This is a repository copy of *Three-voice textures in the mid-15th-century English Mass cycle*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/107301/

Version: Accepted Version

This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced version of an article accepted for publication in Early Music following peer review. The version of record Three-voice textures in the mid-15th-century English Mass cycle, Cook, J, Early Music, is available online at: https://doi.org/10.1093/em/cax007

Introduction

In writing any form of polyphony composers had to balance a range of priorities which formed a matrix of related and sometimes conflicting conventions governing contrapuntal possibilities. For works that utilise pre-existent materials in the form of *cantus firmi* or chant paraphrases, such as some Mass cycles, a further range of constraints is given by the very nature of this material. It is within this matrix of different compositional concerns that composers sought to develop their musical argument and to give voice to their own compositional identities. An understanding of style, be that pertaining to a composer or an entire national, chronological, or generic group, can only be reached through an understanding of these competing compositional principles, how they were prioritised, and what room they allowed for individual answers to common compositional questions.

The stated aim of the conference from which this collection of essays is drawn was to 'face the music of medieval England'. The focus of this contribution is to provide a window through which we might do that, in the context of a small and self-contained repertory, namely the three-voice Mass cycle as cultivated in mid-fifteenth-century England. This repertory has the advantage of boasting a wealth of scholarship which looks at different aspects of its contrapuntal handling. The discussion below brings together Andrew Kirkman's comprehensive study of voice range with Margaret Bent's work on grammatical function as well making some refinements based on an analysis of the nature of pre-existent material found in some of the repertory.[1] This discussion offers new perspectives on some apparently unusual Mass cycles that appear to sit outside of the norms – perspectives which might shed light on issues of authorship, provenance, and chronology. Specifically, I wish to turn my attention to issues of range and grammatical function within a particularly unusual anonymous Mass cycle from the Strahov Codex, the *Veni creator spiritus* Mass, and within three *Sine nomine* cycles by Bedyngham, Standley, and Tik. My hope here is not just to face the music but what stands behind it as well.

Vocal range and texture

Perhaps the most striking change in the handling of fifteenth-century three-voice textures relates to extreme registral shifts in the two lower voices. In the first two-thirds of the century, the prevailing texture gave a high-cleffed upper voice (often unnamed in the sources, but referred to for convenience here as the cantus), [2] with two usually equally-cleffed lower voices: a tenor and either a contratenor or a second cantus, depending on the contrapuntal function of the voice. [3] These two voice types are distinct. The contratenor (see example 1) has an angular character and generally takes the fifth at cadences. Most importantly, it is not grammatically essential, meaning that it does not take part in the essential harmonic framework, instead providing one of a number of contrapuntal possibilities around the harmonic framework given by the grammatical dyad. The grammatically essential voices will form the cadences through moving from an imperfect to a perfect consonance with one voice moving by a semi-tone step whilst the inessential voice will most frequently take a fifth above the lowest voice. By contrast, a second cantus (see example 2) is similar in function and melodic character to the cantus and may take a grammatical role in cadences. This voice type is not named as a second cantus in contemporary sources but rather, like the upper voices of the period, is often unnamed; in terms of function, it best fits the contemporary theoretical description of the cantus.

Example 1: Roy Henry's Gloria (Old Hall, ff.12ᵛ—13), opening. A setting with contratenor.

Example 2: Gloria of the anonymous *Fuit homo missus* Mass, excerpt. A setting with second cantus (labelled as a Contratenor in surviving Continental sources though almost certainly, as Bent notes, [4] not in the original English version).

This 'third voice', regardless of grammatical distinction, was highly mobile in the texture, swapping position with the tenor freely. Around 1465, a new type of 'third voice', which generally rested at the bottom of the texture but followed the grammatical distinction of the contratenor (see example 3), became increasingly common and led to far more stratification of parts. This voice, which increased in popularity over this period before becoming the norm across Europe from around 1470,

has been christened the *contratenor bassus* by Kirkman,[5] though this terminology is not used in contemporary sources.

Example 3: Gloria of Walter Frye's *Summe trinitati* (Brussels Choirbook, 2ᵛ–10)*. A setting with a low contratenor.

