
This book arrived too late to be included in the facsimile survey in PMM 8/2, but it well deserves a review of its own. It offers a colour facsimile of the so-called Cypriot-French Manuscript, with two substantial introductory essays in Italian and English, an inventory and an index of pieces. It is photographically excellent, in some respects the best of its kind, but more than that, it reproduces one of the most extraordinary documents of late medieval music. Just how important it is has become clear only quite recently, as a result of the same initiative that led to this facsimile.

First of all, the manuscript is unique in containing a complete repertory composed, almost certainly to order, for a single court, the Lusignan court of Cyprus in the second decade of the fifteenth century. Included are not only motets, songs and Mass movements of the sort we find in manuscripts from other places, but also the chants for the Offices of the two principal local saints, St Anne and St Hylarion. The liturgy for St Hylarion, the island’s patron saint, was authorised by John XXIII in 1413, in a Bull copied at the start of the manuscript, and presumably was composed very soon thereafter. The polyphonic compositions also appear to have been newly composed for the court. They were entered in round numbers – seven Mass pairs, forty motets, seventy ballades, fifteen virelais and fifteen rondeaux in the first instance (though there were later additions). And they show an extraordinary uniformity of style, leading one to consider the possibility that they were the work of a single composer.

Secondly, the manuscript offers a similar view of its compilation. Close study of its structure and hands shows that (additions aside) it was very probably the work of a single musician and perhaps three text scribes, of whom the musician was one. If these conclusions are correct (and there will be more to say about this in a moment), it follows plausibly that we have in the Turin codex an autograph manuscript of the works of an early fifteenth-century composer on a
scale unmatched anywhere else. The quantity of music exceeds Machaut or Landini (the nearest comparisons) and, because of the chant, covers a wider range of forms than can be found in the work of anyone before Dufay. To have so much in autograph is unique. And yet, because it comes from Cyprus, because there are no concordances (except for the texts of the chant), and above all because we have no name for this musician, his work can be dismissed as ‘peripheral’ and the extraordinary importance of this manuscript can be overlooked.

The modern history of J.II.9 began with disaster and continued with neglect. Friedrich Ludwig (whose attention was drawn to it by Wilhelm Meyer in 1902) saw and made a partial copy of it in 1903, but the following year it was badly damaged in a fire which destroyed almost half the Turin library’s manuscripts. J.II.9 was burned at the edges, particularly up the spine, and as a result lost its gathering structure. When restored, each page was mounted separately, making the task of understanding its original form much harder. Its main champion thereafter was Richard Hoppin, who in the 1960s issued a complete edition of the polyphony and a facsimile of the chant. Then it was largely ignored until 1992, when Ursula Günther persuaded the Cypriot Minister of Education to sponsor a conference in Cyprus and lured a large number of specialists in the late Middle Ages to a beach-side hotel on the island to talk about it. It was only then, thanks to the intermingling of their findings and the presence of a set of colour slides provided by the Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria in Turin, that the true importance of MS J.II.9 began to emerge. The conference papers appeared in 1995 in a volume edited by Günther and Ludwig Finscher.¹ This facsimile, although planned then (and derived, presumably, from the same colour slides), has taken longer to materialize, but amply confirms many of the proposals floated in the proceedings.

Karl Kügле and Isabella Data were both at the conference, and their essays introducing the facsimile reflect several of the themes discussed there. Data provides a circumstantial account of the wedding of Anne of Cyprus and Louis of Savoy in 1434, as a probable result of which the manuscript returned to Savoy, entering the ducal library which, in turn, was ultimately incorporated into the University Library in Turin. Kügłe’s view of the origins of the codex is compatible with this, but somewhat different from the consensus in the conference proceedings. There it was generally agreed, most importantly on stylistic grounds linking the repertory with music composed early in the fifteenth century, that it is most likely to have been made following the wedding of Anne’s father, Janus, to Charlotte of Bourbon in 1411 as part a concerted programme by King Janus to build up the court as an institution. If the repertory were composed specifically for that purpose, it is much easier to understand both its arrangement (a complete

