**Fifty years of debate in *Early Music***

*Joseph W. Mason*

*Early Music*, over the course of its fifty years, has become the prime forum for debate on music before 1800. The journal has fostered conversation, agreement and disagreement on wide range of topics, the most hotly debated of which will be discussed here. Since its inception, *Early Music* has been a platform for musicologists to publish their research, for performers to discuss historical repertoires and historical performance practices, and for both groups to review books, editions, recordings and events in the world of (primarily Anglophone) early music. This broad church of contributors, unique among scholarly journals, has meant that debate has ranged broadly and beyond the usual confines of academic research. Also important has been the journal's frequent issues (four each year) and variety of types of writing, including full-length articles, reviews and letters, which together have enabled debates to retain momentum and welcome the voices of anyone who has an opinion. The field of early music is perhaps especially ripe for debate, given that so much evidence has been lost and that any surviving evidence is frequently ambiguous, partial and contradictory. Key debates of the last fifty years have included the *a cappella* performance of medieval polyphony; the presence of falsettists in English sixteenth-century choirs; the performance pitch of Tudor polyphony and certain movements from Monteverdi's Mass and Vespers of 1610; dotting in French overtures; the performance of conjunct quavers or semiquavers unequally outside of France in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; and the forces required to perform Bach's choruses.

Formalised debate is as old as European universities themselves. With the translation of Aristotle into Latin, first by Boethius, and later by various scholars in the twelfth century,

medieval universities played host to a vibrant culture of debate, formalised in the teaching of dialectic. By the thirteenth century, the vogue for this New Logic had given rise to the disputation, a spectacular form of debate between two students that attracted crowds of spectators at the University of Paris.[1] Dialectic continued to be a major mode of intellectual enquiry in universities and survives today in viva voce examinations. Debate and dialectic can serve various ends. For the twelfth-century Gilbert of Poitiers, the consideration of two contradictory statements required the scholar to uncover the ambiguity of both apparently absolute positions; for Thomas Aquinas, the dialectical method enabled students both to root out fallacy and to uncover fundamental truths.[2] Composers of *jeux-partis*, medieval debate songs, instead enjoyed the irreconcilable contradictions that their songs teased apart from within the typical gestures of courtly love.[3] Later transformations of dialectic altered its traditional functions. The so-called Hegelian method tests the abstract (thesis) in relation to real-world experience (antithesis), leading to a refined product (synthesis); Theodor Adorno turned this method on its head with his negative dialectics. The debates the have played out on the pages of *Early Music*, while lacking the explicit theorisation of these definitions of dialectic, reflect these varied approaches to contradictions and confrontation.

The process of debate serves, first and foremost, to test hypotheses, reveal logical inconsistencies and arrive at scholarly consensus. The debate around the related questions of performing pitch and voice types in 15th- and 16th-century polyphony is illustrative of this. Peter Phillips reported in 1978 (*EM* vi/2) that there was much debate at the time over the pitch at which Tudor vocal polyphony would have been performed. The hypothesis of 'Tudor high pitch', a minor 3rd above *a'*=440 was the pitch level preferred by some performers (see, for example, David Wulstan and the Clerkes of Oxenford's 1988 recording of Tallis's *Missa Puer*

*natus est*, CAL 6623). When sung at modern pitch, the part labelled 'Contratenor' in the sources sits generally comfortably—though often high—in the tenor voice, but at Tudor high pitch the Contratenor becomes too high for a tenor to sing and must be sung by a female contralto or male falsettist.[4] Debate on this issue thus followed two tracks: 1) the pitch at which Tudor polyphony should be performed; and 2) whether male falsettists sang the 'contratenor' part, or indeed any other part in Tudor polyphony.

