LEABHARLANN CHOLÁISTE NA TRÍONÓIDE, BAILE ÁTHA CLIATH | TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY DUBLIN
Ollscoil Átha Cliath | The University of Dublin

Terms and Conditions of Use of Digitised Theses from Trinity College Library Dublin

Copyright statement

All material supplied by Trinity College Library is protected by copyright (under the Copyright and Related Rights Act, 2000 as amended) and other relevant Intellectual Property Rights. By accessing and using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you acknowledge that all Intellectual Property Rights in any Works supplied are the sole and exclusive property of the copyright and/or other IPR holder. Specific copyright holders may not be explicitly identified. Use of materials from other sources within a thesis should not be construed as a claim over them.

A non-exclusive, non-transferable licence is hereby granted to those using or reproducing, in whole or in part, the material for valid purposes, providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. Where specific permission to use material is required, this is identified and such permission must be sought from the copyright holder or agency cited.

Liability statement

By using a Digitised Thesis, I accept that Trinity College Dublin bears no legal responsibility for the accuracy, legality or comprehensiveness of materials contained within the thesis, and that Trinity College Dublin accepts no liability for indirect, consequential, or incidental, damages or losses arising from use of the thesis for whatever reason. Information located in a thesis may be subject to specific use constraints, details of which may not be explicitly described. It is the responsibility of potential and actual users to be aware of such constraints and to abide by them. By making use of material from a digitised thesis, you accept these copyright and disclaimer provisions. Where it is brought to the attention of Trinity College Library that there may be a breach of copyright or other restraint, it is the policy to withdraw or take down access to a thesis while the issue is being resolved.

Access Agreement

By using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you are bound by the following Terms & Conditions. Please read them carefully.

I have read and I understand the following statement: All material supplied via a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of a thesis is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or for educational purposes in electronic or print form providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone. This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

THE VERNACULAR CHURCH MUSIC OF WILLIAM BYRD: A REAPPRAISAL OF CHRONOLOGY, AUTHENTICITY AND CONTEXT

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor in Philosophy

April 2014

by

Andrew Johnstone

(University of Dublin)

Complete in Two Volumes

Volume 1

TRINITY COLLEGE
5 JAN 2015
LIBRARY DUBLIN

Thesis 10850.1

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis has not been submitted as an exercise for a degree at this or any other University, and that it is entirely my own work.



SUMMARY

This aim of this thesis is a unified reappraisal of the vernacular church music of William Byrd (*c*.1540–1623). Specific objectives include the elimination of *opera dubia*, the distinguishing of adapted consort works from original verse compositions, and the evaluation of developments in Byrd's polyphonic language within the vernacular genres. Attention is also paid to the question of how Byrd's recusancy might have impinged on his composition of Protestant music.

In Chapter 1, comparison of the four- and five-part versions of his Second Preces and Psalms shows that the latter are in all likelihood revisions of the former; the possibility is explored that his First Preces and Psalms were partly based on four-part material, now lost. The ascription to Byrd of two settings of the English Litany is shown to be without reliable foundation in the primary sources. Consideration is given to the possibility that the young Byrd composed a service in mid-century style, now surviving as fragmentary voice parts. His subsequent indebtedness to Tallis in composing his own Short Service is quantified in terms of a technique pioneered by the older composer and here dubbed *tautophrasis*. The so-called *auxesis* figure is identified with the first signs of a rhetorical use of harmony in this service. The Three Minims Service is discussed in terms of its further indebtedness to Tallis and its novel approach to rhythm; its inner voice parts are assessed in the light of the evident revisions made to the Preces and Psalms.

In Chapter 2, the chronology of Byrd's early anthems evident from primary MS sources is refined with reference to polyphonic style, specifically the increasing tendency for subjects gradually to transform during passages of *fuga*, and the appearance of the *auxesis* figure in some of those passages. In terms of their sources, texts and technique, two anthems of questionable authenticity are shown not to fit the stylistic trajectory of the undisputed anthems. A detailed investigation of the text of 'O Lord, make thy servant' shows how this anthem may have been the means whereby Byrd could declare wholehearted allegiance to his Protestant queen without compromising his Catholic conscience.

In Chapter 3, a firm technical distinction is established between adapted consort anthems and original verse compositions, chiefly by defining the norms of Elizabethan organ accompaniments. It is further established that metrical texts were normative for Tudor verse anthems, and that those anthems may be held above suspicion of having originated in consort format. Two of Byrd's anthems are shown to have originated in verse format, two others to be adaptations of lost consort works, and one probably to be a homage composition by Byrd's younger contemporary Nathaniel Giles. The evidence of common keys, scorings, motives and musical forms discussed here and in Chapter 4 shows that Byrd's verse anthems and Verse Service are directly related to earlier and later compositions in what would eventually be known as the verse idiom. It is also shown in Chapter 4 that Byrd's Verse Service (despite including an overt homage to a verse anthem by William Mundy) and verse psalms can safely be regarded as the oldest known works of their type.

In Chapter 5, it is shown that Byrd complemented his Great Service with three kindred anthems, and that these most likely formed a large-scale project begun in the late 1590s and continued well into the reign of James I. Special attention is paid to the service's intricate vocal scoring, which is shown to develop polyphonic protocols laid down by Byrd's elders and unique to the English reformation choir. Further manifestations of the *auxesis* figure are identified in passages of *fuga* in this service; those passages are proved to have been composed around harmonic frameworks. Finally, numerous examples are discussed of Byrd's inexhaustibly imaginative text-setting.

CONTENTS

Volume 1

Lists of Abbreviations and *Sigla* ix

Technical Notes xiii

Lists of Music Examples, Figures, Tables and Illustrations xv

Acknowledgements xix

Introduction xxi

1. EARLY WORKS IN THE FULL IDIOM I: LITURGICAL MUSIC 1

1.1 Responsorial music and liturgical psalmody 2

1.1.1 Groupings and liturgical functions 2
1.1.2 Preces and responses 6
1.1.3 Psalms 11
1.1.4 Litanies 17

1.2 Services 25

1.2.1 The Peterhouse fragments 25
1.2.2 The Short Service 31
1.2.3 The Three Minims Service 49

2. EARLY WORKS IN THE FULL IDIOM II: ANTHEMS 59

2.1 Circulation and attributions 59

2.2 Texts 69

2.3 Intimations of politics in 'O Lord, make thy servant' 79

2.4 Musical style 98

2.4.1 Scoring 98
2.4.2 Homophony 101
2.4.3 *Fuga* 105

2.5 Borrowed Works 122

2.5.1 Published songs 122
2.5.2 *Contrafacta* of motets 125

3. VERSE ANTHEMS AND ADAPTED CONSORT ANTHEMS 129

3.1 Introduction 129

3.1.1 Genres 129
3.1.2 The origins of the verse idiom 132
3.1.3 Music for consort and chorus 136

3.2 Organ parts and stylistic affinities in the early verse repertory 141

3.3 Anthems with prose texts 155

3.3.1 'Christ rising' 155
3.3.2 Psittacine settings 163

3.4 Metrical texts and the verse anthem 173

3.5 Anthems with metrical texts 195

3.5.1 'Alack, when I look back' 195
3.5.2 'Let us be glad' and 'Thou God that guid'st' 213
3.5.3 'Behold, O God, the sad and heavy case' and its *contrafacta* 223
3.5.4 'Sing ye to our God' 234

4. LITURGICAL WORKS IN THE VERSE IDIOM 237

4.1 Psalmody 237

4.2 The Verse Service 245

4.2.1 Verse passages 247
4.2.2 Choruses 255

5. LATE WORKS IN THE FULL IDIOM 265

5.1 Unifying features 265

5.2 Sources and datings 269

5.3 Musical style 284

5.3.1 *Fuga* and rhetoric 284
5.3.2 Vocal scoring 297
5.3.3 Text-setting 312

Conclusion 319

DESCRIPTIVE LIST OF CITED MSS 323

BIBLIOGRAPHIES 339

A Bibles, Psalters, Liturgies and Other Prayer Books 339

B Editions of Music 341

C Literature 345

Volume 2

MUSIC EXAMPLES, TABLES, FIGURES AND ILLUSTRATIONS 359

APPENDIX 1. OVERVIEW OF PRE-RESTORATION MUSICAL SOURCES 429

APPENDIX 2. THE TEXT OF 'ALACK, WHEN I LOOK BACK' 439

LISTS OF ABBREVIATIONS AND *SIGLA*

A. General

c.	*circa*
cf.	*confere*
col., cols	column, columns
ed., eds	edited by, editor(s)
edn(s)	edition(s)
ex(x).	example(s)
f., ff.	folio, folios
fig., figs	figure, figures
illus.	illustration
MS, MSS	manuscript, manuscripts
n., nn.	note, notes
p., pp.	page, pages
R	reverse (pagination from the back of a MS)
r	*recto*
repr.	reprinted
sig., sigs	signature, signatures
v	*verso*
v., vv.	verse (i.e. literary unit), verses
vol., vols	volume, volumes

B. Vocal and instrumental parts

Tr	triplex, treble
S	superius, soprano
A	altus, alto
M	medius, mean
Ct	contratenor, countertenor
T	tenor
B	bassus, bass
Q	quintus
Sx	sextus
LH	left hand
RH	right hand
c	cantoris
d	decani

C. Liturgical

V	Venite
TD	Te Deum
Bs	Benedictus
Ks	Kyries
Cr	Creed
S	Sanctus
Gl	Gloria in excelsis
M	Magnificat
ND	Nunc dimittis

D. Bibliographical

Full references are given in the bibliography.

Byrd's publications

1575	*Cantiones, quae ab argumento sacrae vocantur*
1588	*Psalmes, sonets, & songs of sadnes and pietie*
1589i	*Songs of sundrie natures*
1589ii	*Liber primus sacrarum cantionum*
1591	*Liber secundus sacrarum cantionum*
1605	*Gradualia … Lib. primus* (1605a5 = five-voice sequence, etc.)
1607	*Gradualia … Liber secundus*
1611	*Psalmes, songs and sonnets*

BCP	*The Book of Common Prayer*
BE	The Byrd Edition
EECM	Early English Church Music
MB	Musica britannica
MMR	Master and Monuments of the Renaissance
PDD	*The paradyse of daynty deuises*
RRMR	Recent Researches in the Music of the Renaissance
SECM	*The Sources of English Church Music, 1549–1660* (EECM Supplement)
SS	*Seuen sobs of a sorrowfull soule for sinne … A Handfull of honisuckles … The poore Widowes Mite … Comfortable Dialogs betweene Christ and a Sinner*
STC	*A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475–1640* (2nd edn)
TCM	Tudor Church Music
TCMO	Tudor Church Music Octavo Edition
WB	The Collected Vocal Works of William Byrd

E. Library *sigla*

All libraries are located in Great Britain unless otherwise stated.

BEm	United States, Berkeley CA: University of California at Berkeley, Music Library
CAh	United States, Cambridge MA: Harvard University, Houghton Library
Cfm	Cambridge: Fitzwilliam Museum
Ckc	Cambridge: King's College, Rowe Music Library
Cp	Cambridge: Peterhouse, Perne Library
Cpc	Cambridge: Pembroke College Library
Cpl	Cambridge: Faculty of Music, Pendlebury Library
Cq	Cambridge: Queens' College Library
Cu	Cambridge: University Library (Ely Cathedral MSS)
DRc	Durham: Cathedral Library
GL	Gloucester: Cathedral Library
Lbl	London: British Library
Lcm	London: Royal College of Music
LF	Lichfield: Cathedral Library
Llp	London: Lambeth Palace Archiepiscopal Library
NYp	United States, New York NY: Public Library
Ob	Oxford: Bodleian Library
Och	Oxford: Christ Church Library
Oj	Oxford: St John's College Library
SHR	Shrewsbury: Shropshire Archives
SM	United States, San Marino CA: Huntington Library
WB	Wimborne: Minster Library
WO	Worcester: Cathedral Library
WRch	Windsor: St George's Chapel Library
Ws	United States, Washington DC: Folger Shakespeare Library
Y	York: Minster Library and Archives

F. *Sigla* for anthems and other non-liturgical works by or attributed to Byrd

AlackWILB	'Alack, when I look back'
AnET	'An earthly tree'
AriseOL	'Arise, O Lord' (i)
BeholdOGTS	'Behold, O God, the sad and heavy case'
BeholdOGWT	'Behold, O God, with thy all-prospering eye'
ChristR	'Christ Rising', 2nd part 'Christ is risen'
HaveMUMOG	'Have mercy upon me, O God'
HearMPOL	'Hear my prayer, O Lord'
HelpUOG	'Help us, O God'
HowLSME	'How long shall mine enemies triumph over me?'
LetUBG	'Let us be glad' (text only)
NowIMS	'Now Israel may say'
OGodWOO	'O God, whom our offences'
OLordMTS	'O Lord, make thy servant'
OLordRMN	'O Lord, rebuke me not'
OutOTD	'Out of the deep' a6
PreventUOL	'Prevent us, O Lord'
SaveMOG	'Save me, O God'
SingYTOG	'Sing ye to our God' (text only)
ThouGTG	'Thou God that guid'st'

TECHNICAL NOTES

Dates

All dates are given in new style.

Orthography

Original spelling and capitalization have been retained in titles of early printed books, and (except where otherwise stated) have been modernized in the texts of musical works and in quoted poetry and prose.

References

Signature numbers are given in capital letters and Arabic numerals, and folio numbers in Arabic numerals, regardless of their original format.

References to the Psalter

Psalms are numbered according to the Masoretic system of the BCP unless otherwise stated.

Music examples

All music examples are given at their original notated pitch, in their original note values, and where appropriate in their original clefs.

Unless otherwise stated, music examples are drawn from BE 10–11 and have been restored to their original notated pitch.

Sources of other music examples are identified in the footnotes accompanying the references to those examples in the text.

References to bar numbers correspond to the barring of BE, EECM, or the individual edition cited.

All printed sources of music examples are listed in the bibliography.

Except in exx. 1:1 and 4:4d, where accidentals appear amid figured-bass notation, accidentals placed above or below notes are editorial. In exx. with barlines, accidentals are valid according to modern usage; in exx. without barlines, accidentals apply only to the following note and to any contiguous repetitions of that note.

Musical nomenclature

Clefs are identified as F4, C4, C3, C1, G2, the staff lines being numbered from lowest to highest.

Octave-specific note names are given as *C–B*, *c–b*, *c'–b'*, *c"–b"*, where *f*, *c'* and *g'* are the notes represented by the three forms of clef respectively.

Nonspecific note names are given in capitals in quotation marks, (e.g. 'A', 'B', 'C', etc).

Where appropriate, major triads are are given in capitals with quotation marks (e.g. 'D'), and minor triads in lower-case letters with quotation marks (e.g. 'd').

Keys are identified with their historical nomenclature: D sol re, D sol re flat, Gamut flat, C fa ut, F fa ut

Chords are identified thus: 5/3, 6/3, etc.

Suspensions are identified thus: 7–6, 4–3, etc.

Scale steps are indicated with a caret, the final or key-note being identified as $\hat{1}$.

Durations

For the purpose of comparing the durations of whole pieces and sections of pieces the unit of measurement is the minim.

A given section is measured from the beginning of its first entry up to the first entry of the following section. While this does not take account of the residual counterpoint that often overlaps with the following section, it ensures that the sum of the durations of all sections within a piece is equal to duration of the whole piece.

Though they may be notated as longs, terminal chords of a piece or movement (or a larger section within a piece or movement) are pragmatically reckoned as four minims (or six minims in the case of *prolatio perfecta*). When residual activity is contained within a terminal chord, however, those four minims are reckoned from the moment the activity ceases. Thus, while the final bar of OLordMTS (BE 11, p. 56) contains a plain long chord and is reckoned as four minims, that of PreventUOL (BE 11, p. 74), which includes the decorated resolution of a suspended 6/4 chord, is reckoned as six minims.

LISTS OF MUSIC EXAMPLES, FIGURES, TABLES AND ILLUSTRATIONS

Music Examples

Ex. 1.1 Merbecke's Preces, and outer voices of settings by Tallis and Byrd 359

Ex. 1:2 Byrd, Ps. 47, beginning of doxology 361

Ex. 1:3 Tone 8/i (transposed down a 4th) and Byrd, Ps. 54, v. 1 361

Ex. 1:4 Byrd, Ps.114:1–6: vv. 2 and 5 compared 362

Ex. 1:5 Byrd, Ps. 54:1–7,17, v. 1: versions a4 and a5 compared 362

Ex. 1:6 Tones for the Sarum and Cranmerian litanies 363

Ex. 1:7 Four-part litanies compared 364

Ex. 1:8 *TD* and *Bs* attrib. Byrd in *Cp* MSS 34, 38 and 39 365

Ex. 1:9 'Fourth-kind' faburden in early short services 366

Ex. 1:10 Sequence technique in the short services of Tallis and Byrd 369

Ex. 1:11 Rhythmic ambiguity in the Three Minims Service 372

Ex. 1:12 Part-writing in the Three Minims Service 372

Ex. 2:1 The imperfect large from OLordMTS 376

Ex. 2:2 *Tautophrasis* and the *auxesis* figure in PreventUOL 377

Ex. 2:3 Chordal openings compared 377

Ex. 2:4 Anthems by Robert Parsons and Byrd compared 377

Ex. 2:5 Points by Tallis and Byrd compared 378

Ex. 2:6 The second point from OLordMTS 379

Ex. 2:7 Evolving subject from AriseOL 380

Ex. 2:8 Hidden embryonic *fuga* and the *auxesis* figure in AriseOL 381

Ex. 2:9 Evolving subject from OutOTD 381

Ex. 3:1 Openings of verse compositions by Richard Farrant and William Mundy 384

Ex. 3:2 Openings of verse compositions by Morley 385

Ex. 3:3 Openings of verse compositions by Giles, Bull and Weelkes 386

Ex. 3:4 Opening of Richard Farrant, 'When as we sat in Babylon' 387

Ex. 3:5 Opening of Morley, 'Out of the deep' 387

Ex. 3:6 Opening of Morley, 'How long wilt thou forget me' 387

Ex. 3:7 Melisma from the Sarum chant 'Alleluia: Christus resurgens' and its treatment in ChristR 388

Ex. 3:8 Entry schemes in the versions a5 and a6 of the final chorus of ChristR 389

Ex. 3:9 Versions of the accompaniment to HaveMUMOG compared....390

Ex. 3:10 Decorative motivicity in OLordRMN 391

Ex. 3:11 Rhythms for the tune of 'Alack, when I look back' 392

Ex. 3:12 AlackWILB, third chorus 393

Ex. 3:13 Weelkes, 'Give ear, O Lord', first chorus 394

Ex. 3:14 Choruses from the fragmentary Oxford setting of 'Alack, when I look back', with *cantus firmi* inferred from the tune printed by Hunnis 395

Ex. 3:15 Intabulations from the Swarland lute-book 397

Ex. 3:16 Opening of AlackWILB, with organ part as copied by Batten....397

Ex. 3:17 ThouGTG, adaptation of a solo passage into a duet....398

Ex. 3:18 Tunes of ThouGTG and Giles, 'O Lord, my God' compared....399

Ex. 3:19 Giles, First Service, *TD* 399

Ex. 3:20 Two accompaniments for the principal strophe of ThouGTG compared 400

Ex. 4:1 The orphaned B part of Ps. 100, from Byrd's First Preces and Psalms....401

Ex. 4:2 Variant organ parts for Tomkins's so-called Sixth Service compared 402

Ex. 4:3 Conjectural and primary organ parts for Ps. 119:33–8 403

Ex. 4:4 Organ part to Farrant, Verse Service, opening of *M* 403

Ex. 4:5 Variant organ parts for Byrd's Verse Service compared 404

Ex. 4:6 Openings of two settings of the *M* by Thomas Tomkins 405

Ex. 5:1 The three forms of melodic curve in The Great Service 408

Ex. 5:2 Opening and closing sonorities in The Great Service and late full anthems...409

Ex. 5:3 Common material in The Great Service (M) and SingJ 409

Ex. 5:4 The three forms of melodic curve in the late full anthems....410

Ex. 5:5 Free *fuga* within homophony 415

Ex. 5:6 Examples of the *apocope* figure compared 415

Ex. 5:7 Examples of 'rhetorical' *fuga* 416

Ex. 5:8 The ten entries of 'He hath scattered the proud', exposed view 417

Ex. 5:9 Selected entries of 'He hath scattered the proud', grouped view 418

Ex. 5:10 Harmonically oriented *fuga* 419

Ex. 5:11 Harmonically oriented double *fuga*, grouped view 420

Ex. 5:12 Directional word-setting 426

Ex. 5:13 Perpetual canon further realized 427

Ex. 5:14 Quasi-canon five-in-one 427

Figures

Fig. 1:1 Varied scorings from the *Cr* of Byrd's Short Service 366

Fig. 1:2 *Tautophrasis* in the short services of Tallis and Byrd compared 367

Fig. 1:3 Phrase-structure in the Three Minims Service 370

Fig. 2:1 The order for the Royal Maundy 374

Fig. 3:1 Stemma showing conjectured relationships between the sources of the 'Alack' tune and its accompaniment 396

Fig. 3:2 Stemma showing the interrelationship of pre-Restoration organ parts for ThouGTG 397

Fig. 4:1 Phrase-structure in the Verse Service 406

Fig. 5:1 Long services prior to Byrd: basic scorings 421

Fig. 5:2 Sheppard, Second Service: selective scorings 421

Fig. 5:3 Parsons, First Service: scoring of the *V* 422

Fig. 5:4 Parsons, First Service: selective scorings 422

Fig. 5:5 Tutti scorings in The Great Service 423

Fig. 5:6 Selective scorings in The Great Service 424

Fig. 5:7 Scorings of the Bs, vv. 7–8 425

Tables

Table 2:1 Pre-Restoration attributions of HowLSME, SaveMOG and OutOTD 373

Table 2:2 Verbal text variants in Byrd's early anthems 374

Table 2:3 Versions and rewordings of Ps.21:1–7 375

Table 2:4 The structure of PreventUOL 380

Table 3:1 Organ parts to verse compositions and adapted consort anthems by Byrd 382

Table 5:1 Contents of *Y* MSS M13/1–5(S) 411

Table 5:2 Portions of The Great Service and adjoining entries in John Baldwin's Commonplace Book *Lbl* MS R.M. 24.d.2 414

Table A1 Pre-Restoration sources of William Byrd's vernacular liturgical music 430

Table A2 Pre-Restoration sources of Byrd's unpublished anthems 432

Table A3 Pre-Restoration institutional sources of Byrd's printed songs and anthems ...434

Table A4 Pre-Restoration sources of *contrafacta* of Byrd's motets 436

Illustrations

Illus. 2:1 Administration of the Royal Maundy 376

Illus. 3:1 'Alack, when I look back', from the 1585 edn of *SS* 392

Illus. 5:1 Copies of the Md part of The Great Service compared 412

Illus. 5:2 Todd's cursive script 413

Illus. 5:3 Todd's outline majuscules 413

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure to record my sincere thanks to Martin Adams, at whose suggestion this study is being submitted as a doctoral thesis, to Roy Stanley for his assistance in obtaining materials, to Brian Crosby for kindly sharing his intimate knowledge of the Durham Cathedral MSS and associated sources, to Martin G. Cunningham for his incomparable linguistic expertise, to John Harper, John Milsom and Magnus Williamson for their invaluable comments and suggestions, and especially to Kerry McCarthy, whose devotion to all things Byrdian has for many years been a mainstay of encouragement. Finally, I must thank my wife Siobhán and our daughter Cristina, without whose constant love and support this project could never have been completed.

INTRODUCTION

The known facts of William Byrd's association with the established English church may be briefly told. He first turns up in the historical record on 24 April 1563, as the newly appointed master of the choristers and organist of Lincoln Cathedral. He was then in his early twenties. For some unknown reason, on 19 November 1569 the chapter ordered his pay to be stopped, and they did not reverse that decision until 31 July 1570. At Michaelmas of that year, a vaguely worded chapter act was passed apparently ordering a reduction in the extent of Byrd's liturgical organ playing. On 22 February 1572, he was sworn a Gentleman of the Chapel Royal, replacing Robert Parsons who on 25 January had drowned at Newark upon Trent. The following year, on 2 November, the Lincoln chapter awarded Byrd an annuity of five marks for life, the formal patent for which was not issued until 15 January 1577, and included a clause requiring him in exchange to provide the cathedral with 'church songs and divine services well set to music'. It is not known if Byrd ever filled his part of the bargain, but the annual payments disappear abruptly from the accounts after 1582. In 1603 he was issued mourning livery for the funeral of Queen Elizabeth, and was listed among the gentlemen of the chapel at the time of the coronation of James I. His name appears in the chapel lists again on 5 December 1604, and in 1619 he was again issued mourning livery, this time for the funeral of Queen Anne. The Chapel Royal record of his death on 4 July 1623 named him 'a father of music'.[1] Nowhere do these institutional records mention what is abundantly documented elsewhere: that Byrd was a Catholic recusant, tied to his national, Protestant church in strictly professional terms.

1 Harold Watkins Shaw, 'William Byrd of Lincoln', *Music & Letters*, 48 (1967), 52–9; *The Cheque Books of the Chapel Royal, with Additional Material from the Manuscripts of William Lovegrove and Marmaduke Alford*, ed. Andrew Ashbee and John Harley, 2 vols (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), vol. 1, pp. 9, 21 30, 91, 185; *Records of English Court Music*, vol. 4, ed. Andrew Ashbee (Snodland: the editor, 1991), 3, 40, 50.

We would already have a unified study of the vernacular service music and anthems Byrd wrote for that church if Philip Brett had lived to write his contribution to the trilogy of monographs begun by Oliver Neighbour and Joseph Kerman.[2] But these works have long remained the least studied category of the composer's vast and wide-ranging output: beyond passing mentions in the literature, the exceptions have chiefly comprised two chapters in Edmund Fellowes's biography,[3] an important series of articles by Craig Monson (mostly written in conjunction with his Herculean editorial work on BE 10–11),[4] Neighbour's review of BE 10b (The Great Service),[5] and most recently two articles by Roger Bray and Roger Bowers.[6] Monson's findings in particular are addressed in the following pages, some being confirmed, others challenged. For reasons which will become clear, Bray's theory (p. 65) that Byrd composed no anthems for the established church after 1581 need not detain us, but it will be necessary to devote considerable attention to Bowers's views on the verse anthems. The questions of how many pieces of vernacular church music Byrd wrote, when he wrote them, and how he accommodated them to his Catholic conscience will all repay investigation in the chapters that follow.

At the disposal of the scholar of Byrd's motets and songs is a scrupulously produced series of published editions, informatively prefaced and seen through the press by the composer himself. The scholar of his keyboard music has such authoritative MSS as My

---

2 *The Consort and Keyboard Music of William Byrd* (London: Faber, 1978); *The Masses and Motets of William Byrd* (London: Faber, 1981); Brett's volume was to have been entitled *The Songs, Services and Anthems of William Byrd*.

3 *William Byrd*, 2nd edn (London: Oxford University Press, 1948), 115–44.

4 'The Preces, Psalms, and Litanies of Byrd and Tallis: Another "Virtuous Contention in Love"', *Music Review*, 40 (1979), 257–71; 'Through a Glass Darkly: Byrd's Verse Service as Reflected in Manuscript Sources', *Musical Quarterly*, 67 (1981), 64–81; 'Authenticity and Chronology in Byrd's Church Anthems', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 35 (1982), 280–305; '"Throughout All Generations": Intimations of Influence in the Short Service Styles of Tallis, Byrd and Morley' in *Byrd Studies*, ed. Alan Brown and Richard Turbet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 83–111.

5 *Music & Letters*, 65 (1984), 309–13.

6 Bray, 'William Byrd's English Psalms' in *Psalms in the Early Modern World*, ed. Linda Phyllis Austern, Kari Boyd McBride and David L. Orvis (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 61–75; Bowers, 'Ecclesiastical or Domestic? Criteria for the Identification of the Initial Destinations of William Byrd's Music to Religious Vernacular Texts' in *William Byrd: A Research and Information Guide*, ed. Richard Turbet, 3rd edn (New York: Routledge, 2012), 134–60.

Lady Nevell's Book, copied by John Baldwin under Byrd's own supervision. The vernacular church music has fared much less well, however, and a considerable proportion of its study necessarily consists of teasing the truth out of incomplete, corrupt and anachronistic primary sources. A broad distinction will be drawn here between 'institutional' and 'domestic' MSS, the former comprehending privately owned MSS of an ecclesiastical character such as Adrian Batten's organ-book *Ob* MS Tenbury 791, John Barnard's MS part-books *Lcm* MSS 1045–51, an important church MS that appears to be the work of a domestic copyist (*Ob* MS Tenbury 1382), and the part-books *NYp* MSS Mus. Res. *MNZ (Chirk), copied for a household chapel. Dates and other details of these and all the unpublished primary sources referred to in the present study are given with supporting secondary references in the Descriptive List of Cited MSS (see pp. 323–37 below).

The range of music to be discussed is broad. The liturgical setting of Ps. 114:1–6 and the anthem 'O Lord, rebuke me not', to take just two examples, are musically speaking as different from each other as almost any two vocal works by Byrd. Unavoidably, then, the method is what might broadly be termed 'critical', the investigative approach constantly having to adapt to the specifically textual, contextual, text-critical, authorial, political, chronological or taxonomic problems raised by an individual work. 'Style' is used without compunction as a catch-all word for any technical characteristics whereby one composition may be differentiated from another. The choice of terminology is similarly eclectic: widely understood modern terms (e.g. tonal answer) are employed when appropriate, but so too are historical terms of musical rhetoric (e.g. *anaphora*) when these help the modern mind to quantify Byrd's mastery of a wide assortment of continental polyphonic techniques. While existing terms of one kind or the other have been used wherever possible, it was felt that justice could not fully be done to Byrd's (and Tallis's) liturgical music without introducing the mock-rhetoric term *tautophrasis* (explained on pp. 39–41), or to the consort anthems without recourse to the word 'psittacine' (the grounds for which are given

on p. 163). Byrd, of course, used none of this technical vocabulary, probably not even such a basic term as 'suspension'. Yet a present-day study of his music could not be written without it.

CHAPTER ONE

EARLY WORKS IN THE FULL IDIOM I: LITURGICAL MUSIC

First Preces, Ps. 47 and Ps. 54	BE 10a/2
Second Preces, Ps. 114:1–6 and Ps. 55:1–7,17	BE 10a/3a–c; TCM 2, pp. 25–9
[Third] Preces and Responses	BE 10a/1
Five-Part Litany	BE 10a/4
Four-Part Litany	BE 10a/8
The Peterhouse Fragments (*TD*, *Bs*)	BE 10a/11; MS
The Short Service (*V*, *TD*, *Bs*, *Ks*, *Cr*, *M*, *ND*)	BE 10a/5
The Three Minims Service (*M*, *ND*)	BE 10a/6

Evidence is at best circumstantial that the music to be discussed in this chapter dates from the earlier part of Byrd's career. The composer may even have been past his eightieth year when what is probably the oldest extant source containing any of it—the organ-book *Och* MS Mus. 1001—was copied.[1] For Fellowes, it was 'not possible even approximately to say with certainty when any of his music for the English rites of the Church was composed'.[2] Given, however, that of all Byrd's vernacular output some of these liturgical items bear the most explicit stamps of Tallis's influence, the generally early dating first tentatively suggested by Fellowes seems highly plausible.[3] Two factors hint at a more precise chronology, however. First, from 1563 to early 1572 Byrd was at the helm of a provincial cathedral choir with as few as six choristers;[4] and it seems logical to associate his simplest vernacular scores with that period (although it is not impossible that he was composing for the unrivalled resources of the Chapel Royal choir long before he became a permanent member of it). Second, the echoes of Tallis can be shown gradually to die away. For all

---

1 On the date of this organ-book see p. 335 below.

2 *English Cathedral Music from Edward VI to Edward VII* (London: Methuen, 1941), 71.

3 *English Cathedral Music*, 71, 73; Fellowes's view has been reaffirmed by subsequent scholars: see David Wulstan, *Tudor Music* (London: Dent, 1985), 320, and John Harley, *William Byrd, Gentleman of the Chapel Royal* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997), 177–85.

4 Roger Bowers, 'Music and Worship to 1640', in *A History of Lincoln Minster*, ed. Dorothy Owen (Cambridge, 1994), 47–76 (65).

Byrd's dependence on his mentor, the concerns with harmony and rhetoric that would characterize his mature style were already coming into their own.

1.1 Responsorial music and liturgical psalmody[5]

With the exception of the litanies, Byrd's shorter liturgical works are preserved in three sets, two consisting of preces and psalms, and one of preces and responses. Those MS sources that designate the sets of preces and psalms 'First' and 'Second' do so consistently, and agree in those particulars with Barnard's *First Book*. The numbering therefore has more authority either than the designation 'Third' applied by some modern scholars to the preces and responses or than Barnard's apparently autonomous numbering of Byrd's Short, Verse and Three Minims services as 'First', 'Second' and 'Third' respectively. In Monson's opinion, Byrd composed the Second Preces and Psalms before the first set;[6] it will be shown here that while the second set may indeed have been the earlier of the two to assume the overall shape of its two extant versions, there are reasons to believe that the first set incorporates older material. As we shall see, however, the versions of the two sets given in BE 10a are probably a far cry from the composer's first thoughts.

1.1.1 Groupings and Liturgical Functions

All sources agree that each of Byrd's sets should contain two psalms in the full idiom, and consistently assign Pss. 47 and 54 to the first set and Pss. 114:1–6 and 55:1–7,17 to the second. The London B part-books *Llp* MS 764 and *Ob* MS Mus. e. 40, however, include verse settings of Pss. 100 and 119:33–8 in the first and second sets respectively, while the

---

5 The terms 'festal' and 'festival', for which a precedent may be cited in the heading 'psalmi festivales' found in the indexes to the Cp 'Former' set, has been applied by modern scholars to polyphonic psalms from the period: see Ruth M. Wilson, *Anglican Chant and Chanting in England, Scotland, and America 1660–1820* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 44 n. 49. In Byrd's case, however, the term 'liturgical psalmody' is to be preferred because his second set of psalms has yet to be correctly identified with a particular holy day.

6 'The Preces, Psalms, and Litanies of Byrd and Tallis: Another "Virtuous Contention in Love"', *Music Review*, 40 (1979), 257–71 (257–60).

setting of Ps. 119:33–8 is included also in Barnard's *First Book*. Though the intermingling of full and verse idioms within a given set of psalms occurs elsewhere in the pre-Restoration repertory,[7] the verse psalms are conspicuous by their absence from both sets in the Chapel Royal B part-book *Oj* MS 180, and their inclusion in the Chapel Royal word-book *Ob* MS Rawl. Poet. 23 indicates that by the 1630s their preferred use was as anthems. Indeed, Ps. 119:33–8 is mentioned in Barnard's printed index as one of several liturgical pieces 'many times sung in stead of anthems', and it assumes that role in the New College B part-book *Ob* MS d. 162 and the related Denbighshire sources *NYp* MSS Mus. Res. *MNZ (Chirk) and *Och* MS Mus. 6. Discussion of the two verse psalms will be deferred until Chapter 4.

The Second Preces and Psalms were printed by Barnard in a five-part version with which MSS from most institutions concur. The Durham and Peterhouse sources, however, transmit the Second Preces and the two full psalms in four-part versions, plus its verse psalm in a five-part version not found elsewhere. To complicate matters further, those MSS also include duplicate entries of the four-part version of the Second Preces prefixed to 'Lift up your heads' (Ps.24:7–8,10), a *contrafactum* of Byrd's six-part motet 'Attollite portas' (1575/11).[8] The so-called Third Preces are nowhere accompanied by psalms of their own, but are followed in the Peterhouse Latter Set by a fine setting of the responses after the Creed. Despite the younger Thomas Tudway's testimony that these responses were still being sung in 1715, and were by then the only such set in use,[9] their pre- and post-Restoration sources are few indeed, and only one of the two original Ct parts survives.

Byrd's two sets of psalms have proved harder to account for liturgically than any others from the period.[10] Tallis's psalmody, for example, is manifestly a cycle for Christmas and

---

7 See, for example, Morley's psalms for the 26th evening (EECM 38/8), or Edward Smith's psalms referenced in n. 13 below.

8 For the Durham-Peterhouse versions of the Second Preces and Psalms see TCM 2, 25–44.

9 Wilson, *Anglican Chant*, 138.

10 For a list of relevant settings, see Peter le Huray, *Music and the Reformation in England, 1549–1660* (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1967; repr. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 161–2.

St Stephen's Day, since it consists of the verses of Ps. 119 appointed for the 24th evening, two of the three proper psalms appointed in the 1559 BCP for evensong on Christmas Day, and the verses of Ps. 119 appointed for the 26th evening.[11] Morley's setting of the verses for the 26th evening was presumably also intended for St Stephen's Day, while [Robert?] Parsons's setting of the psalms for the first evening would have been appropriate for the feasts of the Circumcision (in January), SS. Philip and James (in May) and All Saints (in November).[12]

It is nonetheless evident that some institutions had proper psalmody of their own in addition to that stipulated by the BCP for the four feast-days of Christmas, Easter, Ascension and Whitsunday. At Durham and Peterhouse, proper psalms were assigned also to Epiphany Day (when, owing to a misunderstanding to be explained shortly, Byrd's Second Preces and Psalms were sung) and All Saints' Day, for which the short-lived Durham Organist Edward Smith had composed a setting of the first and last eight-verse units of Ps. 119.[13] At St George's Chapel Windsor, Pss. 21, 146 and 147 were sung on so-called Obiit days to a setting by [Richard] Farrant,[14] while one of Batten's six sets of Preces and Psalms comprises Pss. 20 and 124, neither of which was ever appointed as a proper psalm by the BCP.[15]

---

11 See EECM 13/7–9 and 16–22 (Ps. 119:9–32, and the B part only of Ps. 119:1–8, Ps. 119:145–76, Ps. 110 and Ps. 132). Ps. 110 survives in *Och* MSS Mus. 544–53, v. 2 being transcribed in John Aplin, '"The Fourth Kind of Faburden": The Identity of an English Four-Part Style', *Music & Letters*, 61 (1980), 245–65 (251–2).

12 *Llp* MS 764; *Oj* MS 180 (B part only).

13 Edn in Simon Anderson, 'Music by Members of the Choral Foundation of Durham Cathedral in the Seventeenth Century', 2 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Durham, 1999), vol. 2, pp. 170–80.

14 *Cpc* MSS Mus. 6.1–6. An Obiit day fell on the Sunday before each of the so-called quarter days—Lady Day (25 March) Midsummer Day (24 June), Michaelmas (29 September) and Christmas (25 December), and was marked by a liturgy commemorating the deceased Knights of the Garter. See Keri Dexter, 'Unmasking "Thomas Tudway": A New Identity for a Seventeenth-Century Windsor Copyist', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 32 (1999), 89–117 (93, 100).

15 *Och* MS Mus. 1148, ff. 3v–4v (B part only), not listed in SECM; partial transcription in John Jebb, *The Choral Responses and Litanies of the United Church of England and Ireland*, vol. 2 (London: Robert Cocks, 1857), 209.

The three psalms from Byrd's first set may also be placed in this non-BCP category, for as Roger Bowers has recently pointed out they had in Sarum use been respectively proper to matins (first nocturn), lauds and prime on Epiphany day (6 January), one of the principal double feasts.[16] Though Bowers suggests this was a Lincoln custom 'in the tradition of the old breviary', the need to mark that feast with special music is more likely to have been felt at the Chapel Royal, since this was the day on which 'at matins time' the Tudor kings had annually re-enacted their own coronation.[17] This was one of a number of ceremonies not prescribed by Sarum use but peculiar to Chapel Royal custom, and which may have continued under Mary and Elizabeth as did the *pedilavium* and distribution of alms on Maundy Thursday (see pp. 74–5 and 96 below). As we shall see, in their surviving form Byrd's psalms are of a lavishness appropriate to such an occasion.

Bowers's discovery shows that at Durham Byrd's second set of psalms was mistakenly assigned to Epiphany simply because it had been confused with his first set (a circumstance that surely says something about Prebendary John Cosin's eye for liturgical details). The proper function of the second set remains mysterious, not least because all its surviving sources omit about two thirds of Ps. 55 and the last two vv. both of Ps. 114 and of the eight-verse unit Ps. 119:33–40. In Bowers's view, Byrd originally set Pss. 55 and 114 in their entirety, as proper psalms for two separate feasts. Plausibly he had reason to do so, since Ps. 114 was one of the BCP proper psalms for evensong on Easter day, while Ps. 55, appointed for the tenth evening in the BCP monthly round, coincided with the anniversary of the consecration of Lincoln's first cathedral on 10 May 1092. Only subsequently, Bowers contends, and presumably not by Byrd, were these two psalms

16 *Breviarium ad usum insignis ecclesiae Sarum*, ed. Francis Procter and Christopher Wordsworth, 3 vols (Cambridge: Almae Matris Academiae, 1879–86), vol. 1, cols. cccxix, cccxxix and cccxxx, cited in Bowers, 'Ecclesiastical or Domestic? Criteria for the Identification of the Initial Destinations of William Byrd's Music to Religious Vernacular Texts' in *William Byrd: A Research and Information Guide*, ed. Richard Turbet, 3rd edn (New York: Routledge, 2012), 134–60 (137).

17 Fiona Kisby, 'The Royal Household Chapel in Early-Tudor London, 1485–1547' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of London, 1996), 152–3; see also Kisby, '"When the King Goeth a Procession": Chapel Ceremonies and Services, the Ritual Year, and Religious Reforms at the Early Tudor Court, 1485–1547', *The Journal of British Studies*, 40 (2001), 44–75 (54, 58).

brought together, shortened (because they 'were found to be tedious in complete performance') and appended with the composer's verse setting of Ps. 119:33–8 (originally 'a free-standing anthem').

It is unnecessary to assume such extensive unauthorized intervention to account for the composition of Byrd's second group of psalms, however. Since it is now clear that the first group originally included the verse setting of Ps. 100, the second group might equally have originally included the verse setting of Ps. 119:33–8 (which, unlike any of Byrd's anthems but like all his other liturgical psalms, ends with a doxology). Moreover, the omitted verses seem less likely the result of seventeenth-century editorializing than signs of pre-Reformation custom, for whereas it would have been illogical to cut just two verses (vv. 7–8) from the end of Ps. 114, under the Septuagint arrangement of the psalter the six verses set by Byrd had belonged to a much longer 113th psalm, and would have resulted from the much more understandable measure of cutting the last twenty-one verses of that psalm. Similarly, the six verses of Ps. 119 set by Byrd would have resulted from cutting the last ten verses from a sixteen-verse portion of the 118th psalm that was regularly appointed for the office of terce.[18] The most likely explanation for Byrd's second set of psalms, then, is that like the Windsor set for Obiit Day it represents some long-established liturgical practice too localized to have left its mark on either the use of Sarum or the BCP.

1.1.2 Preces and Responses

The tradition of prefixing polyphonic vernacular psalms with a setting of the preces, i.e. the opening responses and doxology from the two BCP offices, appears to be due to Tallis, whose two closely related sets of preces have long been revered as the most ancient in existence.[19] To a greater or lesser extent, these served as models for Byrd's three sets, and

---

18 *Breviarium ad usum insignis ecclesiae Sarum*, vol. 2, cols 57–8, 194–5.

19 See Suzanne Cole, *Thomas Tallis and His Music in Victorian England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008), 130–70.

on the basis of a subjective comparison of harmonic content Monson argued that the younger composer's Second Preces were written first.[20] More, however, must be taken into account. First, at the root of the problems Byrd was clearly trying to solve through successive reworkings of these preces was a curious *cantus firmus* with which Tallis had been reluctant to interfere. Secondly, the order in which Byrd apparently introduced his revisions shows that the Second Preces a4—which Monson unaccountably omitted from BE 10a—was the basis for the version a5. Thirdly, from their relationship to the two versions of the Second Preces, and from certain characteristics of their own, the First Preces can likewise be seen as the revision of a four-part original, now lost, that was probably more closely indebted to Tallis than any of Byrd's surviving settings.

John Merbecke's plainchant for the preces at morning and evening prayer (ex. 1:1a)[21] was scarcely inspiring source material for a polyphonic arrangement, offering little more than monotones on $\hat{1}$ and $\hat{5}$ (of which the latter prevails for the whole of the second response and doxology). Short bursts of melodic activity occur in the second of the two versicles—which, being for the minister, could not be set polyphonically—and in the setting of 'Praise ye the Lord' following the doxology, which suddenly moves to an unexpected termination on $\hat{4}$. To these characteristics may be attributed both Tallis's unbalanced tonal plan and Byrd's multiple attempts to rework it.

In neither of his two treatments of this material did Tallis manage to do more than stress its tonal limitations and inconclusive ending (see ex. 1:1b–c).[22] After a promising first response that utilizes all three triads to which the monotone belongs, both settings lapse into chordal longueurs that eventually give way to a flurry of strongly contrasted harmonies. Tallis must have sensed the abruptness of Merbecke's cadence, for he tried to

---

20 'The Preces, Psalms, and Litanies', 259–60. Monson deemed the harmony of the First Preces 'much richer', 'subtler', 'more telling' and less 'abrupt' than that of the Second Preces.

21 *The booke of common praier noted* (London: Richard Grafton, 1550; STC 16441), sig. B1r–v (here transposed a 4th lower, note-values halved).

22 EECM 13/6 (here transposed a 4th lower); EECM 13/5.

stabilize the move to $\hat{4}$ by appending a plagal close that repeats the words 'Praise ye the Lord'. This, however, required the introduction of a startling new tonal ingredient ($\hat{\flat 7}$) that draws attention to the problem posed by the cadence rather than actually solving it. Tallis's more literal rendering of Merbecke's *cantus firmus* occurs in his so-called Second Preces, implying that they are the earlier of the two sets. The corresponding passage of the so-called First Preces seems to be an attempt to clarify, elaborate and at the same time abbreviate an existing polyphonic plan, although to achieve those things Tallis had to dispense with the plainchant cadence in the T part. It was Byrd, however, who ultimately recognized the need not to be bound by it during the recitations also.

In harmonizing Merbecke's $\hat{5}$ monotone, Tallis's only recourse to variety had been to move obliquely to another consonant triad three times and back again, thus adding a modicum of what will be termed here as 'tangential' harmony to the reciting note. Nor, until reaching the last of the tangential chords in his First Preces, did Tallis take the opportunity they offered of incorporating a 4–3 suspension. As well as incorporating further suspensions of that kind (see ex. 1:1e–g), Byrd more importantly introduced ancillary harmonies that were foreign to Merbecke's reciting note, thereby counteracting the monotone 'G' with contrasting chords of 'F', 'B♭' (in the Second and Third preces) and even 'a' (in the Third Preces). At the same time, Byrd evened out the distribution of harmonic variety by simplifying Tallis's setting of 'And our mouth...', first by working in a 6/3 chord above the latter's B part (ex. 1:1e), then by rewriting the B part so that only two 5/3 harmonies were needed (ex. 1:1d, f), and finally by reserving a single change of harmony until the word 'praise' (ex. 1:1g). With 'O Lord, make haste...', Byrd took a rather different tack. Having initially embellished Tallis's handiwork with an ostentatious 6/5 chord (ex. 1:1e),[23] he took the even bolder step of replacing Merbecke's monotone

23 Though this chord appears as such in the sources, with *f'* in the M part (*Cp* MS 34, f. 99v, and MS 47, f. 100v, and Barnard's *First Book*), Fellowes tacitly amended it to a plain 6/3 chord in WB 10, p. 1, with the M a step higher.

framework with an echo, in the M, of the preceding versicle (ex. 3:1d, f–g).[24] When it came to the problematic cadence at 'Praise ye the Lord', Byrd seems to have made a series of experiments with Tallis's two designs before finally opting, in the Third Preces, for a forthright full close on $\hat{1}$. By now, a worshipper hearing these preces could have little hope of tracing in Byrd's music the outline of Merbecke's *cantus firmus*.

Though the four- and five-part versions of Byrd's Second Preces retain identical outer voices as far as '...and ever shall be' (ex. 1:1d, f), from the ensuing music there emerge two indications that the First Preces and the Second Preces a4 both predate the Second Preces a5. First, the material for '...world without end. Amen' from the Second Preces a4 turns up also in the First Preces, while the Second Preces a5 instead substitutes a more dramatic setting (which, through the use of a 'B♭' triad, points the way to the Third Preces). Second, Byrd's jerky rhythm for 'Praise ye the Lord' in the Second Preces a4—seemingly an attempt to compromise between Tallis's two corresponding rhythms—recurs nowhere, and is replaced in the Second Preces a5 with the more spacious rhythm of Byrd's First Preces (itself directly inherited from Tallis). While it might still be objected that the Second Preces a4 could have been derived from the version a5, as Monson believed,[25] this would have required two retrograde steps in Byrd's sequence of reworkings: a reversion to the scalar setting of '...world without end. Amen' and an inferior rhythm at 'Praise ye the Lord'. Furthermore, the probability that the Second Preces began life as a four-part composition is supported by evidence, to be discussed shortly, that so too did its accompanying psalms.

There are intimations that the First Preces too were originally in four parts. As in Tallis's Preces a4, the spacing of Byrd's outer voices suggests only two inner ones, the M often lying a 10th above the B (*cf.* exx. 1:1b and e). Hence, in the surviving version a5, the

---

24 On the inclusion of Byrd's revision of 'O Lord, make haste to help us' in later versions of Tallis's responses, see Fellowes, *William Byrd*, 2nd edn (London: Oxford University Press, 1948), 119, and Cole, *Thomas Tallis*, 136.

25 BE 10a, p. viii n. 12.

T is twice compelled to dip below the B (in the first half of the doxology). Though it is not impossible that the significant reworking of Tallis's 'Praise ye the Lord' originated in Byrd's posited four-part version, the determined harmonic strides through five degrees of the circle of fifths, together with a divergence of the outer voices that in one source admits a third Ct part;[26] suggest a confident departure from Tallis's model that was not taken until the inner voices were rewritten. Certainly the B part of Byrd's Second Preces a4 remains closer to Tallis at this point.

While the revision-history of the First and Second Preces is far from straightforward, there can be no doubt that Byrd's remaining set of preces (ex. 1:1g) represents his last word in this minor polyphonic genre. Both Hughes and le Huray were surely right to call it the Third Preces;[27] even without the support of any primary sources. Here Byrd was at his least dependent on Merbecke and Tallis: the recitations are at their most harmonically varied, individual voice-parts exercise the greatest degree of rhythmic independence, and the music closes affirmatively in the expected key of C fa ut. Not only are the Third Preces thereby unified with Byrd's responses after the Creed, but also a connection is implied with The Great Service and its three associated full anthems, all of which also are in C fa ut. Perhaps, therefore, the Third Preces and Responses formed part of Byrd's late vernacular project—a possibility further hinted at by the pairing of 'Mr Birds [third] preces and great service' in *DRc* MS C18 (pp. 43–56).

Whereas in his successive settings of the preces Byrd gradually freed himself from Merbecke's plainchant, in his sole setting of the responses he made amends by cleaving fast to *The booke of common praier noted* (sigs D2r–D3v), albeit with an amended rhythm.

---

26 The extra part is created by the division of Ct1d and Ct2c. It is found only in Barnard's printed Ct1d volume, where syncopation of the word 'praise' (bar 21) brings about an uncharacteristic, not to say ugly, 7–8 suspension against Ct1c=Ct2d. Though Monson put this down to inexperience on Byrd's part ('The Preces, Psalms and Litanies', 260), the fault might more readily be laid at Barnard's door, and the Ct1d rhythm adjusted to correspond with that of the B and M.

27 Anselm Hughes, *Catalogue of the Musical Manuscripts at Peterhouse, Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 15; le Huray, *Music and the Reformation in England*, 161.

Tallis had twice faithfully set the same *cantus firmus*;[28] and by transposing it down a 5th was able both times to close individual responses on one of five different major chords ('A', 'B♭', 'C', 'D', 'F'). Obviously, such variety was desirable, yet an accumulation of 'B♭' harmony around the *f* reciting note means there is little sense of finality to the ultimate plagal 'Amen' in the key of F fa ut. Whether rationalized in terms of chant or of chordal function, Tallis's responses may truly be said to end 'in the dominant'. Byrd's decision instead to transpose the *cantus firmus* down a 4th restricted the range of available closing chords to four ('C', 'D', 'E' and 'G'), and took the versicles and T part beyond the usual frontier of chant notation by calling repeatedly for the ficta note *f*♯ beneath the reciting note of *g*. Possibly, in choosing this more artificial transposition, Byrd was simply aligning his responses with the *g* reciting note of the Third Preces. Certainly by doing so he secured a more consolidated tonal scheme, rounded off at the final 'Amen' with a lyrical full close in 'C'. The satisfying effect, though perhaps somewhat misunderstood, was not lost on John Jebb:

> These [preces and] responses are worthy of William Byrd, their reputed author, being truly ecclesiastical and majestic, especially in the preces before the psalms, and are well suited for use on the high festivals.[29]

1.1.3 Psalms

In that they initially comprised a four-part chordal texture with a plainchant psalm-tone in the T, the earliest English polyphonic settings of vernacular psalms and canticles represent a late insular equivalent of the continental form of harmonized chanting known as *falsobordone*. Whereas the older techniques of faburden and fauxbourdon had provided easily applicable rules for ad libbing *two* grammatically correct voice-parts against a given chant, it seems unlikely that singers routinely put into practice the rules for improvising

---

28 EECM 13/10–11.

29 *The Choral Responses and Litanies of the United Church of England and Ireland*, vol. 1 (London: George Bell, 1847), 12.

three such parts given by Guilielmus Monachus (in the late fifteenth century) and the theorist known as Scottish Anonymous (in the mid sixteenth).[30] Rather, the four-voice style classified as 'the fourth kind of faburden' by Scottish Anonymous was, as John Aplin has delicately put it, 'clearly derived from that three-part improvised tradition whose influence continued to operate in premeditated four-part composition'.[31] Thus, while four-part faburden depended on being written down, it nonetheless still conformed to the theorists' precepts that the highest voice should sing a 6th above the T, the Ct a 3rd or a 4th above the T, and the B correspondingly a 3rd or a 5th below the T. Though, as we shall see, Byrd himself was not above using this humble technique, in his four-part music he was chiefly concerned with improving on it.

Psalm-tones appear to have been sung in fourth-kind faburden throughout the Reformation period, there being groups of untexted examples, capable of adaptation to any given psalm or canticle, in Morley's treatise and the Peterhouse Caroline part-books.[32] A greater number of examples survives in Edwardian and early Elizabethan sources, where each verse and doxology has been notated with its own bespoke rhythm, the recitations often involving a good deal of inflexible chordal repetition.[33] Such composed rhythms, crude though they may have been, set these works apart from purely improvised polyphony, yet a decisive step further away from the ready-made faburden texture was taken by Tallis, whose use of five voices in psalm-tone settings meant that the interval of an 8ve or more—as opposed to the traditional 6th—now separated the T and M.[34] It was in this state, then, that vernacular polyphonic psalmody reached Byrd, who would advance

30 See Aplin, '"The Fourth Kind of Faburden"', 247–50.

31 '"The Fourth Kind of Faburden"', 250.

32 *A plaine and easie introduction to practicall musicke* (London: Peter Short, 1597; STC 18133), 147–8; *Cp* MS 34, f. 92, and MS 35, f. 22v (olim B3v); Wilson, *Anglican Chant*, 42.

33 Seventeen compositions of this type from *Lbl* MSS Royal Appendix 74–6 (the Lumley Books), *Ob* MSS Mus. Sch. e. 420–22 (the Wanley Books) and John Day's *Certain Notes* were itemized by Aplin ('"The Fourth Kind of Faburden"', 265). On these and further psalm-tone arrangements from the period see RRMR 99, p. xvii; Nicholas Temperley, *The Music of the English Parish Church*, 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), vol. 1, pp. 25–6, vol. 2, p. 31; and Wilson, *Anglican Chant*, 32–45.

34 See EECM 13/7–9.

the genre still further from its roots in improvisation. Now, the composer's insatiable appetite for variety meant that each verse would have to be individualized in more than just rhythmic terms.

As noted above, the First Preces show signs of having been adapted, like the Second Preces, from a four-part version that is no longer extant, and the same goes for Byrd's First Psalm to the First Preces, a setting of Ps. 147 constructed around Sarum tone 8/i. Only in the doxology of the surviving, five-part version does the tone appear intact (ex. 1:2): elsewhere, its influence is exerted less on the melodic contour of a given voice-part than on the harmonic progressions articulated by the ensemble as a whole. Though the two reciting notes are invariably allotted to one of the Ct parts (usually Ct 2), in vv. 2, 3 and 9 the last note of the mediation migrates to the other Ct part. In vv. 4 and 7, the second note of the mediation is altered from *c'* to *c♯'*, showing that Byrd's concern for harmonic variety could take priority over the melodic structure of the *cantus firmus* itself. Harmony becomes paramount in the forcibly declaimed first half of v. 8 ('God reigneth over the heathen'), where the psalm-tone all but vanishes. Its most fragmented states are reached in the terminations, in most of which it is tossed to the T or (an 8ve higher) the M, and sometimes back to a Ct again.

The only satisfactory explanation for the crisis Byrd's *cantus firmus* undergoes here is that the surviving version of Ps. 47 is an elaborate and extremely liberal reworking of a setting originally in four parts, and not necessarily intended for this particular psalm. Indeed, the portion of the doxology shown in ex. 1:2 would, stripped of its T part, form a self-sufficient four-part *falsobordone* with the psalm-tone in its customary place in the part next above the B.[35] In making a five-part version from such an original, Byrd's best option would have been to redeploy the chant-bearing T to fill the gap between the B and the psalm-tone, thereby requiring the chant to be transferred to one or other of the Ct parts. If

35 For comparable four-voice settings of Sarum tone 8/i see RRMR 100/40 (an anonymous *V*), and Morley, *Introduction*, 148 ('The Eighth Tune').

correct, this hypothesis would not only account for the tone's fragmented state in the five-part version, but would also imply that the plainchant incipit (i.e. the first half of v. 1) should not be sung by B with the recitation on *f*, as printed in Barnard's *First Book* and modern editions, but by Ct2 with the recitation on *c'*.

Not every commentator on Byrd's liturgical music has recognized Sarum psalm-tone 8/i as the basis of Ps. 47;[36] and none seems to have noticed that the same psalm-tone—or at least one of the closely related tones 3/ii and 3/vi—is also the basis of the Second Psalm to the First Preces, the setting of Ps. 54 (ex. 1:3). Here the outline of a *cantus firmus*, transposed from 'C' to 'G', is even more fragmentarily dispersed among the voices than in Ps. 47. Yet both psalms may be described in the same very basic terms: recitations on a 'fa' degree, a medial cadence that visits the adjoining scale-step above the recitation and the adjoining scale-step below it, and a terminal cadence ending a fourth below the recitation. In Ps. 54, however, the processes of fragmentation and variation evident in Ps. 47 are taken much further: instead of being *presented* melodically, the psalm-tone may be said to be *represented* by characteristic chord progressions, the recitations being either curtailed by discursive harmonies or even, in the first halves of vv. 4, 5 and 7, dispensed with altogether.

As if these freedoms were not enough, Byrd reassigned the usual antiphonal functions of c and d to two contrasting semichoirs that in each case draw on both sides of the choir. The four odd-numbered verses are thus scored for high voices (two M supported by Td and Ct1c in vv. 1 and 5, and by Tc and Ct1d in vv. 3 and 7), while the three even-numbered verses are scored for low voices (Bcd, Tcd and two Ct parts with gymels for Tc and Td in vv. 2 and 6). The doxology is a typical five-voice tutti, but here a further brief T gymel temporarily increases the number of voice-parts to six (as in Byrd's full anthems 'Help us,

---

36 Though overlooked by Monson ('The Preces, Psalms and Litanies', 264), the presence of a Sarum tone in this setting has been noted by other scholars: see Wilson, *Anglican Chant*, 45, and John Caldwell, *The Oxford History of English Music*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 350 n. 9.

O God' and 'O Lord, make thy servant').[37] The high and low scorings serve no apparent metaphorical purpose; rather, they introduce more than a faint echo of the sectionalized scorings that had been a defining characteristic of the English pre-Reformation repertory, and that continued to be used in some of the (now imperfectly preserved) vernacular psalmody of Tallis, Sheppard and [Richard] Farrant (see pp. 134–5 below).

In common with the freely composed *falsobordoni* that were beginning to appear on the continent around 1570, the two full psalms to Byrd's Second Preces have no discernible *cantus firmus*, yet they continue in the manner of harmonized psalm-tones by adapting each verse to a single basic series of chords. Here too, Byrd's aversion to mere formula means that no two verses are exactly alike: each one introduces some measure of harmonic variety, either to enhance declamation, or simply for its own sake.

Though the four-part version of Ps. 114:1–6 retains the contrapuntal framework of fourth-kind faburden, with a prominent series of 6ths between T and M, all traces of austerity are effaced by opulent harmonic colouring (ex. 1:4). The first three chords take the M through a rising chromatic scale that forms the beginning of an ingenious chordal palindrome: 'B♭', 'D', 'G', F, 'B♭', F, 'g', 'D' and back to 'B♭' again as the following verse begins. (The striking progression between verses—from a major chord of 'D' to a major chord of 'B♭'—would have been instantly recognizable to Byrd's contemporaries as a component of the *passamezzo antico*;[38] and this is but the first of its many appearances throughout Byrd's vernacular church music.) Apparently borrowing an idea from Tallis,

---

37 In the doxology of Ps. 47, and the even-numbered verses and doxology of Ps. 54, the two Ct parts are given by Barnard in his preferred 'crossed' arrangement, i.e. Ct1c=Ct2d plus Ct2c=Ct1d. Since no other sources of the Ct parts survive, it is impossible to tell whether the use of this arrangement in Pss. 47 and 54 is original (as it appears to be in certain portions of The Great Service) or editorial. It does seem likely, however, that Barnard adjusted the scoring of Ps. 47, since vv. 1–5, which are marked 'full' in all MS sources, are assigned in the *First Book* to d and c in alternation.

38 The *passamezzo antico* had been known in England from Henrician times, an early example (the lute composition 'Queen Mary's Dump') having been entered *c*.1530 in *Lbl* MS Royal Appendix 58, f. 54v. See Julia Craig-McFeely, 'English Lute Manuscripts and Scribes 1530–1630' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1993), appendix 1. The characteristic progression had entered the polyphonic repertory by Mary's reign: see Mundy, 'Vox Patris caelestis' (EECM 2/2), bars 94, 156 (for which reference I am indebted to John Milsom).

Byrd enlivened the longer recitations of this psalm with tangential chords somewhat in the spirit of a psalm-tone flex (*cf.* ex. 1:4, vv. 2 and 5).[39] He also avoided excessive repetition of the basic eight-chord progression by treating vv. 3 and 4 as if they were a single verse, using the extended recitations to develop further the tangential harmony (at 'skipped like rams').

The two versions of both these psalms differ in more ways than in the make-up of their inner voice-parts, leaving little doubt that the versions a4 are the originals and those a5 are later revisions. In terms of declamation, the five-part version of Ps. 114:1–6 incorporates three significant improvements on the four-part one: At bars 10–11, a minim rest preceding the phrase has been omitted and the word 'and' has been shortened from a semibreve to a minim; at bars 28–9, the word 'hills' has been extended from a minim to a dotted semibreve; at bars 39–41, three separate adjustments to the rhythm cause the entire phrase to be reduced in length by one semibreve.

A far greater number of revisions is apparent in the five-part version of Ps. 55:1–7,17, of which those affecting v. 1 are shown in ex. 1:5. Here, the addition of a fifth voice to a texture clearly conceived for four voices proved awkward, and resulted in a contrived T part that, in every verse, not only dips momentarily beneath the B but also forms a caustic false relation with the M. At the same time, Byrd made numerous revisions to the rhythm and harmony: in v. 1 alone, he shortened the initial chord, corrected the syllabic emphasis on 'prayer' in the M part, shifted the chord-change from 'and' to 'hide', converted two chords from minor to major, and (as in every verse) terminated the M on $\hat{1}$ instead of $\hat{3}$. His revisions to subsequent verses included a fresh chord at the word 'mourn' (bar 11), correcting the text from 'flee away' to 'get me away' (bar 40), and repeating the words 'the Lord' in v. 17 (bars 50–51). He furthermore almost completely rewrote the doxology, ending it with a completely new plagal 'Amen'.

---

39 See, for example, vv. 10 and 14 of Tallis's Ps. 119:9–16 (EECM 13/7), where the minor chord of 'd' that accompanies the T recitations on *a* switches for one syllable to a major chord of 'A'.

The character and extent of these revisions show that the four-part versions cannot have been an attempt to simplify the five-part ones, and strongly suggest that the person responsible was Byrd himself.

1.1.4 Litanies

At least two settings of the English litany are attributed to Byrd in a handful of seventeenth-century sources, but in no case can a complete musical text be put together without reconstructing a missing vocal part. The Chirk Castle MSS transmit B, T, Ct and M parts of what is listed as 'Mr Byrd's Litany for Trebles' in the original scribe's index to each of the four surviving part-books, the ascription to 'Mr Wm Byrd' being reiterated on the music pages. John Ferrabosco's organ-book *Cu* MS Ely 4, copied *c*.1663, contains the outer voices only of what is clearly a completely different setting, attributed to 'Mr Byrd' and stated to be in four parts. There survive in addition two orphaned copies of a *cantus firmus* T part, both inscribed 'Mr Byrd's Litany' by their original scribes. The first, annotated '4 voc:', is a later addition to *Ob* MS Tenbury 1382; the second is one of five litany settings found in *Cq* G.4.17, a part-book from the Chapel of Queens' College Cambridge dating from the later 1630s and rediscovered in 2013. Whereas the MS 1382 part breaks off at the end of a single page (having reached the response 'Good Lord, deliver us'), enough survives to show that it is almost certainly a concordance of the Queens' part, which transmits the *cantus firmus* in its entirety. In addition to these MS sources, mention must also be made of Byrd's four-part *Laetania* printed in the *Gradualia* (1605a4/16), since a possible close relationship with one of the English settings cannot yet be disproved.

The Ely litany was known to Jebb, who despite the annotation '4 parts' reconstructed it as a five-voice setting.[40] He nonetheless remained skeptical about the attribution to Byrd:

---

40 *The Choral Responses and Litanies*, vol. 1, pp. 68–76.

> As a composition it is much inferior to the [Third Preces and] Responses, and a doubt may be fairly entertained of the assigned authorship.[41]

A four-part reconstruction was included in TCM 2 (pp. 49–50), the editors declining to comment on its authenticity. Monson likewise made a four-part reconstruction for BE 10a, but consigned it to an appendix on grounds of its fragmentary state and 'dubious stylistic features' (p. viii). He noted specifically that the setting included the responses following the Lord's Prayer, which were seldom set by pre-Restoration composers, and that on reaching those responses the M part switches abruptly from its established range (*d'–c"*) into a somewhat higher one (*g'–e"*). To be sure, these later responses might be explained away as a post-Restoration addition, but as Monson also pointed out, throughout this setting the B harmonizes the presumed T reciting note (*g*) at the 8ve below, whereas Byrd's intact responsorial music—the *Laetania* included—demonstrates a marked preference for harmonizing reciting notes at the 5th below. Monson nonetheless cautiously held the initial portion of the Ely litany and the incomplete T *cantus firmus* from MS 1382 to be mutual concordances which, despite some disagreement as regards rhythm, represent 'a shadow of the four-part litany Byrd might have written'.[42]

The already tenuous connection between these two sources appears even more so in the light of both the newly emerged *Cq* T part and the early history of the English litany. Under Sarum use, the litany had been sung to a varied chant setting that included three different tones for the responses 'Miserere nobis … Ora(te) pro nobis', 'Parce nobis Domine … Libera nos Domine' and 'Te rogamus audi nos', as well as through-composed chants for the Agnus Dei and Kyries (ex. 1:6a).[43] Cranmer's ground-breaking English translation of 1544, which by May or June of that year was printed with monophonic

---

41 *The Choral Responses and Litanies*, vol. 1, pp. 12–13.

42 'The Preces, Psalms and Litanies', 269; BE 10a, p. viii.

43 *Processionale ad vsum insignis ac preclare ecclesie Sar[um]* (Paris: Wolfgang Hopyl, 1519; STC 16235), ff. 170r–171r.

music,[44] not only pruned the verbal text but also did away with most of Sarum melody, substituting a variant of the 'miserere nobis' tone for the entire litany (ex. 1:6b). Thus simplified, the chant was soon circulating in harmonized versions: an accompanying vocal part is found in the lone T survivor from a Henrician part-book set,[45] three accompanying parts are present in the Wanley Books,[46] and a complete four-part setting is among the contents of Day's *Mornyng and euenyng prayer and communion*.[47] The Cranmerian chant continued to be sung, and used as a *cantus firmus*, well into the seventeenth century, and formed the basis of a four-part 'Common Litany' attributed to [Thomas?] Tomkins in the *Cp* 'Latter' Set.[48] Moreover, the remains of the Ely Litany show for certain that its initial portion was likewise based on the simple Cranmerian tone.

A somewhat different *cantus firmus* forms the basis of the five-voice litany attributed to Tallis in Barnard's *First Book* and certain MS sources from the 1630s onwards.[49] In the absence of any serious contenders this setting can plausibly be identified with *The Litany in Five Parts According to the Notes Sung in the King's Majesty's Chapel*. Not a single copy of this highly significant publication is known to have survived, but the wholly credible record of its existence states that it was issued by Richard Grafton on 26 June 1644, and adds the comment 'it is printed with notes, as sung'.[50] Almost certainly this was the litany 'noted with plainsong of five parts' of which twelve copies were purchased in the same year by Durham Cathedral at a total cost of three shillings.[51] No composer's name is

---

44 *An exhortacion vnto praier ... Also a letanie with suffrages* (London: Richard Grafton; STC 10621.5, 10621.7 and 10622 (the last is dated 16 June).

45 *Lbl* Add. MS 34191, ff. 35v–36v.

46 *Ob* MSS Mus. Sch. e. 420–22; RRMR 100/54.

47 See n. 71 below.

48 *Cp* MSS 35, f. 21r (olim B2), 36, f. A3v, 37, f. A2(2)r, 42, f. A5r, 43, f. A4v, 44, f. A6v, and 45, f. 6v (olim A3); transcription in Jebb, *The Choral Responses and Litanies*, vol. 2, p. 23.

49 EECM 13/12. MS attributions to Tallis are found in *Cq* G. 4. 17 (f. 57r) and *Cp* MS 42 (a spurious Ct part on f. B6v; in other members of the 'Latter' set Tallis's name is added in a later hand). No sources of earlier date than the 1630s are known.

50 The record is present among Thomas Baker's MS additions to his personal interleaved copy of Andrew Maunsell's *The first part of the catalogue of English printed bookes* (London: John Windet, 1595; STC 17669), facing p. 86 (*Cu* shelfmark Adv.b.52.1).

51 Brian Crosby, 'The Choral Foundation of Durham Cathedral, *c*.1350–*c*.1650', 2 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Durham, 1992), vol. 1, p. 141.

mentioned in connection with this lost print, implying that the music was published anonymously. In the mid 1540s, however, the sole composer of renown closely associated with the Chapel Royal would appear to have been Tallis himself. The litany subsequently attributed to him, furthermore, is the only one known to have formed part of the pre-Restoration Durham repertory (albeit still anonymously); hence the best explanation for the title 'The New Litany' attached to it in the Durham organ-book MS A5 (pp. 277–9), copied 1638–9, is that this was the very five-part setting that had been new in 1544.

The Tallisian setting thus appears to have been published within a few weeks or even days of the surviving monophonic one, and may perhaps be the older of the two. At any rate, in addition to elements of the Cranmerian variant tone (which appear in the M part) rather more Sarum material is incorporated, including the tones for the Agnus Dei (likewise in the M part) and the first Kyrie and Christe (in the T part). The tone for 'Parce nobis Domine ... Libera nos Domine' was rejected for the equivalent English responses 'Spare us, Good Lord ... Good Lord, deliver us', presumably because it contained too many notes for the former. Those responses was instead freely composed, the latter hinting at but not fully incorporating the Cranmerian variant. The tone for 'Te rogamus audi nos', however, was adopted in its entirety for the response 'We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord' (being placed, like the *cantus firmus* of the closing Kyries, in the T part).

Conclusions may be drawn from the presence or absence of these Sarum elements in the litanies attributed to Byrd. Despite treating the incomplete MS 1382 T part as a concordance for the Ely litany, Monson acknowledged that the two sources were incompatible without minor adjustments to the rhythm.[52] On each of those rhythmic points, however, MS 1382 agrees perfectly with the newly discovered Queens' College MS, and the complete text given by the latter shows that the T part represented by both sources mingles Sarum elements with the basic Cranmerian tone in almost, but not quite, the same

52 'The Preces, Psalms and Litanies', 269–70; BE 10a, p. viii.

manner as the Tallisian setting does. The one presumed pre-Restoration source for the Ely litany can thus safely be eliminated, along with any serious obligation to accept its attribution to Byrd. Yet given the existence of two pre-Restoration concordances, the possibility seems stronger that a vernacular litany with four-part music genuinely by Byrd was at one time in circulation. This spectral work will be referred to here as the English Litany a4.

Without a voice-part other than the T *cantus firmus* for comparison, the possible relationship between the English Litany a4 and Byrd's published *Laetania* must remain a matter for conjecture, although it is easy to see how both might have incorporated much the same four-part music (ex. 1:7a–b). Clearly the Latin version, or some English version related to it, was known to Tomkins, whose setting of the response 'Spare us, good Lord' (ex. 1:7c), with its barely avoided parallel 8ves between B and Ct, resembles Byrd's 'Ora pro nobis' too closely for coincidence. While it would be easy to explain the English Litany a4 as yet another of the *contrafacta* that are specially characteristic of MS 1382,[53] the *cantus firmus* of the *Laetania* suggests an alternative possibility. Here it is noteworthy that in some of the responses with English equivalents Byrd did not use the proper Sarum tones but instead adopted the ones used in the English Litany a4, with the result that the three responses 'Parce nobis Domine … Exaudi nos Domine … Libera nos Domine' are all set to the tone proper only to 'Te rogamus Domine'. Could it be, then, that Byrd's starting point for those Latin responses was a setting of 'We beseech thee to hear us, Good Lord' from a four-part vernacular litany he had composed many years previously? Only the re-emergence of a further voice-part from the English Litany a4 will tell.

The possibility that Byrd composed a setting of the litany for a five-part ensemble including the rare Tr voice is implied nowhere else than in the Chirk Castle part-books, the four survivors of a five-volume set that was copied for a Welsh household chapel in the

---

53 See table A4.

mid 1630s, and which emerged from obscurity in 1969. These quirky MSS include rather more 'trebles' repertoire than is to be found in mainstream institutional part-books of the period: three early-Elizabethan four-voice anthems for B, T, Ct or M, and Tr (nos 27 and 29–30), a five-voice morning service 'for trebles' by [William?] Mundy (*TD* and *Bs*, nos. 31 and 32), and two Litanies respectively attributed to 'Persons' and Byrd (nos 33 and 34), also designated 'for trebles' in the index. To judge by the clefs of the service and litanies (F4, C4, C3 and C2), it would seem that Tr parts (in a G2 clef) for those items were contained in the lost fifth volume (although, as we shall see, the exact nature of the missing fifth voice of the 'Byrd' litany has been questioned).[54]

At first sight, all these items appear to be are *unica*, but as Monson pointed out the 'Persons' litany is none other than the celebrated Tallisian one notated a 4th higher than in other extant sources.[55] Though dismissed by Monson as spurious, this version might equally be the closest surviving relative of the setting printed in 1544. The archaic clef combination F4, C4, C3, C2 and (presumably) G2 is more likely to have been used in 1544 than at any time subsequently, and proves compatible with the same printed reciting note ('C') as that of the Sarum and Cranmerian chants. The *cantus firmus* of the first Kyrie closely follows the Sarum model, thereby obviating the parallel 8ves that occur in Barnard's edition,[56] while the unsupported attribution (which may not be unconnected with the address to 'three persons' in the fourth of the opening invocations) is explicable given the indications that the Tallisian setting was published anonymously.

---

54 A Tr part for Mundy's service has been convincingly reconstructed by David Evans (Bangor: Cathedral Press, 2011).

55 'The Preces, Psalms and Litanies', 266.

56 See EECM 13/12, bar 65, where Barnard's corrupt reading has been retained. In this and other respects (notwithstanding some differences of rhythm in the recitations) the Chirk 'Persons' readings concur with the T and Ct parts entered, on a single staff, in *Cq* G.4.17 (f. 57r). In both sources, the *cantus firmus* of 'O Christ, hear us' is placed in the Ct part (Barnard placed it in the M part), and in the repeating music of the four opening invocations there is no exchange of material between voices (here Barnard exchanged material back and forth between the two Ct parts).

It is clear from the Tallisian concordances that the missing fifth part of the 'Persons' litany must indeed have been a Tr bearing the bulk of the *cantus firmus*. With the 'Byrd' litany, however, the exact nature of the missing fifth voice is much less certain, the *cantus firmus* already being present in the extant M and T parts. As Monson correctly noted, the index designation 'for trebles', though reaffirmed in the page headings of the preceding 'trebles' items, is absent from the page headings of the two litanies. Given that not a single other piece of vernacular church music attributed to Byrd has a Tr part, and that gaps are perceptible in the texture formed by the extant voices, Monson was satisfied that the 'Byrd' litany had been indexed in error, and that its missing part was not a Tr but a second Ct. He therefore reconstructed the work with two Ct parts, incorporating material from the Tallisian model wherever possible.[57]

In fact, the assumption that the fifth voice was a Ct presupposes two further inconsistencies on the part of the Chirk scribe which Monson did not address. First, although labelled B, T, Ct and M, the four surviving part-books actually contain a mixture of different voice-parts because the scribe, when entering the items for five and six voices, appears without exception to have assigned the highest voice—be it a M or a Tr—to the lost Q volume. Thus, the two Ct parts of the five-voice items are invariably assigned to the Ct and M volumes respectively,[58] with the result that the Q volume cannot be shown to have contained a single Ct part.[59] Second, whenever the scribe entered a work with two Ct parts it was his practice to annotate them 'primus' or 'secundus', or even 'cantoris' or 'decani'.[60] The absence of any such designation from the 'Byrd' litany's one surviving Ct

---

57 'The Preces, Psalms and Litanies', 265; BE 10a, 173–4.

58 Of necessity the six-voice items are distributed differently. Amner's 'Lord in thy wrath' and 'My shepherd is the living Lord' (nos 50 and 51), which have two M parts, assign both Ct parts to facing pages of the Ct book; Ward's 'Let God arise' (no. 54), which has verses for two B parts, assigns both Ct parts to facing pages of the M book.

59 It may be noted that one of the two Ct parts is missing from Parsons's six-voice anthem 'Deliver me from mine enemies' (no 42), which the scribe erroneously annoted 'v voc'.

60 The single Ct part to no. 42 is not so designated, further indicating that the scribe misunderstood that anthem to consist only of five voice parts.

part further implies that this item never had a second Ct, and that its missing fifth voice was—as specified in the indexes—a Tr.

Transposed up an 8ve, most of Monson's reconstructed Ct part could serve equally well as the missing Tr. Yet regardless of the manner of reconstruction, the fact remains that the four surviving voices are clearly the work of a woefully inexperienced contrapuntist. This is most evident in the opening invocations, where the recitations are so fussily embellished with tangential harmony that no more than two consecutive syllables are sung to exactly the same chord. In addition to parallel 5ths and 8ves,[61] of particular concern are the 6/3 chords frequently attached to the reciting note *g'*, for here the bass note *B* more often than not receives a thoroughly unidiomatic 8ve doubling from the T. Monson's explanation for these shortcomings was that because the English litany had continued to be printed during Mary's reign, the 'Byrd' setting might be an exceptional surviving item of the composer's juvenilia.[62] Yet his only stylistic argument in support of the Chirk attribution was the presence of tangential harmony, a resource Byrd had certainly utilized in building upon the foundation of Tallis's preces, but one which might of course have been utilized by anyone else too.

Perhaps a grain of truth can still be identified in the Chirk attribution without having to lay the litany's crude counterpoint directly at Byrd's door. To be sure, the influence of the Tallisian setting is strongly evident, particularly in the borrowing of certain cadence constructions.[63] But once again it is the elements of the *cantus firmus* that are telling. In contrast to their freely composed Tallisian equivalents, the responses 'Spare us, good Lord ... Good Lord, deliver us' are plainly based on the Cranmerian variant tone, while in addition to melodic and rhythmic differences the Agnus Dei settings both dispense with the

---

61 BE 10a, 174.

62 'The Preces, Psalms and Litanies', 269; BE 10a, p. viii.

63 Cf the first, second and fourth of the opening invocations, and the responses 'We beseech thee...' and 'O Christ, hear us'.

Tallisian monotone repetitions of 'grant us thy peace' and 'have mercy upon us'.[64] Hence, apart from being assigned to the M until the Agnus Dei, the 'Byrd' *cantus firmus* differs only from that of the English Litany a4 on four trivial points of rhythm, all of which may be put down to scribal intervention.[65] In one sense, therefore, the heading 'Mr Byrd's Litany' is justifiable, for the item in question is demonstrably related to the English Litany a4. Yet in view of the considerable number of spurious adaptations of the Tallisian litany that are known to have circulated from the 1630s onwards,[66] it seems highly improbable that the Chirk arrangement 'for trebles' is anything more than the spurious travesty it appears to be.

1.2 Services

1.2.1 The Peterhouse Fragments

Byrd's earliest attempt at a service—if the attribution to him is to be trusted—consists of fragments of a *TD* and *Bs* found exclusively in the 'Former' Set of Caroline part-books from Peterhouse, Cambridge. It comes as no surprise that a *unicum* from this set should be lacking some of its voice parts: three of the original volumes are missing, while the contents of the surviving seven are far from uniform. Yet the fragmentary state of the two morning canticles is due to the additional reason that, at a quite early stage, work on the copying was clearly aborted. Only the Ctd part of both movements survives complete (MS 39, ff. 17r–19r), with the heading '4 voc full Mr Bird' and a much abbreviated verbal text. The Mc part of the *TD* (MS 34, f. 15r) was begun by the same scribe, who again abbreviated the text but named no composer. Here, he copied no further than 'also the Holy

64 See EECM 13/12, bars 48–9 and 57–8.

65 Comparing 'Byrd' with the English Litany a4, in all four opening invocations the word 'sinners' is set to two semibreves as opposed to two minims, so too are the words 'hear us', while 'persons' is set to a dotted rhythm as opposed to two semibreves. *Cq* G.4.17 gives a variant rhythm for the second iteration of 'tak'st away', but a cancelled stem clearly indicates scribal confusion at this point.

66 These include the version with a single, conflated Ct part in the *Cp* 'Latter' Set (see n. 49 above) and at least three further four-part reworkings (see Jebb, *The Choral Responses and Litanies*, vol. 1, pp. 25–9, 51–4, 59–62).

Ghost, the comforter', at which point a double bar coincides with the end of f. 15r, and left the staves of f. 15v empty. The same portion of the *TD* text appears under the heading 'Mr Birds Te Deum Bened.' in the Bd part-book (MS 38, ff. 14v–15r), but in a different hand, unabbreviated, and without any music.

The principal scribe was attentive enough to spot an eye-skip he had made in the Ctd part between the ninth and tenth staves of the first page of the *TD*, and duly accommodated the omitted material by extending the ninth staff into the right margin and the tenth into the left. He made no attempt, however, to correct a crucial error prior to the *TD*'s first double bar, where eighty-eight minims in the Mc correspond to a clearly incorrect eighty-seven in the Ctd. If, on performing a check, the scribe traced this error back to his exemplar, then it is understandable that he left his task unfinished. Indeed, the impression that the exemplar had been damaged, causing the loss of a note at certain line-ends, is affirmed by two further sections that comprise an odd number of minims. Presumably it was for this reason that Monson transcribed no more of the *TD* than the first forty-seven minims, even though Fellowes—by dint of (tacitly) inserting a minim in the Ctd part—had attempted a 'speculative reconstruction' as far as the first double bar.[67] Yet although the Mc continues for a further two sections totalling nearly 200 minims, the missing notes and, particularly, the lack of a B part, make it impossible to trace confidently more than a few snatches of the lost material.

