

# Consort anthem, Orlando Gibbons, and musical texts

David Pinto

He answered very gravely: ‘It rests on something better than evidence.’ I opened my eyes; and he went on as gravely: ‘Conjectural emendation.’  
T.R. Glover *Cambridge Retrospect*

Verse anthem, a mid-Elizabethan innovation in Anglican church music, proved meaningful enough to retain life and develop over centuries. Its first phase, up to the reign of Charles I, was as contrapuntal as full anthem, but tended to be sober and succinct rather than magnificent or florid. In fact, just that tendency can evoke feelings of greater intimacy, since soloists declaim the verses, and texts are as often devotional as scriptural. It all somewhat presages oratorio. About a hundred and ten examples survive from the period c.1570-1630 accompanied by instrumental ensemble rather than organ, eighty-odd complete.<sup>1</sup> To describe them as ‘consort anthem’ grates on some, who feel these two linked components ‘a contradiction in terms: the “anthem” was sung only in church, in which location the consort of viols was never used.’<sup>2</sup> Yet household sets (which incidentally almost never specify viols) can preserve verse or full anthems, uniquely at times; none of them evincing palpable distress over titling out of church.<sup>3</sup> Also, a smatter of evidence shows that English choral foundations of the time used ensemble instruments, if absence of specifics (over date, continuity, repertoire) leaves their habitual part in cathedral or chapel worship open to denial.<sup>4</sup> At stake here is proprietorship. For specialists to assert that absolutely and prescriptively, as if over altar plate reclaimed from thieves’ kitchens, risks casting classification into limbo. There it seems fated to join performance practice, social placement, even the origins of the genre, defeated by lack of evidence and procedural rigour.

The ten consort anthems by Orlando Gibbons, foremost composer in the reign of James I & VI (1603-25), are a test case: all but one unique to a single score, where most are revised and incompatible with counterparts for organ in church sources. The one exception, extant in ensemble part-sets for consort, is also in an unrevised form, and earlier. That double mismatch stymies the easy expectation of a neatly partitioned general function: verse in church, consort at

<sup>1</sup> This count lumps sequential parts (subsidiary verses) within single titles; some, like Michael East’s published efforts, of small length. Roughly four fifths are five-part, almost all the rest in six. Including those printed, about twenty-two sources are extant, roughly a third incomplete. These findings were delivered in gistier form at the Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities, Cambridge, in ‘Chains of Gold: rhetoric and performance in the verse anthem’, 1st March 2013. I am obliged to its convenors in the university faculty of music for an opportunity to present them.

<sup>2</sup> Roger Bowers ‘Ecclesiastical or Domestic? Criteria for identification of the Initial Destinations of William Byrd’s Music to Religious Vernacular Texts’; *William Byrd A Research and Information Guide* ed. Richard Turbet (3/ Routledge; N.Y., 2012) pp. 134-160, part of fn 17, p. 155. This is an article based on one first presented previously, in 2004.

<sup>3</sup> In such sources one can stumble across use of the term ‘anthem’; see fn 57. ‘Give ear O Lord’ by Thomas Weelkes (see below) is one relevant rescue item: verse anthem seemingly for organ, but in a domestic source lacking extant keyboard.

<sup>4</sup> Ian Payne *The Provision and Practice of Sacred Music at Cambridge Colleges and Selected Cathedrals, c.1547-c.1646: A Comparative Study of the Archival Evidence* (Garland; N.Y., 1993); Peter Webster *The relationship between religious thought and the theory and practice of church music in England, 1603-c.1640*, PhD thesis, University of Sheffield (2001); especially Part II chapter 9 ‘The use of musical instruments’.

home.<sup>5</sup> A path out of this fog can be found. Verse anthem as a whole has two textual traits that create a *spoor*. Firstly, no source-type is devoted solely or primarily to the form. Secondly, the two types, for home or church, diverge in significant but so far under-remarked ways, because of differing outcomes to copying procedures. Cathedral choirbooks hold orderly service music, for voices only; they have separate accompaniment, in organ-books. In contrast, domestic part-sets are haphazard farragoes — they mix in consort anthems in a different procedure. They allot vocal-instrumental pairs of like range to shared books on amalgamated lines; singers enter only when underlay is subjoined. This is a compromise: it will be shown how it lets in minor copying quirks. These form an accreted pattern betraying a now-lost previous ‘consort’ form: separate vocal and instrumental part-sets, by no chance closer to the cathedral model. All extant domestic sources therefore derive from a secondary stage, and offer no proof of original functional divide (or much else). Evidence is not so profuse that one can safely ignore any addition to it, whatever upheaval to conclusions it entails. Here, remarks made in the preface to an edition of consort anthems by Gibbons are expanded, to aid reappraisal.<sup>6</sup>

Does ‘consort anthem’, a neologism of no historic standing, define a distinct experience?<sup>7</sup> Or if evidence is short for context (and manner of performance for that matter), can grubbing out ever more arcane detail clarify much? What can textual criticism add? Musicology usually ranks it lower than advances made by stricter policing of repertoire. A relevant example is in renaissance motet, ancestor to verse anthem: one now finds evidence demanded to show function, to prove it liturgical and not devotional (therefore mere domestic). To bring down or wing outworn ahistorical assumptions in this manner is fair game. A riskier allied tendency is for specialists to create nomenclature to fill an original lack. Neater tools for *genre* or form in local contexts can, however careful, predefine by circularity aspects such as function. Is ‘consort anthem’ a case, bypassing the demonstrable to impose premises? It differs from ‘full’ and ‘verse’, the contemporary terms for a procedural or textural divide; almost self-explanatory with ‘full’. In ‘verse’ soloists sing sections; full choruses alternate. The modern novelty ‘consort anthem’, built on admittedly scarce evidence and depleted sources, creates a by-form by *medium* alone, and explicitly deems instrumental ensemble a determinant of domestic use, never church, and never combined with organ.<sup>8</sup> Once promulgated, this decree found ready assent: such as ‘the failure of even one liturgical manuscript to transmit the consort version of an anthem suggests that the organ was the preferred method of accompaniment in public worship’.<sup>9</sup> (Yet evidence to shake this typical

<sup>5</sup> ‘Behold thou hast made my days’ is the only one to have no disparity. ‘Sing unto the Lord’ and ‘This is the record of John’ differ mainly in reworking of ensemble parts accompanying voices. The reworkings lack keyboard parts; which is not to rule out any. They alter no wording but can extend musical phrases and interchange material a little or add *divisi* parts. Two of the texts pray for a monarch’s safety and longevity or health. ‘Do not repine, fair sun’ is an eleventh found elsewhere, which is secular and without trace of keyboard but has a first section with verse-chorus structure.

<sup>6</sup> *Orlando Gibbons The Consort Anthems* ed. and reconstr. David Pinto (Fretwork Editions; Richmond, 2003) 3 volumes, edn nos. FE 23-25. A complete edition combining consort and organ versions in very full fashion is *Orlando Gibbons c.1583-1625* ed. P.C. Buck, E.H. Fellowes, A. Ramsbotham, S. Townsend Warner (Oxford University Press for the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust; London, 1925) *Tudor Church Music* (TCM) vol. 4. *Orlando Gibbons I: Verse Anthems* ed. David Wulstan (Stainer & Bell for the British Academy; London, 1964) *Early English Church Music* 3 (EECM), also covers the *genre*, with a policy of altering pitch and time-values throughout. ‘Do not repine’, not in the last two editions, was edited first by Philip Brett (Stainer & Bell; London, 1961) edn no. 5491, then in *Consort Anthems* (2003); both in score with playing parts.

<sup>7</sup> Experience, not form; for consort anthem is verse anthem if *sub diversis speciebus*. The need is for unimposed distinctions.

<sup>8</sup> John Morehen ‘The English Consort and Verse Anthem’, *Early Music* 6/3 (1978) pp. 381-4; a brief basis for discussion.

<sup>9</sup> Ian Woodfield *The Early History of the Viol* (Cambridge University Press; Cambridge, 1984) p. 221.

argument *ad ignorantiam* is in the public domain.) It is a standpoint that concedes that consort versions *may* have preceded those for organ at times. While clearly not so for most by Gibbons, about a third of known consort forms are doubled by cathedral versions. For many consort forms, too, it is far more probable that their contrapuntal forms preceded reduction to keyboard, not *vice versa*. This concession, though, has a further unadmitted and odd implication: that domestic usage from a casual lay background somehow steered clerical-liturgical practice. ‘The blessed lamb’ à5 for Good Friday by Edmund Hooper is a relevant example: unlikely primary church repertoire, consort anthem to devotional verse, yet in known cathedral use. The paradox may not in itself suffice to alter how the term consort anthem is applied; but an issue needs refining. The English seventeenth century, after all, offers test-cases aplenty to hold novel terminology to account for ‘added value’.