Kügle’s reconstruction of the manuscript’s original structure, using evidence of catchwords and patterns of hair-and-flesh sides, produces identical results to those already published in the conference proceedings by myself and Andrew Wathey (though curiously there is only a passing reference to that essay here). This is to be welcomed as a rare instance of musicologists producing identical results from separate examinations of the same evidence. We differ only slightly in our views of the scribes, Kügle seeing a change of text script in folios 89–92 where we see none. This change is hard to explain, for although the custos changes in the music, the text script still looks in the facsimile to be identical, and there seems no reason to propose any change of hand.2 Much more important is the fact that we all agree on the identity of the music hand throughout, and of the music scribe with the second of the text scribes. This is the key to understanding the origins of the music because of the irresistible connection to be hypothesized between the coherence of the music copying and the coherence of the compositional style. Kügle’s confirmation of our findings gives considerable strength to the ‘autograph collected works’ hypothesis outlined above. Our conclusions on the order of copying are somewhat different, mainly due to the deductions Kügle draws from his very plausible assumption that the music scribe was occupied with copying music while the professional text scribes were working on other parts of the project. (We assumed less imaginatively that work began at the beginning.) He offers valuable conclusions gleaned from colleagues in art history concerning the style of the illuminations, and makes some significant points about the importance of J.II.9 in the history of the emerging Mass cycle and as a repository of *ars subtilior*.

The latter point will need some refinement in a study of compositional procedure, for it could be argued that the features of *ars subtilior* seen here are grafted on to a very simple underlying structure rather than being integral in the way that they are for composers of the stature of Solage or Senleches, for example. But this may simply be a function of the late date of composition in a period when *ars subtilior* could be used (as it was even as late as Dufay) to draw attention to the high style of a song rather than to its modernity.

But what really matters about this facsimile is the fact that it is photographically outstanding. The colours are faithful, the resolution, though fractionally variable, is generally excellent. Each photograph shows the complete leaf

---

2 Other minor corrections required to both studies are Kügle’s missing of the change to custos 2 on f. 158r-v, and the formatting error in our Table 1 at f. 150v. There, R18 and R19, and all subsequent entries, should move down one line. (Unfortunately, we were not shown proofs.)
and more, so that one can see that nothing has been cropped at the edges. It has none of the disadvantages that somewhat marred the same publisher’s Squarcialupi facsimile (those uncertain edges, the added gold), nor does it misguidedly attempt to feel like a medieval manuscript (the Las Huelgas volume, also discussed in *PMM* 8/2). It simply presents outstandingly good colour photographs of the complete document, which is the essential requirement for the scholar. Its shortcomings are few: the size is not absolutely consistent, but varies slightly from page to page (evident if one measures the recto and verso of the same leaf), and it lacks a listing of features not adequately shown by the photographs (principally, erasures), one of the details that so distinguished the recent Chicago facsimile of the Canonici manuscript. But perfection is too much to ask, and this is certainly very good indeed, the best production so far from an outstandingly good publisher. Its value will remain long after current scholarship surrounding the manuscript has become obsolete, which is just as it should be.

**Daniel Leech-Wilkinson**


The hundreds of motets composed during the first three-quarters of the fifteenth century comprise a repertory more known about than known. And after having read Julie Cumming’s *The Motet in the Age of Du Fay*, it is easy to understand why there has been no major study of these works until now, for motets in this period tend to be highly individual, resisting easy stylistic generalization and categorization. In filling this lacuna, the book tackles two preliminary and interrelated problems: first, how to classify generically the 300-odd stylistically disparate motets that survive from the first three-quarters of the fifteenth century; and, second, how to explain the historical development of the genre during that period. These questions are addressed in the three parts into which the book is organized: the first three chapters introduce methodology and terminology; the next four chapters investigate various subgenres of the motets in Bologna Q15 (representing the early fifteenth century); and five further chapters explore the varieties of motet in the mid-fifteenth century, using the enormous repertory of the Trent Codices and ModB as the basis for the discussion. A book that covers such a large repertory risks superficiality; that this book avoids it is due to Cumming’s profound knowledge and appreciation of the individual musical works, evident throughout the book but especially so in in-depth analyses of eight well chosen, little-known motets.

Recognizing that solving the problem of classification is a prerequisite to making any analytic or historical statements about motets, Cumming wisely incorporates the process of classification into the book itself. Her primary model is the genre theory of Alastair Fowler, who suggests that large genres (his
example is the novel) include so many different types of literature that they cannot usefully be considered to be generically united. They are more easily explained as a composite of myriad ‘subgenres’ that reflect both the genre’s diverse roots and the multiplicity of stylistic developments it has undergone over time.