Roger Bowers's 1980 contribution (*EM* viii/1) was an important early challenge to proponents of Tudor high pitch and falsettist participation. By carefully surveying the ranges of voice parts in 15th-century English polyphony, Bowers showed that in the first part of the 15th century, three-voice counterpoint consisted of two voices in the same range (Tenor and Contratenor) and a voice a 5th above (Superius). The two-octave span of these voice parts together fits comfortably within the ranges of the modern falsettist and two tenors, or (as Andrew Parrott suggests in his response, *EM* ix/1, 1981) a modern tenor and two basses. With no fixed pitch, Bowers argues, singers would choose to sing at whatever pitch would best fit their ranges; this is an important counterargument to the idea of Tudor high pitch, for which it was understood that written pitch corresponded to some fixed pitch, albeit a 3rd higher than modern pitch. Bowers understands the later polyphony of the Eton choirbook to be an expansion of the falsetto/tenor three-part texture, to which a lower voice was added at the bottom (Bassus) and a high voice added at the top (Treble), the superius part becoming the Mean. This explains, for Bowers, the fact that in Eton, the tenor and contratenor parts are often written in the same clef, and is corroborated by the appearance of boy trebles in archival documents after 1450/60. Since Bowers envisaged the Tenor and Contratenor to be sung in the early 15th century by two tenors,

it follows that the contratenor part in the later 15th century and 16th century would also have been sung by a tenor, rather than a falsettist, as some choral directors in the 1980s believed.

Bowers's argument was picked over several times in the decades that followed. His belief that the contratenor part would have been sung by natural adult male voices is now largely accepted. Simon Ravens used scientific research into the correlation between height and pitch of male voices (*EM* xxvi/1, 1998) to corroborate Bowers's claim; I find Ravens's proposals convincing, though evidently Trevor Selwood (*EM* xxvi/2, 1998; xxvii/2, 1999) did not. Ravens thinks it very likely that on average Tudor voices were higher than modern voices because of poorer nutrition, and it is therefore probable that contratenor parts could have been sung by high tenors without using falsetto.

Bowers's refutation of the high pitch theory, expounded by Wulstan, is also corroborated.[5] Wulstan had argued that Tudor polyphony should be performed a minor 3rd higher than written pitch, in part because of discussion in treatises that certain clef combinations entail downward or upward transposition, but also because of parts of organs that survive from the period.[6] Ravens (*EM* xxvi/1, 1998) exposes the repeated error in interpreting the organological evidence, suggesting that Tudor organ pitch may have been only one or two semitones higher than modern pitch, in line with his proposal of slightly higher voices; in a brilliant discussion of transposing organs, Andrew Johnstone (*EM* xxxi/4, 2003) argues that Tudor pitch was a little over a semitone higher than modern pitch. Although they do not frame it as such, Johnstone and Ravens's questioning of evidence would satisfy an important aspect of the Aristotelian New Logic: to prove one's point by showing that the contrary cannot be true.

The other part of Bowers's argument—that falsettists sang the superius line in three-part 15th-century polyphony and the mean line in Tudor polyphony—has been less well received.

Christopher Page (*EM* ix/1, 1981) challenges Bowers's citation of 12th- and 14th-century uses of the term 'fausetum' as evidence for 15th-century practice; Parrott, in the same issue, considers Bowers's reasoning to be circular. A response to both Page and Parrott by Bowers is printed immediately afterwards. Ravens (*EM* xxvi/1, 1998) questions Bowers's assertion that the mean line in five-part English works would have been sung by adult falsettists, noting that for the make-up of the Eton choir—ten boys and seven men—*divisi* boys would yield better balance between the voice parts (5-5-2-2-3 rather than 10-2-1-2-2) and make sense of the indications of solo and tutti passages in the choirbook. A magisterial discussion of the evidence for falsetto singing by Parrott (*EM* xliii/1, 2015) refutes all of the arguments put forward by Bowers and (elsewhere) David Fallows, and is almost entirely convincing in its assertion that falsettists did not sing in English choirs until the early 17th century.[7] The debate around pitch, the contratenor line and falsettists thus exemplifies that debate carried out over several years between many scholars and performers can refine our interpretation of the historical evidence and lead to some form of consensus. Other debates in *Early Music* show similar scholarly rigour and the benefits that debate brings to the study of early music; in the remainder of this review, I consider some of the other effects that debate may have.

