Ashgate Historical Keyboard Series

ASPECTS OF EARLY ENGLISH KEYBOARD MUSIC BEFORE C.1630

Edited by
David J. Smith

Aspects of Early English Keyboard Music before c.1630

English keyboard music reached an unsurpassed level of sophistication in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries as organists such as William Byrd and his students took a genre associated with domestic, amateur performance and treated it as seriously as vocal music. This book draws together important research on the music, its sources and the instruments on which it was played. There are two chapters on instruments: John Koster on the use of harpsichord during the period, and Dominic Gwynn on the construction of Tudor-style organs based on the surviving evidence we have for them. This leads to a section devoted to organ performance practice in a liturgical context, in which John Harper discusses what the use of organs pitched in F may imply about their use in alternation with vocal polyphony, and Magnus Williamson explores improvisational practice in the Tudor period. The next section is on sources and repertoire, beginning with Frauke Jürgensen and Rachelle Taylor's chapter on *Clarifica me Pater* settings, which grows naturally out of the consideration of improvisation in the previous chapter. The next two contributions focus on two of the most important individual manuscript sources: Tihomir Popović challenges assumptions about *My Ladye Nevells Booke* by reflecting on what the manuscript can tell us about aristocratic culture, and David J. Smith provides a detailed study of the famous Fitzwilliam Virginal Book. The discussion then broadens out into Pieter Dirksen's consideration of a wider selection of sources relating to John Bull which in turn connects closely to David Ledbetter's work on Gibbons, lute sources and questions of style.

David J. Smith is Founding Professor of Music at Northumbria University, before which he served as Head of Music and Master of Chapel and Ceremonial Music at the University of Aberdeen. He specialises in early keyboard music from England and the Low Countries, and in English instrumental music more generally. As well as writing about the English keyboard music, its sources and instruments, he has edited the keyboard music of Peter Philips (1560/61–1628) for the scholarly series, Musica Britannica, and more recently contributed an edition of consort music by Philips and Richard Dering (c.1580–1630) to the same series, some of which has been recorded by the Rose Consort of Viols. David is co-founder and General Editor of the Ashgate Historical Keyboard Series.

Ashgate Historical Keyboard Series

Series Editors:
David J. Smith, Founding Professor of Music, University of Northumbria and Andrew Woolley

The Ashgate Historical Keyboard Series is designed to provide a natural home for studies in all aspects of keyboard music by musicologists, organologists and analysts, as well as for performers and instrument makers engaged in practice-led research. It therefore provides an outlet for research in the field of keyboard studies in its broadest sense, straddling many and various approaches and research methods in the study of music. What makes the series cohesive is the focus on keyboard music; what lends it vibrancy is its embracing of all historical contexts and styles. The format of each volume is likewise flexible, ranging from monographs, editions of theoretical texts and their translation, to multi-author volumes.

'Historical' should not be taken to imply 'early'. Although the word 'historical' may conjure up images of early instruments (pre-1800), it is in fact open-ended and non-prescriptive. It is used in the sense of the author not being directly involved in the creation of the musical artefact (except, perhaps, in the case of reconstructions of instruments); it implies objectivity, or in other cases reinterpretation, by virtue of being removed from an earlier creative context, or belonging to a different one. The series is therefore concerned with the music of the past, including potentially that of the most recent past.

Academics and students often have interests in keyboard music which extend across chronological boundaries and embrace music intended for different instruments. This series not only provides a natural home for research in the field of keyboard studies, but also allows libraries and individuals to subscribe to a series of publications that are of benefit to a wide range of readers.

Perspectives on Early Keyboard Music and Revival in the Twentieth Century
Edited by Rachelle Taylor and Hank Knox

Studies in English Organ Music
Iain Quinn

Muzio Clementi and British Musical Culture
Sources, Performance Practice and Style
Edited by Luca Levi Sala and Rohan Stewart MacDonald

Aspects of Early English Keyboard Music before c.1630
Edited by David J. Smith

For more information about this series, please visit: www.routledge.com/music/series/AHKS.

Aspects of Early English Keyboard Music before c.1630

Edited by David J. Smith

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2019
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Smith, David J. (David John), 1965-
Title: Aspects of English keyboard music before c.1630 / edited by David J. Smith.
Description: Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY : Routledge, 2019. | Series: Ashgate historical keyboard series | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2019001409| ISBN 9781138088672 (hardback) | ISBN 9781315109701 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Keyboard instrument music—16th century—History and criticism. | Keyboard instrument music—17th century—History and criticism.
Classification: LCC ML728.2 .A76 2019 | DDC 786.0942—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2019001409

ISBN: 978-1-138-08867-2 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-315-10970-1 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman
by Swales & Willis Ltd, Exeter, Devon, UK

Contents

List of figures vii
List of tables and catalogue ix
List of music examples x
Manuscript sigla and bibliographic abbreviations xii
List of abbreviations xiv
List of contributors xv