The surviving parts nonetheless make two things abundantly clear. First, this was a highly ambitious composition: at approximately 930 minims, the *TD* is more than sixty minims longer than any other from the period—that from Byrd's Great Service not excluded. Second, the composer had a lot to learn about large-scale formal design and harmonic planning. The grandiloquent breves and semibreves that open the *TD* (ex. 1:8a) quickly give way to a fitful succession of eight sections, each marked off with a double bar

67 WB 10, 253–5.

and consisting of only three to five of the hymn's twenty-nine short verses. The *Bs* is a more sustained effort, traversing six, considerably longer verses before its first double bar; tonally, however, it remains firmly attached to the starting key of F fa ut. The *TD*'s only significant departures from that key are two 'sharp' cadences on 'A', of which the latter brings the whole movement to a close on $\hat{3}$ in the manner of Tallis's five-part *TD* 'for Means' and the *TD* from Byrd's Great Service. In these and numerous other settings from the period (the short services of Tallis and Byrd included), just such a 'sharp' cadence prominently marks the end of v. 14 ('Thou art the king of glory, O Christ), the point at which the Sarum plainchant *TD* switches from the eighth to the fourth tone.[68] This common custom goes unobserved in the Peterhouse *TD*, however, where v. 14 occurs at the opening of a section and has no distinct cadence of its own.

Allied to the composer's over-reliance on cadences in F fa ut is his immoderate colouring of that key with its flattened $\hat{7}$ (ex. 1:8a, bar 8). No fewer than four 'English' cadences make a feature of crotchet descents from *e♭'* to *a* in the Ctd, and are text-book examples of the 'naught and stale close ... very usual with our organists' that Morley illustrated in 1597 with a purported example from Taverner, and which he deemed only as an expedient 'amongst many parts, for lack of other shift'.[69] The cliché is much too widespread in English polyphony to corroborate even an approximate dating for the Peterhouse service, yet a perhaps firmer stylistic clue is offered by two sections that appear to have contained a 6–5 resolution within their final chord (ex. 1:8b–c). This gesture, strongly reminiscent of Sheppard and Robert Parsons, would from the 1570s have presumably been avoided by a composer alert to changing contrapuntal tastes.

---

68 On this phenomenon see John Aplin, 'The Survival of Plainsong in Anglican Music: Some Early English Te-Deum Settings', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 32 (1979), 247–75 (esp. 249, 260, 274–5).

69 *Introduction*, 154. On the questionable authenticity of the four-part example quoted by Morley, see Hugh Benham, *John Taverner: His Life and Music* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 210–11.

Minor variants in the vernacular liturgy are a far from reliable means of dating service music because composers apparently tended to assimilate texts from other settings rather than referring to a current BCP.[70] A case in point is the doxology, which continued to be set with the wording 'and is now' long after this was regularized to 'is now' by the 1559 BCP. Occasional textual variants in the Peterhouse fragments nonetheless suggest that the service, though not necessarily itself Edwardian, dates from a period when Edwardian settings—such as the service by Heath published by Day in 1565[71]—were still current. Even though the principal scribe entered a minimum of verbal cues, the music of the *Bs* shows beyond doubt that vv. 5–6 took the 1549 form of words—'fathers' and 'father'—as opposed to the 1552 (and later) form—'forefathers' and 'forefather'.[72] A further apparent variant occurs at v. 22 of the *TD*, where the Ctd part provides one note too many for the form of words given in all editions of the BCP, 'and bless thine heritage'.[73] Perhaps, then the composer had in mind a setting such as the Second Service by Sheppard, where the same verse is worded 'and bless thine inheritage' (possibly out of confusion with the office response 'and bless thine inheritance').

In fact, the fragments reveal a number of affinities with Sheppard, not least because they are a setting of the 'long' type in which a basically syllabic presentation of the text is fleshed out with passages of ornamental counterpoint. Unusually for services of that type, both Sheppard's First Service and the fragments were scored for a four-voice ensemble (this being explicitly mentioned in MS 39). The piecemeal structure and tonal constriction

---

70 See Stefan Scot, 'The Prayer Book in Practice: Textual Anomalies and Their Implications in Tudor Musical Settings of the First Book of Common Prayer', *Brio*, 34 (1997), 81–9 (88).

71 *Mornyng and euenyng prayer and communion, set forthe in foure partes, to be song in churches* (London: John Day, 1565; STC 6419); this publication is also known as *Certain Notes*, from title pages Day printed in 1560.

72 These two variants are among the few that reliably indicate the version of the BCP from which a setting, directly or indirectly, draws its text. A third variant in the 1549 *Bs*, 'And hath lifted up an horn of salvation to us' (v. 2), gives no such indication because a scribe could, without adjusting the music, substitute the 1552/1559 form, 'And hath raised up a mighty salvation for us'. See *The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549, and A.D. 1552*, ed. Joseph Ketley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844), 33, 223–4; see also Scot, 'The Prayer Book in Practice', 85.

73 No variants to v. 22 were sanctioned by either of the Edwardian prayer-books: see *The Two Liturgies*, 31, 221.

of the Peterhouse *TD* might well be imputed to the *TD* from Sheppard's Second Service, which falls into no fewer than nine short sections that likewise close only on 'F' or 'A'; the sectionalizing of the Peterhouse *Bs* is identical to that of Sheppard's First Service.[74] Furthermore, all three services make use of c or d independently, a rest of eighty-two minims' duration in the Peterhouse *Bs* indicating that vv. 11–12 were assigned to c alone. All too are arguably in the same key, for although Sheppard notated his First Service in C fa ut, both the inscription 'for means' found in one of the York service-books and the marking 'T' (presumably meaning 'transposed')[75] in Barnard's MS part-books confirm that the composer's unusual combination of low clefs (F5, C5, C4, C3) signifies 4th-higher transposition to F fa ut.[76]

The greatest debt to Sheppard, however, seems to lie in the Peterhouse composer's manner of interspersing chordal passages with short bursts of *fuga* in a way that strikes a balance between the Reformation syllabic ideal on one hand and contrapuntal creativity on the other. 'The style,' Stefan Scot has observed of Sheppard's vernacular music,

> involved a fusion of homophony and imitation, at its best the one flowing almost imperceptibly into the other. A homophonic opening allowed the text to be clearly identified by the congregation, and only when this was established would a passage of polyphony follow...[77]

Even the evidence of one or two surviving voice parts amply justifies Monson's description of the Peterhouse *fuga* as 'short-winded' and 'stereotypical'. Some points are inflexible, quasi-canonic structures (ex. 1:8d), others draw on stock subjects such as the 'cumulative 7th' (ex. 1:8e),[78] while all too many are woefully ill-adapted to the accompanying verbal

---

74 For an edn of both services see Stefan Scot, 'The Vernacular Music of John Sheppard: An Introduction, Edition and Commentary' (unpublished masters thesis, University of Exeter, 1991).

75 For an earlier use of this term see Morley, *Introduction*, 'Annotations upon the Third Part' (no page number).

76 *Y* MS M13/5, f. 35r, *Lcm* MSS 1045–51; it should be noted that in the York part-book set—MSS M13/1–5(S)—the generally accepted order of Sheppard's two numbered services is reversed. See Anthony Langford, 'Music for the English Prayer Book from Tallis to Tomkins' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Reading, 1969), vol. 1, p. 66; see also le Huray, *Music and the Reformation in England*, 207–9.

77 'The Vernacular Music of John Sheppard', 9.

78 On the use of this and similar stock subjects see Julian Grimshaw, 'Sixteenth-Century English *Fuga*: Sequential and Peak-Note Subjects', *The Musical Times*, 148/3 (Autumn 2007), 61–78.

accentuation (ex. 1:8d–e). Yet although Sheppard had a rather better sense of English prosody than his inexperienced imitator, his own points tend to be characterized by the same resolute syllabicity and terraced schemes of entries. In addition, the Second Service provides direct precedents for the Peterhouse composer's apparent fondness for adding a second round of entries to the final point of a section.[79] While he clearly did not absorb from Sheppard the principle that fugal repetitions of this kind are all the more effective for being used sparingly, he was clearly already aware of the climactic effect of nudging the second entry a step higher than the first (ex. 1:8f).

Was Byrd, then, the composer? Given that the service must have been around seventy years old when the Peterhouse musicians attempted to copy it, and given too that it has otherwise vanished without trace, the attribution must remain open to question. The style nonetheless recalls those doubtful, very early motets Kerman has characterized as 'so far from the music that Byrd wrote later—even slightly later—that it seems hard at first to rationalize them into the composer's musical development'.[80] Yet if, as Kerman went on to argue, Byrd did write 'Similes illis fiant' (as part of a collaboration with Sheppard and William Mundy) and 'Alleluia. Confitemini Domino';[81] then his authorship of the fragments seems all the more admissible. The service's extravagant scale, mid-century stylistic traits, stiff technique and unpractised word-setting all point to a composer who was young and ambitious at precisely the time Byrd (and no comparable figure) was young and—presumably—ambitious. It may be significant, furthermore, that the *TD* opens with polyphony rather than the ubiquitous plainchant incipit, for so too does the *TD* from Byrd's Short Service. If the fragments do constitute evidence that Byrd himself was guilty, in his first foray into service composition, of youthful over-exuberance, then this was a mistake

---

79 Monson's description of these entries as 'straightforward repetitions ... after the manner of the French chanson' (BE 10a, p. ix) is clearly mistaken.

80 *The Masses and Motets of William Byrd* (London: Faber, 1981), 59.

81 BE 8/1–2; see *The Masses and Motets of William Byrd*, 59–62.

he would not make again. His place in the canon of English liturgical music was to be secured with an essay in restraint.

1.2.2 The Short Service

Whereas the Peterhouse fragments can be seen as an ill-advised attempt to outdo Sheppard, Byrd's Short Service clearly began life as a studied copy of the model provided by Tallis.[82] The familial relationship between the two composers' short settings was recognized by le Huray (who noted the more obvious structural similarities)[83] and Monson (who particularly stressed the corresponding harmonic content of certain parallel passages).[84] Yet Byrd's initial close adherence to Tallis's example, and the steps he subsequently took to distance himself from it, have gone unnoticed. The musical evidence alone points to the probability that Byrd worked his way through the service gradually, movement by movement, over a period of years or even decades.

This probability is supported by the Short Service's sources, even though none of these can be assigned to a date earlier than *c*.1620. Byrd's settings of the communion ordinaries were unknown at Durham until after the Restoration, and copies of the service that originated there in the 1620s and '30s (some of which were sent to Peterhouse) were tacitly complemented with the *Ks* from Giles's Short Service Two Parts in One and a setting of the *Cr* by [Richard] Farrant.[85] Since Giles, who was born around 1558, might have composed his *Ks* as early as 1580, and Farrant died in that year, their respective settings might theoretically have been mingled with Byrd's at any time between then and the copying of MS C8 in 1629—by which point the Durham musicians seem to have quite forgotten that their version of the Short Service was a composite. At Peterhouse, the

---

82 EECM 13/1.

83 *Music and the Reformation in England*, 235.

84 '"Throughout All Generations": Intimations of Influence in the Short Service Styles of Tallis, Byrd and Morley', in *Byrd Studies*, ed. Alan Brown and Richard Turbet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 83–111 (85–95).

85 BE 10a, p. x; both items are printed (without identification) in TCM 2, 81–9.

composer's own communion ordinaries were eventually obtained, apparently from a source other than Durham, and in the Bd part-book of the 'Latter' Set the *Cr* is annotated 'This is the Right Creed' (MS 37, f. o1).

Though Chapel Royal compositions are said to have been obtained for the Durham choir by William Whittingham, dean 1563–79,[86] the cathedral seems to have enjoyed little other direct musical contact with the Chapel Royal.[87] Nor was Durham alone in acquiring the Short Service without its authentic *Ks* and *Cr*, for blank staves were reserved for both movements in the personal score copied (apparently by 1622) by Benjamin Cosyn.[88] That these unrelated sources both omit the same two movements suggests that the service was already in circulation when Byrd got round to composing the communion ordinaries. All this accords with the possibility that those movements of the Short Service that reached Durham and were later acquired by Cosyn date, like the four-part version of the Second Preces and Psalms, from Byrd's Lincoln period, and that the *Ks* and *Cr* were penned subsequently for the Chapel Royal.[89]

Like four-part liturgical psalmody, short services had their roots in the Edwardian chant-based idiom described above called 'the fourth kind of faburden'. Characterized by pervasive 6ths between the T and M, the idiom's ready-made, four-part progressions could all too easily be appropriated for free chordal composition, generally to an extent that was

---

86 'Concerning singing in the church, Mr Whittingham did so far allow of that as he was very careful to provide the best songs and anthems that could be got out of the Queen's chapel to furnish the choir withal, himself being skillful in music' *Ob* MS Wood E. 64; see *Life of Mr William Whittingham, Dean of Durham, from a MS in Antony Wood's Collection*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London: Camden Society, 1870), 22–3.

87 The only Durham musician to secure a place in the Chapel Royal choir was the lay clerk and former chorister Geo[rge] Sheffield, who was sworn Gentleman in 1610: see Brian Crosby, 'The Choral Foundation of Durham Cathedral', vol. 2, p. 105. It appears also from the list of 'King's Chaplains in Ordinary Attendance 1635' appended to the Chapel Royal word-book *Ob* MS Rawl. Poet 23 (p. 310) that, while the deans of the southern cathedrals were ex officio chaplains, those of Carlisle, Durham, York and Lincoln were not; see John Morehen, 'The Sources of English Cathedral Music, *c*.1617–*c*. 1644' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1969), 427–8.

88 The *Ks* and *Cr* were eventually added to the score by a (much) later copyist.

89 Wulstan's view that the evening canticles were a later addition to the Short Service (*Tudor Music*, 320) overlooks the considerable difference in complexity between the scoring of the *Cr* and that of the other movements.

in inverse proportion to the composer's own contrapuntal resourcefulness. Whereas the dilettante Thomas Caustun leant heavily on the idiom in his freely composed *M* 'for Children' printed by Day (ex. 1:9a),[90] Tallis and Richard Farrant clearly strove in their short services for more varied textures in which tell-tale consecutive 6ths are the exception rather than the rule (ex. 1:9b–c).[91] The sonorities of faburden nonetheless linger on in Tallis's service, where austere perfect consonances are habitually used to open sections and close individual phrases (ex. 1:9b).

To a greater extent than Tallis, Byrd approached the genre as an exercise in avoiding the commonplaces of faburden, allowing himself a prolonged exception only, as we shall see, for the purpose of subtle musical allegory (ex. 1:9d). His phrases invariably commence on a triad, and almost invariably conclude with a 3rd or 10th—often at the expense of a 5th or 12th (e.g. *V*, bars 18 and 20);[92] within phrases too, bare perfect consonances have all but vanished. Byrd's partiality for softer timbres extends to the entire tonal scheme, despite the retention of Tallis's 'D' final. The older composer—in a manner that would eventually earn for his service the title 'Dorian', and of which Glarean himself would surely have approved—had abstained from 'B♭' throughout the *V*, *TD*, *Bs*, *Ks*, *Cr*, *S* and *ND*, and had admitted it only twice in the *Gl* and four times in the *M* (all instances except the final two being passing notes).[93] Byrd, in contrast, employed a flat signature in conjunction with frequent accidental 'B♮'s, thereby adding two instances of 'B♭' to the six diatonic cadence degrees used by Tallis;[94] and allowing cadences of 'F' and 'A' to assume a greater variety of

---

90 TCMO 95. For a detailed discussion of Caustun's penchant for borrowing from the works of other composers, and a balanced assessment of his abilities, see John Milsom, 'Caustun's Contrafacta', *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 132 (2007), 1–31.

91 EECM 13/1, TCMO 33; the item by Farrant is not to be confused with the *Cr* by him that the Durham scribes embedded in Byrd's Short Service (see TCM 2, pp. 81–9).

92 The major 10th at one close (*V*, bar 78) is secured by dint of a momentary division of the two Ct parts.

93 See EECM 13/1, *Gl* bars 15, 18; *M* bars 35, 47, 51.

94 The disposition of Byrd's cadences reveals a carefully planned gradation from the principal degrees 'D' (33%) and 'A' (25%) through the subsidiary degrees 'G' and 'C' (15% each) and 'F' (10%) to 'B♭' and 'E' (1% each).

forms.[95] The flat signature furthermore enabled Byrd to push the 'soft' end of the service's tonal spectrum as far as 'E♭'—although, and again as we shall see, he seems to have done this for allegorical purposes only.

If the privations of the short service style caused Tallis frustration, then he appears to have vented this at the end of his *ND* with an unprecedented, unusually harsh and contrapuntally gratuitous clash of *c*♮' and *c*♯' in the T and M. Byrd, in contrast, could resist such clashes only as far as bar 6 of the *Bs*, where *b* and *b*♭ collide on crotchet 4 (and are colourfully succeeded within the space of two further minims by first *c*' and then *c*♯'). In addition to three subsequent simultaneous false relations,[96] he had already made use of a momentarily suspended diminished 4th (*c*♯ + *a* + *f*' + *a*') at bars 34 and 37 of the *V*—a striking harmonic touch that foreshadows the conclusion of 'Exsurge quare obdormis Domine' (1591/19), though it recurs nowhere in the Short Service. Two other simultaneities worthy of comment occur at bar 5 of the *Ks*, where a 6/3 chord on minim 1 is spiced up with an accented passing 4th, and at bar 20 of the *ND*, where an unsupported 4th *e*' + *a*' between Ctcd and M, prolonged from the preceding chord of 'A', is treated as a consonance. The latter is so irregular that one suspects a textual error, and that Byrd intended the Ctc (which sporadically parts company from Ctd throughout the surrounding passages) to support the harmony with *c*'. That said, the solecistic 4th is corroborated by all sources of the Ct parts,[97] and arguably remains a more effective preparation for the ensuing entry of B and T on *a* and *c*'.

---

95 On the effects of signatures on cadence forms in Byrd's 'Dorian' pieces see Kerman, *The Masses and Motets of William Byrd*, 68–9.

96 *Bs*, bar 91; *Cr*, bar 95; *ND*, bar 38 (presumably a homage to Tallis's Short Service, which incorporates simultaneous false relation occurs at the equivalent point of the *ND*).

97 There are admittedly only three sources of the (perhaps incorrect) Ctc part, but their unrelatedness makes their agreement on the questionable *e*' all the more authoritative; they are *DRc* MS E11a, Barnard's *First Book*, and his MS copy in the hand of Adrian Batten, which was not used as printer's copy. A similar unsupported 4th, again prolonged from the preceding chord, occurs in The Great Service, *Bs*, bar 114.

Chiefly, however, it was by means of subtle chordal juxtapositions rather than garish simultaneities that Tallis and Byrd sustained the harmonic interest of their short services. In particular, those moments at which phrases abut one another offered frequent opportunities for continuity or contrast, and here Byrd used three kinds of progression in roughly equal proportions: (a) a repetition of the major triad that had closed the preceding phrase; (b) a switch to the minor triad on the same degree; and (c) a shift to a triad based on a new scale degree. Within category (c) a considerable number of progressions was possible; here Byrd shifted the bass just as frequently by a descending 5th or ascending 4th as by any other interval (and in these cases his destination triad was twice as likely to be major as minor). Shifts of a descending 4th or ascending 5th, a descending major 2nd and an ascending 3rd were admitted only five or six times each; those of a descending minor 2nd or an ascending 2nd not at all. The rare descending major 2nd (heard three times in the *V* but only twice thereafter, in the *Cr* and *M*) was the only progression to juxtapose triads without a common note; otherwise, at least one common note was the rule.

The one other shift Byrd allowed himself was the most distinctive at his disposal, the *passamezzo antico* progression consisting of two major triads separated by a descending major 3rd, which we have already encountered in the transitions between the verses of his setting of Ps. 114:1–6. Its first appearance in the Short Service occurs in the *Bs*, whereafter it recurs twice in the *Cr*, three times in the *M* and twice in the *ND*. This progression, like all those in category (b) and roughly half the others in category (c), involves a cross-relation or chromatic movement—a pervasive colouring that lingers on the ear, and results from Byrd's preference for closing phrases on major triads as opposed to plain perfect consonances.

It was virtually a principle throughout the Reformation period and beyond that a short service should be composed in no more than four voice parts, without the divisi or

'gymels' that were characteristic of more extended settings.[98] A rare exception is Richard Farrant's Short Service of which the *M* was quoted above (ex. 1:9c); its *TD* and *Bs* contain passages scored for the variant combinations Bc Bd Td Ctc, Td Ctc Mc Md, and Bc Bd Ctc Ctd.[99] Byrd especially seems never to have been satisfied for very long with a single vocal combination, and his Short Service breaks the four-part rule even before reaching the end of the *V*—albeit only with a fleeting division of the two Ct parts.[100] After all, if the singers of one side were capable of holding their own in antiphonal passages, then they were surely capable also of holding independent parts when singing in company with the opposite side. By writing just such parts, however, Byrd effectively restricted the use of his Short Service to choirs that were constituted in two antiphonal halves, and denied it a place in the part-books of small, unitary choirs like those at Chirk Castle and Ludlow—choirs for which any short service ought really to have been bread and butter. It was with good reason that the scribe of the recently discovered Hellwis-Gell part-book wrote the heading 'Mr Birds service for sides' (f. 12).

Byrd's scoring is as complex as it can be without allocating c and d two Ct parts each. Some of the amalgamated passages in the *TD* and *Bs* are in five parts, each movement briefly employing two T parts at the beginning and two Ct parts at the end. Though these passages account for less than a sixth of the two morning canticles, nearly half the music of the evening canticles is set in five parts, and a five-minim segment of the *ND* (bars 18–19)

---

98 Though Benjamin Cosyn's score (*Lbl* MS R.M. 23.l.4) actually presents Byrd's office ordinaries in four parts throughout, bald patches reveal it to be a careless four-part recension of a five-part original. At the opening of the *TD*, the omission of the Td part results in a gap of an 11th between T and Ct (bar 3, minim 4), the omission of the Ctc part from the doxology of the *Bs* results in the loss of essential cadential counterpoint (bars 85–6 and 92–3), and the omission of the Td part from the doxology of the *M* leaves the first three chords without a 3rd (62–3). Furthermore, Byrd's two T parts at bars 7–9 of the *ND* exchange material at bars 9–11: here Cosyn's omission of the Td means this chordal phrase is heard twice but with different material in the T each time. That Cosyn's four-part version was arrived at by accident would be consistent with the unfortunate history of Byrd's gymels in general. Baldwin omitted two such divisi from one of his excerpts from the *TD* of The Great Service (see p. 282 below); similar omissions may be cited in connection with the full anthems HelpUOG, HowLSME, OLordMTS and PreventUOL (see pp. 99–100 below).

99 TCMO 62, pp. 5, 7, 12–13, 17–20; Fellowes's edn correctly reproduces the scoring of these passages.

100 See n. 92 above.

is in six. The communion ordinaries are the most lavishly scored of all: the *Ks* have two T parts throughout, and well over half of the *Cr* departs from the usual four-voice texture in one way or another. In addition to the five- and six-voice textures that result from six T gymels and four Ct ones, a quite extended five-voice passage results from a M gymel (bars 56–64). Six passages, furthermore, recall the varied scoring of the liturgical psalm 'Save me O God' in that they combine diverse sub-groups of voices from c and d (fig. 1:1), three of which include paired M parts. The allusion to pre-Reformation English methods of vocal scoring may not be as explicit as in, say, the services 'for trebles' or 'in medio chori' by Sheppard and William Mundy,[101] yet it comes closer to that tradition than a short service arguably should.

In terms of the choral resources they require, the *V* and *Cr* are worlds apart, and it could be that Farrant's simpler *Cr* was substituted because musicians had baulked at the complex scoring of Byrd's setting, which effectively calls for eight independent parts. Yet this cannot have been the reason Giles's *Ks* were also substituted, since Byrd's own *Ks* use the same five-part scoring as the openings of his *TD* and *Bs*. The most likely explanation for the heterogeneous makeup of the Short Service, then, is that Byrd set the office ordinaries for the eight (or fewer) boy choristers of Lincoln (who could feasibly have sung 'full' throughout, leaving the antiphony to the lower voices), and set the communion ordinaries at a later date, tailoring the *Cr* in particular to the superior forces of the Chapel Royal.

A short service can, of course, be structured in more ways than one. Composers such as Caustun and Richard Farrant seem to have sought a kind of unity in diversity, through-composing each movement as a series of loosely cognate passages that avoid thematic interrelationships. Tallis, in contrast, had used what le Huray has described as 'a sequence-like structure **AA²BB²CC²**...' in which 'the repeated music [is] either stretched or

101 See le Huray, *Music and the Reformation in England*, 208–9, 213; Wulstan, *Tudor Music*, 316–17.

squeezed by the phrase lengths and [verbal] rhythms of the accompanying text'.[102] While conveying a certain sense of Tallis's novel technique, le Huray's terms 'sequence' and 'binary scheme' (p. 235) are somewhat misleading: true sequences (i.e. transposed repetitions) occur infrequently, and when they do the material may be iterated three or more times. More precisely, Tallis appears to have been inspired by liturgical psalmody, where, as we have seen, a short chordal phrase is recurrently adapted—without transposition—to the varying lengths and stress patterns of successive prose verses. In the Short Service, however, each pair of verses or half-verses is set to a new chordal phrase of its own, with the result that phrases, as a rule, are iterated twice only.[103] Thus, in the way that a motet or instrumental fantasia could be formed by stringing together a series of fugal expositions, Tallis formed each liturgical movement by stringing together a series of varied snapshots of liturgical psalmody.

Tallis's technique can be seen as a quite striking departure from the mainstream forms of Renaissance polyphony. While it was ideally adapted to the *alternatim* singing of c and d, at no moment in the Short Service are more than four voices called for. In contrast to continental polychoral practice, therefore, the antiphonal effects are optional (meaning that the service could be entered in the Chirk Castle part-books, the only ecclesiastical set from the period never to have included separate volumes for c and d). The straightforward repetition of chordal passages was, of course, a common polyphonic resource, and three more-or-less distinct forms of such repetition were identified by the German musical taxonomist Joachim Burmeister (1564–1629). Yet in all the examples cited by him—from

---

102 *Music and the Reformation in England*, 198. Fellowes too had noted 'how neatly [Byrd] expands the musical material of the phrase ... to fit the corresponding phrase in reply to it' (*William Byrd*, 123).

103 For a striking exception see bars 55–68 of Tallis's *Bs*, where a single phrase is used for four consecutive half-verses.

motets by Lassus, Handl and others—the repetition is textual as well as musical.[104] The idea that an entire composition could be based on paired musical repetitions with a constantly changing text seems to have had no exact equivalent outside the narrow realm of English service music, where Tallis's technique forms the basis of a small but significant clutch of later compositions.[105] Given that it is such a singular departure from sixteenth-century norms, that it accounts for the most fundamental similarities between the short services of Tallis and Byrd, and that it resurfaces to a certain extent in each of Byrd's three other services, the technique is worthy of a specific term; for want of an established one, it will here be referred to with the mock rhetoric term *tautophrasis*.

Tautophrasis can operate on its simplest level when two paired verbal clauses both happen to be compatible in terms of their stress patterns and the number of syllables they contain. This occurs in v. 25 of the *TD*, for instance, where both composers were able to set each half-verse to identical music:

d And we worship thy Name:

c ever world without end.

Paired clauses were, of course, seldom compatible in these terms, and in order to accommodate both clauses the chordal phrase usually needed adaptation. Exceptionally, both Tallis and Byrd dealt with surplus syllables by inserting a recitation chord in the manner of liturgical psalmody.[106] Other adaptive devices, however, were the rule, and were of three kinds: splitting, insertion and substitution.

---

104 Following his usual practice, Burmeister named these forms after rhetorical figures; they are *analepsis* (a chordal passage repeated without transposition), *mimesis* (one assigned first to one subset of voices and then to another, untransposed) and *anaploke* (a polychoral echo). See Burmeister, *Musical Poetics*, ed. and transl. Benito Rivera (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 164–7, 176–7, 260–68, 289–90.

105 John Farrant, Short Service, TCMO 54; Bevin, Short Service, in Barnard's *First Book*; Thomas Tomkins, First Service, TCM 8, pp. 17–49; Batten, Evening Canticles (from the Short Service), ed. David Evans (Swansea: Cathedral Press, 2001).

106 See for example Tallis, *TD* (bars 50–51), *Bs* (bars 14–15, 19–20); Byrd, *V* (bars 51–2).

1. A half-verse that happened to be a syllable longer than its counterpart, as in v. 7 of the *Bs*, could be accommodated by splitting a single chord into two shorter, repeated ones (shown here in square brackets):

d That we be-ing deliver-ed:

c out of the hand [of our] enemies. (Tallis, bars 36–40)
out [of the] hand of our enemies. (Byrd, bars 39–42)

2. With clauses of dissimilar length, a more artistic solution was to supply the additional syllables with musical material of their own. Tallis seems by and large to have been reluctant to do this, although an example may be cited from his setting of the *Gl* (the additional material is shown here in parentheses, and the point at which it is inserted is marked †):

d Thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Fa[ther, have] mercy up † on us.

c For thou on[ly art] holy, thou only art the Lord, thou only, O (Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art) most high… (bars 27–38)

Byrd inserted material more frequently and with greater freedom, as in these examples from his *TD* (vv. 26–7) and *Bs* (v. 9):

d Vouchsafe, O Lord, to keep [us this] day † without sin.

c O Lord, have mercy upon us, (have mercy) upon us.

…

c † And thou, child, [shalt be] call-ed the † Prophet of the [highest:]

d (for) thou shalt go before the face (of the Lord) to prepare his ways.

3. Though Tallis offered few examples of substitution, the device appears in combination with splitting and insertion in the lengthiest, most developed passage of *tautophrasis* in the whole of his Short Service, vv. 6–8 from the *M* (here the underlined syllables are allocated different music in each iteration):

cd He hath shew-ed strength with his arm:
† he [hath scat]ter-ed the proud
in [the i]magina[ti-on]
of † their hearts.

cd [He hath] put down the mighty [from their] seat:
(and hath ex)alted the humble and meek.
[He hath] fil-led the hungry
with (good things: and the rich he hath sent emp)[ty a]way.

Byrd's freer use of substitution again shows him to have been less of a slave to form. In v. 12 the *Bs*, for example, he tweaked the harmony to obtain a smoother transition into the repeat, and replaced the plagal close of the first half-verse with a more extended full close in the second half-verse:

c and in the shadow of death:

d and to guide our feet into the way of peace.

At v. 6 of the *M*, Byrd's use of insertion and substitution leaves the two half-verses with only five consecutive chords in common:

cd † He hath shew-ed strength with his arm:

cd (He hath) scatter-ed the proud in the imaginati-on of their hearts.

While Byrd may have differed from his mentor on the finer points of *tautophrasis*, in structural terms his use of the technique reveals striking dependency on Tallis's example (see fig. 1:2). The discrepancies in the *V* especially are minimal: whereas Tallis had through-composed vv. 1–2 before switching abruptly to half-verse *tautophrasis* for vv. 3–11, Byrd, through a quite liberal use of insertion, succeeded in adapting a single chordal passage to both vv. 2 and 3:

B[1] d Let us come (be)fore his presence (with thanksgiving:
and) shew ourselves glad in him with psalms.

B[2] c For the Lord † is a great God: †
and a great king above all gods.

From v. 4, Byrd settled happily into Tallis's template, even including a precisely similar short burst for c and d in amalgamation, outside the repetition scheme, at the end of v. 7

('and the sheep of his hand'). His only other departure occurs at vv. 8–9, where material inserted at the end of the longer second half of v. 8 itself forms the basis of both halves of v. 9. Though unorthodox, the resulting threefold iteration affirms the semantic relativity of the two verses:

I[1] c ...in the † wilderness.

I[2] d When your (fathers) tempted me:

I[3] c prov-ed (me and) saw my works.

In the *TD*, apart from a general reversal of the roles of c and d in vv. 2–14, Byrd's departures from Tallis's plan likewise reflect a heightened concern to adapt the musical form to the relative meaning of successive verses. Tallis, in accordance with his established pattern, had apportioned vv. 6–9 to two musical phrases:

F[1] d Heav'n and earth are full [of the] [Maje]sty: of thy Glory.

F[2] c (The) [glori]-ous company of the Apostles: praise thee.

G[1] d The goodly fellowship [of the] [Prophets]: praise thee.

G[2] c The noble army of Martyrs: praise thee.

It must have struck Byrd as odd that the first of the three celestial cohorts should have been assigned to phrase **F** while the other two had to share phrase **G**, for he duly redesigned the *tautophrasis* at this point to allow each cohort a different phrase:

F[1] c † Heav'n and earth are full of the [Maje]sty: <u>of thy Glory</u>.

F[2] d (The) [glori]ous [compa]ny of the Apostles: <u>praise thee</u>.

G c The goodly fellowship of the Prophets: praise thee.

H[1] d The noble army

H[2] c of Martyrs: praise thee.

Later in the *TD*, Tallis had treated vv. 19 and 20 as independent musical units:

P c We believe that thou shalt come: to be our judge.

Q[1] d We therefore pray thee, help thy servants:

Q[2] c whom thou [hast re]deem-ed with thy [precious] blood.

The implication of the word 'therefore' was not lost on Byrd, however, who set both verses to a single phrase despite the considerable amount of substitution this entailed:

P[1] c We believe that thou shalt come: to be our judge.

P[2] d We therefore pray thee, help thy servants:
whom thou hast redeemed with thy precious blood.

In the *Bs*, Byrd's concerns lay less with semantics than with grading the frequency of exchanges between d and c. He faithfully replicated the unusually brisk *tautophrasis* to which Tallis had set vv. 7 and 8—apart, that is, from the most curt of all Tallis's exchanges:

F[1] d might serve him

F[2] c without fear.

Yet instead of jumping abruptly into rapid dialogue, as Tallis had done, Byrd gradually quickened the pace of the antiphonal exchanges during vv. 2–6, and gradually loosened it in vv. 9–11, thus developing Tallis's formal technique into a strategic agent of tension and release.

With each new movement of his Short Service, Byrd seems to have relied less and less on *tautophrasis*. While the technique accounts for nearly three quarters of the *V* and *TD*, that proportion drops to just under two thirds in the *Bs*, to less than half in the *Cr*, and to less than a quarter in the *M*.[107] Simultaneously, Byrd departed further and further from Tallis's model. In the *Cr*, the younger composer's *tautophrasis* recalls the elder's only in the first three musical phrases and one subsequent phrase,[108] and otherwise follows a thoroughly independent plan. In the *M*, where Tallis had used *tautophrasis* for vv. 3–8 and the entire doxology, Byrd used it only in vv. 6 and 10 and the doxology's second half. Presumably he was anxious to avoid the indiscriminate connections his mentor had made

---

107 The only instances of *tautophrasis* in this canticle occur in v. 6 (quoted above, p. 41), v. 10 (bars 56–9, where 'As † he promis-ed' = 'to (our fa)ther Abraham') and the doxology (bars 68–74, where 'As it was in the begin[ning is] now' = 'and ever shall be, world without end').

108 In both composers' settings, 'And in one Lord Jesus Christ' = 'the only begotten Son of God', 'begotten of his Father' = 'before all worlds', and 'Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son' = '... and the Son together'.

between semantically discrete verbal sections whose syllabic structure happened to be more or less compatible, such as in vv. 6–8 of the *M* (quoted above) or in this passage from the *Cr*:

H[1] d is worship-ped and glorified;
Who spake by the prophets.

H[2] c And I believe one catholic
and apostolic church. (Tallis, bars 68–75)

In contrast, Tallis's *ND* proved almost as amenable to emulation as his *V* had done. Thus, as well as recalling the distinctive simultaneous false relation and 9–5–8 suspension of the 'Amen',[109] Byrd obeisantly reproduced the disjointed texture of vv. 2–4, where the M anticipates by two minims the homorhythmic movement of the lower parts. This texture, for which Peter Phillips has advanced the unexceptionable term 'leading voice', was a conspicuous ornament in mid-century, long-texted Latin works such as Tallis's Lamentations and Robert White's 'Miserere'. As the simplest means of adding contrapuntal interest to a syllabic composition without seriously endangering verbal clarity, it would quickly establish itself as one of the most tenacious idioms of the pre-Restoration vernacular repertory. At worst, it could mechanically dominate an entire composition;[110] at best—as we shall see—it would form the basis of some of the subtlest declamation in Byrd's anthems and later services.

One facet of Tallis's setting Byrd rejected was the (albeit quite rare) combination of *tautophrasis* and transposition, whereby all voices—or at least the outer ones—iterate a chordal phrase successively at two or more different pitch levels (ex. 1:10a).[111] While sequential writing of this type does appear in Byrd's Verse Service (see Chapter 4), his

---

109 On the apparent use of this suspension figure to pay homage to Tallis in many later settings of the *ND*, see Andrew Johnstone, 'Tallis's Service "of Five Parts Two In One" Re-evaluated" in *Canons and Canonic Techniques, 14th–16th Centuries: Theory, Practice and Reception History*, ed. Katelijne Schiltz and Bonnie J. Blackburn (Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2007), 381–405 (389–90).

110 An extreme example is the Short Service by George Marson (*c*.1573–1632), *DRc* MSS A6, C1, C13, E11a; see Anthony Langford, 'Music for the English Prayer Book', vol. 1, p. 80.

111 See also Tallis's *Cr* (bars 36–44, 46–55), *M* (bars 64–75) and *ND* (bars 28–33).

Short Service emulates only the more flexible, melodically driven of Tallis's sequences in which the lower voices are significantly reworked with each reiteration (ex. 1:10b).[112] In connection with a keyboard work from the opposite end of Byrd's career (the Galliard Mistress Mary Brownlow, MB 27/34), Oliver Neighbour has commented on the composer's 'habitual dislike of literal sequence',

> ... to avoid which he twists this way and that, forestalling the obvious with every kind of variant, transformation and interruption.[113]

The pseudo-sequence that closes the doxology of Byrd's *V* (ex. 1:10c) is a much earlier case in point.[114] The chords for the four syllables '-gin-ning, is now' are reiterated a 5th lower for the words 'ever shall be', but their upper parts are completely rearranged so that the M lies only a 3rd lower than in the first iteration. In the third iteration, the M is transposed an additional 3rd lower, and is provided with completely fresh accompanying parts, to form a cadence on the words 'without end. A(men)'. Each iteration of this material is ushered in by an autonomous single chord, allowing Byrd to throw in two unexpected 6/3 harmonies (at bars 82 and 84) and a *passamezzo antico* progression (at bar 85). His evident mistrust of allowing the music simply to write itself results in a passage that is as cogent, unpredictable, and assertive as the limitations of the genre allow.

Byrd may have been put off by the mechanized counterpoint of Tallis's more literal sequences, yet he clearly recognized the latent rhetoric in their cumulative harmonic progressions. The passage already cited from Tallis's *Gl* (ex. 1:10a) is more than just a block sequence: quite independently of the patterned superstructure, the B part is forcibly characterized by an ascending series of falling 5ths (*d–G*, *e–A*, *g–c*). Two passages in Byrd's *M* are founded on similarly punctuated B parts, though in both cases the restrictions of strictly sequential writing have been completely cast aside. In v. 1 (ex. 1:10d), recursive 4th movement in the B (*A–d–A*, *c–f–c*, *d–g–d*) marks off three phrases in the M part that

---

112 See also Tallis's *V* (bars 54–62, 75–82),

113 *The Consort and Keyboard Music of William Byrd* (London: Faber, 1978), 218.

114 For similar examples see Byrd's *Cr* (bars 90–95) and *ND* (bars 32–3 and 36–7).

peak successively on *g'*, *a'* and *b♭'*. Though the M ends the first and third phrases with a 9–5–8 suspension, this is the only recursive incident to be co-ordinated with the B: otherwise, the melody and inner voices form an ever changing foil to the harmonic argumentation. Similar argumentation may be observed in v. 4 (bars 18–22, ex. 1:7d above) and v. 8 (bars 44–50). The latter is a straightforward chordal passage that at first glance appears to be free of any sort of repetition. Its B part, however, is sporadically punctuated by a steadily ascending series of rising 5ths:

A A c c c F c G G c c B A G d G c A B c A e

This trajectory is then extended into v. 9, which the B begins with the notes *c c g* (bars 50–51).

It has already been remarked that Burmeister, in the highly improbable event that a copy of Tallis's or Byrd's Short Service fell into his hands, would have had no term at his disposal for the peculiar form of repetition here called *tautophrasis*. Yet the German theorist, whose taxonomic method was based on analogies he perceived between polyphonic technique and literary rhetoric, would readily have likened Tallis's melodic sequences to *climax*, the repetitive figure instantiated by Quintilian in the words 'Africanus' energy gave him his excellence, his excellence gave him his glory, his glory gave him his rivals'.[115] Moreover, the kind of harmonic argumentation we have observed in Byrd's *M* would certainly not have been lost on Burmeister, who associated bass lines punctuated by ascending series of rising 4ths or 5ths with the figure *auxesis* (amplification).[116] To be sure, his definition of this figure as 'harmony [that] grows and rises' is none too precise, and has been misunderstood and disputed in recent

115 'Africano virtutem industria, virtus gloriam, gloria aemulos comparavit.' *Institutio oratoria*, IX.3.56; English translation from *The Orator's Education, Books 9–10*, ed. and transl. Donald A. Russell (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001), 132–3.

116 *Musical Poetics*, 172–5. The examples are from the motets 'Veni in hortum' (RRMR 133/7, bars 24–9 and 50–53) and 'Jerusalem plantabis vineam' (RRMR 133/3, bars 9–15).

scholarship..[117] Yet from the bass line of the first of his three cited examples (all from motets by Lassus),[118] Burmeister's ear for rhetorical harmony is readily apparent:

B♭ e♭ B♭ c G c f c d A

Both the definition and the examples make it clear that Burmeister took *auxesis* to be a corollary of the verbal repetitions inherent in motet composition, which were of course foreign to the strictly concise idiom of the English short service. The definition also includes the proviso that the figure is 'made up of concordant combinations', although the examples do not entirely bear this out. Instances of *auxesis* can indeed be cited in Byrd's music which conform precisely to the definition (see exx. 5:3 and 5:12b below), yet as chordal conceptions these hardly differ in principle from instances in which there is no verbal repetition (see exx. 2:2b and 2:8). Albeit not strictly in Burmeister's sense, therefore, the term *auxesis* will be applied throughout the present study to what will emerge as one of Byrd's most potent harmonic idioms.

While Byrd's particular role in the rhetorization of late Renaissance polyphony is unquestioned, his achievements in this field have generally been evaluated as a thing apart from the complex theory of verbal persuasion.[119] Byrd no more likely knew of Burmeister's taxonomy than Burmeister knew of Byrd's music, and in England rhetorical theory drew more from music than music theory drew from rhetoric. Yet in the calculated

---

117 In his commentary on Burmeister's analysis of Lassus's motet 'In me transierunt', Claude V. Palisca surely misidentified as *auxesis* the setting of the words 'cor meum' (bars 32–4); see '*Ut oratoria musica*: The Rhetorical Basis of Musical Mannerism', in Palisca, *Studies in the History of Italian Music and Music Theory* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 282–311 (298–9). Here the harmony consists of nothing more than alternating chords of 'a' and 'E'. Brian Vickers has accused Burmeister of confusing literary *auxesis* (where intensification results without any repetition) with *climax* or *gradatio* (where intensification results from repeating the last word of a clause at the beginning of the succeeding clause); see Vickers, 'Figures of Rhetoric/Figures of Music?', *Rhetorica*, 2 (1984), 1–44 (28–9). To be sure, Burmeister's *auxesis* involves verbal repetition, but his cited examples show that the figure is not dependent on musical repetition.

118 *Musical Poetics*, 276–7.

119 See, for example, Kerman, *The Masses and Motets of William Byrd*, 343–5; Mike Smith, '"Whom Music's lore delighteth": Words-and-Music in Byrd's *Ye Sacred Muses*', *Early Music*, 31 (2003), 425–35. Kerman nonetheless drew tantalizingly close to the world of rhetorical figures with his allusion to 'a rhetoric of reiteration ... in many varieties with many shades of effect': see '"Write All These Down": Notes on a Byrd Song' in *Byrd Studies*, ed. Alan Brown and Richard Turbet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 112–28 (127).

gradations of Byrd's musical phraseology it is hard not to see something of the definition of *auxesis* given by his English contemporary George Puttenham: it is the 'figure of increase because every word that is spoken is one of more weight than another'.[120] With their climbing harmonies, the three statements with which Byrd opened his *M* have a precisely similar effect: each is more forcible than the last.

Byrd appears actually to have provided an example of the 'figure of increase' at the very point where the text of the *M* suggests it. His setting of v. 4, 'For he that is mighty hath magnified me', assumes the appropriately humble manner of four-voice faburden, but by dint of a simple plagal cadence the prevailing harmony of 'C' is finally raised a step higher to 'D' (see ex. 1:9d above). Two further passages can likewise be read as metaphors or puns, Byrd having responded to their texts with strikingly unusual music. Reference to 'the shadow of death' in v. 12 of the *Bs* prompted the only recourse to pitch-class 'E♭' in the entire service (bars 76–9), while the frequent minim rests that pepper the articles of the *Cr* that relate the Holy Ghost (bars 59–76) allow the singers to take more than their usual quota of inspiration.

The more Byrd mastered the panoply of continental polyphonic idioms, the more he capitalized on techniques and gestures that can be equated with rhetorical figures in terms very close to Burmeister's. It will thus be helpful to revisit the theory of rhetoric (in Chapter 5, pp. 284–97) on assessing the richly allusive musical language of The Great Service and its three associated anthems. For now, it has become clear that the much more humble Short Service, though demonstrably begun as a student work under the shadow of Tallis, already speaks with an intentional eloquence that is distinctively its composer's own.

---

120 *The arte of English poesie* (London: Richard Field, 1589; STC 20519.5), 182.

1.2.3 The Three Minims Service

Judging by the vernacular repertory as a whole, few pre-Restoration musicians shared Byrd's evident enthusiasm for ternary mensuration in church music.[121] While England's Latin repertory had not been entirely strait-jacketed by the binary mensuration of *prolatio imperfecta*,[122] the vernacular repertory to a great extent was. Thomas Ravenscroft cannot therefore have had more than a handful of choral compositions in mind when he declared in 1614 that 'the use of this perfect prolation is, in service divine for jubilees and thanksgivings, and otherwise for galliards in revellings...'[123] As often as not, vernacular pieces with *perfecta* sections are of a muted character: such is the case with the early verse anthems 'Ah, helpless wretch' by William Mundy and 'When as we sat in Babylon' by Richard Farrant, not to mention Byrd's liturgical settings of Ps. 54 ('Save me, O God', written in *perfecta* throughout) and Ps. 119:33–8 ('Teach me, O Lord'). Whereas composers from Mundy onwards included short passages of *tripla* or *perfecta* in their services,[124] Byrd's initiative of setting the evening canticles nominally in *perfecta* throughout spawned only one pre-Restoration imitator which is well known to be an overt act of homage by his younger colleague Morley.[125] Both directly and indirectly, then, Byrd was responsible for most of the *perfecta* eventually printed in Barnard's *First Book of*

---

121 Two distinct forms of ternary mensuration are encountered in Byrd's vernacular works, and the differences between them will be conveniently illustrated by the liturgical verse psalms to be discussed in Chapter 4 below. For now, it will simply be necessary to distinguish between *tempus perfectum*, where each ternary unit comprises three semibreves, and *prolatio perfecta*, where each ternary unit comprises three minims.

122 Some of the most obvious examples of *prolatio perfecta* are to be found among Tallis's office hymns: see TCM 6, pp. 209–10, 214–15, 285–7, 289–91.

123 Ravenscroft, *A briefe discourse of the true (but neglected) vse of charact'ring the degrees, by their perfection, imperfection, and diminution in measurable musicke, against the common practise and custome of these times* (London: Edward Allde, 1614; STC 20756), 12.

124 Such passages are found in the settings of the *TD* from the short services by Mundy and Hooper, the *TD*, *J*, *M* and *ND* from Giles's First Service, and the *J* and *ND* from Gibbons's Second Service. See, respectively Robert Reeve, 'The Life and Works of William Mundy', 2 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of London, 1980) vol. 1, p. 265; *Llp* MS 764 and *Oj* MS 181; Barnard's *First Book*; TCM 4, pp. 95–6, 121.

125 EECM 41/2. On the relationship between the two services see Monson, '"Throughout All Generations"', 104–111.

Selected Church Musick.[126] Not until the era of Purcell would English church music admit ternary mensurations on a par with duple.[127]

Since Byrd's *perfecta* canticles make up the last of his three services in the *First Book*, Barnard's title 'Third Service' probably signifies merely the order of printing rather than of composition. Certainly the service is not so entitled elsewhere, being more literally dubbed '3 minnoms' in the organ-book *Och* MS Mus. 1001 and 'prick semibrief' in the Chapel Royal Bd part-book *Oj* MS 180. Those MSS apply the same quaint titles also to Morley's *perfecta* canticles (called the 'Second Service' by Barnard), showing that the scribes considered both services to be noteworthy exceptions to the *prolatio imperfecta* rule. The conspicuous absence of Byrd's setting from any other MS sources strongly implies that its circulation was restricted—perhaps deliberately—to London circles or even the court. At any rate, owing to the skeletal character of the surviving organ part, the only known T and Ct parts are those contained in the *First Book*;[128] and there are reasons, to be discussed below (pp. 55–6), for doubting their authority.

Byrd's Three Minims Service was clearly a new departure in vernacular liturgical music, and its cross-fertilization of choral homophony with galliard-like rhythms could be taken as a reflection of the broad range of vocal and instrumental genres in which Byrd worked. The two mensurations signs used in its sources—a stroked circle above a 3 in the MSS, and a dotted half-circle in Barnard—are prefixed also to Byrd's galliards in the Nevell and Fitwilliam virginal books. At a push, parallels might be drawn too between the kind of cadential schemes Byrd applied to the three strains of the galliard and the

126 The inclusion of these items is attributable as much to Barnard's demonstrable advocacy of Byrd's music in particular as to an endorsement of *tripla* in general. There is no firm evidence to support Daniel Bamford's association of *tripla* with Laudianism; see his 'John Barnard's *First Book of Selected Church Musick*: Genesis, Production and Influence', 3 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of York, 2009), vol. 1, p. 251.

127 On later 'triple' services, see Ian Spink, *Restoration Cathedral Music 1660–1714* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 26, 162, 346, 409.

128 The post-Restoration New College part-books *Ob* MSS Mus. e. 23–5 are erroneously listed in SECM as sources of voice parts to the Three Minims service; these volumes in fact contain Byrd's Verse Service, the subtitle 'in triple time' applying only to that service's doxologies in *prolatio perfecta*.

apparently tripartite tonal plan of the first eight verses of the *M*—where, as Monson observed, principal cadences fall on 'C' and 'G' in the outer sections and on 'D' and 'A' in the inner section (see fig. 1:3).[129] Yet here the service's resemblance to dance music ends, Byrd having made no attempt to accommodate the text to the omnipresent eight-bar phrasing of his galliards. The *M* opens with a phrase of nine bars (counting each dotted semibreve as a bar) and continues with two of seven bars, while in further contrast to the instrumental dances nearly half the phrases of the service commence with an anacrusis. In addition, and for reasons to be mentioned shortly, it is possible that Byrd composed the service at Lincoln, before his long-lasting fascination with instrumental dances is thought to have begun.[130]

What, then, might have prompted Byrd to impose a dance-like metre on a nascent vernacular genre to which it was clearly still foreign? Curiously enough, the answer may lie in Tallis's Short Service, notwithstanding its duple metre and markedly different key. In one of its two passages that flout the rule of simultaneous declamation, Tallis placed the M and B in canon at the 8ve (at one point switching temporarily to the 12th) at the distance of three minims.[131] Since this arrangement persists for some sixty minims, an unambiguous sense of *prolatio perfecta* is temporarily established without any explicit changes of mensuration. Whether or not this passage provided Byrd with his concept, the subtle parallels Monson has illustrated between further passages from Tallis's service and two portions of the Three Minims Service leave little room for doubt that the two contrasting settings are related. Concealed amid the simultaneous declamation of Tallis's *Bs* (bars 24–

---

129 "Throughout all generations"', 103. *Cf.* the cadences indicated in fig. 1:3 below with the Galliard to the Sixth Pavan (MB 27/32b), where cadences fall on 'C' and 'G' in strains I and III and on 'D' and 'G' in strain II.

130 See Neighbour, *The Consort and Keyboard Music of William Byrd*, 86, 182n., 196.

131 *Cr*, bars 19–34, where the canon was clearly prompted by the clause '...being of one substance...'. The other such passage—*ND*, bars 7–15—likewise incorporates canonic writing, this time at the distance of two minims. On the possibility that the canonic section of Tallis's *Cr* represents a post-1552 revision by the composer, see Stefan Scot, 'Text and Context: The Provision of Music and Ceremonial in the Services of the First Book of Common Prayer' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Surrey, 1999), 79–84.

7, and again at bars 30–33) is the embryo of a canon between M and T at the 8ve, again at the contradictory distance of three minims, which resurfaces in more rigorous form in Byrd's *M* (bars 28–34). From the end of v. 5 of the *M* to the end of v. 6, furthermore, Byrd (bars 19–24) used the very series of four cadence degrees Tallis had done (bars 28–38), as well as incorporating an almost identical scalar descent from *c*" to *e*' at the words 'he hath scattered the proud'.[132]

In more general terms, the debt to Tallis is evident also in Byrd's use of *tautophrasis* and canon as important structural elements. As we have seen, both composers appear gradually to have become less reliant on *tautophrasis* as work on their short services progressed, and it accounts for less than a quarter of Byrd's Short *M*. In the Three Minims Service, however, he used it for one third of the *M* and three fifths of the *ND*. The technique may have been Tallis's, but here its scheme of application is entirely Byrd's own (see fig. 1:3, where the devices of splitting, insertion and substitution are indicated by the methods explained above).[133] In vv. 2–3 of the *M*, Byrd worked his material twice as hard as usual,[134] making a single phrase (**B**) do duty for a series of four half-verses. Though shown as two discrete phrases (**C** and **D**) in fig. 1:3, v. 4 consists of two very similar halves whose effect is barely distinguishable from *tautophrasis* proper. The descending scale quoted from Tallis (phrase **G**) is immediately adapted to the ensuing clause 'in the imagination of their hearts' rather than recurring at the inappropriate clause 'and hath exalted the humble and meek' (as in Tallis's convoluted *tautophrasis* schematized above).

In phrases **I**, **J** and **Q**, *tautophrasis* gives way to canon, recalling not only the isolated canons in Tallis's Short Service but also, perhaps, all nine movements of his service 'of five parts, two in one', of which only the (non-canonic) B part survives. Byrd's deployment

---

132 See Monson, '"Throughout all generations"', 100–103, where Byrd's passages are quoted in parallel with Tallis's.

133 In connection with fig. 1:3 it should be noted that phrase **Q** involves verbal as well as musical repetition, and hence does not qualify as *tautophrasis*.

134 As in vv. 5–6 of Tallis's Short *Bs*: see fig. 1:2c above.

of the M as guide and the T as consequent at the lower 8ve replicates the majority of the older composer's extant canons, and perhaps too the five-part service's lost canonic voices.[135] It is hard to fathom why phrase **I** ('and hath exalted the humble and meek') should have prompted Byrd to incorporate a canon at the lower 5th between M and Ct at the distance of just one minim: if canon had a metaphorical function for him, it was to represent law-giving, the act of following, or some state of unity (see Chapter 5, pp. 289, 315, 317). Yet the use of canon in conjunction with textual and musical repetition in phrases **J** ('He hath filled the hungry with good things: and the rich he hath sent empty away') and **Q** ('and ever shall be, world without end. Amen') seems calculated to emphasize an implicit sense of recursiveness. Additional weight, indeed, is given to phrase **J** by the full close and double bar-line with which it ends, suggesting that Byrd might have singled out this particular passage—as he later would in The Great Service—as a politic allusion to the defeat, real or wished for, of some enemy of the state. There would doubtless have been no shortage of Elizabethan courtiers, not to mention the Queen herself, who would have eagerly drawn such an interpretation from Byrd's word-setting here.

Only one instance may be cited of rhetorical word-setting of the kind we have already encountered in the Short Service. In the Three Minims *M*, Byrd's only recourse to triads of 'B♭' was, as Fellowes noted,[136] in connection with the word 'mercy' in v. 9 (bar 35). To be sure, 'B♭'s occur elsewhere (bars 4, 53), and their occurrence here is less striking than the sudden appearance of 'E♭'s in v. 12 of the Short *Bs*. Yet triads of 'B♭' and 'F' on the word 'mercy' are too clearly an invocation of the so-called 'soft' hexachord to be mere coincidence. As we shall see below (pp. 286–8), the affective potential of harmony on these degrees was to play a more developed part in The Great Service.

---

135 *Oj* MS 181. On this work see Johnstone, 'Tallis's Service "Of Five Parts Two In One"', passim.
136 *William Byrd*, 129–30.

Fellowes's observation that the passage containing the 'B♭' triads 'is in square measure' symptomizes his thoroughly subjective views on the placement of bar-lines.[137] Yet although no change to *prolatio imperfecta* is signed in any of the sources, the ternary rhythms are indeed sometimes eclipsed by binary ones. Whereas Tallis had introduced to the binary metre of his Short Service *Cr* a lengthy passage tantamount to *prolatio perfecta*, Byrd threw that process into reverse. At the start of the *M*, the basic ternary minim groupings (mmm mmm) are disrupted only by cadential hemiolas (mm mm mm, bars 2, 7, 18). In v. 7, however, neither minims nor semibreves fall into ternary groups, with the result that the eight-minim reference to Tallis's descending M (phrase **G**) is to all intents and purposes in *prolatio imperfecta*.[138] An even stronger feeling of *prolatio imperfecta* takes root in phrase **K**, and is consolidated by a further eight-minim phrase (**L**). Only with the ensuing six-minim phrase (**M**) is the sense of *prolatio perfecta* restored. In contrast, the *ND* never implies *prolatio imperfecta* as such: here the rhythm always comprises ternary groups of minims or semibreves, much of it hanging in a delicately ambiguous balance between one grouping and the other. In the doxology, Byrd exploited that ambiguity with 'table-leg' bass-lines of minims that oscillate between *d* and *G* (ex. 1:11), something he would scarcely have allowed himself unless the passages in question could be construed as belonging to varied groups of threes (*d GdG dG*) as opposed to repetitious pairs (*dG dG dG*).[139]

In terms both of key structure and rhythmic organization, then, Byrd's *M* can be seen as centring on his reference to Tallis's setting of v. 6, a reference that necessitated excursion

---

137 *William Byrd*, 129; TCM 2, p. xxvii: 'Bar-lines are placed ... at irregular intervals, according, wherever possible, with the nature of the rhythmic material.'

138 At v. 6 of the *M*, Morley's Three Minims Service likewise loses sight of *prolatio perfecta*, and a temporary switch to *prolatio imperfecta* is at one point actually signed in the sources (bars 39–40). The 'Amen' of Morley's *ND* also is signed in *prolatio imperfecta*.

139 In the light of these observations, it is hard fully to accept John Morehen's opinion that 'Morley's setting, unlike that of Byrd, derives much of its effect from its exploitation of metrical ambiguity'. 'English Church Music' in *The Sixteenth Century*, ed. Roger Bray (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), 94–146 (131).

not only from the major key of C fa ut to the contrasting minor key of D sol re, but also from ternary to binary metre. Did Byrd insert the reference because he happened to find himself in the right key and metre, or did he plan the whole *M* around it in order to place special emphasis on the words 'he hath scattered the proud'? Given that Byrd was nothing if not an obsessive musical architect, and that he clearly emphasized the related phrase 'and the rich he hath sent empty away', the latter possibility seems more likely.

In terms of contrapuntal detail, the Three Minims Service gave Monson grounds for deeming it a less accomplished work than the Short Service, and perhaps even an earlier one.[140] Indeed, despite the flowing polar counterpoint of the B and M, the three inner voices often appear contrived and are surprisingly lacking in independence (e.g. *M*, bars 15–19, where the T shadows the M in close parallel 8ves for fourteen out of twenty-six minims). Rests are crudely employed to avoid consecutive 5ths and 8ves, some being inserted nonsensically in the middle of verbal clauses (e.g. *M*, bar 35), others being used to shorten one voice only of a chord (e.g. *M*, bar 25, where the T is assigned a minim plus a minim rest while the other voices have a semibreve). It is hard to credit Byrd with the lead-up to one full close in particular (ex. 1:12), where makeshift part-writing is made all the more perplexing by a doubled 'C' above *f*♯ in the B.

Some of this unruliness can be put down to a lack of care on Barnard's part. In deference to his printed pages, modern editors have been reluctant to resolve inconsistencies in phrases **L** and **M** (bars 38–42), meaning in TCM 2 that the whole *M* is one minim longer than it should be (p. 116, lower system, first bar), and in BE 10a that a single voice uncharacteristically preempts by one minim the two c entries (bars 39 and 41). Since in chordal antiphony Byrd's entries and cut-offs are invariably unanimous, and given the well-documented sloppiness of Barnard's production methods, future editors need not hesitate to tidy up this passage. A further, worse error occurs at bars 17–18 of the *M*, where

---

140 Preface to BE 10a, p. x.

one of Barnard's Ct parts is one minim too long. It is obvious where the error lies, for while all the other voices divide the word 'throughout' into two syllables the Ct divides it into three ('tho-rough-out', *a a a*). But instead of correcting the Ct to two syllables and omitting the unwanted minim ('through-out', *a a*), later in the same passage the TCM editors shortened a semibreve to a minim. This compensating error has somehow found its way into all subsequent editions of the service,[141] notwithstanding the catachrestic dissonance that results on the downbeat of bar 18.

Misprints, however, account for only a few of the problems posed by the inner voices, and a more comprehensive explanation may lie in the discovery that other five-part liturgical pieces by Byrd are revisions of four-part originals. It is thus possible that the Three Minims Service has a similar history: if so, its antiphonal passages would have been strictly in four parts, while some but not all of its full passages could have been in five, the fifth part being obtained—as in Byrd's Short Service—by the division of Ctc and Ctd, and/or Tc and Td. The suspicion that this was so is bolstered by two further observations. First, four out of the five instances in which overcrowding obliges the T part to cross below the B,[142] and both instances in which the T part exceeds the usual lower limit of *c*',[143] occur in passages for one side of the choir only. Second, while certain five-part full passages give no cause for concern (such as those of the *ND*), others have an awkward feel (such as phrase **J**, where both Ct parts are unusually low). Finally, although the organ part given in *Och* MS Mus. 1001 is almost exclusively a bicinium made up of the B and M parts, the last of three inner notes added at the beginning of the *M* is an *f*♯' not present in any of Barnard's inner voices—a tantalizing hint that this accompaniment may have been intended to go with a different set of T and Ct parts.

---

141 TCMO 8, BE 10a, TCMO 8 (revised).

142 *M*, bars 13 (d), 14 (c), 36 (cd), 41 (d); *ND*, bar 4 (c).

143 *M*, bars 39, where Td descends to *G*, and 40, where Tc descends to *A*. The T part of Byrd's Verse Service includes two exceptional descents to *B*♭ (*M*, bars 26–7); the Tc part of The Great Service exceptionally descends to *A* (*V*, bar 47; *TD*, bar 206).

If the Three Minims Service was conceived, like the Short Service, for a choir with one Ct part per side, then it can safely be assigned to Byrd's Lincoln period. If Byrd himself adapted it for Chapel Royal use, with two Ct parts per side, then he must have done so in some haste, maintaining a five-voice texture at no matter what cost to line. The three inner voices (or at least those portions of them that are not in canon with the M) could even be the work of someone other than the composer—a possibility that has for some time been suspected of other works in the English vernacular repertory.[144] That person might have been Barnard, for although he would surely have been satisfied with a four-part version, as something of a composer he could have essayed a set of too many inner parts if nothing more than a bicinium organ accompaniment were at his disposal. Alternatively, the service's uneven contrapuntal make-up might reflect a composing process whereby Byrd began with a two-voice framework (to be preserved in the organ part) and then added the required number of inner parts whether the framework comfortably accommodated them or not. Yet the likelihood that the five-part version is an adaptation seems much greater. Whatever its genesis, more than enough of the service's essential characteristics have survived to prove it was a novel and—Morley's tribute excepted—unique setting, the product of a stylistic versatility that Byrd, and he alone, could bring to the new vernacular forms.

144 See particularly the case study of Morley's verse anthem 'Out of the deep' in John Morehen, 'The "Burden of Proof": The Editor as Detective' in *English Choral Practice*, ed. Morehen (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995), 200–220 (206–9).

CHAPTER TWO

EARLY WORKS IN THE FULL IDIOM II: ANTHEMS

AriseOL	'Arise, O Lord' (i) (Ps. 44:23–4)	BE 11/1a
HelpUOG	'Help us, O God' (Ps. 79:9)	BE 11/1b
HowLSME	'How long shall mine enemies triumph over me?' (Ps.13:2ii–5)	BE 11/3
OGodWOO	'O God, whom our offences' (Latin collect)	BE 11/5
OLordMTS	'O Lord, make thy servant' (after Ps. 21:1–4)	BE 11/6
PreventUOL	'Prevent us, O Lord' (BCP)	BE 11/8
Doubtful and Misattributed Anthems		
OutOTD	'Out of the deep' a6 (Ps. 130:1–4,7–8)	BE 11/7
SaveMOG	'Save me, O God' (Ps. 54:1–4), by Richard Coste	BE 11/9
	'Christ rising' a5 (BCP), anon.	BE 11/27, EECM 13/2
	'Glory to God on high', anon. C18th	BE 11/25
	'Let God arise', by Thomas Ford?	BE 11/28
	'Out of the deep' a5 (Ps. 130:1–5,8), anon.	BE 11/26
	'Deliver me from mine enemies', by Robert Parsons	
Published Songs		
	'O God, give ear and do apply' (Ps. 55:1–3)	1588/1
	'Blessed is he that fears the Lord' (Ps. 112)	1588/8
	'Even from the depth' (Ps. 130)	1588/10
	'O Lord, my God, let flesh and blood'	1589i/22
Contrafacta		
	'Let us arise from sin'	=1575/11
	'Lift up your heads'	=1575/11
	'Behold now, praise the Lord'	=1575/17
	'O Lord, give ear to the prayers'	=1575/18
	'Behold, I bring you glad tidings'+'And there was with the angel'	=1589ii/20+21
	'Let not thy wrath'+'Thy holy city'	=1589ii/20+21
	'O Lord, turn thy wrath'+'Bow thine ear'	=1589ii/20+21
	'Let not our prayers be rejected'	=1589ii/26
	'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God'	=1591/8
	'Arise, O Lord' (ii)	=1591/19

2.1 Circulation and attributions

Whereas the liturgical works discussed in the previous chapter appear to have circulated exclusively among institutions, and are first found in sources from the second decade of the seventeenth century, most of Byrd's anthems in the full idiom made their way also into sets of part-books copied for recreational music-making, some of which are of Elizabethan date. All eight full anthems to be discussed in this section are present in MSS copied by or

for private individuals, and—with the exceptions of OutOTD and (probably) SaveMOG—each makes its earliest appearance in such a MS from the 1580s or '90s.

AriseOL and HelpUOG most often appear yoked together as a single full anthem in two 'parts', and in that form they were more widely copied than any of Byrd's other church compositions apart from the equally popular 'Sing joyfully'. Although HelpUOG appears alone in its earliest source (a portion of the Petre part-book *Ob* MS Mus. Sch. e. 423 copied *c*.1581), it is there annotated 'Arise O Lord secunda pars'.[1] Within a few years, both anthems had been added in tandem to the part-books of which the *WBmghie* MS and *Ob* MS Tenbury 389 are now the only two survivors. In certain circles, however, both anthems continued to enjoy separate existences. Whereas the presence of HelpUOG without AriseOL in *Ob* MSS Tenbury 1469–71 remains one of the many mysteries of that incomplete set of Paston part-books, the presence of AriseOL without HelpUOG in *Lbl* Add. MSS 37402–6 can be put down to the scribe's reluctance to enter the six voice-parts of HelpUOG in a layer of five-part compositions. But the independence of the two works also had institutional sanction. Their texts were entered separately from one another in the alphabetically ordered Windsor word-book *Lbl* MS Harley 4142, while AriseOL alone is found in the all-important Chapel Royal B part-book *Oj* MS 180 and word-books *Ob* MS Rawl. Poet. 23 and *Lbl* MS Harley 6346. Perhaps, then, the coupling was never authorized by Byrd; certainly there is no evidence that HelpUOG ever entered the Chapel Royal repertory.

Why two such compositions should have fared better in combination than singly is obvious: at 134 minims, HelpUOG is Byrd's shortest anthem, while at 158 minims AriseOL is his second shortest. Yet on several counts the coupling is surprising. Whereas AriseOL is scored consistently for five voices, HelpUOG (with the exception of four short portions where the two T parts are united) is scored for six. The former anthem is in the

---

1 See David Mateer, 'William Byrd, John Petre and Oxford, Bodleian MS Mus. Sch. e. 423', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 29 (1996), 21–46 (38, 41).

key of D sol re flat, the latter in F fa ut, the *segue* being effected via the striking *passamezzo antico* progression since HelpUOG for some reason begins on a chord of 'B♭'. Though neither composition exceeds Byrd's usual limit of three or four accidental degrees, in combination the two take in the unusually broad chromatic spectrum of 'E♭' to 'G♯' (paralleled only by the Bs of the Short Service'). And while it is clear from the verse anthem 'Christ rising' that Byrd was not above writing anthems with second parts, nowhere else in his vernacular output are extracts from two different psalms (Pss. 44:23–4 and Ps.79:9) so combined.[2] Furthermore, marked differences in basic contrapuntal procedures show that Byrd could hardly have written both anthems at the same time. For all these reasons, therefore, each will be considered here as an independent composition.

Though HowLSME is unattributed in most of its earliest sources, its presence with ascriptions to Byrd in Robert Dow's part-books *Och* MSS Mus. 984–8 and the Chapel Royal word-books leaves little room for doubt as to its authorship. The patchy evidence offered by the pre-Commonwealth sources would suggest that this anthem circulated somewhat more widely than the later and more rhetorically effective PreventUOL: as well as appearing in three institutional part-book sets;[3] six singleton part-books and three organ-books, HowLSME is also quite widely represented in domestic MSS including *Lbl* Add. MS 22597, possibly the only Elizabethan source of Byrd's anthems to have been copied as early as the 1570s.

In addition to HowLSME, Dow's handsome set contains PreventUOL and is also the only source to transmit OLordMTS with its text as Byrd set it, addressed on behalf of Elizabeth. The presence here of both anthems corroborates the *terminus ante quem* of the mid 1580s implicit in their musical style. Thereafter, only one or two further domestic

---

2 On the combination of verses from more than one psalm within a single anthem, see John Morehen, 'The English Anthem Text, 1549–1660', *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 117 (1992), 62–85 (66).

3 Reference is incorrectly made to a Tc part in *Cp* MS 43 (f. A2) in SECM and Anselm Hughes, *Catalogue of the Musical Manuscripts at Peterhouse Cambridge* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1953), 15.

copies of these two fine anthems have survived. Both are conspicuous by their absence from the collections of Petre and Paston, which contain large quantities of music by Byrd that was very likely obtained directly from the composer. Both too are known to have become statutory Chapel Royal pieces for the annual *pedilavium* ceremony on Maundy Thursday (on which see pp. 74–5 and 96 below); if Byrd composed these anthems specifically for chapel use, and perhaps even by royal command, then that could explain his apparent reluctance to distribute them himself. Be that as it may, both are widely represented in the pre-Commonwealth institutional sources, and none more so than OLordMTS.

OGodWOO appears not to have circulated in the 1580s, but is first encountered in a Paston lute-book (*Lbl* Add. MS 31992) probably copied in the 1590s—two decades before Thomas Myriell made the oldest surviving copy of 'Sing joyfully', the first of Byrd's three late full anthems to appear in the sources. Since on grounds of key and scoring OGodWOO clearly does not belong with the three late full anthems which, as we shall see in Chapter 5 (pp. 267–9), are linked to The Great Service, it is grouped here with the early ones, even though on stylistic grounds it may be confidently assigned, along with AriseOL, to Byrd's so-called 'middle period' (1575–91).

That leaves SaveMOG and OutOTD, the two anthems from the present group whose authorship has been disputed. Both have conflicting attributions in the sources, but so too does another anthem from the group, HowLSME, whose authorship has gone unchallenged in modern times. For ease of comparison the pre-Restoration sources and attributions of all three works are shown in table 2:1. That in all three cases the greatest number of copies are anonymous is not particularly remarkable: while a composer's name was the only sure way to identify a service setting, scribes were often content to identify an anthem by its text alone. Thus John Stevens, the Chapel Royal copyist of *Oj* MSS 180 and 181, credited Byrd with only two anthems (ExaltTOG and ThouGTG), leaving SaveMOG and OutOTD—as

well as such uncontested items as OLordMTS and PreventUOL—without attributions.[4] At the same time, in all three cases too an attribution is supplied by one member of a part-book set but not by the others, suggesting that similar, solitary attributions may have been present in the lost companions of singleton and doubleton survivors. That said, HowLSME remains the only anthem of the three with an Elizabethan attribution (to Byrd), and indeed the only one with proven Elizabethan sources (while SaveMOG first turns up in the incomplete McGhie/Tenbury part-book set begun in the 1580s, it belongs to a layer added late enough to contain also two of the finest unpublished compositions of Weelkes, which are unlikely to have been in circulation much before 1600).[5] Furthermore, while HowLSME may not be Byrd's most accomplished anthem, we shall see that there are ample stylistic grounds for accepting it as his. Not least of these is its filial relationship to Tallis's motet 'O sacrum convivium', which of itself discredits the attribution of the anthem to Tallis found in the two Paston lute-books *Lbl* Add. MSS 29247 and 31992.

Contemporary word-books offer further attributions for all three anthems, but these are excluded from table 2:1 for the simple reason that no word-book text can irrefutably be linked with a surviving musical setting of it. The problem is illustrated by an entry in the Chapel Royal word-books of the text of SaveMOG, with its distinctive variant 'avenge thou my cause',[6] but with a conflicting attribution to William Mundy.[7] This entry has three possible meanings: first, that the scribe attributed the anthem to Mundy in error; second, that a setting by Mundy of this very text has been lost; or third, that the setting elsewhere attributed to Byrd, but found without a composer's name in *Oj* MS 180, was known by

---

4 It might be added that these MSS supply attributions to only four of the fourteen anthems they contain that are elsewhere firmly attributed to Orlando Gibbons: see John Morehen, 'The Sources of English Cathedral Music, *c*.1617–*c*.1644' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1969), 392–5, 404–6.

5 'O my son, Absolom' (part 2 of 'When David heard', MB 23/16) and 'Alleluia, I heard a voice' (MB 23/1). See Warwick Edwards, 'The Sources of Elizabethan Consort Music', 2 vols (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1974), vol 1, 131. Edwards's suggestion that SaveMOG 'may also come from Weelkes's pen' is consistent with its composer's evident liking for false relations, though not with his restricted contrapuntal skill.

6 As opposed to Coverdale's 'avenge me'.

7 *Ob* MS Rawl. Poet. 23, p. 15; *Lbl* MS Harley 6346, f. 3v.

Chapel Royal musicians actually to be Mundy's work.[8] Attributions to Byrd, it is true, accompany the text of SaveMOG in the Windsor word-book *Lbl* MS Harley 4142, and that of OutOTD, with its distinctive variant 'But with thee there is mercy',[9] in the Chapel Royal word-books. But these do not prove Byrd's authorship of the extant anthems.

It is surely significant that SaveMOG does not appear with Byrd's name in the MSS until the mid to late 1620s,[10] plausibly, as Richard Turbet has suggested,[11] out of confusion with the composer's liturgical setting of Ps. 54 ('Save me, O God') from the First Preces and Psalms. At that point, the attribution is restricted to one of eight surviving part-books, and is corroborated by only four further pre-Restoration MSS out of a total number of thirty-four. After the Civil War, the music of SaveMOG was credited to Byrd in John Ferrabosco's organ-book,[12] the Bing-Gostling part-books,[13] and subsequently in the MS collection of 'ancient church music' compiled between 1715 and 1720 by Thomas Tudway jr.[14] It may be significant, however, that the version of the text printed above Byrd's name by James Clifford lacks the variant 'avenge thou my cause':[15] if this is not simply an error, then it would imply that there once existed a setting by Byrd of Ps. 54:1–4 that was neither SaveMOG nor his own liturgical one from the First Preces and Psalms.

Doubts about the authenticity of SaveMOG were first raised by Craig Monson in the early 1980s,[16] prompted no less by the anthem's stylistic eccentricities than by the fivefold attribution to a certain 'Mr Coste' in *Lbl* Add. MSS 29372–6, Thomas Myriell's

---

8 Roughly half the anthems represented in the word-book are absent from the part-books, while eighteen of the 114 anthems present in the part-books are clearly not represented in the word-book.

9 As opposed to Coverdale's 'For there is mercy with thee'.

10 The period of copying can be determined by the position of SaveMOG in *DRc* MSS C4–6, the second fascicle of C7, and C9–10, between a Caroline version of OLordMTS and a holograph anthem by John Geeres, whose presence at Durham was first recorded in 1628. See Brian Crosby, 'The Choral Foundation of Durham Cathedral, *c*.1350–*c*.1650', 2 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Durham, 1992), vol. 1, pp. 224–5, 232.

11 Letter 'Counting the Coste', *Musical Times*, 142 (2001), 3–4.

12 *Cu* MS Ely 4, pp. R49–50.

13 *Y* MSS M1/1–5(S).

14 *Lbl* MS Harley 7337, ff. 65r–67r.

15 *The Divine Services and Anthems*, 2nd edn (London: William Godbid, 1664), 84.

16 'Authenticity and Chronology in Byrd's Church Anthems', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 35 (1982), 280–305 (289–90); preface to BE 11, pp. vi–vii.

monumental *Tristitiae remedium*.[17] Among the more than 200 attributions in these part-books, it is notable that the only demonstrable error stems from the confusion of Philip van Wilder with Peter Phillips.[18] Though it has been stated to the contrary, Myriell did not identify Coste with a first name or initial, but simply added the prefix 'Mr' (in the A and Q volumes) or 'M.' (in the remaining volumes, by which he may be presumed also to have meant 'Mr'). Apparently on the undocumented authority of Myles Birket Foster (1851–1922),[19] Coste's first name was until quite recently given as Thomas. Although, as John Harley has established, a certain Thomas Coste was baptized at Aldington, Kent, on 1 January 1574;[20] Roger Bowers has more convincingly identified the composer as the individual named in the baptismal register as Thomas's father, Richard Coste (*c*.1535–*c*. 1597). The elder Coste is recorded as a chorister of Ely Cathedral (1543–4), and as a lay-clerk of King's College Cambridge (1555–6) and Canterbury Cathedral (from 1563). In 1566–7, he was one of several lay-clerks to receive payment for 'makyng and pryckyng' music for the Canterbury choir—a turn of phrase Bowers interprets as 'composing and copying'.[21] That this Coste was indeed a composer of sorts is proved by the handful of other works attributed to him in the pre-Restoration sources. These consist of fragments of a morning and evening service (*DRc*), plus 'He that hath my commandments',[22] an intact full anthem for four men's voices that illustrates the same stiffness of technique and lack of invention as SaveMOG.

---

17 See Craig Monson, *Voices and Viols in England, 1600–1650: The Sources and the Music* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1982), 50–53; Turbet, 'Counting the Coste', 3–4 (4).

18 The work in question is Van Wilder's anthem 'Blessed art thou that fearest God' (MMR 4/1); the relevant explanatory footnote is missing from Monson's inventory (*Voices and Viols*, 52).

19 *Anthems and Anthem Composers* (London: Novello & Co., 1901), 30, cited in Turbet, 'Counting the Coste', 4.

20 Turbet, 'Counting the Coste', 4.

21 Bowers, letter (untitled), *Early Music Review*, 42 (July 1998), 27. See also Bowers, 'The Liturgy of the Cathedral and Its Music, *c*.1075–1642' in *A History of Canterbury Cathedral*, ed. Patrick Collinson, Nigel Ramsay and Margaret Sparks (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 408–50 (436–7).

22 Edn (with attribution to Thomas Coste) by Clifford Bartlett and Brian Clark, *Early Music Review*, 41 (June 1998), 11–12 (transcription), *Annual Byrd Newsletter*, 4 (1998), 12 (critical commentary).

In contrast to the widely circulated SaveMOG, the six-voice OutOTD was seldom copied by early seventeenth century scribes, and no later copies of it are known to exist. A five-voice anthem with the same text incipit is listed as Byrd's in the indexes to two of John Barnard's MS part-books (*Lcm* MSS 1049 and 1051), but for some reason its music was never entered into those MSS.[23] Beyond three institutional sources which between them transmit parts for organ, B and Ct2, the music of OutOTD survives only towards the end of John Merro's part-books *NYp* MSS Drexel 4180–5, which transmit all six voice parts but give Byrd's name only in the A volume MS 4181. Merro began copying the set after 1615, adding to it a considerable number of anthems that were presumably accessible to him in his capacity as a lay-clerk of Gloucester cathedral. If that is so, then OutOTD may well have been transcribed from unattributed exemplars, since of the forty-seven anthems in the one pre-Restoration source surviving at the cathedral (the B part-book *GL* MS 93), twenty-one lack a composer's name.[24]

Merro entered OutOTD third in a layer of nine anthems that succeeds a layer of Italian and English madrigals, and is succeeded by a concluding layer of instrumental fantasias. Within the anthems layer, the attributions more than once give cause for concern. The composer of 'O Lord, arise', though correctly identified in MSS 4181–5 as Weelkes, remains misidentified in MS 4180 as Thomas Tomkins, while the other item to which Byrd's name is subscribed in all six part-books, 'O give thanks', is in fact the work of John Mundy. Elsewhere in MS 4180, Byrd also remains misidentified as the composer of 'Blessed be thy Name', the *contrafactum* of Tallis's motet 'Mihi autem nimis' (1575/7), while five further conflicting or disproven attributions have been identified within the set as

---

23 Monson, 'Authenticity and Chronology', 288 n. 16); Daniel Bamford, 'John Barnard's *First Book of Selected Church Musick*: Genesis, Production and Influence', 3 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of York, 2009), vol. 2, p. 408.

24 See John Morehen, 'The Gloucester Cathedral Bassus Part-Book MS 93', *Music & Letters*, 62 (1981), 189–96 (190–91).

a whole.[25] In these circumstances, the single uncorroborated ascription of OutOTD to Byrd in just one of the six part-books (MS 4181) is scarcely conclusive.

Like SaveMOG, OutOTD has a conflicting pre-Restoration attribution, this being found in the organ-book *Och* MS Mus. 1001. Here no composer's name is given next to the anthem itself, but in the index there appears the attribution 'Or Gib', one of several added to the index in various hands. It must be said that the ascriptions given throughout this organ-book are neither entirely complete nor entirely accurate. Seven authenticated anthems by Gibbons bear his name in one form or another, yet an eighth ('Lift up your heads') does not. SaveMOG was left unattributed, yet so too were three anthems of Byrd's undisputed authorship (AriseOL, PreventUOL and 'Sing joyfully'). And although the *TD* misattributed to Byrd in *Ob* MS Mus. e. 40 is correctly attributed to [William] Inglott,[26] two anthems widely documented as Hooper's are passed off as the work of Tallis. The fact nonetheless remains that, whereas two ascriptions to Byrd in Merro's Drexel part-books can be shown to be faulty, the other ascriptions to Gibbons in the organ-book cannot. Arguably, then, the organ-book's ascription of OutOTD might be deemed the more reliable of the two.[27]

In addition to OutOTD, Merro copied three further disputed Byrdian works, although he attached Byrd's name to only one of them, a second, five-voice full setting of 'Out of the deep'. He copied this anthem in both his part-book sets (which remain its only known sources), leaving it anonymous in *Lbl* Add. MSS 17792–6 but adding attributions to four of the Drexel volumes. While those attributions may appear more confident than the solitary one added to OutOTD, they are scarcely borne out by the anthem's pedestrian word-setting and stiff, predictable *fuga*. Even allowing for scribal corruptions, the counterpoint is in places little better than makeshift.

---

25 Monson, *Voices and Viols*, p. 149 nn. 2, 4, 6, p. 150 nn. 1, 3, p. 151 n. 4, p. 152 n. 5, p. 153 n. 1.

26 BE 10a, p. x.

27 For a contrary view, see Richard Turbet, 'Postscript', *Annual Byrd Newsletter*, 1 (1995), 4, and John Harley, *William Byrd: Gentleman of the Chapel Royal* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997), 186.

A five-voice full setting of 'Let God arise' is likewise found in both of Merro's sets, again with attributions in the Drexel volumes only. In the case of this anthem, however, Merro offers an alternative to the ascription to Byrd given in its only other known source, the post-Restoration singleton Bc part-book *Och* MS Mus. 1012 (pp. 102–3), where there is slim possibility that its adjacency to PreventUOL (pp. 101–2) was a source of confusion. Monson's description—'seventy bars of unrelieved imitation that scarcely strays from 'G''—is surely proof enough against Byrd's authorship;[28] Merro's attribution to the court musician and composer Thomas Ford, while plausible enough chronologically (Ford's music was in print from 1607), must await evaluation in the context of Ford's other works.