**Debate as spectacle**

There is a spectacular aspect to much debate. At the University of Paris in the 13th century, university activities were cancelled to allow all members to witness the public debates known as *disputationes*.[8] It has often been assumed that 13th-century *jeux-partis* must have been performed for entertainment at feasts of the Arras *puy*, since the texts of these debate songs are flashy and sensational in nature. In the 16th century, music theorists Vincente Lusitano and

Nicola Vicentino debated musical genera in spectacular form over five days, ending with a formal judgement by three judges.[9] Debate is also a good way to pique readers' interest. When Jean des Murs remarked in his 1321 *Notitia* that there had been daily debates about new notational signs and their interpretation, does he do so to make his notational developments seem more prestigious and worthy of discussion?[10] Was Monteverdi's reply to Artusi included in his 5th book of madrigals in order to make the print a more attractive commodity, as Tim Carter has suggested?[11]

I have reservations about the spectacular and often antagonistic nature of musicological debates—on which I expand below—but one benefit of spectacular debate is that it can attract attention to a thorny problem. One of the debates that dominated *Early Music* in its first 25 years concerned the performance of polyphony without instruments. In many works of secular and sacred polyphony from the 13th to the 15th centuries, the lower voices are not accompanied by text in their manuscripts, save perhaps for the word 'Tenor' that names the voice part. Before the 1970s, the norm was for the texted upper part to be sung by a soloist or group of singers and the lower parts to be played on instruments. Consorts such as Gothic Voices, the Hilliard Ensemble, the Taverner Choir, and the Tallis Scholars began to perform polyphony with voices only, a mode of performance that Howard Mayer Brown, in a review of Gothic Voices' *Castle of Fair Welcome*, dubbed 'the new secular *a cappella* heresy' (*EM* xv/2, 1987). Musicological debate concerning the use of instruments had played out for the previous ten years, much of it on the pages of *Early Music*. Christopher Page, perhaps the key 'heretic', inferred from Deschamps's near-contemporary discussion of music that Machaut's polyphonic songs should be sung *a cappella* (*EM* v/4, 1977); and from his reading of courtly literature, Page argued that instruments and voices were far more likely to perform in separate consorts than together (*EM* x/4, 1982).[12]

A slew of articles followed. Dennis Slavin and Lawrence Earp each discussed the evidence for partially texted tenors and contratenors, which indicate singing even where text is absent in the source (both *EM* xix/2, 1991). Tess Knighton corroborated the hypothesis with evidence from the late 15th-century Spanish *cancionero* repertory (*EM* xx/4, 1992). In other words, the excitement and interest generated by the debate in the late 1970s was the catalyst for further work that, except for notable dissension from Kenneth Kreitner (*EM* xxvi/2, 1998) and Peter Urquhart and Helen de Savage (*EM* xxxix/3, 2011), has confirmed that *a cappella* performance was the norm.

All this debate is good for readership, of course. The editors of *Early Music* must have been thrilled when the debate over Bach's choruses was reignited and began to fill the pages of *Early Music.* Joshua Rifkin had proposed in 1982 that Bach's choruses were mostly performed by solo concertists, with optional ripienists only added occasionally to fill out the texture. Ton Koopman rebutted this theory (*EM* xxiv/4, 1996), while two articles in the same issue by Parrott and Rifkin himself supported Rifkin's original hypothesis. The debate raged for the next three years, as the voices of John Butt, Lucy Carolan and Christoph Wolff joined the conversation, and bubbled up again in 2010 and 2011 when Andreas Glöckner offered further evidence. Doubtless in the late 1990s many readers of the journal, on receiving an issue, eagerly read the contents page to see if the next instalment of this scholarly drama had arrived. Two items of correspondence (*EM* xxvii/1, 1999) humorously illustrate what readers eventually made of this long-running polemic. Lionel Sawkins, Michael Burden, T. M. Pamplin and Susan Wollenberg call for 'a moratorium on further discussion to allow some sober reflection' (p. 172): clearly some readers had had enough of Bach and his choruses. A more positive view is offered by Gavin Kirkpatrick—that the debate had opened up many new questions and had revitalised the

performance of Bach's music. Kirkpatrick notes the power of debate to focus minds on a single problem and to encourage the discovery and analysis of new pieces of evidence.