PART I
Introduction 1

1 Changing approaches to the study of English keyboard music before *c.*1630 3
DAVID J. SMITH

2 An annotated bibliography of selected writings about early English keyboard music: updating *Tudor Music* from 2008 and *William Byrd* from 2012 17
RICHARD TURBET

PART II
Instruments 27

3 The harpsichords of the virginalists 29
JOHN KOSTER

4 The lost musical world of the Tudor organ 49
DOMINIC GWYNN

PART III
Keyboard music and liturgy 67

5 Alternatim performance of English pre-Reformation liturgical music for organ and voices composed *c*.1500–60 69
JOHN HARPER

6 Playing the organ, Tudor-style: some thoughts on improvisation, composition and memorisation 99
MAGNUS WILLIAMSON

PART IV
Sources and repertoire 123

7 Seven settings of *Clarifica me Pater* by Tallis, Byrd and Tomkins: friendly emulation or friendly competition? 125
FRAUKE JÜRGENSEN AND RACHELLE TAYLOR

8 Hunting, heraldry, and humanists: reflections of aristocratic culture in *My Ladye Nevells Booke* 146
TIHOMIR POPOVIĆ

9 Seven solutions for seven problems: the Fitzwilliam Virginal Book 163
DAVID J. SMITH

10 Towards a canon of the keyboard music of John Bull 184
PIETER DIRKSEN

11 Stylistic change in English lute and keyboard sources in the time of Orlando Gibbons 207
DAVID LEDBETTER

Index 240

Figures

4.1 Reconstructed Tudor organ by Goetze and Gwynn based on a soundboard found at Wingfield Church, Suffolk. © Dominic Gwynn 50

4.2 Reconstructed Tudor organ by Goetze and Gwynn based on a soundboard found at Wetheringsett, Suffolk. © Dominic Gwynn 51

4.3 St Teilo Organ, made in the Tudor style for The Experience of Worship in Late Medieval Cathedral and Parish Church research project. © Dominic Gwynn 53

4.4 Oldest organ case in British Isles at Parish Church of St Stephen, Old Radnor. © Dominic Gwynn 53

4.5 Illustration of a regal in Michael Praetorius, *Syntagma musicum*, part 2, 'Theatrum instrumentorum' (Wolfenbüttel, 1620). Public domain 56

4.6 Claviorgan by Lodewijk Theewes, dated 1579, in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. © Dominic Gwynn 57

4.7 Reconstruction of the organ from the Theewes claviorgan, 1579, in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. © Dominic Gwynn 58

4.8 Sir Nicholas Le Strange's organ of 1630 from Hunstanton Hall in Norfolk, now in St Luke's, Smithfield, Virginia. © Dominic Gwynn 59

4.9 Reconstructed 'consort organ' by Goetze and Gwynn for Harm Vellguth at Staunton Harold church. © Dominic Gwynn 60

8.1 Frontispiece of *My Ladye Nevells Booke*. © British Library Board, British Library Music MS 1591, frontispiece 147

8.2 Tomb of Lady Peryam in St Mary's Church, Henley. © Christopher Foley, reproduced by permission 149

8.3 Inscription above the tomb of Lady Peryam in St Mary's Church, Henley. © Christopher Foley, reproduced by permission 150

9.1 (a) FVB, p. 91, system 3. End of no. 49: Oldfield, *Praeludium*. © The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. (b) FVB, p. 92, system 2. Breve-length chord at the end of no. 50: Blitheman, *In Nomine*. © The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. (c) FVB, p. 385, system 3, bb. 3–6. Representative 'redundant' breve-length chord from end of FVB, no. [275]: Byrd, *Canon. 2. pts in one*. © The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge 165

9.2 (a) FVB, p. 41, system 2, bb. 3–4 (no. 24: Byrd, *Praeludium*). © The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. (b) FVB, p. 77, system 1, b. 1 (no. 41: Byrd, *Treg. Ground*). © The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. (c) FVB, p. 92, system 4, b. 2 (no. 51: Bull, *Ut, re, mi, fa, sol, la:*). © The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. (d) FVB, p. 140, system 3, bb. 1–3 (no. 74: Philips, *Pavana Pagget*). © The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge 167

9.3 FVB, p. 372, system 3. © The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge 175

9.4 FVB, p. 134, system 2. Byrd, *The Bells*, ninth variation. © The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge 175

9.5 (a) FVB, p. 285. Note at end of Byrd's first pavan (no. [167]). © The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge. (b) FVB, p. 161, system 4. Note by Philips's first pavan (no. 85). © The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge 176

11.1 Margaret Board Lute Book, fol. 32r. Reproduced by permission of the Royal Academy of Music Library, MS603, from the Robert Spencer collection 208