The Drexel set is furthermore the only intact source for a full setting for five voices of the BCP Easter anthems 'Christ rising' and 'Christ is risen'. This work was left anonymous by both Merro and the copyist of *GL* MS 93, but was attributed to Byrd in the four surviving part-books from Chirk Castle *NYp* MSS Mus. Res. *MNZ (Chirk). The only other source, an organ part copied by John Reading at Winchester Cathedral, probably dates from as late as *c*.1675–81,[29] and its index offers an alternative attribution to Tallis. Scholars of each composer have been inclined to dismiss it as the work of the other: according to Paul Doe, it is 'more likely to be by Byrd';[30] according to Monson, it 'in fact has far less to do with Byrd than his mentor'.[31] Probably closest to the truth is the balanced verdict of John Milsom that 'Christ rising' 'is not especially characteristic of either composer, and is at best an *opus dubium* of both'.[32] It might be added that, as with 'Let God arise', the dubious 'Christ rising' may have been confused with the item that went before it. Since, indeed, the item in question happens to be Byrd's 1589 consort anthem for six voices and viols on the same text, the risk of confusion was in this case far greater.

---

28 BE 11, p. xiii.

29 *BEm* MS 751A, pp. 32–5.

30 *Tallis*, 2nd edn (London: 1976), 55n.

31 'Authenticity and Chronology', 288; BE 11, p. xiii.

32 'English Polyphonic Style in Transition: A Study of the Sacred Music of Thomas Tallis' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1983), 26.

Two more conflicting attributions call for comment. The fragmentary 'Glory to God on high', of which all that survives is the T part of a brief final chorus (*Cu* MS Ely 28, p. 172), is self-evidently not a pre-Restoration composition. Rather, it corresponds to the style of the music occupying the preceding fifty or so pages of the MS, which include anthems by Maurice Greene and James Kent, and excerpts from Handel's *Messiah*.[33] A final one, not mentioned in BE 11, is remarkable in that it is explicitly resolved in another primary source. It concerns the six-voice full anthem 'Deliver me from mine enemies' by Robert Parsons, which Merro misattributed to White in *NYp* MSS 4180–84, the Durham scribes of *Y* MS M29(S) and *Lbl* Add. MSS 30478–9 mistakenly credited to Byrd, and the Chirk copyist headed with the name Strogers. But a singular marginal note transcribed also by the Chirk copyist reveals that the anthem's authorship was discussed at the highest possible level: 'some say Mr Parsons: Mr Byrd affirmed it to be truth'.[34]

2.2 Texts

It is well known that the BCP made no specific provision for non-liturgical music, and that under the terms of Elizabeth's forty-ninth injunction (on 'continuance of singing in the church')[35] the two offices of mattins and evensong could be framed with a wide variety of sacred music, from congregational metrical psalms to elaborate choral polyphony. It is clear from Day's *Mornyng and euenyng prayer and communion* of 1565 that non-liturgical pieces of this kind were referred to as anthems;[36] as the Wanley books show them to have been also under Edward. The extent to which Elizabethan clergy involved themselves in the selection of texts for anthems remains mysterious, but it seems probable that while he was active as a Gentleman of the Chapel Royal Byrd would have had been free to exercise

---

33 For inventory see Ian Cheverton, 'English Church Music of the Early Restoration Period, 1660–*c.* 1676' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, 1984), 315–19.

34 M volume, f. 71v.

35 *Iniunctions geuen by the Quenes Maiestie* (London: Richard Jugge and John Cawood, 1559; STC 10099.5), sig. C4r–v.

36 London; STC 6419; see p. 180 n. 135 below.

his own choice. As Dean of the Chapel from the time of Elizabeth's coronation, the ever compliant George Carew (whom in 1551 Edward had exempted from residence in all present and future livings) seems unlikely to have exerted much influence, for following his death in 1583 the queen saw fit never to appoint a successor.[37] The more onerous position of sub-dean appears to have been held during Byrd's time by other Gentlemen in Ordinary of the Chapel who were in holy orders.[38] If his anthem texts reflect clerical influence, then it was very likely the influence of clerics who were also musicians.

It comes as no surprise that the majority of Byrd's full anthems draw their texts directly or indirectly from the psalter: as John Morehen has shown,[39] some 58% of pre-Restoration anthems are psalm-settings of one kind or another. Yet this trend was by and large established after Byrd had made his contribution to the anthem repertory, and precedents for his habit of setting either a single verse or a selection of verses from an individual psalm are scarce. None of his full anthems sets a psalm in its entirety, as had Philippe van Wilder's 'Blessed art thou that fearest God' (Ps. 128), Tye's 'Blessed are all they that fear the Lord' (Ps. 128) or Robert White's 'Lord, who shall dwell in thy tabernacle' (Ps. 15).[40] None (if AriseOL and HelpUOG are counted as separate compositions) combines verses from more than one psalm, as had the anonymous Wanley setting of 'O Praise the Lord' (Pss. 147:1–3 and 85:9i) or 'Deliver me from mine enemies' (Pss. 59:1–2, 60:11) by Robert Parsons.[41] Nor do any derive their texts from other books of the bible, as did the

---

37 See P. E. McCullough, 'Carew, George (1497/8–1583)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, 2008), <www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4626>, accessed 24 March 2014. It has been incorrectly stated that William Day, Carew's successor as Dean of Windsor, succeeded him also as Dean of the Chapel Royal: see, for example, Peter le Huray, *Music and the Reformation in England* (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1967; repr. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 58–60; this error stems from confusion between the two royal institutions.

38 Alan G. Smith, 'The Gentlemen and Children of the Chapel Royal of Elizabeth I: An Annotated Register', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 5 (1965), 13–46 (26–7, 32–3, 36–7); see also John Harley, *The World of William Byrd: Musicians, Merchants and Magnates* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), 245–8.

39 'The English Anthem Text', 64–6.

40 MMR 4/1; EECM 19/1; TCM 5, pp. 192–6.

41 RRMR 99/9; Parsons, 'Deliver me' ed. Philippe Oboussier (London: Novello, 1954).

several-times-set 'Rejoice in the Lord always' (Philippians 4:4–7)[42] or the characteristically Edwardian 'commandments' anthems by Tallis, Sheppard and others, many of which were settings of the New Testament passages prescribed as post-communion sentences by the 1549 BCP.[43] One text corresponding more closely to those set by Byrd is that of Tallis's 'Remember not, O Lord God' (Ps. 79:8–10,14; EECM 12/9), yet here the selection of verses is not the composer's own but was provided by the 1545 King's Primer,[44] where it appears with the heading 'antem' (i.e. antiphon) between the seven Penitential Psalms (following Compline) and the Litany. The same primer furnished selections of verses for Tye's 'I will exalt thee' (Ps. 30:1–4,11–13) and 'Praise the Lord, ye children' (Ps.113:1–6,8; EECM 19/13).[45] Only with such possible exceptions as Robert Okeland's humble setting of 'Praise the Lord, O our souls' (Ps. 103:1–2,8; RRMR 100/50), therefore, the early vernacular repertory offers no precedents for freely selecting psalm verses in Byrd's manner.

In contrast to those earlier psalm settings that draw on the Primers or other pre-BCP translations, the psalm anthems AriseOL, HelpUOG, HowLSME, OutOTD and SaveMOG conform by and large to the wording of the Great Bible. By order of Thomas Cromwell in 1538, this first authorized vernacular translation had been chained to a bookstand in every church in the realm, and had been provided by its editor Myles Coverdale with a new version of the psalms, superseding the earlier version that formed part of his complete English bible of 1535. Although in 1571 the Great Bible was itself superseded (by the 1568 Bishops' Bible), Coverdale's second psalter had by then established itself as an indispensable adjunct to the BCP. It nonetheless remained a separate publication,

---

42 See MB 1/76 (anonymous); further unpublished settings are found in *NYp* MSS Drexel 4180–4 (two settings by ?Sheppard and Nicholas Strogers), *DRc* MSS A3, C11, C17 and C19 and *Lbl* Add. MSS 30478–9 (an incomplete setting attributed to Mundy) and Day's *Mornyng and euenyng prayer and communion* (a setting by Caustun).

43 See Morehen, 'The English Anthem Text', 67–8.

44 *The primer, set foorth by the Kynges maiestie and his clergie* (London: Richard Grafton, 1545), STC 16034, sigs K4v–L1r.

45 Sigs F3r, P1v.

sometimes prefixed with the orders for morning and evening prayer, until finally joining the official BCP contents in 1662.

Of the early psalm anthems, only HelpUOG reproduces the wording of the Great Bible exactly.[46] While the other four remain closer to that version than to the Geneva or Bishops' bibles, or even to Coverdale's first English bible, they nonetheless incorporate a number of minor variants (see table 3:2). The trivial substitutions of 'God' with 'Lord' (variant vii) and 'to' with 'unto' (variant viii) suggest—as do similar variants elsewhere in his vernacular church music—the setting of texts from memory rather than from the printed page.[47] Perhaps it was for the same reason that words or clauses were sometimes substituted with analogous ones from other published translations or from elsewhere in the Great Bible psalter itself. The phrase 'but with thee there is mercy' (variant v) recalls the forms 'but there is mercy with thee' (from Coverdale's first version) and 'but mercy is with thee' (from the Geneva Bible), while within the Great Bible Coverdale twice used the phrase 'avenge thou my cause' (variant vi, *cf.* Pss. 35:23 and 119:154). Yet from a musical point of view, these two variants may simply have been preferable to their authorized forms, the one marking more clearly a change of affect, the other offering greater rhythmic potential.

Purely musical considerations may likewise have prompted Byrd to appropriate the common Coverdale phrase 'be glad and rejoice' (variant iv, *cf.* Pss. 9:2, 31:8, 35:27, 68:3) in place of the single word 'rejoice'. But the appearance of this variant in HowLSME accompanies a surprising lapse in the relationship between text and polyphonic structure.

---

46 This is yet another respect in which HelpUOG differs from its portmanteau companion AriseOL. According to Monson (BE 11, p. vii), the texts of both anthems 'represent some of the favourite verses that commonly appear in the specially concocted psalms for several orders of service printed in response to the numerous natural or political disasters of the 1580s. This, however, is not entirely correct: although the words of HelpUOG can indeed be traced to no fewer than six occasional services (issued in 1563, 1565, 1566, 1572, 1588 and 1590), those of AriseOL are not to be found in any. See *Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer Set Forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. William Keatinge Clay (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1847), 483, 521, 529, 542, 610, 633.

47 On the possibility that Byrd also set Latin texts unreliably from memory see Owen Rees, 'The English Background to Byrd's Motets: Textual and Stylistic Models for Infelix ego' in *Byrd Studies*, ed. Alan Brown and Richard Turbet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1992), 24–50 (37–8).

Rather than being assigned, as one would expect, to chordal declamation or a point of their own, the words 'they that trouble me will be glad' are imposed on the continuation lines of the preceding point, which themselves quickly merge with the entries of the ensuing point (see bars 37–41). Given that this anthem seems to have been rather hastily put together, one suspects here that Byrd was in a hurry to join the two points, and that recourse to this text variant was simply a matter of expediency. In contrast, his apparent decision at the outset of AriseOL to borrow an alternative phrase from later in the same psalm (variant i) parallels his own reprising of the opening words of the motets 'Vigilate' (1589/16) and 'Exsurge quare obdormis Domine' (1591/19),[48] and may be a response to the restricted musical possibilities of Coverdale's blunt imperative 'Up Lord'. As we shall see, however, the text of this anthem may have another explanation.

No musical explanation suggests itself for Byrd's reference in HowLSME to 'enemies' (variants ii and iii). The singular 'enemy' is found in all the mainstream 16th-century English translations,[49] not to mention the Vulgate. Curiously the first of Byrd's plurals (variant ii) crops up again in the Catholic Douay-Rheims psalter,[50] which although not printed until 1610 presumably formed part of the whole English bible described as 'long since translated' in the preface to the Rheims New Testament printed in 1582.[51] But the theory proposed by Kerman—that pre-publication drafts for this recusant version of the psalter provided Byrd with texts for his 1611 song-book[52]—cannot have any bearing on HowLSME, which incorporates none of the really distinctive phraseology of the Catholic version ('... *be exalted* over me ... *regard* and hear me ... *illuminate* mine eyes', etc.).[53]

---

48 See Joseph Kerman, *The Masses and Motets of William Byrd* (London: Faber, 1981), 154.

49 Coverdale's Bible (1535; STC 2063), sig. Cc2r; Matthew's Bible (1537; STC 2066), sig. Cc3v; Great Bible (1539; STC 2068), sig. JJ3v; Geneva Bible (1560; STC 2093), f. 237r; Bishops' Bible (1568; STC 2099), p. v of the Book of Psalms.

50 *The Second Tome of the holie Bible faithfully translated into English* (Douai: Laurence Kellam; STC 2207), 32.

51 *The Nevv Testament of Iesus Christ, translated faithfully into English* (Rheims: John Fogny; STC 2884), sig. A2r.

52 Joseph Kerman, *The Elizabethan Madrigal: A Comparative Study* (New York: American Musicological Society, 1962), 110 n. 1.

53 *The Second Tome of the holie Bible*, 32.

The remaining three anthems from the present group are settings of prayers. The text of OLordMTS, based on Ps. 21, is arguably one of the most enigmatic ever set by Byrd, and its possible meanings will be explored in the following section. That of PreventUOL, in contrast, comes directly from the BCP, where it began life as the fourth of eight prayers in the 1549 communion service. Though rubricated as 'collects', only two ('Prevent us, O Lord' excluded) observe the usual collect form of address to Almighty God, relative predication, single petition, and closing Christological and Trinitarian formalities.[54] These prayers were directed 'to be said after the offertory when there is no communion; every such day one', and thanks to the reiteration of that rubric in 1552 and 1559 it is possible that Byrd's setting was meant to be sung in that purely liturgical position. Yet his choice had fallen on a versatile text, for both later editions of the BCP had additionally authorized the same eight prayers 'as often as occasion shall serve, after the collects, either of morning and evening prayer, communion, or litany, by the discretion of the minister'.

To judge by orders of service surviving from the seventeenth century, 'Prevent us, O Lord' was a familiar prayer at church consecrations and similar festivals both before and after the Commonwealth.[55] Byrd's setting is nowhere specified in connection with those events, yet there can be little doubt that, along with OLordMTS, it was among the five anthems sung by the Chapel Royal choir on Maundy Thursday, when the monarch personally washed the feet of the poor and distributed alms (see fig. 2:1).[56] Though these anthems were not itemized in the Chapel's so-called cheque book until after the Restoration, and their composers are not identified there, their text incipits suggest that the repertoire for this annual event was established by long tradition, and was entirely the work

---

54 John Mason Neale, *Essays on Liturgiology and Church History* (London: Saunders, Otley & Co., 1863), 50; Josef A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, transl. Francis A. Brunner, rev. ed. (London: Burns & Oats, 1959), 249–54.

55 Morehen, 'The English Anthem Text', 83.

56 The 'Order of the Maundy' was entered on f. 75v of the old cheque book by Thomas Blagrave, clerk of the cheque 1662–88; see *The Cheque Books of the Chapel Royal, with Additional Material from the Manuscripts of William Lovegrove and Marmaduke Alford*, ed. Andrew Ashbee and John Harley, 2 vols (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), vol. 1, pp. 34, 40, 165.

of Chapel Royal composers. If so, 'Hide not thou thy face' and 'Call to remembrance' must have been sung to the settings by Richard Farrant, while 'O praise the Lord, all ye heathen' may have been one of the two settings by Thomas Tomkins (respectively a5 and a12), or perhaps even the *contrafactum* of Tallis's motet 'O salutaris hostia'.[57]

OGodWOO is Byrd's only full anthem to draw its words directly or indirectly from a source other than the Psalter or the 1559 BCP. It resembles no other anthem text from the period, but rather anticipates the Laudian fashion for setting collects.[58] Though pointing somewhat in the right direction, the description given in BE 11—'a paraphrase of the first collect from the end of the litany' (p. 210)—is misleading, since the words Byrd set would be more accurately described as a rather clumsy translation of the fourth of the collects annexed to the litany of the saints in the Tridentine Breviary, 'Deus, qui culpa offenderis'. Importantly, the English version set by Byrd has yet to be traced to any of the vernacular liturgies or private prayer manuals printed with the sanction of Henry VIII, Edward VI or Elizabeth I.

> Deus, qui culpa offenderis, poenitentia placaris: preces populi tui supplicantis propitius respice: et flagella tuae iracundiae, quae pro peccatis nostris meremur propiciatus averte.
>
> O God, whom our offences have displeased, and with our repentance wilt be appeased, we humbly beseech thee with mercy to hear the prayers of thy people, and turn from us the scourges of thy wrath, which our sins have justly deserved.

This collect had not been unknown in pre-Reformation England, yet the English appear to have annexed it to the litany only sporadically. In some but not all early prints of the Sarum Book of Hours it was placed at the end of the suffrages following the litany of the

---

57 TCMO 60 (Farrant), EECM 37/2 and EECM 39/7 (Tomkins), *Lcm* MS 1051 (Tallis). The only other anthems listed in SECM with the incipits 'Hide not thou thy face', 'Prevent us, O Lord' and 'O Lord, make thy servant' are respectively by Adrian Batten, Thomas Wilson and William Cranford (see n. 77 below), none of whom was associated with the Chapel Royal. Farrant's 'Hide not thou thy face' was still being sung (along with anthems by the eighteenth-century composers James Nares and Samuel Arnold) at the Maundy Service of 1861: see Thomas North, 'Maundy Customs', *Transactions of the Leicestershire Architectural and Archaeological Society*, 2 (1860–64), 40–45 (42–3).

58 See Morehen, 'The English Anthem Text', 75–83.

saints (i.e. separately from the principal group of collects);[59] later, vernacular primers, and those with parallel English and Latin texts, altogether omitted it. Rather, in the Sarum, York and Hereford breviaries 'Deus, qui culpa' was appointed solely as the collect for the Thursday after Ash Wednesday, a function it additionally performs in the Tridentine rite to this day.[60]

But whence the English translation? It was not until the turn of the century, when a bilingual version of the Tridentine primer began to be issued by continental recusant presses, that the collect is known to have been printed in English. The paraphrase, possibly by Richard Verstegan, is placed in the usual position after the litany, and differs markedly from the one set by Byrd.

> O God which through sin art offended, and through penance pacified: mercifully respect the prayers of thy people making supplication to thee, and turn away the scourges of thy anger, which for our sins we deserve.[61]

Compared to the anthem text, the printed collect appears much more the work of a practised liturgist (albeit one careless enough to use 'thy' before a vowel). Its rendering of 'qui culpa offenderis, poenitentia placaris' in particular is more polished, avoiding the unintentional rhyme of 'displeased' and 'appeased', and the vague semantics of 'wilt be appeased'. Until an independent source of the version set by Byrd turns up in the mass of printed and MS Tudor devotional literature, the possibility cannot be ruled out that the composer consulted the original Latin, possibly in the copy of the Sarum breviary from which he drew the texts of such motets as 'Laetentur coeli' (1589/28+29)' and 'Afflicti pro peccatis' (1591/27+28),[62] and made the translation himself.

---

59 E.g. *Hore intemerate beatissime virginis Marie secundum vsum Saru[m]* (London: Richard Pynson, 1497; STC 15886), sig. K1v]; *Hore presentes ad vsum Sarum* (Paris: Philippe Pigouchet, 1502; STC 15897), sig. L7r.

60 *Breviarium ad usum insignis ecclesiae sarum*, ed. Francis Procter and Christopher Wordsworth, 3 vols (Cambridge: Almae Matris Academiae, 1879–86), vol. 1, col. dlx; *Breviarium ad usum insignis ecclesie eboracensis*, ed. Stephen Willoughby Lawley, 2 vols (Durham: Surtees Society, 1880–83), vol. 1, col. 267; *The Hereford Breviary*, ed. Walter H. Frere and Langton E. G. Brown, 3 vols (London: Henry Bradshaw Society, 1904–15), vol. 1, p. 255.

61 *The primer, or, Office of the Blessed Virgin Marie in Latin and English, according to the reformed Latin, and vvith lyke graces priuileged* (Antwerp: Arnold Conings, 1599; STC 16094), f. 187r.

62 *Breviarium ad usum insignis ecclesiae sarum*, vol. 1, cols xxix, ccccxiv.

OGodWOO is Byrd's only anthem with what might technically be defined as a Catholic text. Though it contained nothing that could have given offence to a Christian of any denomination, its exclusion from the BCP meant under the terms of the Act of Uniformity that the clergy at least were formally prohibited from using it.[63] Certain other anthem texts are suspect at most by association with works that have been identified as political elsewhere in Byrd's output. HowLSME draws on Ps. 13, one of the psalms (1588/3) from Byrd's first songbook that have been seen to give expression to the personal hardships of religious oppression;[64] while HelpUOG sets a single verse from Ps. 79, which also yielded four, more bloodthirsty verses for the 'gallows' motet 'Deus venerunt gentes' (1589/11+12+13+14).[65] AriseOL is a setting of the same two verses (Ps. 44:23–4) that Byrd used also for his highly charged motet 'Exsurge quare obdormis Domine'; the difference in length between the anthem (158 minims) and the motet (416 minims) surely says something about the relative importance Byrd placed on the two genres.

It was observed at one point by John Harley that these anthems in particular are concerned with oppression, contrition, and the coming of God in vengeance or mercy:[66] themes that contribute in Byrd's earlier publications to a grand metaphor for recusant persecution and the plight of English Catholicism.[67] Yet if Byrd meant these anthems to express disaffection, then he made sure they did so in penitential terms too generalized to be incriminating. For that reason, it seems, Harley subsequently dropped his charge:

> Although we have become used to searching for veiled meanings in the words Byrd set, it is likely that [HowLSME] is just as innocent as it would

---

63 See Joseph Robson Tanner, *Tudor Constitutional Documents, A.D. 1485–1603* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1922), 137–8.

64 See Jeremy L. Smith, 'William Byrd's Fall From Grace and his First Solo Publication of 1588: A Shostakovian "Response to Just Criticism"?', *Music and Politics*, 1 (2007), 1–29 (8–9), and preface to BE 13, p. vii.

65 Monson, 'Byrd, the Catholics, and the Motet: The Hearing Reopened' in *Hearing the Motet*, ed. Dolores Pesce (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 348–74 (354–62).

66 'Byrd's "Catholic" Anthems', *Annual Byrd Newsletter*, 8 (2002), 8–9.

67 See Kerman, *The Masses and Motets of William Byrd*, 40–43.

> have appeared to a congregation familiar with Ps. 13, read once a month at evening prayer.[68]

Yet the truth is not so much that these anthems can be found innocent as that they cannot be proved guilty. Though Byrd would ultimately declare his Catholic hand by publishing settings of the ordinary and propers of the Tridentine mass, the texts through which he first developed the recusant leitmotiv generally provided him with a safe cloak of ambiguity, even though, as Monson has shown, it was through the substance of those texts that English Catholics voiced their frustrations, comforted themselves, or even uttered their last breaths.[69] 'In isolation,' Joseph Kerman warned, 'a text such as "Ne irascaris" would be no sure indication of a strictly Catholic reference.'[70] If with that particular text Byrd intended a ploy, then it surely succeeded, for English translations of the motet are ubiquitous in the pre- and post-Restoration manuscripts of Anglican choral institutions, not excluding the Chapel Royal.

It may be significant that the texts of AriseOL, HelpUOG and OLordMTS do not appear to have been set by any composers other than Byrd.[71] Though anthems by Morley (EECM 38/1), Bryne, Ward, William Lawes and Christopher Gibbons would draw on Ps.13, none incorporated same three and a half verses (2ii–5) he had selected for HowLSME. PreventUOL too seems to have been regarded as a sacrosanct Byrdian text until the young Peterhouse organist Thomas Wilson composed a four-part setting in the late 1630s.[72] These points are perhaps worth making because the texts of the two dubious anthems SaveMOG and OutOTD were in contrast clearly regarded as common property. 'Save me, O God, for thy Name's sake' was set by Bucknam, Child, Rogers, Tye and West, and 'Out of the deep' by Amner, Hutchinson, Inglott, Morley, and Tomkins, as well as by both Giles and Batten

---

68 *The World of William Byrd*, 115.

69 'Byrd, the Catholics and the Motet', passim.

70 *The Masses and Motets of William Byrd*, 43.

71 This paragraph is based on information from SECM, where several domestic settings of 'Save me, O God' and 'Out of the deep' are listed in addition to the church settings mentioned here.

72 Ed. John Morehen (Glen Rock, NJ: J. Fischer, 1969).

thrice over. Both these texts draw on mainstream penitential psalms, to be sure, but it may say something about Byrd's choice of texts that those of his undisputed early full anthems are all unique or at least unusual.

2.3 Intimations of politics in 'O Lord, make thy servant'

The surprising fortune of 'Ne irascaris' shows that an arguably dissident text could be of little impact in the strangely non-committal context of nascent Anglicanism. To register his religious objections in that context, and yet to do so with impunity, Byrd needed to adopt a strategy altogether different from any that sufficed his songs and motets. If the theory to be advanced here is correct, he derived that new strategy from neither religion nor politics, but from contemporary jurisprudence, and deployed it in an anthem that was nothing less than a prayer for the welfare of Queen Elizabeth herself.

Like the majority of Byrd's full anthems, OLordMTS draws its words from the psalter, specifically the first four verses of Ps. 21.[73] Though Byrd seldom followed published translations to the letter when setting prose psalms, his psalm-anthems usually correspond closely to the Great Bible (as we have seen) or the Geneva Bible (as we shall see). The prayer for Elizabeth is a singular exception to that rule, however, being instead a calculated rewording from which the original meanings do not all emerge intact. Most obviously, the psalmist's nonspecific reference to 'the king' gives way to the actual name of the English monarch (see the first two columns of table 3:3).[74]

The rewording has yet to be traced to any source unconnected with Byrd's music, although two inflected versions of verses from the same psalm were printed in the 1580s (see the third and fourth columns of table 2:3). Both made their appearances in ardently

---

73 Not vv. 2 and 4 as stated in BE 11.

74 Robert Dow's part-books *Och* MSS Mus. 984–8 are the only surviving source to name Elizabeth; in the later pre-Restoration sources the words 'Elizabeth our queen' are replaced with 'thy servant James/ Charles our king', 'our sovereign lord King Charles' or 'King Charles our sovereign lord' (see BE 11, p. 211). Three copies exist in the hand of Henry Aldrich: two in which the incipit is changed to 'O Lord, make thy servants King William and Queen Mary' (in *Och* MSS Mus. 16 and 37), and one in which it is changed to 'O Lord, make thy servant our sovereign Lady Queen Anne' (later in MS Mus. 16).

protestant publications, the first an extraordinary manual of private prayer to be discussed below (pp. 87–8), the second an order of thanksgiving published following the arrest of the Catholic conspirators Anthony Babington and John Ballard.[75] The anthem text is clearly the most concise—not to say laconic—of the three versions, its author having added a much briefer introductory clause than that of the 1582 version, and having pruned three clauses of the nine that make up his four chosen verses. In Byrd's hands, this conspicuously pared-down text lends itself so readily to a neat polyphonic scheme (homophony—*fuga*—homophony—*fuga*—plagal Amen) that one suspects the author of an uncommonly sure appreciation of what was required. The possibility thus cannot be discounted that the rewording is Byrd's own;[76] at any rate, his claim to it seems to have been respected by every other composer of his own and subsequent generations.[77]

Modern critics have tended to shrug off Byrd's unusually explicit royal gesture (for an anthem) as the shameless flattery of an aspirant to royal patronage. Morehen speculated that the anthem was 'probably composed in the first flush of enthusiasm for the new reign',[78] while Harley has aired the suspicion that Byrd wrote it either with the object of 'fishing for an appointment to the Chapel Royal' or 'as a tribute to the queen once he had landed the post'.[79] But a composition of this kind was no ordinary means of paying

---

75 *An order of prayer and thankesgiuing, for the preseruation of her Maiestie and the realme, from the traiterous and bloodie practises of the Pope, and his adherents* (London: Christopher Barker, 1586; STC 16517), sig. B1r; see *Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer*, ed. Clay, 599.

76 See Kerman, *The Masses and Motets of William Byrd*, 36–7, 93–4, 153–4.

77 The one known exception is the verse anthem 'O Lord, make thy servant Charles' by William Cranford, but this work appropriates no more than the opening clause of Byrd's paraphrase, and a pencilled correction in one of the Peterhouse Caroline part-books reinstates Coverdale's wording 'The king shall rejoice' (*Cp* MS 33, f. 104r); the remaining text set by Cranford, moreover, adheres to the Great Bible versions of vv. 3 and 5 plus an adaptation of Ps. 132:18. Other composers who set the opening verses of Ps. 21 either conformed to the Great Bible (Amner, Child, Jewett, Malorie, Okeover and John Tomkins) or turned instead to Thomas Sternhold's metrical paraphrase, 'O Lord, how joyful is the king' (Weelkes, MB 23/22). Another related anthem, Weelkes's 'O Lord, grant the king a long life' (MB 23/13), appears to have been influenced by 'O Lord, make thy servant' in that it applies the same paraphrase technique to another 'royal' psalm (Ps.61:6–8, 'Thou shalt grant the king a long life', etc.). The only setting of 'The king shall rejoice' from the period to have been published in a modern edition is the one by John Tomkins, ed. Maurice Bevan (London: Cathedral Music, 1978).

78 'English Church Music' in *The Sixteenth Century*, ed. Roger Bray (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), 94–146 (112).

79 *William Byrd: Gentleman of the Chapel Royal*, 187.

homage to Elizabeth. On her accession, there had been no spate of 'royal' psalm settings by court musicians anxious to prove their loyalty to the new regime, nor are any such works known to have been volunteered by Robert Parsons, William Mundy, Bull, Morley or Giles, the other composers of significance to join the ranks of Elizabeth's chapel.[80] William Parsons's simple setting of the royal collect 'Almighty God, whose kingdom is everlasting' found its way into John Day's *The whole psalmes in foure partes* of 1563;[81] and two years later a metrical prayer for Edward VI, 'Let all the congregation';[82] was updated for the same publisher's *Mornyng and euenyng prayer and communion*, but that appears to have been all.

Byrd, moreover, was no ordinary aspirant to royal patronage, and the least consideration of his royal anthem turns the spotlight glaringly on the vexed question of his relations with protestant authority. Our story would be much simpler if proof existed that OLordMTS—which is generally assumed to be an early work[83]—dates from a time when Byrd may actually have embraced Protestantism.[84] Certainly most of his relatives did: his brother John became a churchwarden, his nephew Thomas a rector, his niece Hester a parson's wife, and his brother-in-law Robert Broughe a vestryman.[85] Nor was it unknown for members of protestant families to convert to Catholicism: prominent recusants who had done so included the martyrs Cuthbert Mayne, Ralph Sherwin and Thomas Alfield, as well

---

80 Not until the reign of James were 'royal' biblical texts widely set to music (see n. 77 above), the annual celebration of Accession Day being by then observed throughout the established church. Despite having each written more than one such piece (see le Huray, *Music and the Reformation in England*, 268, 306), neither John Holmes nor the malcontent Weelkes appears to have been rewarded for his pains with the coveted position of a Gentleman in Ordinary of the Chapel Royal. Together with other verse anthems and service music by him, Holmes's three anthems 'for the king' ('All laud and praise', 'O heavenly Father' and 'O God that art the wellspring') are found only in Batten's organ-book Ob MS Tenbury 791 (ff. 385v–391r). An inscription stating them to have been 'pricked from [the composer's] own pricking' (f. 400) lends credibility to the date 22 April 1603 given at the end of 'All laud and praise' and indicating completion within thirty days of James's accession. Both this anthem and 'O God that art the wellspring' have been reconstructed by Ian Payne (Leicester: EditioPrinceps Publications, 2011).

81 London; STC 2431.

82 RRMR 100/41.

83 Monson, 'Authenticity and Chronology', 287, 304; BE 11, pp. v–vi.

84 See Oliver Neighbour 'Music Manuscripts of George Iliffe from Stanford Hall, Leicestershire, Including a New Ascription to Byrd', *Music & Letters*, 88 (2007), 420–35 (432–4); Monson, 'Authenticity and Chronology', 287, 304.

85 Harley, *The World of William Byrd*, 82, 87, 124.

as the outspoken loyalist Sir Thomas Tresham. Byrd, however, was already moving in Catholic circles when he joined the Chapel Royal in 1572, and was very likely himself a committed Catholic by the time he married Julian Burley in 1568 (it was she who in 1577 would be the first of them to be listed as a recusant).[86] At any rate, it is possible to see OLordMTS as the ingenious solution to what must have been an intractable problem for the recusant Byrd: how to offer an ingenuous prayer for the queen without putting his Catholic conscience at risk.

For non-militant English recusants, allegiance to the Crown was axiomatic.[87] In the opinion of the apologist and martyr Robert Southwell 'a most exact submission' was no less due to Elizabeth than to any Catholic monarch, past or present.[88] Yet Catholics could fulfil the obligation of loyal duty only if they rigidly compartmentalized their consciences as regards temporal and spiritual matters, mentally quarantining the question of whether or not they concurred with all the Crown's policies. It was thus in pursuit of 'the calm and safe haven of indemnity of conscience' that Tresham petitioned Elizabeth in 1585.[89] Early in her reign, there had been few impediments to the passive stance Tresham now sought the freedom to take. But growing official persecution, provoked particularly by Pope Pius V's excommunication and illegitimization of Elizabeth in 1570, had compelled Catholics to be increasingly stubborn about their political neutrality. That very stubbornness in turn proved a vulnerability that the authorities could exploit. Notwithstanding their scrupulously apolitical conduct, scores of missionary priests met their deaths because they refused to declare which side they would take if the forces of the Counter-Reformation invaded England. There was nonetheless a passive answer even to the 'bloody question', as

---

86 Harley, *The World of William Byrd*, 121, 124–5.

87 This paragraph is based on the chapter 'Loyalist Sentiment Before 1595' from Arnold Pritchard, *Catholic Loyalism in Elizabethan England* (London: Scolar Press, 1979), 37–72.

88 *An humble supplication to her Maiestie* (publisher unidentified, 1595 [*recte* 1600]; STC 22949.5), 29, quoted in Pritchard, *Catholic Loyalism*, 69.

89 Pritchard, *Catholic Loyalism*, 56.

Southwell showed when he preemptively declared that he would rather die by the sword of an invader than take up arms against his compatriots.[90]

A further specific vulnerability the authorities could use against Catholics was prayer for the queen. To pay her loyal lip service was one thing; to pray for her was quite another, since what was petitioned on her behalf could all too easily unmask the political face of the intercessor. Immediately prior to their executions at Tyburn on 1 December 1580, England's first Jesuit martyrs were impelled to pray for Elizabeth. By wishing her 'a long quiet reign, with all prosperity', Edmund Campion evaded the trap. But the words of Sherwin, 'I now at this instant pray my Lord God to make her his servant,' were instantly taken to mean 'make her a Papist'.[91] There is something almost chilling in the resemblance between Sherwin's prayer and the text of Byrd's anthem, especially given that the last words of missionary priests are echoed in some of the *Cantiones sacrae*.[92] Yet there is also a crucial difference: by setting a royal prayer to music for use as an adjunct to public worship, Byrd must have taken counsel with his own political conscience, and reconciled himself to the predicate that Elizabeth really was the Lord's servant already. Seemingly, the martyr and the composer have taken opposite sides.

Byrd could, of course, have taken the soft option of setting the opening of Ps. 21 exactly as Miles Coverdale had translated it. The varied interpretations contemporary exegetes drew from this psalm in particular would have provided him with precisely the ambiguity he needed to avoid committing himself to a political statement. No less a commentator than Calvin, with surprising prescience of Southwell's brand of loyalism, declared Ps. 21 to be 'a public thanksgiving for the happy state of the king', in which 'the

---

90 *An humble supplication*, 67, quoted in Pritchard, *Catholic Loyalism*, 69.

91 [Thomas Alfield], *A true reporte of the death & martyrdome of M. Campion Iesuite and preiste, & M. Sherwin, & M. Bryan preistes, at Tiborne the first of December 1581* (publisher unidentified, [1582]; STC 4537), sigs C2v and C4v. This slim volume is additionally the earliest printed source of 'Why do I use my paper, ink and pen', the controversial stanzas Byrd later published in an expurgated musical setting (1588/33).

92 See n. 65 above.

Holy Ghost hath directed the minds of the faithful unto Christ, ... to the intent they should know, that they should not otherwise be saved, than under the head ordained by God'.[93] This was hardly an interpretation that militant Catholics were going to apply to a protestant monarchy, however, and the relevant gloss of the Douay-Rheims psalter informed English recusants that this psalm consisted of 'praise to God for Christ's exaltation after his passion, ... pertaining ... principally to Christ, [and only] partly to godly and victorious kings'.[94]

Though a setting of 'The king shall rejoice' would doubtless have pleased everybody, Byrd opted instead for a pointed rewording which, in mentioning the monarch by name, was quite incapable of a Messianic interpretation. On the contrary, the symbolic place of Christ, 'the King', was now literally taken by 'Elizabeth, our queen'. What is more, this shocking transposition is underscored by the anthem's closing words, 'for ever and ever. Amen', words that in the BCP, as in any other liturgy, are invariably appended to such phrases as 'who livest and reignest' or 'to whom be all honour and glory'. In the anthem, however, they are appended instead to a plea that the queen might enjoy a long life, as if to imply that the eternal praise normally invoked in a doxology is due no less to the monarch than to the Holy Trinity itself. Byrd, then, seems not only to have accepted Elizabeth's divine right to the English Crown, but also to have drawn dangerously close to worshipping her.

It is clear from the apologetics of the missionary priest Edward Rishton that an openly loyal Catholic could still consider English reverence for the temporal sovereign to border on idolatry. Rishton, who was convicted alongside Campion and Sherwin, was able to have his death sentence commuted to permanent exile when he acknowledged Elizabeth as his

---

93 *The Psalmes of Dauid and others. With M. Iohn Caluins commentaries*, transl. Arthur Golding, 2 vols (London: Thomas East and Henry Middleton, 1571; STC 4395), vol. 1, ff. 75[*recte* 74]v–75r. The title reflects Calvin's view, exceptional for his time, that the psalms were not all written by David.

94 *The Second Tome of the holie Bible*, 45.

rightful sovereign.[95] But that did not stop him from censuring an aspect of her queenship he clearly found troubling, if not downright offensive. 'The bells were spared', he wrote,

> that they might be rung whenever, in her progress, she passed by a church; but principally on her birthday and on the day of her coronation [*recte* accession], which days are kept with more solemnity throughout the kingdom than the festivals of Christ and of the saints. ... And to show the greater contempt for our Blessed Lady, they keep the birthday of queen Elizabeth in the most solemn way on the 7th day of September, which is the eve of the feast of the Mother of God, whose nativity they mark in their calendars in small and black letters, while that of Elizabeth is marked in letters both large and red. And, what is hardly credible, in the Church of St Paul, the chief church of London, ... the praises of Elizabeth are said to be sung at the end of the public prayers, as the Antiphon of Our Lady was sung in former days.[96]

It hardly needs pointing out that, if Rishton had wanted to instantiate the last of these grievances, then he could hardly have done so more forcibly than by singling out OLordMTS. That this sacrilegious new antiphon happened to be the work of a Catholic composer would have appalled him.

Rishton's objections to the new Anglican practice of honouring the monarch liturgically, and to the singing of royal anthems in particular, were founded on fact. To be sure, the seventeenth day of November had been a muted date early in Elizabeth's reign because it was not only her Accession day but also the anniversary of Mary's death, an event the new protestant administration was naturally reluctant to memorialize. But as Elizabeth's popularity grew, so the celebrations gathered pace. At first restricted to bell-ringing and revelry,[97] the annual rejoicing may be said to have been semi-officially added to the kalendar of the established church when, in 1576, an authorized form of proper thanksgiving was issued by the queen's printers. This was not a self-contained liturgy but

---

95 James Edward McGoldrick, 'Rishton, Edward (1550–1585)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, 2008), <www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23670>, accessed 25 March 2012.

96 Nicholas Sander, *Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism ... Published A.D. 1585 with a Continuation of the History by the Rev. Edward Rishton ...*, ed. and transl. by David Lewis (London: Burns & Oates, 1877), 284–5.

97 On the initial secular character of the festival see Roy C. Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977), 117–21.

an assemblage of psalms, readings, responses and collects for use at morning prayer, together with Epistle and Gospel readings for the communion office. Ps. 21 figured twice, being appointed as one of the psalms for morning prayer (the others being Pss. 85 and 124) and also to be sung 'in metre before the sermon, unto the end of the vii verse' (Ps. 100 was similarly appointed to follow the sermon).[98] In 1604, James put out similar prayers to mark the anniversary on 24 March 'of his highness's entry to this kingdom';[99] various liturgies were subsequently annexed to the BCP to commemorate James's deliverance from the gunpowder plot, the martyrdom of Charles I, and the accession of the present sovereign.

Records and reports of royal liturgies and the queen's attendance at church, furthermore, contain unusually frequent references (for the period) to the singing of 'anthems'. Certain later prints of Elizabeth's Accession Day prayers are appended with three specially written metrical texts, including an 'anthem or prayer for the preservation of the church, the queen's majesty, and the realm' (see pp. 179–80 below). An account published by the theologian Thomas Holland, who on Accession Day 1599 preached in Elizabeth's honour at St Paul's, leaves no doubt that on 17 November anthem singing was customary. Holland furthermore endorsed the very musical practice Rishton had condemned:

> After the sermon solemn prayers are made by the minister, as set forth by public authority employing matter of this quality. Lastly if there be psalms sung, or sacred antiphons, either by the whole multitude, or by the quire (as it is used in Her Majesty's chapel, or in cathedral churches), they are composed according to this form of prayer in the word going next before specified [i.e. solemn].[100]

The official Accession Day thanksgiving prayers appear tactfully restrained, however, in comparison to other forms of adulation that were heaped upon Elizabeth as her reign wore

---

98 *A fourme of Prayer, with thankes geuyng, to be vsed euery yeere, the 17. of Nouember, beyng the day of the Queenes Maiesties entrie to her raigne* (London: Richard Jugge, 1576; STC 16479), reprinted in *Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer*, ed. Clay, 548–58; see also Clay's comments on pp. 463–4.

99 *A fourme of prayer with thankesgiuing* ... (London: Robert Barker, 1604; STC 16483).

100 *Paneguris D. Elizabethae, Dei gratiâ Angliae, Franciae, & Hiberniae Reginae* (London: Joseph Barnes, 1601; STC 13597), sigs J2v–J3r.

on. Poets wove around her persona an intricate web of metaphysical imagery, repeatedly equating her with the virgin goddesses Astraea and Diana, as well as with Ceres, the goddess of plenty.[101] Such symbols were neither exclusively Pagan nor exclusively poetic. One anonymous prayer for Elizabeth 'on her birthday' predicated her as 'the anointed of the Lord, by whose breath we breathe, and by whose life we live'.[102] When Spenser, in the proem to Book V of *The Faerie Queene*, apostrophized the 'Dread sovereign goddess, that dost highest sit / In seat of judgement, in th'Almighty's stead', he was elaborating on a Christian semideification of Elizabeth that was also being propounded by the most prominent Anglican apologists. John Jewel addressed her as 'the only nurse and mother of the church of God in these your majesty's dominions', praying that she might 'safely walk in the ways of [her] father David'.[103] On quoting the Israelites' battle-cry 'the sword of the Lord and of Gideon' (Judges 7:20), Richard Hooker declared that 'it might [no less] deservedly be at this day ... the true inscription, style or title of all churches as yet standing within this realm, *by the goodness of Almighty God and his servant Elizabeth we are*'.[104]

Worse still, from a Catholic point of view, were the not infrequent indications that in certain English hearts the Virgin Queen had taken the very place once occupied by the Virgin Mary.[105] This could nowhere have been more painfully apparent than in Thomas Bentley's *Monument of matrones*, a veritable encyclopedia of devotions addressed

---

101 From the vast literature on this subject must by cited Frances A. Yates's seminal article 'Queen Elizabeth I as Astraea', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 10 (1947), 27–82; see also Jeremy L. Smith, 'Music and Late Elizabethan Politics: The Identities of Oriana and Diana', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 58 (2005), 507–58, and Carol V. Kaske, 'Spenser's Equations of His Queen with Christ: Royal Supremacy and Royal Psalms' in *Psalms in the Early Modern World*, ed. Linda Austern, Kari Boyd McBride and David Orvis (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 191–215.

102 *Lbl* MS Lansdowne 116, art. 24, transcribed in Clay, *Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer*, 556–7. In the opinion of Kaske ('Spenser's Equations of His Queen with Christ', 192), these attributes come dangerously close to the Apostle Paul's dictum 'For in him we live, and move, and have our being'. This prayer was not 'an optional appendage to the Accession Day service', as Kaske asserts (p. 191), although other material from the same MS reproduced by Clay (p. 516) is related to occasional liturgies issued during Elizabeth's reign and bears editorial markings in the hand of William Cecil.

103 *A defence of the Apologie of the Churche of Englande* (London: Henry Wykes, 1567), STC 14600.5, sig. A4v.

104 *Of the lavves of ecclesiasticall politie. The fift booke* (London: John Windet, 1597), STC 13712.5, sig. A6v.

105 For illustrations see Yates, 'Queen Elizabeth I as Astraea', 74–5.

primarily to female readers and divided into seven treatises grandiosely termed 'Lamps of Virginity'.[106] Well over a hundred of its 1,600 pages are given over to effusive—not to say mawkish—outpourings of prayer for Elizabeth, much of it written in the first person and attributing to the queen herself sentiments that, to her marginalized Catholic and puritan subjects, could only have appeared well-nigh blasphemous. One such passage, a prayer 'to be said ... especially upon the 17. day of November', attributes her with the nauseating petition

> that here on earth ... I may be found faithful, and not fail finally in heaven; but in the pureness of my virginity, and holiness of mine innocency, be presented to the Lamb my sovereign Lord and only God, my heavenly Bridegroom and spiritual spouse, my everlasting King dear Christ, and only sweet Saviour Jesus, there to see the Saints, and to be a Saint, and with all the holy Patriarchs, Judges, Kings, and Queens, yea with all the Archangels, Angels, Saints, Martyrs, Confessors, Virgins, and the whole company of thy celestial and blessed spirits, to reign with him over spiritual powers and principalities for ever, and sing the sugared songs of my wedding-day to my perpetual joy, and thine eternal praise...[107]

Significantly for Byrd's anthem text, a lengthy section of the 'Fourth Lamp' devoted to Accession Day prayers includes a paraphrase of Ps. 21 (see the third column of table 2:3). These adapted verses form part of a 1,600-word 'daily prayer ... for the perpetual happiness of our sacred and most gracious sovereign, and Queen Elizabeth', in which six psalms are reworked along similar lines to the words of OLordMTS.[108] Though Byrd's anthem probably predates the publication of the *Monument of matrones* in 1582, much of the material gathered by Bentley was already in circulation, some of it in print (see p. 97 below). It is therefore not impossible that Byrd, in setting a reworded royal psalm, knew that its matter emblematized a burgeoning sub-culture of fervently anti-Catholic queen-worship.

---

106 3 vols, London: Henry Denham and Thomas Dawson, 1582; STC 1892–4. The first four 'Lamps' are contained in vol. 1, the fifth in vol. 2, and the sixth and seventh in vol. 3. On this remarkable publication see Patrick Collinson, 'Windows in a Woman's Soul: Questions about the Religion of Queen Elizabeth I' in Collinson, *Elizabethans* (London: Hambledon & London, 2003), 87–118 (104–8).

107 Vol. 1, p. 272; this notable passage is quoted in Collinson, 'Windows in a Woman's Soul', 108.

108 Vol. 1, p. 714–19. This prayer paraphrases Pss. 20:3–9; 144:10–11; 21; 119:124–5,129–31; 61; 72:1–9,15,18–19.

Those who sought to sacralize the queen's role—and by extension her persona—could draw the necessary justification for doing so from an underlying concept of monarchy that was firmly enshrined in Elizabethan constitutional law: the celebrated doctrine of the king's two bodies. It may be no accident that Bentley, whose title page describes him as a student of Gray's Inn, addressed his psalm-prayer on behalf of 'our sacred and most gracious sovereign, *and* Queen Elizabeth':[109] for as a practising lawyer he is likely to have studied the momentous cases that, during the 1550s and 1560s, had emphatically defined the monarch's 'body natural' and 'body politic' as discrete legal entities. This curious doctrine was first explored in modern times in a seminal study by Ernst Kantorowicz,[110] who as well as illustrating some of its reverberations in Tudor and Stuart culture also traced its origins in medieval canon law. But a further influence acting on the doctrine was the Athanasian precept, reaffirmed in the Book of Common Prayer, that Christ was both 'perfect god and perfect man, ... one altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person'. As Kantorowicz explained,

> we need only replace the strange image of the Two Bodies by the more customary theological term of the Two Natures in order to make it poignantly felt that the speech of the Elizabethan lawyers derived its tenor ... from theological diction, and that their speech itself ... was crypto-theological.[111]

Theoretically, conforming protestants could reverence the body politic, Elizabetha Regina, as a minor deity without morally implicating her 'body natural', Elizabeth Tudor: as Patrick Collinson has observed, 'the principle of the queen's two bodies preserved the Elizabethan panegyrist from blatant blasphemy'.[112] Yet the two-bodies principle could also

---

109 Vol. 1, p. 714 (emphasis added).

110 *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957).

111 *The King's Two Bodies*, 16.

112 'Windows in a Woman's Soul', 93.

work to the advantage of a royal critic. If the circumstances were orchestrated with sufficient cunning, symbols or metaphors representing the queen could be upbraided, and there was little the queen herself could do about it.

'All this is against me', she declared to the Spanish ambassador when, at Whitehall in 1565, the members of Gray's Inn entertained her with a debate between Juno and Dianna on marriage and chastity, the two subjects about which Elizabeth's continuing indecision infuriated her counsellors. A marriage masque staged the following year by the men of Lincoln's Inn again chided the queen's celibacy to her face: in an audacious variation on the judgement of Paris myth, the golden apple, with the approval of the goddess Diana herself, was awarded to the bride. As Marie Axton has shown, it was through such court entertainments as these that the first generation of Elizabethan lawyers laid the foundations for dozens of later dramas in which the theory of monarchy was tortuously acted out before public audiences.[113] Shakespeare's manipulation of the two-bodies theory in particular was first identified by Kantorowicz in *Richard II*,[114] and was further traced by Axton to *3 Henry VI*, *King John*, *Henry V* and *King Lear*.[115] Nor, if the veracity of her oft-quoted remark to her archivist William Lambarde is to be accepted, was Elizabeth slow to identify with these eponymous royal protagonists: 'I am Richard the Second. Know ye not that?'[116]

The queen was all too familiar with the legal frustrations of possessing two bodies, having famously clashed with her own body politic as early as 1561. The clash arose from a lease of lands in the Duchy of Lancaster that had been granted by Edward VI but had not yet come to term, and which Elizabeth now wished to confer on a new holder. Her only course of action was to challenge the validity of her half-brother's lease on the grounds

---

113 *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977), 1, 49.

114 *The King's Two Bodies*, 24–41.

115 *The Queen's Two Bodies*, 28–9, 107–115, 131–43.

116 John Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, 2nd edn, 3 vols (London: John Nichols & Son, 1823), vol. 3, p. 552, quoted in Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, 41, and Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies*, 2.

that, under common law, his minority or 'nonage' had precluded him from signing contracts. Her jurists, however, held that Edward could not have signed the lease 'without doing it as King', and that

> by the common Law no Act which the King does as King shall be defeated by his nonage. For the King has in him two Bodies, *viz.* a Body natural, and a Body politic ... [the latter being] utterly devoid of Infancy, and old Age, and other natural Defects and Imbecilities which the Body natural is subject to, and for this Cause, what the King does in his Body politic cannot be invalidated by any Disability in his natural Body.[117]

Edward's lease was therefore binding, and although in each law term of the following year Elizabeth ordered the case to be heard again, her jurists each time returned the same opinion.[118]

Only at the safe distance of more than four centuries have historians been bold enough to read Catholic connotations into the impregnable legalese of the Lancaster case.[119] But the ruling was unquestionably recusant by association. Under Elizabeth, the legal profession was notorious for its trenchant Catholicism, and in the early years of her reign its members were exempt from taking the oath of supremacy. Though from 1563 lawyers were required to take the oath, the Inns of Court were slow to conform, and by the late 1570s there was still concern among the privy council that the Inns were 'greatly infected with Popery'.[120] Many of the thirteen jurists who pronounced on the Lancaster case had been promoted under Mary, and although Elizabeth had little option but to retain their services in some shape or form (she even conferred knighthoods on two of them), some had to a greater or lesser extent sacrificed professional advancement on religious grounds.

---

117 Edmund Plowden, *The Commentaries or Reports of Edmund Plowden ... Originally Written in French, and Now Faithfully Translated into English ...* (London: Catharine Lintot & Samuel Richardson, 1761), 213.

118 For discussion of the 'two bodies' doctrine as formulated by Plowden in connection with the Lancaster case (*Reports*, 212–23), see Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, 7–11, 405–6; Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies*, 12–17; Geoffrey de C. Parmiter, *Edmund Plowden: An Elizabethan Recusant Lawyer* (London: Catholic Record Society, 1987), 76–7; and Albert Rolls, *The Theory of the King's Two Bodies in the Age of Shakespeare* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2000), 54–65.

119 Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies*, 16; Rolls, *The Theory of the King's Two Bodies*, 63.

120 Geoffrey de C. Parmiter, 'Elizabethan Popish Recusancy in the Inns of Court', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Studies*, special supplement no. 11 (1976), esp. 2–4, 8–9, 20–24; Parmiter, *Edmund Plowden*, 104–110.

These included the Catholics Sir Edward Saunders and (later Sir) Anthony Browne, both chief justices under Mary whom Elizabeth had quickly demoted, along with William Rastell, who was a nephew of Sir Thomas More and would soon exile himself to Louvain. Also among the jurists were the putative conformists Thomas Carus, who died a Catholic, and (later Sir) Gilbert Gerard, of whom it would one day be said that he was 'a protestant at London and a papist in Lancashire'.[121]

The most disenfranchised of the jurists was the openly Catholic barrister Edmund Plowden, 'the greatest and most honest lawyer of his age',[122] whose call from Mary to the rank of serjeant-at-law had been conveniently shelved by Elizabeth.[123] Thus precluded from a bencher's place, Plowden instead exerted a lasting influence through his widely read law reports published in 1571, among which are his accounts of the Lancaster case and of two other rulings founded on the two-bodies doctrine.[124] Moreover, it was on the basis of the doctrine that Plowden, in a daring MS treatise he completed early in 1567, asserted the right to the English throne of Mary Stewart, the Catholic Queen of Scots. The rival claim of Katherine Grey—for which the polemicist John Hales had earned himself a few months' sojourn in the Tower—had depended on the foreign-born Mary's supposed incapacity to inherit land under English common law, and on the terms of Henry VIII's will, whereby parliament had permitted the king to place the descendants of his younger sister nearer in line to the throne than those of his older sister. Plowden, however, argued that on assumption of the body politic any deficiency in the successor's body natural—such as having been born on Scottish rather than English soil—was immediately effaced.

---

121 J. H. Baker, 'Saunders, Sir Edward (1506–1576)', 'Browne, Sir Anthony (1509/10–1567)', 'Rastell, William (1508–1565)' and 'Carus, Thomas (*c.*1510–1571)', Christopher W. Brooks, 'Gerard, Sir Gilbert (d. 1593)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, 2008), <www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24692>, .../3666>, .../23151>, .../4825>, .../10552>, accessed 23 March 2014.

122 Charles Henry Cooper and Thompson Cooper, *Athenae cantabrigienses*, 2 vols (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Macmillan, 1858, 1861), vol. 1, p. 502.

123 Parmiter, *Edmund Plowden*, 53–4.

124 Hill v. Grange (1556) and Willion v. Berkley (1561): see Plowden, *Reports*, 164–79, 223–52; Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, 11–14, 407.

The validity of the will, furthermore, was contested, since Henry had apparently failed to comply with parliament's requirement that it was to be signed with his own hand. In any case, Parliament had acted illegally: neither the Crown nor its possessions could be bequeathed by will because the body politic never died but was rather transferred or 'demised' from one king's body natural to that of his successor.[125]

Of itself, Plowden's argument was a purely legal construct theoretically aloof from religious partisanship. The Duchy of Lancaster case had, after all, simply endorsed the wishes of one protestant monarch over those of another. But it had been Henry's intention to transfer the succession from the Stewart to the Suffolk line—in other words, from his Catholic to his Protestant relatives. And by upholding the doctrine of the two bodies, the Catholic Plowden had shown how the succession could be transferred back again. Within months of the completion of his treatise, Mary was be forced to abdicate in favour of her infant son James, who was both crowned and raised as a protestant (albeit one to whom recusants would turn for sympathy). Yet, apparently under Plowden's influence, Catholics continued to champion Mary's title to the English throne. A refutation of the Suffolk claim penned by Sir Anthony Browne formed the basis of a succession treatise by her ambassador John Leslie, the Catholic Bishop of Ross.[126] In addition, Plowden's character has been perceived in one of the interlocutors in the notorious Catholic tract later known as 'Leicester's Commonwealth', whose anonymous authors asserted both Mary's claim and the tenet that patriotism and religion were entirely separate issues.[127] Naturally, Plowden never let slip any confirmation that he had, as Albert Rolls has suggested, 'presented the

---

125 Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies*, 18–19, 23–8, 31–3; Parmiter, Edmund Plowden, 75–7, 84–95.

126 Browne, 'The Argument and Answere of Sir Anthony Browne knyght unto the Matters of Sir Nicholas Bacon knyght', *Lbl* MS Lansdowne 254; Leslie, *A defence of the honour of the right highe, mightye and noble Princesse Marie Quene of Scotlande and dowager of France with a declaration aswell of her right, title & intereste to the succession of the crowne of Englande*, 1st edn (London: Eusebius Dicaeophile [actually Rheims: J. Foigny], 1569; STC 15505), later edns (1571 and 1584; STC 15506–7). See Marie Axton, 'The Influence of Edmund Plowden's Succession Treatise', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 37 (1974), 209–26, and Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies*, 19–20.

127 Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies*, 21; Dwight C. Peck, 'Government Suppression of Elizabethan Catholic Books: The Case of "Leicester's Commonwealth"', *The Library Quarterly*, 47 (1977), 163–77 (168).

body politic as an unchanging entity to reaffirm the validity of English Catholicism'.[128] Yet his adaptation of the two-bodies doctrine quickly became the basis of a Catholic cause.

Against the backdrop of the burning Elizabethan question of the royal succession, the unknown individual who turned the first four verses of Ps. 21 into the concise text of OLordMTS can be seen to have stressed, in a few short words, and with the utmost political delicacy, the keystone of Plowden's argument for Mary's claim to the English throne—the perpetuity of the body politic. He began by diplomatically identifying Elizabeth by name, lest anyone should accuse him of having offered a prayer on behalf of the troublesome Queen of Scots. He then seems to have gone out of his way to stress the eternity of the Crown, freely adapting the psalmist's 'blessings of goodness' to an 'everlasting blessing'. And while he pruned three clauses that did not suit his purpose, he retained the reference to 'a long life, even for ever and ever', notwithstanding that this was an absurd request to make on behalf of the mortal woman Elizabeth Tudor. But to anyone engaged with the fine points of the succession debate, and with Plowden's contention particularly, it would have been clear that the anthem's ultimate request could apply solely to the body politic of which Elizabeth then happened to be the possessor. '*King*,' Plowden had reported, 'is a Name of Continuance, which shall always endure as the Head and Governor of the People, ... and in this Name the King never dies.'[129]

It is true that the paraphrase could simply have been handed to Byrd, and that he set it in honest ignorance of any abstruse political undertones. But casual text-setting is the last thing we would expect from Byrd, and in consequence of his non-musical preoccupations he was more likely than most musicians to have been cognizant of Plowden's arguments. There is abundant evidence that composer and barrister both moved in the same recusant circles. The lawyer William Roper, from whose son Byrd purchased the manor of Harlington, was one of Plowden's predecessors as deputy chief steward of the Duchy of

128 *The Theory of the King's Two Bodies*, 63.
129 *Reports*, 177.

Lancaster.[130] Plowden, moreover, was connected with two of Byrd's most prominent patrons: he represented Thomas Paget in a lawsuit of 1572, and later oversaw the will of John Petre's mother.[131] Petre himself had briefly studied law in the Middle Temple at the time Plowden was treasurer of that inn.[132] The tapestry merchant Ralph Sheldon, furthermore, who mentioned Byrd familiarly in letters to Paget of 1581 and 1582, was none other than Plowden's brother-in-law.[133] And though it cannot be proved that Byrd read Plowden's published reports, he is now known subsequently to have possessed at least one legal textbook in which the Duchy of Lancaster case was briefly summarized.[134] Byrd also seems to have written into the music of OLordMTS what is quite possibly a blatant musical metaphor for the everlasting body politic. To be sure, the exceptionally drawn-out plagal 'Amen' that concludes the anthem could be nothing more than a naive symbol for the theme of eternity pointed up by the preceding text. But of the more than thirty times Byrd set the phrase '...saeculorum. Amen' in Latin or English, only here did he chose to illustrate it with an imperfect large, the sole example anywhere in his music of a single note of precisely sixteen minims' duration (ex. 3:1).[135]

---

130 Harley, *The World of William Byrd*, 122, 202–3; Parmiter, *Edmund Plowden*, p. 50 n. 31.

131 Parmiter, *Edmund Plowden*, 123, 145.

132 Arthur C. Edwards, *John Petre: Essays on the Life and Background of John, 1st Lord Petre, 1549–1613* (London: Regency Press, 1975), 16.

133 Harley, *William Byrd: Gentleman of the Chapel Royal*, 62; Parmiter, *Edmund Plowden*, 51–2, 108. On Byrd's association with Paget, Petre and Sheldon see Harley, *The World of William Byrd*, 170–71, 193–201, 205–7 (a connection with Plowden is not mentioned).

134 Richard Crompton, *L'authoritie et iurisdiction des courts de la Maiestie de la Roygne: nouelment collect & compose* (London: Charles Yetsweirt, 1594; STC 6050), f. 134v: '... a son natural corps son corps politique est annex & conioine, le corps natural est merge, & pur ceo son graunt south le graund seale est bon.' See Kerry McCarthy and John Harley, 'More Books from the Library of William Byrd', *The Musical Times*, 153/1 (Spring, 2012), 53–60 (53–5).

135 Voices bearing the *cantus firmus* in some of Byrd's motets and instrumental pieces might be said to terminate on notes equivalent to sixteen or even more minims (see BE 1/17, BE 2/11, BE 3/14, BE 8/9 (*prima pars*), BE 9/27, BE 17/22, BE 17/24; a further example occurs in the instrumental version of the song 'Why do I use?', BE 16/26). These are all, however, terminal notes of indefinite duration, and in Byrd's prints are notated simply as imperfect longs with or without fermatas. The imperfect large of 'O Lord, make thy servant' must, in contrast, be notated as such because it is not a terminal note. The term 'large' is Morley's: see *A plaine and easie introduction to practicall musicke* (London: Peter Short, 1597; STC 18133), 9. On the royal symbolism of a dotted long in Morley's madrigal 'Hard by a crystal fountain' see Smith, 'Music and Late Elizabethan Politics', 540–41.

While there can be no way of knowing if Byrd wrote the anthem for a particular occasion, it became as we have seen (pp. 74–5) one of five anthems sung by the Chapel Royal choir on Maundy Thursday.[136] Anyone who ever had reason to reflect on the two-bodies doctrine was as likely to do so on this annual occasion as on any other, for in reenacting the *pedilavium*, the monarch assumed the role of Christ, the god-man whose Two Natures were the archetypes of the bodies natural and politic. The scene was described by Lambarde in 1573 (coincidentally during Byrd's first Holy Week as a Gentleman of the Chapel Royal):

> after some singing and prayers made, and the gospel of Christ's washing his disciples' feet read, thirty nine ladies and gentlewomen, for so many were the poor folks (according to the number of the years complete of her majesty's age), addressed themselves with aprons and towels to wait upon her majesty; and she kneeling down upon the cushions and carpets under the feet of the poor women, first washed one foot of every of them in so many several basins of warm water and sweet flowers, brought to her severally by the said ladies and gentlewomen, then wiped, crossed, and kissed them, as the almoner and others had done before.[137]

If Byrd composed OLordMTS for this ceremony, and if it represents a political statement on his part, then its words may be understood not only as a prayer for the queen's body politic, but also as a stern admonition to her body natural. To stress in music the humility of the Maundy role was not new: when Mary had washed her subjects' feet, her choir had persistently reminded her that she too was a sinner, repeating the antiphon 'In diebus illis mulier quae erat in civitate peccatrix' after every verse of the Miserere.[138] Now, Elizabeth assumed the role of Christ in the ceremony of the footwashing (see illus. 3:1), just as she can be seen to have taken his place in the words of Byrd's anthem. But as the rephrased verses of Ps. 21 unfolded, it may have served to remind her that at that moment, far from

---

136 See fig. 2:1 and n. 56 above.

137 'The Order of the Maundy made at Greenwich, March 19, 1572', *Archaeologia*, 1 (1770), 7–9 (8); the year is specified old style, the date of Maundy Thursday is correct for that year; the account is quoted in Brian Robinson, *Silver Pennies and Linen Towels: The Story of The Royal Maundy* (London: Spink & Son, 1992), 32–3.

138 After Luke 7:37; this liturgical detail was reported by Marco Antonio Faitta to Ippolito Chizzola, 3 May 1556, *Calendar of State Papers ... Venice*, ed. Rawdon Brown, vol. 6, part 1 (London: Longman, 1877), 435; see also Robinson, *Silver Pennies and Linen Towels*, 30.

rejoicing in his strength, she was abased in his humility, that her jurists had not given her her heart's desire, that they had indeed denied the request of her lips, and that on account of the everlasting blessing of a body politic her intentions had, in the obstructive sense of the word, been prevented.

It is well known that in the language of the prayer-book 'to prevent' means 'to go before' or even, as well-intentioned footnotes to editions of Byrd's anthems would have it, 'predispose to repentance and faith'.[139] Yet sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English translations of the psalter show that in Elizabethan usage this verb was by no means unambiguous:

> They prevented me in the day of my trouble: but the Lord was my defence. (Ps. 18:18, Great Bible, 1539)
>
> Arise God, prevent his coming, make him to bow... (Ps. 12:12, Bishops' Bible, 1568)
>
> The sorrows of hell compassed me about: the snares of death prevented me. (Ps. 18:5, King James Bible, 1611)

Given that this word clearly had two meanings for the Elizabethans, its prominence in both the anthems by Byrd that were sung on Maundy Thursdays is not a little suspicious. To be sure, in composing PreventUOL Byrd faithfully set a BCP text whose first word was clearly intended to mean 'go before'. Yet while this (probably later) anthem could have appeared to confirm that 'prevent' had the same meaning in OLordMTS, it served equally to draw attention to the other anthem's loaded ambiguity. Nor could anyone reflecting on the queen's barren state have heard PreventUOL in complete innocence if they knew that a slightly garbled version of its text also appeared in Bentley's *Monument of matrones* with the rubric 'in doing her office, let the midwife pray thus with herself'.[140]

In setting a deliberately nuanced variation of Ps. 21, Byrd risked the appearance of committing the kind of zealously loyalist act that was anathema to other Catholics. Yet that

---

139 See BE 11a, pp. 54, 69.

140 Vol. 2, *The fift lampe of virginitie*, 137.

risk enabled him to assert, during the queen's own religious ceremonies, a legal doctrine that in theory touched neither religion nor politics, but in practice underpinned the rationale for a Catholic succession. By pointedly addressing his prayer on behalf of the eternal body politic, he could without danger remind Elizabeth of the legal principle, affirmed by the Lancaster ruling, 'that a monarch who places his personal will above his political will exceeds the bounds of his authority and becomes a tyrant.'[141]

In the last analysis, English Catholics who strove to separate their temporal and spiritual allegiances had to grapple with nothing other than Christ's *mandatum* to 'give unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God those things that are God's'.[142] In the context of Matthew's Gospel narrative, the name Caesar stood for the body politic of all Roman emperors: as one shrewd Medieval commentator pointed out, Christ had commanded no one to render 'unto Tiberius the things that are Tiberius".[143] To be sure, OLordMTS originally mentioned Elizabeth by name. But like any piece of Crown property, the anthem demised to her successors, whose names have been fitted with more or less artifice to its adaptable opening chords.[144] In 1952, the original wording was reverted to for the first time, but by no means necessarily the last. By praying in music for the body politic of his own sovereign, Byrd could render unto the Queen what was the Queen's whilst registering for all time his hope that the throne of England would one day again be occupied by a Catholic prince.

2.4 Musical style

2.4.1 Scoring

Whereas Byrd seems to have first composed his preces and psalms in four parts, and to have at least embarked on the Short Service as a four-voice composition, he appears to

141 Rolls, *The Theory of the King's Two Bodies*, 61.
142 Matthew 22:21 (Great Bible).
143 Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, 53–4.
144 See n. 74 above.

have determined that his anthems should be for no fewer than five voices, the fifth voice being a Ct in the usual manner for church polyphony.[145] HelpUOG and OLordMTS both incorporate momentary T gymels, a sure sign (if any were needed) that they are church compositions, but a potential hazard for copyists. Since OLordMTS begins in five parts, and its T part does not split into two until the first point (bar 10), an unwary copyist who did not look beyond the beginning of his Tc and Td exemplars could all too easily assume them to be identical. Hence Robert Dow omitted what was usually the Tc part (T2 in BE) from *Och* MSS Mus. 984–8, though with only minimal damage to the counterpoint (a momentary 6/4 chord on the third minim of bar 39). Hence too the principal scribe of Barnard's part-books omitted the Td part (T1 in BE), instead copying the Tc part into the Td volume. This omission had dire contrapuntal ramifications (parallel 6/4 chords in bar 10, unsupported 4ths in bars 30 and 31, and frequent bare perfect consonances), yet Barnard still printed OLordMTS without its crucial Td part, in the section of the *First Book* devoted to anthems for five voices. The resulting, barely performable version continued to be disseminated by post-Restoration copyists, among whom Henry Purcell and Thomas Tudway filled in the gaps as best they could.[146] The gymels of HelpUOG suffered a similar fate; this anthem lacks its T1 part in William Isaack's scorebook *Cfm* MS 117 (ff. 46r–47r).

HowLSME contains what may be the only instance in Byrd's anthems of a B gymel, and which was presented as such in TCM 2 (p. 246). Certainly the two different readings of the B part at bars 46–7 are simultaneously viable, and in combination would help to

---

145 It has been suggested by John Morehen that PreventUOL may be a five-voice adaptation of a four-voice original: see 'English Church Music', 101 n. 31, and 'The "Burden of Proof": The Editor as Detective' in *English Choral Practice*, ed. Morehen (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995), 200–220 (206). As copied by Tudway without its Ct2 part (Lbl MS Harley 7337), this anthem remains surprisingly complete sounding until the 'Amen', where the penultimate chord lacks a 3rd. Yet the gainful use of all five voices in the points argues strongly against their having been conceived for only four. And as we have seem (p. 36 n. 98), Byrd's services and anthems seem to have been particularly vulnerable to the omission of voice parts.

146 See Robert Shay, 'Purcell as Collector of "Ancient" Music: Fitzwilliam MS 88' in *Purcell Studies*, ed. Curtis Price (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 35–50 (45–6); Robert Thompson, 'Purcell's Great Autographs' in *Purcell Studies*, 6–34 (18 n. 42); Bamford, 'John Barnard's *First Book of Selected Church Musick*:', vol. 2, p. 345.

smooth over what is an uncharacteristically loose joint between two adjoining points.[147] The presence of either one reading or the other in most sources, furthermore, could be for the same reason that OLordMTS circulated so widely without one of its T parts. At the same time *Och* MSS Mus. 1220–24, the anthem's only source to retain Bc and Bd part-books, transmits the same reading in both, while the three singleton Bd volumes *DRc* MS C16, *Oj* MS 180 and *Y* MS M29(S) do not all transmit the same reading. On the basis of the sources, then, the simpler reading (transmitted by Dow) may be deemed the original, and the more elaborate one (which has the Chapel Royal authority of *Oj* MS) may be deemed a revision, perhaps even an authorized one. That said, this is just one of a host of textual issues that make the critical commentary for HowLSME the lengthiest for any work in the whole of BE.

Apart from the gymels, the only exceptional scorings among the anthems of the early group are those of the two dubious ones. Each has two M parts, SaveMOG indulging them both in ascents to *e♭"* that are found nowhere in Byrd's undisputed church music, and having only one Ct part as opposed to the customary two. OutOTD additionally has two Ct parts and thus corresponds to the top-heavy six-voice scoring of Byrd's three late full anthems. Yet the correspondence is suspect, since on technical grounds this anthem's claim to a place in the Byrd canon rests on its being a very early work, dating in Monson's view from no later than the 1560s.[148] At that period, with a maximum of eight Lincoln choristers at his disposal, and probably sometimes fewer even than that,[149] Byrd is less likely to have scored for two M parts than to have exercised his apparent preference for T gymels.

For Byrd the basic five-voice ensemble of these anthems was by and large an indivisible unit. With the notable exception of Tallis's 'Blessed are those' (EECM 12/1), the English tradition of marking musical paragraphs with conspicuous changes in scoring had not

147 In BE 11 (p. 30), the more elaborate of the two readings is relegated to a footnote.

148 'Authenticity and Chronology', 289; BE 11, p. vi.

149 Roger Bowers, 'Music and Worship to 1640', in *A History of Lincoln Minster*, ed. Dorothy Owen (Cambridge, 1994), 47–76 (65).

survived the formal transition from the antiphon to the anthem. As Milsom has observed, Tallis's other anthems and anthem-like compositions achieve contrasts of texture through a straightforward alternation between chordally conceived passages and fugal points.[150] Initially at least, this seems likewise to have been Byrd's strategy in anthems, there being no sections of HelpUOG, HowLSME, OLordMTS or OGodWOO that deploy a distinct sub-group of the five- or six-voice tutti. At single moments in PreventUOL (bars 5–6) and AriseOL (bars 19-21) the number of voices is reduced to three, but in each case the music is adroitly dovetailed into its surroundings and serves to introduce related fugal entries in the remaining two voices. In the two dubious anthems, however, passages for sub-groups are altogether more distinct, the dovetailing being either facile (OutOTD bars 46 and 52) or simply non-existent (SaveMOG, bars 16 and 18; OutOTD bars 48, 50, 84, 85 and 86). These passage all involve the twofold or threefold iteration of a chordal 'cell' (see pp. 112–13 below) in various scorings, a method employed in none of the undisputed anthems in the group. It is true that the first 'cell' of OutOTD is presented in three different transpositions (cadencing respectively on 'G', 'C' and 'A'), yet neither here nor elswhere in the two anthems is a 'cell' repeated with anything but most trivial variation in the contours of the outermost voices.

2.4.2 Homophony

The non-fugal passages of the early anthems are clearly chordal conceptions, yet since they are by no means always homorhythmic it will sometimes be necessary to refer to them with the vague term 'homophony' (here meaning an aspect of polyphony, not its antithesis).

In HelpUOG the homophony is for the most part free from decorations, and with the exception of one moment where the texture is animated by passing notes and some ruffling of the declamation (bars 13–14) it corresponds to the plain style of Byrd's liturgical music.

---

150 'English Polyphonic Style in Transition', 142.

There is not even any use here of the 'leading-voice' texture (see p. 44 above) that appears fleetingly in HowLSME (bars 21–1 and 27–8), assumes a more definite rhetorical function in AriseOL (bars 9–12), and is the basis of the eloquent epilogue of PreventUOL (bars 37–42). It is colour rather than texture that sustains the chordal writing of HelpUOG, and particularly the subtle use of chromaticism.

At first the chromatic contrast is indirect, a triad of 'C' mediating between major triads of 'G' and 'B♭' (bar 4); as well as introducing the 'B♮'–'B♭' contrast, this progression also gently interrupts the established movement back-and-forth on the circle of 5ths. Later, the same contrast occurs directly (bar 13), the Ct2 indulging in the kind of descending chromatic movement over a stationary bass that John Milsom has aptly described as 'melting' (albeit with reference to secular music).[151] Though here it occurs within the middle of a phrase, in Tallis's anthems the 'melting' progression had already demonstrated its usefulness for articulating new portions of text,[152] and Byrd employed it as a paragraphing device in HowLSME (bars 15, 21, 29) and— with more suavity—in PreventUOL (bars 5, 9, 24–5). Towards the end of HelpUOG (bar 27), Byrd exploited the opposite, intensifying effect of ascending chromatic movement. Here the M part (*f*♮', *f*♯', *g*') and its accompanying harmony correspond closely to the more arresting progressions of Ps. 114:1–6 from Byrd's Second Preces and Psalms. It is therefore tempting to speculate that the anthem and the psalm may be of similar date: in his vernacular church music Byrd's only other recourse to consecutive rising semitones was in PreventUOL (Ct1, bars 38–41), and there the rate of harmonic change is considerably less abrupt.

Whereas the plain chordal opening of HelpUOG might be heard as a concession to the Protestant ideal of syllabic word-setting, the same need not be said for the other anthems that begin homophonically. Rather, Byrd began OLordMTS, PreventUOL and OGodWOO

---

151 'Byrd, Sidney, and the Art of Melting', *Early Music*, 31 (2003), 437–49 (444).

152 E.g. 'O Lord, give thy Holy Spirit' (EECM 12/5, bar 5); 'Verily, verily, I say unto you' (EECM 12/10, bar 2).

with chords because one way or another the text called for it. With its eighteen syllables, the adapted first verse of OLordMTS was too long to be set as a point in its entirety,[153] nor did it lend itself to division into a series of short verbal units. Hence the homophony, onto which Byrd superimposed three or four entries of a fleeting stretto at the words 'to rejoice' (bars 5–7). For the same reasons—a surfeit of syllables, and a clause resistant to subdivision—it was convenient for Byrd to resume a chordal texture for the adapted third verse, thereby placing declamatory emphasis on the ambiguous word 'prevent', and facilitating the move to a full close on 'G', the anthem's only one on a degree other than the final 'F'.

The subtlest use of homophony occurs in PreventUOL, where a single series of chords does double duty somewhat in the manner defined in Chapter 1 as *tautophrasis* (see pp. 39–41 above). The two iterations of the chord series are here heard separately rather than contiguously (*cf.* bars 1–4 and 19), and on the second iteration the M part incorporates a little variation towards the cadence. Yet as in Byrd's liturgical music, the series yields paired phrases by means of insertion (here shown in parentheses) and syllable splitting (shown in square brackets):

(Pre)vent us O Lord, in all our doings,
...
† That in [all our] works, be(gun, con)[tinued] and end(ed in) thee,

Further variation includes revoicing of the last few chords, with a higher M part, and a customary exchange of material between the two Ct parts (ex. 3:2).

By applying *tautophrasis* to these two particular clauses, Byrd constructed a powerful rhetorical device whereby the music looks forwards and backwards in accordance with the actions enumerated in the text. The melody and harmony of 'that in all our works' have literally been 'prevented' in the positive sense of the word, for they have indeed gone before, and the anthem is at this moment 'continued' in the same notes with which it was

153 On the applicability of this problem to Latin settings see Kerman, *The Masses and Motets of William Byrd*, 97–8.

'begun'. Yet this musical metaphor is unobtrusive, partly because of the naturalness of the word setting in each cognate phrase, and partly because the second phrase is placed in the shadow of a bold harmonic contrast between its opening chord of 'B♭' and the preceding major chord of 'D' that terminates the immediately preceding point, perhaps the most arresting instance of the *passamezzo antico* progression anywhere in Byrd's anthems and services. The other striking harmonic event in PreventUOL, a chromatic shift mid-phrase from a major triad of 'C' to another of 'A' (bar 39), recalls the similar progression in HelpUOG (bar 27). Here, though, the 'C' to 'A' progression is more than pure colouring, since it is also part and parcel of a canon at the 12th between M and B (bars 37–42).

As Monson pointed out,[154] the chordal opening of OGodWOO recalls blatantly that of 'Emendemus in melius' (1575/4; *cf.* exx. 3:3a–b), and as a whole this anthem comes closer than any in the early group to the scale and contrapuntal manner of certain of the motets Byrd published in 1589 and 1591. Monson likened the opening also to some of the more declamatory motets from those collections, yet the correspondence to 'Vide Domine afflictionem' (1589/9+10), for example, or 'Miserere mei' (1591/20) is short-lived. Whereas the motets remain predominantly homophonic, after a dozen bars the anthem abandons chordal textures altogether for a series of points in the style of more purely fugal motets such as 'Memento Domine' (1589/8) or 'Levemus corda' (1591/16).

This one-way shift from a chordal to fugal texture has no parallels among the published motets, but may be explained by the collect structure of the text. To get to the petitions—the real point of the prayer—without undue delay, it was necessary to deal with the unusually prolix relative predication ('whom our offences have displeased, and with our repentance wilt be appeased') as efficiently as decorum allowed. Byrd duly set this portion of the text to unhurried yet gradually more ornamented homophony, tactfully responding to

154 'Authenticity and Chronology', 292.

the accidental rhyme of the two contrasting participles 'displeased' and 'appeased' with a pair of discreetly analogous cadences (*cf.* exx. 3:3b–c).

The question of chordal concepts in these anthems extends to moments where an internal cadence is directly followed by a homophonic passage (as of course happens constantly in the liturgical music). Here some of Byrd's chord progressions seem intrinsically to complement the verbal sense: the continuity implicit in a phrase beginning with the word 'and' prompts a reiteration of the preceding chord (PreventUOL, bar 32); the conjunction 'but' prompts an advance to a triad a 4th higher (OLordMTS, bar 24); the exclamation 'O' prompts relaxation onto a triad a step lower (HelpUOG, bar 11). In SaveMOG (bar 37) and OutOTD (bar 81), phrases beginning with the word 'and' are likewise begun with a reiteration of the preceding chord, yet so too are others beginning with 'if', 'but' or 'O' (OutOTD, bars 52, 27 and 44). Given that the composer of OutOTD essayed a few 'melting' progressions (bars 31, 39 and 86), and responded to the word 'extreme' with a rapid traversal from 'E♭' to 'C♯' and back again within the short space of fourteen minims (bars 28–31), his harmonic reticence on embarking upon new phrases is puzzling. Conversely, the use of chromaticism in SaveMOG cannot be said to serve any rhetorical purpose; rather, the frequent juxtaposing (bars 6–7, 28–30, 36, 54) or superposing (bars 4, 24, 34) of major and minor 3rds suggests nothing more than a hopeless addiction to false relations.[155]

2.4.3 Fuga

The fugal element is important to all anthems in the present group, and significant clues to their relative chronology are offered by the strictness or freedom with which their points are developed. On this basis HelpUOG may be singled out as Byrd's earliest surviving anthem. With seven entries at the unvarying distance of two minims, the first of its three

155 The references given here are to BE 11, and thus reflect Monson's arbitration on the confused question of accidentals in this anthem.

points briefly reveals Byrd at his closest to the strictly periodic *fuga* characteristic of Tye (bars 6–11). The second point (bars 15–26) incorporates hardly any flexion of its entries, all exclusively in strict subject or answer form, and owes its greater length to a reprise at bars 22–5—without any transposition, redistribution, or significant variation—of the Ct2, M and T entries first heard at bars 15–18.[156] It might be added that the downward scalar movement characterizing the subjects of both these points recalls the vernacular polyphony of Sheppard, and his First Service in particular.

Even at this apparently early stage, however, Byrd was determined to avoid the rigidly terraced *fuga* typical especially of Tye.[157] The entries are assymetrically ordered (T1 M T2 B Ct2 T1 M in the first point, T2 Ct2 M T1 T2 Ct1 B in the second), and the initial entries are accompanied by one or more free voices bearing the same text. In the second point, both instances of the repeating trio of entries are provided with contrasting bass parts (and thus contrasting harmonies), and in one entry a stab is made at stretching the rhythm (bars 23–5). Here too, the handling of the text ('and be merciful / unto our sins') reveals Byrd's instinct for fugal practicalities: instead of taking in all six words, his subject takes in only the first three, leaving the last three to continuation lines that freely shadow the ensuing entries in 3rds and 6ths. Furthermore, in a foretaste of the harmonically oriented *fuga* of The Great Service, the diminutive third point that concludes the anthem (bars 30–33) is strongly directed towards an affective triad on $\flat\hat{7}$. So harmonically striking is this eloquent little peroration that its fugal dimension is easily overlooked.