**Debate and performance**

The debates of *Early Music* have in almost all cases had effects on the performance of early music. In pursuing his *a cappella* heresy, for example, Page (*EM* xx/3, 1992) was faced with a challenge: if the lower voices of medieval polyphony were not to be played by instruments, how should they be sung? One solution is to add a text to music that is not accompanied by text in the manuscript; this option is supported by the work of Slavin and Earp, and for which Page finds further examples of partially texted tenors. Another solution, and one that Page's group Gothic Voices frequently used, is the vocalisation of the lower parts with a vowel that gives the best choral blend. Page proposes that the vowels [y] and [i] yield the best balance, textural clarity and comfort for the singers. The debate over falsetto singing and contratenor lines has similarly initiated much experimentation. Peter Phillips (*EM* xxxiii/3, 2005) speaks from his experience of directing the Tallis Scholars when he discusses the challenges of realising Tudor polyphony with a modern choir. The pitch level of the music determines which modern voice types will sing each of the lines. This aeffects the balance between parts (which Phillips believes should be equally audible) and the tone achieved, but is also shaped by practical concerns such as ability, stamina and availability of singers. Phillips prefers to have high female sopranos than to give consistently high lines to tenors. He advocates that the wide range and awkward position of the contratenor line be sung by a mix of voices: high male tenors, female contraltos, and male falsettists.

Hearing music in performance can in turn often sway scholars one way or the other. The debate over transposition in Monteverdi's Mass and Vespers of 1610 is a case in point. Andrew

Parrott (*EM* xxii/4, 1984; xxxii/2, 2004; xl/1, 2012) and Jeffrey Kurtzmann (*EM* xiii/1, 1985) both advocate that the 'high clef' movements of the print—the Mass, both Magnificats and the psalm setting *Lauda Jerusalem*—should be transposed a 4th lower than printed, as copious evidence from early modern treatises and transposing keyboards would suggest. Bowers (*EM* xxxi/4, 2003; xxxix/4, 2011) does not disagree that some transposition is required, but finds that transposition by a 4th produces music that sounds uncomfortably low; his aural experience seems to be his primary motivation for arguing contrary to the weight of evidence that Parrott summons. As Margaret Bent notes in her review (*EM* xxi/4, 1993) of Page's monograph *Discarding Images*, the use of modern performance to inform our views of the past is risky. (Page rejects this criticism vociferously, as I discuss further below.)

The context for many of these debates was the historically informed performance movement, which has left a lasting impression on the early music performance world, even if questions of authenticity are debated much less fiercely (if at all) in recent years. The quest for authenticity drove and was driven by positivist modes of scholarship that became unfashionable in the disciplinary shifts of the 1990s. Authenticity means determining that a work was played *this* way, not *that* way, implying that there is a single right way to perform a work of early music. Such dogmatism encourages polarised debate. While a scholarly essay can balance the evidence to suggest more or less likely interpretations of the evidence, it is difficult to maintain such nuance in a musical performance. Monteverdi's *Lauda Jerusalem* is either performed a 4th lower than printed or it is not; conjunct semiquavers in Handel and Scarlatti can be played straight or dotted, but a mixture will probably lead to an unconvincing and messy performance.

The effects of this dogmatism on the performance scene have been numerous. David Fallows, writing for the 25th anniversary issue of *Early Music* (xxv/4, 1997), commented that the

debate over the use of instruments in medieval polyphony had made record producers cautious of recording music in a way that might attract the ire of reviewers who prized authenticity. The opinions of scholars of early music gained such force via the concept of authenticity that performance careers were made and broken. The Orlando Consort owes its origin to the *a cappella* heresy, founded as it was to promote the performance of medieval polyphony without instruments.[13] The Medieval Ensemble of London disbanded in 1985; Daniel Leech-Wilkinson speculates that as the use of instruments came to be considered inauthentic, instrumental ensembles found it harder to be accepted in the early music community.[14] Fortunately, the debate on late medieval falsetto singing has not stymied the careers of male countertenors, though equally female contraltos have improved chances of being hired, both in early music ensembles and, in recent years, in cathedral choirs and choral foundations. Similarly, Bach's works continue to be performed with large and small groups of singers for the choruses; choral societies have ignored this particular debate, much to the benefit of their members.