Take ‘declamatory aire’: song that veers in procedures from recitative to arioso and dance-strains; found up to Henry Purcell or beyond (Kathleen Ferrier affectionately dubbed his ‘Mad Bess’, a *genre* extreme, ‘Bad Mess’). Well and good; but no-one *then* saw a need for the term: not even its most polished, published mid-century practitioner, Henry Lawes. Has it extra traction? Does it markedly benefit how we apprehend song-form’s development? By contrast ‘fantasia suite’, for fantasias linked to dance-forms, buckles under its own weight. Only a small sector of repertoire kept its original sequence (developed c.1620), in the hands of just three writers and for little more than two decades.<sup>10</sup> It scants the profuse scorings and variety of dance-forms that were invested in, for a half century before sonata impinged. In this case a term broad enough is hard to come by, owing to the plural *milieux* in which combinations flourished unfettered. ‘Suite’ is anyway an anachronism, at this early generation; not seemingly used until the 1650s. (A ‘set of lessons’ could be a composite nearer to available terminology.) Enter the term ‘consort song’. It postdates Peter Warlock, who revived the form, in a pioneering three-volume edition unmatched for forty years.<sup>11</sup> Joseph Kerman similarly did not devise it, though he first showed how accompanied song pervaded publications until then called madrigalian (William Byrd’s foremost).<sup>12</sup> He found traits of it in *Madrigals* by Gibbons (1612), which led to his most intriguing percept: attributes of verse anthem in the collection’s longest piece, ‘What is our life?’<sup>13</sup> (While a side-issue here, to credit it as a cross-form brings a pessimist blatantly free-thinking voice into a context otherwise conventionally religious, or if secular never overtly sceptical.) ‘Consort song’ is a newcomer, then, but with its uses for fairly standard combinations: one voice or on occasion two, and four instrumental lines (once only, six).<sup>14</sup> A further possibility is offered of choral

---

<sup>10</sup> Fantasia-Almaine-Galliard-Close. The exact form of its inceptor John Coprario was followed only by his pupil William Lawes and then John Jenkins. Maybe 40 years later, Matthew Locke was still innovating in his four-part fantasia ‘sets’. Scorings, continuo usages, and dance-types vary enormously as do naturally the very idiosyncratic styles of writing. I owe much to Layton Ring for his insight on a range of matters discussed here.

<sup>11</sup> *Elizabethan Songs* (Oxford University Press; London, 1926), handsomely produced, stand the test of time if superseded in scale and detail by *Consort Songs* ed. Philip Brett (1967 2/ 1974), MB 22. Even that of course is inexhaustive.

<sup>12</sup> Joseph Kerman *The Elizabethan Madrigal* (Galaxy Music Corporation; N.Y., 1961). Peter Le Huray still employed ‘part-song’ in *Music and the Reformation in England 1549-1660* (Herbert Jenkins; London, 1967 and OUP; New York, 1967).

<sup>13</sup> The verbal text of 1612 seems the earliest, unless preceded by a shorter version in IRL-Dm MS Z3.5.21 f. 126. It is held the chief of variant forms in MS anthologies by Michael Rudick ‘The Text of Raleigh’s Lyric, “What is our life?”’, *Studies in Philology* 83/1 (Winter 1986) 76-87. This mounts on it a brave case for a conventionally religious interpretation.

<sup>14</sup> Philip Brett ‘The English Consort Song, 1570-1625’, *PRMA* 88 (1961-2) pp. 73-88, made the term normative. He attributed it to Thurston Dart, though its only contemporary use in Sir William Leighton *Teares or Lamentacions of a Sorrowfull Soule* (RISM 16147) was for part-song backed by a mixed ‘consort of six’, at times called ‘broken consort’. Gibbons *Madrigals and Mottets* ed. E.H. Fellowes rev. Thurston Dart (Stainer & Bell; London, 1964) edition no. 1660, EMS 5, has a prefatory note dated Autumn 1963 containing ‘consort song’ with reference to Kerman’s findings.

refrain, but the usual result is five-part counterpoint.<sup>15</sup> From that is no big step to another hybrid term, just as handy: our ‘consort anthem’. Almost casually, though, analogy from domestic song has built in the restriction that function and locale must be unliturgical, in senses broad and narrow. Why? Precious little record survives except the musical page. Here, Gibbons repays study. Though not often called an innovator, he was a self-conscious stylist, freely manipulating *genre* or form when it suited (and not just those; if another by-way for present purposes, his very vocal style absorbs instrumental features). His contribution to a vogue c.1610 for ‘Cries’ of City or Country gives examples of cross-form: verse anthem plus consort song. Almost uniquely he vocalised an ‘In Nomine’, imported back from an instrumental *genre*.<sup>16</sup> His work with verse-structure, sacred or secular, could let slip something of what underlies it, coming from a distinguished practitioner in a period of innovation. This textual case, then, stems from examples mainly by him that exhibit boundary conditions, with implications for context, *genre*, and style. Beyond scope for present purposes is the origin of consort song and anthem.

\* \* \*

James I of England returned once only to his native Scotland, in early 1617.<sup>17</sup> He left London with a farewell consort anthem by Gibbons fresh in his ears: Philip Brett compiled known testimony for it and its singular sequel.<sup>18</sup> ‘Great king of gods’, with chorus sections more chordal than often adding stateliness to the occasion, has the king’s Chapel Royal beseeching Jehovah to safeguard him on and after his progress.<sup>19</sup> James, no longer so robust, made it a leisurely journey but still hunted as much game as possible *en route*. His Chapel was shipped as a body to Leith, to be in place to greet him at his Edinburgh palace, Holyrood House. The bill of fare for this occasion was provided by Gibbons again, by now virtual *maestro di cappella*. ‘Do not repine, fair sun’, though akin to consort anthem, sung by a chapel choir, and to verse by one of the attendant English bishops, Joseph Hall, is a welcome ode with outright pagan touches. It begs the sun-god not to ruin this day, 16th May, by sulking at being outshone: a canny trope to ensure its aptness, come rain or shine. As in his last offering, Gibbons commands the medium, moves boundary posts. Ensemble is integral to both, and no mere alternative mode of performance (in which they resemble some fully liturgical anthems).

---

<sup>15</sup> The example with six instruments is US-NYp Drexel MSS 4180-5, Anon., ‘In paradise of late a dame began’: MB 22 no. 27. This source is one of very few to include both consort anthem and consort song, which has bearing on context and usage.

<sup>16</sup> The one uncoincidental parallel predates his birth: Christopher Tye’s In Nomine entitled ‘Crye’, also five-part.

<sup>17</sup> His entourage departed 14th March 1617 (N.S.) according to the diary of William Laud, later Archbishop of Canterbury. Bishops may of course have been separately corralled and despatched in advance.

<sup>18</sup> Philip Brett ‘English Music for the Scottish Progress of 1617’, *Source Materials and the Interpretation of Music A Memorial Volume for Thurston Dart* ed. Ian Bent (Stainer & Bell; London, 1981) pp. 209-226; reprinted with an odd misprint or two in Philip Brett *William Byrd and His Contemporaries Essays and a Monograph* ed. Joseph Kerman and Davitt Moroney (University of California Press; Berkeley and Los Angeles, California and London, 2007) pp. 78-99.

<sup>19</sup> The anonymous verse prays that the king be translated to heaven as ‘liinge flesh’, like Enoch and Elijah. Its incipit is not pagan, *pave* Brett, but from Psalm 95:3 (AV). ‘For the LORD is a great God: and a great king aboue all Gods.’ The piece must be reckoned paraliturgical, but not a *propempsicon*, since it lacks the usual attribute in that of *schetliasmos*, dismay or grief of those left. John Cosin published an almost unaltered text of it: Pinto (2003) and selective bibliography. Wordbooks adapted it for a pre-existing context, a thanksgiving for the foiling of an attempt on the king’s life. The Gunpowder Plot is likely, 5th November 1605; but it could have suited Gowrie Day, marking a purported conspiracy, 5th August 1600; voted for commemoration in England from 1603 and in Scotland from 1610. No source gives a hint of keyboard accompaniment.

'Do not repine' is unique to a part-set copied by a Gloucester Cathedral singer, John Merro (d. 1639).<sup>20</sup> An unusual composite, its first section is for verse and chorus; like consort anthem at its most florid. A second, seemingly for unsupported voices, is closer to ballett; as Brett put it, dance-strains for revels. These two may not amount to a totality: a third section of verse survives without known setting elsewhere. Even the extant music is defective. The first section gives its second verse short of one ensemble line, as Brett saw, and rectified when editing. He passed over an instrumental ritornello twice-stated in this section, where the uppermost line, a capstone to the arch, is also missing. A four-part torso remains, but trudges along; no one could feel it full or supple enough, surely.<sup>21</sup> Now, even one lacuna entails an unsensed enigma. How or why were rests substituted for notes? The query is not trivial: analysis must allow as fully as possible for intentions as committed to the page. A copyist did not casually omit a section, since someone notated rests by working out a full and *exact* complement, a conscious substitute. The tampering cannot be spontaneous, nor can there be erroneous transfer from score to part-set.<sup>22</sup> Someone, Merro or his source, silently added rests that *should not be there*. The niggle is not omission but substitution.<sup>23</sup> After all, what mental process led to outright insertion, rather than to labelling defects in blank areas or even patching them? It is no simpleton's non-problem, since this section has another anomaly that calls for attention. Two lines repeatedly alternate clef-forms: line III has clefs C3-C4, line V clefs F3-F4.<sup>24</sup> All shifts to and fro are at verse-chorus junctures, between untexted and texted portions: but that *explains* nothing. Copyists do with good reason vary clefs for terraced or outsize ranges; but no such case applies here.<sup>25</sup> Aperiodic alternation is cumbersome and uncalled-for, in any era. It forces instruments to adjust mental register throughout a piece, back and forth; for that matter voices too, equally spasmodically, since they are forced to follow the notated line in order to enter aright. Who went out of their way to create these extra pitfalls, and why? Can it be deliberate?