Fowler proposes the establishment of a ‘generic repertory’ – a list of features that can assist in identifying various members of a genre, and through which works can be grouped into subgenres. Following this model, Cumming creates a comprehensive catalogue of style features (pp. 28–40) that she uses to identify the motet subgenres that are the major agents in her history of the motet. The subgenres are born, interact and die out with abandon, and much of the book is devoted to charting their configurations and reconfigurations.

To explain the motet’s historical development, Cumming turns to a biological analogy, suggesting that we regard the motet as an evolving species which adapts to its natural environment over time. This works fine as a metaphor, and indeed, most accounts of historical change are full of evolutionary metaphors: genres mutate, styles die out, etc. But Cumming is proposing more than just the use of metaphorical language. She devotes several pages to explaining Darwin’s account of evolution, and then, proposing that we imagine the motet to be a pigeon, recounts the history of the medieval motet as if it were the evolution of pigeons (p. 20). It is a bit startling to be asked to make this imaginative leap here (and again on pp. 97–8, where the pigeons return, together with quails), and I think that to insist so strongly upon this analogy is to run the risk of alienating curmudgeonly readers. This is a risk that Cumming is surely aware of, and it seems to be part of a larger strategy whereby language and concepts are presented in a way that can seem exaggeratedly simple, as though the author is trying to combat the normal tendency of scholarly language to be unnecessarily complex. At times, this simplification of language can result in simplification of issues; but for the most part the strategy works well, resulting in exceptionally lucid writing for which the reader will be grateful.

In chapter 3, ‘Fifteenth-century Uses of the Term “Motet”’, Cumming considers three kinds of evidence: music-theory treatises, archival references and music manuscripts. This three-pronged investigation yields a rather loose definition of the motet as a genre that ‘excluded prescribed liturgical service music, but included polyphonic settings of many chant texts and/or melodies for which the liturgical usage is optional or flexible, as well as settings of many other kinds of texts with no associated melodies’. The discussion of the generic categories in ModB, a source organized by genre, is particularly illuminating, helping to clear up the often muddled relationship between the ‘motet’ and other sacred Latin-texted works, such as the antiphon. The distinction rests both upon liturgical function and on musical style. Motets in ModB, while Latin-texted and sacred, are generally not strictly liturgical, but are works ‘whose association with the liturgy is flexible and highly variable’ (p. 51). Table 3.1, daunting at first glance, usefully compares antiphon settings in the ‘antiphon’ section of ModB with
antiphon settings in the ‘motet’ section (subdivided into Continental and English works). The comparison shows considerable differences in subject matter, musical features and length between ‘antiphons’ and ‘motets’ that set antiphon texts. The clear-headedness with which the author treats this complex question of genre is typical of the entire book: the approach to problems of terminology, genre and musical style is careful and systematic, and the discussion is extremely easy to follow.

Chapters 4 through 7 discuss motets found in the early fifteenth-century source Bologna Q15. I found this to be the most enjoyable part of the book. The repertory is diverse and quirky, and Cumming’s detailed knowledge of the music is particularly impressive. This is the place where the theory of motet subgenres is first applied, and Cumming’s categorization deftly parses motets in two ways, based on texture and historical development. Table 4.1 (p. 69) summarizes the classification of the Q15 motets into these two categories (like many of the tables in the book, it takes a while to absorb the information here, but it is worth the effort). The essential division of motet textures into ‘motet-style motets’ and ‘cantilena-style motets’ provides a useful starting point for more shaded subdivisions of the repertory on the basis of other stylistic features. Cumming identifies ‘cantilena style’ here simply by vocal texture (a single texted cantus over tenor and contratenor) rather than, as other scholars have done, by type of text, presence or absence of cantus firmus, or presence or absence of isorhythm. She offers a characteristically lucid account of the fourteenth-century ‘English cantilena’ (pp. 85–90) and its adoption in Continental sources in the early fifteenth century, untangling terminological and stylistic ambiguities and reconciling various earlier accounts of this genre.