It is notable that in the past two decades, debates over the authentic performance of early music have receded. Perhaps this is because the most fraught questions of performance practice were so thoroughly debated in the 1980s and 1990s, so that there is little more to say on these subjects; perhaps, though, this is also a sign that times have changed. Performers of early music today tend to be well-versed in the musicological literature and the historical evidence, but enjoy the freedom to experiment with the music and make it their own. This can only be a good thing. There may also have been a shift in the academic study of early music. Many of the key figures in these debates are of the same generation, born during or shortly after the Second World War. Did these scholars, feeling that the place of early music in the discipline of musicology and in university syllabi was threatened, consequently react with such fervour in their debates with each

other?[15] Or do those debates simply reflect the vitality of the discipline at that point, the consequence of having so many brilliant scholars and performers with similar interests? If the ebbing of debate in *Early Music* reflects changes in the academic study of medieval music, we might ask, 'where next?' Is the diminished activity of debate a sign that the study of early music is declining, or rather that younger scholars have different priorities and carry out scholarship in ways different from their older counterparts?

**Debate and 'paranoid reading'**

In looking over the debates that have dominated *Early Music*, I was—as well as being impressed by the abundant scholarly erudition—struck by the tone that the debates often took. I was reminded of something that Emma Dillon said while I was in one of her Masters seminars at King's College London: that behind every text that we as scholars pull apart and criticise, there is a living, breathing person for whom that text represents months of careful research. The debates of early music sometimes turn personal, antagonistic and combative. I wonder if the same words and the same injurious or injured tone would have been used if those debating had been speaking to each other face to face, rather than in the correspondence pages of *Early Music*.[16]

Combat and antagonism are inherent in debate, and are part of what makes debate a spectacle. In my own work on the Old French *jeu-parti*, a debate song between two or more poet-singers, I have noted the number of songs that are described by the singers using violent terminology: a song might be a 'battle' (*aramie*), 'war' (*guerre*), 'struggle' (*estrivement*), a 'combat' (*aatie*) or a 'dispute' (*tenson*).[17] The root of our modern English word 'debate' is the Latin *battere*, 'to beat', the violent connotation of which was carried through to the Old French

noun *debat*. This violence is not confined to medieval debate. The infamous early 20 century case of Jean Beck and Pierre Aubry in which disagreement between the two men over the origins of the modal rhythm hypothesis led to Aubry's death by suicide, and it was rumoured that Aubry had sustained his fatal wound in preparation for a duel with Beck, has been thoroughly documented by John Haines.[18] Thankfully, there have been no such serious consequences to the debates in *Early Music*, but some writers deploy metaphors that point back to violent duelling with swords or firearms: John Byrt is happy 'to cross swords with Beverly Jerold' (*EM* xliii/3, 2015, p. 555) and John O'Donnell calls on 'combatants in the battle of the double dot to cease fire' (*EM* vii/3, 1979, p. 344), for example.

The antagonism in debate causes what Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick has termed the 'paranoid critical stance', which she sees principally in the deconstructive work of queer and feminist scholars, although many of her observations might apply equally to the historical work of early music.[19] The paranoid position—an idea which Sedgwick draws from the psychoanalysis of Melanie Klein, and which we all adopt in our day-to-day lives—is characterised by certain patterns of thinking: the constant attempt to anticipate future criticism; the reflexive application of criticism to one's own work; the belief that there is always a fundamental truth to be exposed or demystified; and a blindness to its own negative affect.[20] This paranoia can be seen in different ways in the debates in *Early Music*.[21] Some essays adopt a forceful argumentative style, which anticipates criticism by trying to eliminate any opposition before it has arisen. Writers are sometimes selective in the way they read and response to criticism, only addressing points that they can easily rebuff. There is often a tacit reluctance to concede error or admit that there might be different ways to read the evidence.