Despite the multitude of textual questions surrounding HowLSME, there is no reason to doubt Monson's discovery that this anthem is connected with Tallis's 'O sacrum

156 The sole instance of flexing occurs in the T2 part at bar 16, the point's first entry, where the falling 3rd with which all subsequent entries end is replaced with a rising 3rd.

157 See, for example, the openings of 'Give alms of thy goods' (EECM 19/5), where the voices enter in strict order from the B upwards, and 'O God, be merciful unto us' (EECM 19/11, two versions), where that order is reversed.

convivium' (1575/9; TCM 6, pp. 210–13).[158] As Milsom has subsequently shown,[159] the older composer's motet began life as a textless instrumental fantasia, portions of which were reworked into the first three of the motet's four sections. The fantasia first turns up in a MS dating from the 1560s;[160] pre-publication versions of the motet were apparently copied from the late 1560s until after the finished version was printed in 1575,[161] and eventually a *contrafactum* with the English text 'I call and cry' (EECM 12/12) was entered in a MS presumed to date from the late 1570s or the 1580s.[162] The last of these MSS is also the earliest known source for HowLSME, yet it remains possible that both vernacular pieces predate the publication of Tallis's motet. There are not any grounds, however, for suspecting that Byrd adapted HowLSME from a Latin original: the opening point and, especially, the angular setting of the words 'for if I be cast down' follow the English prosody too closely. While it remains unclear whether a draft of Tallis's motet, its printed version, or its English adaptation served as Byrd's model,[163] references to the one section Tallis freshly composed for 'O sacrum convivium' prove that HowLSME could not have been based directly on the original fantasia. Thus, if the MS record represents the actual chronology of Tallis's evolving work, then Byrd's anthem can date from no earlier than the late 1560s.

The parallels Monson noted between the motet and the anthem are unmistakeable: both pieces are in the key of gamut flat; they are scored for the same combination of five voices;

---

158 'Authenticity and Chronology', 282–7.

159 'A Tallis Fantasia', *The Musical Times*, 126 (1985), 658–62.

160 *Lbl* MS Harley 7578.

161 *SHR* LB/15/1/226, *Ckc* MS Rowe 316, *Ob* MS Tenbury 1464, *Lbl* Add. MS 31390.

162 *Lbl* Add. MS 22597.

163 Judging by the coda of HowLSME (bars 63–5), Monson asserted that 'I call and cry' rather than 'O sacrum convivium' had served as Byrd's model ('Authenticity and Chronology', 286). It is true that the monotone text repetition of Byrd's M part here corresponds to Tallis's anthem rather than his motet, the latter assigning to the M at this moment a single sustained note. Yet Monson's claim that 'Byrd clearly followed the English version of the inner parts' is exaggerated, for the counterpoint here is not directly derived from either version of Tallis's composition, but has instead been worked out afresh. At the words 'and my', indeed, Byrd reproduced Tallis's two crotchets for the Latin word 'nobis' rather than his single minim for the English syllable 'for-'. Plausibly, then, Tallis's two finished versions *both* made their impression on Byrd's anthem.

those voices make their first entries in the same order (Ct T M Ct B) and on the same notes (*g d d' g G*). Both pieces also open with similar material, although Byrd's largely avoids the clichéd contours of Tallis's, a common-property subject of the kind Julian Grimshaw has termed the 'cumulative 7th'.[164] In both pieces too, the cadence at the end of the opening point juxtaposes *f*♮ in the T with *f*♯' in the M (Tallis, p. 211, second bar; Byrd, bar 13).

Given these similarities, Byrd's departures from his model in the opening point are instructive. Whereas it takes a mere eleven minims for all five voices of 'O sacrum convivium' to come into play, the initial entries of HowLSME are distributed over twenty-three minims, perhaps in response to the more languid mood of the text. Though Byrd's second set of entries proves as compact as Tallis's first set, it excludes a second entry to Ct2. Whereas Tallis had begun all twelve of his entries with $\hat{1}$–$\hat{5}$ or $\hat{5}$–$\hat{1}$, Byrd secured harmonic variety by adjusting his fifth and sixth entries to $\hat{1}$–$\hat{4}$ and his seventh, final entry to $\hat{4}$–$\hat{1}$. And while neither composer baulked at flexing the intervals between the first seven notes of his subject, Byrd's greater adventurousness in this regard is readily apparent (repeated notes are here indicated '='):

'O sa-crum con-vi-vi-um'
+5/+4, =, =, +3, =/–2, –2/=

'How long shall mine e-ne-mies'
+5/+4, –2/–3/–4/–5, +2/+3/+4/+5, +3/+2, =, –2/–3

Since the text of HowLSME is somewhat longer than that of 'O sacrum convivium' (ten clauses as opposed to seven), it is no surprise that for the central portion of his anthem Byrd seems to have laid aside his model. Monson's view that this resulted in 'considerably more textural and tonal variety' is perhaps too generous.[165] To be sure, Byrd obviously took care to utilize an expanded range of cadences and accidentals, and included two

164 'Sixteenth-Century English *Fuga*: Sequential and Peak-Note Subjects', *The Musical Times*, 148 (2007), 61–78 (74–6). The 'cumulative 7th' may be cited in AriseOL (M, bars 4–5) and SaveMOG (bars 1–3).

165 'Authenticity and Chronology', 284.

informal points ('that I sleep not in death', bars 22–7; 'and my heart', bars 54–65) in which padding alone is assigned to T and Ct2 respectively). Yet two of the three clauses he did not set fugally—'lighten mine eyes' (bars 21–2) and 'lest mine enemies say' (bars 27–9)—both constitute very similar and rather undeveloped applications of the leading-voice method. Although Byrd set the clause 'for if I be cast down' to a suitably angular point, he had already in the M part overworked the characteristic effect of its 4th and 5th leaps:

Consider and hear... *g' g' g' c' g'; a' a' a' d' a'*
lighten mine eyes... *a' a' d' a'*
lest mine e[nemies]... *d" a' d"*
for if I be cast down *f f b♭ f b♭' f*

For some 21 minims Byrd anchored his point to 'F' and/or 'B♭', yet flexing just one interval at the end of the M part's second entry (bars 36–7) enabled him to shift the subsequent T entry a step higher:

for if I be cast down *g g c g c' g*

As in HelpUOG, the harmonic orientation of this point serves a noticeably rhetorical purpose, in this case one that can be associated with the *auxesis* figure already identified in Byrd's Short Service (see pp. 46–7 above). That climactic figure sits awkwardly with the idea of being downcast, however, and having thus inappropriately raised the tension Byrd appears to have been unsure of his next move. Instead of dealing prominently with the long delayed consequent clause 'they that trouble me will be glad', Byrd assigned it no subject of its own, instead hiding it away in the continuation lines stemming from the 'for if I be cast down' point. From this confusion, he then salvaged a plain subject (*g' g' c" a' a'*) for 'and rejoice at it', of which the two consecutive identical entries in the M (bars 43–6) form rhetorically perhaps the weakest point of the whole anthem. If Byrd ever lost control of a text, then it was here.

Excepting 'Blessed are those', Tallis customarily reprised the final sections of his anthems,[166] and did the same in 'O sacrum convivium' (p. 213, from the end of the first

166 Milsom, 'English Polyphonic Style in Transition', 142.

bar). Presumably out of deference to his model, Byrd likewise repeated the concluding point of HowLSME, although this was the only anthem in which he ventured to do so. Here, as Monson demonstrated,[167] the model again served obviously as a template. First, Byrd directly appropriated the three core entries of Tallis's point on 'et futurae gloriae' (p. 212, third to seventh bars), adapting them to the words 'But my trust is in thy mercy'. Though here Byrd's Ct2 answer avoids the characteristic clash of *f*♯ and *f*♮' brought about by Tallis's corresponding Ct entry, a precisely similar clash is supplied by the Ct1 when the core entries are repeated (bar 52). Secondly, Byrd mimicked Tallis's stepwise ascents to *d*" at 'nobis pignus datur', using them not precisely in the manner of Tallis but as the basis for a point on the words 'and my heart is joyful in thy salvation'. Lastly, he completed the anthem with a plagal coda similar to that of its model, but enlivening Tallis's foursquare alternation of 5/3 chords on *G* and *c* simply by substituting a single 6/3 chord on *B*♮.

Notwithstanding the expansiveness of Byrd's opening point, the overall pacing of HowLSME generates an unsettled, almost impatient mood. Whereas one of Tallis's most significant amendments to 'O sacrum convivium' was to admit more breathing space between its first and second points (p. 211, second bar),[168] Byrd reversed that process, bringing in his second point some three minims before his first point's ultimate chord (bar 15). He then evaded two further opportunities for repose (bars 21 and 27), launching the M directly as a leading voice. From there (bar 28) until the join between the final point and the coda (bar 63), each new phrase overlaps the end of the one going before it, and every last minim is marked by activity in at least one of the voices. Whatever lessons Byrd may have learned from 'O sacrum convivium', cohesive paragraphing and thoughtful pacing would not appear to have been among them.

---

167 'Authenticity and Chronology', 284–6.

168 In the draft transmitted by *Lbl* MS 31390, the point on 'recolitur memoria' was introduced two minims earlier than in the published version (for a comparison of the two versions see Milsom, 'A Tallis Fantasia', 660).

Byrd had fully mastered his medium, however, by the time he came to write OLordMTS. Its lavish sonorities almost recall the five- and six-part motets of Gombert, but if Byrd had a Chapel Royal model in mind that could have been Robert Parsons's 'Deliver me from mine enemies, O God', a work also for six voices (albeit with two M parts in canon at the unison), also firmly attached to the key of F fa ut, and with a text not inappropriate to supplication on the Queen's behalf (Pss. 59:1–2; 60:11). Though Parsons's textures are more transparent than Byrd's, and are never purely chordal, one phrase in particular might have engendered the second half of Byrd's double point at bars 10–24 (ex. 3:4a), while in both anthems a Ct part approaches the (admittedly clichéd) English cadences by a distinctly similar route (ex. 3:4b).

Though Monson recognized the relative modernity of the double point,[169] he was reluctant to date OLordMTS much later than HowLSME because of what he took to be 'symmetrical structures' in the two points, particularly 'a disguised repetition of the original imitative framework [at bar 14, which] suggests that the young composer was still unsure how best to keep the counterpoint going'.[170] Yet these reservations are hardly borne out by a close reading of the two points. In the first, double point (shown schematically in ex. 4.5b),[171] a fresh start is indeed made at bar 14 (i.e. entry 6), but here a group of entries commencing with a subject-answer pair replaces the answer-subject-answer arrangement of entries 1–3. From hereon, the two-minim stretto at the lower 5th articulated by entries 1+2 and 4+5 disappears. Granted, in the second point (ex. 4.6) entries 4–6 are reiterated as entries 10–12, the only significant adjustment being that entry 11 is an octave higher than entry 5, and is transferred to another voice. Yet because entries 10–12 are placed at the centre of a stretto web extending from entry 7 to entry 14, their reiteration if anything

169 On double points see Kerman, *The Masses and Motets of William Byrd*, esp. 99–100.

170 'Authenticity and Chronology', 287; somewhat rephrased in BE 11, p. vi.

171 The method of showing the subject in outline, without incidental dissonances, derives from John Milsom, 'Crecquillon, Clemens, and Four-Voice *Fuga*' in *Beyond Contemporary Fame: Reassessing the Art of Clemens non Papa and Thomas Crecquillon*, ed. Eric Jas (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), 293–345.

strengthen Byrd's contrapuntal argument. Entries 15–18, furthermore, adding three subject and/or answer stretti to the six alreay employed.

The first half of the double point is of the 'cumulative 4th' type, which Grimshaw illustrated with a passage from Tallis's 'Blessed are those' (ex. 3:5a).[172] In fact, Byrd's entries are arranged so similarly to Tallis's that it is hard not to see a direct correspondence between the two compositions. Out of the ten strettos of which the subject is capable (ex. 3:5c), Byrd used the same three (–5, –4, +4) that Tallis had used. Far from being 'unsure how best to keep the counterpoint going', Byrd rather appears here to bring off the remarkable feat of tranfiguring his mentor's single point into a double one, perhaps not without a nod to his Chapel Royal predecessor, Parsons (see again ex. 3:4a). Whether or not Byrd had any intertextual intentions for this apparent quotation from Tallis is a matter for conjecture, but the allusion to 'Blessed are those that be undefiled in the way' at the words 'Give her her heart's desire' suggests nothing if not a satire on the queen's celibacy.

Monson's view that PreventUOL was 'the last of the full anthems to appear in the Elizabethan sources of the 1580s' was based partly on what he described as 'novel two- and three-voice units subsequently varied and transposed, of the type Joseph Kerman has called "cells"'.[173] In Kerman's own words:

> The composer starts with a clearly defined, rather light phrase or 'cell' for semichoir. Clear definition comes about because the cell is usually short and usually ends with a crisp little cadence; a typical texture involves three voices in stretto imitation.[174]

The substantial duets and trios of the six-voice motet 'Attollite portas' (1575/11; BE 1/5) for which Kerman invoked his new term are, however, hardly comparable to the two passages of PreventUOL to which Monson presumably referred. In the motet, the

---

172 'Sixteenth-Century English *Fuga*', 73–5.

173 'Authenticity and Chronology', 291; BE 11, p. vii.

174 'Old and New in Byrd's Cantiones Sacrae' in *Essays in Opera and English Music in Honour of Sir Jack Westrup*, ed. F. W. Sternfeld, Nigel Fortune and Edward Olleson (Oxford: Blackwell, 1975), 25–43 (36). Kerman subsequently amplified this definition, stating that the 'cell' is 'first sung in one semichoir and then repeated (strictly or freely) in others', and that it could be 'homophonic, half-homophonic, fully imitative or even strictly canonic': see *The Masses and Motets of William Byrd*, 88.

'cellular' treatment of 'Dominus virtutum ipse est rex gloriae' (for example) takes place over fifty minims or so (bars 58–71); its material—a close-knit three-voice stretto—is stated first by three voices, then rearranged for another three, and finally reworked for all six.

In contrast, the first of the two passages in the anthem—'with thy most gracious favour' (bars 5–9)—lasts just sixteen minims. It consists basically of a subject in the Ct1, accompanied by free counterpoint in the T and Ct2, which is then 'answered' a 4th higher by M amid entirely different counterpoint. To be sure, each of these entries culminates in a clearly marked cadence, but the subject and the answer are not parcelled into discrete polyphonic units. On the contrary, the join between them is covered by an interjection from the B, its first three notes themselves resembling neither a subject nor an answer but rather an entry in the relative key. Hence the impression here is not of two 'self-contained "cell [s]" for several voices', but of a point too pressed for time to assign proper entries for the T and Ct2, or a modally correct entry for the B.

The second such passage in the anthem—'obtain everlasting life' (bars 34–7)—likewise resembles a segment of an incomplete fugal exposition, its span of just twelve minims proving too short for anything other than padding in the Ct2 part. The four remaining voices, however, articulate a fleeting double point in which a paired entry for B and T is followed four minims later by another for Ct1 and M, an 8ve higher. Even if only because the first paired entry has no cadence of its own, this passage is clearly something other than a 'cell' construction.

Such informal passages of *fuga* in which the participating voices were not all assigned entries have already been noted in HelpUOG and HowLSME; in fact these represent a widespread method of sixteenth-century motet composition which under the (questionable) rhetorical term *anaphora* was illustrated by Burmeister with three examples from

Lassus.[175] As with the *auxesis* figure, the validity of such a term for Byrd's music depends not on historical usage but on the fact of his having availed of a historically recognized continental technique.

Thus, while in 'Attollite portas', Byrd used 'cells' for prolongation, it may be said that in PreventUOL he used *anaphoras* for concision, securing the textural interest of *fuga* without fully sacrificing the more efficient text-rate of homophony. The placing of the two *anaphoras* in analogous positions at opposite ends of the anthem, furthermore, contributes to the broadly palindromic scheme shown in table 2:4. It may be noted that the most formal element of the text, the Christological close, is set outside the main scheme as a strict canon between M and B, the most formal music of the anthem.

The *auxesis* figure too puts in an appearance in PreventUOL, when in the first complete point ('and further us with thy continual help', bars 9–19) there occurs a group of entries a step higher than those already heard. Yet whereas in HowLSME this figure ran contrary to the idea of being 'cast down', it now admirably complements the sense of 'furtherness', as well as preparing the way for the striking harmonic progression into the next section, mentioned above.

Alongside these rhetorical and formal advances on HowLSME, we might expect the *fuga* of PreventUOL to build upon the nascent flexibility evident in the earlier anthem's opening point. That, however, is not the case with the two fully worked out points. Excepting the step-higher entry in the M (which involves a single flexion at bar 17) and the routine interchange of tones and semitones, only the first melodic interval of 'and further us with thy continual help' is significantly flexed (+2/+3/+4). In the second point, entries with the words 'we may glorify' appear without variation as strict subjects or real answers (even though this leads to a rather abrasive diminshed 12th between the outer voices at bar

175 *Musical Poetics*, ed. and transl. Benito Rivera (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 184–7, 300–301; see also Paul Mark Walker, *Theories of Fugue from the Age of Josquin to the Age of Bach* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2004), 104.

27). Here too, the assignment of the words 'thy holy Name' to free continuation lines recalls the more makeshift handling of text in HowLSME.

The oldest surviving copy of AriseOL, made in the 1580s by the unidentified scribe of *Ob* MS Tenbury 389, demonstrates that by then Byrd's *fuga* had already begun to extend to a level of thematic flexibility not reached in any of the anthems so far discussed. The comparatively isolated instances of flexing that do occur in those apparently earlier works are attributable less to the pursuit of variation for its own sake than to mere contrapuntal expediency. As Julian Grimshaw has aptly observed vis-à-vis certain of Byrd's early Latin works,

> the intervals are flexed as an unavoidable consequence of the impulse to write passages of dense *fuga*, rather than intentionally evolving and expanding according to a compositional principle, as becomes evident in Byrd's later motets.[176]

This 'compositional principle'—which will prove the key to understanding several passages of *fuga* in The Great Service—underpins the second point of AriseOL ('and forgettest our misery and trouble', bars 18–38). Here the subject begins life as shown in ex. 3:7a and gradually assumes the form shown in ex. 3:7b, these initial and final entries both being assigned to the M part. Flexing begins immediately with the second and third entries (Ct2 and T), which in combination with the first entry quickly coalesce from a pseudo stretto into a chain of staggered 6/3 chords (bars 19–20). Whether the second and third entries really ought to be described as such, or are actually free counterpoint bearing a fairly close resemblance to the subject, is moot. Still, from its third note the Ct2 appears to answer the M at the lower 5th, while the T begins as an exact echo of the M at the lower 8ve and continues as would an entry in the relative key, a 3rd lower than Ct2. Clearly, then, Byrd's intention was not to write a passage of dense *fuga*, but to use his subject as the germ of its own accompanying material.

---

176 '*Fuga* in Early Byrd', *Early Music*, 37 (2009), 251–65 (259).

Subsequent events prove that not one of the seven melodic intervals making up the subject is sacrosanct (see the annotations to ex. 3:7). The initial note repetition, for example, is in certain entries flexed in both directions (–2/+2/+5). As a result, the only constant melodic factor is that the middle syllable of 'forgettest' sounds as the peak note of every entry. In a point consisting only of fixed subjects and answers, the cumulative effect of such a peak note would be to emphasize two modally important degrees a 4th or a 5th apart; in the present point, however, flexing causes the peak note to switch degrees too often, and too erratically, for any such emphasis to occur. Indeed, the peak notes take in all the available diatonic degrees except 'E':

c"f d'f f g' a' a d d'f c" c' f f f b♭'

Though small groupings of these notes are related by the 8ves, 4ths and 5ths we would expect from any passage of *fuga*, there can be no doubt that when working out this point Byrd consciously did away with the customary modal framework. Without it, his entries by and large resist classification as subjects or answers, and it is quite impossible to say whether the *fuga* as a whole is geared primarily to the relative key of F fa ut—established by the immediately preceding full close at bars 17–18—or to the home key of D sol re flat —established much less by the last four or five entries than by a coda barely related to the point itself. The four concluding entries are nonetheless instructive, since on reaching them Byrd abruptly ceased flexing all the subject's melodic intervals except the last one (see ex. 3:7b). After a dozen and more trials, the subject ultimately stabilizes.

The possibility that a point could gradually discover its own subject placed unprecedented demands on Byrd's technique. If the *fuga* would no longer be governed by its own raw material, some alternative guiding principle was going to be needed. And in this eccentric, experimental and rather shapeless passage Byrd appears still to have been uncertain as to what that alternative should be. Perhaps the best explanation is to be found

in the text; if so, then Byrd certainly succeeded in creating a point that seems constantly in a state of 'forgetting' both the melodic profile of its subject and its eventual cadential goal.

After the exemplary formal balance of PreventUOL, the first of Byrd's anthems to incorporate a serious essay in flexed *fuga* appears surprisingly inconsequential and lopsided, the first five of its six verbal clauses sweeping by in less time (73 minims) than is then devoted to the concluding flexed point (85 minims). Despite the nine entries for which room is found in the brief opening point, things soon begin to sound perfunctory. The ensuing clause 'why sleepest thou?', though attached to a resonant half-close, is delivered (as if an afterthought) via free continuation lines, instead of being assigned a point of its own. For all their appropriateness, the following chordal declamations of 'awake', with the M striding two minims ahead of the other voices, prove something of a premature intrusion on the thwarted *fuga*.

There is nevertheless considerable interest in Byrd's treatment of the next clause ('and be not absent from us for ever', bars 11–15). Here the staggered text-setting results in what Oliver Neighbour has characterized as 'a kind of syllabic serialism ... in which a sentence is heard not only horizontally but within every two minim beats vertically as well'.[177] Precisely this effect is illustrated by the lowest three voices at minims 2–3 of bar 12:

Ct2	-sent	from	us
T	not		ab-
B	and		be

In English vernacular *fuga*, syllables are superimposed like this as a matter of course. Yet the present passage is very obviously not a point in the usual sense; rather, it appears on first glance to be a chordal conception in which the voices have been intentionally desynchronized to obtain a busier texture than would have resulted from plain homophony. Closer examination reveals, however, that the word pairs 'and be' and 'from us' are more often than not set to rising minor 3rds, and that those minor 3rds form subject-answer

177 Review of BE 10b, *Music & Letters*, 65 (1984), 309–313 (311).

relationships in two groups a step apart (ex. 3:8). We have already encountered informal expositions in the *anaphoras* of HelpUOG, HowLSME and PreventUOL. But here the *fuga* is condensed to bare essentials that are neither distinctive enough nor persistent enough even to catch the ear as *fuga* as such. Rather, the effect yet again is of the *auxesis* figure, as the two groups of embryonic subject-answer pairs, regulated by the sequentially rising B part, move onwards and upwards.

Having set the prolix opening clauses of OGodWOO chordally, Byrd was able to break down the remaining text into units of Latinate brevity which he assigned to four (mostly double) points, following them with an extended plagal Amen:

1. we humbly beseech thee (bars 12–20)

2. [*head*] with mercy to hear
   [*tail*] the prayers of thy people, (bars 20–35)

3. [*head*] and turn from us
   [*tail*] the scourges of thy wrath,

4. [*head*] which our sins
   [*tail*] have justly deserved.

   Amen.

The first point emerges unobtrusively from the preceding homophony, its scalar subject easily withstanding a second round of entries that build the tension by reaching a 2nd or a 3rd higher than those of the first round. Then follows what is effectively a double point, its head firmly wedded to the degrees mi-re-mi-fa-mi, while the end of its tail gradually coalesces into an 'A'–'C'–'A'–'A' ostinato in the M and T parts (bars 30–34). Here, however, monotony sets in, for although the head is subjected to three forms of stretto, all involve the same pattern of tones and semitones centered on 'A' or 'E'.[178] Besides, at bars 20–23 material assigned to M, B and Ct1 (consisting of three stretto entries and two

178 This subject is a mirror image, embellished by one passing note, of the second of three sequential subjects Grimshaw has identified as the common property of Byrd's older contemporaries ('Sixteenth-Century English *Fuga*', 67–9). Grimshaw shows his version of the subject to be capable of four stretti, all invertible, at the distance of one or two notes. In the present instance, Byrd might also have availed of two stretti at the upper 7th of which his embellished form of the subject is additionally capable.

continuation lines) is reiterated wholesale, unvaried and untransposed, by M, B and Ct2 at bars 28–32. Partly as a consequence of this, the *d*'–*c*♯' suspension first heard at bars 14 and 19 re-echoes at bars 20, 24 and 29; it is heard yet again in the cadence at bar 34.

On reaching the third point Byrd again denied himself the opportunity of switching the emphasis to fresh scale degrees. Rather, he allowed three further recurrences of the same *d*'–*c*♯' suspension (bars 39, 44 and 49), now in the context of a principal subject made up of nothing more than the three already threadbare degrees of the key chord (*a*'–*f*'–*d*'–*a*'), and appearing in tightly packed yet facile stretti that serve chiefly to stress the harmonic inhibition (bars 39–41 and 44–6). While a complementary subject delivers the words 'the scourges of thy wrath' with contrast and percussiveness, and in the M part is neatly contrived to reach first *b*♭', then *c*" and finally *d*", its climactic effect is somewhat vitiated by the M part's intervening returns to the all-too-familiar notes of the principal subject.

Though it adds no new accidentals to the 'B♮', 'F♯' and 'C♯' already introduced, the fourth point at last secures tonal freshness by dwelling on major chords of 'G' and 'F'. The passage is at least as contrapuntally advanced as any of the double points in, for example, Byrd's motet 'Tristitiae et anxietas' (1589/6+7). The six-word subject divides into a head and a tail consisting respectively of three rising semibreves and an energetic suspension figure. Though heard consecutively in an initial stretto between Ct2 and T (bars 50–53), the head and tail quickly develop lives of their own; by bar 64, the head has gradually evolved from a slow-moving scale into a syncopated arpeggio (B, Ct1), while the tail has been allowed to disintegrate into melismatic continuation lines (Ct2, T).

The M part's climactic effect in the first half of this point is keenly judged, and represents a conspicuous advance on Byrd's similar treatment of the phrase 'occupa verunt / interiora mea' in the motet just referred to, where in the topmost voice two isolated iterations of the head are followed by two of the tail (bars 23–38). Before being joined with its tail-subject, the anthem's head-subject sounds three times: first as an integral part of the

preceding cadence on 'D' (*e'–f♯'–g'*, thereby anticipating the initial stretto), then in what might be termed a 'subdominant answer' form (*a'–b♮'–c"*), and lastly a tone higher in an official 'answer' form (*b♮'–c♯"–d"*). Thereafter, the tail-subject, in one of the several radically evolved forms it assumes, colours the harmony with an abrupt cancellation of the two foregoing accidentals (*b♮'–c♮"–c♮"–b♭'*). This final double point terminates in what is the first appearance in Byrd's full anthems of a consonant-4th cadence. The following plagal 'Amen', furthermore, manages to be eight minims longer even than that of OLordMTS, its sustained keynote not being assigned to an individual voice but rather being distributed piecemeal among all the voices.

The style of SaveMOG accords well enough with the period when Richard Coste is known to have been active (i.e. for all but the last few years of Elizabeth's reign). With its 'cumulative 7th subject', the opening point echoes that of many another Elizabethan work, such as Tallis's 'O sacrum convivium' or William Mundy's 'O Lord, the maker', not to mention AriseOL. Furthermore, as Richard Turbet has noted,[179] a precisely similar point begins the second, repeated section of the only other anthem attributed to Coste, 'He that hath my commandments'.[180] This and other rhythmic and melodic correspondences enumerated by Turbet were the stock-in-trade of Tudor musicians, yet one passage of *fuga* in SaveMOG suggests a certain awareness of musical rhetoric on the composer's part. For the words 'are risen up...' (bars 28–37), he devised a point in which the entries of the paired M parts successively work their way upwards:

M2	*f' g' a' b♭'*
M1	*f' a' b♭' c"*
M2	*a' b♭' c" d"*

As Monson argued, the anthem's makeshift counterpoint might credibly be attributed to Byrd only if it dated from the very outset of his career, a time when an English composer

179 'Coste not Byrd', *Annual Byrd Newsletter*, 4 (1998), 8.
180 See n. 22 above.

might indeed have set 'and descended into hell' to a falling melody and 'he ascended into heaven' to an rising one,[181] but when the rhetorical potential of *fuga* was to him still a closed book. That potential was, of course, single-handedly realized by Byrd, but it would be difficult to believe he had already begun to do so when his contrapuntal technique was still no better than that of SaveMOG. If instead we posit Coste as the composer, possibly at work in the early 1590s, then the crude word-painting of 'are risen up' can be explained as a dilettante's response to what Byrd had achieved in the two volumes of *Cantiones sacrae*.

The same argument applies to OutOTD, for while the opening *fuga* is perhaps even less fluent than that of SaveMOG,[182] this altogether more ambitious work incorporates an extended exercise in flexible *fuga* that is without parallel in the undisputed anthems prior to AriseOL (bars 66–81; ex. 3:9). As with the almost Manneristic treatment of the word 'extreme' mentioned above, which sits uneasily with the harmonic unadventurousness of the anthem as a whole, it is surprising to find a composer dabbling in such flamboyant fugal variation when he was apparently still incapable of a coherent six-voice exposition. Nor indeed does this composer appear to have been initiated in the writing of consonant-4th cadences; the cross-relations at three full closes (bars 16, 80, 86) are among the anthem's most truly Byrdian features. (It might be added that, in spite of the profuse false relations in SaveMOG, none of its full closes is constructed in exactly this manner, with a 5/4/3 chord.)

Who, then, was responsible for OutOTD? Its curious mixture of old and new, of inexperience and ambition, suggests a young musician steeped in the idioms of the Tallis generation yet receptive to some of the radical stylistic advances Byrd had accomplished by the early 1590s. Given the Mus. 1001 attribution, the possibility cannot be entirely ruled

---

181 As did Sheppard in the Apostles' Creed of his First Service, edn in Stefan Scot, 'The Vernacular Music of John Sheppard: An Introduction, Edition and Commentary' (unpublished masters thesis, University of Exeter, 1991).

182 See in particular the three perilously close 8ves between T and Ct2 in bar 6 (where only four voices are sounding), the suspension doubled in B and Ct1 in bar 9, and the aimlessly repetitive T part (*d a d a d a*) at bars 12–13.

out that this is the earliest surviving full anthem by Orlando Gibbons, and that it dates from around the year 1599 when, at the age of 15, the future Chapel Royal organist completed his three-year stint as one of the sixteen choristers of King's College, Cambridge (a cohort well able for music with two M parts).[183] If so, then he might even have taken as his model a setting of the same text, composed by William Mundy or Byrd, of which the entries in Barnard's indexes and the seventeenth-century word-books may now be the only other surviving traces.

2.5 Borrowed works

2.5.1 Published songs

The church anthems discussed above are all conspicuous by their absence from Byrd's printed song-books, even though the wide circulation of some of them in domestic MSS suggests that the music-buying public would have paid good money for them. Byrd thus seems to have regarded this group of pieces as something to be kept separate from his published *œuvre*, perhaps because the anthems were understood to be the commissioned property of the established church, and not Byrd's to sell. Perhaps too he was reluctant to complicate his public image as a composer of songs, motets, and ultimately Catholic liturgical music with a contradictory Protestant element (although he did not hesitate to style himself 'organista regio, Anglo.' on the title pages of his Latin-texted publications).

While Byrd could control his authorial persona by leaving his church anthems in manuscript, he could not stop his printed songs and motets from being co-opted into the church anthem repertory. Twentieth-century scholars took the same borrowing process much too far, aggrandizing the total number of Byrd's 'anthems' to as many as ninety-two

183 On the constitution of the King's College choir at that time see 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* (New York: Garland, 1993), 215; see also pp. 61–3, where it is shown, despite prior claims to the contrary, that records in the King's College Mundum Books of payments 'pro musica' made to Gibbons in 1602 and 1603 can relate neither to Orlando nor to the composition of new music.

(SECM). The primary sources show that only seven items from his printed song-books—three metrical psalms, two consort anthems, one carol, and one partsong—found their way into the surviving pre-Restoration institutional sources (see table A3), together with adaptations of eight of his motets and motet sections (see table A4).

Though as we shall see below (pp. 173–8) there was no objection in principle to the singing of metrical psalms as anthems, of the fifteen Byrd is known to have set (1588/1–10, BE 15/1–5) only three crop up in a total of just four ecclesiastical sources. 'O God, give ear' (1588/1) is confined to *Ob* MS Tenbury 1382 and the Chirk part-books, two sources with pronounced domestic characteristics. In fact this setting could hardly have been sung from the Chirk books, since owing to a scribal eye-skip eight minims were omitted from the Ct part (bars 50–51). 'Blessed is he that fears the Lord' (1588/8) appears only in *Y* MS M29(S), a Durham volume apparently compiled for the personal use of John Cosin that contains a number of items otherwise unknown in the cathedral's repertory. 'Even from the depth' (1588/10) is among the anthem texts copied by the Windsor scribe Zacharie Irishe, and turns up again in James Clifford's post-Restoration word-book.[184] Yet there is no evidence that this setting was sung as an anthem anywhere other than at Windsor.

Byrd had originally scored 'Blessed is he' and 'Even from the depth' for a M soloist (designated 'the first singing part') and four viols, and subsequently fitted words to their instrumental parts in order to publish them in the more marketable form of partsongs. 'Even from the depth' was scored from the start with a second Ct part as opposed to the Tr more usual in consort songs, making it amenable to church choirs. So too was the purely vocal 'O God, give ear', Byrd's only through-composed metrical psalm, and an example of the ABB form characteristic of Tallis's anthems. That this piece began life as a church anthem, and represents an exception to Byrd's rule of not publishing such pieces, is

184 *Lbl* MS Harley 4142, f. 6r; *The Divine Services and Anthems*, 2nd edn, 220.

however highly improbable. Evidence to be discussed in Chapter 3 suggests that for Elizabethan composers the proper way to set a metrical text for church use was in verse format, as opposed to the full, through-composed format of, say, Philip van Wilder's setting of Thomas Sternhold's versification of Ps. 128 ('Blessed art thou that fearest God'). With a form that was by 1588 becoming old-fashioned, and a Ct2 part that twice transgresses the absolute upper church limit of *a'* (ironically its two *b♭*'s fall within the segment skipped by the Chirk copyist), 'O God, give ear' seems less an authentic church anthem than a parody of one.

The carol AnET and the consort anthems ChristR and HaveMUMOG are among the small number of pieces for which Byrd printed instrumental parts, and will therefore be reserved for discussion in Chapter 3. It need not concern us here whether 'O Lord my God' (1589i/22), the final borrowed work in this group, originated in the form of a partsong or (as Kerman believed)[185] a song for solo voice and three viols: the evidence that it was ever sung ecclesiastically is restricted to the pre-Restoration layer of the New College B part-book *Ob* MS Mus. d. 162. The musicians of the college chapel must have been satisfied that its anonymous and now otherwise unknown text came close enough to the diction of metrical psalmody to be sung as an anthem:

> Let not, O Lord, O mighty God,
> let not thy mortal foe,
> Let not the fiend with all his craft
> thy servant overthrow.

As Jeremy L. Smith has recently pointed out, however, nos 15–22 of Byrd's 1589 song-book can be read as a sequence dealing with nearly all the attributes of Cupid listed in an eclogue from Sidney's *Old Arcadia*: his human and divine nature and his blindness ('Is love a boy'+'Boy pity me'), his prowess as an archer ('Wounded I am'+'Yet of us twain'), his arrows of attraction and rejection ('From Citheron the warlike boy is fled'+'There

185 *The Elizabethan Madrigal*, 106.

careless thoughts'+'If love be just'), and finally his demonic *alter ego* (which Smith convincingly pinpoints as the 'fiend' of 'O Lord my God').[186] The New College choir may have addressed their anthem to the right deity, but not, it would seem, in accordance with Byrd's intentions.

2.5.2 Contrafacta *of motets*

More than fifty Latin motets by English composers from the period are known to exist also as vernacular *contrafacta*.[187] Kerry McCarthy's recent contention that Byrd's known pieces in this category outnumber his surviving anthems is certainly true if the nine undisputed full anthems only are reckoned (counting AriseOL and HelpUOG as two separate anthems, that is),[188] for although there are *contrafacta* of only eight motets and motet sections in institutional sources, both 1575/11 and 1589ii/20+21 were adapted to more than one English text. Of two further *contrafacta* found only in pre-Restoration domestic sources, 'All ye people, clap your hands'—an adaptation of two Ascension propers (1607/26+29) copied by the Gloucester lay-clerk Merro—may have derived from a cathedral source. (The other, an adaptation of Byrd's inalienably Catholic 'Ave verum corpus', surprisingly appears only in a single volume of a set of part-books from the collection of Byrd's friend and fellow recusant Edward Paston.)[189]

Circulation of nearly all the ecclesiastical *contrafacta* was restricted (see table A4). Of the five found in *Ob* MS Tenbury 1382 (a MS unusually rich in adaptations), one is unique while two others have only single concordances. A further *unicum* appears in *Y* MS M29 (S), while *contrafacta* of two 1575 pieces and two adaptations of 1589ii/20+21 (the clumsy

---

186 'The Dilatory Space of 'While that the sun': Byrd, Tessier and the English Sequence', *Early Music*, 40 (2012), 671–85 (677).

187 Morehen, 'The English Anthem Text', 69. Though Morehen (p. 71) lists an adaptation of 'Peccantem me quotidie' (1575/6) with the words 'Let us arise from sin' in *Ob* MS Tenbury 1382, this item is in fact one of the two adaptations of 'Attolite portas' (1575/11).

188 '"Brought to Speake English with the Rest": Byrd's Motet Contrafacta', *The Musical Times*, 148/3 (Autumn 2007), 51–60 (51).

189 McCarthy, '"Brought to Speake English with the Rest"', 57–8.

literal translation 'Let not thy wrath'+'Thy holy city' and the egregious Christmas anthem 'Behold, I bring you glad tidings'+'And there was with the angel')[190] remained almost entirely within the Durham-Peterhouse circle. In fact, the only adaptation that can be said to have become standard repertoire, and the only one to be included in Barnard's *First Book*, was a less literal but much better accented translation of 20+21, the famous 'O Lord, turn thy wrath'+'Bow thine ear'. It was this *contrafactum*, together with the full anthem 'Sing joyfully' and the Short Service, that would chiefly keep Byrd's memory alive in Anglican church music during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[191]

The varied ensembles called for by these Latin pieces were not always amenable to the standard ecclesiastical choir with its ubiquitous paired Ct parts. Indeed, the adaptation of 20+21 is the only piece with a C4 clef in Barnard's printed Ct2 volumes. Sometimes, adjustments were made to keep voice parts within their usual church limits. In 'Lift up your heads' (= 1575/11) a small segment of the T part extending to *g'* was transposed an 8ve lower by the Durham scribes.[192] Some ingenuity clearly went into adapting 'Nos enim pro peccatis' (1589ii/26 = BE 2/14, *tertia pars*), which Byrd scored for the usual four voice-types plus a baritone (F4 C5 C4 C3 C1). The orphaned T part surviving in MS 1382 begins with the music of Byrd's C4 part (bars 117–29, range *c*–*c'*), but then switches to his C5 part (bars 130–70, range *c*–*e*♭*'*). Presumably, therefore, the lost Ct2 part began with the music of Byrd's C5 part (bars 117–29, range *f*–*c'*), and then switched to his C4 part (bars 130–70, range *e*♭–*f'* plus one *d*). It was unfortunate that the attention paid to ranges in this

190 On this and a later bungled adaptation (by Henry Aldrich) of the same motets, see McCarthy, '"Brought to Speake English with the Rest", 54–6; le Huray's view that to sing 'Behold, I bring you glad tidings' to the music of 'Ne irascaris' 'does not in practice seem particularly incongruous' is untenable in the light of what has subsequently been learned about the captivity theme in the *Cantiones sacrae* (*Music and the Reformation in England*, 241).

191 These were the only Byrdiana included in *Cathedral Music*, ed. William Boyce, 3 vols (London: printed for the editor, 1760–73); see also Suzanne Cole, 'Who Is the Father? Changing Perceptions of Tallis and Byrd in Late Nineteenth-Century England', *Music & Letters*, 89 (2008), 212–26 (218).

192 *Cf.* BE 1/5, bars 91–3 ('et nunc et'), and TCM 2, p. 41 n. 1 (where *DRc* MS E10 is erroneously referred to as E7).

contrafactum did not also extend to prosody, the words 'for Christ's sake' proving particularly ill-adapted to the rhythm of Byrd's declamatory 'Domine' (bars 142–3).

It has been argued that the *contrafacta* are symptomatic of a shortage of vernacular anthems in the early years of Elizabeth's reign (by le Huray, who seriously misrepresented the 1589ii and 1591 model motets as 'early works' with 'no very pronounced emotive character'),[193] of 'growing high churchmanship at Peterhouse during the 1620s and '30s (by Monson, who did not take full account of the *contrafacta* found in sources of earlier date),[194] and of 'an effort to add to an existing repertoire in an established style' (by McCarthy, whose point is well made).[195] With no contemporaneous anthem books for comparison with MS 1382, however, it is impossible to gauge how short of anthems Jacobean church musicians really were. Certainly by the 1630s at Durham, there was a repertory of well over 150 anthems and an unusually large quantity of liturgical music, much of it the thoroughly competent work of members of the choral foundation such as Edward Smith, William Smith and Henry Palmer. These musicians did not sing the *contrafacta* because they needed stopgaps; they sang them because they could not get enough of the music of William Byrd.

Did Byrd approve? As McCarthy has argued (p. 60), the fundamental transformation implicit in the *contrafacta* was that they brought essentially private music out into the public sphere, often in distorted forms that clearly went against Byrd's intentions. It may be significant that, 'O Lord, turn thy wrath'+'Bow thine ear', the one adaptation well crafted enough perhaps to have had the composer's authorization, or even to be his own work, is also the only one found in the Chapel Royal sources. At the same time, we do not know if even this *contrafactum* was sung by the royal choir in the composer's lifetime. Yet with AriseOL Byrd himself may have left us a clue to this puzzle. As we have seen (p. 73),

193 *Music and the Reformation in England*, 241.

194 'Authenticity and Chronology', 304; BE 11, p. xiv. See table A4 below: the presence of 'Arise, O Lord' (ii) in MS 1382 was overlooked in SECM and subsequently by Monson.

195 "Brought to Speake English with the Rest", 51.

the words of this anthem differ somewhat from the Great Bible version of Ps. 44:23–4, yet they correspond exactly to those of 'Arise, O Lord' (ii), the *contrafactum* of 'Exsurge quare obdormis Domine' (1591/19). Since the motet appears in sources from the mid 1580s (such as Robert Dow's part-books *Och* MSS Mus. 984–8), and the anthem's advanced fugal style suggests a date no earlier than that, it is not impossible that Byrd was irked by the Englished version of 'Exsurge', and set its vernacular text afresh by way of registering his disapproval.

CHAPTER THREE

VERSE ANTHEMS AND ADAPTED CONSORT ANTHEMS

AnET	'An earthly tree'	MS; 1589i/40+25
AlackWILB	'Alack, when I look back'	BE 11/11b
BeholdOGTS	'Behold, O God, the sad and heavy case'	BE 11/12
BeholdOGWT	'Behold, O God, with thy all-prospering eye'*	BE 11/22
ChristR	'Christ Rising', 2nd part 'Christ is risen'	1589i/46+47; BE 11/13
HearMPOL	'Hear my prayer, O Lord'	BE 11/14
HaveMUMOG	'Have mercy upon me, O God'	1611/24; TCM 4, pp. 203–7
LetUBG	'Let us be glad'*	BE 11/23
NowIMS	'Now Israel may say'	MS (incomplete)
OLordRMN	'O Lord, rebuke me not'	BE 11/15
SingYTOG	'Sing ye to our God'*	BE 11/24
ThouGTG	'Thou God that guid'st'	BE 11/16

* Text only

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 Genres

The question of whether or not the pieces to be discussed in this chapter all properly belong to a study of Byrd's vernacular church music is moot. For Edmund Fellowes it was axiomatic that the psalms and carols from the three printed songbooks were 'Church music', and not until the preparation of BE 11a was any attempt made to distinguish Byrd's anthems from his other settings of devotional texts in English. As we saw in the last chapter (p. 118), the full anthems can readily be seen as a circumscribed group in Byrd's *œuvre* because, although their circulation was by no means restricted to church circles, all are conspicuous by their absence from his publications, all conform more or less to the norms of ecclesiastical choral scoring, and all are settings of prose texts from the psalter or the BCP. The same criteria do not apply, however, to the nine non-liturgical works containing solo or duet passages with obbligato instrumental accompaniment that survive in institutional part-books and organ-books. Three appear in Byrd's prints, most have two T parts as opposed to two Ct parts, and several are settings of metrical texts. Monson's

assumption that 'most of [them] must originally have been created for court performance and subsequently adapted for use in chapel' is undoubtedly true, but the present investigation will reveal good reasons to believe that at least one of the metrical pieces was composed for church use.

Given that the vernacular anthem repertory seems at first to have assimilated to itself a range of musical genres, borrowing or adapting carols, motets, partsongs and even French chansons,[1] the assimilation of Byrd's pieces for voices and viols was only to be expected. Yet while this implies that Elizabethan musicians did not all rigidly distinguish chamber music from church music, it surely remains pertinent simply to enquire whether a given work was conceived with an accompaniment for viols or for organ, and to recognize that distinction with appropriate terminology. The need to do so was first stressed many years ago by John Morehen, and it is to be regretted that his example has gone largely unheeded in more recent scholarship.[2] As invariably happens with genres of the period, historical usage proves unequal to the musicologist's task. Borrowing terms traceable to Byrd's 'O God that guides' (1611/28), two of Michael East's prints offer the term 'anthems for versus and chorus'.[3] Barnard's *First Book* offers 'anthems with verses', and contemporary institutional MSS 'anthems alone', 'a lone verse', 'single anthems', and anthems 'for a man alone' or 'for a child alone'.[4] Since a similar problem was posed by Byrd's songs for solo voice and viols until the introduction of Brett's now universally accepted ahistorical term 'consort song', the similar solution offered by Morehen's ahistorical terms 'consort anthem' and 'verse anthem' will be rigorously applied here.

---

1 See John Milsom, 'Songs, Carols and *Contrafacta* in the Early History of the Tudor Anthem', *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, 107 (1980–81), 34–45; and Milsom, 'Caustun's Contrafacta', *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 132 (2007), 1–31 (3–10).

2 'The English Consort and Verse Anthems', *Early Music*, 6 (1978), 381–5. The usage of 'verse' as a catch-all term may be cited, *inter alia*, in Peter James, 'The Significance of Byrd's Verse Compositions: A Reappraisal', *Annual Byrd Newsletter*, 7 (2001), 7–10.

3 Title pages of *The fovrth set of bookes* (London: Thomas Snodham, 1618; STC 7463) and *The sixt set of bookes* (London: Thomas Snodham, 1624; STC 7466).

4 As, for example, in *Ob* MS Tenbury 1382 (index), *Llp* MS 764 (f. 15r), *Ob* MS Rawl. Poet. 23 (p. 101), *Och* MS Mus. 1220 (p. 98) and *Ob* MS Mus. e. 40 (f. 20v).

A few words are needed on the vexed question of whether or not viol consorts were used to accompany voices in church services.[5] It stands to reason that the need to tune those instruments before every pieces of music would have made them a somewhat disruptive presence in the liturgy, and that their characteristically intimate tone quality was ill-adapted to large interiors. Though studying the viol became a widespread educational activity for choristers in the period, no archival reference to the provision of liturgical viol consorts has yet been discovered. Only two contemporary accounts refer specifically to the playing of viols in church: a biography of the Irish bishop William Bedell (d. 1642) stresses his distaste for the 'organs, sackbuts, cornetts, viols, etc.' at Christ Church Cathedral Dublin,[6] while a certain Lieutenant Hammond's description of music-making at Exeter Cathedral in 1635 mentions 'viols and other sweet instruments'.[7] While both accounts recall contemporary anti-Laudian polemic,[8] Hammond's observation appears to be corroborated by a 1622 record of special seating provided 'for the musicke' in the Exeter quire.[9] Indeed, Hammond's phrase may imply the kind of mixed consort for which Henry Loosemore composed his *Verse for the Organ, a Sagbut, Cornute & Violin* for performance at sermon time in King's College Chapel, Cambridge, during the

---

5 See Peter le Huray, *Music and the Reformation in England* (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1967; repr. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 128–9; le Huray was the first to explore this question, and his conclusion that 'viols seem rarely to have been used [in church services]' has been amply borne out by two subsequent studies: Andrew Parrott, 'Grett and Solompne Singing: Instruments in English Church Music Before the Civil War', *Early Music*, 6 (1978), 182–7 (185–6); and 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* (New York: Garland, 1993), 149–55. All three studies quote *inter alia* the references given in nn. 6–7 and 11 below.

6 Alexander Clogy, *Memoir of the Life and Episcopate of Dr William Bedell*, ed. W. Walker Wilkins (London: Wertheim, Macintosh & Hunt, 1862), 140.

7 'A Relation of a Short Survey of the Western Counties made by a Lieutenant of the Military Company in Norwich in 1635', ed. L. G. Wickham Legg, *Camden Third Series*, 52 (1936), 74.

8 An anonymous pamphleteer (possibly Peter Smart), for example, condemned the singing of the Nicene Creed at Durham Cathedral 'with organs, sackbuts, and cornets, and all other instruments of music, which were used at the consecration of Nebuchadnezzar's golden Image (unfit instruments for Christian churches where men come for to pray, and not for to chant, or hear a sound or consort of they know not what)': *A briefe, but true historicall Narration of some notorious Acts and Speeches of Mr. Iohn Cosens, and some other of his companions contracted into Articles*, included in *The vanitie & downe-fall of superstitious popish ceremonies: or, A sermon preached in the cathedrall church of Durham by one Mr. Peter Smart, a praebend there, Iuly 27. 1628* (Edinburgh: the heirs of Robert Charteris, 1628; STC 22640.3), sig. *2v.

9 Payne, *The Provision and Practice of Sacred Music*, 151.

Interregnum.[10] Such use of strings was clearly unusual, however, and we have the authority of no less a witness than Charles Butler that 'in our church solemnities only the wind-instruments (whose notes are constant) be in use'.[11]

Two relevant musical sources have so far been overlooked in discussions of the viol question. The first is John Merro's part-book set *Lbl* Add. MSS 17792–6, which in addition to a Short Service for four voices by John Lugge (*V*, *TD*, *M*, *ND*) contains five parts of a six-part arrangement of the *TD* from Byrd's Great Service (the Sx part is missing). Since Merro was a lay-clerk of Gloucester Cathedral, and the part-books also contain a number of full anthems and consort anthems, it may reasonably be asked if he ever brought them into the quire for use by a viol consort. In the case of Byrd's *TD*, however, the question is hypothetical because the parts are too faulty ever to have been played from, and the representation of both services in the collection may simply be due to Merro's evident interest in church music. More compelling is the presence of viol parts for ChristR in the Chirk Castle part-books (which were copied for a household chapel known to have been equipped with a two-manual organ), but it is notable that the same MSS include several further consort anthems in verse versions, without viol parts.[12] Here as elsewhere, therefore, the evidence suggests that in services the use of a viol consort was at best the exception rather than the rule.

3.1.2 The origins of the verse idiom

It has been argued that the peculiarly English idiom of the verse anthem was the product of diverse influences: musico-liturgical practice, songs with instrumental accompaniment, and

---

10 *NYp* MS Drexel 5469, pp. 202–4; Payne, *The Provision and Practice of Sacred Music*, 149–50.

11 *The principles of musik, in singing and setting vvith the two-fold use thereof, ecclesiasticall and civil* (London: John Haviland, 1636; STC 4196), 103.

12 Michael East, 'When Israel came out of Egypt', viol parts in his *Third set of bookes* (London: Thomas Snodham, 1610; STC 7462); Orlando Gibbons, 'Glorious and powerful God', viol parts in *Och* MS Mus. 21; Thomas Tomkins, 'Thou art my king, O God', viol parts in *Lbl* Add. MSS 29372–6; and Ward, 'Let God arise', viol parts in *Lbl* Add. MSS 29372–6 and *Och* MSS Mus. 56–60 and 61–6.

music for instruments alone.[13] Among the pieces le Huray believed to be forerunners of the genre is the Wanley copy of an anonymous four-voice strophic setting of the metrical prayer 'Let all the congregation'.[14] This was later printed by Day, though without the curious repetition scheme indicated in the MSS whereby each verse was to be sung first by Ct1 alone (or perhaps as a duet with the lost T part) and then by all voices (presumably, that is, including the lost T part). Though no instrumental accompaniment is indicated when the Ct sings without Ct2 and B, le Huray's suggestion that one may have been played from the vocal B part is not unreasonable. Such a scheme may be implied by the lone B part of a similar anonymous work to which John Milsom has drawn attention,[15] a setting of William Hunnis's poem 'My soul, O God, doth now confess' (*Ob* MS Tenbury 1464, ff. 70v–71r). The single part is entered twice, on opposite sides of a single opening, being texted on the left but untexted on the right. Each line of text, as opposed to each stanza, is clearly marked off with dotted double barlines, and although there is nothing to indicate that the vocal part should be sung on the repeats only it is hard to see why the scribe would otherwise have troubled to enter the instrumental part separately. Whatever way or ways these pieces were performed, it needs to be stressed that neither of them can be deemed an *alternatim* composition in the usual sense because, in a manner that anticipated the eighteenth-century practice of 'lining out' metrical psalms, the opposing musical forces by turns sang the *same* portions of text rather than successive ones.

Though not mentioned in the rubrics of the BCP, *alternatim* psalmody in its most traditional sense is specifically endorsed by one of the earliest of the occasional liturgies issued during Elizabeth's reign, which includes the rubric 'one verse to be said of the

---

13 See le Huray, *Music and the Reformation in England*, 217–19.

14 *Music and the Reformation in England*, 217; *Ob* MSS Mus. Sch. e. 420–22; RRMR 100/41 (see also RRMR 99, p. xx).

15 'Sacred Songs in the Chamber' in *English Choral Practice, 1400–1650*, ed. John Morehen (Cambridge, 1995), 161–79 (168).

minister, and another by the people, clerk or clerks'.[16] A few similarly explicit directions are printed in Archbishop Matthew Parker's metrical psalter of 1567, where the refrains of Ps. 107 are assigned to 'the quire' and blocks of the intervening verses either to 'the mean' (possibly a solo M) or to a group called 'the rectors'. The same tripartite forces are deployed in an even more complicated arrangement in Ps. 136, although in neither case is it clear how Parker envisaged them to function musically.[17] It is notable that, although this publication is decidedly of a non-liturgical nature, the forces it calls for are unquestionably ecclesiastical ones. As we shall see, 'Let all the congregation', 'My soul, O God' and Parker's performance directions all involve the kind of texts that, are characteristic of the early verse anthem: prayers in verse for the monarch, the spiritual ditties of Hunnis, and metrical psalms.

The development of the verse genre is not to be confused with the mid-century practice of scoring certain vernacular liturgical works for two or more contrasting semichoirs, somewhat in the old manner of the Tudor antiphon. Pieces admissible to that category include a fragmentary setting of Ps. 136 attributed to Tallis,[18] another of Ps. 149 with conflicting attributions to Tallis and Sheppard,[19] and (probably) the Obiit psalms by [Richard] Farrant (see p. 237 below). In Ps. 136, the rubric 'trebles' applies to passages apparently of a homorhythmic character that suggests chordal declamation by a high-voice semichoir rather than (*pace* le Huray) a vocal-instrumental texture.[20] Though Ps. 149 bears

---

16 *A fourme to be vsed in common prayer twise a weeke ... during this tyme of mortalitie and other afflictions* (London: Richard Jugge and John Cawood, 1563; STC 16505), sig. A4r; reprinted in *Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer Set Forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1847), ed. William Keatinge Clay, 478–502.

17 *The vvhole Psalter translated into English metre* (London: John Day [1567]; STC 2729), pp. 309[*recte* 310]–315 and 302[*recte* 392]–395. For a facsimile of the first two pages of Ps. 107 see le Huray, *Music and the Reformation in England*, plate 14. Neither of Parker's antiphonal schemes is connected with any of the nine psalm-tunes by Tallis for which this publication is best known to musicians.

18 *Ob* MS Tenbury 791, ff. 448v–449r.

19 *Ob* MS Tenbury 791, ff. 446v–447v ('Sheppard') and *Ob* MS Mus. Sch. e. 423, p. 11 ('Tallis'); this setting of Ps. 149 ('O sing unto the Lord a new song, let the congregation...') is confused in SECM with the setting of Ps. 98 ('O sing unto the Lord a new song, for he hath done...') attributed to Sheppard in *Y* MS M29(S), pp. 4–5; I am indebted to Magnus Williamson for this clarification.

20 *Music and the Reformation in England*, 218; both possibilities were admitted by le Huray.

the intriguing rubrics 'medio chori' and 'base', these by no means necessarily connote an obbligato organ part. All the pieces in this group are most probably examples of schematic *a cappella* scorings of the kind subsequently deployed by Byrd in his liturgical setting of Ps. 54 (see pp. 14–15 above). Since vernacular practice thus appears to have embraced various forms of antiphony besides the simple opposition of c and d, it is necessary to look elsewhere for the origins of the *sine qua non* of the verse idiom, an independent and idiomatic organ accompaniment.

Three early compositions that survive with just such an accompaniment will be referred to repeatedly in this chapter: Richard Farrant's 'When as we sat in Babylon', and William Mundy's 'The secret sins' and 'Ah, helpless wretch'. Questions surrounding the genre and texts of these works will be addressed in due course, but first the attribution of the pieces by Mundy calls for comment. 'The secret sins' is anonymous in all its musical sources except *DRc* MSS C4 (p. 59), C6 (p. 56) and C9 (p. 38), where it is attributed to 'Mr Gibbons', and *Lbl* Add. MS 30479 (f. 89r), a later Durham source which reiterates the name 'Gibbons'. Though on that basis it has twice been published as Gibbons's work (TCM 4, pp. 293–6; EECM 3/14), the attribution is hardly trustworthy, given that the Durham scribes were errant enough also to pin Gibbons's name on one of Byrd's published works, HaveMUMOG. With its simple texture and strophic form, furthermore, 'The secret sins' closely resembles Mundy's 'Ah, helpless wretch', the similar treatment of the words 'secret sins' and 'helpless wretch' being especially remarkable (a dotted minim, a crotchet and a minim, all at the same pitch). There thus seems not to be any reason for doubting the attribution to Mundy given in the Chapel Royal word-books *Ob* MS Rawl. Poet. 23 (p. 105) and *Lbl* MS Harley 6346 (f. 23v), and subsequently to William Mundy in James Clifford's second post-Restoration word-book,[21] where the indications of verse and chorus passages correspond to those of the surviving setting. The only conflicting attribution of

21 *The Divine Services and Anthems*, 2nd edn (London: William Godbid, 1664), 183–4.

'Ah, helpless wretch'—to 'Robert Parsons'—is found in Barnard's Bc part-book *Lcm* MS 1051 (ff. 23v–24r), but is refuted by the two other members of the set that contain this anthem, MSS 1046 (f. 17r–v) and 1048 (ff. 15v–16r), by Barnard's *First Book* and by both of Clifford's word-books,[22] all of which name the composer as either 'Mundy' or 'William Mundy'.

3.1.3 Music for consort and chorus

The course of instrumental ensemble music in England had been decisively set on 1 May 1540 when the royal minstrels were permanently joined by a consort of six viol players from Italy.[23] Within a few decades, an important role had been established for the viol in the education of the choristers, at first in the London area and subsequently as far afield as Exeter, Ely and Lincoln.[24] The chorister play *Wit and Science*, written by the St Paul's organist John Redford in 1545, includes two stage directions for the participation of a consort of four viols. The St Paul's choristers sang and played their viols for the Merchant Taylors' Company in 1549, at a coronation pageant for Queen Mary in 1553, and for the Goldsmiths' Company in 1560 and 1561; the Westminster choristers were likewise engaged to perform for the Parish Clerks' Company in 1562. The demand created by these chorister consorts was such that in 1561 the Court of Aldermen equipped the London waites with a set of viols costing £12, while a private consort identified as 'Currance's Noise' performed for the Goldsmiths in 1564 and, in 1570, at the marriage celebrations of Byrd's friend John Petre.[25]

It seems to have been at this time that a repertory of textless (and very likely didactic) polyphony suitable for instrumental ensemble, much of it based on the 'In nomine' and

---

22 *The Divine Services and Anthems*, 1st edn (London: William Godbid, 1663), 42–3; 2nd edn, 36–7.

23 Ian Woodfield, *The Early History of the Viol* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 208.

24 On the introduction, outside the London area, of viol consorts for the purpose of chorister education see Payne, *The Provision and Practice of Sacred Music*, 137–145.

25 Woodfield, *The Early History of the Viol*, 213–15.

'Miserere' *cantus firmi*, was created by Robert White, Robert Parsons, the elder Alfonso Ferrabosco and, of course, Byrd. Also in the early years of Elizabeth's reign, chorister plays, which had suffered a decline in popularity under Edward and Mary, were firmly reinstated,[26] catalysing the genre of strophic composition for solo voice and a quartet of viols (occasionally a quintet, or perhaps even a trio) known today as the 'consort song'.[27] Like the related verse idiom of church music, this was a distinctively English affair, firmly rooted in the traditions of Tudor court entertainment.[28] When not for Tr, the vocal part of these songs is for M enclosed by a treble viol descant—an arrangement strongly characteristic of Byrd's consort songs but already evident in earlier pieces such as Parsons's 'Enforced by love and fear' (MB 22/5). Since Byrd's vocal parts are almost invariably texted throughout (except, perhaps, when a repeated verbal phrase is to be inferred), it is assumed that he did not intend them to be doubled by instruments. Moral or pastoral poems, but especially metrical psalms, are staple texts.

From its inception, metrical psalmody seem to have been regarded as legitimate material for a solo voice. This is first hinted at in Thomas Sternhold's preface to his *Certayne psalmes* of 1549: 'as your grace [King Edward VI] taketh pleasure to hear them sometimes sung of me, so ye will also delight ... to command them to be sung to you of others'.[29] The often repeated claim that Sternhold's preface mentions instruments is unfounded, but Tye's four-part music for *The Actes of the Apostles* (1553) is described as suitable 'to sing and also to play upon the lute'—although the use of staff notation and choir-book format in this publication was hardly calculated for the convenience of

---

26 Woodfield, *The Early History of the Viol*, 215–16.

27 This now universally accepted term was first applied to the present genre (by Philip Brett) with the caveat that its earliest historical usage—in Sir William Leighton's *The teares or lamentacions of a sorrovvfull soule* (London: William Stansby, 1614; STC 15434), sig. B1r—was to partsongs for four voices doubled by a 'broken consort' of treble viol, bass viol, lute, bandora, cittern and flute (see EECM 11/1–18): see Brett, 'The English Consort Song, 1570–1625', *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, 88 (1961–2), 73–88 (73).

28 Brett, 'The English Consort Song', 74–5.

29 London: Edward Whitchurch; STC 2419, sig. A.3.

lutenists.[30] Similarly, Day's *The whole psalmes in foure partes, whiche may be song to al musicall instrumentes* (1563) can only have been of indirect use to lutenists and keyboard players, yet its presentation as a set of four part-books signals the growing fashion for instrumentally accompanied domestic psalmody.[31]

There are quite clear indications from within Byrd's consort music that he arrived at a solo-chorus format independently of ecclesiastical performance practice. Philip Brett identified a group of five metrical psalm settings that he saw as representing an 'expanded version of the consort song that became known as the verse anthem' (by which, of course, he meant the genre to which we are applying Morehen's term 'consort anthem').[32] These psalms show that the usual consort format of accompanied solo voice could sometimes be juxtaposed with a vocal chorus that doubled the viols in a repeat of the final line or couplet of each verse.[33] Admittedly, the sources provide only scanty evidence that this was so: the concluding repeats of 'O Lord, within thy tabernacle' (BE 15/1) and 'Lord, to thee I make my moan' (BE 15/5) are supplied with the rubric 'chorus' in *Ob* MS Mus. Sch. e. 423 (where the relevant passage of the latter song is accordingly underlaid with text) and in *Ob* MS Tenbury 389. Yet Byrd's strategies in these songs all seem to imply, one way or another, that he envisaged the interjection of a full vocal ensemble: the texture may become more homophonic ('The man is blest', BE 15/4), the ultimate solo phrase may be transferred to another voice ('The Lord is only my support', BE 15/2;[34] BE 15/4), or the

30 London: William Seres; STC 2984, title page.

31 London: John Day; STC 2431, title page.

32 Preface to BE 15, p. vii; the point is made also in le Huray, *Music and the Reformation in England*, 224. Brett also included in this category the consort song 'Mount, Hope, above the skies' (BE 15/20), although its original form and authorship are more uncertain than those of the five psalms; see BE 15, p. 173. For similar consort songs with choruses see MB 22/37, 46, 57.

33 A possible precedent for this practice may be cited in Miles Coverdale's *Goostly psalmes and spirituall songes* (London: John Gough, 1535; STC 5892), f. 39, where in the first stanza of a versified Ps. 128 (here given the Vulgate number 127) the last line and its melody are printed twice over. No performance directions are given, but the repetition would clearly have been appropriate to some form of antiphony.

34 The original Tr part is lost, but at this point it very clearly borrowed from preceding material in the M.

repeated text may be set to completely fresh music ('O Lord, who in thy sacred tent', 1588/6 = BE 16/8).

Four settings of non-psalmodic metrical texts confirm that, as far as Byrd was concerned, it was perfectly legitimate within the consort idiom to alternate solos or duets with passages for vocal chorus. These are the carols AnET, 'From Virgin's womb' (1589i/35+24) and 'O God that guides' (1611/28), together with Byrd's large-scale setting of Queen Elizabeth's own poem celebrating the failure of the Spanish Armada, 'Look and bow down'. Though the music of the last of these works is known only from an intabulation in Edward Paston's lute-book *Lbl* MS 31992, its choruses, like those of the five metrical psalms, clearly served the rhetorical purpose of repeating the last line or couplet of each stanza.[35] The carols, in contrast, are provided with choral burdens or refrains that are both textually and musically independent of the verses, to the extent that the two 1589 burdens, 'Cast off all doubtful care' (24) and 'Rejoice, rejoice' (25), are placed among the song-book's four-voice items, at some distance from their respective five- and six-voice verses. The verses of both carols, furthermore, both circulated with different burdens, respectively 'Cease cares' (BE16/36), also found only MS 31992, and

35 Generally speaking, the arranger of the songs and anthems in Add. MS 31992 intabulated the lowest voices only, leaving the topmost part of OGodWOO and other full anthems to be sung from some unidentified M part-book. Likewise, both M parts are omitted from ChristR, the intabulation comprising the four viol parts only. These intabulations offer no information about their absent upper voice parts beyond Spanish rubrics indicating the pitch of the initial entry (see BE 16, p. 196). Yet the intabulation of 'Look and bow down' for some reason includes one of its solo voice parts, and offers several clues about another.

Whereas only four voices were intabulated in v. 2, five were intabulated in vv. 1 and 3, the highest of which is marked out—very clearly in v. 1—by a dot over each relevant fret number. Elsewhere in the same MS, such dots indicate a vocal part that has been included in the intabulation. In the case of 'Look and bow down', the dotted notes fall within the range *b♭–d"*, and must therefore represent a M voice. From the marginal indication '6 voc.', and from the absence of dots in v. 2, it may be deduced that the solo function presumably performed by a M in v. 1 was transferred in v. 2 to a missing sixth voice. Furthermore, whereas v. 1 appears to have been contrapuntally complete without a sixth voice, v. 3 does not, meaning that the sixth voice must have been present in addition to the M.

Assuming that the omitted voice was the highest (as it is in the other Paston intabulations), and given the contrapuntal possibilities admitted by the lower voices, it may be concluded with reasonable certainty that the sixth voice was a Tr, that vv. 1 and 2 were therefore solos for M and Tr respectively, and that v. 3 combined both voices in a duet. All three verses are rounded off with conspicuously homorhythmic passages; the multiple dots arranged in a vertical line adjacent to fret numbers at the start of those passages doubtless indicate that here the instruments were joined by a vocal chorus.

what appears to be an alternative setting of 'Rejoice, rejoice' in Batten's organ-book *Ob* MS Tenbury 791—the only source indicating that any of the three carols was ever sung in church.

Unlike the metrical psalms and carols, 'Look and bow down' is a through-composed, tripartite work that treats each of the queen's three stanzas in the manner of a one-verse consort song for solo or duet with concluding chorus. Thus, this important *pièce d'occasion* can be seen as a link in the chain connecting the consort song, the consort song with chorus, and the through-composed consort anthem. Notwithstanding the appearance of ChristR, HaveMUMOG and AnET in institutional sources, it is clear that the necessary performing conditions for those works existed within the courtly tradition of consort music, and extended to households such as that of John Petre, for whom 'Lord, to thee I make my moan' and ChristR were copied into *Ob* MS Mus. Sch. e. 423.

Elizabethan works for consort and chorus were nonetheless few and far between. Viol parts are known for only five anthems by composers other than Byrd born before 1570: Hooper's 'Hearken ye nations' and 'The blessed Lamb', and Bull's 'Almighty God' (dated 1592 by Tudway);[36] 'How joyful and how glad' and 'In thee, O Lord'.[37] Passages for M duet, akin to those of ChristR, are consistently a prominent feature of all these pieces, but the two younger composers also introduce passages for trios and quartets, and break with

---

36 *Lbl* MS Harley 7337, f. 76v; the date is reasonable, but like other dates given by Tudway it is not supported by any evidence and cannot be otherwise confirmed.

37 With the exception of 'Almighty God' (TCMO 91), modern edns of the anthems by Bull and Hooper have yet to be published; viol parts for their unpublished anthems are found only in *Ob* MSS Tenbury 807–11 ('In thee, O Lord') and *Och* MSS 56–60 ('How joyful and how glad' and both anthems by Hooper). On these anthems see Edmund Fellowes, *English Cathedral Music from Edward VI to Edward VII* (London: Methuen, 1941), where one of the M duets from 'In thee, O Lord' is described as 'so grotesque that it would be impossible to sing it in church at the present time' (p. 108), and le Huray, *Music and the Reformation in England*, where extracts are quoted from 'The blessed Lamb' (p. 260) and 'In thee, O Lord' (p. 265). Two points raised by le Huray in connection with consort anthems call for comment. First, his statement that viol parts exist also for Hooper's anthem 'O God of gods' (p. 259) appears to be without foundation; second, although a textless copy of 'Almighty God' appears in John Baldwin's commonplace book *Lbl* MS R.M. 24.d.2 with the Latin incipit 'Deus omnipotens' (ff. 80v–82r), this hardly constitutes evidence that the anthem 'was originally a motet..., or possibly a string fantasia with that title' (p. 263); the sixteen psalm settings of the Lumley books *Lbl* MSS Royal Appendix 74–6, for example, all appear under Latin headings, yet clearly none of them is a *contrafactum* of a Latin original.

Byrd's practice by doubling the M part with a treble viol. Of the fifty or so verse anthems by Thomas Tomkins, consort versions survive in various states of completeness for only six;[38] while even Orlando Gibbons, the most prolific exponent of the consort anthem, can securely be credited with no more than ten examples of it.[39]

Reasons will become clear for bracketing with Byrd's two fully extant consort anthems a further two works—HearMPOL and OLordRMN—for which viol parts have not survived. At the same time, it will be argued that AlackWILB and BeholdOGTS never existed in consort versions but were conceived as verse anthems *per se*. It will be shown too that ThouGTG cannot confidently be classified as a verse adaptation of a consort anthem by Byrd, but primarily because it appears to be at least partly the work of another composer.

3.2 Organ parts and stylistic affinities in the early verse repertory

The task of distinguishing Byrd's original verse anthems from adaptations of his consort pieces will depend to a considerable extent on establishing points of comparison with accompaniments known to have been composed for organ and those known to be arrangements of viol scores. But this is no simple matter. Though the transposition system entailed by the pre-Restoration English organ is now quite well understood,[40] and the organ's accompanying roles in seventeenth-century chamber music and post-Restoration

---

38 Edns of 'Above the stars', 'O Lord, let me know mine end', 'Rejoice, rejoice and sing', 'Sing unto God' and 'Thou art my King, O God' in *Five Consort Anthems*, ed. David Pinto and Ross W. Duffin (London: Fretwork Editions, 1994). The treble viol part alone survives of a sixth consort anthem, 'Know you not'; for a transposed edn of the same anthem in verse format by Peter James see *An Anthology of English Church Music*, ed. David Wulstan (London: J. & W. Chester, 1971), 116–34.

39 EECM 3/3–5, 7, 9, 11–13 and 15–16.

40 See John Bunker Clark, *Transposition in Seventeenth-Century English Organ Accompaniments and the Transposing Organ* (Detroit: Information Coordinators, 1974); William Reynolds, 'Chirk Castle Organ and Organbook: An Insight into Performance Practice Involving a Seventeenth-Century "Transposing" Organ', *Journal of the British Institute of Organ Studies*, 21 (1997), 28–55; and my article '"As it Was in the Beginning": Organ and Choir Pitch in Early Anglican Church Music', *Early Music*, 31 (2003), 506–25.

church music have been investigated in some detail,[41] developments in the composing and playing of organ parts up to the Laudian period remain unexplored. For Monson, the more meagre surviving organ parts simply represented 'an outline for improvisation' that ought ideally to be filled in with all the contrapuntal rigour of a consort song.[42] But by unquestioningly following 'the guidelines of Byrd's fuller viol accompaniments' (p. 71), Monson's method inevitably obscured what prove to be essential differences in texture between verse and consort compositions. The object of the present investigation, then, is to reveal those differences in the light of the early verse repertory as a whole.

The surviving organ parts to Byrd's vocal-instrumental compositions coexist in bewilderingly diverse states, their textures varying widely between different copies of the same piece, and even between sections of an individual copy. This problem does not apply to choruses, which are in the style typical for compositions in the full idiom tend simply to double the outer voices in homorhythmic passages, and supply certain inner notes when the texture is ruffled or actually fugal. Rather, it is in the solo and duet passages that telling discrepancies occur. As table 3:1 shows, the only relevant composition with two identically constituted organ parts is HaveMUMOG (which is not to say that those two parts are by any means identical as regards detail). Otherwise, differences in constitution are substantive and even dramatic: one version of an accompaniment may double the vocal part while another does not (AlackWILB); one may include an instrumental descant above the vocal part while another omits it (ThouGTG); multiple versions may respectively amplify the texture with their own independent inner lines or harmonic padding (HearMPOL).

---

41 See Peter Holman, '"Evenly, Softly, and Sweetly Acchording to All": The Organ Accompaniment of English Consort Music' in *John Jenkins and His Time: Studies in English Consort Music*, ed. Andrew Ashbee and Peter Holman (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 353–82; and Rebecca Herissone, *'To Fill, Forbear or Adorne': The Organ Accompaniment of Restoration Sacred Music* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).

42 'Through a Glass Darkly: Byrd's Verse Service as Reflected in Manuscript Sources', *Musical Quarterly*, 67 (1981), 64–81 (65–6).

The organ parts for AnET, ChristR and HaveMUMOG by and large compare rather unfavourably with the authorized consort prints. Despite Byrd's practice of writing purely vocal solo or duet parts that stand apart from the accompaniment, and would appear not to have been doubled by viols, in the organ arrangements the solos and duets are invariably doubled throughout. The only other constant is the instrumental bass line; beyond that, the arrangers seem to have been a law unto themselves, incorporating as much or as little of the remaining instrumental detail as suited them. While one arrangement of ChristR includes more notes than are really practicable at the keyboard, others consist of almost nothing more than the two vocal parts plus the bass line (as also do certain portions of AnET). In HaveMUMOG, Byrd's solo, uppermost viol and bass parts are sometimes amplified with a free fourth voice that must be the work of the arranger or a later copyist. Fidelity to Byrd's viol scores does not therefore appear to have been a universal concern of seventeenth-century organists.

The three organ parts to the Verse Service will be discussed in the next chapter, but it must be pointed out here that while two of them agree with respect to to their instrumental bass line, doubling of the vocal part, and instrumental descant, the same two disagree on their additional inner notes. From a purely textual point of view, neither of these witnesses can be deemed entirely correct, since each appears to represent—like the organ part to HaveMUMOG—an autonomous venture in adding a fourth voice to an existing three-voice framework. Yet as we shall now see, a framework of that kind is an essential characteristic of early verse compositions, and one that seems to have been especially vulnerable to scribal amplification.

Fortunately, a number of organ parts for works by Elizabethan composers other than Byrd have come down to us in what appear to be their original, unamplified states. Variously cleffed and transposed, and randomly dispersed among the thousand or so pages of *Ob* MS Tenbury 791, these parts are in the hand of Adrian Batten, and correspond to

verse compositions by Byrd's seniors Richard Farrant and William Mundy (ex. 3:1)[43] and his junior Thomas Morley (ex. 3:2).[44] This is not to say that all Batten's accompaniments are similarly untouched: those for the Verse Service (as we have seen) and ThouGTG, for example, contain what is evidently scribal padding. Yet in the six accompaniments under examination here, the instrumental bass and descant form a widely spaced bicinium enclosing the vocal part. Although not consistently enriched with imperfect consonances, the resulting three-voice texture is contrapuntally self-sufficient.[45]

Given that contrapuntal loose ends—such as the unfinished opening entries in Palmer's sketchy arrangement of ChristR—are an all-too-familiar feature of seventeenth-century organ-books, it is hard not to think of the more sparsely textured accompaniments as shorthand reductions. That the passages by Farrant, Mundy and Morley are nonetheless three-voice conceptions is clearly evident at the cadences. With full closes, a tenorizans component in the vocal part is complemented with basizans and suspended cantizans components in the LH and RH of the organ part respectively (see ex. 3:1a at 'round about', ex. 3:2a at 'O Lord', and ex. 3:2c at 'Saviour mine'). Similarly, ascending closes in the

---

43 The following references are to *Ob* MS Tenbury 791 plus the MS or edition from which the vocal part has been quoted: (a) ff. 361v–362r (LH part a 5th higher than here, RH part a 4th lower, see n. 45 below), vocal part from the M part-book of *NYp* MSS Mus. Res. *MNZ (Chirk), f. 72r–73r; (b) f. 70r (a 5th higher than here), EECM 3/14 (on the attribution of this work see p. 135 above); (c) ff. 73v–74r (a 5th higher than here), RRMR 116/31. For a reconstruction of the first verse and chorus of 'When as we sat in Babylon' (made before the vocal parts came to light in the Chirk MSS, and with the accompaniment from *Och* MS Mus. 6), see le Huray, *Music and the Reformation in England*, 221; for a facsimile of the organ part from *Och* MS Mus. 6 and parallel transcriptions of portions of both organ parts, see le Huray, 'The Chirk Castle Partbooks', *Early Music History*, 2 (1982), 17–42 (29, 40–41); see also n. 62 below.

44 As n. 43 above: (a) f. 430r–v (at quire pitch, as given here), EECM 38/8 (p. 93); (b) ff. 84v–85r (at quire pitch), EECM 38/3; (c) ff. 85v–86v (at quire pitch), EECM 38/2.

45 It must be noted that in Farrant's 'When as we sat in Babylon' the disposition of the two instrumental parts relative to the vocal part is not unambiguously apparent from Batten's copy alone. Usually, Batten's C5+G2 clef combination would signify that the entire accompaniment should sound a 5th lower than written, i.e. with the RH part an 8ve lower than shown in ex. 3:1a. There are reasons to believe, however, that in this instance Batten notated the RH part an 8ve too low, for in the only other known copy of the accompaniment the two parts are indeed disposed as shown in ex. 3:1a (see ex. 3:4 below). Batten, furthermore, appears to have made just such a slip when copying the organ part to Giles's 'O Lord, of whom I do depend' (see n. 48 below), a verse anthem closely related to Farrant's, which he rectified with the explicit marginal direction 'the treble must be 8 notes higher' (*Ob* MS Tenbury 791, f. 34r; the intended meaning is, of course, seven notes higher). In this case too the resulting disposition is confirmed by another copy (*DRc* MS A5, pp. 112–15). On these and similar cases of 8ve ambiguity see Clark, *Transposition*, 45–8; Reynolds, 'Chirk Castle Organ and Organbook, 40; and le Huray, 'The Chirk Castle Partbooks', 40–2.

vocal part are made up into textbook Phrygian cadences by the addition of paired stepwise descents in the accompaniment (see ex. 3:1a at 'in Babylon', ex. 3:1c at 'what shall', and ex. 3:2b at 'O Lord'). The purely instrumental lead-ins too are very largely bicinia: Farrant's consists of a neat subject-answer stretto, both of Mundy's incorporate two subjects plus an answer, while each of Morley's pre-echoes the vocal entry over a striding bass line. It is noteworthy that Mundy's three-entry schemes do not develop into fully fledged three-voice counterpoint. Clearly, there was nothing to prevent the composer—or even an intervening copyist—from breaking into three parts during the lead-in, since this indeed happens fleetingly in 'The secret sins', and more substantially in 'Out of the deep', where a temporary canon at the lower 8ve develops. Elsewhere, however, any temptation to amplify the texture has been firmly resisted. It is noteworthy too that during the initial, LH entry of 'The secret sins' the RH inserts free counterpoint rather than resting until its own entry in the second bar. We shall have reason to refer again to this RH part later in the present chapter.

The most significant textural difference between the organ parts quoted in ex. 3:1 and those quoted in ex. 3:2 is that in the latter a doubling of the vocal part is notated in addition to the instrumental bass and descant. Such doublings need not necessarily have been played by the organist, however, for in the anthem by Farrant (ex. 3:1a) the vocal part is omitted altogether, while in the two anthems by Mundy (ex. 3:1b–c) it is merely cued with an initial note and a *signum congruentiae*. The first doubled note of Morley's Ps. 119:169–76 (ex. 3:2a) is likewise marked with a *signum congruentiae*, perhaps therefore indicating that the doubling was intended only as a cue. Certainly accompaniments without comprehensive doublings of the vocal part exist for compositions later than Farrant's and Mundy's anthems, such as Weelkes's celebrated Trebles Service.[46] In Morley's 'Out of the

46 Ed. Peter le Huray (London: Stainer & Bell, 1962): see, for example, bars 8–15 of the *M*, and bars 32–51 of the *ND* (there is momentary doubling of the Md part at bars 45–6). This edition collates two copies of the organ part (*Ob* MS Tenbury 791, ff. 405v–407r, and *DRc* MS A6, pp. 54–60; a third copy (*DRc* MS A2, pp. 344–52) is similarly constituted.

deep', however, the doubling seems somewhat more obligatory because it continues as a third, purely instrumental strand during subsequent interludes between vocal phrases. It would probably be fair to say that doubling of the vocal part had become the norm in organ parts for Jacobean and Caroline compositions: had it not done so, indeed, the solo passages of many works—Gibbons's verse anthem 'Grant, O Holy Trinity' (EECM 3/6), for example—would now be beyond confident reconstruction.

Ex. 3:3 shows the openings of three further verse compositions copied by Batten which, although not necessarily of Elizabethan date, are clearly very similar to the six shown in exx. 3:1–2.[47] Again, the accompaniments are widely spaced bicinia that enclose the vocal part and double it or not as the case may be; again too, the resulting three-voice counterpoint is self-sufficient. Out of all nine pieces, seven feature the Ct voice and are in the key of Gamut flat, while the remaining two feature the M voice and are in the key of d sol re, implying that the nascent genre's conventions extended to associating voice-type with key. Morley's Ct duet 'O Jesu meek' finds a counterpart in Bull's 'Deliver me O God' (*cf.* exx. 3:2c and 3:3b; the simpler, strophic structure of the younger composer's anthem suggests that it may be the earlier of the two). But the most striking correspondence occurs between 'When as we sat in Babylon' and 'O Lord, turn not away thy face' (*cf.* exx. 3:1a and 3:3a). Here, Giles's reference to Farrant's melody is quite unmistakable, and is the first of several in the opening solo passage and its ensuing chorus. This anthem, furthermore, is one of three attributed to Giles which draw on freely composed verses from the English metrical psalter. The second surviving member of that

47 As n. 43 above: (a) ff. 35r–37r (at quire pitch), EECM 23/11; (b) f. 53r–v (at quire pitch; a second copy, for some reason transposed 'a note higher', appears on f. 82r–v), Barnard, *First Book* (a modern edition of this anthem has yet to be published); (c) ff. 54r–55v (a 4th lower than here), MB 23/18.

trilogy, 'O Lord, of whom I do depend',[48] also opens with a M solo in d sol re, and refers—albeit more obliquely—to the opening melody of 'When as we sat in Babylon'. The third, lost member, 'O Lord, in thee is all my trust' likewise appears to have been a homage act, but as we shall see below (p. 222) its object may instead have been Tallis.