Only one unitary explanation makes full sense of both quirks. It begins in a truism. Verse anthem by nature has verses, allotted to soloists. In all of them, all choirbooks methodically notate rests in silent voices, in full, to enable time-keeping (also sectional bar-divisions, and often

---

<sup>20</sup> Drexel 4180-5: a set with five consort anthems, including Byrd's 'Lullaby'. Andrew Ashbee 'John Merro's Manuscripts Revisited', *The Viola da Gamba Society Journal* 7 (2013) on-line pp. 1-19.

<sup>21</sup> Brett transcribed the extant texture (example 7.1, as reprinted 2007) to single out a falling-fourth 'x' motif developed later on. This is precisely the element needed to devise the lacking top part, added in *Consort Anthems* ed. Pinto (2003).

<sup>22</sup> For a copyist's eye to wander throughout a whole verse and produce continuous rests from another stave in a score-system would be an epic fit of abstraction. It anyway cannot apply here; *no* other voice is at rest, in either section.

<sup>23</sup> Put another way, the copyist has done either too much, or else not enough. A counterexample is in a contemporary score-volume, GB-Lbl Egerton MS 3665, probably copied by Francis Tregian the younger. He did not insert rests when he met a lacuna in Thomas Morley 'Mi sfidate, guerriera' (unique to this source, line II; not the only such defect, but the only one he spotted). He began with a continuation fragment. On sensing that it could not be an incipit, he left it *in situ* and accurately posted what followed against the rest of the texture, clearly after scoring that around it. Most notably, he did not fill the intervening space with rests, but left it blank: good practice in a score, if a lacuna has attracted attention. But Merro gives rests added *in a part*, where defects stay unobvious unless marked somehow.

<sup>24</sup> If clef-alternation were intended to demarcate vocal areas it would be uniform throughout the five parts, not just two. (Here clefs are named by a lowest stave-line 1, and highest 5: C3 being 'viola' clef, normative for modern tenor viol.)

<sup>25</sup> Robert Dow's partbooks, GB-Och Mus 984-8, can alter clef briefly to avoid leger lines. Merro himself copied repertoire needing continual clef-change, a section for viola bastarda or like division instruments: GB-Ob MS Mus. Sch. D.246 pp. 245-253. In John Jenkins, Fantasia à6 no. 12, the one extant copy for line I, GB-Och Mus 423, shifts clef to G2 after an initial stave in C1, simply so as to avoid two leger lines for a single low note (a).

verbal cues, for good measure). The key is to realise that for consort anthems two complementary sets of parts must have existed, made out specifically for *performance*.<sup>26</sup> In the separate set for voices, choirbook norms prevailed: ‘tacet’ sections were given, notated by rests in full. The set for accompanists had continuous lines that did not and could not notate vocal rests: beyond capacity and purpose, as much as in any single organ part.<sup>27</sup> The surviving circulated text, assumed basic hitherto, was a later resort. To create it, part-pairs were side by side *merged into single partbooks and sets*. In these a continuous musical texture subsumed verbal text, routinely suppressing the now-functionless vocal ‘tacet’ sections. The proof is simple: the transformation into single part-sets gave room for exactly the unusual types of error encountered, that *only this process* could have produced. Parts were being recast, not recopied: focus shifted to emphasise a double duty for a new class of users, using any means at hand for economy of effort. In the blending process, pressure on time curtailed procedures. In reconciling part-pairs, renotating clefs for consistency took low priority.<sup>28</sup> A more casual effect was inadvertence: the eye overlooked entire instrumental verse-sections by fixating on the vocal book of a part-pair. (Two partbooks were scanned simultaneously since sequential, incremental copying was felt inefficient use of time.) The hand then copied inapplicable rests. Next, a check for integrity of copy was not always rigorous; in this production line, attention moved on smartly, to another pair of parts. Quite apart from these failings in copy, common sense must have regard to practicalities. No performer can have tolerated the increased risk of malfunction created by hobbling instrumentalists and singers together, cramped over amalgamated parts. This should never have been assumed a professional standard. ‘Do not repine’ was, after all, performed, if any verse piece ever was. So was other work for the Chapel, self-evidently: one cannot believe Gibbons unique there. Undeniably consort anthems were printed in amalgamated style (which can be regarded as a publishing ‘form’) for the domestic market, but instances are few: William Byrd in *Songs of sundrie natures* (1589) and *Psalmes, Songs, and Sonnets* (1611); Jacobean successors were Richard Alison’s *An Howres Recreation in Musicke* (1606), for a ‘thankesgiuinge’, and notably John Amner’s *Sacred Hymnes. Of 3. 4. 5 and 6. Parts for Voyces & Vyols* (1615) with three ‘motects’ or ‘alleluias’ à6.<sup>29</sup> It is easy to see the imperative that made amalgamated forms normative in manuscript or print, ousting any arrangement for bulkier double sets. If these last had existed, though, how can they have vanished without leaving a single trace?

---

<sup>26</sup> Of relevance to this argument, choirbooks were habitually duplicated in parallel sets for Decani and Cantoris sides of a choir facing across the chancel. Complementary parts were thus no innovation but a familiar copying process or ‘form’.

<sup>27</sup> Norms of practice assumed for consort rule out a keyboard part, but present absence is far from sure-fire proof. In GB-Och Mus 67, a keyboard book part-copied by Thomas Myriell and part-matching the set Mus 61-66, he tabled ‘Songs for vials & organ, in the great booke’ (*viz* not 67 itself, where parts for named pieces are absent, but *Tristitia Remedium*), by William Daman, Alfonso Ferrabosco I, Thomas Lupo, Luca Marenzio. It is unclear if this implies that organ accompanied viols and singers. Mus 67 retains parts for ‘The Cry’ (of London) by Gibbons, and two consort anthems: John Ward, ‘Let god arise’ (which 61-66 give at two pitches, a 4th apart), and [John] Bennett, ‘O god of gods’. Craig Monson *Voces and Viols in England, 1600-1650 The Sources and the Music* (UMI Press; Ann Arbor, 1982) pl. 2c (p. 14) reproduces a section of the ‘Cry’; the part is a reduction, curiously incomplete, on a single six-line keyboard bass stave. See also fn 44.

<sup>28</sup> Consciously or not, an available vocal part-line will have been treated first, to avoid a second stage of fitting underlay that would need to apply a different mental process of combination-checking. Loss of whole instrumental sections then, small interjections even, was a *propensity* among types of error: it would have been to lose vocal underlay, had instrumental parts been preferred.

<sup>29</sup> Martin Peerson is later, smaller-scale. Amner called first parts of his Christmas consort anthems ‘A Motect’, succeeding parts ‘An Alleluia’. ‘My Lord is hence removed’ for Easter is just ‘An Alleluia’, a shorter piece in one section. All terminate in alleluia, and none with ‘Amen’ or anything else church-fashion. His five-part consort anthems are only in manuscript.

The answer seems to be, very easily. Merro alone, in only one piece, is skimpy evidence for original notation in consort anthem; but patterns of error in other partbook sets parallel and extend the categories of defect. Six books entitled *Tristitia Remedium* (1616) are a prime source for consort anthem, if as usual in anthology form that mixes secular and sacred (full anthem, too).<sup>30</sup> Their copyist-compiler Thomas Myriell took pains seldom matched elsewhere. That, like his fine hand, exhibits a standard of best practice. There is, then, strong evidential value in two anomalies in his unique copy of John Mundy's 'Sing joyfully' à5.<sup>31</sup> Line II alternates clefs C2-C3 at all verse-chorus borders; just as in Merro.<sup>32</sup> The second is that when the one soloist (bass) rests in the verses, chord-fundamentals take leave of absence too; uncouth harmonic inversions open.<sup>33</sup> In other words, an ensemble bass is missing entire, and Myriell did not spot it. Compare his handling of 'Sing unto God' and 'Thou art my king' by Thomas Tomkins, both in essence five-part. He labelled them six-part because he included complementary vocal and ensemble basses.<sup>34</sup> (A slight procedural variation between these for notating soloist against chorus shows that he was not an amalgamator of texts, but diligently followed copy.<sup>35</sup>) He consigned Mundy to the five-part section under a rubric to match; all for the lack of an essential semi-independent ensemble bass. It seems then that contemporary practice did retain dual parts if needed; unless overlooked, with resultant grief.<sup>36</sup> A final instance of lacuna is 'See, see, the word is incarnate', the sole consort anthem by Gibbons in domestic books. It is in Myriell and the one other set to exceed his in bulk, where it is a fourth lower.<sup>37</sup> Otherwise the two accord, even over a defect. In the third verse an instrumental line, present at first, lapses after six breves.<sup>38</sup> Regardless of copyists' standards, to find the same gap plugged by identical rests in two copying-bouts at different pitches beggars belief as coincidence. The only explanation is of a common source. A

<sup>30</sup> GB-Lbl Additional MSS 29372-7; wholly manuscript but for engraved title-pages all with title and date, as if published.

<sup>31</sup> Psalm 81: 1-4. The bass soloist, line V (Bassus partbook 29375) in clef F4, doubles chorus bass in the same partbook. The other parts are copied in an array and clefs much as normal: I-IV, books -72, -76, -73, -74, clefs G2 C2-C3 C3 C4. Editions have been in *TCM* second series (octavo) since 1937, since revised.