As an example of Sedgwick's concept of paranoia, we might take the debate that arose from Page's *Discarding Images*, which Bent reviewed in *EM* xxi/4, 1993. On reading Page's response to Bent (*EM* xxii/1, 1994), I was surprised by how much criticism Page felt was implicit in Bent's review. To me, reading nearly 30 years later, Bent's writing is critical but polite and well-reasoned. But Page mounts a robust defence, ~~accusing~~ arguing that Bent ~~of sins of omission~~ 'passes over virtually everything that looks like cultural history', and claiming both that she 'misrepresent[s]' him and that Bent's own musicological ethos is flawed.[22] In other words, Page sees much more criticism in Bent's review than I do: his position is precisely what Sedgwick would term paranoid. I say this not as a criticism of Page or of any other participants in scholarly debate: the paranoid is a natural and normal position to adopt within Klein's model of the psyche and, perhaps more to the point, it is the way that modern scholars are trained to think and write. (Indeed, I am aware that much of my own writing in this review has been paranoid.) Is it any wonder that scholars adopt paranoid modes of thinking and writing when they know that their ideas may be subjected to rigorous debate? Yet Sedgwick's point is that there are other approaches available to us, ones with different affects.

Sedgwick argues not that we reject the paranoid entirely, since the paranoid stance has been crucial to much important scholarly work. Rather, she proposes an alternative that she terms the 'reparative'.[23] This mode of reading is attuned to the pleasure of reading a text, to its texture and affect rather than to its hidden meanings that ideology critique or textual analysis must uncover. Indeed, the reparative lies hidden in many of the debates already discussed. Bowers prefers the sound of Monteverdi's *Magnificat* a7 transposed down a 3rd rather than a 4th, Wulstan likes Tudor polyphony at a thrillingly high pitch, Page is more convinced by the sound of *a cappella* polyphony, and John Byrt cannot but imagine Handel's vocal lines to be

completely aligned with the rhythm of the instrumental parts. These pleasures and preferences are powerful motivations for debate, as scholars adopt the paranoid mode to try to uncover truth that can justify their enjoyment of certain styles of performance. But in such cases, why adopt the paranoid mode at all? If debate encourages us to think in the paranoid mode, it is also important not to lose sight of the reparative, of pleasures which require no justification.

Fortunately, early music offers ample opportunity to indulge in reparative reading. The debates over performance tend to suggest that there is only one right way to perform a work of early music. Instead, I suggest, we might take debate as an invitation to experiment in performance. A piece of music can be performed again and again: there is no need for the final judgement to be given on what the 'right' performance is, because there can always be another performance that tries something different. As the policing force of authenticity has waned, performers have had greater liberty to experiment with performance modes that might formerly have been considered heretical. This is evident in early music performance over the last decade. In their ~~2016~~ 2014 recording of the Monteverdi *Vespers* (COR16126), for example, The Sixteen offer two versions of *Lauda Jerusalem*, one at high pitch and one at low pitch. I confess that I like both, but for different reasons.

At a time when social media is highly divisive and political debate has become so polarised, I cannot help but hope that we can retain what is positive in debate while also making space for reparative approaches. *Early Music* has been a wonderful forum for debate, and I look forward to another fifty years of robust intellectual discussion that will refine our knowledge of the past and offer early musicians many possibilities for performance. But perhaps as we engage in debate we might also keep sight of the real, feeling individuals who produce research and the love of early music which we all share.