English Discant

This apparently simple distribution is somewhat complicated by regional variants. As Kirkman has noted, the concept of stratified vocal ranges is nothing new but is instead pre-figured by the practice of English discant.[6] This practice – which requires some discussion in its own right – produced simple, note-against-note works by prescribing intervals for a new voice above or below pre-existent material at given vocal ranges known as 'sights'.[7] As a simple, two-part practice, it was improvisational and yet there are a large number of surviving written-out three-part versions. Perhaps the best-known examples, which lack voice names, are written in score, and mostly have the pre-existent material in the middle voice, survive in the Old Hall manuscript (see example 4). Since these works lack voice names in the manuscript, these have been reconstructed in modern editions, with the most recent naming the middle voice tenor,[8] presumably since tenor and *cantus firmus* function are often combined in other repertories. It does not take grammatical Tenor function here, however, and, in contemporary theoretical testimony, is referred to as the 'plainsong'.

Somewhat problematically, all but one theorist describes discant as occurring only in two-part pieces. Pseudo-Tunstede does, however, admit the following three-part possibility: '… as long as you are descanting beneath the plainchant no one may discant above, unless he is previously acquainted with the pitch levels of the lower voices, because all of the upper voices must make consonance with the lowest'.[9] This perhaps explains why more three-part than two-part examples survive despite the theoretical testimony suggesting the opposite; the necessity for the upper voice to remain consonant with both lower voices may have proved challenging to perform without notation.

Example 4: A discant-type setting of an anonymous Gloria (Old Hall ff.1ᵛ—2) with a 'counter',

excerpt.

The Old Hall edition names the lowest voice as a 'counter' and it clearly fits the theoretical

description of that voice in Pseudo-Chilston's treatise, since it always remains beneath the pre-

existent material.[10] In grammatical terms, however, this voice clearly has tenor function. Quite how

to name the upper voice is open to question given the lack of theoretical detail on three-voice

discant conceptions. The passage above does, however, appear to imply that the upper voice must

discant against the lowest, rather than the chant voice, suggesting that this voice may be conceived

as a treble.

A comparison of examples 1-4 shows some important distinctions. The low contratenor of

example 3, for instance, may occupy the same range as a counter but the former, unlike the latter

which functions as a tenor, is not grammatically essential. By contrast, the middle-range contratenor

of example 1 shares the same range, if not the same function, as the low-contratenor of example 3.

Similarly, example 2 might share the range of example 1 and yet it functions in a very different

grammatical manner.

As Kirkman has noted, there is a tradition of 'discant-type' compositions, such as Plummer's

Sine nomine Mass which, though no longer note-against-note or requiring pre-existent material,

remain remarkably texturally stratified. To an extent, these build on a practice already found in Old

Hall where discant and chanson texture are combined (such as in the Gloria on ff.4v-5v). These later

works can exhibit tenors cleffed lower than the third voice, like Plummer's *Sine nomine* Mass, or

otherwise equally cleffed lower voices, such as the anonymous 'Two Kyries' Mass, but either type is

remarkably stratified. Kirkman has noted that the 'Two Kyries' mass, despite its equal cleffing, has a

contratenor that is above the tenor 90% of the time.[11] Plummer's Mass has many moments when

the contratenor and tenor briefly touch but do not cross and both Mass cycles tend to have the

contratenor following the contour of the tenor but staying around a third above it.

Two paradigms for third-voice range within the English three-voice Mass cycle repertory before c.1470 can therefore be determined.[12] The first is stratified with a low tenor which is either cleffed equally with or below a third voice (which sits in the middle of the texture) and is indebted to discant style. The second utilises a mobile third voice which occupies either the foot of the texture or the middle depending on context. After c.1470, a third paradigm, in which the third voice sits at the bottom of the texture, takes prominence.

Pre-existent material: *Cantus firmus* Mass cycles

Pre-existent material, most commonly in this later repertory found as a *cantus firmus* in the tenor, may have the effect of posing textural questions to a composer. If the pre-existent material goes particularly high in the range, does a normally low tenor swap position with the third voice, or does the third voice follow its contour? And, if swapping textural position at a point close to a cadence, does it retain its grammatical function or cede this to the third voice too?

If we consider the *cantus firmus* Mass repertory alongside those Masses with no apparent pre-existent material, we can see this effect on compositional choices. Other than an important group of Masses with a lower-cleffed third voice to which I will later return, almost all English *cantus firmus* Mass cycles from this period have equally-cleffed lower voices. Despite this, some are seemingly highly stratified whilst others have overlapping ranges. A brief survey of two examples: one – *Fuit homo missus* – with frequent voice crossing, and the other – *Quem malignus spiritus* – particularly stratified, demonstrates precisely on what these differences rest. In terms of third-voice function, both of these Masses have a second cantus and so the extreme difference in texture clearly cannot rest on differences in voice function.