Given that Giles was among Farrant's successors as one of the organists of St George's Chapel, Windsor, his tributes to the older composer are hardly surprising. Yet the $\hat{1}\ \hat{3}\ \hat{4}\ \hat{5}$ melodic outline that opens 'When as we sat in Babylon' also appears in pieces by Mundy, Morley and Weelkes (exx. 3:1c, 3:2b and 3:3c), and is but a single step from the rising scale deployed by Morley and Bull (exx. 3:2a and 3:3b). As Richard Turbet has pointed out, the $\hat{1}\ \hat{3}\ \hat{4}\ \hat{5}$ head motive with which Byrd unified the two movements of his Verse Service was repeatedly adverted to in service settings by later composers.[49] But the chain of melodic allusion clearly extends backwards to Byrd's seniors Farrant and Mundy. As we shall see in the next chapter, the Verse Service may not have had any antecedents in the realm of liturgical music. Yet through its head motive it was explicitly linked to an already growing corpus of verse anthems.

To return to the question of texture, it must be stressed that the organ parts for early verse compositions are by no means always transmitted in pure bicinium form (regardless of whether or not the vocal part is doubled), and—like the Byrdian accompaniments detailed in table 3:1 above—are perhaps more often than not amplified with anything from short snatches of counterpoint to whole additional voices. A series of three additional inner notes is in fact already present in the fourth bar of 'Give ear, O Lord' (ex. 3:3c), and their function is puzzling. Did Weelkes insert them purely to impart a little harmonic colour? Or

---

48 *Ob* MS Tenbury 791, ff. 34r–35r; EECM 23/appendix no. 10. It should be noted that this anthem appears in the Durham sources as a *contrafactum* with the woefully ill-fitting text 'O how happy a thing it is', and unfortunately has reached complete modern publication only in that form (EECM 23/9). In SECM, furthermore, the *contrafactum* was confused with a probably genuine setting of 'O how happy a thing it is' attributed to Giles (EECM 23/appendix no. 6), which in turn was mistakenly assumed to be two separate anthems, one listed under its text incipit, the other under its heading in *Oj* MS 181, 'Anthem for St George's Feast' (see p. 159 below).

49 'Homage to Byrd in Tudor Verse Services', *The Musical Times*, 129 (1988), 485–90.

were they intended to help an organist fully amplify the organ part in performance, by signalling two 6/3 chords that could not be inferred from the bicinium voices alone? If so, then why was the organist not also cautioned against playing a 'B♮' until after the soloist had sung a *b♭*? And what helpful purpose could have been served by the momentary doubling of the vocal part in the fifth bar, which follows ungrammatically from the preceding inner notes, and where 5/3 chords alone would be apposite? With so many imponderables, it remains frustratingly uncertain how Weelkes and Batten would have realized this accompaniment, and indeed whether they would both have realized it in quite the same way.

Not all Batten's copies are the only surviving ones, and other organ-books show that in certain circles greatly amplified accompaniments were preferred. The organ part for 'When as we sat in Babylon' in the hand of the Chirk Castle copyist is a case in point (ex. 3:4; *cf.* ex. 3:1a):[50] its outer voices clearly share a common ancestor with Batten's bicinium, but they have become cluttered with crotchet decorations, and are joined not only by a doubling of the vocal part but also by a fourth voice that pads out the tenor register. From the fifth to the seventh bars, the three upper voices are rearranged in Baroque manner to fall within reach of the RH, leaving the LH free to indulge in some pointless 8ve leaps. In the process of reverting to something like the original disposition at the end of the seventh bar, the pre-echo of the following vocal phrase (*a' g' f' e'*) in Batten's instrumental descant has been forfeited—as indeed has most of the Tudor flavouring. (Henry Palmer's organ part for Giles's 'O Lord, turn not away thy face' shows that this anthem too was subject to scribal amplification, the initial lead-in—though surprisingly little else—being fleshed out with two and sometimes three inner voices.)[51]

---

50 *Och* MS Mus. 6, ff. 46v–47r.

51 *DRc* MS A5, pp. 10–15; the amplifications are fully preserved in EECM 23/11, bars 1–4.

The recasting of Farrant's anthem cannot necessarily be blamed on the Chirk copyist, who appears to have dutifully transcribed organ parts in whatever form they happened to come his way. He thus entered Thomas Tomkins's 'Thou art my king, O God' twice, noting that it was '...pricke[d] 2 several ways to the organs',[52] and provided an alternative accompaniment for Morley's 'Out of the deep' in addition to the one transmitted by Batten (ex. 3:2b) and other copyists.[53] The two Morleian organ parts were interchangeable, this being signalled by the quaint inscription 'you choose which you play' (f. 52r). But the alternative one depended on a reading otherwise unique to the Chirk Ct book,[54] namely the $e\flat'$ explicitly signed in bar 47, at which point $e\natural'$ is signed, or may at least be inferred, in all the other vocal and instrumental sources.[55] Indeed, the quite radical reharmonization of the surrounding passage (bars 42–8) is one of several respects in which this organ part seems not so much a retouching as an entire recomposition of the other one. That it is the work of someone other than Morley seems almost certain: much genuine counterpoint has been supplanted by chordal clichés (e.g. bars 9–13), a vital pre-echo by meandering crotchets (bars 59–61), and—perhaps worst of all—the idiomatic lead-in by a halting and unimaginative passage of *fuga* (*cf.* exx. 3:2b and 3:5).[56] At the same time, roughly 60% of the bass line for the solo passages has one way or another been retained. Perhaps, then, the best explanation for this accompaniment is that it represents someone's attempt to reconstruct a damaged copy, or even just a dim memory, of the original organ part. But the

---

52 *Och* MS Mus. 6, ff. 45r–46r and 53v–54r; inscription on f. 54r. The two accompaniments differ as regards transposition and decorative details, but are otherwise quite similarly constituted.

53 *Och* MS Mus. 6, ff. 44v–45r (the alternative accompaniment, EECM 38/12) and 51v–52r (the accompaniment much as it appears in *Ob* MS Tenbury 791 and in all other sources, EECM 38/3). The incipits of both accompaniments are transcribed in parallel in le Huray, 'The Chirk Castle Partbooks', 26 (the respective folio numbers given on p. 25 have been inadvertently exchanged).

54 Ct part-book from *NYp* MSS Mus. Res. *MNZ (Chirk), f. 67v.

55 See EECM 38, p. 137.

56 The doubling of the upper voice in 3rds at bars 1–2, which results in parallel 5ths with the lower voice, may be put down to a copying error; as a whole, however, this accompaniment differs so markedly from those quoted in exx. 3:1–3 above that there seems no reason to accept le Huray's suggestion that it could represent Morley's own 'first thoughts' ('The Chirk Castle Partbooks', 25).

less wholesome possibility—that it was intended as a brazen improvement on Morley—cannot entirely be dismissed.

The presence of incipient idioms of four-part keyboard harmony in these variant accompaniments is a salutary reminder that the generation of musicians who copied organ-books in the 1630s had concerns very different from those of the pioneers of the verse idiom sixty or so years earlier. One relevant factor that cannot have left accompanying styles untouched during that time was the development of the two-manual or 'double' organ. It was not until after 1600 that organs began to be fitted with integral 'Chair' divisions tailored to accompanying vocal solos and reduced ensembles: chair cases are mentioned at King's College Cambridge no earlier than 1605–6, and at Norwich Cathedral in 1608. Even at Windsor, where the verse anthem had been pioneered by Farrant and taken up by Giles, there seems not to have been a two-manual organ until 1609, when Thomas Dallam was commissioned to convert the chapel's three existing organs into 'a whole instrument consisting of a great organ and a chair portative'.[57] The same chapter minute refers also to 'the easy and gentle going of the said portative keys', suggesting an action that allowed the keyboards of both divisions to be placed within simultaneous reach of the organist.

Though manual changes are never specified as such in the organ-books, there are intimations that the ubiquitous directions 'cho:' and 'vers:' invoked the Great and Chair divisions respectively. Organ parts exist in which the chorus passages have been transposed a 5th higher and the verse passages a 4th lower, thereby corresponding to the respective 10- and 5-foot foundation stops of the two divisions.[58] The weightier sonorities of the Great are therefore associable with the bicinium textures typical for choruses, and the lighter sonorities of the Chair with the three- and four-voice textures typical for verses.

---

57 Sydney Campbell and W. L. Sumner, 'The Organs and Organists of St George's Chapel, Windsor Castle', *The Organ*, 45 (1966), 145–56 (146–7); see also Stephen Bicknell, *The History of the English Organ* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 74–5.

58 Clark, *Transposition*, 44; Reynolds, 'Chirk Castle Organ and Organbook', 40.

For an Elizabethan organist, such contrasts had been possible only by switching between entirely separate instruments, which can scarcely have been feasible during the performance of a verse composition. In the absence of evidence relating to pipe voicing and registration, the actual sonorities that were considered suitable for accompanying the earliest verse music remain a matter for speculation. The point is that the organs first put to that purpose were the legacy of the *alternatim* tradition, and had been destined to sound in opposition to the human voice rather than in concert with it. For all we know, the characteristic disposition of bass and descant in Tudor accompaniments may actually have been the optimal means of securing tonal balance between a contemporary instrument and a solo singer.

The present investigation of early organ parts cannot be closed without reference to the question of whether or not any of the examples quoted in exx. 3:1–3 might be arrangements of viol scores, as many of the Byrdian accompaniments undoubtedly are. Roger Bowers has recently gone as far as to assert that the three pieces by Farrant and Mundy are all seventeenth-century adaptations of consort songs, and that in consequence none of them 'qualifies to be considered a pioneering example of the verse anthem idiom'.[59] His objection to the metrical texts set by Mundy—which inevitably extends to Morley's 'O Jesu meek' and the three pieces by Giles, Bull and Weelkes, among others—will be addressed at length below (pp. 173–95). But it may be said here and now that neither the primary sources nor the musical style of the pieces in question fully bear out Bowers's assertion.

It is true that Farrant's and Mundy's pieces, as Bowers objects, are not present in any sources dating from before the Caroline period. Yet in that respect they are hardly exceptional. Byrd's Verse Service, for example, and OLordRMN (which Bowers would

---

59 'Ecclesiastical or Domestic? Criteria for the Identification of the Initial Destinations of William Byrd's Music to Religious Vernacular Texts' in *William Byrd: A Research and Information Guide*, ed. Richard Turbet, 3rd edn (New York: Routledge, 2012), 134–60 (158 n. 45).

have us believe is an original verse anthem from the 1560s) have no sources from earlier than the 1630s. Nor could the settings of metrical texts be expected to appear in any of the extant Elizabethan sources, since the only such part-books compiled for use with an organ —*Y* MSS M13/1–5(S), which include Morley's First Service—are devoted exclusively to liturgical music. Moreover, it is surprising that Bowers's misgivings about primary sources do not extend to the consort versions in which he claims metrical pieces such as the seven quoted in exx. 3:1–3 were initially cast. Such versions might have found their way into the considerable number of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century domestic part-book sets that are still extant.[60] Yet the only such set to contain any of the seven pieces is Thomas Myriell's *Tristitiae remedium* (*Lbl* Add. MSS 29372–7), and the one piece it does contain —Weelkes's 'Give ear, O Lord'—was entered by Myriell in verse rather than consort format. Neither for this piece, nor for any anthem by Weelkes or Giles, is a single viol part known to exist.

On musical grounds, Bowers's sole argument for the primacy of consort versions is that the organ part for 'When as we sat in Babylon' is 'sufficiently plainly derived from an original setting for viols for it to have been possible for this to be restored in modern edition'.[61] In terms of spacing, textural control, motivicity and grammatical correctness, however, the cited viol parts can hardly be said to have restored anything.[62] As transmitted by Batten, the organ parts for the metrical pieces are simply not constituted in the manner of the arrangements of Byrd's consort pieces; rather, they closely resemble the accompaniments for indubitable church pieces such as Morley's Ps. 119:169–176 or, as we shall see, Byrd's Verse Service, where the prominent use the $\hat{1}\,\hat{3}\,\hat{4}\,\hat{5}$ motive would be hard

60 For example *NYp* MSS Drexel 4180–85, *Lbl* Add. MSS 17792–6, *Ob* MSS Tenbury 341–4, and *Och* MSS Mus. 56–60, 979–83 and 984–8.

61 'Ecclesiastical or Domestic?', 158 n. 45. The viol parts referred to are by Robert Reeve:

62 Edn by Robert Reeve in *An Anthology of English Church Music*, ed. Wulstan, 41–8. Reeve's conjectural viol parts do not bear comparison with the two genuine consort songs attributed to Farrant (MB 22/7–8); Wulstan's viol parts for Mundy's 'The secret sins' (EECM 3/14) are barely more convincing.

to explain if it did not refer to other pieces of church music.[63] To be sure, the inscription 'the singing part' added to Farrant's piece in the Chirk M part-book recalls the nomenclature of Byrd's 1588 consort songs.[64] But it would be strange indeed if the five metrical pieces that feature the Ct voice (exx. 3:1b–c, 3:2c and 3:3b–c) originated in consort format, given that Elizabethan composers—to judge by the seventy-odd relevant works by Byrd and the sixty-five included in MB 22—invariably scored their consort settings for M or Tr.[65]

There are thus no compelling textual or musical reasons to suspect that the seven quoted metrical pieces are anything other than what they appear to be: verse anthems. But that is not to say that genuine organ parts from the period are always readily distinguishable from arrangements of consort pieces. That problem is illustrated by the accompaniment to one further work by Morley, 'How long wilt thou forget me' (ex. 3:6),[66] which anticipates its initial vocal phrase with a set of fugal entries precisely analogous to many of Byrd's consort songs. The intersection of the subject and its answer on a unison in the second bar would be more apt for two instruments than for a keyboard, while the key is not one of those usual for church music. At the same time, there are indications that Morley composed this piece for church use. The accompaniment quickly settles into the usual bicinium-plus-doubling format when the vocal part enters, while the chorus parts are laid out in the standard ecclesiastical manner with two Ct parts and even some decani-cantoris divisi. Nor do the sources of this composition suggest that it was ever performed anywhere but in church (some, indeed, include a doxology, though it is unclear whether this is original or a perhaps unauthorized addition). Mention should be made also of services such

---

63 It might be added that the choruses of Morley's 'O Jesu meek' incorporate gymels for Bc/Bd and Mc/Md that would be impracticable within a set of domestic part-books.

64 As was first noted in Morehen, 'The English Consort and Verse Anthems', 385 n. 1.

65 The only two possible exceptions to this rule are 'The day delayed' (see p. 210 below) and 'Ah, silly poor Joas' (MB 22/24, anon.), the solo vocal parts of which are notated in the C3 clef. The vocal part of the latter song could have been sung by a M, however, since its range is $c\sharp'$–a' with a single descent to a.

66 EECM 38/1.

as Orlando Gibbons's Second (TCM 4, pp. 68–125) in which the *M* (though curiously in this case not the *ND)* is provided with a quite lengthy fugal introduction. Composed lead-ins such as these are perhaps vestiges of the verse or voluntary some organists may have been required to play before psalms or canticles, evidenced by the phrase 'here the organs do play' inserted in the fragmentary Preces and Psalms by [Robert?] Parsons (*Ob* MS Mus. e. 40; *Llp* MS 764). Musically, however, they might be taken to be an element of the stylistic cross-fertilization that would come to blur the distinction between verse and consort genres, and that introduces a note of uncertainty as to whether ThouGTG in particular (not to mention much of the Gibbons canon) originated in one format or the other.

From what has been gleaned about the constitution and transmission of pre-Restoration organ parts, a somewhat clarified picture of the Byrdian accompaniments emerges. The instrumental descant characteristic of genuine organ writing is by and large absent not only from the known arrangements of consort pieces AnET, ChristR and HaveMUMOG but also from HearMPOL and OLordRMN, suggesting that the last two anthems also may be adaptations of lost consort originals. It may be observed too that both the organ parts for AlackWILB and the single one for BeholdOGTS are constituted in precisely the manner we would expect for original verse compositions. We shall see below (pp. 243–5) that there is an explanation for the lack of an instrumental descant in Ps. 119:33–8, which being a liturgical work was presumably composed with an idiomatic organ accompaniment. In the case of an anthem, however, the presence or absence of a descant is no sure indication of a given work's original format. One was added, albeit abortively, to the arrangement of ChristR copied by Batten, meaning that a question mark must be placed against the one present in some but not all of the organ parts for ThouGTG. The evidence of the organ parts, then, is not entirely free of contradictions, and must be regarded as corroborative at best.

A broader conclusion emerging from the present discussion is that the conflation method of editing is inimical to the sheer diversity of readings typical of the organ books, and can all too easily lead to a critically edited organ part that never existed in any primary source. This problem applies to most of the accompaniments in BE 11: while in several places Monson scored variant versions in parallel (particularly those of ThouGTG), he failed to report the frequent instances when an inner note might be absent from, say, two organ-books out of three. HearMPOL is a case in point, where the denser readings of *Och* MS Mus. 6 are tacitly preferred to the sparser ones of *Och* MS Mus. 1001 and *Ob* MS Tenbury 791, despite not always agreeing with the vocal parts (see bars 23–4). The organ-books can be shown to contain much that is not textual, a problem to which the best hope of an editorial solution lies in identifying authoritative copy texts, or at least in identifying and eliminating scribal elements.

3.3 Anthems with prose texts

3.3.1 'Christ rising'

Nowhere in Byrd's output is the distinction between consort and verse idioms more blurred than in ChristR, and the suggestion has even been made that it originated as a verse anthem for church use.[67] In terms of form, it has parallels only among Byrd's liturgical verse compositions, while its text is both rooted in the Sarum liturgy and pertinent to the BCP. Its domestic MS sources are considerably outnumbered by institutional ones,[68] and it was one

---

67 John Harley, *The World of William Byrd: Musicians, Merchants and Magnates* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), 136. Harley's term is simply 'anthem', but the context makes it clear that a church composition is signified. The Chapel Royal cheque book entry he cites as evidence that ChristR was 'sung as an anthem in the chapel in the seventeenth century' does not, in fact, specify Byrd as the composer, hence the setting referred to could have been one of several by other composers: see *The Cheque Books of the Chapel Royal, with Additional Material from the Manuscripts of William Lovegrove and Marmaduke Alford*, ed. Andrew Ashbee and John Harley, 2 vols (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), vol. 1, p. 185.

68 To the institutional sources for ChristR listed in table A3 below may be added the following domestic ones. Sources of the pre-publication version collated by Monson for BE 11 are *Ob* MS Mus. Sch. e. 423, *Ob* MSS Tenbury 341–4 and *Lbl* Add. MS 31992. Further sources listed in SECM but not collated by Monson (and therefore presumably deriving from 1589i), are *Lbl* Add. MSS 29372–7, *NYp* MS Drexel 4302, *Ob* MSS Mus. Sch. d. 233–6 and *Ws* MS V. a. 412.

of the eleven verse anthems to be granted a place in Barnard's *First Book*. With the notable exception of Peterhouse, few pre-Restoration cathedral or collegiate choirs would appear to have been without it. In terms of instrumental and vocal texture, however, it is clearly a work conceived for voices and viols that must have originated as a consort anthem for court ceremonial. Its scoring for S duet plus four intertwining parts for tenor and bass viols conforms precisely to that of Byrd's two other published consort duets, AnET and 'Who made thee, Hob' (1589i/40 and 41).[69] Since Byrd appears not to have been in the habit of publishing his vernacular church music, his decision to employ ChristR as the grand finale of a printed song-book indisputably aimed at a domestic market suggests that he for one did not consider the anthem to be church music *per se*. As we shall see, however, in this case Byrd may have allowed something of an exception to his own rule.

The anthem's unusual form is inextricably linked to the dual function of the chorus, which serves both to emphasize and complement the utterances of the duet. The result is that certain passages are treated as in the consort songs, their ultimate clause being hammered home by a choral reiteration, while others are despatched by duet and chorus in strict alternation, a method Byrd is otherwise known to have employed only in his liturgical verse music and the lost anthem LetUBG (see pp. 214–15 below). The choral interjections thus never become predictable, and in combination with word-setting that is vivacious even by Byrd's standards this creates an ambience of drama for which, in le Huray's view, the anthem is chiefly notable.[70]

The text itself, based on two extracts from Paul's epistles (Romans 6:9–11 and 1 Corinthians 15:20–22),[71] came not from any vernacular version of the bible but directly from the BCP. Printed immediately before the collect, epistle and gospel for Easter Day, it was an extended English translation of 'Christus resurgens', the Sarum antiphon appointed

---

69 To these examples may also be added a partsong that appears to have been adapted from a consort duet, 'Love is a fit of pleasure' (1589i/43).

70 *Music and the Reformation in England*, 143–4, 244–5.

71 Incorrectly identified in BE 11 as adaptations of Romans 6:9–10 and Romans 6:11.

for Easter morning, when the cross, concealed in a 'sepulchre' since Good Friday, was formally returned to the altar.[72] The words and melody of this antiphon were the basis of several polyphonic settings, including one of the most puzzling of Byrd's *cantus firmus* motets (1605a4/10).[73] Shorn of directions for ritual actions, the old ceremony lingered on in the 1549 BCP as a miniature liturgy in its own right, the requirement being retained for the 'anthems'—of which there were now two, each rounded off with an 'Alleluia'—to be 'solemnly sung or said ... afore mattins'.[74] Thus it was that John Sheppard set the new BCP anthems for four men's voices, complete with both 'Alleluias';[75] from 1552, however, the 'Alleluias' were dropped, and the anthems were instead appointed to be sung in place of the *V* during mattins itself. By the time Byrd composed ChristR, then, its text was unmistakably an office proper of the BCP; apparently as such, it was set by Tye, Tomkins, Weelkes (with a concluding 'Alleluia'), Amner and other composers.[76]

The combination of a liturgical prose text and consort scoring has only one parallel in Byrd's output, the curiously song-like 'Adoramus te' from the *Gradualia* (1605a5/26).[77] Yet for another setting of a BCP proper text for S duet, consort and chorus, we need look no further than Bull's famous anthem 'Almighty God, who by the leading of a star'.[78] Despite evading Barnard's print, in verse format this work was at least as widely copied by institutional scribes as ChristR was.[79] In their consort formats, both anthems might well

---

72 *Antiphonale ad vsu[m] ecclesie Sa[rum]* (Paris: Wolfgang Hopyl, 1519; STC 15790), f. 214r.

73 See Kerman, *The Masses and Motets of William Byrd* (London: Faber, 1981), 62–5; and Peter le Huray, 'Some Thoughts about cantus firmus Composition; and a Plea for Byrd's *Christus resurgens*' in *Byrd Studies*, ed. Alan Brown and Richard Turbet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 1–23.

74 *The booke of the common prayer* (London: Edward Whitchurch, 1549; STC 16267), f. 57v.

75 *Lbl* MSS 30480–83, edn in *Anthems for Men's Voices, Vol. 2: Tenors and Basses*, ed. Peter le Huray, Nicholas Temperley, Peter Tranchell and David Willcocks (London: Oxford University Press, 1962).

76 See EECM 19/2; EECM 5/6; Weelkes ed. David Brown (London: Novello, 1973); Amner ed. Anthony Greening (London: Oxford University Press, 1968); on the five-voice setting dubiously attributed to both Tallis and Byrd (EECM 13/2), see p. 68 above.

77 BE 6a/1.

78 Bull's substitution of the BCP wording 'O God' with the more musically favourable 'Almighty God' is perhaps analogous to Byrd's adjustment of Coverdale's Ps. 44:23 in the full anthem AriseOL (see p. 73 above).

79 See SECM; almost the only sizeable pre-Restoration institutional anthem MSS not to include 'Almighty God' are the Chirk Castle part-books.

have fulfilled similar functions, for the festivals to which they were respectively proper, Epiphany and Easter, had been marked by conspicuous royal ceremonial at the early Tudor court. As we have seen (p. 5), Epiphany was the day reserved annually for Crown Wearing (when, following a reenactment of the coronation service, the members of the Chapel Royal performed an interlude and a wassail song), while Easter was one of four days appointed for Wearing of the Purple. On both festivals, the king had walked about the palace in procession, reaching the chapel from his private apartments via the Privy Chamber, the Presence Chamber and a gallery adjoining the Great Chamber.[80] The Chapel Royal cheque book does not disclose whether or not these particular ceremonies were fully maintained in the court of Elizabeth. But the queen most certainly did observe the Maundy Thursday ritual of the *pedilavium* in the manner of her Tudor forbears, and the existence of both Byrd's cycle of Epiphany psalms and Bull's consort anthem suggests she may have continued to honour that festival also in the best pre-Reformation manner. If Easter too was formally celebrated not just in the chapel but throughout the palace, then ChristR—a chamber work proper to a religious festival—might have served a purpose comparable to that of Byrd's two carols for Christmas day, also included in his 1589 song-book.[81] Two further works from the period are explicitly associated with, and may have been composed for, the annual gathering of the Order of the Garter on St George's day: they are Bull's consort anthem 'How joyful and how glad', headed 'An Anthem for the Garter' in the Chapel Royal word-books *Ob* MS Rawl. Poet. 23 (p. 178) and *Lbl* MS Harley 6346 (f.

---

80 See Fiona Kisby, '"When the King Goeth a Procession": Chapel Ceremonies and Services, the Ritual Year, and Religious Reforms at the Early Tudor Court, 1485–1547', *The Journal of British Studies*, 40 (2001), 44–75 (53–5, 58–9).

81 It is true that Byrd had at his disposal an Easter text more similar to those of the carols in the form of Jasper Heywood's poem, 'All mortal men this day rejoice', which was actually printed facing Francis Kindlemarsh's 'From virgin's womb' in the first edition of *The paradyse of daynty deuises* (London: Henry Disle, 1576; STC 7516), pp. 4–5. Perhaps because a line was omitted from its third stanza in every known printed copy, however, 'All mortal men' seems never to have been set by any composer. Heywood, moreover, was an eminent Jesuit, and active as a missionary in England in 1581–3. Thus, while there was nothing to stop Byrd from setting, for purposes of his own, the Catholic poem 'Why do I use my paper, ink and pen?' (1588/33), to set a poem of Heywood's for performance at a court ceremony would have been impolitic. See *The Paradise of Dainty Devices (1576–1606)*, ed. Hyder E. Rollins (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927), pp. li, 13, 189.

59v), and Giles's 'O how happy a thing it is',[82] headed 'Anthem for St George's Feast' in the Chapel Royal B part-book *Oj* MS 181 (ff. 149v–150r).

The lead-in to ChristR is one of Byrd's more loaded opening gambits. In contrast to the fugal entries that usually prepare the way for the vocal part of his consort works, the viols commence somewhat in the manner an 'In nomine'. The *cantus firmus*, however, is not that of the Easter morning antiphon, but a mass chant for Low Sunday and throughout the following week, 'Alleluia, Christus resurgens'.[83] Byrd, then, not only associated his BCP text with a Sarum chant: he also emblematized the mass. But his borrowed material—the melisma attached first to the syllable '-le-', and repeated on the syllable '-stus' (ex. 3:7a)—delivers its coded message only fleetingly. Once outlined in the first viol part (ex. 3:7b), its first three notes undergo a series of radical flexions as they are passed back and forth between the two vocalists (ex. 3:7c–f). A vivid image of 'rising' develops as the subject *d'*–*f♯'*–*g'* grows, as if organically, into its own answer *a'*–*c♯"*–*d"*.

The adaptation of the viol parts for organ clearly proved problematical. In the first five bars alone, an arranger had to cope with a close stretto at the unison, part-crossings and unison doublings, none of which was idiomatic to the keyboard. The stretto confused the arranger of the Durham organ part (MS A5, pp. 55–9), who mistakenly outlined three entries instead of two. The organ part copied by Batten (*Ob* MS Tenbury 791, ff. 215v–217v) represents the contrapuntal details of these bars more faithfully—but only as far as the first part-crossing. It is notable that in the initial duet passage Batten's arranger went on to add an instrumental line above the two vocal parts. But he quickly gave up his attempt to rework the accompaniment in the texture usual for an Elizabethan verse composition,

---

82 See n. 48 above.

83 *Graduale ad consuetudine[m] Sarum* (Paris: Wolfgang Hopyl, 1508; STC 15862), f. 123v; see also the *Liber usualis* (Tournai: Desclée, 1961), 827, where the Gregorian version of the chant is appointed for mass on the fourth Sunday after Easter. The Sarum version is notated with the final on *a*, a 5th higher than the Gregorian, to accommodate an accidental ♭$\hat{2}$ (at the word 'moritur'). The similarity of Byrd's introduction to an 'In nomine' was pointed out, and the chant identified, by le Huray (*Music and the Reformation in England*, 244).

his right-hand part deteriorating into a mere doubling of the vocal parts at bars 9–12 and throughout the remaining duets.

Adapting the voice parts for a church choir was a relatively straightforward matter, even though the anthem's two C4 parts and single C3 part mark it out as a chamber composition.[84] With a general lower limit of *d*, and only one descent to *c*, the higher C4 part was feasible instead as a C3 part for Ct2. The S duets, moreover, worked perfectly as verses from Mc and Md, while the choruses—most which Byrd had scored with only a single S part—could be assigned to the two M cohorts in amalgamation. Yet despite the anthem's readiness to comply with ecclesiastical double-choir protocols, Byrd's handling of the two S parts makes more sense in consort than in verse format. The choruses of the consort version are allocated to the two S parts in alternation (as opposed to amalgamation), allowing the initial entry of each duet passage to be assigned to the singer who has just rested. The resulting cycle—long rest, first entry of duet, chorus, short rest, second entry of duet, long rest, first entry of duet, and so on—thus provides each S singer with periodic breathing spaces.

The form in which Byrd first implemented this scoring scheme is still evident from those sources of ChristR that reflect its state prior to publication in 1589 (*Ob* MS Mus. Sch. e. 423 and MSS Tenbury 341–4). Whereas the first part of the anthem was rounded off with a brief chorus a6 involving both S singers, the extended final chorus and 'Amen' of the second part remained a5. One S was thus left to endure the chorus in tacit embarrassment, and in a rare breach of part-book etiquette the single S part for the 'Amen' was entered in both the S and Sx volumes. These ramifications prompted Byrd to revise the final chorus, and write a completely new 'Amen', before putting the anthem into print.

---

84 Though in his vernacular liturgical music and full anthems Byrd not infrequently introduced a second T part, he never did so without also introducing the statutory second Ct part: see the Short Service (particularly the opening and closing passages of the *TD*), The Great Service (where the addition of a sixth part to the basic five-part tutti is usually effected by a T gymel), and the anthems 'Help us, O God' and 'O Lord, make thy servant' (which are scored on the same principle).

By way of illustrating Byrd's revisions, outlines of the two versions of the chorus are scored in parallel in ex. 3:8 (since their barring differs in BE, the present ex. will be referred to in terms of its own bar numbers, shown in italics). As Monson first observed, Byrd's primary means of obtaining two S parts was to assign most of the existing S material to S2 (bars *1–3*, *5–8*, *15–16*) and to reassign two lower-voice entries to S1 an 8ve higher (T, bars *3–6*; Ct, bars *13–14*). The subject consisted of a plain head ('all men shall be') plus an a syncopated tail ('restor-ed to life'), and in the version a5 the tail had begun to take on a life of its own at the S entry in bar *9*. At that point in the version a6, however, Byrd postponed independent development of the tail, substituting a head-plus-tail stretto for S1, S2 and T, and thereby extending the chorus by six minims.

The revisions show that in order to obtain his paired S parts Byrd was prepared to make concessions to motivicity in the lower voices, and even to grammatical rectitude. The T, having lost its initial entry to S1 (bars *3–6*), now had to burst in with mere padding (bars *5–7*), while the B, already less concerned with the subject than with providing the upper voices with perambulatory harmonic support, now gained six more minims of the latter. At bars *4–5* in the a5 version, the T had paralleled the Ct in consecutive perfect 4ths, and giving the T entry to S1 an 8ve higher resulted in consecutive 5ths between the Ct and S1 parts. The solution—an evasive little quaver in the Ct part—was a blatant fudge, and it reveals the extent to which in Byrd's mind local contrapuntal operations took second place to wider strategies of musical design.

Byrd's revisions notwithstanding, the anthem continued to circulate in its pre-published form, the parts that now form the incomplete set *Ob* MSS Tenbury 341–4 having been copied for Byrd's friend Edward Paston around 1600. The organ part copied by Batten likewise incorporates the chorus a5 (annotated by the principal scribe of Barnard's part-books with a warning to look elsewhere for the version a6). But Batten also incorporated a

minor revision found in the 1589 print,[85] implying that his exemplar was an interim version of the anthem, older than the print but newer than the one represented by Paston's copies. There can of course be no telling at what point Batten's accompaniment made the transition from viol score to keyboard part, and it may even have done so at the hands of Batten himself. Yet the arranger's abortive attempt to recast the opening duet in the mould of an archetypal bicinium looks suspiciously like an early experiment in adapting a consort composition for organ. It is therefore not impossible that Byrd published ChristR in the knowledge that it was already being sung as a verse anthem in the established church.

Thus adapted, ChristR was not only popular but also influential. Settings in the verse idiom by Tomkins and Weelkes borrow extensively from it, each being divided into a first and second part of which the respective opening subjects are thinly disguised variations on Byrd's corresponding ones. Tomkins went on to invert Byrd's subject at 'For in that he died', while Weelkes directly quoted his jaunty rising scale at 'he liveth unto God'. Both younger composers also switched to *prolatio perfecta*—albeit only temporarily—at the beginning of the second part. Despite using more varied combinations of voices than the persistent M duet of ChristR, both too apportioned the text to verses and choruses in schemes almost identical to Byrd's: apart from omitting a chorus reiteration of 'For seeing that by man came death', Tomkins followed Byrd's plan precisely. It would therefore be hard to cite a more specific example of the influence of consort music on the burgeoning repertory of verse anthems.[86]

---

85 See ChristR, bar 24 of the second part. Here the S2 part reproduces the plain semibreves and minims of MS Tenbury 342 (the second note of the bar is misprinted: for g' read instead $b\flat'$), while Batten's organ part reproduced below it includes crotchet movement identical to the published S2 part (*cf.* BE 13/47, bar 89).

86 Consort works too were composed after the model of ChristR, among which three anthems by Matthew Jeffries (RRMR 113/1–3) notably reproduce its form, methods of text-setting, and scoring for M duet, four viols, and five- and six-part chorus.

3.3.2 Psittacine settings

The case for bracketing together HaveMUMOG (1611/25), HearMPOL (BE 11/14) and OLordRMN (BE 11/15) was first put forward by Monson,[87] and is one of the keys to establishing a distinction between Byrd's compositions in consort and verse formats respectively. The most compelling reason for regarding these three works as a group is that they assimilate to a common unusual form, and concomitantly assign to the chorus an equally unusual function. As Monson stressed, the chorus does not merely insert refrains or repeat the closing words of a solo passage, as in a consort song; nor indeed does it take turns with a soloist to deliver the text in alternate portions, as in a liturgical composition. Rather, the chorus assumes the new role of echoing all the words—and to a greater or lesser extent the melody and harmony—of each successive solo passage. This very particular method seems both distinctive and significant enough to deserve a term of its own, and in default of an established one it is here dubbed *psittacine* ('parrot-like'). Predictably, we shall see that Byrd applied this formal principle in just the way he did others: never the same way twice.

The anthems have further common technical features that bolster Monson's theory. All three of them exist in verse format, yet the survival of HaveMUMOG also in what is clearly its native, consort format implies that the other two anthems may likewise be adaptations of lost consort originals. That possibility is borne out by the organ parts, none of which is in the characteristic bicinium style (though as we shall see the same reservation would apply also to Ps. 119:33–8, unquestionably a verse composition). Chamber-music forces are further suggested by the ranges of the inner voice parts. HaveMUMOG and OLordRMN are scored with two C4 clefs and one C3, in the manner of ChristR, while the copying of HearMPOL with one C4 and two C3 clefs may simply have been a concession to ecclesiastical usage (the lower C3 part, which has a range of *c*–*f'*, was surely composed

87 'Authenticity and Chronology in Byrd's Church Anthems', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 35 (1982), 280–305 (301–2); BE 11, pp. x–xi.

in a C4 clef). The solo passages, moreover, are for the M or Tr voice customary in Elizabethan consort music.

A more fundamental similarity stressed by Monson is that of text. Each anthem sets a prose version of the first two verses of one of the seven Penitential Psalms, OLordRMN adding the fourth verse of its psalm. (The possibility that these anthems represent an incomplete or partly lost cycle of seven is therefore a tantalizing one, but external evidence for this still awaits discovery.) It was pointed out by Kerman that whereas the texts of six psalm settings from Byrd's 1611 song-book are closely related to the Douay Rheims translation, those of three—including HaveMUMOG—correspond more closely to Coverdale's translation for the Great Bible.[88] Yet despite keeping to Coverdale's sentence structure, HaveMUMOG includes five variant words and phrases (Byrd's readings are given first, then Coverdale's):

and according to	according unto
wipe away	do away
clean	throughly
purge	cleanse
sins	sin

Kerman suggested that in this instance Byrd drew his text 'not from the BCP but from another psalter in the same tradition', and such a source may indeed yet be identified. But it seems equally likely, if not more so, that Byrd simply set the text from memory rather than from a printed page, confusing elements of other English versions with the one best known to him as a musician of the established church. The first two variants, for example, can be traced to a translation of Savonarola's meditation that circulated in print from the 1530s and was often appended to the English primer.[89] Something similar seems to have happened with OLordRMN, except that here Coverdale's translation of Ps. 6:1–2, 'for thy

---

88 *The Elizabethan Madrigal A Comparative Study* (New York: American Musicological Society, 1962), 110 nn. 1–2; but see the reference given in n. 287 below.

89 *An exposition after the maner of a co[n]templacyon vpon ye .li. psalme, called Miserere mei Deus* (London: John Byddell, 1534; STC 21789.3) and (for example) *A goodly prymer in englyshe* (London: John Byddell, 1535; STC 15988).

mercy's sake', was corrupted with wording from elsewhere in the psalter, 'for thy Name's sake'. The principal copyist of Barnard's part-books appears to have known Coverdale's Ps. 6 better than Byrd did, for he twice wrote 'mercy's' in the Md part-book, both times amending it to 'Name's'.[90] In copying HearMPOL, however, he several times substituted 'Lord' with 'God', thereby corrupting the one text (of the three) that Byrd had set precisely as it appears in the Great Bible.

The survival of HaveMUMOG in consort format is almost certainly due entirely to Byrd's having included the viol parts in his 1611 print (their only other source, the part-books *Ob* MSS Mus. f. 20 and 22–4, is a copy of the print dating from the 1630s, lacking the Ct and Sx parts).[91] Both other anthems appear side by side in Barnard's part-books and the *First Book*, thus supplying yet another intimation that they belonged to the same group. While OLordRMN has only one further source (the unusually skeletal accompaniment from Henry Loosemore's organ-book *NYp* MS Drexel 5469), HearMPOL circulated much more widely, and is the only anthem of the three to appear in sources from the Chapel Royal (*Oj* MS 181 and *Ob* MS Rawl. Poet. 23).

The verse-anthem arrangement of HaveMUMOG is largely confined to MSS from Durham Cathedral, although its wider circulation is evidenced by sources from London (*Ob* MS Tenbury 791 and *Llp* MS 764) and the Welsh Marches (*SHR* LB/15/1/229). Indubitably the Durham recension cannot have derived directly from Byrd's 1611 print, since the cathedral scribes misattributed it to Gibbons (the possibility that it was he who arranged the accompaniment for organ, though attractive, is scarcely borne out by the end product, as we shall see). On the basis of this misattribution, the Durham recension was included with Gibbons's services and anthems in TCM 4, and references below will apply to that edition. Since the editors did not realize the anthem was by Byrd, they failed to

90 *Lcm* MS 1045, ff. 150v–151r.

91 See BE 14, p. 185.

collate any sources that correctly attributed it to him—such as the closely related organ part copied by Batten.[92]

In addition to the organ part, the Durham sources represent the chorus passages of Byrd's original six vocal parts as follows, with the higher of the two original T parts (the Sx) assigned to Ct2 in the manner of ChristR:

Cantus 1	missing (presumably Md, with the solo verse passages)
Cantus 2	MS C1 (Mc)
Ct	missing (presumably Ct1)
Sx	missing (presumably Ct2)
T	MSS C10, C11; *Lbl* Add. MS 30478 (T)
B	MS C19; *Y* MS M29(S) (B)

Independently of the Durham voice parts, the organ part offers suggestive evidence of the anthem's earlier copying history, specifically with respect to its refashioning in verse format. By and large in the first three verse passages, the arranger appears to have made up a three-part framework by adding the lowest and highest viol parts to a doubling of the voice part, and either he or a later scribe then filled out that framework with a patchy fourth part that is quite independent of Byrd's score. In the fourth and final verse, however, he broke from the established register of the uppermost viol part, adding snatches of counterpoint above the vocal part. (Inevitably, this misled the TCM editors, who duly reconstructed the passage as a duet for M and Tr.) Given the desultory nature of much of the filling-in, and the arranger's unwillingness to observe register limits, it seems most unlikely that a musician of Gibbons's calibre can have been responsible for this organ part —meaning, of course, that the Durham misattribution is purely erroneous.

Certain further variants in the organ part are not necessarily liberties taken by the arranger, and may even signal that he worked from viol parts somewhat different from the ones Byrd printed. In the second verse passage, one active figure from the 1611 instrumental bass (dotted crotchet, quaver, two crotchets) is represented by a plain

92 *Ob* MS Tenbury 791: Batten entered this accompaniment twice (f. 284r–v and ff. 433v–434v); the first entry is incomplete and crossed out, and offers no significant variant readings.

semibreve (p. 204, second note), while in the third verse passage the organ part inserts a fleeting little stretto, absent from the print, between the two descending figures of the vocal part (ex. 3:9). But most telling in this respect is the 4–3 suspension that concludes the 'Amen'. Whereas the organ part outlines a disposition in which the suspension was assigned to the Ca1, in the print Byrd assigned it instead to the Ct, diverting the Ca1 upwards to $\hat{5}$. Grammatically, the former arrangement is surely preferable, since in his determination to expand the spacing of the final chord Byrd blatantly doubled a suspended 9th in the penultimate bar, thereby introducing close consecutive 8ves between Ct and Ca1. This bending of contrapuntal rules to serve some higher musical purpose recalls the revisions, discussed above, that Byrd made in preparing ChristR for the press. As was perhaps the case with ChristR, therefore, HaveMUMOG too may have made the transition to verse format in a pre-published state, and Byrd printed it despite knowing that it had done so.

Without consort versions for comparison, the sources of neither of the two other psittacine anthems can be held above suspicion. The two Ct parts of HearMPOL, for instance, momentarily amalgamate (bars 39–40), while the Tc part of OLordRMN is little more than a sub-8ve shadow of the M part for much of the first chorus (bars 20–26). It may be recalled that a similar series of close 8ves occurs in the Three Minims Service, another work for which Barnard is the sole supplier of inner voice parts. One dubious passage, however, is the result of inadvertent modern editing. As is also the case with the service (see pp. 55–6 above), one of Barnard's errors has been incorrectly amended in the final chorus of OLordRMN, with the result that six-minims' worth of the Td part is placed one minim too early (see TCM 2, p. 276, the first two bars, and BE 11/15, bars 95–6, where Barnard's erroneous minim on the word 'me' should be amended to a semibreve, not his correct minim on the word 'Name's').

The role of formal *fuga* in these anthems is restricted to just three passages. In HaveMUMOG, three- or four-note motives introduced in the second and fourth solo verses ('after thy great...'; 'wipe away...') are fugally developed with much flexing in the second half of each ensuing chorus. The fugal element of HearMPOL, however, is even more noticeably unlike any other section in the three anthems. Byrd set the phrase 'and consider my desire' as four successive groups of entries, assigning the first and third of them to the solo voice with its accompaniment, and the second and fourth to the chorus, and dovetailed the initial entry or entries of each group with the end of preceding group.[93] The resulting flux from solo to chorus and back again is in marked contrast to their clear separation not only elsewhere in the psittacine anthems but also throughout Byrd's liturgical verse compositions. Yet since it occurs also in ChristR,[94] the dovetailing may be taken as a further indication that HearMPOL was originally a consort work.

In contrast to Byrd's 1588 metrical psalms, where the 'first singing part' is usually the last voice to enter in a strict fugal exposition, none of the three anthems opens with a full round of anticipatory entries. It is true that during the lead-in to HaveMUMOG the upper two viols engage in a subject-answer stretto, but this is to a considerable extent disguised by free writing for the two lower viols, not to mention the purely harmonic decoy note that initiates the topmost viol part. In HearMPOL, a subject-answer relationship is formed between the opening instrumental bass line and the initial vocal phrase, but this is never extended to any other parts. From what can be gleaned from the meagre organ part, the introduction to OLordRMN appears to have dispensed with fugal principles altogether, replacing them with nothing more than an advance harmonic outline of the first twelve minims of the vocal solo. Yet here Byrd's options were restricted, for the solo part—which lingers of the note *f'* for no fewer than eight consecutive minims—is quite devoid of contrapuntal potential. Subsequently in this anthem, the solo vocal part does suggest intra-

93 Bars 18–30.

94 Bars 35, 52 and 56–7.

linear answer-subject relationships by instigating a motive ('have mercy upon me', 'O Lord, heal me') and immediately repeating it a 4th higher.[95] But neither of those motives is taken up by the instrumental bass, and it is hard to see how either of them might have fitted elsewhere in the accompaniment. Rather, as the chorus passages show, the few incidences of motivicity that are to be found in OLordRMN are never primarily structural, but rather appear within the fabric of voices that are already sounding, and are subtle, fleeting, and chiefly for decorative purposes (ex. 3:10).

With each anthem, Byrd worked out the psittacine principle in a somewhat distinct manner. In OLordRMN, the M melody and instrumental bass of each solo passage establishes a framework that forms the basis of the ensuing chorus with very little variation, the only significant exceptions being that the chorus skips the motivic reiterations of the opening solo,[96] occasionally introduces alternative harmony,[97] and substitutes the closing phrase of the last solo with a new, more expansive one.[98] In the choruses of HearMPOL, however, material from each preceding M solo is sometimes transferred to another voice an 8ve lower,[99] while any such material that remains in the M part, untransposed, is conspicuously re-harmonized.[100] With HaveMUMOG, affinities between the solo passages and their attendant choruses are further de-emphasized. In the first chorus, the opening solo melody is reduced to a mere three-note reminiscence in the Sx part before being recaptured by the M,[101] while in the third chorus the M roughly reproduces the contours of the foregoing solo, initially at the unison but switching to the lower 4th and eventually the lower 5th.[102]

---

95 Bars 30–35, 51–5.
96 *Cf.* bars 11–16 and 26–7.
97 *Cf.* bars 7–10 and 23–5; also bars 35 and 45.
98 *Cf.* bars 81–3 and 97–9.
99 Bars 4–11, 31–40.
100 Bars 11–18, 43–63.
101 BE 14/25, *cf.* bars 5–9 and 9–13.
102 *Cf.* bars 29–37 and 38–47.

Regardless of the type and extent of variation that differentiates a given chorus from its antecedent solo passage, Byrd seems in these anthems to have observed one self-imposed rule. He waived that rule only in HearMPOL, both in the second chorus, where a general re-harmonization causes the soloist's plagal cadence on 'E' to be substituted with a choral full close on 'G',[103] and in the special passage, mentioned above, that temporarily blurs the usual distinction between solo and chorus.[104] Otherwise, he ensured that the terminal cadence of each solo passage—and the medial cadence too, if it happened to be a clearly defined one—would consistently recur in the following chorus. Thus the third chorus of HaveMUMOG, for example, which as we have just seen subjects the common melodic material to a varying degree of transposition, nonetheless reiterates the medial and terminal cadences of the preceding solo, these being full closes on 'C' and 'D' respectively.[105]

These repeating cadential schemes serve purely to associate a chorus with its corresponding solo passage, and do not appear to fulfil any prescribed tonal function. Whereas HaveMUMOG and HearMPOL form cadences on $\hat{5}$, $\hat{2}$, and one other scale degree before eventually reaching a full close on $\hat{1}$, no fewer than eight of the ten cadences in OLordRMN are full closes on $\hat{1}$, the two exceptions both being full closes on $\hat{6}$. Yet the discovery that Byrd linked his solos and choruses to parallel cadence points confirms the importance of harmonic strategy in all three anthems. In each of them, penitential affect is very largely the product a slow rate of harmonic change, Monson's observation that their bass lines are 'often ... more static' being borne out by comparison with other pieces. For roughly 19% of HaveMUMOG, 24% of OLordRMN and a significant 28% of HearMPOL.[106] the bass line stays put for four or more consecutive minims,[107] and in one

---

103 *Cf.* bars 14 and 17–18.

104 See n. 93 above.

105 Bars 38–47.

106 Reckoned in minims, the respective figures are 57/302, 102/420 and 75/264.

107 By 'staying put' is meant held notes, repeated notes and 8ve leaps.

case for as many as ten.[108] This compares with only about 11% of OLordMTS, and 14% of ChristR.[109]

Pedal points of the kind common in the psittacine group were, of course, potentially conducive to the consonant 4th idiom, whereby a breve in the lowest voice could support the progression 7 – 6/4 – 5/4 – 5/3. Byrd, always very sparing in his use of that idiom, got by without it in HaveMUMOG and HearMPOL. But in OLordRMN he relented, putting it prominently to use at three or (probably) four cadences.[110] So persistent a departure from Byrd's usual practice, were it to occur in some other work with a comparably small number of primary sources, would perhaps give grounds for questioning his authorship. Yet OLordRMN is too clearly a member of its group, and the group too clearly one of Byrd's projects, for its authenticity to be seriously doubted.

One significant difference among the three anthems in this group is that the printed one is scored for six voices while in the form that they come down to us the two MS ones are scored for five. Byrd's deployment of the voices in HaveMUMOG was directly related to the antiphony implicit in his verbal repetition scheme, each phrase being iterated first by Ca1 to the accompaniment of four viols, and then reiterated by the other five voices (of which the viols presumably doubled the lowest four). It is easy to imagine the initial sections of HearMPOL and OLordRMN in similar scorings, Barnard's indecision as the allocation of the solo passages (he included them in both M volumes of the *First Book*) being attributable to their derivation from a domestic part-book in which neither c nor d would have been specified. In the final chorus and 'Amen' of HaveMUMOG, however, Byrd employed all six voices, presumably so as not to leave the Ca1 singer at loose ends as the anthem reached its apotheosis. Yet both other anthems conclude with a final chorus and 'Amen' in just five parts, and in neither case does a sixth part appear to be missing. Since

---

108 HearMPOL, bars 54–6.

109 Reckoned in minims, the respective figures are 22/196 and 80/578.

110 Bars 18, 58 (by analogy with the following chorus), 66 and 98.

Byrd never revised those pieces for publication, their presumed consort versions may well have been analogous to the pre-publication version of ChristR, in which the Sx, as we have seen, remained silent during the final chorus, and joined the S in unison for the 'Amen'. It is possible that HaveMUMOG too was first composed in this way.[111]

On the grounds that neither HearMPOL nor OLordRMN 'exhibits traits of contrapuntal or harmonic usage associated with Byrd's full maturity', and that both of them embody 'the structural contrast between choral and solo singing already long manifest by the performance of responsorial plainsong', Bowers has proposed that these two works are verse anthems dating from Byrd's Lincoln period.[112] Yet flexible and even non-functional motivicity, and the manipulating of harmony for affective purposes, are precisely the kind of usages to be expected from a more mature Byrd. And the two MS anthems' formal kinship with a late consort work, overlooked by Bowers, rests on a principle of verbal repetition that is at odds with traditional *alternatim* practice, and might even be described as 'positively anti-liturgical' (to borrow a phrase from Kerman).[113]

Whether or not the technique reflects some shadowy yet established form of performance practice is still unclear: from the simple echoic schemes of the metrical anthems 'Let all the congregation' and 'My soul, O God' (see p. 133 above) it was no small stylistic leap to Byrd's three psittacine settings of prose texts. But at least three later musicians seem to have learned from those settings that a chorus could be formed by repeating text and reusing melodic material and cadence patterns from a solo passage. In this way are constructed Thomas Tomkins's verse anthems 'Hear my prayer, O good Lord' (EECM 9/23, where due respects are paid to HearMPOL in the homorhythmic character of the choruses), and 'Oh, that the salvation' (EECM 14/34), as well as Gibbons's

111 This possibility was raised by Morehen: see BE 14, p. 185.

112 'Ecclesiastical or domestic?', 147–8. Bowers's further argument that the accompaniments are 'idiomatic for keyboard' (p. 147) takes into account none of the important textual and textural issues discussed above (pp. 141–55).

113 *The Masses and Motets of William Byrd*, 33; these are Kerman's words to describe the inaptness of Byrd's 'Christe qui lux es' for *alternatim* use.

consort anthem 'We praise thee, O Father' (EECM 3/16).[114] Mention should also be made of Giles's 'O hear my prayer, Lord' (EECM 23/8), which although it does not develop all its choruses from the entirety of the solo matter is clearly another homage to HearMPOL, and likewise appears to have been adapted from a lost consort original.

3.4 Metrical texts and the verse anthem

As is abundantly clear from Byrd's first two published song books, metrical psalms and devotional poetry were normative texts for Elizabethan consort music, and account for some 11% of anthem texts surveyed by Morehen from the period 1549–1660.[115] But were such texts deemed appropriate for the nascent anthem repertory? It has recently been forcibly claimed by Bowers that contemporary expectations dictated otherwise. In Bowers's opinion, settings of strophic texts can only have been strictly antithetical to the worship of the established church during the time Byrd was involved in it. Metrical psalms may have been 'entirely acceptable and efficacious as overture and finale to the free-standing sermon', but they 'had never been conceived as, or understood to offer, any substitute for the authentic Word of God possessed of a refinement or elevation sufficient to be set as anthems in the context of a bible-centred liturgy'. Texts of personal piety, such as that of AlackWILB, were 'irreconcilable with' and 'wholly alien to' the language of the BCP, while the BCP itself never had the purpose of catering to 'individual spirituality'. Rather, with the exception of the Nicene and Apostles' creeds, the 'exclusively public and corporate' character of the BCP was confirmed by its having pluralized all singular personal pronouns from the Latin rite, whereby 'Domine labia *mea* aperies', for example, had become 'O Lord, open thou *our* lips' (emphasis added). The 'legitimate role' of

---

114 Gibbons's anthems 'Great Lord of lords' (EECM 3/7) and 'O God, the king of glory' (EECM 3/10) embody textual repetition in the psittacine manner, but the solos and choruses are not always linked by melodic material and cadence schemes.

115 'The English Anthem Text, 1549–1660', *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 117 (1992), 62–85 (66–7).

Elizabethan and early Jacobean institutional choirs was to reinforce the 'predominantly austerely Calvinist' ethos of the contemporary established church, to which end the 'sole texts' admissible were those of the Bible and the Prayer Book.[116]

Sixteenth-century settings of other kinds of texts do, of course, appear in seventeenth-century anthem collections. In Bowers's view, all such pieces can only have been conceived for a domestic milieu, and were allowed to creep into the church repertory from the mid 1620s to meet a growing demand for anthems that the composers then living could not supply (pp. 145–6). Yet he does not speculate by what turn of events the texts of those older pieces should at last have been rendered acceptable. If anything, the growing influence of Arminianism was directing church musicians away from popular godly verse and towards the liturgically proper matter of the BCP collects.[117] The appropriation of chamber repertoire for church use, furthermore, was by no means a phenomenon exclusive to the 1620s and '30s; on the contrary, a higher proportion of adapted pieces is to be found in the very earliest of the surviving seventeenth-century institutional anthem books, MS Tenbury 1382, dated 1617. In any case, as the following survey of the relevant primary evidence will now show, the Elizabethan church not only tolerated the singing of anthems with non-biblical, non-BCP texts, but even encouraged it.

The use of metrical psalms as anthems has in fact only an indirect bearing on Byrd. As we shall see, the fragmentary setting of William Whittingham's versification of Ps. 124,

---

116 Bowers, 'Ecclesiastical or Domestic?', 139–42. Here is not the place fully to discuss Bowers's representation of the Elizabethan church as 'predominantly austerely Calvinist' (p. 140). But that premise scarcely does justice to the delicate doctrinal balancing act achieved by the queen's settlement of religion. As Diarmaid MacCulloch has observed, from 1559 the influence in England of more developed Calvinism was checked by the persistence of the episcopal system and of Lutheran and Zwinglian influences on the BCP, and by Elizabeth's stubborn refusal to be drawn on doctrinal matters. The tortuous position of John Whitgift, her third Archbishop of Canterbury, is a case in point. In 1595 the archbishop laid bare his Calvinist leanings by putting forward the so-called Lambeth Articles, a potentially momentous move to align established English Protestantism with the doctrine of predestinarianism which the queen, of course, decisively quashed. Yet only two years later Whitgift appeared, presumably with his own consent, as dedicatee of the fifth book of Richard Hooker's fervently anti-Calvinist *Lavves of ecclesiasticall politie*. This contradictory stance was possible, MacCullogh explains, because of Whitgift's conviction that the invisible Church of the elect was a different entity from the visible Church of which the queen had made him head. See MacCullogh, *The Later Reformation in England 1547–1603* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990), 70–71, 76, 89.

117 See Morehen, 'The English Anthem Text', 75–83.

NowIMS, almost certainly represents someone else's attempt to adapt the very particular verse anthem BeholdOGTS for more general use, while, as we have seen (p. 123), only three of Byrd's fifteen fully preserved metrical psalm settings turn up in sources of institutional provenance, and are not to be found in mainstream institutional sources such as *Cpc* MSS Mus. 6.1–6, *Och* MSS Mus. 1220–24 and the Chapel Royal MSS.[118] Nevertheless, one of the small number of textbook examples of the early verse anthem is a setting by Richard Farrant of Whittingham's Ps. 137, 'When as we sat in Babylon'.[119] If any conclusions about the origins of the genre are to be drawn from that work, then Bowers's objection to its text must first be addressed.

It is true that metrical psalms are nowhere mentioned in the rubrics of the BCP, that opposition was sometimes voiced to their use in church, and that the polyphonic metrical psalters printed during Elizabeth's reign were aimed chiefly at a domestic market.[120] There is nonetheless ample evidence that psalms were sung 'in English metre' not only 'afore the sermon and after the sermon',[121] but also as adjuncts to the two BCP daily offices. From 1562, the title page of the official metrical psalter explicitly described the contents as 'allowed according to the order appointed in the queen's majesty's injunctions'—in the crucial forty-ninth injunction,[122] that is, whereby the singing of anthems was also

---

118 1588/1 is found also in the Chirk part-books, 1588/8 in *Y* MS M29(S), and 1588/10 in the word-book *Lbl* MS Harley 4142.

119 See le Huray, *Music and the Reformation in England*, 220–21; and David Wulstan, *Tudor Music* (London: Dent, 1985), 317.

120 See le Huray, *Music and the Reformation in England*, 375–83, Nicholas Temperley, *The Music of the English Parish Church*, 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), vol. 1, p. 42, and Beth Quitslund, *The Reformation in Rhyme: Sternhold, Hopkins and the English Metrical Psalter, 1547–1603* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 240–41, 248–9.

121 From a 1562 injunction in which the evangelical bishop of Winchester Robert Horne ordered his cathedral choir to sing 'psalms set forth in English metre'—see *Visitation Articles and Injunctions, Vol. III, 1559–1575*, ed. Walter H. Frere and W. P. M. Kennedy (London: Longman, 1910), 138. Psalters purchased by cathedrals in the period may have been of the metrical kind; at Canterbury in 1567, payment was made explicitly for 'libris psalmorum in metro': see Alan G. Smith, 'The Practice of Music in English Cathedrals and Churches, and at the Court, During the Reign of Elizabeth I' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Birmingham, 1967), 243 (of which see also pp. 155, 172–3).

122 *Iniunctions geuen by the Quenes Maiestie* (London: Richard Jugge and John Cawood, 1559; STC 10099.5), sig. C4r–v.

permitted.[123] What little regulation there was for extra-liturgical music under the terms of the Elizabethan settlement therefore applied with equal force to anthems and metrical psalms, and drew no distinction between them.

There is doubtless more than a grain of truth in Nicholas Temperley's paradigm that 'as far as music was concerned, the Anglican ideal prevailed in cathedrals, while in parish churches the Puritan pattern of congregational metrical psalm singing was allowed to establish itself'.[124] Yet the two forms of extra-liturgical music-making need not be regarded as mutually exclusive. In several of the exceedingly scarce Elizabethan vocal part-books that were copied for use in churches, or that at some point in their lifetime appear to have been so used, compositions of both types appear side by side. Through-composed settings of Thomas Sternhold's Ps. 25 ('I lift my heart to thee') and Ps. 128 ('Blessed art thou that fearest God'), by Tye and van Wilder respectively, are found in the T part-book *Lbl* Add. MS 22597; the latter setting is found also in the part-books Add. MSS 30480–84, a set that also contains BCP canticles. More than sixty metrical psalm settings (chiefly by Sheppard) are interspersed with some eighteen prose anthems (by Sheppard, Tallis, Tye and others) in the M part-book *Lbl* Add. MS 15166, which also contains Sternhold's Ps. 20:1–2 ('In trouble and adversity') fitted by Thomas Caustun to the music of an In nomine by Taverner. It is true that these MSS tell a slightly equivocal story in that they all contain Latin or secular pieces that are either unlikely to have been sung as anthems, or that manifestly cannot have been.[125] But no such caveat applies to the one other, fully preserved

---

123 *The whole booke of Psalmes collected into Englysh metre* (London: John Day, 1562 etc.; STC 2430, 2432–2435). Edns from 1566 onwards adopted the even more explicit wording 'to be sung of the people together, in churches, before and after morning and evening prayer, as also before and after the sermon' (STC 2437–2699, plus hundreds of edns post 1640).

124 *The Music of the English Parish Church*, vol. 1, p. 42.

125 Present in the anthem layer of Add. MS 22597 (ff. 3r–24r) are two motets, Lassus's 'Angelus ad pastores ait' (f. 16v) and Tallis's 'Salvator mundi' [i] (1575/1, ff. 22v–23r). The last liturgical item to be entered in Add. MSS 30480–84, Caustun's morning service for children, is directly followed by the anonymous consort song 'O death, rock me asleep' (MB 22/1) and the partsong 'Come, pale-faced death' attributed to Robert Johnson (i) (MB 15/32). Byrd's 'In fields abroad' (1588/22) is present at the very end of Add. MS 15166 (f. 89v), yet it is the only secular piece in that volume, and is also the only item not in the hand of the principal scribe.

source of Caustun's adaptation, Day's *Mornyng and euenyng prayer and communion* of 1565, which is specifically designated 'to be sung in churches'.[126] From these precious few sources—nearly the sum total to bear contemporary witness to the Elizabethan anthem repertory—it would be unwise to conclude that church musicians who sang anthems discriminated between prose biblical texts and psalms in metre.

While it is true that Robert Parsons, William Mundy, Bull and Morley are not known to have set metrical psalms as anthems, three late Elizabethan composers did set them, and in one well documented case did so before the queen's reign was out. Of Giles's four or five verse settings of metrical psalms, the accompaniment to an anonymous versification of Ps. 71 ('O Lord my God, in all distress') conforms to the simple texture of known Elizabethan organ parts.[127] Six versified psalms are among the texts set in verse format by Weelkes,[128] whose composing career was under way by 1597, and whose anthems neither survive in any consort versions nor appear to have been adapted from consort originals. And annotations in Batten's organ-book to two metrical verse anthems by his teacher John Holmes state that 'O how happy a thing it is' (words from Whittingham's Ps. 133) was 'made the 25 of October 1602' (i.e. five months before Elizabeth's demise), and 'All laud and praise' (words from Hopkins's Ps. 30, also set by Weelkes) was 'made 22 of April 1603' (i.e. within thirty days of James's accession on 24 March).[129] Only the organ parts of Holmes's anthems survive, yet as Ian Payne has observed, these 'do not look as though

---

126 STC 6419, title page. It might be added that Day's polyphonic metrical psalter of 1563 (STC 2431) includes through-composed, anthem-like settings of two prayers and a prose psalm, although the wording of the title page ('set forth for the increase of virtue, and abolishing of other [*sic*] vain and trifling ballads') and the inclusion of a woodcut of a domestic scene (sig. A1v) clearly indicate that this publication was not intended primarily for church use.

127 EECM 23/10; the text is a variant of Whittingham's versification found in the metrical psalters, 'My Lord, my God, in all distress'. Among the other verse anthems attributed to Giles are settings of metrical versions of Pss. 6:1–4 (also attributed to Amner), 67, 128 (text only) and 133 (EECM 23/ appendix nos 5, 3, 2 and 6; see also n. 48 above).

128 Pss. 21:1, 30:1–6, 25, 43:5, 47:1 and 133; see MB 23/17, 22, 24 and appendix II. It is possible that Weelkes's full setting of Whittingham's Ps. 130:1–2 ('Lord, to thee, I make my moan', MB 23/7) was also composed for church use, since it is scored for the usual five-voice ecclesiastical ensemble and appears in Barnard's MS part-books.

129 Ob MS Tenbury 791, ff. 383r–384r and 385v–387r; see p. 81 n. 80 above.

they have been arranged from "domestic" original versions composed in the first place for voices and (five-part) viol consort'.[130] Nor can the metrical settings by Giles and Weelkes be any more easily dismissed as chamber pieces co-opted to swell a decadent Laudian repertory; rather, all these verse anthems from around 1600 must be taken to illustrate what varieties of text were deemed acceptable in the late Elizabethan and Jacobean church. And in Weelkes's case, that could extend even to a poem by the Jesuit martyr Robert Southwell, 'If King Manasses' (MB 23/20).

Indeed, the admissibility of metrical psalmody is quite widely corroborated by evidence for the admissibility of metrical texts that were not based on the psalter but were instead freely composed. Of several such anthem texts associated with Byrd, three (BeholdOGTS, BeholdOGWT and ThouGTG) are prayers for the monarch, and a precedent for them can be identified in an anonymous 'godly prayer' that names Edward in the Wanley Books and Elizabeth in Day's *Mornyng and euenyng prayer and communion* (RRMR 100/41):

> Let all the congregation
> That is within this place
> Cry unto God, that holy Lord,
> To send us of his grace.
> ...
> Grant us that we may keep always
> Thy holy statutes ten:
> [Wanley:] Preserve our king Edward the sixth,
> [Day:] Defend and save Elizabeth our queen,
> All people say Amen.

It is in connection with four further royal texts of this type that the term 'anthem' makes some of its extremely rare appearances in official Elizabethan documents. 'An anthem' is the final item in an Accession Day liturgy composed by Edmund Bunny and issued by the queen's printer Christopher Barker in 1585.[131] No music is specified, but the metre is that

130 'The Will and Probate Inventory of John Holmes (d.1629): Instrumental Music at Salisbury and Winchester Cathedrals Revisited', *Antiquaries Journal*, 83 (2003), 369–96 (385).

131 *Certaine prayers and other godly exercises, for the seuenteenth of Nouember* (STC 4089), sig. E4v.

of two psalms (112 and 127) for which Day's psalter prescribed Luther's tune for the Lord's Prayer:

> O glorious God, respect our song,
> And from the heavens bow down thine eyes:
> Grant that our queen may prosper long,
> And scape the snares her foes devise.
> So shall each faithful heart always,
> To thee give honour, laud and praise.

Nor was Bunny's Accession Day anthem the first of its kind. On 15 November 1578, Barker had obtained licences to print two '*Little Anthemes or thinges in meeter of hir maiestie*' and '*An Antheme or songe beginninge 'Lord save and blesse with good encrease the Churche our quene and realm in peac*[*e*]''.[132] All three are to be found appended to copies of the official Accession Day liturgy Barker issued in 1580 and which was reissued by deputies of his in 1590.[133] Placed first is a 'thanksgiving' of fourteen stanzas which borrows its first three lines from Hopkins's Ps. 81 and is directed to be sung to the tune of that psalm. In the manner of the Wanley/Day text, the tenth stanza refers to the monarch by name:

> Lord, keep Elizabeth our Queen,
> defend her in thy right:
> Show forth thyself, as thou hast been,
> her fortress and her might.
> Preserve her grace, confound her foes,
> and bring them down full low:
> Lord, turn thy hand against all those
> that would her overthrow.

The third item licensed to Barker is placed next, with the heading 'an anthem or prayer for the preservation of the church, the queen's majesty, and the realm, to be sung after evening prayer at all times'. Lastly comes 'a song of rejoicing for the prosperous reign of our most gracious sovereign lady Queen Elizabeth, made to the tune of the 25. psalm'. From the

---

132 *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554–1640*, ed. Edward Arber, vol. 2 (London: privately printed, 1875), 341.

133 *A fourme of prayer with thankes giuing, to be vsed of all the Queenes Maiesties louing subiects euery yeere, the 17. of Nouember, being the daye of the her Highnesse entry to her kingdome*, STC 16481 and 16482 respectively. The three metrical texts are reprinted in *Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer*, ed. Clay, 558–61.

enigmatic initials 'I. C.' printed at the end of this item, it must be concluded that the tantalizing description 'of her majesty' entered in the stationers' register signifies content rather than authorship.

Whereas the 'thanksgiving' and the 'song of rejoicing' are both in a cross-rhymed double-ballad metre redolent of popular metrical psalmody, the 'anthem' consists of four sestets of rhyming couplets with a two-line refrain or 'burden' placed directly before the first sestet:

> Save, Lord, and bless with good increase
> Thy church, our queen and realm in peace.
>
> As for thy gifts we render praise,
> So Lord, we crave still blessed days,
> Let thy sweet words and Gospel pure
> With us, dear God, for aye endure.
> With prosperous reign increase it still,
> That sound thereof the earth may fill.
>
> Save, Lord, and bless [...]

This text, then, is an example of a carol, the verse form traditionally associated with such festivals as Christmas and New Year, and as such it would surely have gratified proponents of the still new festival of Accession Day. The printed designation 'anthem' is not entirely surprising: as John Milsom has shown, there is some evidence that carols were deemed appropriate for co-option into the early anthem repertory and may even have been set to music specifically for use in church.[134] Pieces that are incontestably anthems (such as Sheppard's 'I give you a new commandment' and 'Submit yourselves')[135] are intermingled with carols in two of the Elizabethan MS sources to which we have already referred: Mundy's 'Prepare you, time weareth away' is found in *Lbl* Add. MSS 30480–84, and Sheppard's 'Vain, vain' in *Lbl* MS 15166.[136] The latter's 'Of all strange news', furthermore, appears in two

---

134 'Songs, Carols and *Contrafacta*', 36–7.

135 Both pieces are designated 'antem' (*sic*) in the Wanley books (see RRMR 99/8 and 18), and either 'anthem' or 'prayer' in the part-books of Day's *Mornyng and euenyng prayer and communion* (where the two terms are used interchangeably).

136 Sheppard's carol (f. 70r) appears between Tallis's eight tunes for Matthew Parker's psalter (ff. 67v–69v) and a further layer of metrical psalmody (ff. 72r–75r).

singleton part-books also containing BCP canticles: *Ckc* MS Rowe 316, which additionally contains the anonymous carol 'A maid immaculate', and *SHR* LB/15/1/226.

If these mid-century carols were sung under the terms of Elizabeth's forty-ninth injunction, and since in any case Barker's two editions of the Accession Day order gave implicit sanction for them to be so used, then there is no reason in principle why Byrd's two 1589 carols 'From virgin's womb' and AnET should not also have been appended to Elizabethan common prayer. To be sure, neither 'From virgin's womb' nor Byrd's 1611 carol 'O God that guides the cheerful sun' appears in any institutional sources, and all three carols are self-evidently consort compositions. But the possibility cannot be ruled out that the church version of AnET, like that of ChristR, was already several decades old when Batten transcribed it in the 1630s.

The practice of singing metrical prayers for the sovereign is further evidenced by the verse anthems 'O God of gods' by Hooper and 'Preserve most mighty God' and 'O God, best guide' by Bull,[137] as well as by three verse anthem texts associated with Byrd, two of which survive with music attributed to him. BeholdOGTS and BeholdOGWT are extant only in forms addressed to Charles I; the latter, indeed, is unimaginable in a form addressed to any other monarch, and is almost certainly a *contrafactum* of the former. The text of a third royal prayer, ThouGTG, is in contrast indubitably of Elizabethan date. Like the texts of AlackWILB and LetUBG, it is the work of Byrd's Chapel Royal colleague William Hunnis (d. 1597); like them too, it was published in a volume of Hunnis's spiritual verse that ran through more than a dozen editions between *c*.1579 and 1636. For convenience, the whole of this volume will be referred to here as *Seuen sobs* (*SS*), although all surviving copies of it comprise four distinct collections, at least one of which began life as a separate publication. All four are named on the front title page, but the second, third and fourth have

137 The texts of all three anthems are found in the Chapel Royal word-book *Ob* MS Rawl. Poet. 23, pp. 135, 164 and 171. Hooper's anthem alone survives with music, but it is plausible that the poulter's metre text of 'Preserve most mighty God' was written to fit the music of Bull's verse anthem 'Deliver me, O God'.

interior title pages of their own. Placed first are Hunnis's paraphrases of the penitential psalms, alliteratively entitled *Seuen sobs of a sorrowfull soule for sinne*. There then follow three prayer miscellanies: *A Handfull of honisuckles* (doubtless a pun on the poet's name); *The poore Widowes Mite;* and *Comfortable Dialogs betweene Christ and a Sinner*.

The oldest surviving edition of *SS* was printed by Henry Denham in 1583.[138] One of its four constituent collections, however, had already been issued by another printer, Thomas Dawson, who on 11 December 1578 was granted a licence for 'a book entitled *A handfull of honnie succles gyven for a newe yeres gift vnto the Ladies and gentlewomen of the privie chamber*'.[139] Denham, who at that time was the lease holder of William Seres's patent for printing all books of private prayers,[140] was quick to claim that the rights to the *Honisuckles* belonged instead to him, and accordingly brought a case before the court of the Stationers' Company in August 1579. An awkward compromise resulted, for while Dawson was ordered to surrender his remaining stock of the *Honisuckles* to Denham at a rate of eight shillings per hundred, the court clearly viewed the book as falling outside the terms of the Seres-Denham patent, and permitted Dawson to reprint it provided that he 'leave out all such titles and notes as do show or declare the same to contain any prayer or prayers'.[141] Undeterred, on 7 November 1581 Denham secured a licence of his own for the *Honisuckles*, together with the *Widowes Mite* (some of which he printed the following year among the vast contents of Thomas Bentley's *Monument of matrones*)[142] and Hunnis's penitential psalms (under the otherwise unknown title *vij Steppes to heaven*).[143] But the matter was not finally settled until 6 December 1585, when the court confirmed Denham's

---

138 STC 13975; subsequent edns date from 1585 (STC 13975.5) and 1587 (STC 13976) up to 1636 (STC 13984.5); the words of ThouGTG are addressed on behalf of James from 1604 (STC 13980 et seq.) and on behalf of Charles from 1629 (STC 13984 et seq.).

139 *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers*, vol. 2, p. 343.

140 *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers*, vol. 2, p. 771.

141 *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company, Vol. 1: 1576–1602*, ed. W. W. Greg and E. Boswell (London: Bibliographical Society, 1930), 9.

142 Vol. 2, *The fift lampe of virginitie* (London: 1582; STC 1893), 173–7; see pp. 87–8 above.

143 *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers*, vol. 2, p. 403.

rights to the three titles mentioned in the 1581 licence (the psalms now being entitled *Seuen sobs*) on condition that he pay Dawson forty shillings in exchange for copyright of the *Honisuckles* plus the hefty sum of £4 as compensation for having printed it 'diverse times heretofore to the injury of the said Dawson'.[144]

The details of this wrangle tell us three things about *SS*, the first being that a high price could be put on the right to print Hunnis's godly ditties. Though the reported dedication of Dawson's edition of the *Honisuckles* was never precisely reiterated by Denham, his print of the penitential psalms does bear an inscription to the Countess of Sussex, one of the ladies of the privy chamber, while a dedicatory poem declares the *Widowes Mite* to be a new year's gift to the queen herself. *SS*, then, was nothing if not a prestigious publication with prominent court credentials.

Secondly, the 1583 edition of *SS* was probably not the only one Denham issued prior to December 1585 (the edition of that year was not licensed until 6 December, the day of the final court hearing).[145] The court's ruling mentions 'diverse' prints of the *Honisuckles*, which together with the *Widowes Mite* and the *Comfortable Dialogs* are described on the 1583 front title page as 'newly printed and augmented'. Furthermore, a late Elizabethan MS copy of items from all three miscellanies differs markedly from the known prints of *SS*, and is most readily explained as the derivative of a lost, earlier edition (its variant readings of 'Alack' will be discussed below, pp. 206–8).[146]

---

144 *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company*, 18.

145 *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers*, vol. 2, p. 445.

146 *Lbl* MS Egerton 2403. Of the five relevant items, only 'Thou God that guid'st' is substantively the same as its printed version; in the following collation, the MS readings are given first, then the printed readings:

'O Jesu meek' (f. 35v, from the *Honisuckles*)

I know also it is thy grace	Jesu, thy grace I know it is
Have mercy Lord on me.	Have mercy now on me. *Amen*

'Like as the guilty prisoner stands' (f. 34r–v, from the *Widowes Mite*)

rejoice [once only]	be glad, be glad

'Give ear, O Lord' (f. 36v, from the *Comfortable Dialogs*)

Shall of thy mercy try.	Shall taste of thy mercy.

In addition, the MS copy of 'Give ear, O Lord' includes a refrain not present in any editions: 'With mourning voice we sing, / With heavy hearts we cry; / Our spirits all sad, good Lord, make glad, / With mercy, Lord, mercy.' The MS belonged to one Thomas Wenman, who inscribed his name and the date 10 July 1601 on f. 51v, and has been identified with the Oxford graduate of that name who served as public orator to the university: see *The Legend of Mary Queen of Scots*, ed. John Fry (London: Longman, 1810), pp. xi–xii.

Thirdly, notwithstanding the court's decision in 1579, Denham clung to his conviction that *SS* was a prayer book, and a glance through the contents quickly shows why. Following the seven psalms is a medley of daily devotions, graces, prayers for the queen, twenty-five invocations beginning 'O Jesu...', and versifications of Deuteronomy 28, the Athanasian Creed, and Savonarola's meditation on Ps. 51. This material is, admittedly, all rhymed (and almost entirely in Sternhold's metre), but at the very end of the volume are two dozen pages of prayers in prose—supplemented, perhaps, as proof of Denham's point.

Though Hunnis is nowhere mentioned in connection with the copyright dispute, certain substantive revisions and corrections to successive editions of *SS* are almost certainly evidence of his involvement in their production. It may therefore not be coincidental that, of the more than sixty poems in the volume, the three associated with Byrd are placed last, in a sequence directly adjoining the prose back-matter, even though this results in a more contrasted juxtaposition of moods and subjects than is to be found elsewhere in what is otherwise a quite orderly collection. In Monson's view, the sequence is explained by 'Byrd's methodical adoption of three consecutive poems'.[147] If, however, it was actually in Hunnis's mind that these disparate texts formed a group, then that may have been because Byrd had already set them to music. As we shall see, further sources of the text of AlackWILB provide evidence that this was so.

It is perhaps surprising to find Byrd's name associated with the poetry of an individual whom Milsom has aptly described as the composer's 'antithesis' (although with one of the three poems in question the impulse to search for coded Catholic messages in Byrd's chosen texts yields a surprising possibility).[148] Hunnis's first appearance in the historical record is as the author of a 1550 collection of six metrical psalms (none of which had previously been versified by Sternhold).[149] By 1552, he had gained a place in Edward's

147 'Authenticity and Chronology', 299.

148 'Sacred Songs in the Chamber', 168.

149 *Certayne psalmes chosen out of the psalter of Dauid, and drawen furth into Englysh meter* (London: John Harrington, 1550; STC 2727); see Quitslund, *The Reformation in Rhyme*, 73, 84–6.

Chapel Royal, but under Mary his court career was dramatically interrupted following his embroilment in the Dudley Conspiracy of 1555–6. Reinstatement to the Chapel early in Elizabeth's reign led to his appointment in 1566 as master of the children, which onerous office he still held on his death thirty-one years later. From 1569 to 1580, however, Richard Farrant had served as master, and it was during that period that Hunnis seems to have been most actively engaged in literary endeavours. In 1578, he again ventured into biblical versification with a metrical version of the book of Genesis.[150]

Though by no means a poet of the first rank, Hunnis was clearly a major player in the field of Elizabethan devotional verse. Indeed, his six metrical psalms have been hailed by Beth Quitslund as 'the purest example of biblical versification designed for the reader's (and the singer's) private prayers'.[151] In terms of subject matter, diction, and—perhaps above all—the ubiquitous Sternhold's metre,[152] freely composed spiritual poetry of the kind found in *SS* can be seen as a natural by-product of versifying the bible. Two Pauline epistles exhorted Christians to combine 'psalms and hymns and spiritual songs' (Ephesians 3:19, Colossians 3:16), and Miles Coverdale's pertinently titled *Goostly psalmes and spirituall songes* includes an English translation of the Lutheran hymn 'Ich ruf zu dir, Herr Jesu Christ' apparently on the understanding that it had been freely composed in the vernacular.[153] Sir Thomas Smith added three of his own 'psalms' to a selection from the psalter he versified in 1549–50,[154] and in like manner Hunnis and others supplemented

---

150 *A hyue full of hunnye contayning the firste booke of Moses, called Genesis. Turned into English meetre* (London: Thomas Marsh; STC 13974).

151 *The Reformation in Rhyme*, 84. Quitslund's opinion may be contrasted with that of Bowers, who dismisses the text of AlackWILB as 'conventionally shallow and uninspired', and that of ThouGTG as 'banal in the extreme' ('Ecclesiastical or Domestic?', 146).

152 As Quitslund notes, prior to Sternhold 'the metre was neither especially common nor associated with psalmody' (*The Reformation in Rhyme*, 22).

153 See n. 33 above. The item in question, 'I call on thee, Lord Jesu Christ' (ff. 24v–26r) is set apart from the main group of thirteen metrical psalms, and has neither the Latin incipit nor marginal bible references appended to many of the other items. It is nonetheless based on a German paraphrase of Ps. 22, 'Ich ruf zu dir, Herr Jesu Christ': see Sander L. Gilman, 'The Hymns of Johannes Agricola of Eisleben: A Literary Reappraisal', *The Modern Language Review*, 67 (1972), 364–89 (375–81).

154 'Certaigne Psalmes or Songues of David translated into English meter', *Lbl* MS Royal 17.A.xvii.

their psalms with original poems or hymns cast in the same stylistic mould.[155] In *SS*, Hunnis did not scruple to describe the non-biblical text of LetUBG as 'a psalm of rejoicing'.

Supplementary poetry found its way too into the official metrical psalter that, in the hands of the queen's printer John Day, accumulated around the versifications of Sternhold and John Hopkins. Thus, by 1562, Day's *The whole booke of Psalmes* included seven such hymns with their own proper tunes—among them John Marckant's *The Lamentation of a Sinner* ('O Lord, turn not away thy face') and *The Humble Suit of the Sinner* ('O Lord, of whom I do depend'), as well as the anonymous 'O Lord, in thee is all my trust'.[156] These texts clearly appealed to Elizabethan and Jacobean composers, and were repeatedly set to music for both domestic and institutional use. Fido, Weelkes and Amner are known each to have set one of them as an anthem, Hooper and Holmes two, and Giles all three; all ten of these settings survive exclusively in institutional sources.[157] Moreover, Day saw fit to include among the anthems of his *Mornyng and euenyng prayer and communion* both the words and melody of 'O Lord, in thee is all my trust', in a four-part arrangement credited to Tallis (EECM 12/6). This hymn at least, then, was deemed appropriate for a prayer-book service in the early years of Elizabeth's reign.

Hunnis must have had *The whole booke of Psalmes* in mind when assembling the contents of *SS*, not only because his poems and their headings (*An humble suit*, *A Lamentation*)[158] recall the freely composed items in the metrical psalter, but also because the earliest surviving editions are furnished with eleven monophonic tunes which in

---

155 See *The Reformation in Rhyme*, 229–30, 277, 279–81.

156 STC 2430, sigs B5r–B7r, pp. 389–90.

157 See SECM. Most of these anthems are incomplete; the only ones to have been published are Amner's 'O Lord, of whom I do depend', ed. Anthony Greening (Croydon: The Royal School of Church Music, 1973), Giles's setting of the same text (EECM 23/9, but see n. 48 above) and his 'O Lord, turn not away thy face' (EECM 23/11). A further setting of 'O Lord, in thee is all my trust', by Gibbons, is scored for the usual institutional ensemble, but the music survives only in the score book *Och* MS Mus. 21 (see EECM 21/7). A single setting of a fourth, similar, anonymous text from *The whole booke of Psalmes*, 'Where righteousness doth say', is attributed to both Angus and Kemp (SECM).