Tables and catalogue

5.1	Incidence of transposition in alternatim organ settings	77
5.2	Transpositions of the hymn melody *Salvator mundi*	77
5.3	Ranges of sung faburden on the hymn melody *Salvator mundi*	78
5.4	Finals in Te Deum chant, and in faburden and polyphonic settings	80
5.5	Alternatim hymn settings	84
5.6	Alternatim hymn settings – scoring and ambits	88
7.1	Occurrences of Motif A on each pitch in Tallis, *Clarifica me Pater II*	132
7.2	Imitative structure of Tomkins's setting	141
10.1	1185 – first hand	187
Catalogue	John Bull – Catalogue of the keyboard music	196

Music examples

5.1	Hymn melody *Conditor alme siderum* in simple faburden	75
5.2	Three melodic formulas of Te Deum	79
6.1	Magnificat in Tone VIII (Attaignant, 1531) and Magnificat in Tone VIII, 'The viij tune in C fa ut' (*GB-Lbl* Add. MS 29996)	103
6.2	English anon., Magnificat, showing the final bars in manuscript (*GB-Lbl* Add. MS 29996, fol. 28r), and in transcription. © British Library Board, British Library Add. MS 29996, fol. 28r	104
6.3	(a) Opening of 'Adesto nunc propitius', second verse *Salvator mundi domine.* (b) Opening of 'Adesto nunc propitius', stock formula at end of first phrase	107
6.4	*Salvator mundi* set in five idioms	110
6.5	John Redford, *Christe qui lux withe a meane* (Mulliner, fol. 47r)	112
6.6	'Christe' *Or me veult* (*GB-Lbl* Roy. App. 56, fol. 15r–v)	115
7.1	*Antiphonale ad usum ecclesie Sarum* (1519), fol. 188r, Palm Sunday, First Vespers, and fol. 247v, Vigil of the Ascension, Lauds	127
7.2	Similar opening figures in Tallis and Byrd	129
7.3	Contrapuntal modules in Tallis's first setting	130
7.4	Motivic repetition in Tallis's second setting	131
7.5	Motif and canonic entries in Tallis's third setting	133
7.6	Motivic variation and repetition in Byrd's first setting	135
7.7	Motives and modules in Byrd's second setting	136
7.8	Imitative counterpoint against the cantus firmus in Byrd's third setting	137
7.9	Tomkins's setting	140
8.1	William Byrd, *a voluntarie for my ladye nevell*, *My Ladye Nevells Booke*, no. 26, bars 1–2	155
8.2	Giovanni Gabrieli, *Intonazione del ottavo tono* (Charteris no. 246), bars 1–2	155
8.3	William Byrd, *a voluntarie for my ladye nevell*, bars 17–20	155

11.1 *Courante Lespine*, tablature and transcription 214
11.2 *Prelude mr Daniel*, tablature and transcription 217
11.3 (a) Gabriel Bataille, from *air*, *I'auois brisé mes fers*, voice, tablature and transcription. (b) *Courante Gauthier, sur J'avois brisé mes fers* (first strain only), tablature and transcription 220
11.4 *Courante Gauthier son adieu* / *La double*, tablature and transcription 221
11.5 (a) *Courante*, anon. (lute), tablature and transcription. (b) *A french Corantoe* / *Mr orlando Gibbons* (keyboard) 225
11.6 (a) Pierre Guédron, *Ces Nimfes* (melody and bass reduction of the voice and lute *air*). (b) *Coranto* / *Mr Gibbons* (keyboard). (c) *Corrãto*, anon. (keyboard) 227
11.7 (a) *Mr Orlando Gibbons*. (b) *Coranto* / *Monsieur Barre* in Benjamin Cosyn's hand, *Mr Orlando Gibbons* in another hand 229
11.8 Purcell, *Corant* 231

Manuscript sigla and bibliographic abbreviations

A-Wn	Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Musiksammlung (followed by shelf-mark)
B-Bc	Conservatoire Royal de Musique, Bibliothèque
CS-Pnm	Prague, Narodní muzeum – Muzeum české hudby, hudební archive (followed by shelf-mark)
D-B	Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung (followed by shelf-mark)
D-Lr	Ratsbücherei und Stadtarchiv der Stadt Lüneburg, Musikabteilung (followed by shelf-mark)
D-Mbs	Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Musikabteilung (followed by shelf-mark)
D-W	Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Musikabteilung (followed by shelf-mark)
F-Pn	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Fonds du Conservatoire (followed by shelf-mark)
F-Psg	Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève (followed by shelf-mark)
FVB	Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, Mus. MS 168: Fitzwilliam Virginal Book
GB-AB	Aberystwyth, Llyfryell Genedlaethol Cymru (followed by shelf-mark)
GB-Cfm	Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum (followed by shelf-mark)
GB-Cu	Cambridge, University Library (followed by shelf-mark)
GB-En	Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland (followed by shelf-mark)
GB-HAdolmetch	Haslemere, Carl Dolmetch Library (followed by shelf-mark)
GB-Lbl Add. MS(S)	London, British Library, Additional Manuscript(s) (followed by manuscript number)
GB-Lbl R. M. MS(S)	London, British Library, Royal Music Library Manuscript(s) (followed by manuscript number)
GB-Lbl Roy. App. MS(S)	London, British Library, Royal Appendix Manuscript(s) (followed by manuscript number)