***Cantus firmus* Mass cycles with equally-cleffed lower voices**

The original Sarum chant melody of *Fuit homo missus* has a complete range of a ninth from c-d'. In exploring the full extent of this range, the chant occupies either extreme of the tessitura for long periods. It begins low then shifts far higher around the syllable 'mis-'. At the syllable 'Jo-', it again explores the lower before returning to the higher tessitura from the syllable 'hic' (see Example 5).These changes in tessitura correspond well to the sections within which the tenor and second cantus swap position. Compare bb. 33–7 of the Kyrie, corresponding to the end of the melisma on the syllable 'mo-', with bb. 44–55 of the Kyrie, corresponding to the syllables 'missus a' in the plainchant. When the tenor explores the higher range, it generally rests above the second cantus but, when lower, rests below it.

Example 5: *Fuit homo missus,* adapted from M. Bent, 'Four anonymous Masses', *Fifteenth-century liturgical music, 22* (London, 1979): a. plainchant; b. Kyrie bb.33-7; and c. Kyrie bb.44-55.

A comparison of *Fuit homo missus* with *Quem malignus spiritus* (Example 6) demonstrates why this latter cycle has a second cantus that generally rests above the tenor. This chant explores a wider range more consistently, rather than resting at either extreme. The plainchant does not fully explore its upper reaches until the word 'prece'. It is only where the chant reaches its absolute upper range that the second cantus briefly reaches below the tenor in the polyphonic Mass, as can be seen in a comparison of bb. 91–6 to bb. 162–6.

Example 6: *Quem malignus spiritus* Mass, adapted from Bent, 'Four anonymous Masses…': a. plainchant; b. Kyrie bb., 91-96; and c. Kyrie bb., 162-166.

In both cycles, it seems that all three voices perform different aspects of the grammatical dyad at different points. Either cantus can form a cadence by forming an octave or unison with the tenor, with the remaining cantus taking the fifth or sometimes the third/sixth (as is common in English works of the period). Similarly, the two cantus parts can form the grammatical dyad between themselves, articulating the cadence with a move to an octave/unison and with the tenor part taking either the fifth or the third/sixth. There is even one striking moment in *Quem malignus spiritus*

(Kyrie, bb.39–40) where the first cantus dips below both other voices, eventually cadencing on a unison with the tenor but having reached it through ascent in contrary motion. Whilst both cycles are characterised by this free interchange of grammatical function in all three voices, the nature of the *cantus firmus* in *Quem malignus* is such that there are comparatively few opportunities for the tenor to take a non-grammatical role.[13]

The same textural paradigm, where the degree of stratification is largely controlled by the nature of the pre-existent material in the tenor, can be found in English cycles with more traditional contratenor parts too. Where these examples clearly differ is that the contratenors are far more angular and do not participate in the grammatical dyad. It would be erroneous to suggest that composers have no control over the range of a *cantus firmus* tenor in a Mass cycle of either type of construction since they could choose to transpose the plainchant or use extensive paraphrase. The desired registral and textural features of the Mass may also have been taken into account when choosing the *cantus firmus,* alongside the obvious liturgical or intertextual considerations – a pre-compositional, rather than compositional choice.

Cantus firmus Mass cycles with lower-cleffed third voices

There are three English *cantus firmus* Mass cycles from this period which, at face value at least, approach the handling of texture in a different manner. All three have a third voice cleffed below the tenor. Two are by Walter Frye and are found in the Brussels choirbook whilst the other, *Veni creator spiritus*, is anonymous and found in the Strahov codex.

A close comparison of the two works by Frye tells much about composerly intention. *Nobilis et pulcra* (example 7), though cleffed with a third voice below the tenor, opens with it as the middle voice of the texture. Brian Trowell has previously described this as a Mass with a middle-voice contratenor and as one of the earliest of Frye's works.[14] My opinion here differs in both respects. The plainchant on which this work is based is a relatively low-lying chant and begins at the lowest point of its range, in precisely the same range as *Quem malignus spiritus.* The third voice begins as

the middle voice and, just as with both examples above, only reaches its *this time expected* position at the foot of the texture as the chant begins its first ascent towards the upper reaches of its range, as shown in the comparison of bb. 1–4 with 13–16 of the Kyrie in Ex.7b-c. In this regard, it behaves identically with *Quem malignus* or *Fuit homo missus* though with the opposite concern since the intention seems to be to keep the third voice at the foot of the texture as far as the *cantus firmus* allows.