158 *SS* (1583 edn; STC 13975), sigs G5v, G8v.

several respects resemble those of the official psalter.[159] These tunes are made up almost entirely of semibreves and minims, and each is set in either a C4 or C3 clef. They are either proper to an individual poem or shared among several poems by means of such directions as 'sing this as before' and 'to be sung as the former'.[160] They are also unattributed, there being within the pages of *SS* not a single indication as to whether Hunnis composed them himself or borrowed and perhaps adapted them from elsewhere. None is known from any other printed source,[161] and MS concordances have been identified for only two—'My soul, O God, doth now confess' (see p. 133 above) and, of course, 'Alack'. Still, as we shall see, even though three surviving polyphonic compositions incorporate the 'Alack' tune (AlackWILB, a similar verse anthem, and a lute song), none of them can have derived its verbal text—directly or indirectly—from either *SS* or the publication in which a slightly different version of Hunnis's poem had previously appeared, *The paradyse of daynty deuises*.

The *Paradyse* (*PDD*) is generally recognized as having been the most widely admired of all Elizabethan poetry anthologies. It originated as a MS compilation accumulated by Richard Edwards (d. 1566), one of Hunnis's Chapel Royal colleagues and his predecessor as master of the children. Ten years after Edwards's death, it became an auspicious first publication for the young printer Henry Disle, and up to 1606 went through no fewer than nine further editions.[162] The first five all differ substantially in terms of their contents and ascriptions. Though Edwards continued to be named on the title page as the principal contributor, if all ten editions are taken into account that honour belonged equally to

---

159 The tunes may have been included in successive reprints of *SS* at Hunnis's personal insistence, because following his death in 1597 the collection went through several editions containing no music at all (STC 13979–81). A few of the tunes, however, were reinstated from 1615 (STC 13982 et seq.), although the 'Alack' tune was not one of them.

160 *SS* (1583 edn; STC 13975), sigs A10v [*recte* A11v], G4v.

161 The absence of printed concordances is confirmed by Nicholas Temperley, *The Hymn Tune Index: A Census of English-Language Hymn Tunes in Printed Sources from 1535–1820* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), where Hunnis's tunes are listed as HTI nos 257–67.

162 STC 7516–7524; the second, 1577 edn, of which no printed copies survive, has no STC number. For a description of the extant edns, see *The Paradise of Dainty Devices (1576–1606)*, ed. Rollins, pp. xiii–xvi, xviii–xxx.

Hunnis.[163] His conspicuous profile in the anthology doubtless reflects the probability that he himself saw its second, 1577 edition through the press. Though all printed copies of that edition have vanished, a MS transcript made *c.*1777 by the bibliographer William Herbert reveals that, in addition to five poems carried over from the first edition, Hunnis gained seven new ones plus six more that had previously been misattributed to other authors or left anonymous. The transcript reveals too that an errata list included in the lost edition consisted exclusively of corrections to eight of Hunnis's poems. Over and above those errata, more corrections and revisions were made to his contributions than to those of any of the other poets.[164]

'Alack' was one of the seven new Hunnis items introduced to the 1577 edition, and is perhaps an example of how the evolving anthology could be a source of ideas for those who continued to contribute to it.[165] The subject matter (not to mention the exact phrase 'when I look back') appears to derive from one of the poems by Lord Thomas Vaux (1509–56) included in the original 1576 corpus. It would be rash on those grounds to assign 'Alack' to the months between the first and second editions of *PDD*, since Hunnis might well have first encountered Vaux's poem long before 1576. Still, the resemblance was not lost on a contemporary reader of the third, 1578 edition, who annotated both poems with cross references.[166] The older poem—of which there exist fragments of a partsong setting by Robert Parsons[167]—is prefixed with the argument 'Of the instability of youth':

---

163 In Rollins's analysis (*The Paradise of Dainty Devices (1576–1606)*, pp. xlvii, lii), Edwards and Hunnis total twenty poems each. Though the attribution of 'Sweet the joys' (Rollins's no. 4) to Hunnis is doubtful, this is offset by his elegy for the Earl of Pembroke, which was unknown to Rollins because it appeared only in the lost, second edn of *PDD* (see below).

164 *Ob* MS Douce e. 16, ff. 1r–115r; see Steven W. May, 'William Hunnis and the 1577 *Paradise of Dainty Devices*', *Studies in Bibliography*, 28 (1975), 63–80 (70–73).

165 See Ros King, *The Works of Richard Edwards: Politics, Poetry and Performance in Sixteenth-Century England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 42.

166 *Ob*, shelfmark Wood 482 (6), STC 7517, ff. 7v, 36r. The similarity between the two poems was noted also by Philip Brett in 'The Songs of William Byrd' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1965), 297–8.

167 *Ob* MS Mus. Sch. e. 423, p. 41 (Ct); *Och* MS Mus. 986, no. 99b (modern numbering, Ct, incomplete); *Lbl* Add. MS 31992, f. 51v (lute intabulation).

When I look back and in myself behold
The wand'ring ways that youth could not descry,
And mark the fearful course that youth did hold,
And meet in mind each step youth strayed awry,
My knees I bow, and from my heart I call,
O Lord, forget these faults and follies all.[168]

In comparison to Vaux's six stanzas, which are of the Venus and Adonis type and develop the rueful theme through a deft series of biblical references,[169] Hunnis's imitation appears pale. Still, via a reference to the myth that eagles shed and then regenerate their beaks ('as the eagle casts her bill, whereby her age renew'th'), Hunnis did work in an allusion to Ps. 103:5, 'and thy youth is renewed like the eagle's'.[170] And his more pedestrian refrain, 'Good Lord with mercy do forgive, the follies of my youth', acts as a pointer to the psalm verse from which Vaux must have taken his cue, 'O remember not the sins and offences of my youth: but according to thy mercy think thou upon me O Lord for thy goodness' (Ps. 25:6). 'Alack', then, notwithstanding the dominant secularism of *PDD*, was firmly enough rooted in scripture for Hunnis to be able to include it also in his exclusively devotional *SS* —albeit with the pithy argument 'He repenteth his folly' amended to the more pious one 'A lamentation touching the follies and vanities of our youth'.

Returning to *SS*,[171] we may note that the three Byrdian texts are not the only ones to have been set as verse anthems by Byrd's contemporaries. For younger composers, indeed, the precedents of AlackWILB, LetUBG and ThouGTG seem to have sanctioned Hunnis's volume as a semi-official source of non-biblical, non-liturgical words for anthems. Stanzas selected from the *Handful of Honisuckles* make up the texts of 'O Jesu meek' by Morley and 'O Jesu mild' by John Hilton (father or son),[172] while 'Give ear, O Lord', a poem

168 First, 1576 edn (STC 7516), 11 (spelling modernized).

169 See *The Paradise of Dainty Devices (1576–1606)*, ed. Rollins, 196, where the biblical references are identified.

170 Translation from the Geneva Bible (1560), which is more specific on this point than Coverdale's 'making thee young and lusty as an eagle'. For further Elizabethan references to the same myth, see *The Paradise of Dainty Devices (1576–1606)*, ed. Rollins, 260.

171 The following references are to the 1583 edn (STC 13975).

172 Sigs E1r–E2v and E6r. Morley's anthem (EECM 38/2) is found exclusively in sources of an institutional character (*Ckc* MSS Rowe 10–17, *Lcm* MS 1051 and *Ob* MS Tenbury 791); of Hilton's, only the organ part survives (*Ob* MS Tenbury 791, ff. 264r–265v).

printed just three page-turns before 'Alack', was set in its entirety by Weelkes (who did not omit an overt musical acknowledgement to AlackWILB, as we shall see).[173] Perhaps following the lead of ThouGTG, John Fido composed a verse setting of 'O king of heaven', another of Hunnis's royal prayer-poems.[174]

It is possible that the original precedent for turning Hunnis's poetry into anthems was set by a composer senior to Byrd, since an excerpt from the Savonarola paraphrase 'Ah, helpless wretch' served as the text of the verse anthem by William Mundy.[175] Caution must be exercised in drawing conclusions from this work, for its relationship with Hunnis's printed version is far from straightforward. Whereas in *SS* the poem comprises nine quatrains in Sternhold's 8686 metre, in the anthem it comprises four quintains in the exceptional metre 88888 plus an 888888 sestet.[176] The omission of fourteen of Hunnis's lines is hardly surprising, since these included indelicate references to 'the gates of hell', a 'bloody murdering knife' and 'the bloody price', as well as the Latin refrain 'Peccavi, peccavi, / Miserere mei'. But the remaining amendments are more problematical. The even-numbered lines of each stanza have been extended from six to eight syllables, in some cases by inserting unmistakable padding, and in others by more substantive reworking. The line 'or which way shall I run?', for example, is spun out to 'or which way shall I go or run?', while 'Receive my plaints, accept my spirit, / and mercy grant at last' is rendered as 'Accept therefore, my humble plaints, / and grant me rest among thy saints'. The fifth line of each quintain, furthermore, is entirely new, and supplements a simple, independent invocation in rhyme with the fourth line. Hunnis's 'The earth bewrays, and heaven records / the sins that I have done' thus becomes 'The earth bewrays, the heav'ns

---

173 Sigs G5v–G6r; MB 23/18.

174 Sig. F1. All that survives of this anthem is the T part to the choruses in *Ob* MS Tenbury 1382 (f. 25r–v); here Hunnis's text is updated on behalf of King James, but it differs slightly from the Jacobean editions of *SS* (STC 13980 et seq.).

175 Sig. F4r–v; RRMR 116/31.

176 I am indebted to John Harper for this observation.

record / the wickedness that I have done; / Have mercy, Lord, for Christ thy Son'. Clearly, then, the anthem text represents a reworking of the poem, and not *vice versa*.

Did the poem undergo these adaptations so that it could be fitted to music that Mundy had originally composed for some other text legitimately in 88888 metre? Though that would be the most straightforward explanation, the considerable scarcity of poems in that metre argues against it.[177] The augmentation of syllables, furthermore, is by no means an isolated phenomena in the early history of the strophic verse anthem: as we shall see, the texts of two other such anthems (AlackWILB, and Bull's 'Deliver me, O God') exist in metrically extended versions, presumably to enable them to be sung to a greater number of familiar tunes. A similar fate might already have befallen 'Ah, helpless wretch' when the poem fell into Mundy's hands—at which point, indeed, the *SS* version might still not have been published. Nor is it impossible that the additional lines were put there to suit Mundy's artistic purposes: if the fifth phrase of each solo vocal passage served originally to reiterate the preceding line of text (abcdd), then the most convenient alternative to an undesirable third iteration by chorus (abcddD) would have been to add a fifth line of text (abcdeE). Perhaps in consequence of Mundy's having done this, the text of Byrd's lost verse anthem LetUBG appears likewise to have included four lines not printed by Hunnis, and precisely similar in character to those of 'Ah, helpless wretch'.

Mundy does appear also to have composed another, similar work that also survives exclusively as a verse anthem, 'The secret sins'.[178] The text, in Sternhold's metre, is anonymous and otherwise unknown. But in tone, style and even wording it so closely

---

177 See Steven W. May and William A. Ringler, Jr, *Elizabethan Poetry: A Bibliography and First-Line Index of English Verse, 1559–1603*, 3 vols (London: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004) vol. 3, pp. 2,135 and 2,142–3. Of the 32,588 poems included in this census, fewer than one in three hundred might have fitted Mundy's solo passages without the need to repeat a line (one with the metre 16 16 8, and 100 with the metre 88888). Only two metrical psalms—William Kethe's Ps. 36 and John Craig's Ps. 132—are known to have been written in 88888 form, but their circulation was for the most part restricted to the Scottish psalter: see Temperley, *The Hymn Tune Index*, HTI no. 136a.

178 EECM 3/14, where it is included on the basis of a conflicting attribution to Orlando Gibbons. This poem is listed neither in Roman B. Dubinski, *English Religious Poetry Printed 1477–1640* (Waterloo, Ontario: North Waterloo Academic Press, 1996) nor in May and Ringler, *Elizabethan Poetry*.

resembles Marckant's hymns from *The whole booke of Psalmes* that it may safely be classified with the kind of freely composed spiritual verse implicitly endorsed by the metrical psalter:

(anon., setting attributed to Mundy)

The secret sins that hidden lie
within my pensive heart,
Procure great heaps of bitter thoughts,
And fill my soul with smart,

(Marckant)

O Lord, of whom I do depend,
behold my careful heart,
And when thy will and pleasure is,
release me of my smart.

One further Elizabethan metrical text calls for comment, since it exists in a setting by John Bull, and one of its non-musical sources provides third-party evidence that it served as an anthem during the queen's reign. Owing to its independent circulation in print, this poem has a complex history that cannot be fully documented here; nevertheless, a slim volume that went through two editions in 1606 describes it as 'an anthem often sung in the Royal Chapel of our late Queen Elizabeth, in any time of danger: made in anno Dom. 1588'.[179] In both editions (and, it must be admitted, in the 'corporate' manner Bowers notices of the BCP), the poem is expressed in the first-person plural:

Deliver us, O Lord,
from all our foes that be,
And eke defend all Christian Souls
that put their trust in thee.

Preserve us still, good Lord
from all the wicked train,
From such as long and thirst for blood
and doth thy truth disdain. (sig. C3v)

179 John Rhodes, *A briefe summe of the treason intended against the King & state, when they should haue been assembled in Parliament. Nouember. 5. 1605* (London: Edward Allde for Edward White), STC 20960 and 20960.5, sigs C3v–C4r.

A version with substantial variants appears in *The countrie mans comfort*, an Elizabethan anthology now known only from a 1637 reissue,[180] where it accompanies the text of Byrd's 'Look and bow down' under the heading 'Two excellent songs or ditties, made by Queen Elizabeth'. In so far as it extends to the Bull text, this royal attribution is nowhere corroborated and is probably without foundation: as we have seen (p. 88), Elizabethan writers were not above putting words into the mouth of their sovereign, and it is plausible that a popular poem dating from the time of the Armada crisis should sooner or later have been passed off as one of the queen's personal writings.[181] For the most part the 1637 print adopts the first person singular, and augments the metre, in the manner described above, from poulter's to regular fourteeners:

> Deliver me, O Lord my God,
> ...
>
> Preserve us now and evermore
> ... (sig. D6r)

In the sources containing Bull's music, however, the text appears with fewer variants, and is consistently in poulter's metre and the first-person singular:

> Deliver me, O God
> from all my foes that be,
> and me defend and those withstand
> that riseth against me.

---

180 London: M. Dawson, 1637; STC 20961; the editor is identified only by the initials 'I. R.'. The title page and front matter (sigs A1r–A2v) state the volume to be a revision 'by the same author' of a volume first published in 1588, and this is corroborated by an entry in the stationers' register dated 16 December of that year (*A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers*, vol. 2, p. 511). Though 'I. R.' has been identified with the John Rhodes who was responsible for *A briefe summe* (see n. 180 above), the two titles may in fact be the work of separate individuals. Rhodes took his B.A. at Cambridge in 1599–1600, and is therefore unlikely to have published anything as early as 1588: see Charles Henry Cooper and Thompson Cooper, *Athenae cantabrigienses*, 2 vols (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Macmillan, 1858–61), vol. 2, p. 447, where the list of Rhodes's publications includes *A briefe summe*, but not *The countrie mans comfort*.

181 The editor's claim that 'Deliver me' was written by Elizabeth in 1588—'as it is credibly reported (and as it is very likely by some words in it)'—is too cautiously worded to inspire much confidence either that the poem came from the queen's pen or that it formed part of I. R.'s original publication.

Deliver me also
from those that wicked be,
From such as thirsteth after blood
Good Lord deliver me.[182]

It is unfortunate that a recent theory that Bull composed his setting specifically for the 1588 Armada thanksgiving is not based on firmer evidence than that provided by the 1606 and 1637 publications.[183] Confirmation that 'Deliver me/us, O God/Lord [my God]' was intended for that event would establish a much-needed landmark in the early history of the verse anthem (this work survives exclusively in institutional sources; there are no musical grounds for assuming it ever existed in a consort version). Yet although Bull, who was sworn a Gentleman of the Chapel Royal in 1586, might have set this modest text to music at any time prior to his ignominious departure for the continent in 1613,[184] there is no obvious reason to mistrust the 1606 report that the same freely composed, non-biblical text —or at least a closely related version of it—formed part of the anthem repertory of Elizabeth's chapel.

Under the broad terms of the forty-ninth injunction, the Elizabethan church anthem was by no means restricted to purely scriptural texts. As an appendage to the BCP offices, it was never bound by the strictures of formal liturgy, but rather provided a space in which varied modes of spiritual creativity could flourish. It is evident that musicians sometimes turned to metrical psalms and freely composed devotional verse (Hunnis's particularly), and that they had a measure of official endorsement for doing so. The devotional poetry that grew up around the metrical psalter represented, as Quitslund has observed, 'a very popular form of piety that encompassed most of the theological spectrum, and would

182 The Chapel Royal word-book *Ob* MS Rawl. Poet. 23 and Barnard's *First Book* agree on this reading of the first two couplets; it is perhaps in error, therefore, that only one musical source—the T part-book *Ob* MS Tenbury 1382—gives the anthem's incipit as 'Deliver me, O Lord'.

183 Arthur F. Marotti and Steven W. May, 'Two Lost Ballads of the Armada Thanksgiving Celebration', *English Literary Renaissance*, 41 (2011), 31–63 (46).

184 Bull was still composing for the Chapel Royal early in that year, for the cheque book records that he set the words 'God the Father, God the Son' as a benediction anthem for the marriage, in Whitehall Chapel on 14 February, of Princess Elizabeth and Frederick V; see *The Cheque Books of the Chapel Royal*, ed. Ashbee and Harley, vol. 1, p. 175.

offend no one who accepted the validity of non-scriptural songs'.[185] Perhaps it was with such songs in mind that one contemporary anonymous author (John Case?)—in what appears to be a rare if not unique comment on the question of anthem texts—took care not to limit his approval to scripture alone:

> I put this as a principle: that as nothing is to be taught, so nothing to be sung in the church but either that which is set down in the express word of God, *or that may certainly be showed to be collected out of it*. ... I would not admit any other matter than is contained in the written word of God, *or consonable thereunto*.[186]

3.5 Anthems with metrical texts

3.5.1 'Alack, when I look back'

Of all the anthems attributed to Byrd, AlackWILB (BE 11/11b) is perhaps the most problematical. Its words, by William Hunnis, survive in a number of non-musical printed and MS sources, and appear in combination with the melody of its solo verses in three other contexts: a monophonic song from Hunnis's *SS*, fragments of a closely related but clearly different verse anthem attributed to Hunnis, and an anonymous lute song (BE 11/11a). (Unless otherwise stated, all bar-numbers given here will apply to the Byrdian verse anthem, for which the *siglum* AlackWILB will be reserved at least initially.) The lineage of these differing manifestations of text-plus-tune is by no means immediately obvious, and the hypothesis to be offered here—that Byrd alone set the poem, and that he set it as a verse anthem—will entail text-critical analysis of words and notes, and the close comparison of rhythms, registers and textures.

---

185 *The Reformation in Rhyme*, 232.

186 *The Praise of Musicke* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1586; STC 20184), 135–6, emphasis added. For the fullest recent discussion of the authorship of this tract (which some believe to be the work of the Oxford Aristotelian John Case), see the introductory notes accompanying the online edn (2009) by Dana Sutton, <www.philological.bham.ac.uk/music3>, accessed 11 January 2013. The same passage was paraphrased out of context by Temperley, who in stating the author's opinion to have been that 'nothing but the word of God should be sung' surely misrepresented it (*The Music of the English Parish Church*, vol. 1, p. 41).

In his devotional verse, Hunnis seldom strayed from the prevailing form of fourteen-syllable couplets known as Sternhold's or common metre, which was usually laid out as four short lines with syllables distributed in the pattern 8686. With 'Alack, when I look back', however, he made a rare exception, for although each stanza culminates in a pair of regular fourteeners, it begins with alternating lines of twelve and fourteen syllables (known as poulter's measure because vendors of that class sold their wares at twelve or fourteen to the dozen). The resulting metre—6686.6686.8686—was unique,[187] and it precluded the poem from being sung to anything other than a tune specifically composed for it.

As we have seen, the collection of Hunnis's poetry in which the monophonic song was printed took its cue from the freely composed hymns supplemented to *The whole booke of Psalmes*. Not all the poems in *SS* are supplied with music, and it is unclear at what point in the volume's contentious early publishing history the tune for 'Alack' was first included. Possibly, this was not until 1583, since in the edition of that year the tune contained errors and irregularities that were amended in the next known edition, from 1585 (see illus. 3:1).[188] The amendments consisted partly of simple corrections,[189] but they also included adjustments to certain note values that settled the rhythm in favour of a consistent *prolatio perfecta*.

The concern for note values extended to four of the other tunes in *SS*, which likewise emerged with clarified ternary mensuration.[190] This perhaps sheds light on the vexed question of the tunes' authorship, since Hunnis is unlikely to have dithered over such a basic matter as their mensuration if he had composed them himself. Rather, the best

---

187 See Temperley, *The Hymn Tune Index*, vol. 2, p. 341 (HTI no. 261).

188 *Cf.* the corresponding opening of the 1583 edn, reproduced in Monson, 'Authenticity and Chronology', 296).

189 The corrections comprised inserting the missing word 'alas' (omitted in 1583 despite being essential to the scansion of the second stanza), correcting the grammatical error 'hath the follies' to 'have the follies' (see appendix 2 n. 5; this correction was in fact misprinted), making good a missing accidental (*c*♯', fifth rastrum), and deleting a superfluous *f* (eighth rastrum).

190 *Cf.* the 1583 and 1585 versions of the tunes on sigs A5r (*recte* A4r) and G5v–G8r (the sig. nos are the same in both edns).

explanation that can be offered for his indecision is that all five tunes had begun life as voices of polyphonic compositions in *prolatio imperfecta* and proved too syncopated to make sense without their accompanying voices. In the case of 'Alack', the 1583 rhythm can thus be seen to represent an ambivalent stage between the syncopated binary scheme of AlackWILB and the regular ternary one of 1585 (*cf.* ex. 3:11 and illus. 3:1).

Rhythm aside, there are musical indications that the tune is the work of an accomplished composer of courtly song. Its six phrases are punctuated by a suitably varied scheme of cadences that, in true Byrdian style for pieces in gamut flat, approaches $\hat{5}$ at one juncture from the sharpened form of $\hat{6}$ and at another from the flattened form (illus. 3:1, fifth and eighth rastra).[191] A calculated meta-melody results as successive peaks are reached on *d'*, *e♭'* and *f'* (first and second rastra), the single ascent to *g'* being reserved for the final phrase (ninth rastrum). Admittedly, one melodic peak hardly serves to illustrate the word 'deeply' with which it coincides in the first stanza (second rastrum). But as Philip Brett cautioned, in strophic settings we should look not for localized word-painting but rather for the active musical expression of poetic forms.[192] And the unique metre of 'Alack' seems not to have been lost on the composer, who brought out the switch from poulter's to fourteeners by situating the crucial pair of additional syllables in a series of three repeated notes, and by following them with the distinctive leap of a minor 6th (seventh rastrum). This, then, is a tune worthy of Byrd.

In formal terms, the two verse anthems appear to continue a line of development traceable from kindred works by Richard Farrant and William Mundy. The simplest work of this type, Mundy's 'The secret sins', consists of a single musical strophe sung to two stanzas, plus an 'Amen'. All four lines of each stanza are sung contiguously by the soloist before the fourth line is repeated by chorus. The form may be schematized as follows (with

---

191 On this modal characteristic, see Kerman, *The Motets and Masses of William Byrd*, 68–9.

192 'Word-Setting in the Songs of Byrd', *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, 98 (1971–2), 47–64 (51–3).

lowercase letters for lines or half-lines of text allotted to the soloist, and capitals for lines or half-lines allotted to the chorus):

abcdD (twice) / Amen

In Farrant's 'When as we sat in Babylon', a similar plan is supplemented with a musically independent final stanza in *prolatio perfecta* in which each line is sung first by the soloist, then by the chorus:

abcdD (four times) / eEfFgGhH Amen

In Mundy's 'Ah, helpless wretch', the further step is taken of punctuating the basic strophe with an internal chorus (E) shorter than the one that rounds it off (IJ). Again, the independent final stanza is set in *prolatio perfecta*:

abcdeEfghijIJ (twice) / kKlLmMnNoO Amen

The two 'Alack' anthems take the same process further still, incorporating two short internal choruses (D, H) in the basic strophe. But since, as with 'The secret sins', there are only two stanzas, there is not scope for a musically independent final stanza. Instead, the concluding 'Amen' is approached via two further iterations of the refrain, first by soloist, then by chorus:[193]

abcdDefghHijklKL (twice) / klKL Amen

So meagre are the sources of AlackWILB that a score cannot be put together without the need for some reconstruction. There are nonetheless two copies of the accompaniment, found respectively in the organ-books *Och* MS Mus. 1001 and *Ob* MS Tenbury 791. In this instance Mus. 1001 provides the most unevenly textured of all the organ parts relevant to the present chapter, for while it doubles the solo vocal part in the verse passages, and offers copious inner notes for the third chorus, it gives the remaining choruses merely as a *basso seguente*. Tenbury 791, not unusually for a part copied by Batten, gives only the

193 Monson's statement ('Authenticity and Chronology', 297) that the verse and chorus following the second stanza of AlackWILB were both 'absent from the model' (i.e. from the Oxford anthem) is incorrect. But the chorus in question is missing from MS 1382.

instrumental matter of the verse passages, without doubling the solo vocal part. Though in the first two choruses Batten doubled the M as well as the B, he reverted to a *basso seguente* for the final chorus. At the beginning of the third chorus (ex. 3:12), a handful of inner notes added by Batten corroborate Mus. 1001 precisely, but subsequently the two organ parts disagree on what was presumably the M part (bars 47–8), and go on to offer substantively different versions of the final verse passage (bars 99–105).[194]

Vocal parts for AlackWILB are in short supply, and those that do exist are clearly the products of a convoluted copying history. Perhaps having nothing more than a bicinium accompaniment at his disposal (albeit one different from Batten's), the principal scribe of John Barnard's MS part-books wrote out only the B and M of the choruses (the M of the third chorus agrees with neither of the organ books at bars 47–8, see ex. 3:12).[195] The impression that Barnard was unable to lay hands on authoritative exemplars is strengthened by the curiously mixed readings offered by the only extant T and Ct parts, these being all that survives of the anthem at Durham. In the Durham recension, the solo verse passages alternated between the Ct1c part (contained in the second fascicle of MS C7) and another Ct part which for some reason is not present in any of the three associated Ct volumes (MSS C4–6). Since the surviving part contains the second of the three passages in the first stanza, and the first and third of the second stanza, the notes—though not the words—of each missing passage can be reconstructed by analogy with the other stanza. The final verse passage, however, was unique to the missing Ct part; the difficulty of reconstructing a solo vocal part that agrees with both organ accompaniments for this passage suggests that differing versions of the vocal part too may have circulated.

---

194 The topmost line of the accompaniment given in BE 11a at bars 99–102 is found in MS Mus. 1001 only.

195 *Lcm* MSS 1048, f. 6v (Mc), and 1051, f. 15v (Bc). The annotation 'first verse cantoris, second verse decani' in MS 1048 does, however, suggest that the scribe was aware of vocal parts for the solo verses that were antiphonally arranged in the manner of the Durham recension but with the allocations to c and d mutually exchanged.

What does survive of the solo verse passages appears textually accurate and stylistically authentic. Yet while the same goes for the final chorus and the 'Amen', there are clear signs of intervention in the first two choruses. Each of these choruses appears in both stanzas with the same B, Ct and M parts, the two Ct parts being exchanged in the second stanza. But grafted on to the self-sufficient texture formed by those four voices, and different in each stanza, is a crude T part that cannot be Byrd's work.[196] In the third chorus, furthermore, the Durham parts disagree substantively with the inner notes supplied by the organ-books (ex. 3:13). Neither set of readings may be held entirely above suspicion, the vocal parts not least because their piquant residual counterpoint (bar 49) savours too strongly of the *stile nuovo*, the organ notes because it is far from obvious how they might be teased out into contrapuntally viable strands.[197]

If the Durham T and Ct parts of the third chorus appear contrived, then this may to some extent be a consequence of Byrd's design. The melodic material, taken from the preceding vocal solo, consists of little more than two descending scales, each of which is tightly packed into a short, self-contained set of quasi fugal entries. Within those narrow confines, the predominance of smooth downward movement leaves little room for equally smooth movement in the opposite direction. The necessary concessions are made chiefly in the Ct1 part, specifically in its forced syllabic crotchets, close 8ves with the M, and diminished 5th leap. As we have learned from the revisions to ChristR, Byrd was not one to put trifling issues of grammar before the greater considerations of musical form. These roughnesses at least, then, need not necessarily be put down to faulty MS transmission; rather, the apparent willingness to sacrifice contrapuntal polish to the working out of a highly individualized polyphonic conception is what we would expect from Byrd.

---

196 In the first stanza, the T evades direct consecutive octaves only by dint of crotchet movement or a rest (bars 15 and 28); in the second, it does little more than double the Ct1 part (bars 63–5 and 76–8).

197 This is not the only case of disagreement between Mus. 1001 and a set of vocal parts: this organ-book includes an accompaniment for OLordMTS that in places is contrapuntally at odds with that anthem's considerable number of vocal sources: see TCM 4, p. 270.

The third chorus takes a 6/3 chord as its starting point—a strikingly expressive gesture that seems not to have been lost on certain younger composers of consort and verse anthems. Markedly similar choruses—in which the interval of a 6th between two lower voices initiates a series of descending scalar entries—are found in Bull's 'Almighty God, who by the leading of a star', Morley's 'How long wilt thou forget me?', and Weelkes's 'Give ear, O Lord' (ex. 3:14).[198] For Weelkes especially, who in choosing another Hunnis text from *SS* had already linked his composition to AlackWILB, the unmistakable musical allusion to the older verse anthem can only have been intended as an overt act of homage.

The Oxford verse anthem is known only from two fragments of the choruses: a T part in *Ob* MS Tenbury 1382, which is attributed to Hunnis, and a B part in the New College part-book *Ob* MS Mus. d. 162, which is anonymous. As we shall see, the attribution to Hunnis probably means nothing more than that the scribe of MS 1382, working from an anonymous exemplar, recognized the text and tune from *SS* and simply put two and two together. And as John Morehen pointed out, one of this part-book's notable peculiarities is that pieces by the same composer are conscientiously grouped together. The placing of 'Alack' immediately after a group of four pieces by Byrd (ThouGTG, HearMPOL, NowIMS, and ChristR) may therefore not be coincidental.[199]

Though the final chorus is missing from MS 1382, MS Mus. d. 162 shows it to have been an exact repeat of the third chorus.[200] It is easy to see why, until Monson noticed otherwise, the Oxford chorus parts were mistakenly assumed to be those of AlackWILB: as well as setting the same portions of text, they are in the same key (gamut flat) and the same, binary mensuration. There are indications too that the strophic solo passages of both anthems were similar if not identical. If the relevant annotation to the index of MS 1382 is to be trusted, then the Oxford solos, like those of AlackWILB, were for Ct (although the

198 TCMO 91 (rev. edn, 1998), bars 22–7; EECM 38/1, bars 70–75; MB 23/18, bars 27–32.

199 'The Southwell Minster Tenor Part-Book in the Library of St Michael's College, Tenbury (MS 1382)', *Music & Letters*, 50 (1969), 352–64 (355–6).

200 See n. 194 above.

index signals only one Ct as opposed to the two antiphonal ones of the Durham recension). Moreover, the Oxford choruses were almost certainly based on portions of the tune in precisely the form it takes in the solos of AlackWILB (ex. 3:14).[201] And it is in this respect that the two anthems can be shown to have mutually differed, for in contrast to the more autonomous choruses of AlackWILB, which reiterate the solo material only in generalized melodic and harmonic terms, the Oxford choruses were bound by a *cantus firmus*.

The song setting of 'Alack' is known exclusively from the lute-book *Lbl* Add. MS 15117, an assortment of sixteenth- and early-seventeenth-century music copied *c*.1616 and owned at some early date by a certain John Swarland.[202] The MS was for some time believed to have been put together for a theatre musician,[203] but Linda Phyllis Austern has recently put forward the much more compelling theory that it was compiled for the private use of a lady lutenist.[204] Indeed, Austern's theory best explains why the same binding originally contained also a copy of Richard Allison's *The Psalmes of Dauid in meter*, a collection dedicated to the Countess of Warwick, and notable for enabling the tune to be sung 'either [as] tenor or treble to the instrument, according to the nature of the voice'.[205]

---

201 Reconstructions of the first and second choruses, but not the third, were made on the same basis by Monson ('Authenticity and Chronology', 298–9). It need not trouble us that the Oxford MSS disagree with AlackWILB (not to mention with each other) on the length of the block rests representing the solo passages: in giving different rests for each strophe, MS Mus. d. 162 is clearly erroneous, while in MS 1382 correct block rests are the exception rather than the rule.

202 Complete facsimile in *English Song 1600–1675: 1. British Library Manuscripts, Part I*, ed. Elise Bickford Jorgens (New York and London: Garland, 1986). The contents are listed in Mary Joiner, 'British Museum Add. MS 15117: A Commentary, Index and Bibliography', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 7 (1969), 51–109 (76–7). On the dating of this MS see Julia Craig-McFeely, 'English Lute Manuscripts and Scribes 1530–1630' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1993), chapter 7.

203 See Frederick W. Sternfeld, *Music in Shakespearian Tragedy* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963), 35, and Joiner, 'British Museum Add. MS 15117', passim.

204 '"For Musicke is the Handmaid of the Lord": Women, Psalms, and Domestic Music-Making in Early Modern England' in *Psalms in the Early Modern World*, ed. Linda Phyllis Austern, Kari Boyd McBride and David L. Orvis (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 77–114 (100–101).

205 London: William Barley, 1599; STC 2497, title page. Whether the copy bound up with the Swarland lute-book was printed or MS is uncertain; see Austern, '"For Musicke is the Handmaid of the Lord"', 94–6 and n. 99. Though Craig-McFeely (see n. 203 above) and Austern have pursued a notion that Allison was one of the two scribes who contributed to Add. MS 15117 (the one, indeed, whose three contribution included the 'Alack' song), this seems unlikely given Allison's disappearance from the historical record after his *An howres recreation in musicke apt for instrumentes and voyces* (London: John Windet; STC 356) was published in 1606.

In addition to three or four instrumental pieces, the Swarland lute-book contains altogether thirty-five vocal items, none of them attributed. Very nearly half of these are original lute airs, several being from the publications of Dowland and Campion. But almost one song in three is an adaptation of a composition originally for vocal ensemble or solo voice with instrumental ensemble. These include two pieces of mainstream sacred repertoire, Tallis's 'O sacrum convivium' (1575/9; ff. 16v–17r), with its parallel English text 'I call and cry' added below the Latin, and Robert Parsons's full anthem 'Deliver me from mine enemies' (ff. 12v–13r).[206] Both have been transposed—upwards by a major 2nd and a perfect 5th respectively—to accommodate a lute with regular *G* tuning; other pieces call for *D* tuning (e.g. Robert Parsons's 'In youthly years', f. 14v)[207] or an instrument with multiple diapasons (e.g. Dowland's 'Sleep wayward thoughts', f. 7r, which is provided with a lute part different from the composer's published one of 1597).[208]

The version of 'Alack' contained in this MS (ff. 6v–7r) corresponds very closely to the verse passages of AlackWILB, the principal difference being that the voice part is notated a perfect 5th higher than in the verse anthem, in a C1 clef, while the outermost voices of the lute part, which broadly resemble the outermost voices of the two organ parts, are transposed a perfect 4th lower. Thus transposed, the accompaniment requires an eight-course lute tuned *D F G c f a d' g'*, the single instance of the note *E* being assigned to the *D* course. Since a seventh course was not called for in the published repertory until Dowland's 1597 song-book, and an eighth not until later than that,[209] this manifestation of the 'Alack' tune must almost certainly be a Jacobean lute adaptation as opposed to an Elizabethan lute composition. But an adaptation of what? The lute-book's contents—

206 Ed. Philippe Oboussier (London: Novello, 1954).

207 Edn in King, *The Works of Richard Edwards*, 247–9.

208 Joiner, 'British Museum Add. MS 15117', 58–9.

209 See Matthew Spring, *The Lute in Britain: A History of the Instrument and Its Music* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 101: 'Only manuscripts, or sections of manuscripts, that were primarily Jacobean suggest a lute of more than six courses as the norm.'

partsongs, consort songs, anthems—are simply too diverse to offer a firm clue. In pursuit of the lute song's origins, therefore, it will be necessary to look to other evidence.

In Monson's view,[210] the relationship between the monophonic song, the two anthems and the lute song followed two lines of descent in which Byrd borrowed extensively from Hunnis. Taking the MS 1382 attribution at face value, Monson proposed that the Oxford anthem was entirely the poet's own composition (though without venturing an opinion as to its relationship to the monophonic song). He further proposed that Byrd took the text and tune directly from the 1583 edition of *SS*, setting them as 'a simple consort song' which subsequently formed the basis of the lute song. Finally in Monson's scenario, Byrd 'later' added choruses to the consort song using Hunnis's anthem virtually as a template;[211] presumably it was at this stage that Byrd changed the format from consort anthem to verse anthem (though on that point too Monson did not commit himself).

The presumed original consort setting is, of course, no longer extant, but in support of Monson's case it may be noted that a dozen of Byrd's consort songs—including the important 'Look and bow down'—survive only as lute intabulations.[212] And since, as we saw in Chapter 1 (pp. 41–4), Byrd was not above adopting Tallis's *V* as a detailed formal model for his own Short Service, one of his first essays at a verse anthem might have depended just as heavily on the work of another composer. At the same time, it is hard to accept that Byrd could have appropriated both the Oxford anthem's formal plan *and* its concomitant melody without crossing the line between 'friendly emulation' and downright plagiarism. Besides, Monson's classification of AlackWILB as one of Byrd's early works is scarcely consistent with his view that it derives from the 1583 edition of *SS*. Furthermore, in comparison to Byrd's known mentors—Tallis, Ferrabosco, de Monte—Hunnis seems a most unlikely candidate. Apart from the questionable attribution in MS

---

210 'Authenticity and Chronology', 295–7, partly reiterated in BE 11, p. ix.

211 See n. 194 above.

212 See BE 15/25 and BE 16/34-8, 40–42 and 45–7.

1382, there is not a shred of MS or printed evidence that the poet ever doubled as a composer, not even a minor one. Except for the Oxford anthem, the only composition that has been ascribed to him in modern times is the consort song 'In terrors trapp'd' (MB 22/18), and while *PDD* confirms that the words are his,[213] there are no indications whatsoever that Hunnis was responsible also for the music.[214]

As we have seen, the two verse anthems may not have differed as regards their strophic solo passages. But the Oxford anthem's *cantus-firmus*-based choruses were less adventurous than those of AlackWILB, and its final solo and chorus merely reiterated material already sung twice over. Since vocal parts of AlackWILB appear to have been hard to come by, it is just conceivable that the Oxford choruses were substitutes worked out by a competent musician, perhaps to complement solo passages reconstituted from a copy of the lute song. Much more plausible, however, is that the Oxford fragments represent Byrd's own first version of the anthem, and that the freer polyphonic technique and more cogent rhetoric of the choruses of AlackWILB result from just the kind of revisions Byrd would sooner or later have thought desirable. On those grounds, it seems justifiable from now on to refer not to two verse anthems, but to two versions of the same verse anthem (the *siglum* being applicable to both).

As we shall now see, the notion that either form of the verse anthem was in any way derived from the 1583 edition of *SS* is quite clearly controverted by the primary sources of the 'Alack' poem. The possibility was mentioned earlier that the texts of AlackWILB, LetUBG and ThouGTG were grouped together at the end of *SS* because Byrd had already set them to music; we have seen too how Hunnis's rhythmic revisions to the 'Alack' tune

---

213 The poem, ascribed to 'T. M[arshall]' in the first, 1576 edn, was one of the six that Hunnis reassigned to himself in the edn of 1577: see *The Paradise of Dainty Devices (1576–1606)*, ed. Rollins, 92–3, 249, and May, 'William Hunnis and the 1577 *Paradise of Dainty Devices*', 71.

214 Brett's speculation that Hunnis 'may also have written the music' of this song (MB 22, 180) seems to have gained believability with each reiteration in the subsequent literature: see, for example, David Mateer, 'Oxford, Christ Church Music MSS 984–8: An Index and Commentary', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 20 (1986–7), 1–18 (p. 14 n. 17).

imply the phased transformation of a highly syncopated polyphonic voice part in binary mensuration into a self-contained melody in ternary. But text-critical evidence, reported yet overlooked by Monson,[215] points even more firmly to the conclusion that 'Alack' had been set by Byrd before it was published as a monophonic song, and perhaps even before it was published in any form.

Nearly all the musical witnesses transmitting AlackWILB consist of chorus parts only and thus contain few if any informative verbal variants. Of the original seven solo verse passages, furthermore, the three surviving ones are confined to a single source, the Durham Ct book MS C7. The lute-book is therefore the only musical witness to transmit the poem intact. Though a version of the entire anthem text is present in the Chapel Royal word-books *Ob* MS Rawl. Poet. 23 and *Lbl* MS Harley 6346, its variant readings suggest derivation from a printed copy of the poem. The word 'alas' is missing from the second stanza, for example, as in the 1583 edition of *SS*, while the concluding 'Amen' is omitted, as in *PDD*.[216] Fortunately, however, a version of the text corresponding much more closely to the musical witnesses was included in James Clifford's word-book of 1663,[217] in a form that implies derivation from an intact set of institutional part-books. Instead of being lineated as in *PDD* or *SS*, the words are run on in a single justified paragraph, while every phrase repeated by the chorus is scrupulously indicated with a Roman numeral 'ii'. Clifford's version agrees closely with both MS C7 and the lute-book, and although each of these three witnesses includes a handful of variants unique to itself, the alternative reading is in every case corroborated by both other witnesses. Eliminating those unique variants therefore leads directly to a close common ancestor that may well have been the version of Hunnis's poem that passed across Byrd's composing desk (see appendix 2).

---

215 BE 11, 218–19.

216 See also appendix 2 n. 3.

217 *The Divine Services and Anthems*, 1st edn, 216–17.

The version of the poem thus deduced is set apart from the published versions by a telling group of variants, nearly all of which are too significant to be mere errors (the Byrdian readings are given first):

tears and sighs	sighs and tears (*PDD*); sighs and sobs (*SS*)
through	with
field	fields
seem-ed	I thought
I	do (*PDD* only)[218]
in	with
But	Yet

The first of these variants alone rules out the extant editions of *SS* as possible sources for Byrd's text, while the group as whole shows that Byrd cannot have relied on *PDD* without substantively interfering with Hunnis's published wording. If, however, Byrd set 'Alack' in a pre-publication form, then the variants of his version are easily accounted for. As we have seen, the poem first appeared in print as part of the second, 1577 edition of *PDD*, which was apparently seen through the press by Hunnis himself. The circumstantial evidence that may be cited for Hunnis's editorship includes the copious retouching of those of his poems that had already appeared in the first, 1576 edition. In addition to eleven error corrections (the most for any poet in the anthology), some twenty-eight arbitrary revisions were incorporated (more than three times the number for any other poet)[219] of which the following examples are typical (the 1576 readings are given first):[220]

request	require
youth	ruth
thoughts	thought
strive	strove
find	try
He travaileth a space	Doth frame himself apace
noise	voice

218 On the absence of this reading from *SS*, see appendix 2 n. 4.

219 May, 'William Hunnis and the 1577 *Paradise of Dainty Devices*', 71.

220 For the 1576 readings see *The Paradise of Dainty Devices (1576–1606)*, ed. Rollins, pp. 65 (line 4), 67 (lines 3, 6 and 19), 68 (lines 4 and 20) and 73 (line 16). The 1577 variants are listed in May, 'William Hunnis and the 1577 *Paradise of Dainty Devices*', 76–80. Spellings here are modernized.

Clearly, Hunnis's poems in the second edition of *PDD* were subjected to numerous finicky pre-press revisions, and from the precisely similar character of the variants between the Byrdian and published versions of 'Alack' it may be inferred that that poem was no exception. If our inference is correct, and provided that Byrd set the most up-to-date version of the poem available to him, then his original setting cannot date from later than 1577.

To be sure, none of these findings has any bearing on the central question of what form Byrd's composition first took, and with respect to that question there are no conclusively informative patterns among the purely musical variants found in the lute song and the two versions of the anthem. Yet something of the relationships between the musical witnesses may be inferred by applying the *lectio brevior* rule, whereby the simpler of two given readings is to be preferred because the elaborate one is more likely to be the outcome of scribal intervention. The resulting distribution of variants is shown in fig. 3:1.

Judging by the *lectio brevior* rule, the earliest of the three versions of the accompaniment is the one transmitted by Mus. 1001 (a further suggestion that this MS dates from before 1620). Here the uppermost part lacks several of the more elaborate readings (a, c, d, f and I) that are present in Tenbury 791 (copied in the 1630s). Furthermore, the two organ-books differ with respect to transposition,[221] accidentals (d, h and k),[222] the format of the chorus passages, and much of the accompaniment to the final verse. It is therefore most unlikely that Mus. 1001 and Tenbury 791 are close relatives.

The lute part incorporates a number of variants unique to itself. Most are of a kind to be expected in an accompaniment adapted for an instrument with quickly decaying tone,[223]

---

221 Mus. 1001 is pre-transposed to the key of D sol re, a 5th higher than Tenbury 791 and the vocal parts. The LH part only of Mus. 1001 is supplied with a flat signature, $\hat{6}$ in its RH part being flatted with accidentals instead (though not in the cases of variants b, g and p).

222 Variants b, g, j and p appear to be errors of omission, b, g and p for the reason given in the preceding footnote, j in view of the other evidence for the primacy of Mus. 1001.

223 These variants include an arabesque at the very outset (BE 11/11a, bar 1), embellished cadential suspensions (bars 3 and 7), and the splitting of long notes into shorter ones (bars 1–2 and 8–9, for example).

and are therefore not reported in fig. 3:1. Nonetheless, four variants shared with Tenbury 791 (d, f, h and i) are absent from Mus. 1001, suggesting that the lute song and the 791 organ part are derivatives of a common ancestor that was itself only indirectly related to Mus. 1001.

The numerous rhythmic variants that developed in the *SS* version of the tune are clearly irrelevant to the verse anthem, and these again are not reported in fig. 3:1. There are nonetheless three extant witnesses to the anthem's solo vocal part: Mus. 1001 (in which it is doubled, the lute book and the Ct book MS C7. Excepting transposition, text underlay, and an omitted accidental that is obviously erroneous (variant p),[224] there are only three readings on which the witnesses in this group disagree. Two (n and o) are trivial, but being unique to Durham and Mus. 1001 respectively they argue against a direct line of descent between those witnesses.[225] The third (m) might likewise be described as unique to Mus. 1001, except that in this case Mus. 1001 gives a two-note melisma—the *lectio brevior*—while the other two witnesses give a four-note one.[226] The more elaborate, four-note melisma would therefore appear to have been inherited from a common ancestor to which Mus. 1001, once again, can have been only indirectly related.

If, as Monson believed, both the verse anthem and the lute song are derivatives of a lost consort song, then we would expect the two versions of the organ part to be more closely related to each other than to the lute song. But the distribution of variant readings suggests instead that the lute song is more closely related to the Tenbury 791 and Durham versions of the anthem than to the Mus. 1001 version. That relationship in turn suggests one of two possibilities: either that Mus. 1001, and subsequently Tenbury 791 and the lute song, were

---

224 See n. 222 above.

225 C7 begins bar 18 with a minim rest; Mus. 1001 gives the last two minims of bar 31 as a dotted minim plus a crotchet (this variant is not reported in BE 11).

226 *Cf.* bar 7 of BE 11/11a with both the vocal and organ parts of bar 7 of BE 11/11b. Neither the melisma from BE 11/11b bar 7 nor another from bar 40 is present in *SS*, even though the publication includes melismata elsewhere: see sigs E9r, F4r–v, F9r, G2r, G3r–v and G4r.

each of them independently adapted from an original consort song, or—much more straightforwardly—that the lute song was adapted from the verse anthem.

Three firm arguments in favour of the latter possibility are made by the lute song itself. First, Monson did not speculate whether his presumed consort song was for solo Ct, in gamut flat, or for M, in D sol re flat. Yet neither configuration is entirely plausible. On one hand, Byrd was never in the habit of writing consort songs for Ct. His name is attached to only one such work with a vocal part in the C3 clef, 'The day delayed' (BE 15/44), but the attribution occurs in a demonstrably unreliable layer of a single MS, and is difficult to reconcile with the almost complete lack of motivicity in the three lower string parts.[227] On the other hand, Hunnis's poem—which assumes a perspective of maturity or even old age—was an illogical text for the M voice, since on court occasions consort songs were performed by choristers. (It is worth recalling that Vaux's poem 'When I look back', the model for Hunnis's 'Alack', was set by Parsons as a partsong, not as a consort song.)[228]

Secondly, in contrast to Byrd's invariable practice of placing the highest viol part roughly half an 8ve higher or lower than the vocal part, the lute's topmost line and the vocal part occupy precisely the same range (*c'*–*d"*). Consequently, there are none of the subject-answer relationships that typify Byrd's vocal phrases and their pre-echoes in the highest viol part; rather, the vocal phrases are consistently anticipated at the unison.

Thirdly, when it came to representing vocal or instrumental polyphony, the lute's only serious limitation was its lack of sustaining power. The considerable level of detail within its capability is amply illustrated by the intabulations of Paston's lute-books,[229] yet for a comparable reduction of four viol parts we need look no further than another item in the Swarland MS, Byrd's unpublished consort song 'O God, but God, how dare I' (ff. 19v–20r;

---

227 Though attributed to Byrd in the Paston lute-book *Lbl* MS 31992 (ff. 53v–54r), this song is placed apart from the volume's principal sequence of Byrdiana (ff. 1r–45v); the same MS misattributes Byrd's 'How long shall mine enemies' to Tallis (ff. 48v–49r). In its only other source—Robert Dow's part-books *Och* MSS Mus. 984–8, no. 124 (modern numbering)—'The day delayed' is unattributed.

228 For sources see n. 168 above.

229 See, for example, the lute arrangements cited in n. 213 above.

BE 15/6).[230] Whereas this song's original instrumental strands are quite clearly delineated in the Swarland intabulation, the 'Alack' accompaniment seldom coalesces into four viable parts (*cf.* ex. 3:15 a and b). It is true that a cogent four-part texture materializes in certain passages, yet these often contain doublings of the vocal part at the lower 8ve (BE 11/11a, bars 4, 6–7, 14, 18-19 and 33–4) or the unison (bars 13 and 34–5)—something unthinkable in a composition for voice and viols. One full close, furthermore, lacks the 4–3 suspension that would unquestionably have been present in a viol consort accompaniment (bar 13).

None of these reservations applies, however, if AlackWILB is posited as the original form of Byrd's composition. Its solo voice, key, and internal register relationships are all normative for a Tudor verse anthem, while the lute song's textual and musical peculiarities are consistent with its being a subsequent adaptation, as Austern has argued,[231] for the personal music-making of a spiritually minded lady. The necessity for the arranger to add inner notes to what would have been a bicinium organ accompaniment explains the curiously non-contrapuntal quality of much of the lute part (and the incomplete full close in particular, of which the 4–3 suspension is lacking, unremarkably, in both sources of the organ part). The required transpositions—lute down a 4th, voice up a 5th—further explain why the lute sometimes doubles the voice at the lower 8ve, a consequence of the organ part's having doubled it at the unison.

Turning to the organ accompaniment itself, we may note that with regard to texture its two sources differ only in that the scribe of *Och* MS Mus. 1001 included a full doubling of the solo vocal part whereas Batten did not. In the form Batten copied it, furthermore, the format is identical to that in which he copied the accompaniments to the two anthems by Mundy (exx. 3:1b–c), even to the extent of cueing the first vocal note only and marking

---

230 Only one of the four viol parts survives; the three reconstructed ones given in BE 15 are Brett's deductions from a keyboard arrangement very likely copied by Thomas Weelkes (*Lbl* Add. MS 30485, f. 15r–v; see MB 55/54).

231 See n. 205 above.

this with a *signum congruentiae* (ex. 3:16).[232] But the relationship with Mundy surely goes much deeper than this, for the uppermost voice of the organ introduction to 'The secret sins' (*b♭' a' a' a' a' d" d" d" a' b♭' b♭' b♭' a'...*) seems to have provided a template for the six syllables of 'Alack, when I look back' (*b♭ a d' a b♭ a...*), Byrd developing the four tail notes independently of the two head ones (*cf.* exx. 3:1b and 3:16). Thus, while both anthems fall outside the group of verse compositions connected by the $\hat{1}\,\hat{3}\,\hat{4}\,\hat{5}$ motive, they are connected by a $\hat{5}\,\hat{2}\,\hat{3}\,\hat{2}$ motive of their own.

From the foregoing textual and musical observations, the following possible order of events emerges. By 1577, Hunnis had made an initial version of the 'Alack' poem which was set by Byrd as a verse anthem along stylistic lines probably already established by Mundy and Farrant. Having revised the poem for publication in *PDD*, Hunnis continued to tinker with it in successive editions of *SS*, issued from 1581 onwards. *SS* was a hymn-book in all but name, meaning that unlike the texts of LetUBG and ThouGTG, which could be sung to any common-metre tune, 'Alack' had to be provided with a monophonic tune of its own—Byrd's tune, adapted from the solo passages of his verse anthem, but left unacknowledged as was customary in printed metrical psalters. Detached from an accompaniment, however, the tune's syncopated rhythm proved ineffective, prompting Hunnis soon to devise a ternary mensuration of his own. Byrd, meanwhile, revised his original chorus parts, adding new, independent settings of the final solo, final chorus and 'Amen'. Perhaps at this time too he divided the solo work into alternating passages for two mutually opposing Ct singers;[233] perhaps too it was with the intention of distinguishing between the initial and revised versions that Batten added the unusual heading 'Alack for 2 coun[terteno]r[s]'.[234] Eventually, the verse anthem—in one version or the other—was ransacked again, the solo verses this time being converted into a lute song. The modern,

---

232 *Ob* MS Tenbury 791, ff. 72v–73r.

233 The supplemented index table of MS Tenbury 1382 specifies only one Ct soloist, and may in this instance have been correct (in others it demonstrably was not).

234 *Ob* MS Tenbury 791, f. 73r.

eight-course instrument needed to accompany the arrangement suggests that this did not happen until the second decade of the seventeenth century, not long before the only surviving copy of the arrangement was made.

If Byrd set Hunnis's poem specifically as a verse anthem, then he presumably did so for the Chapel Royal choir, of which he was an active member in 1577. The anthem's solo passages, therefore, may well have been among those Byrd sang himself, and were perhaps even intended to be so. The idea would not be particularly evocative had there not recently emerged a considerable body of evidence to suggest that Byrd was raised as a Protestant (see p. 81 above), and embraced Catholicism only in early manhood, '[throwing] himself into the cause,' as Oliver Neighbour has put it, 'with all the zeal of a convert'.[235] Re-reading Hunnis's words with this in mind casts Byrd's setting of them in a new and eerie light: as a recusant's apology for past heresies, articulated through the poetry of an arch-Protestant, alluding to another anthem about 'secret sins that hidden lie', and voiced in the very chapel of a Protestant queen. Such a ploy, as audacious as it was unassailable, could have been Byrd's alone.

3.5.2 'Let us be glad' and 'Thou God that guid'st'

The two remaining Hunnis texts of which verse anthem settings are attributed to Byrd, LetUBG and ThouGTG, have fewer printed and MS sources than AlackWILB, with the result that variant readings are not informative enough to confirm the theory that Byrd set them to music prior to their publication in *SS*. Such as they are, however, they do not contradict that theory, since any of them might well represent another instance of Hunnis's well documented penchant for pre-press revisions (the Byrdian readings are given first, followed by the *SS* readings):

LetUBG	love still dwell	love so dwell

235 'Music Manuscripts of George Iliffe from Stanford Hall, Leicestershire, Including a New Ascription to Byrd', *Music & Letters*, 88 (2007), 420–35 (432).

ThouGTG	in whom	on whom
	harms	harm

The music of LetUBG is lost, and its text is known exclusively from the two Chapel Royal word-books *OB* MS Rawl. Poet. 23 and *Lbl* MS Harley 6346, where it appears in a form that surely derives from a musical exemplar. Six passages for chorus are clearly annotated as such, four of them being interpolations not found in *SS*. As in Mundy's verse anthem 'Ah, helpless wretch', these added lines consist of naïve glosses in rhyme with the preceding line—as, for example, in the penultimate stanza:

[verse]	So shall his love abide in us,
	and dwell for evermore.
chorus	*With grace abundant store.*

The faint possibility that Mundy's anthem was originally a setting of some text other than 'Ah, helpless wretch' has already been referred to, yet the more concrete evidence that Byrd glossed a Hunnis text in like manner suggests that he knew the older composer's work in more or less the form we know it. But whereas with Mundy the interpolations are first sung by the soloist and then reiterated by chorus (abcdeE), it would appear that Byrd enhanced the dialogic aspect by reserving them for the chorus only (abcdE). In terms of form too, if the annotations in the word-books are to be trusted, Byrd seems to have departed from the Farrant–Mundy model of repeated basic strophe plus independent final strophe. Two quatrains elapsed before the first of the chorus interpolations, the remaining three occurring after the third, fifth and sixth quatrains respectively. In contrast, the fourth and seventh quatrains employed the same third and fourth lines, in the manner of a refrain, and with Byrd's customary sensitivity to poetic form this refrain was both times reiterated by chorus. Perhaps with the purpose of accommodating the refrain, the anthem was structured thus, with a short independent solo strophe preceding the principal, repeated one:

abcd / efghI jklmN opqrQR (twice) / [Amen]

ThouGTG, in contrast, follows a notably similar formal plan to that of Farrant's 'When as we sat in Babylon': a basic strophe—in which the entire stanza is first sung by a soloist and its last few words are then repeated by chorus—plus a musically independent final strophe that is marked by a change from duple to triple mensuration, and in which the chorus echoes the soloist line by line. Yet although the first two stanzas of ThouGTG are musically identical as regards their solo portions, each is rounded off with its own independent chorus, while the third and final stanza is treated to much more repetition than is to be found in any other work of this type:

wxXyYzZyzYZ(Y)Z Amen[236]

The reason for all this reiteration is obvious: at just three stanzas of Sternhold's metre, the text is the shortest of any Elizabethan verse anthem, and did not readily lend itself to a musical peroration without some spinning out. Yet the attempt at a grand closing gesture is compromised by poor musical rhetoric. The extent of textual repetition is strikingly disproportionate to that of the basic strophe, the switch to triple mensuration proves but a short-winded excursion (33 minims, bars 30–34), and the sudden reversion to duple mensuration ushers in some oddly pedestrian declamation in which plain semibreve chords are interspersed with general semibreve rests. Indeed, the whole design of the final strophe is so lacking in cohesion, and so antithetical to the solid phrasing of the basic strophe, that it is hard not to connect it to the fact—to be discussed shortly—that Byrd is not the only composer to whom this anthem is attributed in the MSS.

Though without exception the sources agree on the anthem's unique structural details, they differ on the texture of the accompaniment and the scoring of the verse passages in the final strophe.[237] The four pre-Restoration copies of the organ part are diversely constituted, and this can be shown without entering into a detailed study of variant readings (fig. 3:2).

---

236 Only the last three words of the Y line are included in its final iteration.

237 No light is shed on this question by the eighteenth-century score of ThouGTG present in *Lbl* Add. MS 39572 (ff. 33r–35v), which lacks an accompaniment. The score of ChristR found in the same MS (ff. 36r–40v) is similarly patchy.

Concerning the instrumental bass line, these versions disagree only trivially, but in *Och* MS Mus. 1001 the bass forms the lower voice of what is by and large a widely-spaced bicinium in the manner typical of early verse compositions. The vocal part is never doubled in this version; what few inner notes there are serve to pre-echo an ensuing phrase, particularly at the fill-in covering the central caesura in the vocal part (bars 13–14).[238] The three other versions include a doubling of the vocal part, but whereas *Ob* MS Tenbury 791 combines this with a broadly similar form of Mus. 1001's instrumental descant plus an autonomous inner part, *NYp* MS Drexel 5469 and *Och* Mus. 6 omit the descant altogether, the latter introducing two autonomous inner parts. Drexel 5469, Tenbury 791 and Mus. 6 nonetheless appear to derive from a common ancestor that was only indirectly related to Mus. 1001, since their readings of the central fill-in are mutually almost identical, and more elaborative than the Mus. 1001 reading.

In neither Tenbury 791 nor Mus. 6 do the additional inner voices contribute motivically to the texture; rather, they serve only to amplify the general sonority and rhythmic activity (and arguably too much so in Tenbury 791's quaver-laden treatment of the initial vocal phrase). In Drexel 5469 and Mus. 6, furthermore, the loss of the instrumental descant perhaps parallels the apparent fate of the accompaniment to Ps. 119:33–8 (see pp. 243–5 above). As with AlackWILB, then, Mus. 1001 (which we have seen may date from before 1620) transmits the accompaniment to ThouGTG in what appears to be its most idiomatic form, while the independent accretions of Tenbury 791 and Mus. 6 (both known to have been copied in the 1630s) argue for later datings and for a mutually indirect relationship.

It is evident that the voice parts of ThouGTG circulated in two versions, one of which added a second M to the duple-mensuration verse passages of the final strophe. Both Tenbury 791 and Mus. 6 describe ThouGTG as being 'for a mean', as also do the T and B

---

238 Mus. 1001 includes also the inner *c'*, *b* and *c'* that pre-echo the ensuing instrumental bass at bars 16–17.

volumes from the set associated with Mus. 6, the Chirk Castle part-books.[239] But since it was the Chirk scribe's custom to enter the highest voice of five-part compositions in the lost Q volume (see p. 23 above), this copy of the single M part is now missing. Apart from doublings in the organ accompaniments, M parts survive only for the paired version, and are restricted to sources associated with Barnard: *Lcm* MSS 1045–51, where the designation 'for 2 means' appears in the Ctd volume MS 1046 (f. 19r), and the *First Book*, where the anthem is headed 'A prayer for the king for two means'.[240]

The copying and subsequent printing of one of the passages for M duet perhaps sheds light on the extent Barnard's editorial interventions. Since the original solo M part can readily be extracted from Tenbury 791 and Mus. 6 (particularly the latter, where it consistently lies at the very top of the texture), it is possible to re-imagine the process whereby the anthem's last three solo passages were adapted into duets. In the third of these passages, shown in ex. 3:17, the semibreve declamations were apportioned to Mc and Md in alternation, the remaining solo matter was assigned to Mc, and vocal counterpoint for Md was appropriated from the upper voice of the organ bicinium. The treatment of the first passage was similar, but in this case the counterpoint for Md was obtained by transposing an inner voice from the accompaniment an 8ve higher.[241] (The first of these passages in fact contains new vocal counterpoint not present in Tenbury 791, but as we have already learned from AlackWILB a verse anthem could be entered in Barnard's part-books without reference to its corresponding accompaniment in his colleague Batten's organ-book.)

---

239 For what it is worth, the demonstrably unreliable additions to the index of MS Tenbury 1382 likewise indicates that the verse passages were for a single M only.

240 One of the two M parts—though luckily not the same one—is transmitted imperfectly by each of the two Barnard sources. The only extant copy of his printed Mc volume (*Lcm*, shelfmark D7) lacks all folios after f. 127, with the result that ThouGTG breaks off at the beginning of bar 46. For some reason the anthem was never entered in the Md part-book MS 1045, although the Md verse passages of the final strophe were entered in the Mc part-book MS 1048 (see below).

241 Hence Monson's decision to transpose the same inner voice an 8ve higher in his edition, to avoid parallel 8ves between it and the Md part of the duet: see bars 37–8 and BE 11, p. 223. But the Mus. 6 organ part remains incompatible with the duet version of the verses, and Monson was obliged to retain similar parallel 8ves at bars 53–5.

Since the duets involved 8ve transposition of the kind Byrd deployed in revising ChristR for publication, Monson was not averse to the idea that they represent Byrd's own second thoughts on ThouGTG.[242] An alternative scenario, however, is suggested by the second of the three duet passages, which exposes some significant backtracking by the principal scribe of Barnard's part-books. The scribe appears to have begun work by entering the whole of the Mc part on f. 14v of the Mc part-book MS 1048, during which he entered the verse passage in question as rests rather than notes. Because these part-books were intended for reference rather than performing purposes, it was unnecessary to duplicate the chorus passages in the Md part-book MS 1045. Instead, the scribe entered the Md verse passages only, and for some reason he chose to do so on f. 15r of the Mc part-book, facing the already entered Mc part. Entering the Md verses seems to have prompted him to change his mind about the rests in the Mc part, however, since he went on to strike them out and enter the corresponding Mc duet matter on a vacant staff below the Md part, labelling it 'vers: can:'. (Not until Monson edited the anthem did this amendment see the light of day, for it went unnoticed by Barnard's typesetter, who—like the editors of TCM 2 after him—again represented the troublesome verse passage with rests in the Mc part.)

It is surely telling that the scribe first entered rests, and subsequently amended them to notes, since the rests are most unlikely to have been entered by mistake. Rather, it seems more plausible that the rests derived directly from the Mc exemplar from which the scribe was working, meaning that the exemplar cannot have contained the duet version of the anthem, but rather must have contained the solo version, with verses for Md only. It would appear, then, that our scribe was in the very act of turning the solo into a duet as he wrote out the two M parts in MS 1048, that he initially chose to leave the second of the three verse passages as a solo (perhaps because, unlike the other two, it did not begin with semibreve declamation), and that the manner in which a second M could be added only

242 'Authenticity and Chronology', 299; preface to BE 11, p. x.

became clear to him subsequently. While we still await confirmation that the principal copyist of Barnard's part-books was Barnard himself, the tantalizing possibility emerges that the adaptation of ThouGTG 'for two means' was Barnard's doing.

Though Byrd is named in eleven of the twenty-three MS part-books and organ-books in which the anthem appears, six pre-Restoration Durham Cathedral part-books give an alternative ascription to Giles.[243] This is not easily dismissed as a misapprehension, for Barnard's Bc part-book MS 1051 gives the double ascription 'Byrd:– Giles:–'. Given what has been deduced from MS 1048, it seems improbable that Giles adapted the duets. Monson, who was convinced that the whole of ThouGTG was an adaptation of a consort work, took the double ascription to mean that Byrd's younger contemporary was responsible for adapting the accompaniment for organ.[244] But the extent of Giles's interventions may have been far greater. That he knew ThouGTG is beyond doubt, because its principal tune is the object of a grand homage in his anthem 'O Lord, my God, in all distress' (ex. 3:18).[245] Admittedly, there is nothing comparable to the final strophe of ThouGTG in any of his ten intact verse anthems;[246] yet his First Service, unpublished and scarcely copied since 1641, shows that he was not above similarly transient bursts of triple mensuration (thirty-three minims at v. 27 of the *TD*, and thirty in the doxology of the *M*), and moreover that he could be guilty of equally pedestrian word-setting (ex. 3:19).[247]

If the ineffective rhetoric of the final strophe can be laid at Giles's door, then to what extent may he also have imposed on the basic strophe? Byrd's own touches seem strongly apparent in the spacious, arch-like phrases of the solo vocal part, and in the chorus to the first stanza, where the homorhythmic inner parts are cleverly ruffled into a neat little stretto

---

243 MSS C2, 3, 7 and 14, C11 and C16 (see BE 11, p. 223). The attribution to Giles is reiterated in the post-Restoration Durham Tc part-book *Lbl* MS 30478, f. 170v.

244 Preface to BE 11, p. x. In support of Monson's interpretation, it may be pointed out that a similar explanation may apply to the attribution to 'Dr Giles et Mr Gibbons' of the latter's verse anthem 'Blessed are all they that fear the Lord' in the word-book *Lbl* MS Harley 4142 (f. 3r).

245 EECM 23/10.

246 EECM 23/4–13 (but see n. 48 above).

247 Barnard, *First Book*; organ part from *Ob* MS Tenbury 791, f. 2v.

(bars 22–3). But the assumption that these were the vocal ingredients of an original consort setting calls into question certain aspects of register and counterpoint in the accompaniment. While the instrumental descant of Mus. 1001 suggests a treble viol part lying above the solo M, that arrangement is apparently abandoned in the chorus sections, where it would have been Byrd's practice to retain a Tr part.[248] The fugal introduction to the basic strophe, furthermore, marshals its four entries into two rigidly identical stretti an 8ve apart, and isolates them from the initial vocal entry by four minims' worth of harmonic stasis. This is characteristic neither of Byrd, whose 'first singing part' invariably forms the last entry in an integrated exposition of five, flexibly disposed entries, nor Giles, whose verse anthem introductions are typically brief and informal. Therefore, while the vocal parts of the basic strophe might plausibly derive from a consort setting by Byrd, the accompaniment appears atypical whether one views it as an arrangement or as an original organ part.

Some light is shed on this problem by a previously unnoticed copy of the ThouGTG in the post-Restoration organ-book *Cu* MS Ely 4 (pp. R20–21). Since this MS also contains a highly questionable accompaniment for Byrd's Verse Service (see pp. 252–5 below), it cannot be regarded as a trustworthy source *per se*. Yet its version of ThouGTG is in several respects stylistically more convincing than any of the pre-Restoration ones. Though the middle portion of the second strophe is missing (the lowest two staves of p. 20 have been torn off), the remainder of the anthem is complete. The repetitious final strophe is present in its usual form, but in place of the discursive fugal introduction to the principal strophe is a pithy bicinium in typical Elizabethan style. The accompaniment to the solo section of the principal strophe is shown in ex. 3:20, in parallel with the version given in Mus. 1001.

The Ely LH switches several times between C4 and F4 clefs, and wanders over an unusually a wide range. This may, however, be the result of careless transcription from a

---

248 See the choruses to 'O God that guides' (1611/28) and BE 15/1, 4 and 5.

pre-transposed exemplar, for if all the C3 portions are transposed an 8ve lower the whole bass line falls naturally within the limits of a 9th (those portions are indicated accordingly in ex. 3:20).[249] It is true that the bicinium introduction might have been supplied at any time by a scribe who felt, quite justifiably, that the fugal one was too long. But as a whole the Ely accompaniment has more Byrdian cogency about it than any of the four others. The introduction is proportionate to the ensuing solo, while the instrumental descant offers a dynamic commentary on the vocal part, anticipating it by turns at the unison, the upper 5th, the 6th, again at the 5th, and finally at the 8ve. The answer-subject relationship at the mid-point fill-in is more compelling than the subject-subject relationship offered by Mus. 1001 and the other organ-books, where indeed much of the Ely motivicity has given way to fussy note-spinning. Only in Mus. 6 are filaments of the Ely descant discernible, transposed an 8ve lower, and restricted to the second of the four vocal phrases (*cf.* BE 11/16, bars 11–13).

There are four basic stylistic objections to Byrd's authorship of ThouGTG as it stands in Monson's edition. Two of these—the long-winded and rigid fugal introduction, and the lack of motivicity in the principal strophe's accompaniment—are dispelled by the Ely organ-part, while the final strophe's suspect switch from M solo to M duet can positively be traced to Barnard's MS part-books. That leaves the musical bombast of the final strophe, which was clearly an integral part of the anthem before any of the surviving copies were made, and in which Giles is perhaps implicated by the double and conflicting attributions to him. It is also possible that Giles piggybacked on the music of another senior composer, for a setting of 'O Lord, in thee is all my trust' is ascribed jointly to him and to Tallis in the verse anthem section of the Chapel Royal word-books.[250] The music of what was

---

249 Similar errors have already been noted in *Ob* MS Tenbury 791: see n. 45 above).

250 *Ob* MS Rawl. Poet. 23, p. 115; *Lbl* MS Harley 6346, f. 28r. It is of course possible that the single text was meant to represent two individual anthems. But it seems unlikely that the Chapel Royal repertory stooped to such a simple work as Tallis's four-part strophic setting. Nor do the word-books attach two or more composers' names to any other texts.

presumably Giles's adaptation does not survive, but Tallis's original four-part full setting does (EECM 12/6), and it is not hard to imagine how the younger composer might have redeployed portions of its T melody as M solos.[251]

To set another composer's tune afresh in that way was a compliment; to add new solos, duets, choruses and tedious fugal introductions to another composer's verse anthem was potentially an affront, particularly if that verse anthem happened to be the work of a senior and much more distinguished Chapel Royal colleague. Simply on the grounds of protocol, therefore, Giles is much more likely to have converted one of Byrd's existing songs into a verse anthem than to have tampered with one of his existing verse compositions.

A hypothetical genesis of ThouGTG thus emerges. Byrd initially set Hunnis's text as a consort song for M, four viols and five-part chorus (the scoring of the chorus suggests there was no treble viol in the consort), and he had very likely done so by the time Hunnis —for no other readily apparent reason—printed the text in sequence with those of AlackWILB and LetUBG in 1583. In Byrd's usual manner with consort songs, a single strophe sufficed for all three of Hunnis's stanzas.[252] Next Giles, presumably not without Byrd's permission, reworked Byrd's tune and chorus into a verse anthem. Rather than arranging the four close-knit viol parts for keyboard, he constructed a new, idiomatic organ part with an instrumental descant that incorporated some of the motivicity of the consort score. Farrant's and Mundy's precedents meant that an independent final strophe was expected, which Giles supplied as best he could. By that point, the anthem had reached the form eventually reflected in MS Ely 4; meanwhile, in other branches of the copying tree, it

---

251 Curiously, it was the M part of Tallis's setting, and not the T melody, that was printed in Day's *The whole booke of Psalmes*.

252 Admittedly the rest in the middle of the opening solo phrase ('Thou God * that guid'st...) would have made less sense in v. 3 ('So shall * all we...). The same objection, however, applies to v. 2 as it stands in the verse anthem ('Conserve * her life...'). It is of course impossible to say whether the rest formed part of Byrd's supposed original song or belongs to a revision by Giles. But if the former, it would not be the only rest Byrd wrote that fitted the first strophe only: see John Milsom, 'Byrd, Sidney, and the Art of Melting', *Early Music*, 31 (2003), 437–49 (444–5).

had picked up a fugal introduction, a second M part, and various amplifications of the accompaniment.

3.5.3 'Behold, O God, the sad and heavy case' and its contrafacta

The curious text of BeholdOGTS survives only in sources dating from the 1630s,[253] and in forms mentioning King Charles that cannot have been set by Byrd. The version transmitted by the anthem's only known musical sources, all of which originate from Durham Cathedral, will be discussed shortly; that given in the Chapel Royal word-book *OB* MS Rawl. Poet. 23 begins thus:

> 1. Behold, O God, the sad and heavy case
> Wherein we stand as simple sheep forlorn:
> If death possess whom life doth yet embrace,
> Then we may wail, that ever we were born;
> Wherefore (good Lord) preserve in perfect health
> Thy servant Charles, our king, our peace and wealth.

As we shall see, the music itself shows clear signs of having been composed specifically for a version of this very text that must have been addressed on behalf of an earlier monarch, and that was subsequently updated in a similar manner to 'O Lord, make thy servant' (see p. 79 n. 74).[254] But it remains a matter for speculation whether the original last line began 'Elizabeth our queen...', as Monson has argued, or rather cited James instead of Charles.

Philip Brett's view that the text had originated as a 'prayer for King James in illness' was not entirely without foundation.[255] Following the death of his son Arthur in 1613, the king suffered periodically from arthritis, inflammation of the kidneys, and renal stones; in 1616 he developed gout, and by 1621 he could no longer walk.[256] It was following one of

---

253 It is listed in neither Dubinski, *English Religious Poetry*, nor May and Ringler, *Elizabethan Poetry*.

254 BE 11, p. 219.

255 'The Songs of William Byrd', 303.

256 Archibald L. Goodall, 'The Health of King James the Sixth of Scotland and First of England', *Medical History*, 1 (1957), 17–27 (22–6). Accounts of James's postmortem examination suggest vascular disease in the limbs and brain.

these illnesses that Gibbons composed his consort anthem 'O all true faithful hearts' as 'a thanksgiving for the king's happy recovery from a great dangerous sickness'.[257] But in terms of prosody, the Elizabethan form of the BeholdOGTS reconstructed by Monson makes a thoroughly convincing fit for the rhythms and melodic contours of both the duet passages and the choruses. Furthermore, the Chapel Royal version of the text contains several phrases that would have been inapposite to a sick James: 'preserve in perfect health', 'support with quiet health', 'still maintain in health', and 'vouchsafe still to preserve in health'. Unless those phrases also were part and parcel of the Caroline adaptation process, Byrd's anthem must originally have been addressed on behalf of a monarch who was not actually sick, but rather one who was under the threat of some potentially fatal contagion.

It is well known that Elizabeth enjoyed remarkably good health. Prior to her final decline in the early months of 1603, her only perturbing illness had been a bout with smallpox in October 1562. But no Elizabethan, not even the queen herself, could lead a life untouched by the effects of bubonic plague. Always a lingering threat to public health, the usually fatal 'pestilence' became rampant in the summer of 1563, provoking the queen to retreat to Windsor and to erect there a gallows on which all further persons arriving from London were to be summarily hanged. Although there would not be a comparable epidemic until 1593, periodic minor outbreaks in London and its environs put the authorities on constant alert. Over the course of the queen's reign, threats of plague obliged her to issue no fewer than thirty-five proclamations regulating public events. During the years 1576–80, it took only a handful of cases to bring about the adjournment of law terms, the segregation of infected buildings, and the cancellation of plays and fairs.[258] In 1578,

---

257 *Och* MS Mus. 21, p. 210.

258 John F. D. Shrewsbury, *A History of Bubonic Plague in the British Isles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 190, 212–17, 224–30; Robert Steele, *A Bibliography of Royal Proclamations of the Tudor and Stuart Sovereigns, Vol. 1: England and Wales* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), p. lxxxix.

Elizabeth personally sought and caused to be published the advice of the College of Physicians on remedies, cures, quarantining and disinfecting.[259]

Hence there is considerable circumstantial evidence to support Monson's proposal that BeholdOGTS was composed in time of plague, although his association of the anthem with the last and most serious of the Elizabethan epidemics in the summer of 1593 excludes many earlier occasions to which the anthem would have been appropriate. Its text is in fact relevant to plague in more ways than Monson mentioned. Among the 'tokens whereby a sick man may understand whether he be infected with the plague or no', the contemporary quack Thomas Brasbridge described 'much heaviness ... [and] great pain of the head', and 'an outrageous heat within the body, as if a man were in the fire, and yet oftentimes the outward parts are so cold that it maketh a man to shake, as if he were in a fever'.[260] The same symptoms are detailed with surprising directness in the second of the anthem's four stanzas:

> 2. O God, thou know'st that if the head but ache,
> The body must partaker be of pain,
> And ev'ry limb will tremble, shake and quake,
> Till health possess her wonted course again.

Since in the Old Testament plague was synonymous with the vengeance of God, it was generally accepted that present epidemics were the outcome of human transgressions. 'Sin,' according to Brasbridge, was 'the principal cause of the pestilence' (sig. A6r), and the same certainty was resonantly proclaimed by the occasional liturgies authorized for the 'present visitation of God's heavy hand for our manifold sins'.[261] Even Elizabeth's privy council, on confronting the critical outbreak of 1593, felt bound to acknowledge that 'these

---

259 *Orders, thought meete by her Maiestie, and her priuie Councell, to be executed throughout the counties of this realme, in such townes, villages, and other places, as are, or may be hereafter infected with the plague* (London: Christopher Barker; STC 9187.9).

260 *The poore mans ieuuel, that is to say, A treatise of the pestilence* (London: for George Byshop, 1578 etc.; STC 3549 et seq.), sigs C3r–C4r.

261 Title page of *Certaine praiers collected out of a fourme of godly meditations, set foorth by her Maiesties authoritie in the great mortalitie* (London: the deputies of Christopher Barker, 1593; STC 16524), a reissue of *A fourme to be vsed in common prayer twise a weeke* ... (see n. 16 above).

plagues and sickness ... proceed from the hands of God as a due punishment of our sins'.[262] It is in just these terms that the anthem text makes its single theological point: 'We all confess our sins such plagues deserve' (v. 4).

Beyond that general principle, however, lay life-and-death controversy. While theologians such as Theodore Beza (who himself survived an infection of plague, and whose treatise *De peste quaestiones duae explicatae* circulated in an English translation)[263] were prepared to argue that plague was contagious, others still held that because infection was due to divine will alone the disease itself was not contagious, and that to 'flee' or desert an infected household was to deny one's faith. The latter persuasion was, of course, dangerously antithetical to public health, and orders attached to the queen's medical advice of 1578 sternly outlawed the preaching or publishing of 'such dangerous opinions upon pain of imprisonment'.[264]

The sharply augmented death-toll brought on by an epidemic could serve as a reminder that recusants held to their own funerary rites and soteriological doctrines, and had to make their own arrangements for burying their dead. Beyond that, however, plague could hardly be made into a serious confessional issue. It might have pricked the conscience of a sixteenth-century ruler to read that Kind David, after presuming to conduct a census of his able-bodied men, had opted for the punishment of a pestilence that carried off seventy thousand of his subjects (2 Samuel 24; 1 Chronicles 21). Yet it was clearly of no consequence whether the ruler was Catholic or Protestant, for sixteenth- and seventeenth-century epidemics struck Paris no less frequently than London.[265] Any concerns that the

---

262 *Acts of the Privy Council of England, Vol. XXIV 1592–3*, ed. John Roche Dasent (London: HMSO, 1901), 400.

263 *A shorte learned and pithie treatize of the plague*, transl. John Stockwood (London: Thomas Dawson, 1580; STC 2046).

264 *Orders, thought meete by her Maiestie*, sig. B2v.

265 See Vanessa Harding, *The Dead and the Living in Paris and London, 1500–1670* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 25.

words of BeholdOGTS might contain some invidious political sub-text may therefore safely be laid aside.

The author of the anthem text nonetheless used a recurring image with classical as well as obviously Christological connotations that was potentially provocative to a recusant: that of Elizabeth as a shepherdess. He likened her subjects to 'simple sheep forlorn' (v. 1) and to a 'silly flock' (v. 4), and predicated the pastoral role vested in her own person (and not, it should be stressed, in her body politic) as something absolute and indispensable:

> 3. Behold also, what bloody broils may rise
> Throughout the flock for want of such a one...

If Monson's dating of the anthem to 1593 is correct, then the image was a current one, for in the 1591 pageant *Descensus Astraeae* George Peele had cast the celestial virgin Astraea, the queen's literary *alter ego*, in the guise of a shepherdess.[266] The cult of Elizabeth—from which at no cost to his own loyalty Byrd appears ingeniously to have distanced himself through the subtle semantics of 'O Lord, make thy servant'—thus had a pastoral facet that could also be read into the words of BeholdOGTS. In setting those words, Byrd signalled that at the very least he accepted the queen's pastoral role in so far as it extended to purely temporal matters. For a Catholic, however, the only person qualified to assume Christ's place as spiritual shepherd on earth was the Vicar of Christ.[267]

Given the extremely restricted usefulness of a plague text, it is hardly surprising that Byrd's anthem was adapted for use on other, less grave occasions. The Durham version is a half-hearted effort, retaining the highly topical first four lines of each stanza whilst replacing the final couplets with *non sequiturs* of a generalized regal character:

---

266 Frances A. Yates, 'Queen Elizabeth as Astraea', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 10 (1947), 27–82 (57–8).

267 See Thomas Harding, *A confutation of a booke intituled An apologie of the Church of England* (Antwerp: John Laet, 1565; STC 12762), f. 8v: 'This schism, division, and conspiracy against the head shepherd, is no less wicked than that of Dathan and Abiron against Moses and Aaron was. For as God commanded Moses and Aaron to be obeyed of the children of Israel, so Christ commanded all his sheep to obey and hear the voice of him, whom in Peter, and succeeding Peter, he made shepherd over his whole flock.'

Wherefore, good Lord, vouchsafe that we may sing
And praise thy Name for our most sacred king.