GB-Lcm	London, Royal College of Music (followed by shelf-mark)
GB-Och	Mus. Oxford, Christ Church Library, Music (followed by manuscript number)
MB	Musica Britannica
Mulliner	London, British Library, Add. MS 30513
PL-KJ	Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellońska (followed by shelf-mark)
S-Sk	Stockholm, Kungl. Biblioteket (followed by shelf-mark)
S-Uu	Uppsala, Universitetsbiblioteket (followed by shelf-mark)
US-CA	Cambridge, MA, Harvard University, Harvard College Library (followed by shelf-mark)
US-Cn	Chicago, Newberry Library (followed by shelf-mark)
US-NH	Yale University, Music Library (followed by shelf-mark)
US-NYp	New York Public Library at Lincoln Center, Music Division (followed by shelf-mark)
US-R	Rochester, Sibley Music Library, Eastman School of Music, University of Rochester (followed by shelf-mark)

Abbreviations

C-clefs are described with reference to the line on which they are positioned, counting from the lowest on the staff. Thus C4 is a tenor clef, and C3 an alto one.

LH: left hand

RH: right hand

MS and MSS: manuscript, manuscripts

New Grove 2: Grove Music Online: www.oxfordmusiconline.com/grovemusic

NS: New Style (in relation to dates)

Pitch: C_1–B_1, C–B, c–b, c^1–b^1, c^2–b^2, c^3–b^3, where c^1 is middle C [Chapter 3, Table 3.1 and note 50 goes down to G_1]

Contributors

Pieter Dirksen, an internationally active harpsichordist and organist, received his PhD 'cum laude' in 1996 with a dissertation on Sweelinck's keyboard music, which was awarded the Dutch Praemium Erasmianum. He has published books on Sweelinck, Scheidemann and Bach's Art of Fugue, and edited keyboard music by composers from Bull to Bach.

Dominic Gwynn is a professional organ builder with a special interest in the revival of the classical English organ. Dominic has written a number of articles and essays on British organ building history and is writing a book on the English organ in early modern society and culture, 1500 to 1770.

John Harper is Emeritus Director of the Royal School of Church Music (RSCM) and holds honorary professorships at the universities of Birmingham and Bangor. He has published on liturgical music, and was a driving force behind the Early English Organ Project and the recreation of a late medieval organ.

Frauke Jürgensen is Senior Lecturer in Music at the University of Aberdeen. She studies Renaissance compositional and performance practice, and develops and implements computational methods for the study of counterpoint. As a singer, she is especially interested in early music, late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century art song, and contemporary music.

John Koster was Professor of Music and Curator of Keyboard Instruments at the National Music Museum, University of South Dakota. He has written extensively about the history of musical instruments and in 2016 received the American Musical Instrument Society's Curt Sachs Award for lifetime achievement.

David Ledbetter is an independent researcher in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century keyboard music and performance practice, with a particular interest in how an understanding of context and structure may deepen and enrich performance. Publications include *Harpsichord and Lute Music in 17th-Century France*, *Continuo Playing According to Handel*, *Bach's Well-Tempered Clavier* and *Unaccompanied Bach*.

Tihomir Popović is Professor and Research Coordinator at the Hochschule Luzern and Lecturer at the Hochschule in Hanover. He obtained his DPhil degree and habilitation at the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, where he has also lectured. His publications include two monographs on English music.

David J. Smith is Founding Professor of Music at Northumbria University, before which he served as Head of Music and Master of Chapel and Ceremonial Music at the University of Aberdeen. He is a General Editor of the Ashgate Historical Keyboard Series, and specializes in early English keyboard music.

Rachelle Taylor is Adjunct Professor of Performance at McGill University and historian and archivist at Library and Archives Canada. She is co-editor of *Networks of Music and Culture* (Ashgate, 2013) and *Perspectives on Early Keyboard Music and Revival in the Twentieth Century* (Routledge, 2018), and principal associate of the translating and research firm Le Trait juste in Montreal.

Richard Turbet was Special Collections Cataloguer and Music Librarian until 2009 at Aberdeen University Library. His books *Tudor Music: A Research and Information Guide* (1994) and *William Byrd: A Research and Information Guide* (3rd edn, 2012) were awarded the C.B. Oldman Prize.

Magnus Williamson is Professor of Early Music at Newcastle University, General Editor of Early English Church Music and Principal Investigator of *Tudor Partbooks* (AHRC, 2014–17) and *The Sarum Hymnal* (British Academy, 2017–18). His research focuses on Tudor musical sources and contexts, improvisation and editorial practice.

