while the ornamentation of Monteverdi's upper parts in both this Magnificat and the "Sonata sopra Sancta Maria" has a strong family resemblance with that used by Rossi. Monteverdi's orchestration, never really derivable from that of the younger Gabrieli (whatever the textbooks say), is now a little more illuminated by this apparently modest work. Again the editing is sensible, though in a couple of places one might disagree with the corrections to misprints in the original (the one on page 14 leads to consecutive octaves which are really unnecessary). But this is a worthy venture. Will someone now complete the picture by tackling Rossi's madrigals, still languishing in Vincent d'Indy's pioneering edition of nearly a hundred years ago?

Denis Arnold
University of Hull


This volume is a welcome addition to the growing repertory of 17th-century English consort music now available in modern publications. Here we have for the first time a complete set of pieces and, as such, a fine sequel to Helen Joy Sleeper's excellent anthology of Jenkins' instrumental music, which inaugurated the Wellesley Edition seventeen years ago.

There are several unique, and quite remarkable, aspects of the music. Division technique—breaking of or descanting upon a bass line with ornamental variations—penetrated nearly all 17th-century English instrumental forms, including the venerable polyphonic fancy. These Jenkins fancy-ayres exhibit an unusually extensive, almost systematic, use of divisions, which are skilfully integrated into the imitative texture. Also exceptional is their high degree of variety and complexity. The only other extant examples of a similar 3-part division style are nine fancy-suites (Fancy-Allemande-Courante) by Jenkins and the "Months" (12 fancies) and the "Seasons" (4 fancy-suites) by Christopher Simpson. All of these are for treble and two basses to the organ, favoring the original division instrument. The present set is the only known combination of two trebles and bass exploiting such virtuoso passage work.

Jenkins' fancy-ayres occupy a rather special place in English ensemble music of the 17th century. The pairing of an ayre (or even an almaine) with a fancy was not as frequent in this period as Mr. Warner suggests. In fact, fancy-suites in three movements were much more prevalent, especially under the patronage of Charles I. Aside from the 6-part Fantazia-Almaine pairs by Martin Peerson (d. 1650), written earlier in the century, the only other composer to pair a fancy with an almaine was John Hingeston, whose entire consort output is organized in either Fantazia-Alamand pairs or fancy-suites.¹

Apparently the combination of fancy and ayre appealed to Jenkins as much as the more common three-movement fancy-suite. The ayre, usually a simple, sprightly bipartite piece similar to (if not synonymous with) the almaine, is here developed in both structure and treatment to form a balanced compositional unit with the fancy. While not forsaking their lighter, quicker character, these ayres display a variety of styles, including triple passages and broad closing sections. In addition to the seven division fancy-ayres here published, Jenkins composed another set of fifteen pairs (plus two extra ayres), three of which were printed in Miss Sleeper's edition. These, too, are in Jenkins' late style, but incorporate division technique to a lesser extent.

¹ In his "Flat Consort" Matthew Locke paired a fancy with either a courante, saraband, or jigg, though not an ayre or almaine. Other paired movements are not particularly common.
The title, "Mr Jenkins' 3 Partes Divisions for two Trebles & a Base" found on the manuscript parts (Oxford Bodl. MSS Mus. Sch. d.241-4 and d.261) containing the fancy-aye divisions, was written by the then Oxford Professor of Music Edward Lowe, whose fastidious efforts contributed substantially to the reorganization of the Music School after the Restoration. The Mr. Theodore Colby or Colbius, "a German," who gave the partbooks to Lowe and who may have copied the organ part, was the organist of Magdalen College from 1661-4, until he became organist and lay vicar of Exeter Cathedral. As a member of the Oxford musical community, Colby may have participated in the music meetings and donated his partbooks and organ score to Professor Lowe upon departing from Oxford. (In a characteristic annotation in another manuscript, Mus. Sch. c.44, Lowe refers to Mus. Sch. d.241-4 as "the Bookes I had of Mr. Colby in the Schoole," i.e. Music School.) One wonders about Mr. Colby's source for Jenkins' division pieces, especially since the nine fancy-suites, "Mr Jenkins 3 Partes Divisions for 2 Bases & a Treble," appear unique in MSS Mus. Sch. d.241-4 and d.261, alongside the division fancy-ayres and written in the same manuscript hand. As Mr. Warner conjectures, the music itself probably dates from the 1650's; and Simpson might well have had it at hand when he wrote his description of division writing in three parts in The Division Viol.