The two lone Oxford part-books *Ob* MSS Mus. d. 162 and Tenbury 1382 transmit the B and T chorus parts of another adaptation that clearly went to the opposite extreme, pressing Byrd's music into the service of a completely unrelated and entirely different text. On casting around for this alternative, the arranger cannot have been spoiled for choice, for although the six decasyllable 'Venus and Adonis' form of the original text was widespread in secular poetry, it was employed in neither the official metrical psalter nor the spiritual poetry of Hunnis. The nearest metre offered by *The whole booke of Psalmes* was uniquely that of Ps. 124, 'Now Israel may say', which in 1558 the still-exiled William Whittingham had versified as five decasyllables in order to fit the Geneva tune for the same psalm.[268] With some repetition and a little rewording,[269] Whittingham's five lines could be accommodated to Byrd's music for the original six. But the inevitable consequence of imposing such repetition on a melody not shaped for that purpose was a rhetorical disconnect between words and melody of which Byrd would scarcely have approved.

The Chapel Royal word-books credit Byrd with a setting of another, otherwise unknown six-decasyllable text that might well represent a further general-purpose adaptation of the plague-time anthem.[270] Though there is a slim possibility that this text represents a completely independent, lost composition, its stress patterns and verbal repetitions correspond unexceptionably to the extant one. It notably also proceeds from the same three opening words:

Behold (O God), with thy all-prospering eye
The happy state of this our blessed king...

---

268 Quitslund, *The Reformation in Rhyme*, 165–7. The Geneva tune accompanies Whittingham's versification in the English psalters (see Temperley, *The Hymn Tune Index*, HTI no. 123a).

269 In order to correspond to a caesura after the fourth syllable in the original text, the last line of Whittingham's final stanza had to be changed from 'His Name hath saved us / from these wicked men' to 'He hath us saved / from all these wicked men'.

270 *Ob* MS Rawl. Poet. 23, p. 170; *Lbl* MS Harley 6346, f. 55v.

Furthermore, some effort seems to have been made to echo the plague text's central tenet that the monarch is the mainstay of order and prosperity:

> Preserve (good Lord) his sacred majesty,
> Who to this land all happiness doth bring...

As Monson pointed out, this text can date from no earlier than 1625, since the wording 'that royal progeny / Of blessed James, great king of Britanie' cannot be an adaptation of an earlier version addressed on behalf of James himself. If the indications that it was concocted for the music of the plague text are correct, then the presence of both texts in the Chapel Royal word-books implies that the original one was kept on standby for use in time of plague (there had been further epidemics in 1603, 1625 and 1630, and another would follow in 1636, one year after the copying of *Ob* MS Rawl. Poet. 23).[271] The alternative text, allowing Byrd's special anthem to be sung at any time, may be seen as a response to the increasing vogue for verse anthems that also propelled his two liturgical verse psalms into the anthem repertory (in *Ob* MS Rawl. Poet. 23, verse anthems outnumber full anthems by well over two to one).[272]

It seems to have been quite widely accepted in the Reformation period that strophic music could freely be allied to more than one set of words. As we have seen, directions for singing one text to the tune of another are frequently encountered in both the metrical psalter and Hunnis's *SS*. Albeit over-optimistically, the 'ditties' of *PDD* were described by their publisher Henry Disle as 'aptly made to be set to *any* song in 5 parts',[273] while on the title page of Sir William Leighton's *The teares or lamentacions of a sorrovvfull soule* it is stated more realistically that the first seventeen items, which are settings of long-metre poems, are suitable for '*all* psalms that consist of so many feet'.[274] Though the repertory of

---

271 Shrewsbury, *A History of Bubonic Plague*, 264–70, 318–32, 354–6, 372–7.

272 Sixty-four texts appear under the heading 'full anthems', and 153 under the heading 'single anthems', although a number of verse anthems (including BeholdOGTS) were for some reason mistakenly entered under the 'full' heading: see Morehen, 'Sources', 419–24.

273 1576 edn (STC 7516), sig. A2v, emphasis added.

274 As n. 27 above (see also EECM 11, p. ix), emphasis added.

metrical verse anthems does not appear to have been very widely affected by this principle, reference has already been made to the egregious Durham adaptation of Giles's 'O Lord, of whom I do depend' to Whittingham's versification of Ps. 133, 'O how happy a thing it is'.[275] At Durham too, one of eight vocal parts for Mundy's 'The secret sins' is underlaid instead with Whittingham's Ps. 23, 'The Lord is only my support',[276] while at the Chapel Royal Hooper's 'The blessed Lamb' was sung with the substitute text 'A fruitful branch of Jesse's blissful stem'.[277]

Even though the author of the alternative text apparently went to some trouble to achieve the prosody required by Byrd's music, the application of any substantively new text to that music resulted in the undoing of word-setting that was unusually vivid for a strophic composition. Since the first four lines of each stanza contained no verbal units suitable for brief choral reiterations of the kind found in AlackWILB, the chorus's rhetorical function was necessarily restricted to a restatement of the final couplet of each stanza (plus of course the concluding 'Amen').[278] To enhance the antiphonal rhetoric, Byrd might have followed the Farrant/Mundy precedent of adding an independent final strophe, where more rapid exchanges between duet and chorus could have been developed. The text suggested a novel alternative approach, however, since the odd-numbered stanzas happened to include mutually comparable imagery, and so too did the even-numbered ones. Byrd therefore composed two quite contrasting strophes, one for the first and third stanzas, the other for the second and fourth. Two clauses—'the sad and heavy case' (v. 1) and 'what bloody broils may rise' (v. 3)—are thus aligned with a singular reference to

---

275 See n. 48 above; this example and the two following ones were first cited in Morehen, 'The English Anthem Text', 73–5.

276 *DRc* MS C7, pp. 265–6; the stress patterns of the music (particularly the dotted rhythms) are better accommodated to the usual text (which is crossed out in this MS).

277 The text 'A fruitful branch' is found in the two Chapel Royal word-books, and appears with music in the Chapel Royal Bd part-book *Oj* MS 180 and Barnard's Bc part-book *Lcm* MS 1051.

278 As in the consort psalms 'O Lord, who in thy sacred tent' and 'O Lord, within thy tabernacle', Byrd treated the final couplets of 'Behold, O God, the sad and heavy case' to a fresh musical setting in the choruses, in this case perhaps because he had already developed their initial setting at some length in the preceding Ct duets (bars 23–37 and 68–83).

'A♭' (bar 10), unparalleled in Byrd's vernacular church music), while the words 'tremble, shake and quake' (v. 2) are illustrated by a nervous dotted rhythm (bar 60) that serves also to invoke the tripping of the 'silly flock' (v. 4). These little madrigalisms, which needless to say lost their effect when new words were substituted, are the clearest possible indications that the plague-time text was the one originally set by Byrd.

In terms both of its scoring for Ct duet and of its alternating strophic form, BeholdOGTS can be seen to represent a logical stage in the evolution of the metrical verse anthem. Farrant's and Mundy's contributions had been scored for a single soloist, as perhaps also had been the Oxford version of AlackWILB (see p. 212 above). In the Durham recension of AlackWILB, however, the solo passages are carved up into portions assigned to Ctd and Ctc by turns: this division of the labour cannot irrefutably be attributed to Byrd, yet since he appears at some point to have substantively reworked this anthem, the desirability of a more collegial scoring might plausibly have been one of his motives for doing so. At any rate, the odd-numbered stanzas of BeholdOGTS begin by observing the same principle: in the first stanza, the first two lines are assigned to Ctd and the next two to Ctc, while in the third stanza these assignments are interchanged. As with the two M parts of AnET (bars 21–37), it is only on reaching the final couplet of the odd-numbered stanzas that the two Ct parts at last realize their potential to form a fully concerted duet (bars 23–36), in which manner they go on to deliver the entirety of the two even-numbered stanzas. The resulting assignment of vocal resources to lines of text may be schematized as follows (with solos for Ct1d represented by superior letters, solos for Ct1c by inferior letters, duets by regular lower-case letters, choruses by upper-case letters, and duets with exchanged voice parts by italics):[279]

1. $^{ab}{}_{cd}$efEF 2. ghijklKL 3. $_{ab}{}^{cd}$*ef*EF 4. *ghijkl*KL Amen

279 The two Ct parts of the odd-numbered choruses (E, F) are assigned to Ct2c and Ct2d only, to allow Ct1c and Ct1d to rest (although Monson decided against this arrangement; see BE 11, p. 106n). The two Ct parts of the even-numbered choruses (K, L) are assigned to Ct1+2c and Ct1+2d respectively.

These scoring details are more likely the composer's own than the result of scribal intervention, since as well as apparently developing the rostering of the solos in AlackWILB they anticipate the careful management of the four Ct parts in The Great Service. Furthermore, in Bull's verse anthem 'Deliver me, O God' (see ex. 3:3b above) we find not only a further example of alternating strophic form but also a more developed application of the same principle of exchanged Ct parts (choruses with exchanged Ct parts are here represented by italic capitals):[280]

1. $^{a}{}_{ab}{}^{cd}{}_{dCD}$ 2. $_{efghGH}$ 3. $_{a}{}^{ab}{}_{cd}{}^{dCD}$ 4. $^{ef}{}_{ghGH}$ Amen

In the manner of Byrd's anthem, Bull's odd-numbered stanzas consist initially of antiphonal solos followed by a concerted duet, and the even-numbered stanzas likewise place greater emphasis on duet writing and more intricate rhythms.

With the possible exception of Giles's 'What child was he' (EECM 23/13), which provides an independent strophe for the second of its three stanzas, after 'Deliver me, O God' it appears to have become customary for metrical verse anthems to be through-composed, allowing successive stanzas by turns to employ a variety of solo and duet scorings.[281] Such is the case with Morley's 'O Jesu meek' (EECM 38/2), but as with BeholdOGTS the paired voices of its initial verse passage are at first heard singly in alternate phrases (bars 1–24; see ex. 3:2c above) before eventually developing into a fully concerted duet (bar 16).

The more detailed musical attributes of BeholdOGTS cannot be assessed with certainty because, as with AlackWILB, the largely uncorroborated readings offered by the Durham sources are plainly untrustworthy. Though the four chorus passages of BeholdOGTS are to all intents and purposes identical, the lower voice parts provide no fewer than three

---

280 This is the scoring as given in Barnard's *First Book*, where the Ct chorus parts are arranged in Barnard's preferred manner (Ct2c=Ct1d and Ct1c=Ct2d).

281 See, for example, all Giles's fully extant metrical verse anthems apart from 'What child was he': EECM 23/5, 9 (see n. 48 above), 10 and 11.

different workings of the final cadence: that for the third stanza (bars 48–9) and that shared by the second and fourth stanzas (bars 91–2) include a consonant 4th suspension that was clearly not present in the Oxford *contrafactum*, where all four stanzas can be seen to have concluded with cadences similar to the Durham one for the first stanza (bars 45–6).[282] In the 'Amen', furthermore, blatant parallel 5ths occur between T and M (bars 95–6, the T part in this case being confirmed by its Oxford source), while most improbably for a five-part work the terminal chord is bereft of a 3rd.

Henry Palmer's organ part is at least as contrapuntally ragged as his copies of the accompaniments to ChristR and HaveMUMOG. In the solo and duet passages, the vocal parts are sometimes doubled, sometimes not, and the purely instrumental strands lack cogency. The odd-numbered stanzas, like the first two stanzas of ThouGTG, are introduced by four fugal entries that suggest viols but by no means necessarily connote them. In any case, just as with ThouGTG the authenticity of the introduction is open to question, given that Palmer quickly broke off the two inner entries, and that the order and timing of the entries is hardly typical of Byrd (each voice is succeeded by its lower neighbour at the regular distance of four minims).[283] Yet although at one cadence the two strands copied by Palmer fail to supply an essential contrapuntal element (bars 21–2), at all the other principal cadences the outermost strands of the organ part enclose the vocal solo or duet to form a self-sufficient three- or four-voice construct (bars 14–15, 27=73, 36–7=83–4, 57–8 and 66–7), suggesting that the accompaniment could originally have been of the bicinium type characteristic of verse anthems. In addition, had Byrd ever scored this work for Ct duet with four viols, then we should expect the choruses to be in six parts, whereas (excepting the ultimate omitted 3rd) the extant choruses appear more than complete

---

282 *Ob* MSS Mus. d. 162, pp. 25–6, and Tenbury 1382, f. 15r–v.

283 It is instructive to compare the anthem's fugal introduction with the much less predictable one of AnET (which, though in a different key, is based on a notably similar subject). Numbering the voices from the top down, and reckoning the temporal arrangement in minims, the anthem's entries may be expressed as I 4 II 4 III 4 IV, and those of the consort duet as I 4 III 2 IV 4 II.

enough in five (see the close unisons between B and T, and between T and Ctd, at bars 39–40 = 85–6).

The surest signs that BeholdOGTS originated in verse format nonetheless remain its apparent evolutionary relationship to other verse anthems, and its typically ecclesiastical combination of featured Ct voices and the key of Gamut flat. Its text too is of the kind known to have been authorized for use at the end of Anglican offices, and would have fulfilled what was presumably deemed an urgent intercessory function of the Chapel Royal in time of widespread public anxiety.

3.5.4 'Sing ye to our God'

Chiefly on the basis of contrapuntal texture and of musical affinities with works by older and younger composers, the present investigation will leave the number of Byrd's extant original verse anthems at just two. Both are settings of metrical texts, in contrast—as was remarked at the outset—to the composer's prose-texted full anthems, from which it would not be unreasonable to infer that the Elizabethans set such texts in the verse idiom simply because that was perceived as the proper way to set them. Thus Bowers's observation that 'no such text is found set by any composer of this period in the form of a full anthem preserved in an ecclesiastical source and indisputably for church use', intended as an argument *against* the existence of the Tudor metrical verse anthem *per se*,[284] may in fact be the correct explanation *for* the genre's existence.

If our inference is correct, then it may shed a little light on a final, shadowy item among the verse anthems attributed to Byrd, SingYTOG. Only the text survives, in the 'single anthems' section of the Chapel Royal word-books exclusively,[285] and thanks to an important recent discovery by David Fraser,[286] it can be shown to derive directly from a

284 'Ecclesiastical or Domestic?', 142.
285 *Ob* MS Rawl. Poet. 23, p. 160; *Lbl* MS Harley 6346, f. 50v.
286 'Sources of Texts for Byrd's 1611 *Psalmes*', *Early Music*, 38 (2010), 171–2.

Catholic source, the bilingual primer edited by Richard Verstegan in 1599.[287] The word-books' only departures from Verstegan's printed version are notable in that they suppress from his English rendering of Ps. 149:1–4 two instances of a known recusant shibboleth, the original phrases 'Sing ye to our Lord' and 'our Lord is well pleased' both being amended to 'our God'.[288] Byrd is identified as the composer by a back-reference ('idem') to the preceding item, his liturgical setting of Ps. 100.

Byrd's last printed song-book in fact contains an unexpurgated setting of the same text (1611/6), but since that work is a vocal trio with clefs C3, G2 and G2 it hardly qualifies as a verse anthem in the usual sense. It moreover comprises only the first two verses of Ps. 149, whereas the Chapel Royal text extends to the first four. Whether or not SingYTOG was an extended version of the 1611 trio is entirely a matter for conjecture: on one hand such a trio might indeed have been classed as a verse anthem simply because it called for unusual vocal resources; on the other hand, the word-book text may instead represent a completely independent composition. Possibly too it was the work of another composer, and picked up the ascription to Byrd because he was known to have set part of the same text. In any case, the present conclusion that Byrd's true verse anthems are metrical pieces casts some doubt on the possibility that he set a non-liturgical prose psalm in the verse idiom. It nonetheless remains highly intriguing that one of Verstegan's translations somehow insinuated itself into the use of the Chapel Royal, and that in the process its specifically Catholic inflections were censored. And the finger of suspicion points inevitably at Byrd.

---

287 *The primer, or, Office of the Blessed Virgin Marie in Latin and English, according to the reformed Latin, and vvith lyke graces priuileged* (Antwerp: Arnold Conings; STC 16094), 57.

288 I am indebted to Kerry McCarthy for pointing out this usage, which accounts for such absurdities in Verstegan's primer as 'Our Lord said unto my Lord' (p. 113) and 'My soul doth magnify our Lord' (p. 117).

CHAPTER FOUR

LITURGICAL WORKS IN THE VERSE IDIOM

Ps. 119:33–8 ('Teach me, O Lord')	BE 10a/3d
Ps. 100 ('O by joyful in the Lord')	BE 10a/10; MS
The Verse Service (*M*, *ND*)	BE 10a/6

4.1 Psalmody

Byrd's only rival for priority in the field of liturgical psalmody in the verse idiom is a work attributed to 'Farrant', and there is circumstantial evidence that the composer was Richard of that ilk, Byrd's senior by an estimated fifteen years. This Farrant's settings of Pss. 21, 146 and 147 for Obiit Day are found only in *Cpc* MSS 6.1–6, a set of part-books known to have originated at St George's Chapel Windsor, where Richard (who was also a Gentleman of the Chapel Royal) was master of the choristers and one of the organists from 1564 until his death in 1580. Frustratingly, the set lacks its Ct2c, Ct2d, Ct1c and Mc volumes, and is thus too depleted to show conclusively the form taken by Ps. 147, the most interesting item of the three. Whereas the successive verses of Pss. 21 and 146 were clearly assigned to c and d alternation, in Ps. 147 the even numbered verses appear to have been for full chorus while music for the odd-numbered ones is marked 'vers:' and is confined to the Md part alone. Owing to the incompleteness of this part-book set, however, it remains impossible to determine whether the 'vers:' passages were solos requiring organ accompaniment or were semichoruses for Md plus two or three of the missing parts. But as we have seen (pp. 129–30), there exist a number of mid-century liturgical psalms with verses scored for contrasting semichoirs, and it would appear from the recitation-like character of the Md that Farrant's Ps. 147 was another composed in that style.

Byrd's setting of Ps. 100 appears among the First Preces and Psalms solely in the two related Bc volumes *Llp* MS 764 and *Ob* MS Mus. e. 40 (ex. 4:1).[1] Enough can be gleaned from the single surviving part to confirm that it belonged to a composition unlike Byrd's five other liturgical psalms, and that it probably came closer than any of them to the style of the Verse Service. Like several sources of the service, in both its sources it is headed 'for a man alone', meaning that the missing solos were almost certainly for Ct in the usual Elizabethan manner. Though the scribe who copied both MSS neglected to enter any block rests, the three solo passages were respectively taken up with vv. 1 and 3 and the first half of the doxology, and may therefore have been roughly equivalent in length to the three choruses (vv. 2 and 4 and the second half of the doxology). The repetition of a quite substantial verbal clause at the end of v. 2, unique in Byrd's liturgical psalmody, suggests that the verses too might similarly have embodied repetitions for rhetorical effect.

The bass part's frequent 4th and 5th leaps indicate that the choruses consisted for the most part of the kind of sturdy chordal progressions that characterize the choruses of the Verse Service. Its frequent and unpredictable shifts of modal axis further indicate that—in contrast to the associated settings of Pss. 47 and 54, which as we saw in Chapter 1 are based on tone 8/i—Ps. 100 must have been freely composed. The text repetition in v. 2 appears to have been linked to wholesale musical repetition, although a few subtle variations are evident in the repeat. On their second hearing the verbal stress patterns are correlated with an inverse arrangement of strong and weak minims. The word 'are' is assigned to a triad the first time round, then to a 6/3 chord. In addition, some restructuring of the counterpoint is evident at 'and the sheep of his pasture', where the minim rest and anapaestic rhythm suggest either a leading-voice texture in which the M anticipated the lower voices by one minim, or perhaps even stretto *fuga* in the manner of the fragmentary Peterhouse service.

---

1 The fragment is here given in full because Monson edited it only as far as the end of the first chorus.

In v. 4, Byrd seems to have introduced the technique of *tautophrasis*, apparently adapting the same series of six chords to fit each of the first two verbal clauses:

> For the Lord is [graci]ous,
> [his mer][cy is] everlasting:

In the last verbal clause, an even shorter chord series does duty for two halves of a verbal clause that are not grammatically self-sufficient (we shall see that *tautophrasis* of this kind is characteristic of the Verse Service):

> from [gene][rati]on †
> to genera(ti-on)

Ps. 100 nonetheless appears to have been through-composed to the extent that each of its choruses was based on its own material, and in this important respect at least it was clearly unique in Byrd's output. That here Byrd employed musical repetition both rhetorically and organically adds weight to the impression that in their final, five-part form the First Preces and Psalms are a middle-period work for the Chapel Royal. As with Ps. 54, there is nothing to suggest that Ps. 100 was reworked from a simple, early composition, as both the preces and Ps. 47 appear to have been.

Ps. 100 contains the only instance in Byrd's vernacular church music of a passage in *tempus perfectum*, and thus points to conclusions about his (much more frequent) use of *prolatio perfecta*. In Monson's view, the *perfecta* portions of Ps. 119:33–8, the Verse Service, ChristR and ThouGTG were all subject to Morley's precept that 'true *tripla* maketh three semibreves or their value in other notes to the time of one semibreve'.[2] Yet the general consistency of note values in these passages is really no different from that of the adjoining ones in *prolatio imperfecta*; indeed, there is a greater concentration of crotchet movement in the *perfecta* section of ChristR than in the *imperfecta* section. In the *tempus perfectum* passage in Ps. 100, however, the use of shorter note values is markedly reduced, strongly implying that a proportionally quicker pace was intended here. It is true

2 *A plaine and easie introduction to practicall musicke* (London: Peter Short, 1597; STC 18133), annotations to p. 29 (sig. *4r).

that controversy surrounded the mensuration system in the England of Byrd's time;[3] and that his own usage of mensuration signs is notoriously inconsistent.[4] Yet his apparent distinction between *prolatio perfecta* and *tempus perfectum* suggests that he used the one when there was not to be a change from the regular minim tactus and the other when there was to be.

Byrd's other verse psalm, Ps. 119:33–8 ('Teach me, O Lord'), is simpler in form, and its choruses are in the manner of liturgical psalms in the full idiom. Roger Bowers has put forward the view that it originated as 'a free-standing anthem', partly on the grounds that it consists, like the other two psalms of Byrd's second set, of a selection of verses with no identifiable liturgical precedent.[5] It is true that the presence of a doxology in all three psalms does not irrefutably indicate a strictly liturgical function, since a small number of other pre-Restoration settings of selected psalm verses likewise conclude with a doxology.[6] Yet while we must await a proven explanation for the puzzling choice of verses, from the purely musical point of view it seem most unlikely that Ps. 119:33–8 began life as an anthem, given (a) that the verses of its text are delivered in strict alternation between soloist and chorus, without any of the echoic antiphony found in the verse anthems, (b) that its four choruses are all adapted from a single series of chords, and (c) that the series in question is itself based on the Sarum *tonus peregrinus*. If these two characteristics are not sure signs of a liturgical psalm as opposed to an anthem, then none could be.

On the basis that there is 'no difference of pitch between the reciting tones of each half [verse]', Bowers has argued that any resemblance to the *tonus peregrinus* can only have

---

3 See Thomas Ravenscroft, *A briefe discourse of the true (but neglected) vse of charact'ring the degrees, by their perfection, imperfection, and diminution in measurable musicke, against the common practise and custome of these times* (London: Edward Allde, 1614; STC 20756), passim.

4 See Herbert Kennedy Andrews, 'Printed Sources of William Byrd's "Psalmes, Sonets and Songs"', *Music & Letters*, 44 (1963), 5–20 (8–9, 13–17).

5 'Ecclesiastical or Domestic? Criteria for the Identification of the Initial Destinations of William Byrd's Music to Religious Vernacular Texts' in *William Byrd: A Research and Information Guide*, ed. Richard Turbet, 3rd edn (New York: Routledge, 2012), 134–60 (138).

6 See John Morehen, 'The English Anthem Text, 1549–1660', *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 117 (1992), 62–85 (65–6 n. 19).

been 'subconscious' on Byrd's part.[7] The distinctive mediation and termination are nonetheless unmistakeable in the M part, and while the second, lower reciting note indeed features only incidentally, this is true also of two earlier manifestations of the *tonus peregrinus* in English vernacular music: the *Benedicite* from Merbecke's *The booke of common praier noted*,[8] and the *Bs* from Caustun's Service for Men (where it appears in the T part).[9] It remains to be explained why Byrd chose to pair such an evocative psalm-tone with this liturgically obscure group of verses from Ps. 119; indeed, the coupling is all the more baffling given that the same set of psalms also includes a freely composed setting of Ps. 114, the psalm to which the *tonus peregrinus* had been proper in pre-Reformation England, as elsewhere.[10] As Mattias Lundberg has recently suggested, however, the contiguity of Ps. 113:1–6 may in fact be the best explanation for Byrd's use of the *tonus peregrinus* for Ps. 119:33–8.[11] His use of it also for an isolated solo in the *M* of the Verse Service (see p. 254 below) is further evidence that he did not regard its traditional association as sacrosanct, but rather as a point of reference.

As we saw in Chapter 1, the Second Preces and Psalms exist in two versions, the full items from the set being for four voices in the Durham and Peterhouse MSS but for five in Barnard's print. Both versions of the verse psalm, however, are scored for five-part chorus, albeit with significant variants in the part-writing.[12] It is possible that this item was always scored in five parts because, in contrast to the full psalms, its chorus sections do not call for any antiphony between c and d, allowing independent parts to be assigned to Ctc and Ctd

---

7 'Ecclesiastical or Domestic?', 155 n. 10.

8 London: Richard Grafton, 1550; STC 16441, sigs F3v–H1r.

9 *Mornyng and euenyng prayer and communion, set forthe in foure partes, to be song in churches* (London: John Day, 1565; STC 6419), quoted in John Aplin, '"The Fourth Kind of Faburden:" The Identity of an English Four-Part Style', *Music & Letters*, 61 (1980), 245–65 (256). A *ND* from the Wanley Books also is based on the *tonus peregrinus*: see RRMR 100/33.

10 The collaborative setting of 'In exitu Israel' attributed to Sheppard, Byrd and Mundy (EECM 48/41) is based on a faburden of the *tonus peregrinus*; see Joseph Kerman, *The Masses and Motets of William Byrd* (London: Faber, 1981), 59–60.

11 *Tonus Peregrinus: The History of a Psalm-tone and Its Use in Polyphonic Music* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 179–80.

12 The Durham/Peterhouse versions of the choruses are given in TCM 2, pp. 30–33, and BE 10a/appendix II.

respectively. But certain features of the Durham/Peterhouse version suggest its choruses were originally in four parts and underwent an unauthorized conversion to five. In particular, while the characteristic medial cadences of the *tonus peregrinus* is correctly represented by a chord of 'F', the *cantus firmus*–bearing M part momentarily diverts to *a'* at those cadences, suggesting that Byrd had only four parts at his disposal and felt impelled to close on a full triad (as he did throughout the Short Service).[13] Sure enough, in the version printed by Barnard, the M correctly falls to *f'* while the presence of two Ct parts allows the triad to be completed by the T (a precisely similar revision is evident between the four- and five-part versions of Ps. 55:1–7,17, at the terminal cadence; see ex. 1:5).

Barnard's version is clearly superior on several other counts. It circumvents a diminished 5th leap in one Ct part (bars 37–8), obviates a rather ill-matched melisma by introducing a modicum of text repetition ('may fear thee', bars 40–41), refines the prosody by shortening one instance of the word 'the' from a semibreve to a minim (bar 50), and improves the general sonority and continuity towards the end of the doxology (bar 50). At the expense of a ripe false relation between *F*♯ and *f*♮' (bar 58), it also does away with some fussy crotchet movement in the Ct parts (bars 55–8). The possibility that the Durham/Peterhouse version represents an already altered state of a four-voice original means, however, that the Barnard readings cannot necessarily be taken to be revisions of it.

The only surviving copy of the accompaniment to Ps. 119:33–8, which is found in the Chirk organ-book *Och* MS Mus. 6 (f. 48r), mostly corroborates Barnard's versions of the choruses, but minor points of disagreement indicate that the two sources represent diverse branches of scribal elaboration.[14] Those variants, however, pose a much less onerous problem than does the purely instrumental component, for which no other sources are

---

13 Caustun did likewise with the terminal cadence of *tonus peregrinus*: see Aplin, '"The Fourth Kind of Faburden", 255–6.

14 These include a dotted rhythm (Chirk, bar 7), a quaver *échappé* (*First Book*, bar 35), a more elaborate rhythm (Chirk, bar 44) and a melisma (*First Book*, bars 48–9). In all cases except bar 44, the simpler reading is confirmed by Durham/Peterhouse (see n. 12 above).

available for comparison. Given the presence in the same MS of at least two organ parts of unorthodox character (see exx. 3:4–5), its authority must be assessed on stylistic grounds alone.

Even by the usual standards of seventeenth-century organ books, the texture of the four solo passages is surprisingly inconsistent (vv. 33, 35 and 37, plus the first half of the doxology). Each has a brief introduction and mid-point interlude which may consist of anything from four- or five-part chords (v. 33) down to a solitary bass line (doxology). Once the vocal part is present, the organ invariably doubles it, accompanying it either with three lower parts (vv. 33 and 35) or, again, just a bass (v. 37 and doxology). The descant we would expect to find in an Elizabethan organ part is conspicuous by its absence.

To be sure, this is not the only Byrdian accompaniment constituted with nothing higher than a doubling of the M part. The same goes not only for the adapted consort anthems but also for two of the organ parts for ThouGTG, one of which is found within the same organ-book as Ps. 119:33–8. Since there is no reason to suspect the verse psalm is an adaptation of a consort work, the possibility must be entertained that it began life with an instrumental descant but, *en route* to *Och* MS Mus. 6, lost it. Fortunately, the same fate can be shown to have befallen another liturgical work from the period: Thomas Tomkins's so-called Sixth Service (*M, ND*). There exist two versions of the organ part, to this work, one transmitted by Batten with the usual instrumental descants, and another (found at Durham) from which the descant to the opening M solo is missing (ex. 4:2).[15] In the opinion of Peter James this descant represents 'the composer's maturer further thoughts',[16] but given that Richard Farrant, Giles, Morley and Weelkes all scored their M solos with organ descants it seems unlikely that Tomkins would have done differently at any stage. Rather, as John Bunker

---

15 (a) *Ob* MS Tenbury 791, ff. 208v–210v; (b) *DRc* MSS A2, pp. 214–19, and A5, pp. 171–7, both a 5th higher than here; M part from *DRc* MS C1, p. 165; Ct part inferred from Tenbury 791.

16 'Sacred Music Omitted from *Musica Deo sacra*' in *Thomas Tomkins: The Last Elizabethan*, ed. Anthony Boden (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 285–300 (297).

Clark pointed out,[17] the Durham accompaniment never exceeds the upper sounding limit of quire-pitch *d*", and thus appears to have been adapted at some point either for a 10-foot stop (on which *d*" would have been sounded by the topmost key, *a*") or for a non-standard organ of restricted compass. An upper limit of *d*" is likewise observed by the two accompaniments for ThouGTG that lack an instrumental descant, although in this case the possibility remains that the descants found in other accompaniments for that anthem represent unauthorized revisions. But if Ps. 119:33–8 underwent an adaptation in the manner of the Tomkins service (and assuming, of course, that Byrd had composed its organ part in the usual way), then it is easy to see how its verse passages might have been reduced to a mere doubling of the M part plus the instrumental bass (in the manner of the third and fourth bars of ex. 4:2).

For the Chirk accompaniment to reach its present state, some pre-Restoration editor must subsequently have taken it upon himself to add inner parts beneath the M doublings, and to fill in the gaps left in the introductions and interludes by the elimination of the instrumental descant. He seems to have fatigued of those tasks on completing the introduction to v. 37, however, and left the rest of the accompaniment in its two-part form, with the organ bass alone sufficing for the remaining two interludes and the introduction to the doxology. It is not clear whether this editor was the copyist of the Chirk MSS or of some earlier exemplar. But he was musically alert enough to realize that in the introductions to vv. 33, 35 and 37, and in the interlude of v. 35, an untransposed pre-echo of each ensuing vocal entry fitted perfectly with the organ bass (although in the Chirk copy of the introduction to v. 33 the pre-echo is concealed amid thick chords). What he did not realize, however, was that the organ bass of the interlude of v. 33 and the introductions and interludes he left blank can instead accommodate a pre-echo a 5th higher than the ensuing

17 *Transposition in Seventeenth-Century English Organ Accompaniments and the Transposing Organ* (Detroit: Information Coordinators, 1974), 47–8.

vocal entry (a conjectural reconstruction of v. 33 is shown in ex. 4:3).[18] The resulting answer-subject relationships resemble, for example, the openings of Giles's 'O Lord, turn not away thy face' (ex. 3:3a) and—as we shall now see—of Byrd's own Verse Service.

4.2 The Verse Service

Byrd's Verse Service consists, like his Three Minims Service, of evening canticles only, and the sources offer no reason to suppose that the composer ever provided it with complementary morning canticles or communion ordinaries. The title 'Second Service' is unique to Barnard's 1641 print, and would appear—like the titles 'First' and 'Third' under which Barnard printed Byrd's Short and Three Minims services respectively—to indicate the ordering within the anthology rather than, necessarily, the order of composition. Like the other two printed services, the Verse Service reveals in its own way the guiding influence of Tallis's Short Service. More importantly, however, it is without doubt the oldest intact service of its type. Were it not for the fragments of a verse service attributed to 'Mr Farrant' in two Durham MSS, there would be nothing to refute the claim that Byrd was the first to apply the verse principle to the Anglican service.[19]

Even if the attribution is to be trusted, the question still remains of whether the composer was the Windsor and Chapel Royal organist Richard Farrant (d. 1580, Byrd's senior by an estimated fifteen years), or one of the two or three John Farrants known to have been active between 1570 and 1618. While enough survives of the service to show it to have been half as long again as Byrd's Verse Service, the precise vocal resources it called for are far from obvious. The sole surviving vocal component is the Bd part of the choruses (MS C18, p. 31), which themselves account for slightly less than one third of the whole composition. Moreover, the organ part (MS A6, pp. 61–7), though copied in the fine

---

18 This possibility was realized by Monson, whose edition shows also that in the interlude of the doxology an untransposed pre-echo is additionally possible.

19 David Wulstan, *Tudor Music* (London: Dent, 1985), 322; Richard Turbet, 'Homage to Byrd in Tudor Verse Services', *The Musical Times*, 129 (1988), 485–90 (487 n. 8).

legible hand of Henry Palmer, is frustratingly sketchy. In both the verse and chorus sections, the organist's right-hand part seems to correspond rhythmically to the BCP text, suggesting that its function was simply to double the lost M part throughout rather than to supply the verses with an instrumental descant (ex. 4:4). It is faintly possible that this is another of those accompaniments that have lost their instrumental descant, but in the opening verse of each canticle it seems more likely that the two strands of the organ part doubled the outermost voices of a three-voice semichoir. In vv. 3 and 6 of the *M*, repeated phrases in the RH part suggest two M parts—perhaps even two semichoirs—in dialogue with each another. The function of the LH part is hard to fathom here: in v. 3, it might conceivably have been a purely supportive instrumental bass line. What seems certain about the verse sections, however, is that several of them were prefixed with brief snatches of thematically pertinent counterpoint that are too brief to deliver rational portions of the text, and must therefore have been short introductions and interludes for organ alone (see the first two and a half bars of ex. 4:4). In this respect at least, then, the designation 'for verses to the organ', found only in MS C18, seems justified.

Palmer's outline suggests Farrant's choruses were chiefly homophonic, with some ruffling of the texture here and there. There are no signs of the short-service technique of *tautophrasis* pioneered by Tallis (see pp. 39–41 above), perhaps suggesting that the composer is more likely to have been Richard Farrant, whose own Short Service is devoid of that technique, than the John Farrant of Salisbury whose Short Service leans heavily on it.[20] With its framework of alternating 5ths and 10ths, the climbing figure that forms the basis of the second half of the opening verse (see again ex. 4:4) is one of several that recall the schematic style of the anonymous early full anthem 'Rejoice in the Lord always' (MB 1/76). Fugal points occurring at vv. 5 and 7 likewise suggest the stiff manner of Tye, and are similar to the top-down, terraced sets of entries that open Richard Farrant's anthem

20 See TCMO 33, 54 and 62, and pp. 39–41 above.

'Call to remembrance' (the only passage of vocal *fuga* that can confidently be attributed to him).[21] Though Palmer sketched out only four of the five entries that presumably made up the first of the service's points (at 'throughout all generations'), it would appear that those entries were likewise arranged from the top down (beginning respectively on *f'*, [*c'*'], *f*, *c* and *F*), and that they were all timed at the utterly regular distance of four minims. The verbal text too hints at an early, perhaps even Edwardian date. Though the evidence of the organ part is ambiguous, v. 10 of the *M* may have incorporated the 1549 wording 'to our *fathers*, Abraham...', while the *ND* voice part contains a quite rare variant found only in certain printings of the 1549 BCP, 'before the face of all *thy* people'.

This combination of mid-century features strongly suggests a somewhat older composition than Byrd's Verse Service. Yet Byrd seems not to have drawn any ideas from Farrant's work beyond, perhaps, the notion of composing a service with an independent organ part. Rather, as we shall now see, the solo passages of the Verse Service can be connected with a number of the Elizabethan verse anthems discussed in the preceding chapter, while its choruses to a large extent develop the structural method laid down by Tallis.

4.2.1 Verse passages

Primary sources of the Verse Service are not especially scarce, but they are contradictory.[22] A complete musical text can be derived from Barnard's printed vocal parts and Batten's organ accompaniment (*Ob* MS Tenbury 791, ff. 17r–18v), three of the five verse passages being allocated by Barnard to Ctlc ('My soul doth magnify the Lord', 'He hath put down...' and 'Lord, now lettest thou...'), one to Md ('As he promised...') and one to a semichoir comprising Ctlc, Ctld, Mc and Md ('To be a light...'). But the MS sources do

21 See TCMO 60.

22 To the sources listed in SECM should be added *Ob* MSS Mus. e. 23–5 (Ct, T and B; see p. 50 n. 128) and the recently discovered Hellwis-Gell part-book (Ctd), which transmits only the choruses and the verse 'To be a light...'.

not all agree on the details of this scheme. The rubric 'for a man alone' appearing in four of the vocal MSS may indicate that in some earlier form the service might have allocated all its verses to a Ct.[23] In the incomplete set of part-books *Cpc* MSS 6.1–6, the verses 'As he promised...' and 'To be a light...' are respectively absent from the Md and Ct1d volumes, and the volumes to which they might have been allocated instead (Mc and Ct2d) are now missing.

More significantly, the post-Restoration organ-book and T part-book copied *c.*1663 by the Ely Cathedral organist John Ferrabosco (*Cu* MSS Ely 4 and 28)[24] include an otherwise unknown alternative setting, for T, of the verse 'He hath put down'. In Monson's opinion, this otherwise unknown variant is an authorized revision that may have been scored for Ct but was subsequently transferred to T on account of its low tessitura.[25] A precisely similar transfer is apparent in the Ely T book at the verse 'To be a light...'; the impression that Ferrabosco's choir was short of Ct singers is strengthened by the sporadic inner-voice cues he added to the bicinium framework of his organ part, which occur for the most part at moments when the harmony depends for completeness on the Ct2 part.[26] Nor is this the only seventeenth-century organ part to suggest that on occasion an organist covered for a missing voice in the choir. In *Och* MS Mus. 1001, the accompaniment to the *TD* from Byrd's Short Service consists of a bicinium with the Td part—but not the Tc part—added in darker ink; further items in the same volume have T parts added in a similar manner.

It is easy to see why Monson did not reject Ely's variant T verse out of hand, since several features do indeed suggest a considered reworking as opposed to an unauthorized substitution. The passage fits its surroundings well: it is precisely the same length as the

---

23 *Cpc* MS 6.4, f. 29r (Md); *Och* MS Mus. 1220, p. 98 (Ct1d); *Oj* MS 180, f. 134r (Bd); *Llp* MS 764, f. 2r (Bc). The editors of TCM 2 assumed the inscription 'a man alone' to be an error for 'a mean alone' (p. xxxii), but this seems unlikely given that only one verse ('As he promised...') is so scored.

24 For a partial facsimile of MS 4 see Monson, 'Through a Glass Darkly: Byrd's Verse Service as Reflected in Manuscript Sources', *Musical Quarterly*, 67 (1981), 64–81 (72–3).

25 BE 10a, pp. 180–81.

26 *M*, bars 25–7, 33–5, 37–8, 56–8 and 75–7; *ND*, bars 8–18 and 36–9.

Barnard–Batten version, and it terminates likewise with a full close on 'D'. The voice part begins by transposing the Barnard–Batten voice part down a 4th; its subsequent melodic contour is persuasive, peaking first on *b♭*, then *c'* and finally *d'*. A melisma on the penultimate syllable of the word 'exalted' is semantically apt, and parallels the occasional melismas in solo passages from Byrd's anthems.[27]

At the same time, it is hard to know what to make of Monson's intriguing observation that the first four bars of the Ely verse (bars 41–4) can be correlated to the hypothetical background of a perpetual canon.[28] The only certain things that can be said of these bars is that they are unusually periodic, and that the organ bass—effectively a series of four breves 'G' 'D' 'G' 'D'—of itself generates the kind of harmonic cycle in which such a canon might arise by chance. Indeed, Monson admitted that 'the conjectural canon ... may be more apparent than real' (p. 78): whether it is the cause or the effect of the bass-line is impossible to say. But no manner of subtle motivicity can be called to account for the accompaniment's uncharacteristically weak mid-verse cadence on a 6/3 chord; the ensuing interlude, furthermore, makes no reference whatsoever to the vocal phrase it serves to introduce (bars 46–7). The melisma, though certainly justified by the verbal text, is at odds with the uniformly syllabic text-setting of the service's other solo verses. While, with a range of *d–d'*, it would not have been beyond the lower reach of an Elizabethan Ct, its ascent to *d'* on the word 'exalted' would be rhetorically effective only for T, a voice-type for which solos are otherwise unknown in the Elizabethan verse repertory. On stylistic grounds, then, the case for attributing this variant solo to Byrd is equivocal at best.

---

27 See, for example, HearMPOL, bars 6–7.

28 'Through a Glass Darkly', 77–8.

Leaving aside John Bishop's mid-nineteenth-century transcription from Batten's organ-book,[29] just four MSS are known to contain accompaniments to Byrd's Verse Service. Only one of those MSS—Batten's organ-book—dates from before the Civil War; the others, in order of date, are Ferrabosco's organ-book, the score-book compiled by William Isaack of Eton and Windsor between 1677 and *c*.1684, and an organ-book copied in the 1750s for Christ Church Cathedral Oxford by William Walond sr. The versions of the opening verse of the *M* given in these MSS are shown in ex. 4:5 a–d.[30]

Of the three post-Restoration scribes, Isaack was probably best placed to obtain an authoritative exemplar for the Verse Service. Though his volume contains a number of pieces scored from Barnard's *First Book*, two full anthems by Byrd ('Prevent us, O Lord' and 'O Lord, make thy servant', ff. 26v–28v) derive directly from Henry Purcell's score-book *Cfm* MS 88, while the contemporary repertory reveals close connections with the Chapel Royal and Westminster Abbey. From a purely text-critical point of view, the accompaniment to the Verse Service given by Isaack is decisive, since it shows that, while each contains variants that could not have been copied from the other, both of them derive from a common ancestor.[31] It is furthermore clear that by stripping away from Batten's copy the notes not present in Isaack's, and from Isaack's copy the notes not present in Batten's, a two-voice framework remains that must have been the accompaniment's original basis (ex. 4:5e).

In positing a stylistic model for the service's verse passages, Monson turned not to contemporary church repertoire but instead to three of Byrd's five consort songs with

---

29 From a three-volume score of Barnard's *First Book*, compiled 1840–76, *Lbl* Add. MSS 30085–7 (MS 30086, ff. 140v–146v). The organ parts to the verse service and several other compositions are stated to derive from a MS belonging to Joseph Warren (i.e. *Ob* MS Tenbury 791); others are stated to derive from the Gloucester organ-books. Bishop was obliged to leave OLordRMN and Ps. 119:33–8 without organ parts, and regrettably he did not transcribe any Byrdian accompaniments that are unknown today.

30 (a) *Ob* MS Tenbury 791, f. 17r; (b) *Cu* MS Ely 4, p. 129; (c) *Cfm* Music MS 117, f. 341r; (d) *Och* MS Mus. 1227, p. R59.

31 The correspondence of Batten's and Isaack's accompaniments was not lost on Monson (BE 10a, p. 180); his decision not to draw any textual conclusions from it was presumably influenced by his opinion that Batten had provided nothing more than 'a scanty, drastically simplified shorthand score' ('Through a Glass Darkly', 71).

choruses (BE 15/1, 4 and 5; see pp. 138–9 above.).[32] It is indeed true that, like the Verse Service, those songs open with concise, largely homorhythmic introductions in which the only fugal element is a single pre-echo (in the highest or the lowest viol part) of the ensuing vocal phrase. As we saw in the Chapter 3, however, two-voice frameworks of the kind deduced in ex. 4:5e are characteristic of organ parts for almost all the verse compositions of known Elizabethan date. It furthermore emerges that, just as Byrd took Mundy's 'The secret sins' as his starting point for AlackWILB (see p. 212 above), he also took the same composer's 'Ah, helpless wretch' as the starting point for the Verse Service (*cf.* example 3:1c, from the third bar). In both pieces, the vocal part begins with Farrant's $\hat{1}\,\hat{3}\,\hat{4}\,\hat{5}$ motto; in both it is pre-echoed a 5th higher in the RH of the organ part; in both too the LH of the organ part follows a precisely similar trajectory. This undisguised homage to Mundy is doubly revealing, first because it establishes a genetic relationship between the service and anthem branches of the early verse repertory, and second because it marks out Batten's and Isaack's accompaniments as the true descendants of Byrd's original.

What, then, of the two other post-Restoration organ parts? Walond's, though broadly compatible with the voice parts printed by Barnard,[33] is in no way thematically related to them, and must therefore be a substitute penned by some anonymous organist for a set of voice parts that had circulated without the authorized accompaniment. It is understandable —if a little surprising in such an active centre of choral activity as Oxford—that organ and vocal parts could become separated in this way, given that organ-books and their associated vocal part-books were more often than not copied by different scribes, and that Barnard had failed to provide an organ part for his *First Book*. The lesson to be learned from Walond's MS, then, is that vocal parts of a verse service or anthem could, in isolation, spawn a bastard accompaniment.

---

32 'Through a Glass Darkly', 69–71.

33 Doubtless owing to scribal error, a rhythmic variant in the doxology of the *ND* is at odds with all known copies of the voice parts, including the part-books with which Walond's accompaniment was presumably intended to be used, *Och* MSS Mus. 1220–24.

Ferrabosco's organ part is less easily eliminated, not least because of the time-honoured authenticity it has gained through its adoption in Fellowes's widely circulated modern edition of the Verse Service (TCMO 24). Monson, like Fellowes, found its opening—a three-voice stretto on a telescoped version of the $\hat{1}\ \hat{3}\ \hat{4}\ \hat{5}$ motto—more compelling than Batten's solitary pre-echo. He was persuaded partly by a fourth, telescoped entry overlapping with the solo vocal part, and a pre-echo, also telescoped, of the voice part's $\hat{3}\ \hat{2}\ \hat{1}$ cadence figure.[34] This motivicity, together with the generally expanded form of the introduction and the presence of the melisma in the verse 'He hath put down...', led Monson to the conclusion that 'the Ely version, for all the difficulties of its date and lack of concordance with other earlier sources, embodies enough of Byrd's aesthetic preoccupations to suggest that it reflects, from some distance to be sure, his own second thoughts, perhaps from around 1590'.[35]

Introductory *fuga* is, of course, characteristic of many if not most of Byrd's published consort songs, especially the ten settings of metrical psalms that open the 1588 song-book. But in each of those pieces, the initial entry of the solo voice part completes an unbroken chain of entries begun by the instrumental parts. In Ferrabosco's opening verse, that principle is flouted: following the first three entries, which are dispatched in a mere nine minims, a further eight minims elapse before the subject is taken up again. The consonant 4th cadence that partly fills this hiatus (7/#3 – 6/4 – 5/4 – #3) is an idiom Byrd used only sparingly, and although Monson was able to cite several instances of it elsewhere in the composer's work,[36] these do not explain why it should occur so early on in the Ely introduction, in the middle of an exposition, and unconnected to any thematic activity.

---

34 'Through a Glass Darkly', 71–5.

35 'Through a Glass Darkly', 80–81.

36 'Through a Glass Darkly', 75 n. 11: see BE 11/10 (bar 29); BE 15/7 (bar 24), 14 (bar 21), 18 (bars 4, 9), 41 (bar 33); BE 16/29 (bars 12–13), 35 (bar 5); SingJ (bar 29); The Great Service (e.g. *M*, bar 218). Byrd also approached consonant 4ths otherwise than in conjunction with a suspended 7th: see, for example OGodWOO (bar 67) and The Great Service (*ND*, bar 5).

Furthermore, in the three minims that elapse following the cadence it is impossible to see anything other than padding.

Questions about the authenticity of fugal introductions have already been raised in connection with ThouGTG and BeholdOGTS, but further benchmarks against which to gauge the authority of the Ely accompaniment are provided by two settings of the *M* by Thomas Tomkins. That from the Fourth Service opens with a vocal phrase clearly modelled on Byrd's (ex. 4:6a), the only differences being its 5th-higher transposition, its concomitant reassignment to the M voice, the duration of its second note, and the relative pitch of its third note.[37] Its accompaniment, moreover, closely matches Byrd's deduced bicinium (*cf.* ex 4:4e), further developing Mundy's original outline. Though the cadence of Tomkins's accompaniment admits a third, inner voice, its basic design is the same as Byrd's, with basizans and cantizans components in the organ part enclosing the tenorizans component in the vocal part. Apparently, Byrd had not revised his introduction by the time Tomkins paid this detailed homage to it. In the unlikely event that, despite his obligations to Mundy, he ever felt the need to exchange his bicinium introduction for a fugal one, then it would surely have had the kind of thematic integrity displayed in Tomkins's Fifth Service, where yet another manifestation of the $\hat{1}\,\hat{3}\,\hat{4}\,\hat{5}$ motto is presented fugally without any telescoping and without a break in the chain of instrumental and vocal entries (ex. 4:6b).[38]

A final, more general reason for rejecting Ely's fugal introductions is that they are out of place in a composition that otherwise contains not a single passage of *fuga*. The same objection cannot be levelled at pieces such as Mundy's 'Ah, helpless wretch', where fugal relationships between accompaniment and voice are repeatedly developed within extended solo passages, or Tomkins's Fifth Service, where certain chorus passages are themselves

---

37 *Musica Deo Sacra* (London: William Godbid, 1668), medius, p. 35; pars organica, p. 68.

38 *Musica Deo Sacra*, pars organica, p. 87. The first note of the organ part to the *M* is unaccountably omitted in TCM 8 (p. 237), and is a step too low in the edition by Bernard Rose (London: Oxford University Press, 1959).

fugally constructed. Byrd, however, had effectively written a short service 'with verses to the organs' (to borrow Barnard's subtitle). If Batten's bicinium organ part appears 'too plain, too bare and straightforward';[39] then that is because Byrd's surest means of avoiding a stylistic conflict between the verses and their adjoining choruses was to exercise restraint.

While precedents for the Verse Service's solo passages can be positively identified only in the anthem repertory, links with strictly liturgical traditions are established through the construction of the choruses (to be discussed in the next section), the use of a high-voice semichoir in the *ND* (which parallels Byrd's Ps. 54 and similar mid-century psalm settings),[40] and a reference to the *tonus peregrinus* at v. 10 of the *M*. As in Ps. 119:33–8, the appearance of this distinctive melodic formula is unambiguous, but is all the more unusual for being restricted to a single verse. It is surely no coincidence, however, that the verse is question is 'As he promised to our forefathers: Abraham and his seed for ever', and that the tone is proper to the psalm 'When Israel came out of Egypt: and the house of Jacob from among the strange people'. As Lundberg explains,

> this isolated use of the *tonus peregrinus* can fruitfully be interpreted as a rhetorical figure signifying something ancient in general and the commandment of God in relation to Israel in particular.[41]

Musically, the tone fits its surroundings well, its characteristic semitone intonation *a*'–*b*♭'–*a*' having already been anticipated three times in the M part of three preceding choruses (bars 7–8, 19–20, 51–2). Yet Byrd could not achieve a comfortable *segue* into the ensuing doxology without supplementing the *d*' final of the chant with a full close on *c*', a measure Lundberg asserts to be unique (p. 181).

Here too there are significant differences between the two versions of the organ part. Ely articulates the join from the immediately preceding chorus via the colourful *passamezzo antico* progression (in this case 'A'–'F'), but its harmonic resources are

---

39 'Through a Glass Darkly', 69.

40 See pp. 129–30.

41 *Tonus Peregrinus*, 180–82.

exhausted by this manoeuvre, the ensuing eight-minim recitation on *a'* being accompanied by nothing more than a repeated triad of 'F'. The Batten/Isaack version likewise exploits the *passamezzo antico* progression, but as the culmination of a series of tangential harmonies attached to the *a'* recitation. As the M rises to *b♭'*, the accompaniment strikingly descends to a triad of 'E♭', resulting in a rapid traversal of the service's entire tonal spectrum. If the bare perfect consonances of the bicinium framework are editorially filled up as triads, the move from 'C♯' to 'E♭' is accomplished via a single intervening chord of 'F' (another reason, perhaps, for an editor to think twice before adding anything to this organ part). At any rate, the 'richer harmonic matrix' Monson claimed for the Ely version surely belongs in this verse to its contender.[42]

4.2.2 Choruses

As we saw in Chapter 1 (pp. 39–44), in his own Short Service—and, to a lesser extent, the Three Minims Service—Byrd borrowed from Tallis's work the novel technique of *tautophrasis*, whereby a single series of chords was made to serve for two consecutive verses or half verses of the prose text. Following another of Tallis's precedents, Byrd introduced at vv. 2–4 of his Short *ND* the 'leading-voice' texture whereby the M anticipates by two minims the homorhythmic movement of the lower parts. Both *tautophrasis* and leading voices play more significant roles in the chorus passages of the Verse Service than in any of Byrd's other settings of the evening canticles.

In certain respects Byrd's application of *tautophrasis* remains the same as in the other services. As shown in fig. 4:1, the adaptation of a single chord series to two verbal clauses of dissimilar length and accentuation still depends on the three devices of splitting (*ND*, phrase **G**^{2}), insertion (*M*, phrase **F**^{2}) and substitution (*M*, phrase **L**). Still too, these devices are used in combination (*M*, phrase **D**; *ND*, phrase **D**). Though they are not heard

42 'Through a Glass Darkly', 71.

consecutively, the two incipit verses of Byrd's canticles are related in the manner of *tautophrasis*, since it is the simple device of note-splitting that allows their common melody to serve as a head motive:

My soul doth magnify the Lord:

[Lord, now] lettest [thou thy ser]vant de[part in] peace:

In terms of *tautophrasis*, leading-voice texture, and even the notes of the M part, it is noteworthy that v. 2 of the *ND* is almost identical to the equivalent passage in Byrd's own Short Service (phrase **C**). Though there is no certain way of knowing which service borrows this material from the other, two apparently new departures in the general phrase structure of the Verse Service suggest that it is the later composition.

The first of these new departures is what might be called a more organic use of *tautophrasis*. In its most basic form, *tautophrasis* tends to be antiphonal because the required double iterations of a given phrase usually form the two halves of a dialogue between c and d. With the Verse Service, however, neither the sources nor the music itself offer any indications that c and d were ever assigned independent roles. Rather, the dialogic aspect, such as it is, has shifted to the four contrasting groups of Ct plus organ, M plus organ, semichoir, and full chorus. As a result, the chordal building blocks forming the *tautophrasis* are in general more compact than those of the Short Service. The effect is not so much that of repeated chordal phrases, but of chordal phrases made up of repetitions.

Instead of serving for two consecutive verses or half verses, the chordal phrases of the Verse Service more often than not serve for smaller chunks of text that are not grammatically self-contained (see phrases **C**, **D**, **F**, and **L** of the *M*, and **C**, **D**, **G** and **H** of the *ND*). The musical repetition is consequently more intensified than in Byrd's other services, especially at moments when the usual twofold iteration is exceeded. Phrase **L** of the *M* is stretched to five iterations (three of which are transposed); phrase **H** of the *ND*, at the end of its second iteration, returns yet again to its initial chord, hinting at an abortive

third iteration. Moreover, the latter phrase can be construed as a miniature perpetual canon, being formed from a short unit of double counterpoint between T (*g g f♯ g*) and M (*g' b♭' a' g'*); each half of this unit receives four iterations (two in each voice) and hints at an abortive fifth iteration.

Byrd's second new departure was to combine the repetition of chordal material with various degrees of transposition. Here we may distinguish between 'transposed *tautophrasis*', in which each iteration is adapted to its own portion of text, and pure sequence, in which words and music together are repeated at a new pitch level. As we saw in Chapter 1, though Tallis's Short Service had provided examples of the sequential treatment of all voice parts (exx. 1:8a–b), in his own Short Service Byrd rejected it in favour of a more flexible procedure governed by sequential treatment of the M alone. This particular facet of Tallis's technique would instead feed into the Verse Service.

One passage in particular of the older composer's Short Service (EECM 13/1) seems to have caught Byrd's attention (*V*, bars 54–62). A series of four chords repeats itself a 3rd higher, and then begins to repeat itself again, a 3rd higher still, before breaking off into fresh material that culminates in a cadence. The entire construction then serves again for a further half-verse of text:

d		Forty years long
	+3	was I griev-ed
	+3	with this…
		[gene][rati]on and said:
c		It [is a] people
	+3	[that do] err [in their] hearts
	+3	for they…
		have not known my ways.

Here we see not only a harbinger of the organic kind of *tautophrasis* that characterizes the Verse Service but also its use in combination with transposition. In the Three Minims *M*, Byrd had made a single chordal phrase do duty for the four consecutive half-verses of vv. 2–3 (see fig. 1:3, phrase **B**). Now he set the corresponding verses with a similar economy

of material, but shifted it a 3rd higher at the third iteration, and a 2nd higher again for a fifth and final iteration (see fig. 4:1, phrase **C**). In contrast to Tallis's two shifts of a 3rd, Byrd's scheme offers a more graded scheme of harmonic contrasts: whereas the initial shift of a 3rd retains two common degrees in each transposed triad ('D'+'F'+'A', for example, becomes 'F'+'A'+'C'), the ultimate shift of a 2nd retains no common degrees ('F'+'A'+'C' becomes 'G'+'B'+'D'). Clearly this was a method for Byrd, since the series of cadences arising from his treatment of phrase **C** is precisely replicated in his subsequent treatment of phrase **F**. The common transposition sequence (+3, +2) will be recognized from the opening of the *M* of the Short Service (see ex. 1:10d).

Tallis's most extended passage of transposed *tautophrasis* occurs in his setting of the *Cr*, where a single phrase (cadencing on 'D') is reiterated first a 2nd lower (cadencing on 'C'), then a 3rd lower than that (cadencing on 'A'), and finally a further 2nd lower (cadencing on 'G'); these fourfold iterations are then rounded off with a freshly composed phrase (cadencing on 'D'). All this music is assigned to d alone, and in the ensuing response from c the whole of it is adapted to fit the next portion of the verbal text. In this manner, a passage of quite remarkable length ('And was crucified...' up to '...whose kingdom shall have no end', bars 36–57) is formed from only two short chordal phrases, one of which serves no fewer than eight times.

For all Tallis's ingenuity, this passage does little to impel the music forwards because, unlike the example from the *V* quoted opposite, the transposition works exclusively and repeatedly downwards. At the end of his *M*, however, a comparable passage of descending *tautophrasis* serves more appositely to bring the movement to a halt (bars 64–75). Here, the chordal phrase is heard twice at the first pitch level (cadencing on 'A') and twice again at the next level (cadencing on 'F') before being heard once at its ultimate level (cadencing on 'D'):

Glory be to the Father,
and to the Son, and (to the Ho)ly Ghost.
–3 As it was in [the be]ginning,
is now and ever shall be;
–3 world without end. A-a-men.

Byrd, in contrast, opted for a more leisurely winding-down at the end of his Verse *ND* (phrase **K**). The second iteration is anything but a straightforward transposition of the first; rather, some considerable shuffling of the parts is involved. In the first iteration, the perpetual canon hinted at by M and T at the start of the doxology is developed in those voice parts to a canon at the lower 8ve that is sustained from bar 33 to bar 36 (albeit with a little stretching of the T rhythm as the cadence at bars 35–6 is approached). In the second iteration, the same canon rematerializes at the unison in the two Ct parts, its former upper and lower voices now respectively transposed down a 5th and up a 4th. Fragments of ancillary counterpoint from the first iteration are rearranged to create the B and T parts, while the M is assigned what can most simply be described as an inverted tonic pedal.

Nor was this the only time Byrd allowed himself the luxury of repeating a line of text. In the *M*, the third iteration of phrase **I** incorporates a textual repeat purely to accommodate the climactic transposition scheme described above (+3, +2), while phrase **O** undergoes three iterations which rise successively by step (the first of which, to avoid predictability, is harmonized somewhat differently from the other two). All three textual repetitions signal a move away from the ritualistic ethos of *tautophrasis* and towards musical repetition of a more rhetorical kind. The influence acting on these passages, then, is no longer that of functional liturgical music; it is instead that of the motet.

The humanistic aspect extends to a modicum of musical metaphors, including a brief canon at the lower 5th between M and Ct2 to symbolize the words 'which thou hast prepared' (*ND*, bars 14–19). In this respect, two further differences may be noted between between the two versions of the *M* verse 'He hath put down…'. Though the voice parts of both versions illustrate the sense of those four words with the downward leap of a 4th, the

Batten–Isaack accompaniment complements this with a sudden downwards shift of the modal axis of the organ bass (*G g g d d g G d d g f f c f*). And although, as we have seen, the Ely version treats the word 'exalted' suitably to a rising melisma, the ensuing cadential figure takes the voice part to the very bottom of its range. In contrast, the Barnard version, sets 'the humble and meek' at the very top of the vocal range, thereby emphasizing, with the semantic precision typical of Byrd, the objective sense of the whole verse.

In certain respects the Verse Service's harmonic colourings are similar to those of Byrd's Short Service. Cross-relations can occur where phrases abut one another; these result most frequently from a switch to the minor triad on the same degree, but occasionally from a shift between major triads lying a minor 3rd apart. One instance of the former case occurs where a verse abuts a chorus (*M* bars 50–51); two further such instances occur only if, on the terminal chord of the verse, a major 3rd is added to the bicinium framework of the organ part (*M* bar 6; *ND* bars 7–8).

Harmonic contrasts figure less prominently in the Verse Service, however, than do harmonic clashes. Out of fifteen full closes, ten are of the 5/4/3 cluster type, of which seven include a cross-relation between the natural and raised forms of the local $\hat{7}$. Possibly too, simultaneous false relations involving *B*♭ and *b*♮ arise from contrary-motion scales in the B and Ct2 parts (*M*, bars 56–7), although the primary sources are not absolutely unanimous about accidentals in this passage.[43] To Monson, Byrd's 'almost obsessive use of the false relation' was evidence of 'immaturity',[44] yet the frequency of these cadences can partly be put down to the effect of *tautophrasis*, which in phrase **C** of the *M* is responsible for the fivefold iteration of a 5/4/3 cluster. Furthermore, in contrast to the recurrent English cadences of the fragmentary Peterhouse service (see p. 27 above), which in the prevailing

43 In the *Lcm* copy of Barnard's printed Bd part-book (shelfmark D4, f. 71v), a diesis has beed added before each of the *B*♭s in this passage, thereby eliminating the false relations with Ct2 (BE 10a, p. 181). These are, however, later additions as opposed to print-shop manuscript corrections: see Daniel Bamford, 'John Barnard's *First Book of Selected Church Musick*: Genesis, Production and Influence', 3 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of York, 2009), vol. 2, p. 453.

44 BE 10a, p. xi.

four-part texture serve a purely decorative purpose, the five-part cadences of the Verse Service are to some extent warranted by what Morley termed a 'lack of other shift'[45]—or at least by a lack of more sonorous alternatives.

Not only at the cadences, but throughout the choruses, the sometimes rugged counterpoint of the Verse Service recalls that of the Three Minims Service, again raising the possibility that the choruses may be adaptations of cleaner, four-part originals. Parallel perfect consonances are in one case mitigated by nothing more than the commencement of a new phrase; elsewhere they are narrowly circumvented by rests (in one instance as short as a crotchet) and by passing notes or a brief intermittent consonance (in two instances as short as a quaver).[46] Yet although it is easy to re-imagine most of the chorus passages in the blameless four-part idiom of much of Byrd's Short Service, to do so is to rob the Verse Service of an essential aspect of its character. If the voice parts have indeed come down to us in their original form, then it can only be concluded that for Byrd, contrapuntal niceties were trifling in comparison to the large-scale concerns of polyphonic composition.

Within the still experimental medium of the verse service, it took a sure sense of design to bring solos and choruses into a happy coexistence. Byrd seems to have measured his materials with some precision, fashioning half of his service (264 minims) from *tautophrasis*, a quarter of it (135 minims) from freely composed choruses, and the final quarter (134 minims) from verses. Perhaps the chief means whereby these assorted phrases link themselves into a chain of compelling musical argument is the metamelody—Byrd's over-arching and continuously strategic tunefulness. In the *M*, the highest note of phrase **A** (*f*') is taken up in the M part of phrase **B** as the starting point for a further ascent (to *b*♭'). In phrases **C**[1] and **C**[2], the local summit temporarily recedes a step (to *a*') before reaching a new height in phrases **C**[3] and **C**[4] (*c*"), and a still higher one in phrase **C**[5] (*d*"). A two-stage

45 *Introduction*, 154.

46 See *M* bar 8 (T+Ct2), 27–8 (T+Ct1), 35 (Ct1+M) and 55–6 (B+T); *ND* bars 14 (B+Ct1) and 31 (B +Ct1).

descent is achieved (via *c*" to *b*♭') in phrases **D** and **E**, where the notes of phrase **D** (*c*" *g*' *a*' *g*' *e*') leaves two scalar gaps that are immediately filled by the highest and lowest notes of phrase **E** (*b*♭' *a*' *g*' *f*' *e*' *f*'). The same upper limit (*b*♭') remains in force for phrases **F**, **G** and **H**; again it recedes a step (to *a*') in phrase $\mathbf{I}^1$ before rising higher (to *c*") in phrase $\mathbf{I}^2$ and higher again (to *d*") in phrase $\mathbf{I}^3$. The overall upper contour of phrases **F–I** thus echoes, in slower motion, that of phrases **B–C**.

Wherever one looks for melodic logic in this composition, one finds it. Though a natural break in the vocal metamelody occurs with the switch from chorus back to Ct verse at phrase **J**, the organ part (both versions of it, in fact) creates a sense of continuity by spinning out the tonal material of the foregoing cadence. In the M verse based on the *tonus peregrinus*, phrase **L**, the two recitation degrees *a*' and *g*' look respectively backwards to phrase **K**, where in both scalar and rhythmic terms *a*' has been the most prominent note, and forwards to phrase **M**, where the M part opens with its own mini recitation on four *g*'s. In the *ND*, the 5th (*d*'–*a*') separating the last note of phrase **A** from the first M note of phrase **B** is immediately filled in by the succeeding notes of the M (*g*' *e*' *f*♯'). The list could go on.

The conclusions to be drawn from the present study of Byrd's Verse Service are that it was probably not the earliest work of its kind, that contradictions among its sources can by and large be resolved on text-critical and stylistic grounds, and that its choruses and—almost certainly—its verses have clear antecedents in the music of older composers. The mid-century characteristics discernible in the Durham fragments strongly suggest that Richard Farrant composed a verse service of sorts long before Byrd did. But this older composition appears not to have been influential. Once the distractions of the Ely organ part are removed, it becomes clear that Byrd's innovation was simply to apply to service music a manner of verse composition that was distinguishable in important respects from consort genres, and that was becoming—or had indeed already become—stereotypical for

the composers of Elizabeth's chapel. Though Byrd's incipit verses re-echo in Tomkins's Fourth Service (and, with lesser degrees of distinctness, in a host of other subsequent settings of the evening canticles), it is at least equally significant that they themselves are re-echoes of anthems by Richard Farrant and William Mundy. Here, then, as so often elsewhere, due obeisance to senior colleagues seems to have been among Byrd's highest priorities.

CHAPTER FIVE

LATE WORKS IN THE FULL IDIOM

ExaltTOG	'Exalt thyself, O God'	BE 11/2
OGodTP	'O God, the proud are risen against me'	BE 11/4
SingJ	'Sing joyfully unto God our strength'	BE 11/10
	The Great Service (*V*, *TD*, *Bs*, *Ks*, *Cr*, *M*, *ND*)	BE 10b

5.1 Unifying elements

As the natural successor to the polyphonic mass in England, the Anglican service inherited certain of the mass's cyclic aspects. *Cantus firmus* and parody techniques may have gone by the board, but other unifying attributes held: the same final, signature, and basic vocal scoring for all movements, perhaps a pervading technical feature such as chordal homophony or canon, and sometimes (as for example in Sheppard's First Service)[1] a recurring opening phrase that in the context of a mass would now be dubbed a 'head motive'. All the movements of The Great Service (apart from the *Ks*, that is, where the musical possibilities are constrained by liturgical considerations) open with related passages for various four-voice semichoirs. While it is tempting to regard these openings collectively as a kind of head motive, they consist of much more than a common phrase adapted to six different texts. To be sure, they are all scored with two M parts and without B, and they all take as their point of departure a chord of 'C' topped by the note *g'*. Thereafter, however, every opening up to that of the *M* yields a fresh succession of chords, and in the place of a common melody we find instead a recurring, abstract melodic idea: truly a motive in the strictest sense of the term.

Except in the *TD*, each opening assigns to one of the M parts a melodic curve peaking on *c''*. In the *V*, both the ascent and descent are made via *b'*; in the *Bs*, *M* and *ND*, however,

1 Edn in Stefan Scot, 'The Vernacular Music of John Sheppard: An Introduction, Edition and Commentary' (unpublished masters thesis, University of Exeter, 1991).

the ascent is via *b'* and the descent to *a'*, while in the *Cr* the ascent is via *a'* and the descent to *b'*. It is the Mc part that makes the first opening inflexion to *c''*, and only when it has done so in all three possible ways is the opening inflexion transferred to the Md part. Why neither M part touches *c''* in the opening bars of the *TD* becomes perfectly clear when the preceding plainsong incipit is taken into consideration, for it will have supplied precisely the melodic curve that is missing from the polyphony at this point. The distribution of the curve's three forms across the six openings thus follows exactly the kind of plan we would expect from Byrd: never formulaic yet always logical:

mattins	*b'–c''–b'*, *a'–c''–b'*, *b'–c''–a'*
communion	*a'–c''–b'*
evensong	*b'–c''–a'*, *b'–c''–a'*

Related schemes like these, with variety among the three mattins movements and similarity between the two evening canticles, apply also to aspects of technique, modulation and vocal scoring. The two M parts are accompanied in the mattins movements first by two Ct parts, next by two T parts, and then by a Ct and a T. As if having passed an audition, this final grouping is retained for the communion and evensong movements. The mattins movements open with freely varied chordal textures which, although they all begin with a similarly arranged chord of 'C' and pass through a chord of 'G' somewhere along the way, nonetheless all arrive at their own individual closes: two plagal, one full; another two in 'C', another one in 'A'. The *Cr* opens with yet another free chordal progression of which the *tenorizans* close on 'G' is different again. In the evening canticles, however, the lower voices that have hitherto merely provided harmony now assume the apparently primary roles of guide and consequent, and enhance the expressiveness of the M curve to *c''* by leading it into a full close in 'D'. These last two openings are in many respects similar, yet the spinning out of the latter one with longer notes and rests decisively turns the mood from jubilation to lyricism.

It was Edmund Fellowes who first noted the frequent occurrence in the Great Service of a motif he suggested might derive from the chant incipit of the Sarum *TD* (*e g a c' b a*).[2] The exceptional absence of Byrd's basic curve from the opening polyphony of the *TD* strongly suggests that the incipit itself was the germ of Byrd's melodic curve. As Kerry McCarthy has observed, 'a chant quotation, even a brief and symbolic one, has a normative status that gives authority to the new composition that surrounds it'.[3] This particular incipit certainly did that, for it was one of the rare vestiges of Sarum chant to linger on in post-Reformation polyphony.

Approximately 60% of The Great Service consists of phrases with a M part based on one of the three forms of the curve (instances from the *V* are shown in ex. 5:1). The *b'–c"–b'* form accounts for roughly 25%, the *a'–c"–b'* form roughly 20%, and the *b'–c"–a'* form roughly 15%. That the M part should reach the upper limit of its official modal ambit so frequently (and over-reach it so infrequently) results in one of the service's most pervasive tonal characteristics. The fixation on *c"* would surely grow monotonous were it not that the three forms of the curve are conscientiously rotated, Byrd seldom using the same one more than twice in succession, and never more than three times in succession.

The pre-Restoration practice of composing anthems for use with particular services was first registered in modern times by Fellowes, who observed that Weelkes's *M* for Five Voices and his anthem 'O how amiable' share an identical concluding 'Amen'. Peter le Huray also noted 'links of a similar kind' between the same composer's Ninth Service and 'O Lord, arise'. and his Trebles Service and 'Alleluia';[4] John Morehen subsequently validated more than a dozen further pairings by Batten (five), Child (three), Deane (three), Gibbons (one) and Weelkes (two).[5] All the anthems concerned are in the same key, as their

---

2 Edmund Fellowes, *William Byrd*, 2nd edn (London: Oxford University Press, 1948), 125.

3 *Liturgy and Contemplation in Byrd's* Gradualia (New York and London: Routledge, 2007), 170.

4 Peter le Huray, *Music and the Reformation in England, 1549–1660*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 309.

5 'The "Burden of Proof": The Editor as Detective' in *English Choral Practice*, ed. Morehen (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995), 200–220 (211–15).

respective 'parent' services, and employ the same vocal resources; some also share similar polyphonic material.

On the basis of madrigalian elements in their stylistic make-up, and particularly the presence in all three of paired S or M parts, Craig Monson grouped together ExaltTOG, OGodTP and SingJ as the composer's three final contributions to the full anthem genre.[6] Like the motet 'Laudibus in sanctis' (1591/1+2), Monson observed, OGodTP and SingJ open with a high-voice semichoir passage with two medius parts, the entry of the bass part being delayed until the ensuing passage. Though there are no extant sources for the opening of ExaltTOG (see p. 269 below), there are firm reasons to believe that this anthem too opened with its upper voices alone.

Perhaps not to risk of stating the obvious, Monson left it unsaid that all three anthems are in the low key of C fa ut. This is, of course, the key of the Great Service, whose movements other than the responsorial *Ks* all begin in the manner just described: high voices (including paired M) followed by full choir. Except in the special case of the *TD*, which observes the old custom of a 'sharp' ending,[7] the opening and closing sonorities of every movement of the service and all three anthems emphasize the scale degrees 'C' and 'G' (ex. 5:2). The 'Third' Preces and Responses, which as was suggested in § 1.1.2 may also have been composed in conjunction with The Great Service, similarly close on the *C–g'* sonority at 'Praise ye the Lord' and the final 'Amen'. Fortuitous though that may be, Byrd was not bound to a particular closing sonority in the key of C fa ut: his other vernacular compositions in that key (the two canticles of the Three Minims Service and ThouGTG) all end on the sonority *C–e'*.

---

6 'Authenticity and Chronology in Byrd's Church Anthems', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 35 (1982), 280–305 (292–3, 304).

7 See John Aplin, 'The Survival of Plainsong in Anglican Music: Some Early English Te-Deum Settings', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 32 (1979), 247–75 (275). Of eleven Tudor and Jacobean *TD* settings analysed by Aplin, four end with a cadence on $\hat{3}$.

Though tradition seems not to have required shared material in service-anthem pairings, the openings of both evening canticles are closely paralleled by the first full-choir entry of SingJ, this being signalled particularly by a chromatic ascent from *f'* to *f♯'* (ex. 5:3). The connection was not lost on the Durham scribes Henry Palmer and William Smith, who both rounded off their respective organ parts to The Great Service with this anthem.[8] While the other two anthems are connected to the service neither by shared material nor by scribal authority, a motivic connection is nonetheless evident in the three forms of curve peaking on the note *c"*. All three types of phrase are similarly represented in each of the anthems (ex. 5:4).

5.2 Sources and datings

As we saw in Chapter 2, the apparent stylistic evolution of Byrd's earlier full anthems is in broad terms corroborated by their earliest surviving sources, all of which are Tudor domestic collections. HelpUOG and HowLSME first appear in MSS begun in the 1570s, OLordMTS, PreventUOL and AriseOL in MSS of the 1580s, and OGodWOO in a lute-book of the 1590s. The more advanced style of the three late full anthems, however, is corroborated only by their complete absence from Elizabethan sources, and, indeed, from any Jacobean sources known to date from earlier than 1616. SingJ, entered by Thomas Myriell in part-books dated that year (*Lbl* Add. MSS 29372–6), was widely copied thereafter by institutional and domestic scribes, and has more surviving primary sources than any of Byrd's other anthems. The same cannot be said of its two companions, however, neither of which is represented in any domestic sources or in Barnard's *First Book*. Although OGodTP reached most of the principal choral foundations, ExaltTOG seems hardly to have circulated at all, and would today be mere fragments were it not for the chance survival of a score, albeit incomplete, in the hand of Nathaniel Tomkins.

---

8 *DRc* MSS A1 (pp. 134–69) and A2 (the once independent fascicle now forming pp. 130–161).

This score is for some reason present in *WO* MS A.3.3, a miscellany of T parts in various seventeenth- and eighteenth-century hands. The T part of the anthem is among them, also in Nathaniel's hand, as too are the Tc and Td parts of The Great Service, split where necessary onto two staves in the manner Nathaniel adopted in the part-books of *Musica Deo Sacra* to obviate the considerable expense of producing separate volumes for c and d. Though it has been stated that the score's first page or folio is missing,[9] this is somewhat misleading, for it is clear that Nathaniel only commenced writing the score at bar 21. He did so because rests in the T part are incorrect, and the only way to correct them was to score all six parts from a point up to which he was sure they contained no errors. He used barlines, curling these around notes in the neighbouring bar when the T part was misaligned. Curiously, having completed this exercise, he left the individual T part's incorrect rests unaltered, meaning that although a corrupt copy of the anthem reached Worcester, it may well never have been sung there.

It is only by an even more remarkable stroke of good fortune that the whole of ExaltTOG may quite confidently be recovered from Nathaniel's score, since of all Byrd's full anthems this happens to be the only one to conclude with a reprise of the opening material (a circumstance evident from Nathaniel's T part and from two unattributed B parts in the singleton part-books *Oj* MS 180 and *Y* MS M29(S)). From the twenty-one bars thus repeated towards the end (bars 80–100) can be reconstructed the twenty not copied by Nathaniel, while the first bar he did copy shows something that would not otherwise have been evident: that between the original opening and the reprise there was an exchange of material between Mc and Md, and likewise between Ctc and Ctd. It remains only for an editor to decide whether to include in the opening the 'non-entry' of M1 at bars 82–3, and which words to use for the entry of the T.[10]

---

9 'Exalt thyself, O God', ed. Peter James (Oxford: Oxenford Imprint, 1981), p. 9; BE 11, p. viii.

10 Monson and James decided both these details differently.

Despite the lack of sources from before 1616, there is evidence that SingJ had been composed by 1605. An account, entered in the Chapel Royal cheque book, of the christening of James's daughter Mary at Greenwich in May of that year states that after the godparents made their offerings '[there] followed a full anthem (Sing joyfully)'.[11] Since no other anthem with that incipit is known to have been in the repertory of the Chapel Royal, this was in all probability Byrd's. At that time it may even have been quite a new composition, for its pointed mention of 'the God of Jacob' can have been calculated only to honour the new king.[12] While no particular occasion for ExaltTOG suggests itself, Byrd could hardly have made a more dignified musical response to the gunpowder plot than with the words 'O God, the proud are risen against me, and the assemblies of violent men have sought my soul, and have not set thee before them. But thou, O Lord, art a pitiful God, and a merciful, slow to anger, and great in kindness and truth.'

If the Great Service was the 'parent' piece of the three anthems, by how long does it predate them? In Monson's view, it 'seems to reflect most consistently the musical preoccupations of the 1580s', and represents 'the crowning achievement of two decades of creativity in the Chapel Royal'.[13] That very period, however, saw the culminations of a number of Byrd's other major projects, and it is hard to imagine that My Ladye Nevells Booke, the song-books of 1588 and 1589 and the *Cantiones Sacrae* of 1589 and 1591 can have left him with nearly enough time for a composition on the Great Service's vast scale. Much more plausibly, such time would have been available to him during the ten-year gap that separates the publication of the three Masses in 1592–5 and the two books of *Gradualia* in 1605 and 1607. While this conjecture amounts to a quite radical re-ordering

---

11 *The Cheque Books of the Chapel Royal, with Additional Material from the Manuscripts of William Lovegrove and Marmaduke Alford*, ed. Andrew Ashbee and John Harley, 2 vols (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), vol. 1, p. 95.

12 See Monson, 'Authenticity and Chronology', 293, and Richard Turbet, 'Joyful Singing: Byrd's Music at a Royal Christening', *The Musical Times*, 145/1 (Spring 2004), 85–6.

13 BE 10b, p. vii.

of the Byrd canon, it is nonetheless supported by a fresh examination of the service's oldest extant sources.

It has long been recognized that the oldest part-books to contain The Great Service are those forming the York Minster set MSS M13/1–5(S), dated *c.*1618 by le Huray and all subsequent scholars.[14] As we shall now see, however, a reassessment of these important sources leads to the conclusion that they were most probably copied some twenty years earlier. A revised date of *c.*1598 is the outcome of two significant findings by Brian Crosby: the first is his identification of the Durham precentor the Revd John Todd (bur. 3 January 1631 new style) as one of the copyists, *inter alia*, of the service-books *DRc* MSS E4–11;[15] the second is his discovery of a barely legible entry in the York dean and chapter acts for 20 November 1597 that is clarified by the following marginal comment:

> A[d]missu[m] Joha[nnis] Todde clerici in vicaria[m] chorale[m] Ecclesiae Ebor[acum][16]

Though this record cannot be proved to apply to the same John Todd, it fits the known fact that 5s was allowed for the purchase of a psalter for the scribe of that name at Durham in December 1599. This Todd was first mentioned as a minor canon in the Durham treasurer's roll for 1598–9, and received payments for copying music there in 1600, 1627 and 1630. Despite the long gap in this payment record, his presence at Durham is fully accounted for during the whole period, not least by the parish records he kept as rector of St Mary-le-Bow from 1605 until his death.[17] Moreover, everything that can be established about the

---

14 See Peter le Huray, 'Towards a Definitive Study of pre-Restoration Anglican Service Music', *Musica Disciplina*, 14 (1960), 167–95 (185); John Morehen, 'The Sources of English Cathedral Music, *c.*1617–*c.*1644' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1969), 98; BE 10b, p. 151. A date of *c.*1620 is given in 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* (New York: Garland, 1993), 188, 417.

15 'The Choral Foundation of Durham Cathedral, *c.*1350–*c.*1650', 2 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Durham, 1992), vol. 1, p. 238, vol. 2, pp. 121–3.

16 *Y* MS H4 f. 333v; I am indebted to Brian Crosby for the transcription of the marginal comment; the entry itself is in an almost entirely illegible secretary hand, although Todd's name can be made out.

17 Crosby, 'The Choral Foundation of Durham Cathedral', vol. 2, pp. 270–71.

five York service-books accords with their having been copied by him during a limited period spent at the Minster in the late 1590s.

This exceptional set of part-books has proved unusually resistant to modern scholarly enquiry. Searches of the Minster archives conducted by John Morehen (covering the first three decades of the seventeenth century) and Ian Payne (extending back to the last two decades of the sixteenth) turned up no records conclusively relating to the set's copying,[18] while a more recent study by Daniel Bamford likewise uncovered no decisive evidence external to the volumes themselves.[19] Nor is the set's subsequent history entirely clear, for its five currently known members have not always resided together. The Md volume (MS M13/1) is perhaps one of the items referred to in a shelf-list dated 1775, and is definitely listed in another dated 1831.[20] That this volume was accessible in the nineteenth century is clear from an undated remark pencilled on the flyleaf by the Victorian music antiquarian Edward Rimbault: 'Medius Decani part of services by Mundy, Robt Parsons, Shepperd &c (temp. Eliz) probably one vol. of a set in use at the Minster'. Two further volumes (Ctld and Bc, MSS M13/2–3), the blank leaves of which had been used for the Minster's registers of baptisms, marriages and burials from the mid seventeenth century to the early eighteenth,[21] were recognized as members of the part-book set only in 1964;[22] and two more (Td and Bd, MSS M13/4–5) emerged from private ownership in 1978.[23]

---

18 Morehen, 'Sources', 101–3; Payne, *Provision and Practice*, 65, 75. A payment of 40s 'for pricking books for the quire' made to Valentine Glorie, and recorded in the Fabric Roll for 1607, was rejected by Morehen on grounds of its date ('Sources', p. 103); in any case, at the 1633 Durham Cathedral copying rate of 4d per page this amount would have covered only 120 pages, and the surviving members of the York set comprise 451 pages. See Crosby, 'The Choral Foundation of Durham Cathedral', vol. 1, p. 277.