Part I

Introduction

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

1 Changing approaches to the study of English keyboard music before *c.*1630

David J. Smith

This book draws together revised versions of selected papers delivered at the Festival of Virginals, Delft (2004), the Symposium of Early English Keyboards, Aberdeen (2005) and the Annual Conference of the Royal Musical Association, Aberdeen (2008). Plans to publish papers from these conferences at the time did not come to fruition, leaving valuable research and insights into early English keyboard music inaccessible. Other chapters in the book have been specially commissioned to broaden the scope.

In this chapter, the intention is not so much to give a chronological narrative, which is readily available elsewhere, or to write an extensive historiographic account of early English keyboard music, but rather to offer some reflections on the evolving approaches taken to the study of composers, their music and the instruments on which it was played.

Establishing the canon

Some of the earliest accounts of early English keyboard music in the modern era were written by continental scholars, such as Charles Van den Borren's *Les origines de la musique de clavier en Angleterre* of 1912.[1] The publication of Willi Apel's *Geschichte der Orgel- und Klaviermusik bis 1700* in 1967,[2] an English translation of which appeared in 1972,[3] offered a narrative of early keyboard music which was similar in scope to post-war studies of musical periods, such as Gustav Reese's *Music in the Renaissance* and Manfred Bukofzer's *Music of the Baroque Era*.[4] Apel's approach was to focus on composers and forms, and to use style analysis to trace musical influences of one generation on the next. The story of the English virginalists was set within a bigger picture of continental keyboard composition. In the year after the translation appeared, John Caldwell published his seminal history of English keyboard music before the nineteenth century.[5] These books played a pivotal role in establishing a chronological narrative without which other, later approaches to the topic would have floundered. In the early 1990s, this story of British keyboard music was refined in two book chapters. Alan Brown made a contribution on England to Alexander Silbiger's *Keyboard Music before 1700*, a book which perhaps consciously referred back in its title to Apel's monumental work, although it called on the expertise of several

authors rather than being the work of one.[6] Whereas Brown's work on England was situated in the context of continental keyboard music, as had been the case with Apel's book, Barry Cooper's chapter in a volume of the Blackwell History of Music in Britain mirrored Caldwell in its national context.[7] Meanwhile, John Harley published a two-volume study of British harpsichord music in which the focus was as much on the sources as on composers and their music, although the subject matter necessarily excluded the organ; Virginia Brookes published her thematic index of the sources at around the same time.[8]

The aim of these studies was in part to establish a canon, and this was facilitated by the publication of early English keyboard music in Musica Britannica, a post-war initiative by the Royal Musical Association to make British music available in modern, scholarly editions. The very first volume was an edition of a keyboard manuscript, The Mulliner Book (MB 1), which sat neatly alongside transcriptions of seminal manuscripts such as the Fitzwilliam Virginal Book (FVB) and *My Ladye Nevlles Booke* (MLNB) that had been published in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[9] However, by and large the Musica Britannica project has reflected a concern with establishing a canon of works based around significant composers: complete editions have appeared of Thomas Tomkins (MB 5), John Bull (MB 14; MB 19), Orlando Gibbons (MB 20), Giles and Richard Farnaby (MB 24), William Byrd (MB 27; MB 28) and Peter Philips (MB 75). Inevitably, some composers did not produce enough to warrant a volume all to themselves, so there have been a number of volumes that have mopped up the rest, organised by period: Alan Brown published a volume which included intabulations as well as original works from the Elizabethan age (MB 55); similarly, John Caldwell included keyboard versions of vocal works in his volume of music from earlier Tudor times (MB 66); at the other end of the period, Alan Brown drew together a variety of keyboard music from *c.*1600 to 1625 (MB 96). Interestingly, the latest volume of keyboard music before *c.*1630 centres on repertoire contained in manuscripts from the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge that has not appeared elsewhere in the series (MB 102), so there is a sense of returning to the source-centred first volume.

The only printed volumes of keyboard music to appear during the period were *Parthenia* in about 1613 and *Parthenia In-Violata* the following year (or possibly later).[10] There was a manuscript culture in the transmission of keyboard works, creating a high degree of variation between sources. The editorial approach of Musica Britannica followed a model offered by textual criticism in fields such as literature and biblical studies by collating the surviving texts to create a composite which took into consideration all the surviving material. Such an approach has fallen out of favour in some quarters, with editors preferring to use one 'best text' at the expense of others. In some cases, there is a degree of dogmatism which discounts Musica Britannica editions entirely: in the notes accompanying Siegbert Rampe's 2005 recording of keyboard music by John Bull, it is astonishing to read that, 'since there is no modern edition of Bull's works, the present performances are each based on one of the numerous sources which have survived from both time and sphere of influence';[11] Rampe thus dismisses entirely the Musica

Britannica edition, the first volume of which appeared as early as 1960. In fact, of course, the matter is not cut-and-dried, and there are as many problems surrounding the 'best text' approach as its proponents find in editions which collate sources. Also, the reality is that most collated editions are based around a core, primary text, and most 'best text' editions draw upon other sources to correct obvious errors; thus, the approach to editing this repertoire may be seen more as a continuum, with most editions occupying a middle ground.[12] The choice of overall approach perhaps should rest on whether the focus is to be on composer or source.