The preparation of this edition required mainly the regularizing of accidentals, barring, and rhythms, which Mr. Warner has done with discernment. Several other of his editorial procedures are less than convincing. Mr. Warner's "modernization" of the duple time signature C to 4/4 is somewhat misleading since the tactus is surely based on the half, not the quarter, note. Whereas it is difficult to think of any of the openings of the fancies in 4/4, it may be desirable for performers to subdivide the beat in the division passages, just as it may be necessary to adjust the tempo relative to the rapid note values. Since the final note, whatever its value, was always marked with a fermata, it was, no doubt, intended to be held for a longer, indefinite period of time; eliminating all fermata from this edition conceals the composer's intention and the contemporary practice. Likewise, omitting the repeat marks at the ends of the ayres obscures the fact that the second, as well as the first, strain should be repeated. While repeat dots are transcribed at the internal double bar in most ayres, they are overlooked at the ends of all but one ayre.

As for other performance matters, slurring pairs of notes (even the final turn) was quite acceptable 17th-century practice and was probably performed more than it was notated. Also, if properly executed, no "omission of certain unplayable multiple stops" will be necessary in the bass part; for all multiple stops, regardless of stringed instrument, should be arpeggated, striking most firmly the lowest note of the chord, as Mace admonishes in Musick's Monument (p. 149). Furthermore, Mace's advice that "The Humour must be found out, by Playing Soft, and Loud, and making your Pauses, &c." (p. 142) might well be used to temper the "quiet, precise playing" recommended by Mr. Warner. "Humouring" the music with expressive contrasts in dynamics and tempos, an important aspect of performance practice, was also discussed by other contemporary writers, such as Simpson, Playford, and North.

As Mr. Warner admits, the keyboard part is the most problematic. He offers a "quasi-realization" which is ambiguous at best. Is one to amplify his realization as well as simplify it, as he further suggests? The intention is unclear and the printed solution unsatisfactory. It is weakened, in particular, by too many octaves and doubled thirds and dissonant tones. The original part has not been as

---

faithfully followed as one might expect in a scholarly edition, where above all else an accurate text should be given. A case in point is the curious E natural, arbitrarily changed to G, in the organ part at the ends of both the fancy and ayre in g minor. Perhaps it would have been better to print only Jenkins' organ score with the explicit direction for the organist to supply inner voices according to the dictates of the performance medium and his own taste.

The edition suffers most from the unfortunate number of typographical errors, which even the errata sheet does not completely rectify. (One wonders, for example, if the Critical Notes were proofread for missing deviations, wrong rhythms in variant readings, etc.) And beware! The sequence of pages 10-14 is out of order, so follow the measure numbers, which are an accurate guide.

Simpson complained that the cost of printing divisions prevented more from being published in his own day. The expense of time and effort required for scoring and editing division style pieces accounts, in part, for the dearth of editions today. Now, thanks to Mr. Warner, a superb set of pieces, displaying an extraordinary application of division technique, is available to the musical scholar and performer. In view of the growing interest in the instruments and music of this period, it would be immensely useful if the Wellesley Edition would also supply parts with this publication.

JANE TROY JOHNSON
Menlo Park, California


A second facsimile edition of Musick's Monument, this appears with a companion volume containing a monograph by M. Jacquot and transcriptions of Mace's examples by M. Souris. There is every reason to be grateful for their efforts. M. Jacquot not only provides a précis of the more interesting technical parts of Mace's book for those who have neither time nor patience (it requires a considerable fund of both) to read for themselves. He also delves into what one can only call the background—English musical taste, Cambridge life, intellectual and literary trends, and so on. He performs this task with a detachment, a scholarly care, above all with a generosity that the subject scarcely seems to merit (at least in this reviewer's judgment). M. Souris saves one the trouble of deciphering the original tablatures, and adds to the examples from the book the few additional pieces by Mace that have been recovered from manuscript.

Some books are destined to be quoted more often than read. Mace's nostalgic accounts of music and music-making in the palmy pre-Commonwealth days; his bitter attacks upon the new fashions of the Restoration; and his denigration of the violin: all these are well known. And his book has been accepted as a storehouse of knowledge about instruments and manners of performance. Yet a cover-to-cover reading prompts certain questions. How reliable is the author as musician or chronicler; and how seriously should he be taken?

Musick's Monument purports to be "A Remembrancer Of The Best Practical Musick, Both Divine, and Civil, that has ever been known, to have been in the World." A tall order for a provincial lay-clerk. And easily dismissed as sheer title-page bravura were it not typical of the tone adopted throughout much of the rambling, tendentious discourse that follows. What was this "best music"? So far as composers are concerned, Mace scarcely mentions those Englishmen most famous in his life-time, let alone those earlier masters whose works an ardent conservative might reasonably be expected to know. (For the rest of the world, by the way, one reference to