question of provenance only the following items amongst the Trent 89 hymn settings show no sign of Germanic or central European origins: nos 105, 113, 115, 117, 121, 122 and 125a (the latter is by Dufay). For the rest of these settings, my critical commentary shows that Germanic chant variants and connections with similar pieces that use Germanic chants are involved. Therefore only half a dozen out of the 23 settings presented here have no detectable links with German sources, and even no. 105 has a secondary text that would have been used at Trento for its patron saint Vigilus.

Another common way to look at such pieces is so describe how their parent chants are used. Twelve settings use Superius-based chant, and one of these (no. 111) uses long-note technique in the Superius with active lower voices. Five settings treat their hymn melodies in migrant fashion. Another five have Tenors that elaborate the chants concerned in varying degrees, and just one (no. 120) has an unelaborated Tenor cantus firmus. Apart from no. 111 (which is probably part of the large anonymous chant-setting complex in Trent 91) no. 120 can be singled out as a particularly forward-looking setting whose texture is quite like that of later Tenorlieder. Likewise, one of the migrant settings (*Veni creator* a 4, no. 121) is modern-looking in texture and is not too different from settings found in sources from around 1500. However, not all attempts at four-part texture with chant elements in more than one voice were so successful; *Ave maris stella* no. 126 is an elaborated Tenor cantus firmus setting which clearly has partwriting deficiencies.

The elaborated Tenor settings are quite varied. *Sanctorum meritis* no. 124 has twin Discantus voices in a motet-like texture, and the *Christe redemptor* setting no. 122 presents the opposite pole of style options with its utter simplicity. Settings no. 109 and 116 incorporate the speed of the Tenor's triple-meter phrases with the surrounding voices. However the greatest variety within a single type of chant treatment is in the Superius paraphrase settings. These range from the succinct *Ave maris stella* setting no. 104 with its filler Contratenor (probably quite an old piece by 1460) to the highly elaborate no. 111 which sets the same chant. In between these two outermost style points are a variety of attractive settings with filler Contratenors such as *Pange lingua* no. 117 and the extended and dense four-part *Urbs beata* setting no. 118. Some of the duple rhythm settings such as nos 113 and 119 maintain a reasonable level of rhythmic activity, but perhaps the simplest duple setting in rhythmic and harmonic terms is *Aurea luce* no. 115 - which hardly goes beyond early 1430's Dufay with its successions of first inversion progressions.

This brings us to the way in which some hymn settings seem to have been transmitted. We have already seen that chant settings other than hymns sometimes survive merely as page-fillers in large manuscripts or as little nests of pieces. Individual hymn settings were also transmitted by monastic personnel, perhaps because a single setting sometimes served a specific local purpose where a small imported book of neatly-copied

settings with no local connections might not. Dufay's *Ad cenam agni* has therefore survived in its original plus the original fauxbourdon version (which are probably both the work of Dufay) and has also survived in the quite different Trent 89 fauxbourdon version (no. 125b) plus two peripheral-looking readings now at Cividale and Merseburg. Both of these give the Superius and Tenor but neither will work properly with a fauxbourdon voice added. Perhaps the Trent 89 125b version results from a second composer reworking the piece to make a fauxbourdon setting when he did not have access to the Dufay fauxbourdon version in ModB. The two peripheral readings seem to be ideal examples of extended transmission, with the users possibly being people culturally remote from the traditions and circumstances surrounding the original Dufay setting.¹¹

I will not attempt to mention every piece in my hymn section here, and it will be for readers and users to explore this marvellously varied repertory with its share of excellent compositions (my favourites are nos 109, 111 and 116) as well as more mediocre pieces. Meanwhile I have one criticism of some of these hymn settings and the four-part pieces in cut-C which precede them, notably *Salve festa dies* no. 100, *Urbs beata* no. 118, and the hymn settings nos 112 and 114. All of these duple settings are rather mechanically composed, with their dense textures consisting of different successions of formulaic constructs and sometimes ineffective handling of dissonance. But perhaps a good vocal ensemble will make something of such pieces, so I would not want to condemn these settings before others have tried to use or enjoy them. Almost finally, I have worked on these settings for a number of years in the hope that they will be used, and not sit on library bookshelves like so many hard-bound complete editions. The work that I have put into their texting and chant versions is behind that intention, since so many published versions of hymns and other chant settings often leave performers wondering where to find things like even-numbered verses, doxologies, and chant versions that match the polyphony sufficiently.