[1] On the New Logic, see S. Kay, *Courtly contradictions: the emergence of the literary object in the twelfth century* (Stanford, 2001), pp. 11–12; A. J. Novikoff, *The medieval culture of disputation: pedagogy, practice, and performance* (Philadelphia, 2013), pp. 104–26. On the spectacle of the disputation, ibid., pp. 133–71; J. Enders, 'The theater of scholastic erudition,' *Comparative Drama*, xxvii/3 (1993), pp. 341–63.
[2] On Gilbert of Poitiers and Thomas Aquinas, see Novikoff, *Medieval culture of disputation*, pp. 114 and 170.
[3] M. Gally, *Parler d'amour au puy d'Arras: Lyrique en jeu* (Orléans, 2004), pp. 59–61.
[4] D. Wulstan, 'The problem of pitch in sixteenth-century English vocal music,' *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, xciii (1966), pp. 97–112, at p. 101.
[5] Bowers's refutation is implicit in *EM* viii/1, 1980 p. 25 and explicit R. Bowers, 'To chorus from quartet: the performing resource for English church polyphony, c. 1390–1559', in *English choral practice, 1400–1650*, ed. J. Morehen (Cambridge,1996), pp. 1–47, at pp. 43–7.
[6] Wulstan, 'Problem of pitch'.
[7] The one part of Parrott's thesis that did not wholly convince me was the discussion of *Gaude virgo mater Christi* by H. Battre (*EM* xliii/1, 2015, pp. 90–2), which Fallows (*EM* xxvi/2, 1998) considers to be key evidence for falsettists.
[8] Enders, 'The theater of scholastic erudition', p. 341.
[9] B. Blackburn, 'Lusitano, Vicente', *Oxford Music Online*, https://doi.org/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.article.17205.
[10] G. Rico, 'Music in the arts faculty of Paris in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries' (DPhil diss., University of Oxford, 2005), p. 231.
[11] T. Carter, 'Artusi, Monteverdi, and the poetics of modern music', in *Musical humanism and its legacy: essays in honor of Claude V. Palisca*, ed. N. K. Baker and B. R. Hanning (Stuyvesant, NY, 1992), pp. 171–94, at p. 176.
[12] The other key figure in these debates, as all the writers on this topic acknowledge, was David Fallows, whose article 'Specific information on the ensembles for composed polyphony, 1400–1474', in *Studies in the performance of late mediaeval music*, ed. S. Boorman (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 109–59 was crucial in throwing the instrumental hypothesis into doubt.
[13] See Donald Greig's discussion in *EM* xliii/1, 2015, p. 129.
[14] D. Leech-Wilkinson, *The modern invention of medieval music: scholarship, ideology, performance* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 138–9 and Greig in *EM* xliii/1, 2015, p. 133.
[15] Bent (*EM* xxi/4, 1993), for example, likens Page to Joseph Kerman, whose *Contemplating music* (Cambridge, MA, 1985) is often particularly critical of scholars of early music (e.g. at pp. 116–20). The journal *Early Music* itself is the target for some of Kerman's critique (pp. 203–13).
[16] Robert L. Marshall comments, for example, that his dispute with Joshua Rifkin over Bach's choruses caused 'sever damage to a valued friendship': R. L. Marshall, 'Belated thoughts on Bach's chorus', *Early Music America*, xv/4 (Winter 2009), pp. 24–8, at p. 25. See the response by Andrew Parrott in 'Bach's chorus: no change', *The Musical Times*, cli (no. 1913, 2010), pp. 4–6.
[17] J. W. Mason, '*Trouver et partir*: the meaning of structure in the Old French *jeu-parti*', *Early Music History*, xl (2022), pp. 207–51, at p. 239.
[18] J. Haines, 'The footnote quarrels of the modal theory: a remarkable episode in the reception of medieval music,' *Early Music History*, xx (2001), pp. 87–120, esp. at p. 115.
[19] E. K. Sedgwick, *Touching feeling: affect, pedagogy, performativity*, ed. M. A. Barale, J. Goldberg and M. Moon (Durham; London, 2003), p. 126.
[20] See also the discussion of paranoia in W. Cheng and S. McClary, *Just vibrations: the purpose of sounding good* (Ann Arbor, 2016), pp. 3–5.
[21] Donald Greig specifically uses the term 'paranoia' in his discussion of scholarly debate and performance practice: *EM* xliii/1, 2015, p. 134.
[22] Page sees 'a sense of willing enclosure and delimitation of the musicological field' in Bent's review, for example, whereas one of his aims in *Discarding Images* was to 'bring medieval musical life into contact with other aspects of culture': *EM* xxii/1, 1994, pp. 127–8.
[23] Sedgwick, *Touching feeling*, p. 147.