<sup>32</sup> Quintus partbook (29376), original pp. 200-202. In other parts of this anthem a freight of inaccurate notes suggests some clef-adjustment from dual parts, leaving traces of the unenviably-placed copyist's struggles; such as misplacement to an adjacent line or space. Another sort is for adjacent lines to read exactly the same notes, which could suggest intervening resort to a score-form: IV-V bars 78-79 (maybe also bar 92).

<sup>33</sup> Extant line V begins with a vacant 3½ bars (breves) in the introductory portion *before* the soloist enters; similarly verse 2 for nearly 2 bars (20-1), verse 3 (bars 34-5, 37-8), verse 5 (bars 72-3) and possibly verse 6 bar 92.

<sup>34</sup> In both works ensemble bass when divergent from bass solo voice gives essential connective tissue. 'Sing unto God': bars 18-23, bass solo doubled by ensemble line IV: ensemble V, tacet at first, adds pedal notes beneath. Bars 41- 44, ensemble IV doubles bass; ensemble bass adds nothing. Bars 51-2, bass voice is lower; 62-3, 86-9, 96-7, the two alternate as *bs*. Bars 98-9, soloist joins III while ensemble bass is absent; 100, interjection by ensemble bass alone. In both pieces, the ensemble bass recoils to the octave above when the voice sings low D: that may reflect on instrumentation. The treatment of *basso seguente* suggests that both consort textures are adapted from keyboard originals. See *Thomas Tomkins Five Consort Anthems* ed. David Pinto and Ross W. Duffin (Fretwork Editions; London and Bermuda, 1994) FE 10. 'Rejoice and sing' by Tomkins affords another instance of consort anthem in Merro defective by a whole part and more. The absence led cataloguers to call this *unicum* five-part, not six-part. It also needs extra *divisi* forces in its final full chorus. Astoundingly for the post-Reformation period, it ends by repeatedly invoking 'Blessed Virgin Mary': this is no Anglican domestic piety in origin.

<sup>35</sup> 'Sing unto God': both ensemble and bass solo parts take on underlay in chorus sections to become the 'full' voice. 'Thou art my king': again the ensemble part has underlay for chorus sections, but the bass solo has fully-notated rests.

<sup>36</sup> The part for Mundy may have been discarded for this reason of assumed obsolescence; implying shift in practical usage. Other possibilities relate to typical loss of bass parts in especial from a set; from the outside of a roll, or end of stack.

<sup>37</sup> GB-Och Mus 56-60, a set with a sacred-secular ratio roughly 3:1. The only reuse of this text was by the Hatton domestic, George Jeffreys: GB-Lbl Add. MS 10338, GB-Lcm MS 920.

<sup>38</sup> A mere semibreve rest precedes the 16-bar lacuna, but space enough for the eye to wander. Scoring is uncommon: a wordless part (atypically static) descants above the texted three. The verse is begun by a fifth part (ensemble Altus; bars 55-9), but that exits after dovetailing with the vocal bass entry over three consecutive minims, bars 58-9.

stock copy (whether in score or parts), kept for commissions, had a latent fault due to a previous amalgamation process. In making it the primary combiner's eye had wandered; here, in mid-section.<sup>39</sup> The sole other source is intact. It is the revised version in score; but this verse stayed unaltered.<sup>40</sup> In any case, withdrawing the one instrumental strand leaves the partbook version too thin for purpose. (Still, comparing the prelude to 'Do not repine', one wonders if a lack would have been sensed without source-authority.)

In Myriell, clef-alternation occurs only in verse anthem, not in full, and so not at random.<sup>41</sup> Search confirms only one other real parallel, Martin Peerson's six-part setting 'O that my ways' (second part 'I will thank thee'): in this two lines alternate clefs as before.<sup>42</sup> 'Give ear O Lord' by Thomas Weelkes falls in a class apart. One voice is affected, once only, and to a different end. Altus shifts *tessitura* in verse 2 from clef C3 to C2, to partner Cantus in a duet, but returns to C3 from the very next chorus until the end. This sort of sleight, inserting a sixth line for *divisi* parts into an otherwise five-part piece, is an uncommon tactic in contrapuntal consort anthem. In fact this piece, alone in Myriell, is not even for consort. All lines are purely vocal and totally lack ensemble infill; they have full rests in the verses as if taken direct from choirbooks.<sup>43</sup> Myriell surely did not waste efforts to bring such a large, extended work to an unperformable state. It implies a completing organ-book for his set; but with no other evidence for an incomplete set, the case is dormant. Editions to date have conducted a *sub rosa* wedding on disparate source-types — the unique vocal text from a consort anthem source, quietly allied to the sole extant but unconnected organ-part, and no eyelid batted.<sup>44</sup>

Nothing yet weakens the case for amalgamation from paired part-sets for voices and instruments. Even a unique instance of clef-alternation would validate it, because complementary partbook pairs will have tended to use common clefs in consort anthem, leaving no hint of a merging process. Various other detail in the unique score for consort anthems by Gibbons may confirm pre-existing dual part-sets. 'Oh all true faithful hearts', again paraliturgical for the Chapel Royal (for the king's recovery from sickness), parallels 'Great king of gods' in simpler chordal style. Its ensemble bass hardly diverges from vocal, except fleetingly in one bar (76) where the two lines share one stave; unnormative in actual partbooks.<sup>45</sup> 'Sing unto the Lord' in the revised

<sup>39</sup> This extends slightly a category of error, in failing to transmit a full text (or texture): loss of a portion of a part-line *within* a section, not a whole part-line for a whole section. The incipit of 'Doe not repine' may count less as part of a section, than as an introductory stanza before the voice enters — a discrete ensemble introduction.

<sup>40</sup> GB-Och Mus 21, in score. This particular verse is otherwise identical. TCM's comment on the passage in the Cantus lines from this point on, 'Ch.Ch. 21 only, to end of verse', rather opaquely detracts attention from a deficit in the other sources.

<sup>41</sup> Some partbooks could by nature be more liable than others; such as Sextus, home to varied clefs for anomalous parts. None of eighteen consort anthems in Myriell's other fragmentary single book, GB-Lbl Additional MS 29427, is affected.

<sup>42</sup> Sextus (29377) has C3 for vocal sections (all choruses), C4 for ensemble in verses; Quintus (29376) clefs C1-C3 similarly.

<sup>43</sup> Verse 2 in the Altus even ends by placing before the usual bar-line a colon; a sign found throughout choirbooks (and also, *inter alia*, all three of Byrd's surreptitiously printed Latin masses), but atypical of consort anthem copies.

<sup>44</sup> Thomas Weelkes *Collected Anthems* ed. David Brown, Walter Collins and Peter Le Huray (Stainer & Bell; London, 1966 2/ 1975) MB 23: *The Treasury of English Church Music Volume Two 1545-1650* ed. Peter Le Huray (Blandford Press; London, 1965). The extant part is in GB-Ob MS Tenbury 791, the so-called Batten Organ-book, which is immethodically grouped. Monson (1982) p. 298 fn 12 noted the lack of accompaniment in Myriell. For his possible but non-extant organ part, see fn 27.

<sup>45</sup> There are instances in GB-Ob MSS Mus. Sch. D.212-16, E.381: 'Above the stars' by Thomas Tomkins and 'O Lord consider my distress' by Edward Smith. Richard Nicholson of Magdalen College, Oxford compiled this portion of the set for use in weekly meetings at the University Music School during his tenure of the music professorship. These and other like contents differ markedly from versions in cathedral sources close to their

consort version has notational shorthand of linked sort. In an initial verse duet for bass voices, ensemble bass is not given its own line in score: just a few notes, passed from one vocal stave to the other.<sup>46</sup> ‘We praise thee O father’ is the most striking case of an instrumental complement gone missing. Only in its second verse (bars 26-44) are a full five parts scored in; they are wholly absent otherwise, except that fully-notated rests represent them in the first verse (1-13).<sup>47</sup> A later verse even lacks any form of *basso seguente* (56-72).<sup>48</sup> This not-quite total absence makes the case for faulty transmission into score from dual part-sets quite plain. The two sets were necessarily separate (whether loose parts or partbooks). For this piece the vocal set survived, the instrumental left barer traces.<sup>49</sup>

Still, a vast problem looms. Not one playing set of deduced sort survives; collateral evidence that any existed is meagre. Yet textual evidence is paramount. Deductions from it are uncontrovertible, since extant parts (whether labelled ecclesiastical or secular, in intact sets or not), and indications from within them, are our sole evidence, until supplemented in ways yet to be proposed. Only one possible, novel and dismaying conclusion is open: we have lost touch *to wellnigh absolute degree* with consort anthem’s primary mode of dissemination at an epoch of major cultivation and innovation. We can say nothing authoritative about first copying or performance.<sup>50</sup> One could begin to suspect on this basis that dual parts were roundly suppressed in some way; but what?

Consort anthems can be de-aggregated. Some may well have begun in combined parts for home music-making, especially if an already published evolved ‘form’ was a model. John Ward is the chief example. His single known musical employment was domestic. Only one of his anthems had currency in cathedral sources; the rest favour unliturgical scoring for two equal top lines.<sup>51</sup> Then, what of households? Could many summon the daunting double forces needed to render consort anthem in 5-6 parts? Did London citizen prosperity make it a regular event? Dual part-sets would have been a menace to store. Amalgamated sets will have been inviting on two other counts: they avoided paying for extra (or double) copying, and did not even need a full dual complement of users. By 1600 title-pages of madrigalian issues were coming to include a common subtitle for dual use: Byrd followed it in 1611 with *Psalmes . . . Fit for Voyces or Viols*. Its purpose may have been less to *recommend* doubling than guarantee all-round utility for prospective

---

composers. They seem to be his arrangements especially to accommodate two chorister assistants at his meetings: hence *divisi* notation (and clef-change, in Tomkins).