In Table 4.1 Cumming divides the repertory into works that represent one of the fourteenth-century ‘ramifying roots’ (French isorhythmic, English isorhythmic, Italian, English cantilena) and those that fall into one of eight new ‘hybrid subgenres’: works, that is, which combine elements of established motet genres to form new hybrids. One of the new hybrid subgenres that Cumming identifies, and to which she devotes a chapter, is the ‘cut-circle motet’; these are cantilena-style works that betray a particular cluster of rhythmic and metric style features, and which often, though not always, have a cut-circle mensuration. Two of Du Fay’s best known early works, Vergine bella and Flos florum, exhibit these characteristics, which include florid melismas, fermatas, and imitative repeated-note figures. The creation of this stylistic category leads Cumming to a characteristically lucid and in-depth discussion of the complex and recently much-contested issue of the meaning of cut circle. She proposes that one meaning of that sign is to indicate rhythmic organization derived from the renotation of C one mensural level higher, resulting in imperfect modus. Cut-circle metric features are closer to the modern $\frac{6}{8}$ than to $\frac{3}{4}$ (Cumming suggests transcription in $\frac{6}{4}$), and include remote imperfection of the long, hemiola at the breve level, and semibreve ‘pick-ups’. Cut-circle has the advantage over C that the rhythmic field is expanded by one level, allowing a larger range of durations (since, for example,
the semiminim is one-sixth of the semibreve pulse in C, but one-twelfth of the breve pulse in cut circle. As the example of a cut-circle motet, Cumming laudably chooses to analyse a work that demonstrates the complexity of the issue rather than simplifying it: Ave mater by Johannes de Sarto. This is a work that begins in O and changes to cut circle about two-thirds of the way through, but as Cumming points out, the section in O has stylistic features of cut circle and vice versa, raising the question of what the new sign is supposed to indicate (to complicate matters, the cut circle is found in different places, a bar apart, in the two sources that transmit the work). A facsimile in original notation would have been welcome here, as the reader must work backwards from Cumming’s transcription to understand the original mensural relationships. Cumming’s decision to transcribe the entire work into $\frac{6}{4}$ is puzzling in light of her persuasive suggestion about the metrical significance of cut circle, for the transcription masks a difference between the mensural organizations of the two sections. Were bars 1–37 transcribed into $\frac{3}{4}$ to reflect the breve organization of O, they would better highlight the structure of phrases whose cadential arrivals are now buried in the middles of bars 4, 11, 20 and 25, and better reflect characteristic rhythmic subdivisions of the breve (S–M–S–M; M–S–M–S; and even M–M–M–Sm–M–M–Sm–M, in bar 25, none of which is found in the cut-circle section). The cut-circle section, which to my mind more logically starts in bar 38, where Q15 has it, is then differentiated by its grouping at the modus level, and perhaps by a slightly faster tempo (although I agree with Cumming that tempo is not the central issue).

The discussion of the motet in the early fifteenth century ends with a wonderful reading of Du Fay’s Supremum est mortalibus (pp. 158–63). After having so carefully set up the various stylistic permutations of the subgenres, here it is payoff time. Cumming has prepared the reader well to understand and accept her interpretation of Du Fay’s motet as a genre-bender, an isorhythmic motet that makes myriad references outside the isorhythmic motet tradition to a wide range of other subgenres of the motet.

Just as Q15 formed the source of the repertory for the early fifteenth-century motet, the Trent Codices provide the source for the mid-century motet, analysed in chapters 8–12. The methodology is the same: Cumming takes the repertory of motets and organizes them into subgenres based on shared stylistic features. While in the Q15 discussion the scribe’s assignation of works to the section of the manuscript devoted to motets was the starting point for investigation, here it is up to Cumming to decide which of the non-Mass and non-Magnificat works are to be considered motets. Using the organization of the repertory of ModB as her guide, Cumming eliminates liturgical service music (too liturgical), cantiiones and Leisen (musically too simple and geographically too remote), and textless works (no text), to arrive at a repertory of 200 motets in the Trent Codices. This method could certainly invite some quibbles, but Cumming is, as always, quick to point out ambiguities and borderline cases, thus showing that she is aware of the dangers of category-making.
Cumming characterizes the motet in this second phase of her account as having ‘a more muted palette’ than that of the earlier motet: while a colourful ‘mosaic’ of subgenres co-existed in the Q15 repertory, by the second half of the century there was less subgeneric variety and more stylistic ‘inbreeding’ (p. 184). Certain of the subgenres of the first phase have died out (including the cut-circle motet), and the new subgenres include tenor-based motets and a variety of four-voice motets. While the story in the first section is about diversity, that in the second section is about evolution towards a goal: the late fifteenth-century four-voice motet with the familiar voice distribution of single cantus, tenor, and high and low contratenors. English music again has an important role to play, but Cumming shows how the presence of English music reaches its peak in the 1440s and dies out by the 1460s.