Alongside general histories and modern editions there have appeared books on composers which include material on their keyboard music.[13] Edmund Fellowes produced his seminal work on William Byrd and Orlando Gibbons in the 1920s and 30s,[14] and the more recent editions of these books are still valuable today alongside those by John Harley and Kerry McCarthy.[15] Similarly, Denis Stevens included material on keyboard music in his book about Thomas Tomkins from 1957,[16] and more recently John Harley considers each of Tallis's keyboard works in his monograph on the composer.[17] Some have focused on instrumental music, such as Oliver Neighbour's book on Byrd's consort and keyboard music in which the main focus is on establishing the chronology of works in different forms.[18] Other studies are doctoral theses, some of which have been published; between them, they cover most of the main figures, including John Bull, Thomas Tomkins, Benjamin Cosyn and Peter Philips.[19]

A focus on composer necessitates the creation of a canon of works since the boundary of what is being studied is determined by authorship. Where a work has been attributed to two composers in different sources, the question asked is who wrote it – in order to determine whether or not it should be included – rather than what the conflicting ascriptions tell us about the nature of the sources, modes of dissemination and keyboard culture in England more generally. When considering matters of authorship, a useful distinction can be made between ascription – writing occurring in a source which contains a name that may or may not be that of the composer – and attribution, in which various evidence is brought to bear on the identification of a composer.[20]

In his book on Bull, Cunningham employs the same identification of pieces by genre and final as used by Neighbour for Byrd's oeuvre; this concern for classification by genre is closely related to the broader picture of developments in English keyboard music painted in the general histories where the focus is on forms and stylistic analysis, and the influence of one composer on another. Stylistic analysis is used also to place English keyboard music in a continental context: Alan Curtis was among the first to claim English influence on the Dutch, particularly Jan Pieterszoon Sweelinck,[21] and Pieter Dirksen's monumental study of the composer contains a great deal of material on the English school.[22]

Work on establishing a canon of early English keyboard music is still ongoing, which is reflected in the title of Pieter Dirksen's work on John Bull (Chapter 10). In his contribution, Dirksen shifts the focus from stylistic analysis to a consideration of the sources. David Ledbetter looks at some small-scale pieces in

Chapter 11; unlike some previous authors, he considers keyboard style not in a bubble all of its own, but as intrinsically connected with the lute, the other main domestic instrument of the period.

Cultural context

Recent work has begun to move away from a linear narrative – a straightforward story in which each successive generation of composers learns from the previous one – to place keyboard music into a broader cultural context in which the focus is as much on the scribes and users of manuscripts, and on the function played by keyboard practice in society, as it is on composers. Such an approach has ramifications for how we approach surviving texts: if scribes play an active role in shaping the music as it passes from one person to the next, then any sense of authorial intention is necessarily weakened. Composers of keyboard music were practitioners whose written works may often be associated with their teaching; they were not engaged in creating a piece of artwork fixed in form and content, so each time they wrote down a piece it could vary in matters of detail and, sometimes, of substance. Hence, the degree of variation to be found between the sources of any one work may reflect discrepancies between versions stemming from the composer, as well as changes made by scribes, whether intentional or not.[23]

Some manuscripts have long held a fascination for writers as worthy of examination in their own right: as well as the 1899 edition of FVB mentioned above, Elizabeth Cole published on the manuscript in the early 1950s, and her paper on seven problems of the Fitzwilliam Virginal Book provides the stimulus for my own chapter in this volume.[24] MLNB has also been the subject of attention, in part because it is a rarity, comprising a collection of pieces all by one person, William Byrd, rather than being the usual compendium of material by many different composers. The identification of Ladye Nevell as Elizabeth Neville, née Bacon, who was wife of Sir Henry Neville of Billingbear in 1591,[25] has allowed the focus to shift to a consideration of the manuscript as an object of material culture, its place in the Elizabethan system of patronage and what it can tell us about the association of virginal music with female players.[26] However, in Chapter 8, Tihomir Popović points out that it is Henry's coat of arms which is present in MLNB, and suggests that a consideration of his role in the manuscript's compilation may provide fresh insights. Similarly, Janet Pollack has examined *Parthenia* in relation to its dedicatee, Princess Elizabeth, rather than considering it from the perspective of what it can tell us about the male composers whose music it contains.[27] Indeed, the long association of virginal music with young ladies makes the study of this repertoire fascinating for what it can tell us about music and gender during the period. Less well-known manuscripts have been considered for what light they can shed on the place of keyboard music in society, as well as being evaluated in terms of their usefulness as sources of pieces by named composers. In general terms, those owned by young ladies tend to be representative of amateur, domestic music-making,[28] and those associated with men contain professional repertoire.[29]