<sup>46</sup> That is, they are slipped in while each solo voice is resting. The omissions do in fact lead to ambiguity in deciding how best to make a summation for a full instrumental bass line. This and the last case seem to show a copyist combining from pre-existent parts into a score pre-ruled in systems of five staves, and economising to save adding temporary sixth.

<sup>47</sup> The copyist could have assumed this incomplete representation to be interpretable as a lacuna, in a piece self-evidently lacking ensemble parts. Nothing here, then, is in a category of notational oversight.

<sup>48</sup> A form of one can be supplied from extant organ parts, as for the incipit. It thus becomes likely that other ensemble lines are lacking in this verse, which has frequent interstices between short solo phrases.

<sup>49</sup> The alternative is incredible: that a composer began devising an accompaniment only after completing full vocal parts, and in mid-stream at that.

<sup>50</sup> Pieces may have been circulated onwards chiefly in score; even so, the thesis about primary playing condition stands.

<sup>51</sup> ‘Let God arise’ à5, scored for two basses with a single high voice; significantly found at two pitches. Ward published no domestic verse anthem in his only madrigalian book à5-6 (1613): maybe on grounds of decorum and style. Richard Alison’s *Howres Recreation* is subtitled ‘. . . apt for Instru- | mentes and Voyces. | Framed for the delight of Gentlemen | and others which are wel affected to that qualitie, | All for the most part with two trebles, necessarie for | such as teach in priuate families’. None of Michael East’s consort anthems, published 1610, 1618, 1624 for a domestic market, occurs only in MS.

purchasers. A singer falls out? A player steps in; or *vice versa*.<sup>52</sup> Merged parts for anthems similarly enable one to ‘get by’. That is not to disallow possibilities that separate households joined forces with two sets of books.

Domestic sources leave unquantifiable the proportion of consort repertoire begun in dual part-sets. Retention after use would have been mainly as adjuncts in the context of anthem where full was anyway separately categorised from verse. Even if choral establishments made unsystematic provision, one would expect traces in this area; yet no contemporary seems to comment on it, and a hint of instrumental part-sets comes from only one cathedral. Loss of musical sources is apparently total in this area and, on any current index, unfactorable. This puts major constraint on any pronouncement about consort anthem’s normative usage. Simply, no-one can be sure that it was *not* performed in church. The repertoire itself does not divide neatly by function, to go by evidence of texts. ‘Hearken yee nations’ by Edmund Hooper, found in cathedral sources with organ alone, follows the foiling of the Gunpowder Plot. Since in full six-part counterpoint, surely it was devised and *performed* so, for full effect? It is designed to impress, and on a scale to suggest public (not domestic) celebration. Why not make it a default assumption that this was in the Chapel Royal or Westminster Abbey, Hooper’s work-places?<sup>53</sup> There is a remaining oddity: prolific anthem-composers at the centre of musical life in major institutions from whom one would expect the odd anthem in consort scoring, such as Nathaniel Giles and Adrian Batten, are totally unrepresented.

Or maybe this is all a blind alley. Whatever the problems, why snipe at church practice? Surely knowledge for its sources is secure? There, organ still rules. That makes missing parts or large source-loss for consort forms irrelevant; in the context of ritual nothing ruffles a stern divide of cathedral from home. But once evidence is scrutinised, this line is far less sturdy. Peter Le Huray’s unchallenged, standard discussion of Anglican repertoire up to civil war frankly admitted a dearth of church sources for the whole foundation period until well beyond 1603: ‘between 1565 and 1617 there is almost nothing, apart from the Ludlow fragments. The gap could not have been more awkwardly placed, for it completely spans the most fruitful period in the entire history of pre-Restoration English church music’.<sup>54</sup> That, unvarnished, is a musical void until 14 years after the death of Elizabeth I: the very time that consort anthem burgeoned. One cannot be sanguine to much greater degree over Jacobean sources: extant choirbook sets become ample only in the 1630s. Post-Restoration sources are pressed into service to fill the gaps, even for Gibbons; his ‘O clap your hands together’ à8 relies on the post-1670 Bing-Gostling Partbooks at York. Awkwardness is usually negotiated in respectful silence; but the skew of sources blights knowledge of church practice in the very period for which it has been allowed by default to dictate the terms of debate. Now even the most rabid positivist might hesitate to claim that the spread of available sources invalidates *all* assumed practice before 1630, in verse or full anthem; even so, a long-standing self-validating traditional consensus is too little questioned. Ironically, consort sources turn out to be closest in time to verse anthem’s Jacobean Spring, and the best testimony, if in the ‘wrong’ arena.<sup>55</sup>

A dissentient glance at the period must then examine claims that cathedral ensemble parts did not and cannot have existed. Dr Le Huray noted instances in two verse anthems by Gibbons, found in choirbooks from a college and a private chapel c.1630-5: one bass and one fragmentary

<sup>52</sup> This contrasts with Byrd’s practice in 1588-9 of giving consort songs underlay in all parts; but perhaps both practices are two sides of the same coin, in enabling mixed ensembles. Byrd did after all label ‘the first singing part’ in 1588, as if to make returns to origins easier.

<sup>53</sup> His consort anthems lack bass parts in consort sources, but can be completed through organ parts.

<sup>54</sup> Le Huray (1967) Chapter 4 *passim*; quoted comment at p. 93, and sources listed in Table 19 (pp. 91-2).

<sup>55</sup> Introduction to Monson (1982), p. 2, made this exact point, with a somewhat different focus.

treble part, untexted. ‘No other curious slips of this kind have yet been discovered in other music of the period’, his remark, branded them isolates peculiar to one composer.<sup>56</sup> A preconception that inclusion of ensemble parts must have been error leads one to wonder of what extreme sort that oversight was; then to ask, instead, if instruments were *becoming* unwelcome in the 1630s at Lambeth or anywhere. Experts in church sources may be best placed to say if any further fragments have been dismissed for being similarly atypical or aberrant.<sup>57</sup> Still, another misinterpreted isolate in a valid source does occur: the posthumous collection by Thomas Tomkins, *Musica Deo Sacra* (1668). ‘O Lord, let me know mine end’ à5 here is a normal verse anthem but for one thing. Choirbook parts are given with full rests, except in the Bassus: that prints a consort part intact, untexted in verse sections.<sup>58</sup> Those verses, instrumental, are congruent with the *basso seguente* of the organ; though, quite legitimately, that breaks into a few decorations. Otherwise only a few minor dotted rhythms differ. Nothing here is variant enough to rule out performance jointly with ensemble: any contrary claim to suggest incompatibility lacks substantiation, or is just misguided.<sup>59</sup> The part, furthermore, must be a chance remnant of a whole set, passed to the printer in error for a ‘normal’ part and set up in good faith. (It is unlikelier that all other parts were doctored into conformity, segments excised by some scissors-and-paste method.) This instance of joint provision with an organ part is a middle case, since not an example of dual sets: if not full proof that either sort of part had cathedral use, it is strongly suggestive. It does prove that amalgamated parts were kept by, for some such use during the composer’s working life to 1642, but weeded on publication. There is another twist, though: this same piece is found in partbook sets for consort anthem, c.1610-1620, but textually at odds.<sup>60</sup> Tomkins must have worked up consort versions twice over; paralleling the incompatible doublets in Gibbons.<sup>61</sup> It suggests a period of demand in which he needed a ‘spare’. Different locales can explain that, since like other cathedral organists he was a pluralist. The title underlaid to the printed part’s first stave, ‘*The Symphony*’, may bear on terminology for such parts on their first circulation.<sup>62</sup> (Compare the heading to the *ritornelli* of ‘Doe not repine’, to which partbooks

<sup>56</sup> GB-Cpc MSS Mus.6.1-6, ‘Behold, I bring you glad tidings’; GB-Llp MS 764, ‘Almighty God, who by thy son’ (Cambridge, Peterhouse, and London, Lambeth Palace). Le Huray (1967) Chapter 9 p. 318.

<sup>57</sup> A single part for ‘Know you not’ à5-7 by Tomkins (entitled a ‘Funerall Anthem’) is in the set GB-Och Mus 61-66. It is in amalgamated form, seemingly modified to adapt (combine) *divisi* lines in the now-missing parts for domestic use.

<sup>58</sup> *Musica Deo Sacra & Ecclesia Anglicana* (1668) pp. 65-6. The publication’s history of preparation, by the composer’s son, vouches for integrity of copy.

<sup>59</sup> Thomas Tomkins: *Musica Deo Sacra: II* ed. Bernard Rose (Stainer & Bell for the British Academy; London, 1968) EECM 9 no. 16, in the 1668 form. To call the Bassus (p. 165) ‘not identical with the organ bass in *Pars Organica* and . . . probably a copy of the string part which was a companion to *M*’ (GB-Lbl Additional MSS 29366-8) is doubly inaccurate and inept.

<sup>60</sup> The solo voice-line is unaltered; the largest variants are for ensemble parts in a tripla verse-section. *Tomkins Consort Anthems* (1994) gives this form, completeable from the three partial sources GB-Lbl Additional MSS 29366-8, 29427; US-CLwr, Blossom Partbooks. All seem London-centred. Myriell copied 29427 before 29372-7, but did not recopy this piece. EECM 9 (1968) no. 16 prints the 1668 form, and lists 29366-8 and 29427.