It remains for me to summarise all information on suggested anonymous groups of pieces in Trent 89 that I have given, since this is the last instalment of this edition dealing with chant settings.¹²

1. *Ex Codicis II / I* nos 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 13 and 14 (a probable set of insular-looking Marian Propers plus a *Hec dies* and a *Regina celi* setting).
2. *Ex Codicis II / I* nos 8-12 (the Missa *Ad voces pares*) and Instalment 5 nos 29a/b (Missa *Caput*).
3. *Ex Codicis II / II* nos 12 and 13 (a Kyrie and Gloria), plus no. 5 (*Spiritus Domini*) and possibly *Sancta genitrix* (Instalment 5 no. 53).
4. Instalment 1 nos 2 and 5 (two Masses with lied cantus firmus) plus possibly the Missa *Grune linden* in Trent 88. See the critical notes to Instalment 1 for other works in Strahov which might belong to the same group.
5. Instalment 2 nos 8-11 (works using 02 which may all be the work of a single person) plus the motet *Advenisti / Lauda Syon* in Trent 88.
6. Instalment 2 nos 12 & 13 (the Missa *Fa Ut* and its related Kyrie in Strahov). Both may be by Touront.
7. Instalment 5 nos 34 and 36 (two four-voice motets with probable insular connections).

¹¹ It is therefore all the more surprising that the host volume of Merseburg (a Bible concordance) may have come from Cambrai, where Dufay lived in his later years.

¹² For those unfamiliar with earlier instalments in this series, it should come as no surprise at all that manuscripts with large numbers of sacred works like Trent 89 and Trent 91 (and indeed Trent 88) contain a certain quantity of works which remain anonymous but look and sound genuinely similar to each other, either because of the likelihood of a common composer for each individual group or because one musician was imitating the works of another.

8. Instalment 5 no. 47 (the *Salve Regina* misattributed to “Wilhelmus Duffay” in Mu 3154) plus nos 100 and 118 in the present instalment.
9. Instalment 5 no. 56 (*Benedicta sit*) and the 5-voice Magnificat no. 74 in the present instalment
10. Instalment 5 nos 57 and 58 (*Regis celorum* and *O sacrum manna*).
11. Instalment 5 no. 30 (*Levavi oculos meos*) and the Missa *Christus surrexit* (Instalment 2 no. 7).
12. Magnificat settings nos 63 and 64.
13. Magnificat no. 65 and the *Sendliche pein* song preceding it in Trent 89.
14. Magnificats nos 69 and 70.
15. Various items in the Magnificat antiphon set nos 76-88, but amongst such short items it is hard to determine which might have been the initial group of pieces.
16. *Grates nunc omnes* no. 96 and the *Puer natus* setting following it in Trent 89 (*Ex Codicis II / II* no. 6).
17. Sequence settings nos 102 and 103.
18. Hymn settings nos 106 and 107.
19. Hymn settings nos 108 and 109.
20. Hymn settings nos 112 and 114.
21. *Ex Codicis II / II* no. 11 (a troped Kyrie) plus nos 116-119 in the Trent 91 edition (no. 118 is the Tone I Magnificat Trent 89 f. 394v).
22. Item 115 in the Trent 91 edition (which is a four-voice *Christe redemptor* from Trent 89) plus various other items in Instalment 5 of the Trent 91 edition which are similar to works by Martini or may be attributable to him.

Most of these items have been mentioned or discussed in previous instalments or other published work of mine. Those interested in further links between similar pieces (i.e. possible master-pupil relationships in pairs of settings) should consult the critical commentary here for nos 71 and 72, 105 and 113, and the likely imitations of Touront’s Magnificat Tone VI. Regarding groups 12-20 above, see the current critical commentary. Similarly, all tentative composer attributions made to Martini, Touront, Busnois, Henricus Tik and ‘Philippus’ have been discussed in the appropriate instalments where they occur.

Finally, my acknowledgements. This instalment would not have been possible without the help of David Fallows, Peter Wright, Jaap van Benthem, Thomas Schmidt-Beste, Bonnie Blackburn, Leofranc Holford-Strevens, Margaret Bent, Reinhard Strohm, Pawel Gancarczyk, and Mike Beauvois - who all generously contributed when badly-needed material was otherwise unavailable.

.....

NOTE: for continuation of complete two-sided print-out of the Trent 89 edition, the following scores begin on a left-hand page.