Although the basic outlines of the history of the motet in the fifteenth century remain unchanged by this book, what was something of a historiographical cartoon has now been given the nuance of light and shadow, and a much richer portrait has emerged through Cumming’s careful, penetrating, work-centred account. *The Motet in the Age of Du Fay* is a masterful survey of a surprisingly neglected repertory, providing an essential foundation for future research.

**ANNE STONE**


The worth of Patrick Macey’s book is by now no secret to anyone working on music and religious life around 1500. The very difficulty in choosing the correct adjective (‘medieval’, ‘Renaissance’, ‘early modern’) to describe the intellectual content of its subject, namely, Girolamo Savonarola’s radical reinterpretation of religious life and its musical reflections, justifies a review in these pages, as the friar’s inspiration and influence seems very much a late ‘medieval’ product, rather than some early manifestation of rational modernity (let alone humanism) in the Renaissance. Macey has carefully and neatly divided the volume into two rather different halves, the first concerning the repertory and reconstruction of the laude that were so important to the friar’s movement, and the second on the very different motet settings of texts derived from his meditations *in extremis* on Psalms 50 and 30. Macey thus links music created for (if not entirely by) ‘popular’ social classes with some of the most elite, private musical creations of the sixteenth century, a move that reflects the continuities of Renaissance culture over social divisions. This is a very helpful approach, one very much in line with recent trends in general historiography. For the purposes of this journal, I should like to concentrate on the former category.

The first five chapters are concerned with a summary of the Dominican’s career
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and ideas (pp. 11–33), the interplay between the *canti carnascialeschi* and laude repertories that was key to his attempts to secularize Florentine popular music (pp. 34–58), musical recreations of the last three Carnivals under his influence (pp. 59–90), his rejection of complex polyphony and the musical versions of the laude texts that can safely be attributed to him (pp. 91–117), and the remarkable survival, largely due to musical and oral transmission, of his cult among the social world of Dominicans in Cinquecento Florence. Macey’s book thus joins a distinguished tradition of laude scholarship (Ghisi, Cattin, Barr, Wilson).

The first technical problem that Macey had to confront is that of the extremely marginalized and seemingly lost state of the repertory, due to Savonarola’s defeat, execution in 1498 and subsequent status at the margins of Catholic thought during an era of reformulation. Contemporary chronicles and slightly posterior biographies give incipits for laude associated with the Piagnoni, the ‘weepers’ who formed the city corps of the Dominican’s movement, and some of the texts by the friar or his followers can be found in six Florentine manuscripts that are given summary inventories in Appendices B-G. But absolutely central to Macey’s reconstruction of the corpus is his postulation of Serafino Razzi’s 1563 *Libro primo delle laudi* as a kind of tune book for the repertory of two generations earlier (see esp. pp. 51–8). By process of ‘cantasi come’ or simple contrafact, seeking the metrical and rhyme schemes in the printed book that have counterparts among the earlier literary texts, he maps the laude that can be associated with the friar, and especially those sung at the Carnivals of 1496–8, on to Razzi’s corpus, normally set a₂ or a₃. The idea presupposes a remarkable fixity of what must have been a largely oral melodic/polyphonic tradition, and the gradual acceptance of the texts, ‘sanitized’ from their more radical Savonarolan connotations, among a broader public.

In general, Macey’s procedure works and is fairly musically convincing. The most striking case of forced fit is found in the effort to use Razzi’s *Signor Giesù* as a template for Girolamo Benivieni’s *Viva ne’ nostri cuori* (pp. 69–73), a lauda that was vital to the success of Savonarola’s preaching and influence at the 1496 Carnival. But the adaptation would require a switching of line lengths, and even Macey himself seems somewhat more sceptical of the idea than of the other, more convincing, pieces he supplies with melodies.