<sup>61</sup> The example of Tomkins shows that Gibbons could have added new organ parts to revised consort forms. ‘Whenas we sat in Babylon’ à4 by Richard Farrant (d. 1580), verse anthem at its early stage (though copies are far later), survives with two incompatible organ parts; one factor that hinders definitive reconstruction and comment.

<sup>62</sup> Forms of ‘symphony’ emerge by 1630: (a) titling of two *ritornello*-type ‘Symphonia’ by Nicholas Lanier, GB-Och Mus 379-381 (c.1630); (b) Walter Porter *Madrigals and Ayres* (1632), a titlepage broadly specifying ‘toccatos, Sinfonias and Ritornellos’; (c) similar *ritornelli* (in all but name) à3 under the name of Henry Lawes. The first two are headed ‘Simphonye in St Johns play. before the song’, ‘2<sup>d</sup> Simphonye before the 2<sup>d</sup> Songe’; seemingly for enactments at the Oxford college of the name during the royal progress of 1636: GB-Ob MSS Mus. Sch. D.233-6: 233 f. 32, 234 ff. 43-4, 236 f.27, also with 2 further simphonies à2 (Tr-B only); (d) George Jeffries autograph score, Add. MS 10338. Peter Holman ‘George Jeffries and the “great dooble base”’, *Cheys* 5 (1973-4) Correspondence pp. 79-81; Peter Holman ‘The “Symphony”’, *Cheys* 6 (1975-6) pp. 10-24, including other sources, later 1630s on, not included above. In Christmastide verse, some set by Henry Lawes and performed for Charles I at Whitehall probably 1640-1, Robert Herrick used ‘flourish’ to describe instrumental interludes: *Hesperides* (1647-8). David Pinto ‘The True Christmas:

give the title ‘*Preludium*’.) A now forgotten unrecorded part for ensemble in cathedrals is the harder to deny.

A parallel process is seen in consort song at times, when ensemble parts conclude with a chorus or refrain, demanding verbal underlay in all five lines. Did voice-integration into instrumental parts in this way precede amalgamated part-types for domestic verse-forms? Almost all examples postdate the type’s evolution and so give no evidence for priority. Choruses in Byrd’s sacred consort songs are all reconstructions by modern editors, but for just one line in a single partbook c.1580: slender basis for a case, however likely, that underlay was customarily inserted into instrumental parts.<sup>63</sup> If combined parts for consort song had ousted dual sets of books, they would be undetectable, as usual. Except that one partbook set along such lines *does* survive. Copied from c.1605 onward, it preserves the domestic output of William Wigthorp, sometime organist at New College, Oxford: it has solos and duets, secular or devotional, some with underlaid choruses.<sup>64</sup> It amounts to six books, so as to include doubling vocal parts. (A seventh book or fascicle, needed for completing anthems à7 by Weelkes and Tomkins, is lost: they, and six further items, have full vocal underlay.)

In these books, all lines are intact for all instrumental contents. Voice parts are present for only about half the solo songs (and for duets, never both); the rest were in the missing book. Craig Monson’s survey of the set made a point that others have tended to neglect: singers are doubled in *all* songs.<sup>65</sup> Instrumental books prove this function; they are, after all, the ones that survive whole. The aberrance is *not* to double the voices, for the repertoire of this set if no other. It is wholly futile to argue that its wordless doubling part was copied *so as not to be played*, even in embellished vocal lines like ‘This merry pleasant springe’.<sup>66</sup> The constraint placed on the concept of solo voice is a point not so well received as it should be.<sup>67</sup> ‘Borne is the babe’ is one

---

Carols at the Court of Charles I’ *William Lawes (1602-1645) Essays on His Life, Times and Work* ed. Andrew Ashbee (Ashgate; Aldershot, 1998) pp. 97-120.

<sup>63</sup> *William Byrd Consort Songs for Voice and Viols* ed. Philip Brett (Stainer & Bell; London, 1970) *Byrd Edition* 15. Chorus is added editorially to nos. 1-2, 4, 20. For no. 5, only, a waif Contratenor book, GB-Ob MS Mus. Sch. E.423, has a rubric and underlay: David Mateer ‘William Byrd, John Petre and Oxford, Bodleian MS Mus. Sch. E. 423’, *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle* 29 (1996), pp. 21-46. Byrd entitled two pieces à5-6 published in 1589 as ‘Carowle’. Here untexted lines do not merge into texted ‘full’ choruses, which are printed apart, differentiated by scoring à4, *tesitura* and clefs. ‘Christ rising / Christ is risen again’ in 1589 is the first dated instance of amalgamated parts with instrumental lines leading into texted chorus underlay; well-circulated in church sources with reductions for organ but seemingly primarily for six-part consort. ‘O God that guides the cheerful’ of 1611 is also worth noting: close to the border between carol-form consort song, with chorus, and verse anthem.

<sup>64</sup> GB-Lbl Additional MSS 17786-17791: Monson (1982) Chapter 5 pp. 159-180. The set’s repertoire is entirely secular in five parts; six-part a mix of texted Latin, Latin-English, and English, also fantasia and almaine; the two seven-part are English anthems. ‘Phantasia Richard Deringe’ at f. 35v is Hieronymus Praetorius ‘Gaudete omnes’ à6, untexted. The correct attribution survives in a fantasia source: David Pinto ‘Marsh, Mico and Attributions’, *Chelys* 27 (1999), pp. 40-58.

<sup>65</sup> See also Craig Monson ‘Consort Song and Verse anthem: a few performance problems’, *JVDGSA* 8 (1976) pp. 4-11.

<sup>66</sup> MB 22 no. 62; giving further ornaments printed small, unique to a source for voice with lute, GB-Lbl Egerton MS 2971. Listing in the Viola da Gamba Society *Thematic Index* of this edition’s anonymous contents, for voice and four instruments (A-CS-1/3), could be stretched to admit to five-part instrumentation with voice, for items from this source if no other.

<sup>67</sup> *Thematic Index* also misrepresented source practice for all songs listed for Wigthorp. ‘Come hither’, discussed below, is credited to ‘voice + 5 viols’ instead of 2 voices, 5 viols (5-part); as applies also to ‘Smiths are good fellows’ and ‘I am not I’. ‘Were I made juror’ should be 1 voice, 5 viols (5-part). ‘To plead my faith’, arranging Daniel Bacheler’s setting of famous verse by his master the Earl of Essex, has no voice-part credited. Text does though survive in 17790 for the top line; it is scored, then, as for ‘Were I made juror’. The point about scoring, amplified

devotional song ending in a chorus for which all instrumental lines add verbal underlay; even to the previously untexted line that doubles voice: which makes a chorus of five in addition to the soloist.<sup>68</sup> How both voices were doubled in duets can be seen in a dialogue among contents hitherto unpublished in full: see the Appendix. This set falls into the period for amalgamated part-sets, printed or manuscript, and cannot vouch for early practice; only suggest it. Incomplete as it stands, though, it does confirm doubling practice in a domestic arena. Its copyists and users were seemingly amongst musical members of Oxford colleges participating in choral services: for them to have erected a tacit barrier between leisure practices and official duties seems an artificial distinction for us to presume.

Into this context fit disclosures by Roger Bowers: contemporary testimony of instrumental parts in use. Sackbut players at Canterbury Cathedral had a music book specifically for playing with the choir.<sup>69</sup> Records of 1625 refer to a payment for repairs to the 'Sackbut book', and another of 1634-5 for 'prickinge one service in both Sackbut booke'.<sup>70</sup> One may take that to be in anthems as well as services. Viol players of the cathedral also had manuscripts of sacred music for their use: in 1626-7, the chapter spent about 40 shillings to have *cantiones* (usually designating choral polyphony, Dr Bowers interprets) copied 'for the viols'. Peter Webster has summarised evidence assembled by Ian Payne for the use of wind and viols; little of this though is repertoire-specific or relates to extant sources, and cannot show how or where instruments were used in services (or indeed whether the viols commonly maintained by choral establishments had any function at all for such uses).<sup>71</sup> Do then surviving choirbooks represent practice manicured somewhat as the 1630s progressed? In 1633 came the start of Laud's rule as Archbishop of Canterbury, and the inception of his visitations. Laud is known to have been suspicious of the private chapel movement, where the consort anthem repertoire may have been most in use. If one adds, as put forward convincingly by Dr Webster, that there is no real evidence to associate Laudians with musical ceremony in cathedral practice apart from the one large exception of John Cosin at Durham, it is even possible to wonder if Laud's much-quoted 'beauty of holiness' in ceremony expressed his desire to impose conformity, and stamp his authority, more than see music as inevitable part of that beauty. Laud's writ as Dean in the Chapel Royal ran 1626-43, and could have induced a new sobriety there too. The exiguous trace of ensemble parts in surviving chapel and cathedral sources may then be signs of just how the pruning process first began (and has been taken as a norm). Absence of contemporary testimony or sources cuts two ways here, and depends on validity of other evidence for bolstering either argument. The output of Gibbons is another part of the rejoinder: in itself, and as part of a body of general work with polyphonic, even highly contrapuntal accompanying material. It is significant and large enough to show that organ accompaniment was not always a sole or even primary form.