Instruments

Alongside music manuscripts, musical instruments are objects of material culture which can contribute to our understanding of keyboard practice. Whereas in the past there has been a tendency to make assumptions about instruments from the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries based on ones surviving from later in the seventeenth century, the work of Darryl Martin, John Koster, Malcolm Rose and Dominic Gwynn has begun to redress the balance.[30]

Most surviving virginals date from the middle to end of the seventeenth century; similarly, it is worth noting that most surviving manuscripts date also from the seventeenth century, even when they contain music known to have been composed in the sixteenth. John Koster offers an exploration of the harpsichord's place in English keyboard culture of the period in Chapter 3; an article by Darryl Martin in which he considers the technical reasons for the difference in sound between the sixteenth-century virginal and later instruments will appear shortly in the online journal, *Scottish Music Review*, where his work will be copiously illustrated with charts, diagrams and audio examples.[31]

The situation regarding the organ is similar: the ravages of time, combined with Reformation, Civil War and Commonwealth, mean that there are no sixteenth-century English organs still existing. However, the imaginative use of surviving soundboards in the creation of two Tudor-style organs for the Early English Organ Project, based on extensive archival research with reference to continental instruments of the same period, has transformed our understanding of the liturgical organ in England. The construction of a third organ as part of another research project, The Experience of Worship in Late Medieval Cathedral and Parish Church, has built on this work.[32] Such instruments pose as many questions as they answer. Although they have helped to determine Tudor organ pitch, a question of particular significance when combining organ with voices,[33] the way in which they might have contributed to liturgical practice is still open to discussion. In Chapter 5, John Harper (the driving force behind both projects) examines possible ways in which organ music could have been combined with chant and polyphony of various kinds.

Performance practice

Assumptions surrounding the choice of instrument for early English keyboard music have recently been challenged: the organ is often taken to be synonymous with the liturgical instrument, and secular performance contexts involving chamber organs ignored. The evidence suggests that the music of Byrd and his contemporaries was considered equally suited to any keyboard instrument, regardless of genre; only later in the seventeenth century did instrumental designation for works become more common, and genres such as voluntary and fantasia become associated exclusively with the organ.[34] The corollary of this is that keyboard technique was common to all keyboard instruments, without differentiating between organ and plucked string in terms of touch.[35]

There are no English sources of information about keyboard technique or interpretation such as the treatises found for continental repertoire. However, the numerous fingerings included in a great many of the manuscript sources make it possible to gain a good idea of English fingering, which seems to have been particularly methodical. The rediscovery of old fingering systems played an important part in the early music movement from the late 1970s onwards, with many players choosing to adopt them in performance. Ton Koopman's article focusing on the fingering found in MLNB is now freely available on the Internet;[36] Peter le Huray and Mark Lindley have surveyed the sources containing fingerings with a view to uncovering the fingering system in use, and determining the degree to which such fingerings affect phrasing and articulation.[37] A prelude by Orlando Gibbons seems to have been used extensively in keyboard pedagogy, and the variation in fingering between the sources is a salutary reminder that all fingering systems encompass a significant degree of flexibility.[38]

Evidence for the temperament used during the period is harder to come by, as is any information about how the single- and double-stroke ornament signs should be interpreted. Meantone tuning is usually assumed but, in the absence of any evidence that English instrument makers experimented with split-keys producing more than twelve divisions to the octave, something approaching equal temperament must have been used for pieces such as John Bull's *Ut re mi*, in which the six-note hexachord scale is transposed to each chromatic degree.[39] In the booklet accompanying his recording of Byrd's complete keyboard works, Davitt Moroney suggests that a modified Pythagorean temperament, favouring fifths over thirds, might make more sense for English repertoire, given the prevalence of open octave-fifth sonorities in the left hand of much of this music.[40] Then, as now, it is likely that players chose from a range of possibilities; in the reconstruction of the Tudor organs for the Early English Organ Project, Goetze and Gwynn tuned one in Pythagorean tuning, and the other in quarter comma meantone.

The earliest explanation of how to interpret English ornament signs is Edward Bevin's idiosyncratic 'Graces in play' from *c.*1630, and there are further explanations of ornament signs from later in the century. However, the extent to which such evidence can be brought to bear on much earlier repertoire is unclear; indeed, the strokes appear to have originally been used as marks of correction.[41]

There is more to performance practice than the study of fingering systems and ornament signs, and choosing the right sort of instrument. Questions of playing technique, style and the interpretation of texts are intrinsically linked to our understanding of music theory and composition of the time, and especially keyboard practice. The exploration of improvisation at the keyboard in the writings of Jane Flynn,[42] and in Magnus Williamson's chapter in the present volume, thus offers as much of an insight into organ performance practice as it does into the sources and their music. Similarly, John Harper's contribution is as much to do with organ performance practice as it is to do with the church's liturgy.