Example 7: *Nobilis et pulchra* Mass, taken from G. Curtis, 'The Brussels Masses', *Fifteenth-Century Liturgical Music, 34* (London, 1989), a. plainchant; b. Kyrie bb.1-4; c. Kyrie bb.13-16; d. Gloria, bb. 92-93.

One of the most interesting elements of this work is the grammatical function of the third voice. It is clearly a contratenor and yet, if we switch our attention to the moment when the chant reaches its highest point, we see some interesting features. At this point in the Gloria (example 7d), we have the contratenor, now firmly at the foot of the texture, taking the grammatical role of the tenor at the cadence. As Bent has previously noted,[15] Frye seems to do this relatively frequently, especially where to do otherwise would necessitate the octave-leap cadence. This practice is a clear feature of his two masses with lower-cleffed contratenors but is seemingly absent in the *Sine nomine* Mass attributed to him by Kirkman.[16] As we have seen in the above examples with *cantus firmi* that move between extremes of range, it is the contrapuntal questions posed by these registral shifts that grant Frye the opportunity to break the grammatical dyad when the third voice reaches the foot of the texture. In the *Sine nomine* attributed to Frye by Kirkman, the third voice sits as a middle voice in the texture and there is no pre-existent material to force (or perhaps provide the opportunity) for the crossing of voices and consequently no need for Frye to choose between the octave leap cadence or a switch of grammatical function. The *Sine nomine* I have recently tentatively attributed to Frye, which is the only surviving English *Sine nomine* with lower-cleffed contratenor would surely, if it is by Frye, have had moments of the contratenor assuming tenor function due to the normal range of its

contratenor being below the tenor. [17] The profile of the surviving voices is suggestive of this, but not enough survives to prove it.

Summe trinitati (example 8) makes an illuminating comparison with *Nobilis et pulcra.* Both have the same distance between clefs, even if they differ in the detail, but, on face value, seem to have quite different textural properties. As Kirkman has shown, the contratenor of this Mass remains below the tenor for almost the entire work.[18] Again, a consideration of its chant basis explains why. This chant is much higher in range than *Nobilis et pulcra* and opens relatively high in that range. Just as with each of the above examples, the third voice drops below the tenor when the tenor is particularly high (compare examples 8b and 8c), in this case 94% of the time.[19] Importantly, the contratenor again sometimes takes the role of the tenor at the cadence, when afforded the opportunity by the range of the plainchant (see examples 8d and 8e). Given how frequently the tenor is above the contratenor the number of instances is remarkably high.

Example 8: *Summe trinitati* Mass, taken from Curtis, 'The Brussels Masses…', a. plainchant; b. Gloria, bb.10-15; c. Gloria bb.20-22; d. Gloria bb.17-18; e. Gloria, b.56.

Whilst it seems clear that English Masses based on *cantus firmi* in this period are only as stratified as their *cantus firmi* allow, there do seem to be two clear paradigms based on whether the third voice is nominally a middle or a lower voice. This latter option seems to be a later development and, unusually, one for which the only attributed examples are found in works by Frye. This development also seems to account for those works in which the contratenor occasionally supplants tenor function. This brings to mind Anonymous XI's famous contention that 'insofar as the contratenor goes beneath the tenor, it is called tenor.'[20] When it was believed that this was a fourteenth-century formulation this seemed patently wrong. Now that it is believed to date from the late fifteenth century,[21] it is possible that the theorist was describing a new practice in which the contratenor does, very occasionally, supplant the role of the tenor when underneath it. The generality with which he makes this statement does still remain questionable, nonetheless. We must also question

just what it means that the nominally lower third voice apparently belongs only to works by Frye. As Bent has asked in this volume, 'do the often striking imbalances of genre among surviving works by different composers …represent compositional preference or accidents of transmission?'[22]