Remapping 'consort' against 'verse' should lead, from a textual point of view, to a view of the form of music *on the original page*. For some part of the repertoire (how large cannot be told),

---

below, stands even though — precisely because, in fact — this source habitually labelled consort songs and duets '5 voc.'

<sup>68</sup> Chorus text sits uneasily in the Tenor voice, which cannot accommodate the refrain's first four words. Maybe doubts are valid here, not simply over chorus insertions. Archaic style could make the piece a pre-Byrdian survival, unless poor part-writing and underlay makes it likelier to be a more recent elaboration from a simpler, maybe lute-accompanied, form. As presented in score, *MB* 22 no. 46, the singer is not doubled. Obscuring the practice in the part-set is implicitly to discourage it; though doubling parts are mentioned in the introduction, and textless parts listed in the commentary.

<sup>69</sup> There is nothing for cornettists, whether a failure of record or categorisation.

<sup>70</sup> Roger Bowers 'The liturgy of the cathedral and its music, c. 1070-1642', *A History of Canterbury Cathedral* ed. Patrick Collinson, Nigel Ramsay, Margaret Sparks (Oxford, 1995), pp. 408-50; at pp. 445, 450.

<sup>71</sup> *Id.* p. 445; cited by Webster (2001) Part II chapter 9; especially pp. 156-61.

original performance of a piece will have needed copies in distinct sets for voices, ensemble, and (or) keyboard.<sup>72</sup> Most likely this evolving repertoire would in the first instance have been loose: not added to pre-existing bound volumes, nor possibly copied for use beyond the immediate, and so for easy transportation (as in saddle-packs) on oblong quarto paper, not best-quality but still practical. A fairly basic keyboard form may have been outlined, to go by many organ sources concentrated on vocal texture with independent matter left sketchy. Signs are of some sorts of organ part available for combining with extant ensemble sets, but so few that for now queries have to remain. Dual part-sets may have been combined fairly quickly as a matter of course, carrying through sheaves of parts to a next stage, through the medium of score as well. Economising copying-time was surely paramount. A chain of recopying from an amalgamated stock set of parts, for a consideration, had its clientèle in private chapels; but even the gentry may not have had the manpower to use complementary part-sets for anthems. Thus the mould will have been set early on. How cathedral establishments may have reacted to new material is another matter. They may have bought in consort material on occasion, especially if it reflected central practice. How often they will have used it is less clear. What is clear by contraries is that cathedrals are a place to expect traces of dual part-sets, but also where they are lacking, except for the scantiest of traces as mentioned. Evidence for private chapels barely exists, or is to be assessed. If this is all accepted, the situation is bleaker than realised, and leaves little sage counsel in trying to shape a coherent programme against defects. One recourse is a pro-active shift in focus, maybe to build on (rather than dismiss) meagre evidence to suggest patterns in activity; as for example in considering stray remarks by casual visitors to cathedrals mentioning ensemble accompaniment other than by organ. Common hearty dismissal of such evidence relies on a positivism that, as shown above, is not itself robustly founded.<sup>73</sup> A further step is to burrow afresh for evidence, of any stripe; in private chapels, as much as the Chapels Royal, since the enigma of doublet versions in Gibbons is not yet solved.

---

<sup>72</sup> One cannot presume a score as such if a composer assembled parts piecemeal from sections drafted in provisional or temporary form; maybe on card, leather or slate, and not necessarily in semi-permanent paper form.

<sup>73</sup> Lieutenant Hammond at Exeter, on ‘their viols and other sweet instruments and tunable voices’: one of only two citations found by Le Huray, (1967) 128; from Hammond’s journals 1634-5. It is, of course, a moot point whether this was in the cathedral itself. *A Relation of a Short Survey of 26 Counties, Observed in a Seven Weeks Journey begun on August 11, 1634, by a Captain, a Lieutenant, and an Ancient, all three of the Military Company in Norwich* ed. and intr. with notes L[eopold]. G[eorge]. Wickham Legg (F. E. Robinson & Co.; London, 1904). See GB-Lbl Additional MS 34754 (19th-century copy?). L. G. Wickham Legg ‘A Relation of a Short Survey of the Western Counties Made by a Lieutenant of the Military Company in Norwich in 1635’ *Camden Society Third Series Volume 52* (July 1936) pp. 1-128; *Camden Miscellany XVI* (Royal Historical Society 1936).

## Appendix

### Doubling partbooks: an underappreciated setting of verse by the Earl of Oxford

The British Library's 'Wigthorp' partbooks first came to notice for five-part dance.<sup>74</sup> (Some of that may have been texted in a now-missing vocal partbook.<sup>75</sup>) Total instrumental-vocal content à5-7 includes no consort anthem, but instead consort song, much of it archaic by 1605.<sup>76</sup> There are also more recent, locally-composed duets, by Richard Nicholson (at Magdalen College) and William Wigthorp, some with vocal chorus.<sup>77</sup> All lack a voice, but texts have been salvaged for five.<sup>78</sup> Among so far underexamined incomplete pieces is a sixth titled 'Come hither &c' in ensemble books, and 'a dialogue' in the extant vocal partbook (Additional MS 17790). That alone writes out a musical repeat for a third stanza, to introduce a third set of words in the last two verses, interchanging phrases of underlay. The lost part will have followed that pattern in its now-lost wording. To it, the extant voice responds *alternatim* in rhyme; single lines, until a shift to distichs in the last (third) stanza.

The snatches of text provide a trail leading to a short dialogue in the canon for Edward de Vere, 12th Earl of Oxford; first printed in *Brittons Bowre of Delights* (1591). Identification from partial wording is news only in a musical context.<sup>79</sup> It takes a form well-known for centuries, though in disguise; extra first and last verses modify appearance and focus. For this adapted form, the only complete source was late printed; a rehashed, garbled text by then, but at least of use in completing this setting.<sup>80</sup> 'Come hither Shepherd swain' begins the verse devised to preface de Vere's opening ('When wert thou borne Desire?'). The music, even if seventy years earlier, has a text of no better standing, of the same compromised stock. For these purposes though verse has

---

<sup>74</sup> *Eight Short Elizabethan Dance Tunes for Small String Orchestra or Quintet* ed. Edmund H. Fellowes (Stainer & Bell; London, 1924) edn no. 2948: MS nos. 4-6, 11, 31-4. *Six English Tunes from the XVI and early XVII Centuries for String Quintet (from a MS. in the British Museum circa 1625)* ed. Peter Warlock (Oxford University Press; London, 1926) Oxford Orchestral Series 28: MS nos. 4, 6, 11, 18, 32-3.

<sup>75</sup> For example '[When] Daphne', retexted in MB 22; maybe 'My Robbin is to the [greenwood gone]', tantalisingly short of a text, and 'M<sup>r</sup> Dowlands Lacrimæ', adapted in Wigthorp style but a fourth higher; though these could all be instrumental.

<sup>76</sup> The only two fully-texted à5 are secular and have no wordless parts: a macaronic anti-monkish travesty 'Resurrexit a mortuis', and Thomas Weelkes, 'Grace my louely one faire bewties'. It is often assumed that the books may be Wigthorp's own copying since his name lacks honorifics. This is not quite uniform: he appears as 'm<sup>r</sup> Wigthorp' at Add. MS 17791 f. 11.

<sup>77</sup> Monson (1982) gives source-lists and a thorough discussion: Chapter 5 'The Oxford Sources', principally pp. 159-180. One partbook includes two duets 'For two Basse Violls and the Organ' by 'Jo: Coperario': Add. MS 17790 ff. 12v-14, VdGS nos. 7-8. Even if these were completed in the missing book, how an organ part was attached, if casually, is yet again unexplained.

<sup>78</sup> Joane quoth John/John quoth Joane', 'Smithes are good fellowes', 'What meate eates the spaniard', 'I am not I of such belief', 'Of all iolly pastimes': MB 22 nos. 51, 55, 57-9.

<sup>79</sup> *Brittons Bowre of Delights* 1591 ed. Hyder Edward Rollins (Harvard University Press; Cambridge, Mass., 1933) facsimile reprint. Steven W. May "The poems of Edward DeVere, Seventeenth Earl of Oxford and of Robert Devereux, Second Earl of Essex", *Studies in Philology* 77 (Winter 1980), Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1-132, listed the set Add. MSS 17786-17791 for the first time for this piece (no. 11), but as 17790-6, without direct reference to the later publication, first noticed in Thomas Percy's *Reliques* (1765). His text did not follow or take notice of the 1591 version.

<sup>80</sup> [Thomas Deloney] *The Garland of Good=Will* (London, 1678) sig. G3r-v: Second Part, numbered 6, titled 'A Communication between Fancy and desire'. Its placement is hard to fathom; the table of contents does not list it, ending at no. 5 in this part; similarly unlisted in reprints 1685, 1688: STC (Wing) 946, 947, 947A. It has solecisms: e.g., line 1 'Shepherds', in which Deloney's hand seems most unlikely. Percy seems to have assumed it the completest form and not a rehandled adaptation.

to yield and serve the setting, not least because musical structure embeds the adaptations. The verse original is not hard to find, moreover; and is included below for good measure.