Networks

Identifying networks of connections can be particularly illuminating, especially when studying a period of history for which a great deal of evidence has been lost over the centuries.[43] There is a limit to what can be known about composers and their music in the early modern period because of the relative scarcity of surviving evidence. Any linear narrative of a composer's life, or of the development of a genre, is thus going to be far from complete. A complementary approach is to look for networks of connections, both musical and cultural in the broadest sense. Whereas a linear account implies the one-way influence of a master on his students, looking at the past in terms of networks leads to a more nuanced understanding of musical influences, involving reciprocity.

Connections may be the fruit of analytical work or may be rooted in the historical record. Interestingly, it is often the case that connections which may be surmised through an examination of the surviving music are corroborated by historical evidence. Thus, Frauke Jürgensen and Rachelle Taylor find a close connection between the *passamezzo* pavan and galliard pairs by William Byrd and Peter Philips through analysis, suggesting a close relationship which is confirmed by evidence that the former was the latter's teacher.[44] This suggests that analysis can be a useful tool for making historical connections even when documentary evidence has not survived. In Chapter 7, Frauke Jürgensen and Rachelle Taylor examine the relationship between Tallis, Byrd and Tomkins through consideration of their settings of *Clarifica me Pater*, postulating that connections between them imply a relationship beyond what might be expected within the improvised tradition of setting chant.

Why 1630?

English keyboard composers of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries are usually classified as the English virginalists. By *c.*1625, most of them had died, and the period immediately afterwards is often labelled as one of decline, or as a transition to Purcell and composers working after the Restoration. However, it is important to distinguish two distinct traditions of keyboard practice, one functional (involving liturgical organ playing and teaching), the other involving the creation of autonomous keyboard works composed for their own sake. Throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, keyboard playing formed part of the education of choristers in cathedrals and collegiate foundations, and of young ladies in the home. The music of the English virginalists was, in fact, composed by musicians who were organists by profession; after the Reformation, the role of the organ in the liturgy was not as involved as it had been, which gave composers such as Byrd the time to take the everyday, functional keyboard music of the home and elevate it to a genre comparable with the finest vocal music of the day. I have recently argued that the so-called English Virginalist School should be regarded as an anomaly, existing outside traditions of liturgical and domestic

keyboard practice that remained surprisingly consistent throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[45] English keyboard music did not, therefore, decline from around 1630, as has sometimes been claimed; rather, this point marks the end of an exceptional period during which keyboard music was elevated from functional music for church or the home to autonomous music to be shared with professional colleagues and connoisseurs.

Notes

1 Van den Borren 1912.
2 Apel 1967.
3 Apel 1972.
4 Reese 1954; Bukofzer 1947.
5 Caldwell 1973.
6 Brown 1996, pp. 23–89.
7 Cooper 1992, pp. 341–66.
8 Harley 1992–4; Brookes 1996.
9 Both editions have had their usefulness extended through reprints by Dover publications. See FVB 1899 (Dover edition of 1979–80); MLNB 1926 (Dover edition of 1969).
10 Parthenia 1613; Parthenia In-violata. The latter must have appeared after 1613, a date that occurs in a watermark. Thurston Dart suggested a connection with Prince Charles on his forthcoming marriage to Henrietta Maria in 1625, arriving at a date of *c.*1624; see Dart 1961. However, it seems unlikely that paper from 1613 would have remained unused in a printing house for such a long time, and the pieces within it all point to a date just after 1613; see Pinto 1996, pp. 98–100.
11 Rampe 2005.
12 Editing early keyboard music is discussed in Smith 2013b. There is now broad agreement that original note-values should be retained, and the practice of halving note-values prevalent in the early volumes has been rightly abandoned. The latest edition of MB 19 thus reverts to original values, although curiously the third edition of MB 14 did not.
13 There are also articles on composers, some examining what is known of their lives, others focusing on their keyboard music or its sources. Richard Turbet's bibliographies offer a comprehensive view of the literature. As a general rule, articles from the early years of the twentieth century tend towards the descriptive and, whilst being commendably enthusiastic about music which at that time was little known, they do not usually provide deeper analytical insight.
14 Fellowes 1936; Fellowes 1925, with a second edition under a new title as Fellowes 1951.
15 Harley 1997; Harley 1999; McCarthy 2013. The latter includes an entire chapter on MLNB, a manuscript containing only keyboard works by Byrd.
16 Stevens 1957.
17 Harley 2015.
18 Neighbour 1978.
19 Cunningham 1984; Irving 1989; Memed 1993; Smith 1994.
20 This distinction is useful also for lute music. See Smith and Robinson 1998, pp. ix–xii.
21 Curtis 1969.
22 Dirksen 1997. Dirksen's search for the sources of stylistic traits in Sweelinck's works extends well beyond English music to repertoire from elsewhere in Europe.
23 As well as the discussion of the role of the scribe in the transmission of Philips's keyboard music to be found in Smith 2013b, David Schulenberg offers a compelling