It will not have escaped the eagle-eyed reader that there is a third Mass cycle with a *cantus firmus* and a lower third voice mentioned above – not ascribed or attributed to Frye – which I have so far ignored. This cycle, the *Veni creator spiritus* Mass, is extremely problematic in almost every regard and clearly unrelated to the examples previously discussed. It is one of a group of cycles that I consider to have been created through a process of intensive interaction and cultural exchange between England and the Continent and which therefore has features that seemingly rule out either purely English or Continental origin.[23] To summarise, the cycle's Kyrie is a quintessential example of what I have termed a curtailed troped Kyrie which is otherwise, seemingly, found only in English cycles.[24] Similarly, the degree of text omission in the Credo seems more indicative of English than Continental practice, yet the departure from its prevailing mensural scheme in two movements is indicative of Continental origin, as is the lack of any prevailing textural groundplan, and the positioning of both mensural changes in the Agnus Dei. The position of mensural changes in the Sanctus is unusual; both fall in positions not normally found in either English or Continental cycles, though damage to this movement may obscure the original structure.[25] Kirkman, the last scholar to have discussed this cycle in detail, agrees that whilst it 'contains a number of features typical of insular music, its place of origin remains unclear.'[26]

Perhaps the most unusual element for a supposedly English Mass cycle of this time is the presence of the *cantus firmus* in the upper voice, which is a paraphrase of *Veni creator spiritus.* This occurs in no other contemporary English Mass cycle. It is, however, quintessential for the genre of chant paraphrase compositions, as found in Trent 91, the Glogauer Liederbuch, the *Speciálník* codex and even elsewhere in Strahov, that Adelyn Peck-Leverett has linked with the Imperial Court in Vienna.[27] The disposition of the lower voices in *Veni creator spiritus*, c_1 c_2 c_5, is very close to the prevailing textures found in these compositions too, as is the tendency for cadences to end on

octaves in all voices rather than having the contratenor a fifth above the tenor (example 9). Perhaps due to this lack of fifths in cadences, the scribe seems confused by voice designation, swapping the initial indication of voice names for the tenor and contratenor.

Example 9: The *Veni Creator Spiritus* Mass, Kyrie bb.33-35, showing a standard cadence type for this cycle.

The general stylistic profile of the Mass cycle clearly fits perfectly within this repertoire, even down to the tell-tale use of pre-imitation – the prefiguring, in one or both of the lower voices, of melodic material from the chant paraphrase in the top voice during the passages in which this voice rests (example 10). This offers a context for the most apparently unusual aspects of this cycle: its use of upper-voice chant paraphrase and its unusual texture. Nonetheless, given the cycle's undeniably English aspects it does not fit entirely easily as a work produced purely in the orbit of the Imperial Court. Instead, it seems to be a work produced through an engagement between compositional models from the two regions.

Example 10: The *Veni creator spiritus* Mass, Agnus Dei, bb.53-55. Pre-imitation in which the tenor prefigures the cantus melody by one beat in b.53.

It is not the only work that may be viewed in this context either; the 'Gloria Paschalis' on ff. 94v-96 of Trent 88 follows a lot of the same procedures: the chant paraphrase in the top voice, the unusual texture, and the pre-imitation. This Mass movement has been noted as being English by both Charles Hamm and by Curtis and Wathey due to the presence of the 'English figure' and the occurrence of thirds in cadences.[28] Peck-Leverett has, however, described this as fitting the same stylistic profile as her Imperial Court compositions and has even identified the paraphrased chant as belonging to the Passau Rite.

The idea of intensive interaction between the Imperial court and England is nothing new, of course. As Peck-Leverett has noted, some works from this region use the kind of black mensural notation favoured in England and she notes similar English notational peculiarities in a paraphrase cycle from Trent 91 that she convincingly argues comes from the diocese of Passau.[29] Further evidence of English influence on this region has been discussed by Trowell, who noted that the Holy Roman Emperor sent to England for English singers in 1442, and also by Gerber who argued for English influence on early Austrian polyphony in Trent 88.[30] Perhaps the similarity between the textural procedures produced in this kind of chant-paraphrase composition and the textures of English discant are not coincidental, not least since English discant may give the *cantus firmus* in the upper voice. Voice layout may even give a tantalising hint of a shared origin. In *Veni creator spiritus*, as with other similarly constructed works, the scribe has eschewed the usual voice disposition, generally aiming to place all three voices of a section on the same page where possible. Whilst not strictly score notation (the format in which most discant-style compositions were notated), it nonetheless mirrors the *mise-en-page* of this format.