That original dialogue is interrogative: each line a complete question and reply, called ‘*Antipopphora*, or Figure of responce’ in a grammarian’s quoted excerpt.<sup>81</sup> As first printed it was continuously set in unspaced pairs of alexandrines and fourteeners (poulter’s measure). The later version teased it out into quatrains giving visible stichomythia: trimeters varied by a tetrameter in third place (short metre, 6.6.8.6; favoured by Emily Dickinson for terseness). Curiously, the first and final inserted verses, as later printed, both have shortened third lines (printed as four trimeters 6.6.6.6, equal to two alexandrines) but in all medial verses the fourteeners, the original *second* lines, are kept unaltered. The shorter lines accord with the music’s opening phrase-lengths; but those are unvariable, and so cannot handle exactly the original tetrameter phrases (all in bar 5, of the score given here). The missing voice, unavailable for interrogation, would have had to accommodate an extra syllable of underlay in stanzas 2-3 at that point: unpolished, but possible and necessary.

The surviving voice-part sings half-phrases of a tune. The first halves, in the missing dialogue voice, are musically covered (and more) by the extant doubling instrumental partbook. Joined, they make the ballad tune ‘Rowland’. This may have had its origin as an item in Will Kemp’s acclaimed jigs, and is thought to have accompanied him on tours of the Low Countries and Denmark 1585-6, to become familiar over northern Europe. Its second title ‘Lord Willobbies Welcome Home’ is from alternative ballad use, after the return to England in 1589 of Peregrine Bertie, 13th Baron Willoughby de Eresby (1555-1601), from command over expeditionary forces in the Netherlands.<sup>82</sup>

For the two top lines, three parts survive in clef G2; those for the second line are complementary vocal-instrumental.<sup>83</sup> They double at the unison, but the instrumental line continues when the voice has fully-notated rests. The lost book would likewise have sung its own half-phrases and then rested as mandated. The procedure shifts in the third musical stanza: to conclude, each voice sings two consecutive lines. Lengthened verse-phrases result in musical interchange, as seen here in the score. That musical change is made to suit the final original verse (here, the penultimate). Since it did not concern the added final verse, the result was a small new vocal melisma in it, not transmitted to the accompaniment. These details in a minor item merit attention, especially for the slight deviations, as in the varied melisma (bar 22), since they validate exactly the practice of doubling parts suggested for a lost form of partbook set. Last notes of vocal phrases also can differ in length (every four bars, 8-20). This set is an extant missing link, not so remote as it turns out, between consort song and discarded original sets of parts for consort anthem.

The music’s half-lines and its late printed form also concur in rearranging the form first printed: it interchanges lines 21-24 with 25-28 (taking the added verses as lines 1-4, 33-36).<sup>84</sup> Pile on that the metrical departure in the two added verses, and little shred of possibility is left that anything

<sup>81</sup> George Puttenham *The Arte of English Poesie* (London, 1589) Part III Chapter IX, labels the piece ‘an emblem of desire otherwise called *Cupid*’. Its model is no emblem, though, but an Italian sonnet by Panfilo Sassi: Rollins (1933).

<sup>82</sup> Charles Read Baskervill *The Elizabethan Jig and Related Song Drama* (University Chicago Press; Chicago, 1931) Chapter VII ‘Jests and Novella plots in the Ballad Jig’, especially pp. 217-234.

<sup>83</sup> Add. 17786 first voice, untexted, 17790 responding voice with 17787. The piece has been as published as five-part dance: Warlock (1926), edn no. 5; *English Ballad Tunes in ensemble settings (c. 1600)* ed. Bernard Thomas (London Pro Musica; London, 1985), LPM TM 51, edn no. 6.

<sup>84</sup> The music’s verbal fragments are as unsatisfactory as the later form: the text arrangement below mixes both freely.

in this composite can be attached to de Vere. There is no sign that the ballad tune predated composition of the verse (in circulation by late 1582).<sup>85</sup> The words are then most unlikely to have been written to this music. Rather the exact contrary; it was for the sake of the music that embracing stanzas were added, in order to match the whole better (in length and phrase) against a recent popular tune. What is gained is a better appreciation of performance practice. A piece in Wigthorp's usual firmly rhythmic style, with limited contrapuntal enterprise, is crafted around an 'orchestration' nominally in five parts, labelled as such, and one that never rises above five-part writing (apart from the voice-doubling) but is pieced out over seven. Here, it requires vocal and instrumental pairs to regroup in the final section. That level of abstraction is noteworthy when considering Wigthorp's work, which as found in this set has attracted unfavourable descriptions.<sup>86</sup> In this instance he took some pains to devise apt scoring. That intent and commitment, in turn, show instrumental doubling as routine practice, for this Oxford circle — and maybe others.

---

<sup>85</sup> The date comes from a part-quotation in *Philotimus. The Warre Betwixt Nature and Fortune*. This was seemingly set up by December 1582: Ralph Maud 'The Date of Brian Melbancke's *Philotimus*', *The Library* Vth Series xi/2 (June 1956) 118-120; also May (1980), commentary to the verse (no. 11).

<sup>86</sup> Artisan practice is visible in head-on parallel motion, bar 8, and in the penultimate bar of the first strain the same only just avoided by inserting a rest. In scoring terms it is noteworthy that in the third stanza the voices migrate between different doubling instruments; a parallel with practice in Myriell's copies of consort anthems by Tomkins, where bass soloists at times are doubled by a tenor-range instrument.

Come hither &c A dialogue  
British Library Additional MSS 17786-17791  
f. 11 (7v, 17790)

(Edward de Vere, 12th Earl of Oxford, adapted by anon.)  
(‘Rowland’; arr.) William Wigthorp  
ed. and reconstr. David Pinto

5

The musical score consists of six staves of music. The lyrics are written below the staves, corresponding to the notes. The lyrics are:

1. Come hither Shepherd swain. Sir what do you require? I prithee shew thy Name, My name is Fond Desire. When  
2. What had'st thou for to drink? Unfaid lovers' tears. What cradle wast thou rocked in? In Love devoid of fears. What  
3. Doth company displease? Yea sure, in many a one. Where doth Desire delight to live? He loves to live alone. Doth

1. Come hither Shepherd swain. Sir what do you require? I prithee shew thy Name, My name is Fond Desire. When
2. What had'st thou for to drink? Unfaid lovers' tears. What cradle wast thou rocked in? In Love devoid of fears. What
3. Doth company displease? Yea sure, in many a one. Where doth Desire delight to live? He loves to live alone. Doth

Bass (line VII) bar 8 note 1: semibreve in MS. Note parallel octaves in lines II and VI

vv. 1-2

10

The musical score consists of six staves of music. The lyrics are written below the staves, corresponding to the notes. The lyrics are:

wast thou born, Desire? In pomp and pride of May. By whom (sweet Child) wast thou begot? Of fond Conceit, men say.  
lull'd thee then asleep? Sweet speech, which lik'd me best. Tell me where is thy dwelling place? In gentle hearts I rest. What

wast thou born, Desire? In pomp and pride of May. By whom (sweet Child) wast thou begot? Of fond Conceit, men say. Tell

lull'd thee then asleep? Sweet speech, which lik'd me best. Tell me where is thy dwelling place? In gentle hearts I rest. What

20

me, who was thy Nurse? Sweet Youth, and sug- red joys. What was thy meat and dainty food? Sad sighs and great annoy.

thing doth please thee most? To gaze on beauty still. Whom dost thou think to be thy Foe? Disdain of my good-will.

What was thy meat and dainty food?  
Whom dost thou think to be thy Foe?

Sweet Youth, and sug- red joys:  
To gaze on beauty still.

Sad sighs and great annoy.  
Disdain of my good-will.

me, who was thy Nurse? Sweet Youth, and sugred joys. What was thy meat and dainty food? Sad sighs and great annoy.

thing doth please thee most? To gaze on beauty still. Whom dost thou think to be thy Foe? Disdain of my good-will.

v. 3 only

10

either Time or Age bring you unto decay?

Then

No, no, Desire both lives and dies, ten thousand times a day.

either Time or Age bring you unto decay?

Then

No, no, Desire both lives and dies, ten thousand times a day.

either Time or Age bring you unto decay? No, no, Desire both lives and dies, ten thousand times a day. Then

A musical score for a three-part setting. The top part starts with a treble clef, the middle part with an alto clef, and the bottom part with a bass clef. The key signature changes from common time to A major (one sharp) at measure 20. The lyrics are written below the notes in a blackletter font. The first line reads 'Fond Desire, fare-well; thou art no mate for me.' The second line begins with a sharp sign and reads 'I would be loth to dwell with such a one as thee.'

Fond Desire, farewell; thou art no mate for me. I would be loth to dwell with such a one as thee.

The text originally published in 1591 is given here for comparison: roman and black letter font is changed to italic and roman respectively, and initial drop capitals for 'vv' suppressed.

*Of the birth and bringing vp of desire.*

VWhen wert thou borne Desire? in pompe and prime of May:

By whō sweet boy wert thou begot? by good cōceit mē say

Tell me who was thy nurse? fresh youth in sugred ioy:

What was thy meat and dayly food? sore sighes with great annoy.

What had you then to drinke? unfained louers teares:

[5]

What cradle were you rocked in? in Hope deuoide of feares.

What brought you then a sleepe? sweet speach that liked men best:

And where is now your dwelling place? in gentle hearts I rest.

Doth companie displease? it doth in many one.

Where would *Desire* then choose to be? he likes to muse alone.

[10]

What feedeth most your sight? to gaze on fauour still:

Who find you most to be thy foe? Disdaine of my good will.

Will ever age or death bring you unto decay?

No, no, *Desire* both liues and dies ten thousand times a day.

*Finis. E. of Ox.*