The other cases, though, are much clearer, and the author deserves the highest praise for tracking down the printed versions of the *santapazzia* texts by Benivieni that encapsulate much of the spirit of Savonarola’s movement (pp. 82–6). The musical settings of Savonarola’s poetry, and the veneration in which he was held by later Dominicans, are more obvious, and Macey does a very precise job in defining the references (or stanzas) that would prove problematic in the very different atmosphere of post-Republic Florence. His earlier work has shown the role of such nuns as Caterina de’ Ricci (1522–90) in the diffusion of such domestic sacred songs. I would only suggest in this regard that the transmission of the Savonarolan repertory via the female monasteries was even more marked than Macey suggests, in light of such inscriptions as that of BNF, Rossi 395 (noted
but not discussed on p. 313), a mid-Cinquecento laude collection that passed from its compiler Fra Leone Forteguerri to his niece Suor Lisabetta Tolomei at S. Chiara in Pistoia. The side of the movement that emphasized the extremely affective personal relationship to Christ, expressed and transmitted in the very simple music of such laude, seems extremely typical of the level of spirituality and culture in the ‘middle-class’ female houses of Tuscany.

This simplicity, the traditional musical garb of the movement, raises the broader question of what Savonarola’s efforts meant for music. On the level of devotional aesthetics, its implications are most obvious in the friar’s diatribes against the kind of polyphony which, as Macey noted, was being sung in the city’s cathedral even as he fulminated against it down the street at S. Marco (pp. 91–8). With its apocalyptic rhetoric, scathing criticism of Roman practice, and policy of ‘anti-polyphony’, the Dominican’s revolution seems hard to understand as anything but a late manifestation of the various dialects of radical reform that dated back to the twelfth century. In that light, the seemingly ‘irrational’ aspects (burning of vanities, attacks on polyphony) make perfect sense as yet another example of the long survival of late medieval modes of thought in even the centres of humanist practice.

To write the kind of book that Macey has means to draw on widely disparate discourses in music history, religious studies and textual philology. He has done remarkable reading in the religious history of Florence and in the often tendentious Savonarola literature, and the devotional background is convincingly presented, always shaped towards the understanding of the repertory. In the second part of the book, the passages on the reception of the friar’s meditations, and the ways in which the motet tradition served to encapsulate them for specific figures, are among the best case studies ever written of the social and personal meanings of sixteenth-century motets. As anyone who has ever undertaken such a project knows, however, it is extremely difficult to balance previous scholarship and current readership, in and out of the musicological public. Perhaps this led to some of the book’s occasional unevenness. Some parts of it (e.g., ch. 1) summarize work in religious history well. But is any reader really unaware of the function of mendicant orders in late medieval Italy (p. 49)? Similarly (and surprisingly), a good deal of basic information is often repeated, as in the successful characterizations of Pope Paul III’s condemnation of the friar’s thought (pp. 160 and 163).

The other great strength of Bonfire Songs, though, is its tracing of Savonarola’s meditations in the ‘high-culture’ motets of the sixteenth century, the second half of the book. Part of this comes out of Macey’s work on Savonarola’s influence on Ercole I d’Este and its reflections in Josquin’s Miserere mei, Deus, although it seems a bit much to suggest that the composer was consciously attempting to enact the friar’s thought through his setting (p. 191). Although it falls outside the scope of this review, it should be noted that Macey’s analysis of the literary structure of the two meditative texts allows him to parse the various settings of Infelix ego in the very different versions of Willaert and Rore, and the far less
known (and simpler) one by Simon Joly; and thus the tracing of the Estense influence through Ippolito II’s career is extremely persuasive. Macey saves his best writing for Byrd’s setting of this text, providing more detail and more nuanced insight than one finds in the discussion of his former teacher Joseph Kerman. As a case study in the musical fortune, and differing cultural meanings, of these two meditations, Macey’s book could not be bettered.

The presentation of the book, together with the other materials that reflect Macey’s work, is also excellent. The accompanying CD, recorded by Macey and a largely student ensemble from the Eastman School of Music, gives satisfying recordings of many of the pieces discussed, including almost all the laude discussed in detail. His edition of the unpublished or little-known pieces (both laude and motets) has also appeared (in the A-R Editions series of ‘Recent Researches in the Music of the Renaissance’), and so the reader has almost everything needed to study the repertory of the book. From its beginning, this has been a model project, and Bonfire Songs is a very fitting testimony as to how to carry out such work.

Robert L. Kendrick