Freely-composed Mass cycles

So far, this article has considered only those Mass cycles that contain identified pre-existent music. However, if third-voice handling is so constrained by *cantus firmus* choice, then it must be questioned whether the freely-composed repertory displays a different approach to texture.[31] This certainly seems to be the case as the majority demonstrate a comparatively stratified texture, including most of Kirkman's most highly stratified examples.[32] Most interestingly, only three mid-century freely-composed masses, the *Sine nomine* by Bedyngham, Standley, and Tik, appear to avoid a generally stratified texture.

Kirkman has already noted that Tik's *Sine nomine* Mass has a contratenor that is 'somewhat less *altus*', but still spends more than half of its time above the tenor.[33] Most interestingly, whilst

often taking the fifth at cadences, the contratenor almost never does so by using the octave-leap cadence. When assuming the fifth would require an octave leap, the contratenor instead often takes the role of one of the two grammatical voices. Perhaps the most interesting examples are those in which the contratenor and cantus swap roles, as seen in Example 11. Both the Standley and Bedyngham cycles respect the grammatical dyad throughout, even though the Bedyngham cycle has a particularly low contratenor which sits at the foot of the texture more than half the time.

Example 11: Henricus Tik, *Sine nomine* Mass, a. Kyrie bb.106–107; b. Kyrie bb.147-148; and c. Kyrie bb.106-107.

So, what to make of these cycles? They could simply be seen as a step towards the lower-cleffed contratenor. However, they are quite early since two were copied in Continental sources of the early 1450s. I wonder if this might instead be seen as indicative of Continental influence on the composers in question since all have, with varying degrees of confidence, been linked to Continental employment.[34] We now know that Tik, thought by Strohm to have been active in Bruges,[35] was living and working in Seville later in the century whilst both Bedyngham and Standley have been linked to Italy by Rebecca Gerber.[36] Of course, Bedyngham is the only English composer of this period to compose a Mass on a Continental song. If this should be seen as evidence of Continental influence, should the lower-cleffed contratenor itself? If so, this could offer more evidence for the presence of Frye on the Continent, especially given the increasing number of works potentially by him found in Continental sources. It is probably too early to say, but this is perhaps a fertile area for further research.

---

[1] A. Kirkman, *The three-voice Mass in the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries: style, distribution and case studies* (New York and London, 1995) and M. Bent, 'Naming of parts: notes on the contratenor, c.1350–1450' in *Uno gentile et subtile ingenio: studies in renaissance music in honour of Bonnie J. Blackburn* ed. G. Filocamo and M. J. Bloxam (Turnhout, 2009), pp.1–12.

[2] The terms discantus, cantus, and superius are often used interchangeably in the literature.

[3] For more on the difference between contratenor and second cantus, see Bent, 'Naming of parts', *passim*.

[4] M. Bent, 'Four anonymous Masses', *Fifteenth-century liturgical music, 22* (London, 1979), p. 170.

[5] For a detailed description of these developments see Kirkman, *The three-voice Mass*, pp.1—138, particularly pp.12—21.

[6] Kirkman, *The three-voice Mass*, p.17.

[7] For more on the contrast between what might be termed 'chanson' and discant style, see R. Strohm, *The Rise of European Music, 1380–1500* (Cambridge, 1993), 201-204.

[8]), *The Old Hall Manuscript*, ed. A. Hughes and M. Bent, Corpus mensurabilis musicae 46, 3 vols. in 4 pts. (Middleton, WI, 1969–73).

[9] *Scriptorum de musica medii aevi, nova series,* ed. E. de Coussemaker (Paris, 1864-1876), IV, 294. trans. A. Besser-Scott, 'Beginnings of Fauxbourdon: A New Interpretation', *Journal of the American Musicological Association*, 24/3 (1971), 345-363, at 347.

[10] See the useful discussion in A. Busse-Berger, *Medieval Music and the Art of Memory* (California, 2005), 201-206.

[11] Kirkman, *The three-voice Mass*, p.313.

[12] See Kirkman, *The three-voice Mass*, passim.

[13] Modern editorial convention seems to prioritise the articulation of cadences through the imposition of *ficta* between the high cantus and tenor more frequently than between other voices. This may lead to the assessment, though not always true, that these voices are more contrapuntally essential.

[14] Trowell, B., 'Frye [ffry, ffrye, Frey, Frie], Walter' in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music* <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/10327 >

[15] M. Bent in J. Cook, 'The style of Walter Frye and an anonymous Mass in the Lucca Choirbook', *Music & Letters*, pp.1–27 at p.15, fn. 43.

[16] Attributed in A. Kirkman, 'The Style of Walter Frye and an Anonymous Mass in Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, Manuscript 5557', *Early Music History*, 11 (1992), pp. 191–221 at pp. 215–18.

[17] Cook, 'The style of Walter Frye', *passim*.

[18] Kirkman, *The three-voice Mass*, p.318.

[19] Kirkman, *The three-voice Mass*, p.318.

[20] Anonymous XI, *Tractatus de musica plana et mensurabili*. Text available at

<http://www.chmtl.indiana.edu/tml/15th/ANO11TRA_TEXT.html>

[21] Bent, 'The naming of parts', p.3.

[22] M. Bent, 'What next? Recent work and new directions for English medieval music', *Early Music, THIS VOLUME*

[23] For more on this topic, see J. Cook, *Mid-fifteenth-century English Mass cycles in continental sources* (PhD diss., U. of Nottingham, 2014) available as a DIAMM resource (www.DIAMM.AC.UK).

[24] Cook, 'The style of Walter Frye', pp.3–14.

[25] Cook, *Mid-fifteenth-century English Mass cycles*, *passim*, summarised at p.269.

[26] Kirkman, *The three-voice Mass*, p.155.

[27] A. Peck-Leverett, *A Paleographical and Repertorial Study of the Manuscript Trento, Castello del Buonconsiglio, 91 (1378)* (PhD, Diss., Princeton U., 1990) available as a DIAMM resource (www.DIAMM.AC.UK), 73-111.

[28] C. Hamm, 'A catalogue of anonymous English music in fifteenth-century continental manuscripts', *Musica Disciplina,* 22 (1968), pp.47-76 at p.66. Listed as Gloria G76 in G. Curtis and A. Wathey, 'Fifteenth-century English liturgical music: a list of the surviving repertory, *RMA Research Chronicle,* 27 (1994), pp.1-69.

[29] Peck-Leverett, *A Paleographical and Repertorial Study,* 176-185.

[30] B. Trowell, 'Heinrich VI', in *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Berlin, 1957) and R. Gerber, *The Manuscript Trent, Castello del Buonconsiglio, 88: a study of fifteenth-century manuscript transmission and repertory* (PhD. Diss. U. of California, Santa Barbara, 1985), 257-258.

[31] The term *Sine nomine* tends to be applied both to Mass cycles that are not dependent on pre-existent material and to those that carry pre-existent material that is yet to be identified. An example of the latter may be the 'Two Kyries' Mass, since it could potentially carry a *cantus firmus* in the tenor which has, so far, proved impossible to identify. There is, perhaps, a grey area occupied by works such as Cox's Mass cycle. This work appears to be a contrapuntal tapestry of continual elaborations of a short motif in all voices, quite unlike what we might consider to be usual *cantus firmus* technique. This motif could be pre-existent material or otherwise simply an idiosyncratic approach to free composition. It is possible that there are *cantus firmus* Masses hiding

amongst the *Sine nomine* repertoire. If the 'Two Kyries' Mass is such, then its stratification of parts could be explained in terms of its *cantus firmus* range instead of, or perhaps as well as, its indebtedness to discant style. The three *Sine nomine* cycles discussed below section seem highly unlikely to make structural use of pre-existent material in their tenor parts and their lack of conformity to general patterns is therefore unlikely to be due to their status as unrecognised *cantus firmus* cycles.

[32] Kirkman, *The three-voice Mass*, pp.313–319.

[33] Kirkman, *The three-voice Mass*, pp.40–41.

[34] For more on this see Cook, *Mid-fifteenth-century English Mass cycles*, pp.267–268.

[35] R. Strohm, *Music in late medieval Bruges* (Oxford, 1985), p.123.

[36] For evidence of Tik's Continental career, see J. R. Jiménez, '"The Sounds of The Hollow Mountain": Musical Tradition and Innovation in Seville Cathedral in the Early Renaissance', *Early Music History*, 29 (2010), pp.189–239 at pp.216–7. For a discussion of Bedyngham and Standley, see *Sacred Music from the Cathedral at Trent: Trent, Museo Provinciale d'Arte, Codex 1375 (olim 88)*, ed. R. Gerber, Monuments of Medieval Music (Chicago, 1998), pp.20–21.