19 'The Music of York Minster, *c*.1616–*c*.1625: A Study of the Music Manuscripts *GB-Y* M13/1–5 (S)' (unpublished masters thesis, University of York, 2004).

20 David Griffiths, *A Catalogue of the Music Manuscripts in York Minster Library* (York: York Minster Library, 1981), 79.

21 These two volumes thus still also go under their archives shelfmarks of S2(1)b and S2(1) respectively.

22 Morehen, 'Sources', 98.

23 BE 10b, 151.

Though it had been known to Rimbault, the Md book remained in obscurity, evading the TCM editors in the 1920s,[24] and escaping notice in Jack Pilgrim's 1958 summary of the Minster Library's music holdings.[25] When in 1960 le Huray finally described it in print, he gave the shelfmark as M18, not M13.[26] These points need to be stressed because in 1948 Fellowes had published a description of a part-book, unquestionably belonging to the set, that he stated had come to light in the Minster Library in 1946.[27] Fellowes's description, however, does not precisely match any of the five members now among the library's catalogued holdings.

Fellowes gave no shelfmark for the volume in question, presumably because one was still wanting. Having stated it to be a Mc book, he went on to make the apparently contradictory assertion that it contained the Ctlc part of the *V* and *TD* of The Great Service. He gave the date unequivocally as 1620, whereas the dates added to the surviving Md book are all 1618 or 1619. Indeed, the only particular he gave that could apply to the Md book—that 'several names of choristers and of lay clerks ... have been inscribed on the blank pages, both at the beginning and the end of the volume'—might plausibly have applied also to some other member of the set, particularly a M book. Though brief, his comments imply he had paid the volume close attention:

> In every detail the text [of The Great Service] agrees with the large folio book at Durham, but it is the only known text of that voice-part besides that of the Durham MS. (p. 12)

Was Fellowes referring to a Mc part or a Ctlc part? Neither of those voice parts for the *V* and *TD* was—or still is—known otherwise than from the large folio volumes *DRc* MSS E5 and E7 or the slightly smaller MS E11a. Were Fellowes in fact referring to the Md part in MS M13/1, he would at the time have been correct to state that that part was otherwise

---

24 The set is absent from the list of sources for The Great Service given in TCM 2, p. xxxiii.

25 'The Music of York Minster Library', *The Musical Times*, 99 (1958), 100–101.

26 'Towards a Definitive Study', 185. MS M18 is an eighteenth-century single folium, the autograph vopy of a psalm-tune by E[dward] F[inch]: Griffiths, *Catalogue*, 84.

27 TCM appendix vol. with supplementary notes (London: Oxford University Press, 1948), 12.

known only from *DRc* MS E4 because *Cpc* MS 6.4 was still undiscovered. But erroneously to describe a Md book as a Mc book containing a Ct1c part would imply a lack of rigour hardly to be expected from a scholar of Fellowes's experience. The possibility, first raised by Morehen,[28] that the volume Fellowes described had been found and was subsequently lost again is perhaps corroborated by one further curious circumstance. Pilgrim identified the Dunnington-Jefferson MS with the shelfmark M29(S), implying that the shelfmark M13 had already been assigned by 1958. His failure also to identify a volume with the latter shelfmark, not to mention le Huray's use of another shelfmark for the Md book, is thus all the more mysterious.

The volumes contain three to seven services (see table 5:1), all represented as complete, seven-movement cycles except the last one to be entered, which was The Great Service. The emphasis on Edwardian or early Elizabethan repertoire is striking: a collection supposedly copied in 1618 might reasonably be expected to include services by Giles, Tomkins, Weelkes and Gibbons, but appearing instead are four mid-century settings by Sheppard Robert Parsons and William Mundy. Amid this venerable company, Morley appears quite the new boy, and the service by which he is represented mixes the morning canticles and *Cr* from his First Service in D sol re with the evening canticles in G sol re ut which circulated more widely as his Second Service.[29] It is surprising too that the scribe completed the liturgical cycle for Morley but not for Byrd, contrary to these two composers' relative standing.

The scribe began with blank leaves onto which he ruled staves a few pages at a time. In certain cases (for example MS M13/3, p. 28), he clearly ruled the staves to fit around his own decorative initial majuscules. He appears to have entered the words and music

---

28 'Sources', 114–15.

29 That Morley's First Service circulated somewhat in its York form is implied by *Och* MSS Mus. 1220–24, which likewise transmit the *TD*, *Bs* and *Cr* in D sol re in combination with the *M* and *ND* in G sol re ut (although the proper *M* and *ND* appear a few pages later in these MSS). The organ-book *Och* MS 1001 places the *M* and *ND* in G sol re ut immediately before the *TD* and *Bs* in D sol re, and omits the *M* and *ND* in D sol re.

simultaneously or very nearly so. His work on the volumes clearly fell into three distinct layers. Layer one consisted of the three services by Parsons and Mundy, which are present in all five surviving volumes with the running headers 1, 2 and 3 in Arabic numerals. Some of these headers have been partially cropped, indicating binding subsequent to copying;[30] and it is this layer alone which shows signs of wear and tear, and to which MS additions and corrections have been made. Layer two consisted of the services by Sheppard and Morley, which are present in only four of the surviving volumes without running headers and in a slightly browner ink. Layer three consisted of The Great Service, which appears in only three of the surviving volumes and reaches no further than the end of the *TD*.

The five currently known books provide a complete enough picture of how things stood at the moment their copyist abandoned them. The *Ks* from Parsons's First Service were initially omitted from the Ctld and Td books, and these omissions were made good in the form of hurried entries in the lower page margins, possibly in another hand.[31] The Bc book was ready for layer two, for several pages of blank staves follow Mundy's First Service. Elsewhere, the scribe had already moved on to layer three, but this too he left dramatically incomplete. In the Bd book, Byrd's *TD* breaks off abruptly at 'Day by day we magnify —',[32] the page-turn occurring at that point being succeeded by a single opening of unused staves. Clearly, the copying of this set was interrupted.

Once abandoned by their copyist, the York service-books can at the very most have contained complete, usable vocal parts for the three services of their first layer. The only indications that any of them might have been put to official use are occasional appearances of the marking 'vers:' in the first layer only of the Md book, at points where decani sing alone. Though Morehen suggested that the set might have been 'brought out only on

30 Bamford, 'The Music of York Minster', 47–8. MS M13/4 appears to have been rebound or at least repaired at some point, f. 10 now being placed between ff. 12 and 13.

31 MSS M13/2, pp. 32–3; M13/4, ff. 16v–17r; see Bamford, 'The Music of York Minster', 46–7.

32 MS M13/5, f. 51r.

important occasions',[33] certain details strongly suggest that the whole of it may never have brought out at all. All books other than the Md one are devoid of 'vers:' markings, while in the Td book two correction slips, both in the original hand, remain wedged into the spine, neither of them, it seems, ever having been glued permanently in place.[34] Furthermore, in 1618 the usual apparatus that would help singers find what they were looking for—an index, a complete set of running headers, even page or folio numbers—was apparently still wanting.[35]

In addition to its 'vers:' markings, the Md book contains copious unofficial annotations in various hands, some of them childish. 'A more chaotic essay in "doodling",' Morehen declared of the flyleaves, 'is not to be found in any liturgical part-book of the period.'[36] These pen trials, lists of names and random jottings are nonetheless of considerable value, for their inclusion of two lists of the Minster choristers, respectively dated 1618 and 1621, confirms the volume's York provenance.[37] Other annotations are confined to the three services of layer one: these include a receipt scrawled in the margin of p. 4 that clearly has nothing to do with the copying ('received of Mr Emondson[?] the sum of xii s', dated 7 August 1618), a note on p. 13 accompanying the *Cr* from Parson's Second Service ('10 of June 1618: this Creed was sung') and the date '9 of August 1618' at the head of Mundy's *Cr* on p. 50. Morehen's suggestion that the last of these annotations likewise records an actual performance date must be rejected;[38] for as Bamford pointed out, '9 of August' is prefixed to the *Td*, *Cr* and *M* of each of the first three services in the part-book (pp. 4, 13, 17, 24, 33, 36, 43, 50 and 53), and the same choir would hardly have performed all these movements on a single day.[39] Rather, the real significance of these dates would seem to be

---

33 'Sources', 113.
34 MS M13/4, between ff. 16 and 17, and ff. 18 and 19.
35 The current pagination (MSS M13/1–3) and foliation (MSS M13/4–5) are modern.
36 'Sources', 100.
37 See Bamford, 'The Music of York Minster', 23–5.
38 'Sources', 101.
39 'The Music of York Minster', 43–4.

that by the time they was added no one cared what was written on MS M13/1, or by whom it was written. In other words, by 1618 the volume was in all probability no longer a newly copied one.

A connection between the York service books and those at Durham has long been recognized on the basis of their common repertoire. Of the eight services contained in MSS M13/1–5(S) and the six in MSS E4–11, movements from five are common to both (Sheppard's First, Parsons's Second and Morley's Second appearing only in the former, and Giles's First only in the latter). That the relationship between the two sets must be an indirect one is obvious from the two versions of The Great Service: the York version cannot derive from Durham because the Durham version dates from the 1620s, while the Durham version cannot derive from York because the York version was never finished. The same may also be said of Morley's service: the York version is entitled Service for Means, and amalgamates the evening canticles elsewhere designated as Morley's Second Service, while the Durham version alone is entitled First Service, and contains the proper evening canticles in D sol re. By collating the concordant pieces Morehen and Bamford confirmed that neither part-book set could have been copied from the other, but proved also that the two copies of The Great Service are irrefutably derivatives of a common exemplar (the exact correspondence of the M parts has already been noted).[40]

One detail of The Great Service supplied by the York MSS, however, is to be found neither at Durham nor in any of the service's other sources. In the Td book, at the top of the page on which the *V* begins, the original scribe wrote this prominent inscription:

> Heere follow[e]th Mr Birds new service for meanes:[41]

He added similar inscriptions in the Md and Bd books:

---

40 Morehen, 'Sources', 104–110 (following TCM 2, Morehen referred to MS E4 as E9); Bamford, 'The Music of York Minster', 70–82.

41 MS M13/4, f. 46v; spelling original.

Heere followeth Mr. Birds new sute of service for meanes:[42]

Mr. Birds new sute of service for meanes:[43]

The term 'sute', meaning suite or set, is unusual or even exceptional in a MS of this kind, especially given that the movements entered are by no means a finished liturgical set. Possibly the scribe identified the service in this way so that anyone taking over his unfinished business would know that a *Bs* at least was available, and that a suite for mattins could be completed. It would only have been necessary for him to do so, however, if the service were indeed 'new' and still relatively unknown, a circumstance some scholars have found hard to reconcile with the assumed copying date of 1618.[44] Judging by that date, Morehen repudiated the term 'new' on the grounds that some three decades after the death of Nathaniel Giles a service by him was so styled by a Windsor copyist, who presumably took the title New Service from an outdated exemplar.[45] Yet although a common exemplar clearly served both the York and Durham copies of The Great Service, the term 'new' is attached to none of the latter.

The knowledge that a John Todd was a member of the choral foundation of York for a few months from November 1597 is a perfect fit for the missing piece in the puzzle Morehen and Bamford were obliged to leave incomplete. To be sure, Bamford observed that the hand of MSS M13/1–5(S) is 'reminiscent of the hand of the precentor of Durham Cathedral, John Todd', and it is certainly true that the York and Durham part-books are uncommonly neat, presentation MSS copied formally and impersonally. Comparison of parallel readings of a passage from Byrd's *TD* (illus. 5:1a–b) nonetheless shows Morehen's description of the notation in both MSS as 'identical' to have been no exaggeration.[46] (As

---

42 MS M13/1, p. 99.

43 M13/5, f. 49r.

44 In le Huray's view, however, the York inscription implied that the service was of 'a comparatively late date': *Music and the Reformation in England*, 237.

45 'Sources', 101 n. 2. Giles died 24 January 1634; his 'New Service for Verses' was so headed in *WRch* MSS 1 (p. R29) and 3 (p. R30) after 1660.

46 'Sources', 100.

Morehen further noted, both readings of this passage fail to slur two notes for the word 'in', a clearly corrupt reading which is made good at the equivalent place in MS E5,[47] the Mc volume copied by Toby Brooking.)

The only significant discrepancy revealed in illus. 5:1a–b is calligraphic: the lettering of MS M13/1 is compact and somewhat slanted, with looped ascenders and descenders on the 'h's, whereas that of MS E4 is stiffer, perpendicular, and characterized by more deliberate pen-lifts. The combination of diamond noteheads with looped lettering used in the York books is not to be found in any of the Durham MSS copied by Todd, yet the same looped lettering does appear in combination with rounded noteheads in MS C18 (*cf.* illus. 5:2a–b). (It was not unusual for scribes of the period to switch between diamond and rounded noteheads, sometimes even within the same MS.)[48] A further calligraphic York-Durham correspondence worth noting is that of the striking outline majuscules (illus. 5:3a–b), which have a stencilled appearance, and are conspicuous by their absence from Brooking's c volumes MSS E5, 7, 8, 10 and 11.

If it is posited that Todd copied the service-books at York *c.*1598, then this explains their many anomalies. They contain no Jacobean repertory for the simple reason that they are Tudor MSS. They include Morley's evening canticles in G sol re ut because at the time of copying the composer, still with three or four years to live, might not have yet written the canticles in D sol re that would assume their proper place in later copies of his First Service.[49] They were left unfinished because their scribe was called away to a new appointment. They were scribbled on in 1618 because, following their scribe's departure, arrangements had not been made to have them completed, and they were by then considered defunct. Their readings of The Great Service were later reproduced at Durham

---

47 'Sources', 106.

48 Craig Monson, *Voices and Viols in England, 1600–1650: The Sources and the Music* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1982), 24–27, 134–5. The scribes in question are Thomas Myriell and John Merro.

49 For exceptions see n. 29 above.

because the scribe took with him to Durham his own Great Service exemplar.[50] Most of all, their wording 'new sute' need not be explained away as an anachronism, but may instead be taken at face value.

The possibility that The Great Service was 'new' in 1598 is not contradicted by the only surviving pre-Restoration source to include any of service in score, for which we are indebted to the singer, composer and copyist John Baldwin (d. 1615). Baldwin was a lay-clerk at St George's Chapel Windsor from 1575, and it is not unlikely that a direct commission from Byrd, while he was resident at nearby Harlington, lay behind the copying of *My Ladye Nevells Booke*, the celebrated collection of forty-two of the composer's keyboard pieces which Baldwin finished transcribing in September 1591.[51] Though the material Baldwin is known to have copied for the Windsor choir in the 1580s is no longer extant,[52] further examples of his hand survive in Dow's part-books (to which he added items 53–4), in the Forrest-Heyther part-books *Ob* MSS Mus. Sch. e. 376–81 (where he restored a damaged portion of the Sextus book), and in two collections of his own compiling that are among the most important sources of Latin music by English composers: the part-books *Och* MSS 979–83 and the 'commonplace book' *Lbl* MS R.M. 24.d.2.

Though the last of these MSS contains madrigals, motets and a quantity of light secular pieces, its first layer resembles the commonplace books of Renaissance students of rhetoric in that Baldwin gathered within it a hoard of vocal and instrumental pieces in score.[53] It

---

50 It has been observed by Bamford that the watermark (Strasburg arms, shield with bend, fleur-de-lis above) of all five MSS dates their paper to 'the early seventeenth century' ('The Music of York Minster', 38, 43). Though the date of *c.*1598 would be close enough to that period, this common watermark (Briquet no. 995) has in fact been cited in maps printed by Christopher Saxton *c.*1590–1600, in *Lbl* Add. MS 31853 (dated 1595) and MS Harley 6159 (dated 1598). See Edward Heawood, 'Sources of Early English Paper-Supply II: The Sixteenth Century', *The Library*, 4th series, 10 (1929–30), 427–54 (430).

51 Hilary Gaskin, 'Baldwin and the Nevell Hand' in *Byrd Studies*, ed. Alan Brown and Richard Turbet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 159–173 (163).

52 Gaskin, 'Baldwin and the Nevell Hand', 159.

53 See Roger Bray, 'British Library, R. M. 24 d 2 (John Baldwin's Commonplace Book): An Index and Commentary', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 12 (1974), 137–51 (138–47).

was thus in the spirit of study and curiosity that he entered in this layer passages from the *TD* and *Bs* of The Great Service, together with a parallel passage from the *Bs* of Sheppard's Second Service. From an adjoining holograph *In nomine* dated 1606, it is clear these items were among the very last he added to the volume, the bulk of his work on it apparently having been completed between 1586 and 1591. The ramifications of copying six-voice scores on pre-ruled ten-stave pages prompted Baldwin to contrive an irregular page layout (see table 5:2); by doing so, however, he left little doubt that the last two Great Service excerpts were copied after the 1606 *In nomine*.

Being strictly for five voices, excerpts 1 and 2a could be entered straightforwardly on two systems per page. That pattern, however, had to be abandoned both with excerpt 3, which Baldwin mistook for a passage culminating in six parts, and with excerpt 4, which is in six parts throughout. Baldwin duly added a single extra staff in the lower margin of ff. 83v and 84r, started excerpt 3 on the top five staves of f. 84r, and finished it in the lower half of f. 83v, marking the added staff 'gimell'. Though convoluted, this solution reveals forethought, for if Baldwin had begun excerpt 3 on the lower system of f. 83v (i.e. directly following excerpt 2), not one but two extra staves would have been needed on f. 84r, for which the margins were too small.

Next, having started excerpt 4 on the lower system of f. 84r, Baldwin filled up the top six staves of ff. 84v, 85r and 85v with the residue of excerpt 4 and the parallel passage by Sheppard, leaving four vacant staves at the foot of each page. Though this space (or at least the first page and a half of it) would have perfectly accommodated the four voices of excerpt 5, Baldwin instead used it for his own five-voice *In nomine* (again adding an extra staff in the lower margin of all three pages), and entered excerpts 5 and 2a on f. 86r. Apparently, then, excerpts 1, 2a, 3 and 4 were entered earlier than the 1606 *In nomine*, and excerpts 5 and 2a were entered subsequently.

The sections of The Great Service that interested Baldwin are all specimens of extended *fuga* and formulaic counterpoint. From the *TD*, he selected the two most substantial points together with their introductory homophony (excerpts 1 and 3); from the *Bs*, he selected a passage in strict canon (excerpts 2a and 2b), the central motet-like paragraphs (excerpt 4), and a passage almost in canon (excerpt 5). The only non-trivial difference between excerpts 2a and 2b is that, presumably to make the canon between Ct1 and T easier to read, in excerpt 2b those two voices are placed next to each other, Ct1 exchanging staves with Ct2. Excerpt 3, notwithstanding Baldwin's careful efforts to fit it into the available space, is seriously corrupt. Had he looked at the Tc and Mc part-books he would have realized that this passage contains not one gymel but three, causing the number of voice-parts to increase gradually from five to eight. Shorn of two voices, Baldwin's score in several places lacks essential imperfect consonances, and even includes an ungrammatical 6/4 chord (bar 74, minim 3).

More noteworthy, though, is that Baldwin restricted his Great Service excerpts to the *TD* and *Bs*. Understandably, there was little to interest him in the *V*, which contains hardly any developed *fuga*, or the *Cr*, which is made up largely of the kind of polychoral textures he had passed over in the *TD*. The *M* and *ND*, however, are richer even than the *TD* and *Bs* in precisely the sort of motet-like counterpoint that clearly appealed to him. Why, then, did Baldwin not enter excerpts from those movements on ff. 86v–89r of his commonplace book, instead of leaving those six pages to be filled in by a later hand? Surely not because exemplars were inaccessible to him, for in addition to his contact with Byrd through the Nevell project Baldwin had since 1598 been a Gentleman of the Chapel Royal. Quite possibly, then, the reason he excerpted nothing from the evening canticles of The Great Service was that in 1606 those canticles did not yet exist.

5.3 Musical Style

5.3.1 Fuga *and rhetoric*

We have already drawn on the historical vocabulary of musical rhetoric to account for two processes in Byrd's music for which no widely recognized modern term exists: the tendency for successive blocks of the polyphonic framework to shift upwards by steps (the *auxesis* figure), and *fuga* in which not every one the sounding voices is assigned an entry proper (the *anaphora* figure). It hardly needs to be repeated that this terminology is Joachim Burmeister's and would probably have been familiar to Byrd only in its application to literary figures. The mere existence of such terminology nonetheless proves that the German theorist and the English composer were equally well aware of common idioms in the continental motet repertory. There are furthermore positive indications that certain of Byrd's English contemporaries postulated an association of some sort between music and rhetoric. Whether in general or specific terms, the pursuit of that association is fruitful for making sense of the sophisticated polyphonic language of The Great Service and its three anthems.

Though Morley, like contemporary theorists in Italy and France, never formally worked out the music-rhetoric association, his remark that 'your plainsong is at it were your theme, and your descant ... as it were your declamation' shows that he could conceptualize contrapuntal discipline in terms of the speech-maker's art.[54] Indeed, in Byrd's lifetime England came a close second to Germany in doing just that;[55] although the process was begun in the opposite direction from that taken by Burmeister, in explications of literary figures that alluded to music, rather than explications of music that alluded to literary figures. Henry Peacham the elder, whose celebrated rhetoric treatise was first published in 1577, compared *traductio* (frequent use of a particular word) to 'pleasant repetition and divisions in music', the more 'peaceable and quiet' instances of *articulus* (separation of

---

54 *A plaine and easie introduction to practicall musicke* (London: Peter Short, 1597; STC 18133), 86.

55 Gregory G. Butler, 'Music and Rhetoric in Early Seventeenth-Century English Sources', *The Musical Quarterly*, 66 (1980), 53–64 (53).

words by commas, as in a list) to 'a semibreve in music', and the more 'pleasant' manifestations of *epizeuxis* (contiguous repetition of a word) to 'the quaver in music'.[56]

These correlations are technically as crude from a musical point of view as some of Burmeister's are from a literary point of view. Yet in the hands of Francis Bacon they were developed with considerably more musical intelligence, and in the music-rhetoric direction. Bacon postulated that 'there be in music certain figures or tropes, almost agreeing with the figures of rhetoric', and went on to liken specific musical idioms to 'affections of the mind and other senses': 'division and quavering' to the glistening of light on water, 'triplas and changing of times' to 'changes of motions', and 'falling from a discord to a concord' to 'the affections, which are reintegrated to the better after some dislikes'. When overused, the last-named idiom was like 'the taste, which is soone glutted with that which is sweet alone'. Most specifically, Bacon declared 'reports and fugues [to] have an agreement with ... repetition and traduction' (a more technically cogent correlation of *traductio* than Peacham's), and accorded 'sliding from the close or cadence' (i.e. Zarlino's 'fuggire la cadenza' and Morley's 'false close') the status of a 'trope of music' equivalent to the figure of *praeter expectatum* (deceiving expectation).[57]

Of all the English rhetoricians, however, it was Bacon's contemporary Henry Peacham the younger who came closest to Burmeister's *Figurenlehre*:

> Yea, in my opinion, no rhetoric more persuadeth, or hath greater power over the mind; nay, hath not Music her figures, the same which rhetoric? What is a revert but her *antistrophe*? her reports, but sweet *anaphoras*? her counterchange of points, *antimetaboles*? her passionate aires but *prosopopoeas*? with infinite other of the same nature.[58]

---

56 *The garden of eloquence conteining the most excellent ornaments, exornations, lightes, flowers, and formes of speech, commonly called the figures of rhetorike* (rev. edn, London: R. F. for H. Jackson, 1593; STC 19498), 48–9, 57. The musical meaning of 'quaver' is unclear here: according to Butler (Music and Rhetoric, 55), it means 'shake' (i.e. trill?); according to Claude V. Palisca, it means vibrato see 'Ut oratoria musica: The Rhetorical Basis of Musical Mannerism', in Palisca, *Studies in the History of Italian Music and Music Theory* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 282–311 (294).

57 *Sylua syluarum: or A naturall historie In ten centuries* (London: J. H. for William Lee, 1627; STC 1168), 38.

58 Henry Peacham the younger, *The compleat gentleman fashioning him absolute in the most necessary & commendable qualities concerning minde or bodie that may be required in a noble gentleman* (London: F. Constable, 1622; STC 19502), 103; see Butler, 'Music and Rhetoric', 57–60.

A word of caution is necessary here, for *antistrophe* is actually a variant term for *epistrophe* (the ending of two or more otherwise different clauses with the same word or words). Peacham seems to have meant to liken *revert* (a fugal answer in contrary motion) to *anastrophe* (a syntactical inversion),[59] which under its alternative name *hypallage* Burmeister too had likened to the same musical process.

It is not only Peacham's malapropism that reveals him to have drawn these parallels independently of any German theorist. His likening of *anaphora* (the commencing of two or more otherwise different clauses with the same word or words) to the report (Morley's fugal answer in direct motion) is arguably more fitting than Burmeister's likening of that figure to fugal repetition in some but not all of the voices. Peacham was furthermore the only rhetorician to equate *antimetabole* (exchange of grammatical order) with any musical device,[60] and as a term for double counterpoint it too is arguably more fitting than Burmeister's *metalepsis* (the clarifying of one thought with another).

Peacham also anticipated by nearly three decades any continental theorist's classification of *prosopopoeia* (personification) as a musical figure.[61] The English rhetorician George Puttenham had described this literary ornament as occurring 'if ye will attribute any humane quality, [such] as reason or speech, to dumb creatures or other insensible things...'.[62] Presumably, the human quality assumed by Peacham's 'passionate aire' is affection—a quality Burmeister confined to the related figure *pathopoeia* (arousing the emotions), and which he imputed to the emphasizing of a scale-degree not belonging to, or not normally prominent within, the mode.[63] Burmeister's citations of this figure all

---

59 The error was pointed out in Brian Vickers, 'Figures of Rhetoric/Figures of Music?', *Rhetorica*, 2 (1984), 1–44 (25–6).

60 Butler, 'Music and Rhetoric', 59.

61 The first and only continental theorist to classify *prosopopoeia* as a musical figure was Athanasius Kircher in 1650; see Dietrich Bartel, *Musica poetica: Musical-Rhetorical Figures in German Baroque Music* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 106, 360.

62 Puttenham, *The arte of English poesie* (London: Richard Field, 1589; STC 20519.5), 200.

63 Burmeister, *Musical Poetics*, ed. and transl. Benito Rivera (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 174–5, 278–82; Bartel, Musica poetica, 359–62.

show Lassus's use of flatted scale-degrees for such verbal phrases as 'mori dignatus est' (worthy to die), 'crudelem mortem' (cruel death), 'dolose agebant' (acted deceitfully), 'Mulier quid ploras?' (Woman, why do you weep?) and 'et flebant' (and wept). Byrd likewise introduced accidental 'B♭'s at moments when the texts of the Great Service and its anthems allude to affections ('Through the tender mercy of our God', 'great in kindness and truth'), and he did so most prominently at the service's affective high-point ('And was crucified also for us, under Pontius Pilate he suffered').[64] In addition to these instances of *pathopoeia*, Byrd's 'B♭'s also suggest *prosopopoeia*, since they are most frequently deployed in clauses that refer to groups of persons ('the house of his servant David', the 'Apostolick Church', 'the face of all people').[65]

Byrd's contemporary rhetoricians—German and English—were untroubled by modern semiological concerns about music's lack of meaning. The inherently rhetorical properties of music are likewise axiomatic in modern Byrd criticism. Joseph Kerman has written of the late Tudor 'passion to make music match the quality of the word, phrase, sentence, sonnet, or psalm: to make music rhetoric'.[66] Philip Brett has described *decorum* (appropriateness) as 'the governing aesthetic principle' of Byrd's time, claiming for it a musical importance that 'cannot be too greatly stressed, for it explains many things that elude our ready comprehension'.[67] In an analysis of Byrd's lament for Tallis, 'Ye sacred Muses', Mike Smith has listed as rhetorical its various musical characteristics of unity, repetition, contrast, and 'avoiding the obvious'.[68] Yet these scholars have tended to invoke rhetoric in the eclectic, Aristotelian sense of 'discovering the possible means of

---

64 *Bs*, bars 153–4; OGodTP, bars 62–5; *Cr*, bar 48.

65 *Bs*, bar 22; *Cr*, bar 99; *ND*, bars 22–30.

66 Kerman 'Byrd, Tallis, and the Art of Imitation', *Aspects of Medieval and Renaissance Music, ed. Jan LaRue* (New York, 1966), 519–37 (537).

67 'Word-Setting in the Songs of Byrd', *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, 98 (1971–2), 47–64 (61).

68 '"Whom Music's lore delighteth": Words-and-Music in Byrd's *Ye Sacred Muses*', *Early Music*, 31 (2003), 425–35 (432–3).

persuasion',[69] an objective that can be tackled with whatever critical method lies to hand. 'Sooner or later,' wrote Kerman, 'Byrd always brings in a third semitone, a B♭ or an E♭ which artfully lacerates the modal purity.'[70] Smith went as far as to describe the effect of an accidental 'B♭' as 'heart-stopping'.[71] To invoke rhetoric in the epistemological sense, and introduce to both these cases the connotations of *pathopoeia* or *prosopopoeia*, probably comes closer to a late-sixteenth-century understanding.

As well as filling gaps in the modern critic's vocabulary of terms, the figures serve as a reminder that classical rhetoric regarded ornament as an indispensable component in persuasive speech. In the context of Elizabethan Protestantism, a religious oligarchy with factions deeply suspicious of elaborate music, musical ornament took on a heightened significance. Just as a literary figure is, in Quintilian's words, 'that which is poetically or rhetorically varied from the simple and immediately available means of expression',[72] so too the musical figures can all be seen as departures, in texture or in effect, from the four-voiced, homorhythmic counterpoint that under various Reformation ideologies had established itself as the normative medium of sacred music. And it is from that medium—the 'simple and immediately available means of expression' of the metrical psalm and the short service—that The Great Service so manifestly departs.

Kerman lamented that 'analysis of 16th-century music remains pretty helpless in the description or appreciation of mixed textures, though these often seem to hide tantalizingly the composer's highest art'.[73] These 'mixed textures' are persistently a feature of The Great Service and its anthems, and at the most basic level may be understood as the integration

---

69 Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, I.2; English translation from *The 'Art' of Rhetoric*, ed. and transl. John Henry Freese (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926), 15.

70 Kerman, 'Byrd, Tallis, and the Art of Imitation', 532.

71 Smith, '"Whom Music's lore delighteth"', 433.

72 '... quod sit a simplici atque in promptu positio dicendi modo poetice vel oratorie mutatum.' *Institutio oratoria*, IX.1.14; English translation from *The Orator's Education, Books 9–10*, ed. and transl. Donald A. Russell (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001), 16–17.

73 Kerman, 'On William Byrd's "Emendemus in melius"', *The Musical Quarterly*, 49 (1963), 431–49 (434).

of *fuga* and homophony. A short passage from ExaltTOG is a case in point (bars 22–6, ex. 5:5), for although the focus here is on an exchange between the two M parts, all of the lower voices manage one way or another to assimilate the basic shape of that exchange. To be sure, the melodic intervals are flexed, and the rhythms stretched, almost beyond recognition, and the 'entries' do not necessarily serve to bring in voices that have been absent from the texture. The motivicity here, indeed, is of the purely decorative kind we have already encountered in the adapted consort anthem OLordRMN (see ex. 3:10). Yet *fuga* nonetheless remains the guiding principle, for since each 'entry' peaks either on 'G' or 'D', it may surely be identified as a subject or an answer.

One of Burmeister's figures may conveniently be called upon to explain a common occurrence in Byrd's homophonic passages, whereby some of the voices enter in close stretto but go on freely to flesh out the ensuing harmony rather than to complete entries *per se*. That figure is *apocope* (the shedding of a final syllable), and Burmeister instantiated it with a passage from a motet by Lassus that makes for telling comparison with similar passages by Byrd (ex. 5:6a–b).[74] All of Lassus's voices enter with a minor 3rd descending, and three of Byrd's with a minor 3rd ascending. Thereafter, however, each voice goes its own separate way, with Byrd's trio neatly using up the three possibilities of descending (T), staying put (Ct1) or ascending (B).

Another figure may go some way to explaining the final point of SingJ ('and a law of the God of Jacob', bars 54–70). Here Byrd invoked musical canon as a symbol of lawgiving, arranging his subject and answer in a close stretto at the 5th between Ct2 and Md. At the same time, he doubled the answer at the lower 10th in the B, an ornament Burmeister equated with *parembole* (the insertion of supplementary matter), and for which the more obvious modern term 'shadowing' has been offered by John Milsom.[75] In this

74 RRMR 133/17.

75 Burmeister, *Musical Poetics*, 176–9, 291; Milsom, 'Crecquillon, Clemens, and Four-Voice *Fuga*' in *Beyond Contemporary Fame: Reassessing the Art of Clemens non Papa and Thomas Crecquillon*, ed. Eric Jas (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), 293–345 (345).

case, however, the *parembole* takes on a life of its own, for while there are five entries on 'C' (subjects), there are as many on 'A' (relative subjects, for want of a better term), two of which do not 'shadow' subjects but occur independently (T, bar 56; Md, bar 60). While there is only one entry on 'G' (an answer), there are two on 'E' (relative answers), one of which again occurs independently (B, bar 66). Nor was this enough variety for Byrd, for it is also possible to identify one entry (Ct2, bar 57) that, had it not been flexed, would have begun on 'F' (a subdominant answer), plus two further independent ones (T, bar 59; Mc, bar 66) beginning on 'D' (relative subdominant answers). Thus, while the basic stepwise movement of the subject remains little altered, it may be said to appear in this passage on every diatonic scale degree except 'B'.

Though not strictly in Burmeister's sense, the literary figures offer a way of thinking laterally about Byrd's fugal technique, a technique which, as we saw in Chapter 2, became steadily more flexible as his style matured. Perhaps, indeed, *fuga* with literal, unyielding entries had become for Byrd the correlate of *tautologia*—the elocutionary vice Peacham the elder illustrated with the words 'if you have a friend, keep your friend, for an old friend is to be preferred before a new friend, this I say to you as your friend'.[76] Even the three simplest figures of varied repetition—*anaphora*, *epistrophe* and *symploke*, all of which would have been instantly recognizable to educated Elizabethans—can be called upon to rationalize some of Byrd's bewildering fugal freedoms in The Great Service, and can readily be instantiated from Coverdale's Great Bible psalter. In terms of pitch class, there is a fundamental formal resemblance between the pair of fugal entries shown in ex. 5:7a (*Bs*, bars 31–5, where both voices begin their entries on 'C', but end respectively on 'C' and 'G') and *anaphora*, the figure defined by Peacham the elder as 'a form of speech which beginneth diverse members still with one and the same word':[77]

---

76 *The garden of eloquence*, 49.

77 *The garden of eloquence*, 41, Peacham also used the variant term *epanaphora*.

> Praise him in his noble acts:
> praise him according to his excellent greatness. (Ps.150:2)

Similarly, the pair of entries shown in ex. 5:7b (*Bs*, 173–8, where the voices begin respectively on 'E' and 'A', but both end on 'D') resembles *epistrophe*, 'a figure which endeth diverse members or clauses still with one and the same word':[78]

> Behold now praise the Lord:
> all ye servants of the Lord. (Ps:134:1)

Again, but now in terms of melodic shape, the pair of entries shown in ex. 5:7c (*M*, bars 29–31, where both voices begin and end similarly, but each behaves differently on its second and third notes) resembles *symploke*, 'a form of speech which maketh many members or clauses following to have the same beginning and the same ending which the first had going before, comprising both the last ornaments in one':[79]

> O give thanks unto the Lord for he is gracious:
> and his mercy endureth for ever.
>
> O give thanks unto the God of all gods:
> for his mercy endureth for ever. (Ps:136:1)[80]

'This figure,' continues Peacham, 'may serve to any affection, and is a singular ornament, pleasant to the ear, which of some is called the rhetorical circle, and of others the musical repetition.'[81]

Byrd's increasibly flexible approach to *fuga* gradually led to the almost complete exclusion from his music of prefabricated, self-developing material such as strict canon and regular invertible counterpoint. What remains is an elusive polyphony of compulsory invention, hard to rationalize either melodically or contrapuntally because its subjects are constantly in a state of flux. There is thus a sense of relief in the discovery that certain

---

78 *The garden of eloquence*, 42; Peacham used the variant term *epiphora*.

79 *The garden of eloquence*, 43.

80 The use in this psalm of *anaphora* and *symploke* was noted by Peacham the younger (*The compleat gentleman*, 97). His omission of *epistrophe* can be ascribed to the same cause as his misunderstanding of *antistrophe*, noted above.

81 *The garden of eloquence*, 44.

passages of *fuga* in The Great Service can be rationalized harmonically, but which is meant they can be shown to have been written around periodic, chordal plans.

One of the most remarkable passages in the whole service occurs in a six-voice section of the *M* modelled on the corresponding passage of Robert Parsons's First Service, and likewise scored without T parts. Byrd set the words 'he hath scattered the proud' as a point with ten entries (bars 92–8), which for ease of comparison are shown stripped of ancillary counterpoint in ex. 5:8. With the exception of entry 4—which begins by inverting strong and weak minims, and doubles the lengths of the third and fourth notes—the rhythm never changes. Beyond that, their only common characteristic is contour: of the six melodic intervals that make up each entry, intervals 1, 2 and 5 invariably rise, while intervals 3, 4 and 6 invariably fall. There, however, consistency ends.

At least some tweaking of the entries is, of course, only to be expected when, in such a short space of time, so many of them are heaped on top of one another. To be sure, the point begins sparsely, with the initial subject-answer pair being separated by four minims, perhaps because both entries have to be fitted in with the residual counterpoint of the preceding point. Entries 3–10, however, come thick and fast, at distances of one or two minims. So dense is the activity here that entry 5 constantly overlaps with at least three other entries, while entry 7 likewise momentarily overlaps with four.

The scarcely avoidable melodic diversity among these entries would surely be a recipe for fugal anarchy were it not that, like those of the point quoted from ExaltTOG above, a majority of them are firmly anchored to $\hat{1}$ and $\hat{5}$. Entries 1, 5 and 6 peak on pitch-class 'C' (subjects), while entries 2, 3, 4, 7 and 9 peak on pitch-class 'G' (answers). In this context, then, special attention must be paid to the exceptional entries 8 and 10—which by peaking respectively on pitch-classes 'D' and 'A' divert the point from its established modal profile. Indeed, it is these two entries that will reveal the surprising architecture concealed beneath this extraordinary point's seemingly haphazard surface details.

Entry 8 begins life as an exact copy of entry 5 before crucially adjusting the peak-note from *c*" to *d*". Not only does this adjustment mark the first significant departure from the 'C' mode; it also marks the first significant departure from melodic variation simply for the sake of stretto. For this particular variation between entries 5 and 8 cannot be attributed merely to the necessity of fitting in with another entry. On the contrary, it is possible only because it is accompanied by a corresponding variation between two other entries.

These corresponding variations are much more obvious when the score is rearranged as in ex. 5:9, with entries 1, 2 and 4 omitted, entries 3 and 5–9 sorted into two groups of three, and the mutable intervals marked with chevrons.[82] Group A is formed from a polar stretto between Bc and Md (entries 3 and 5). Here, interval 6 of entry 3 (a falling perfect 5th) coincides with interval 2 of entry 5 (a rising minor 2nd) to articulate the chord progression 'G'–'C'. The common pitch-class of these two chords, 'G', is taken by Ct1c as the first note of entry 6. Group B is formed initially from the same polar stretto, now between Bd and Mc (entries 7 and 8). Here, however, interval 6 of entry 7 (now adjusted to a falling perfect 4th) corresponds with interval 2 of entry 8 (now adjusted to a rising minor 3rd) to articulate the chord progression 'G'–'D'. The common pitch-class of these two chords, 'D', is taken by Ct1d as the first note of entry 9.

It would have been contrapuntally viable for the stretto first presented by entries 3 and 5 to have been repeated verbatim by entries 7 and 8. Yet Byrd chose an alternative harmonic articulation for entries 7 and 8 that shifts the course of the entire point a step higher. The shift is corroborated by entry 10, which is precisely a step higher than entry 3. Indeed, entries 5 and 6 might also have been repeated a step higher by the other Group A voices, were it not that the initial entries of the ensuing point are now due. The single factor governing the differences between the entries in group A and those in group B is thus neither melodic nor contrapuntal: it is harmonic. The radical *melodic* discrepancy between

---

82 The method of marking flexions derives from Milsom, 'Crecquillon, Clemens, and Four-Voice *Fuga*'.

the two 'sandwiched' Ct entries 6 and 9 (which have only one melodic interval in common) is directly a product of the radical *harmonic* discrepancy between the two entry-groups. The process is none other than the one we first observed in one of the points from PreventUOL (see p. 114 above), and can be identified as yet another manifestation of the *auxesis* figure.

Once Byrd's point on 'he hath scattered the proud' is recognized as having a harmonic basis, its bold harmonic outline quickly surfaces. To schematize the outline in full: each of the entries 3, 7 and 10 articulates a progression between two chords; the duration of each individual chord is one semibreve; the duration separating each pair of chords is likewise one semibreve. The first two pairs of chords both originate from 'G', but the second pair rises a step higher than the first pair, to 'D'. The second and third pairs both rise to 'D', but the third pair originates a step higher than the second pair, on 'A'. Semibreve by semibreve, step by step, the harmony on which this point is based steadily works its way onwards and upwards.

Ultimately, then, this point's most obvious attribute—that each of its entries is melodically different from the others—turns out to have been very likely fortuitous. Whether or not entries 1 and 2 represent the first form in which Byrd's raw material presented itself to his imagination, they retain the discrete function of dovetailing the preceding point into the new one. The point proper is reached only with the group A and group B entries, and is wound up with entry 10 in fresh harmonic territory that the succeeding point goes on to explore. Within this framework, room was somehow found for entry 4, the only entry to contort rhythm as well as melody. Yet, in a double stroke of luck and genius that might have surprised even Byrd himself, entry 4 still manages to observe the up-and-down contour of its nine companions.

'He hath scattered the proud' turns out not be the only point in the Great Service with a demonstrable harmonic basis, and two further examples may be cited. 'Thou didst not

abhor the Virgin's womb' (*TD*, bars 96–103; ex. 5:10) is not only strikingly similar to the passage we have just examined, it is also much more blatant. Indeed, this instance of harmonic *fuga* seems in many respects to be an earlier, cruder essay in the technique. Here too, the harmonic basis consists of alternating chords that gradually work their way a step higher. Again, there are discernible subjects and answers, three entries being anchored to pitch-class 'B', and four to pitch-class 'E'. At the beginning of the point, a subject-answer pair dovetails with the preceding material; at the end, two entries divert from the established 'C' mode and head for a cadence on 'D'. In between, entry 2 departs strikingly from the others (recalling the unusual contortions of entry 4 in 'he hath scattered the proud'), while entries 5–8 form a stretto of alternating answers and subjects that piggy-back on alternating semibreves of 'C' and 'G' harmony. Entries 9 and 10, however, form a subject-answer pair that piggy-backs on alternating semibreves of 'G' and 'D' harmony. Excepting entry 2, the first and the fifth notes of each entry may be either a 2nd or a 3rd *above* the intervening notes, or, in the case of entry 10, a 2nd *below* it. Just as with 'he hath scattered the proud', these anomalies occur not for the sake of melodic variation *per se*, but in response to a periodic chordal plan.

Even in the stringent medium of the double point, when to adjust non-invertible material to make it invertible would smack of contrapuntal fraud, Byrd readily subordinated his entries to a harmonic agenda. Ex. 5:11 shows in exploded score the double point on 'and ever shall be' from the doxology of the *Bs*. The two subjects, *x* and *y*, may be sorted into six groups, of which the first three combine one form of *x* with one form of *y*, and the last three combine one form of *x* with two forms of *y*. Since the second note of *x* and the second note of *y* make a 5th in necessarily consonant position, *x* and *y* are not self-sufficiently invertible at the 8ve, and some melodic variation would be required to make them so. Yet when (in group 4) Byrd did get round to transposing *x* below *y*, the

melodic variation he introduced affects *other* harmonic intervals than the contrapuntally problematic 5th, and the inversion still requires a supporting voice.

In the middle groups, melodic variation becomes extreme, so much so that even the contour of the last two notes of *y* is gradually transformed, first from a falling step into a repeated note, and then into a rising step. Indeed, once this last transformation has been achieved, *all* the original melodic intervals of *y* have been adjusted by a semitone or more. By the time group 4 is reached, not one of the entries preserves its original melodic form. Lengthy speculation might ensue here on which voice is accommodating which other voice in this densely packed stretto. Just as in 'he hath scattered the proud', however, a corresponding variation between two entries shows that neither one is accommodating the other, but that both must be yielding to Byrd's chordal plan. Here, we have an altogether neater, more regular construct than anything that could be construed from the entries themselves. So firm is this harmonic basis, indeed, that Byrd did not need to treat his ensemble strictly polyphonically: the number of parts varies from five to seven, with T and Ct2 subdividing to accommodate whatever additional entries can be woven in.

As we shall see in the next section, *fuga* is one of several methods whereby Byrd selectively teased out an essentially concise presentation of the text in The Great Service. Nonetheless, some three dozen or so fugal passages account for roughly one third of the entire service, ranging in scope from the three-note point 'that fear him' (*M*, bars 64–8), a tiny echoic stretto that flows out of the preceding homophony, to the extended points in which the *TD* and the doxology of the *M* respectively culminate. The subjects of both freely evolve, the one gradually shifting from ascent into descent (*cf.* T bars 192–7 and 210–12, two entries that chart their courses respectively from *e* up to *a* via *b*, and from *g* down to *e* via c^1), the other developing imperceptibly from an active mixture of melodic leaps and syllabic crotchets into the image of a scalar *cantus firmus* (*cf.* T bars 200–203 and 216–219). It might also be pointed out that at one stage of its evolution (M, bars 201–

4), the subject of the *TD* peroration passes through a form—*a' a' c" b' a' g' f' e'*—that directly parallels the corresponding passage in Tallis's Five-Part *TD* for Means (EECM 13/3). This previously unnoticed homage to Tallis has a later corollary in a homage to Byrd's *TD*, for which Thomas Tomkins picked out what is arguably the least evolved form of the same subject— 'A' 'A' 'C' 'B' 'C' 'D' 'B' 'A'; T, bars 190–93; B, bars 193–6)—as the basis for his great keyboard Offertory of 1637 (MB 5/21).[83] To be sure, after a fugal opening this work is written in the form of an ostinato, yet it perhaps says something about the two composers' relative approaches to musical composition that in well over fifty iterations of the subject Tomkins flexed its penultimate note alone, and that only twice (bars 15 and 249).

5.3.2 Vocal scoring

Byrd inherited from the first generation of composers of long services a uniquely experimental tradition of deploying choral resources. Not only was this tradition distinctively English, it was also well-nigh exclusive to the long-service genre: here alone, rather than in the short service or the anthem (to say nothing of the mass or motet), did composers explore the Anglican double choir's special potential for dynamically variable configuration.[84]

One English peculiarity that need not detain us here is the early Tudor ensemble of five voice-types: B, T, Ct, M and Tr.[85] A small group of early Anglican works—including services surviving in various states of completeness by Sheppard, Mundy, Holmes and Weelkes—testifies to a vestigial post-Reformation interest in the treble voice. The vast

---

83 See John Irving, 'William Byrd and Thomas Tomkins's Offertory: (Re-)evaluating Text and Context', *Annual Byrd newsletter*, 5 (1999), 10–12.

84 See Morehen, 'The "Burden of Proof"', 208–11, where the exceptional antiphonal directions given by Barnard for William Mundy's anthem 'O Lord, the maker of all thing' are discredited.

85 On the English view that there were five voice-types, see le Huray, *Music and the Reformation in England*, 121–2. On the rare appearance of five voice-types in continental polyphony, see Siegfried Gissel, 'Die Tonart Ionicus connexus in der Motettensammlung "Opus melicum" von Friedrich Weissensee', *Musica disciplina*, 52 (1998–2002), 57–137.

majority of anthems and services, however, including all of Byrd's, conform to the continental principle of four voice-types, a principle that was a matter of Platonic propriety for continental theorists. Here it is worth pointing out that the number of voice-*types* should not be confused with the number of voice-*parts*: whereas a five-part early Tudor composition might indeed consist of the five voice-types already mentioned, a five-part continental composition would almost invariably involve an additional B, T, A or S. In the early Anglican repertory, the continental model of four voice-types quickly established itself, with a second Ct providing the fifth voice-part whenever there was one.[86] The M voice, so called because it had once occupied the middle ground between Ct and triplex, retained its nomenclature even though it was now technically the S.

The defining characteristic of the ecclesiastical ensemble was not, therefore, that of occasionally introducing the Tr voice, but that of optionally subdividing any voice-part into two. Corresponding singers on c and d might either share a single voice part (e.g. Mcd) or supply two independent parts (e.g. Mc and Md). As we have already seen in the *Cr* of Byrd's Short Service (fig. 1:1), a single choir of four nominal voice-parts could thus transform itself into a choir of five to eight voice-parts, into two four-part choirs operating successively or in dialogue, or into any number of selective ensembles in which certain voice-types were omitted while others might be duplicated. A second Ct on each side of the choir extended those possibilities, although the instances in which all four Ct parts were simultaneously provided with independent parts are rare in the extreme, being confined to exceptional passages in The Great Service and (probably) Weelkes's Ninth Service.[87]

The three processes catalyzed by optional c-d subdivision—gymels, antiphony, and selective scoring—can be traced to the very beginnings of the long service genre. The

---

86 Duplication of a voice other than the Ct is virtually unknown in the vernacular repertory, a notable exception being the doubtful SaveMOG probably by Richard Coste (see p. 100 above). *Contrafacta* of motets—such as Byrd's 'O Lord, turn thy wrath'+'Bow thine ear', which has two T parts—reflect the varied duplications encountered in the motet repertory.

87 See the reconstructed edn by David Wulstan (Oxford: Oxenford Imprint, 1979), *M*, bars 199–203, and *ND*, bars 91–9. The survival of three independent Ct parts for these passages makes a fourth probable.

basic configuration from which variant scorings were derived was subjected to gradual enlargement: having started with a four-part ensemble in his First Service (fig. 5:1a), Sheppard increased this to five parts in his Second Service by consistently assigning independent parts to Ctc and Ctd (fig. 5:1b).[88] William Mundy and Robert Parsons did the same in their first services (as, indeed, did later service composers such as Elway Bevin), yet the Second Service begun by Parsons and completed by Mundy deploys a more balanced ensemble in which the addition of two further Ct parts allowed representation of all five voice-parts on each side of the choir (fig. 5:1c).[89] It was in this form that the ensemble was taken up by Byrd, the apparent desirability of antiphony a5 obliging him, as we saw in Chapter 1, to revise certain early liturgical works that had originally incorporated antiphony a4.

As the basic scoring of long services increased in size, so too did the range of variation to which it was subjected. Variations in Sheppard's four-part First Service conform to a quite restricted scheme, with certain passages being scored for c or d alone (still in four parts) and others increasing the number of independent parts to eight (distributed equally between the two sides). These eight-part textures occur sometimes when the c and d components of an antiphonal dialogue overlap,[90] and sometimes when the scheme of entries forming a point is assigned first to one side and then, before its first iteration is fully complete, to the other side, in the manner of a canon eight-in-four. In neither case, however, do more than five, six or seven voices sound simultaneously.

In Sheppard's Second Service, the five-part basic scoring shown in fig. 5:1b is the basis for four-part scorings for one side alone, and eight-part textures similar to those just described. Yet in this service are also found several instances of more flexible gymels

---

88 Edns of both services by Sheppard from Scot, 'The Vernacular Music of John Sheppard'.

89 Edns of both services by Parsons, respectively ed. George Steel and Ralph W. Buxton, from <www.millertheatre.com/parsons/english.html>, accessed 29 September 2013; Mundy, First Service (*M*, *ND*), ed. S. Royle Shore (London: Novello & Co., 1912).

90 See, for example, the doxology of the *ND*, quoted in le Huray, *Music and the Reformation in England*, 208.

whereby the temporary subdivision of Tc and Td or Bc and Bd momentarily increases the number of parts to six.[91] Here too, Sheppard experimented with selective scorings in which certain voice-parts subdivide while others remain silent (fig. 5:2). The presence of two M parts in all three of these scorings demonstrates that the wide use of paired M parts in Byrd's late anthems and The Great Service cannot be attributed to the influence of the madrigal alone.[92]

Judging by the evening canticles (the only movements currently available in score) and the opening of the *Cr* (see p. 315 below), Mundy's First Service would seem to depart little from its basic scoring beyond the assignment of certain passages to c or d alone in four parts. Nor is the scoring of Mundy's evening canticles for Parsons's Second Service any more adventurous, although here passages for one side alone are in five parts. Parsons, in contrast, had in his First Service already outstripped Sheppard for variety of scoring, taking its choral textures to a level of intricacy le Huray judged 'expressive'.[93]

The scoring of the *V* from Parsons's First Service is schematized in fig. 5:3. The basic five-part tutti holds good for vv. 1–2, 4, 6 and 9b, and the beginning and end of the doxology. C alone are assigned three passages (vv. 5a, 9a and 11), while just one passage (v. 10a) is assigned to d alone. In two other passages (vv. 5b and 8), the four d voice-parts are supplemented by Bc, in one other (v. 10b) by Bc and Mc in a manner recalling Sheppard (fig. 2b). In v. 3a, the two B parts are joined by three upper voice-parts (one from c and two from d); in v. 3b, a mirror image of this dispersed five-part combination is achieved by exchanging each of the three upper voice-parts for its opposite number (one from d and two from c). The sense of antiphony thus created is of a different kind from the conventionally spatial one of c and d. Gymels account for the remaining variations in

---

91 See, for example, *TD* (bar 85), *Bs* (bar 69), and *M* (bars 39–40, 109–11) for subdivided tenors, and *Cr* (bars 29–32) for subdivided basses.

92 On the presumed influence of the madrigal on this aspect of Byrd's scoring see BE 10b, pp. vi–vii, and Monson, review of *The Consort and Keyboard Music of William Byrd* by Oliver Neighbour, *Music & Letters*, 61 (1980), 100–106 (104).

93 *Music and the Reformation in England*, 192.

scoring, with subdivision of B and M (in v. 7 and the third part of the doxology) bringing the number of real parts to seven, and the additional subdivision of the T parts (in the second part of the doxology) bringing it, for one brief moment, to eight.[94]

Some of the selective scorings used later in Parsons's First Service are shown in fig. 5:4. That for v. 10 of the *Bs* (fig. 5:4a) is a mirror image of the five-part combination we have already observed at vv. 5b and 8 of the *V*. The high voices deployed at v. 18 of the *TD* (fig. 5:4b), which are in marked contrast to the low voices deployed in the surrounding verses (fig. 5:4c), may be intended to suggest the celestial locus of the text ('Thou sittest at the right hand of God: in the glory of the Father'). If so, this verse is the first identifiable instance in the long service repertory of representational use of high and low timbres. The high voices deployed at vv. 7–8 of the *Bs* (fig. 5:4d) cannot have a representational function, however, for the locus here is decidedly mundane ('all the days of our life'). This scoring is nonetheless one of three in which Parsons subdivided the M in the manner of Sheppard's Second Service. The influence on Byrd of one of those combinations is unquestionable, since in The Great Service the six-voice, T-free combination assigned to v. 6 of the *M* is precisely similar to the one Parsons had assigned to that verse (fig. 5:4e).

As Byrd would also do, Parsons treated v. 6 of his *M* ('He hath shewed strength with his arm...') as an elaborate and rhythmically active point requiring greater vocal agility than any other passage in the service. The exclusion of both T parts from this verse, together with Parsons's reluctance to subdivide the T parts (they are always the last voice-type to subdivide, and the first to reunite), suggests a certain technical inhibition among the singers of that voice-part.[95] As we shall see, however, nothing else about the T parts of The Great Service suggests concern to keep them simple: their omission from v. 6 of Byrd's *M* was thus solely an act of homage to Parsons.

---

94 Bars 118–21. The liberal use of rests in this passage means, however, that only for the duration of the second minim of bar 120 are all eight voice-parts actually sounding.

95 On contemporary disparagement of the T voice see le Huray, *Music and the Reformation in England*, 120–21.

Calculating the precise number of vocal combinations Byrd employs in The Great Service is no straightforward task. Though some two dozen combinations involving subsets of voice-parts are readily identifiable, those combinations that involve all ten voice-parts are subject to frequent and confusing variation: the occasional subdivision of a single part, for example, or, in passages for two semichoirs, the merging of one semichoir with the other. And while most such variations are classifiable, to list them does not fully do justice to the numerous occasions when one combination briefly overlaps with the next, or when voices enter by turns with a point. Nevertheless, even the roughest taxonomy of vocal combinations in The Great Service will show that, by exploiting the idiosyncrasies of post-Reformation English choral practice, Byrd was able to deploy polyphonic forces with unparalleled flexibility, variety and expressiveness.

Ascertaining whether a given passage does or does not involve all ten voice-parts can depend on the function being performed by the two sides c and d. When not acting in amalgamation, they may behave either as interacting components (i.e. one *responds* to the other), or as autonomous units (i.e. one *relieves* the other). In the case of interaction, neither side is indispensable, and the combination must be said to involve all voice-parts even though one side is sometimes silent. In the case of autonomy, however, one side is indeed dispensable, and the combination must be said to involve only some of the voice-parts. With this criterion established, the service's vocal scorings may be sorted into fifteen tutti and twenty-three selective combinations.

Among the tutti combinations (fig. 5:5) two related families are identifiable, each descended from a five-part combination in which d and c act together as a unified chorus. The first of these families descends from combination 5^{a}, in which Ct1c and Ct1d, and Ct2c and Ct2d, sing in parallel. Accounting for 28.2% of the service, this combination is by far the most prevalent of all.

From combination 5^a, a sixth voice-part is formed by the subdivision of Tcd into Tc and Td (6^a), suggesting that Byrd, unlike Parsons, could rely on his Ts to supply two independent parts. From here, a seventh voice-part is formed either by subdivided M (7^a) or by subdivided Ct2 (7^b). From 7^a, the number of voice-parts is increased to eight by subdivided Ct1 (8^a, our first polychoral combination, to be discussed on pp. 310–11 below). These related combinations tend to adjoin one another: the doxology to the *Bs*, for example, proceeds (with some minor variations)[96] through combinations 5^a, 6^a, 7^b, 6^a, 7^b, 5^a, 6^a and 7^a; similarly, sections vii–viii of the *Cr* proceed through combinations 8^a, 7^a, 5^a and 6^a.

Likewise, in the second family of tutti combinations the number of voice-parts is successively increased to six, seven and eight by d-c subdivisions. The parent combination (5^b) accounts for 11.1% of the service and is the second most prevalent of all. It differs from combination 5^a only in that one Ct part is shared by Ct2c and Ct1d, and the other by Ct1c and Ct2d—the 'crossed' arrangement, encountered in certain institutional sources (notably the latter portion of Barnard's *First Book*), whose intimations about choral protocol will be investigated shortly.

In total, the ten subdivided tuttis that descend from combinations 5^a and 5^b account for 10.9% of the service, and they reveal a characteristically Anglican approach to polyphonic scoring. The idea that separate parts did not have to be written, but could be written, for equivalent members of each respective side allowed Byrd freely to increase (and sometimes then reduce) the number of voice-parts. This happens most dramatically at bars 63–84 of the *TD*, where five parts steadily burgeon into eight during the working out of a

96 A surprising variation occurs at bars 204–5, where the number of Ct parts reduces from three to two. Rather than rejoining Ct2d at this point (i.e. reverting to combination 6a), Ct2c instead temporarily joins Ct1cd. Not only is the resulting combination of one Ct versus three unbalanced: Ct2c's defection also introduces blatant parallel octaves with Td that would otherwise have been avoided. Yet rejoining Ct2d here would have given Ct2c two identically pitched entries of the current point in close succession, a defect Byrd was clearly ready to avoid whatever the costs in choral balance and contrapuntal rectitude.

single point ('Also the Holy Ghost: the comforter. Thou art the King of Glory: O Christ'). Such freedom would have been quite unthinkable to Byrd's continental contemporaries, for whom an increase in the number of voice-parts could be countenanced only for an entire movement or section of a movement, and that usually the concluding Agnus Dei of a mass.

Three further tutti combinations are shown in fig. 5:5, of which 10^{a} and 10^{b} are polychoral and will be discussed below (pp. 309–11). Combination 7^{f} resembles combination 7^{c} in all respects except that its Ct parts are in neither the parallel nor the crossed arrangement: instead, one is taken by c and the other by d. This exceptional arrangement occurs at only one moment in the entire service, the *apocope* at bars 12–15 of the *M* ('in God my Saviour'). Here, the c-d division of the Ct parts serves the technical purpose of complementing the c-d division of the T parts, with which the Ct parts are respectively in stretto (and perhaps too the symbolic purpose of associating a seven-part texture with the seven joys of Mary).

The only apparent explanation for the 'crossed' arrangement of the two Ct parts is that it ensured a junior and a senior singer were both assigned to each part. But does Byrd's use of it imply that he did not trust the juniors to hold their own? To be sure, the crossed arrangement (combinations 7^{c} and 8^{b}) serves for the lengthy and complex point at bars 63–84 of the *TD* ('Also the Holy Ghost the comforter. Thou art the King of glory, O Christ'). Yet the parallel arrangement (combination 5^{a}) serves too for the no less complex, freely evolving point at bars 200–219 of the *M* ('and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.'), a passage so challenging for the Durham singers that they added synchronization cues to it.[97] Furthermore, when the parallel arrangement subdivides to form a third Ct part, it is to the two junior singers that separate parts are assigned (combination 7^{b}). And at the four moments when an *a'* is required from the Ct parts, it is assigned not to the seniors alone but

97 MSS E5 (Mc) and E8 (Ct2c) have barline cues at points equivalent to the beginning of bars 207 and 217; MSS E9 (Td) and C18 (Bd) at a point equivalent to the beginning of bar 207 only; and MS E7 (Ct1c) at a point equivalent to the beginning of bar 217 only.

to a junior and a senior together in the crossed arrangement (*V*, bar 81; *TD*, bars 65 and 71) or to both juniors in parallel (*TD*, bar 14).

Nonetheless, it is the seniors who figure more prominently in the passages for reduced voices. It is they, and never the juniors, who contribute Ct parts to the openings of the *V*, *Bs*, *Cr*, *M* and *ND*, and it is the senior Ctc part that is placed in opposition to three d parts at bars 157–63 of the *TD* ('O Lord, save thy people'). These are subtle biases, to be sure, yet they seem to say something about Chapel Royal protocols: in a choir where positions were held for life, the older singers were willing to delegate certain vocal difficulties to their younger colleagues,[98] but not to surrender too much prestige. In the light of these observations, it may be significant that on reaching v. 7 of the *M* ('He hath put down the mighty from their seat: and hath exalted the humble and meek') Byrd opted for a combination (8^{c}) involving all singers *except* the senior Ct singers.

The Great Service's selective scorings raise a moot point of editorial and performance practice. The direction 'verse', encountered sporadically in the MSS at the outset of selectively scored passages, has been treated by modern editors and interpreters as a synonym for the direction 'solo', implying that passages so marked (or, indeed, that the editor believed ought to have been so marked) were conceived for groups of soloists selected from the ranks of a larger choral tutti. In Monson's words (which echo le Huray's),[99]

> contrasts of decani and cantoris and verse and full are clearly a central feature ... , contributing considerably to the grand effects the composer envisioned, and they must be carefully observed. Much of the impact of the work disappears if indications of full and verse are ignored altogether, as they were in Fellowes's edition of the Magnificat.[100]

---

98 The gentleman in ordinary Robert Stone, composer of the four-voice Lord's Prayer in free rhythm, died in office in 1613 at the age of ninety-seven: see *The Cheque Books of the Chapel Royal*, ed. Ashbee and Harley, vol. 1, p. 27.

99 *Music and the Reformation in England*, 237.

100 BE 10b, p. viii.

The two forms of contrast (d/c and verse/full) Monson posited are, however, effectively one and the same, for the term 'verse' (or 'vers:' as it invariably appears in the manuscripts) literally means 'side'. A part marked 'vers:' is thus intended for either c or d alone; a part marked 'full'—or, more usually, 'cho:'—is intended for both in amalgamation. Those selective combinations that include two B, T or M parts invariably draw on both c and d, implying that neither side could be relied upon to supply more than one of those voice-parts. And since in the vocal manuscripts the marking 'vers:' is nearly always absent from passages for reduced combinations, the only reasonable assumption is that every available voice participated in those passages. The few indications that do appear in the MSS occur, almost without exception, at moments when c and d either go their separate ways (vers:) or unite their efforts (cho:), and serve to warn a singer whether or not his part was being doubled by his opposite number. A solo-tutti contrast thus seems not to have been a consideration in Byrd's scoring, although with choirs that could supply only one voice per part per side such a contrast would have been inevitable.

The service's twenty-three combinations that include fewer than the total number of ten voice-parts are shown in fig. 5:6. With the exception of combination 3 (a descendant of 4^{a}) and of 5^{c} and 5^{d} (both of which sometimes appear as descendants of 5^{a} or 5^{b}), these combinations are unrelated to the ones that surround them. On the contrary, their character is contrastive rather than derivative. Indeed, to secure the maximum possible contrast and variety, Byrd was concerned (just as Sheppard and Parsons had likewise been concerned) not only with eliminating parts, but consistently also with subdividing them. None of Byrd's reduced combinations, therefore, is as plain as, say, Bcd Tcd Ctlcd Mcd: instead, some measure of c-d subdivision ensures that at least one voice-type is always duplicated.

The number of sounding voice-parts seldom falls below four, and does so only when sections begin with a point (*TD*, bar 85; *Bs*, bar 71; *M*, bars 81 and 151), at brief moments of transition from one scoring to another, and with combination 3 (which in any case is

almost too fleeting to merit separate classification). This is in marked contrast to the Latin polyphony of England, and to Byrd's Mass for Five Voices in particular, much of which is made up of lengthy three-part passages. In none of the earlier long services, however, is three-part writing a feature; moreover, it is combinations of four rather than three voices that better satisfy both Byrd's liking for duplicated voice-types and his evident concern for c-d balance. Thus (for a reason to be speculated on below, p. 309), in only two of the Great Service's selective combinations (3 and 4^{e}) is one side of the choir represented by a single voice-part.

It would probably be fair to describe many of the selective combinations, and the four-part ones in particular, as manifestations of 'gymel', the English practice of temporarily subdividing a single voice-part into a pair or 'twins' while at the same time eliminating certain other members of the ensemble.[101] None of Byrd's scorings couples B and M parts without any voices between. Yet combination 4^{f} (which lacks a Ct), and combinations 5^{g} and 6^{e} (which both lack a T) might be said to strike a compromise between the English tradition of non-contiguous scoring and the continental tradition of avoiding it.

The use of selective high-voice scorings (4^{a}, 4^{c} and 4^{f}) to initiate the three late full anthems and all movements of the Great Service except the *Ks* has obvious precedents in English festal masses. It has parallels too in the longer movements of Byrd's own masses for four and five voices and his motet 'Laudibus in sanctis' (1591/1), all of which open with passages scored without B and sometimes also without T. Only in the motet did Byrd also duplicate the highest voice part, as in the openings of the vernacular pieces. And although, as we have already seen, selective scorings with subdivided M can be traced back to Sheppard, the idea of placing them at the beginning of a movement seems to have been without precedent in long service repertory.

---

101 The marking 'gimell:' is found at the subdivision of bassus parts at bars 75–84 of the *TD* in Baldwin's score of this passage, showing that by the late sixteenth century the term embraced subdivision without elimination.

In contrast, the scoring of two passages in the Great Service is clearly indebted to earlier works in the genre. One is v. 6 of the *M*, where Byrd's use of combination 6^{e} (the only six-voice combination with no T component) derives, as we have seen, from Parsons. The other is vv. 7–8 of the *Bs*, where Byrd's use of combination 6^{d} derives from Sheppard (see fig. 5:7). Parsons and Mundy too had singled out this portion of text for some special, selective variation in scoring, both of them following Sheppard's example of two M parts.[102] Byrd alone, however, followed Sheppard's example of six-voice writing here, a particular that was not lost on John Baldwin, who as we have seen entered both composers' settings side by side in his commonplace book. Though Monson has described the two six-voice scorings as 'identical',[103] comparison of fig. 5:7a and fig. 5:7e reveals a minor discrepancy. By substituting Sheppard's Tc with Td, Byrd improved the distribution of parts between c and d. The adjustment of Sheppard's 4+2 distribution to 3+3 balances the voices not only in this section, but also in the following one, where all activity is transferred to the four voice-parts that have just rested.

Two further instances of rostering the ten voice-parts in this way occur in the Great Service: the four voice-parts assigned to v. 18 of the *TD* (4^{c}) are relieved in v. 19 by the remaining six (6^{i}), while the five assigned to v. 9 of the *M* (5^{e}) are relieved in v. 10 by the other five (5^{f}). Yet the rostered scoring of vv. 7–8 and 9 of the *Bs* remains the most interesting instance. First, combination 6^{d} deliberately recalls Sheppard's setting of vv. 7–8. Secondly, the durations for which combinations 6^{d} and 4^{e} are respectively deployed—170 minims (vv. 7–8) and 108 minims (v. 9)—approximate closely to the 3:2 ratio by which these six- and four-part combinations are themselves related. Thirdly, as well as reactivating the four voice-parts that have held silence for 170 minims, the men's voices

---

102 The scoring given in fig. 5:7d is that of Ralph Buxton's reconstruction: though the original Mc part does not survive, there is no reason to mistrust Buxton's derivation from the organ part of independent Mc and Md parts in this passage.

103 BE 10b, p. vi n. 8.

combination 4^{b} serves as a verbal conceit ('And *thou child* shalt be called the Prophet of the High'st').

Nor is this the only occasion on which Byrd allowed the text to inform the character of the scoring. Children's voices are again conspicuous by their absence in combinations 5^{h} ('Who for *us men*') and 5^{f} ('As he promised to *our forefathers*'). In the *TD*, the high-voice combinations 4^{c} and 4^{d} locate vv. 18 and 21 in heaven ('Thou sittest at the right hand of God: in the glory of the Father', 'Make them to be numbered with thy Saints: in glory everlasting), while the contrasting low-voice combinations 6^{j} and 4^{e} locate vv. 19 and 22 firmly on earth ('We believe that thou shalt come: to be our judge', 'O Lord, save thy people: and bless thine heritage').

The only documentary indication of the voice-part Byrd may have sung in the Chapel Royal choir is that on his death in 1623 his place was taken by one John Croker, 'a countertenor of Westminster'.[104] Though all four Ct parts of The Great Service are rich in technical interest, the Ct1c part is arguably more so even than the others. It is the only Ct part to appear in as many as five of the six four-part passages that, with the exception of the *Ks*, initiate each of the service's movements. It is involved in the two scorings that incorporate a single voice-part on one side of the choir (combinations 3 and 4^{e}, the latter being a solo for Ct1c placed opposite three d voice-parts). It is also the only Ct part to be included in v. 7 of the *Bs* (combination 6^{d}), where the text ('That we being delivered out of the hands of our enemies: might serve him without fear...') recalls the captivity theme running through the two books of *Cantiones sacrae*. If Byrd wrote one of the four Ct parts to sing himself, then it would appear to have been this one.

In order to distinguish combinations 10^{a} and 10^{b} (fig. 5:5) from combinations 5^{c} and 5^{d} (fig. 5:6), it has already proved necessary to draw the line between unalterably polychoral

---

104 *The Cheque Books of the Chapel Royal*, ed. Ashbee and Harley, vol. 1, p. 30.

textures and mere shift work. This qualitative distinction is implicit in Anthony Carver's rigorous definition of the term 'polychoral':

> the ensemble is consistently split into two or more groups, each retaining its own identity, which sing separately and together within a through-composed framework in which antiphony is a fundamental compositional resource; in tutti passages all voice-parts should normally remain independent, with the possible exception of the bass parts.[105]

As Carver goes on to state, music written for the two-sided English choir generally falls outside this definition: as a rule, c–d antiphony is fundamentally a performative rather than a compositional issue, and in tutti passages all voice-parts normally duplicate those of the opposite side. The Great Service, however, includes some sixteen passages (accounting for 13.2%) that qualify as polychoral fully in accordance with Carver's definition. Some involve all ten voices, others do not. The dialogue usually takes place between c and d, but in two instances (combinations 8^{a} and 8^{c}) it takes place between two groups within each of which c and d voice-parts are combined.

In continental polychoral music, it was expected that all participating voice-parts would be treated as so many real parts. With the exception of bass parts, where a token measure of independence could be created by alternating unisons and octaves, no voice-part was permitted to move in consecutive perfect consonances with any other voice-part in the composition. Not until works published from 1607 by Michael Praetorius, and in 1615 by Giovanni Gabrieli, is there to be found evidence for any relaxation of that rule on the continent.[106] In England, however, the insular attitude whereby c and d could function either in amalgamation or independently of each other meant that a polychoral texture could be deployed for mere sections of a composition, not necessarily for the whole of it.

Two passages in The Great Service resembling polychoral canons appear to follow precedents set in the second services of Parsons and Sheppard respectively: 'And was

---

105 *Cori spezzati: The Development of Sacred Polychoral Music to the Time of Schütz* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p. xvi.

106 Carver, *Cori spezzati*, 166, 217–8, 223–5.

incarnate ... he rose again' (*Cr*, bars 36–61), and 'He hath put down ... the humble and meek' (*M*, bars 108–27). In both passages Byrd departed appreciably from canon *per se*, twice allowing the d-c dialogue of 'And was incarnate' to dissolve into generalized nine- or ten-part *fuga*. But he had long ago pithily demonstrated the extreme rigour with which he was capable of applying eight-in-four technique in the motet 'Diliges Dominum' (1575/25), arguably his only essay in genuinely polychoral writing outside The Great Service.[107]

Though they deploy identical forces, Byrd's polychoral combinations 10^{a} and 10^{b} differ from each other in that d take the lead in one and c in the other. Furthermore, and as reference to combinations 8^{a} (fig. 5:5) and 8^{c} (fig. 5:6) will show, our usual topographical schematization with c on the left and d on the right is impossible when both component choirs are made up of voice-parts from c *and* d. Byrd's six double-choir combinations are therefore shown, in figs 5 and 6, with choir I (the leading ensemble) on the left and choir II (the responding ensemble) on the right.

We have classified as polychoral tuttis those passages where one side of the choir *responds* to the other (combinations 10^{a} and 10^{b}), and as reduced scorings those passages where one side merely *relieves* the other (combinations 5^{c} and 5^{d}). Not surprisingly, Byrd treated these two contrasting functions—d *or* c, and d *against* c—as extremes between which he could explore a graduated middleground. In the *TD*, antiphony is prompted by the litany-like text of v. 27, and follows a c-d schedule identical to that of the corresponding passage in Sheppard's First Service. To pave the way for this, Byrd assigned the preceding four verses to c and d in alternation, but admitted no rhythmic, melodic or harmonic common property until reaching the antiphony proper. Shift-work thus initially

---

107 On this motet, in the second half of which each four-part component choir repeats in retrograde the exact notes sung by the other choir in the first half, see Joseph Kerman, *The Masses and Motets of William Byrd* (London: Faber, 1981), 117, and (for a more positive view) Willem Elders, *Symbolic Scores: Studies in the Music of the Renaissance* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 10–11, 115–16.

hints at antiphony, eventually gives way to it, and finally dissolves into a merged passage of seven real parts (combination 7g).

More remains to be said in the next section about the polychoral passages of The Great Service, which are among the many symbolic devices with which Byrd enriched his setting of the BCP ordinary text. From the foregoing lengthy discussion (which could have been much lengthier had it also taken in such questions as the extent to which individual voice-parts are used), it will be readily apparent that the sheer complexity of Byrd's scoring has been underestimated by modern editors and commentators, not least by Fellowes, whose twice-issued edition of the service omitted all original d/c directions from the passages for reduced voices.[108] From John Caldwell, however, has come the recognition that the service 'can ... serve as a textbook for the choral layout of the period'.[109] Nor did Byrd neglect to extend his grand scheme to the three satellite anthems, which are all scored for B, T, Ct2, Ct1, Mc and Md. Thus, in addition to the service's thirty-eight scorings, he reserved for the anthems a thirty-ninth.

5.3.3 Text-setting

If the York service-books are accepted as dating from *c*.1598, and their inscription 'new service' is taken at face value, then it was as an experienced composer with well over fifty motets, more than seventy songs and three masses behind him that Byrd must finally have turned his attention to the long service, a genre (Morley's contribution excepted) still dominated by early Elizabethan paradigms, and one that had not yet succumbed to the humanistic touch of transcendent text-setting. Modern commentators, however, have scarcely recognized that Byrd's contribution draws Cranmer's English into an unprecedentedly telling and material association with music: in 1969, Walter Gray declared

---

108 TCMO 22; WB 10, 136–252.

109 *The Oxford History of English Music*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 352.

that Byrd's vernacular music is 'nearly barren of word illustration'.[110] Yet as we have already seen in connection with the use of high- and low-voice semichoirs in the *TD*, in this respect at least Byrd exemplified the advice of his presumed pupil Morley:

> You must have a care that when your matter signifieth ascending, high heaven, and such like, you make your music ascend: and by the contrary where your ditty speaketh of descending lowness, depth, hell and others such, you must make your music descend.[111]

That the effect of gravity on the rise and fall of physical objects is akin to the effect on music of tension and release (in the human voice or the strings of an instrument) is an axiom enshrined in even the most primitive forms of Western musical notation. To ignore that axiom, Morley makes clear, is to offend against the rhetorical principle of decorum:

> it will be thought a great absurdity to talk of heaven and point downward to earth: so it will be counted great incongruity if a musician—upon the words 'he ascended into heaven'—should cause his music descend.

Morley's remarks would be of little import were it not that in polyphonic composition (where motion in one voice must be balanced by opposite motion, or at least stasis, in another voice), to make notes rise and fall with the sense of the words is often easier said than done. The young Byrd may be observed in an early encounter with the problem in his Short Service, where the depiction of heaven's high place results in a musical ascent quite contradictory to the physical descent signified by the text (*Cr*, bars 30–31; ex. 5:12a). In the Great Service, however, accurately representing the relative positions of high and low, and the direction taken in moving between them, seems to have become almost an obsession for Byrd. Here, the same problematical clause is treated with semantic precision: a melodic fall for the words 'came down' followed by a melodic rise to the word 'heaven'. In a single voice part, to be sure, this would have been be straightforward enough, yet by deft of timing and almost without exception, Byrd managed to observe this little propriety in six voices simultaneously (*Cr*, bars 33–6; ex. 5:12b).

---

110 'Some Aspects of Word Treatment in the Music of William Byrd', *Musical Quarterly*, 55 (1969), 45–64 (49).

111 *Introduction*, 178.

In a similar instance from the *TD*, the opposing situations of heaven and earth are writ large, timing again being of the essence since the consecutive descends of each voice may not coincide with those of any other voice (bars 30–33; ex. 5:12c). And while there is nothing contrapuntally remarkable about Byrd's proper rising scales for 'he ascended into heaven' (*Cr*, bars 36–8), here the composer has not forgotten that the Ascension necessarily proceeded from earth, duly represented by a held *G* from which the B part itself finally rises upwards. (It may be significant that this detail, though absent from Byrd's Mass for Four Voices, is present in the later-composed masses for three and five voices. Its presence also in The Great Service likewise argues for a date of composition later than that of the first of the masses.)

Sustained notes function also as symbols of temporality and continuance in the manner the sixteen-minim note of OLordMTS may have symbolized the sovereign's unending body politic (see p. 95 above). At 'all the days of our life' (*Bs*, bars 109–113) another pedal 'G' established by Bc passes via Td to Bd, thus being present in the texture for no fewer than eighteen minims, and lingering on harmoniously for the first eight minims of the following section (bars 113–15). Similar pedals accompany such phrases as 'glory everlasting' (*TD*, bars 151–6, where apart from a few momentary digressions 'E' is sustained for twenty-four minims, plus the eight ensuing ones) and 'and to his seed for ever' (*M*, bars 176–82, where apart from one minim digression 'G' is sustained for twenty-eight minims).

Beyond these merely mimetic imitations of space and time, Byrd contrived to represent eternity itself with musical metaphors addressed much less to the listener's ear than to the singer's mind (or even the scribe's). The repeating melodic contour +2 –3 +2 –3 to which are set the words 'Father everlasting' (*TD*, M, bars 8–10) might in theory extend forwards and backwards *ad infinitum* into an unsung past and future. Similar, partially realized potential for infinite repetition and transposition occurs in two of the doxologies at the

words 'world without end. Amen.' (*Bs*, bars 197–205: –4 +3 –4; *ND*, bars 82–8, where slow movement +3 –4 +2 –4 +3 –4 in the B is complemented by corresponding sequential scalar patterns in the upper voices). Such potential is not even realized at all, but merely hinted at, in a three-voice, three-note canon from the *TD* (bars 171–3, 'ever world without end'). Though this unobtrusive little construct is heard only once, its ending has the property of linking with a transposed form of its beginning, and thence to perpetual repetition (ex. 5:13).

Nor was eternity the only abstraction to which Byrd could give musical expression. Not long into the *Cr*, the text states in no uncertain terms the indivisibility of the first two persons of the Holy Trinity:

> God of God,
> Light of light,
> Very God of very God,
> Begotten not made,
> Being of one substance with the Father...

This verbal climax on the theme of unity in diversity meets with an increasingly unified yet still diverse musical setting that exploits the capacity of c or d to function alone, as a unity in itself, or jointly with the opposite side, as part of a greater unity. The first clause is assigned to d and the second to c: though they are differently harmonized, both clauses share a common melody and rhythm. The third clause is assigned to c and d in amalgamation, although still with traces of rhythmic deviation in Ct2cd. The fourth clause consolidates the rhythm among all the voices, while in the fifth and final clause a fragment of common melody pervades the entire musical fabric, all five voice-parts now being, quite literally, of one substance (ex. 5:14; the treatment in Mundy's First Service is similar).

The polychoral passages of the *V*, *TD*, *Cr* and *M*, indeed, contain some of Byrd's most immediately obvious commentary on the verbal text, the performative effect of these ornaments being spatial, even visual, as well as auditory. They thus serve as reliable pointers to verbal clauses that Byrd must have singled out for special emphasis. One in

particular seem calculated to rejoice the hearts of contemporary anti-Puritan hearers. No sooner does the *V* mention the singing of psalms (v. 2) than Byrd slips into regular antiphony, setting the next verse with the now familiar technique of *tautophrasis*:

d For the Lord is (a) great God:

c [and a] great king (a)bove all gods.

Sheppard, in his Second Service, and Mundy and Parsons in their respective first services, had treated this portion of the *V* similarly, but Byrd's decision to follow their precedent now served the additional purpose of defying Puritan objections to choral psalmody, a practice listed as one of several 'popish abuses' in John Fielde's *An admonition to the Parliament* of 1572:

> In all their order of service there is no edification, according to the rule of the Apostle, but confusion; they toss the psalms in most places like tennis balls.[112]

As if the resemblance to psalmody were not clear enough, Byrd went on to set several further verses of the *V* antiphonally, employing *tautophrasis* more or less strictly in accordance with the semantic relationship between the two halves of the given verse. In v. 3 (quoted above) and v. 11 ('Unto whom I sware in my wrath: that they should not enter into my rest'), the answering half is corroborative, and is set to music closely related to that of the leading half. In v. 4 ('In his hand are all the corners of the earth: and the strength of the hills is his also'), however, the answering half supplements rather than corroborates the leading half, and is set to fresh rather than repeated music. Explicitly negative antiphony occurs in v. 10 ('Forty years long was I grieved with this generation and said: it is a people that do err in their hearts, for they have not known my ways'), where the response of d makes no reference whatsoever to the music just sung by c, thus conforming to the theme of deviation.

---

112 STC 10847, sig. C3v.

In two instances, Byrd's text-setting might even be read as a doctrinal statement of sorts. Few of his contemporaries can have realized that words 'I acknowledge one baptism' (*Cr*, bars 110–12) incorporates a strict canon three-in-one (between M, B and T), surely inserted as a reminder that that baptism was made in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and with the sign of the cross that was particularly irksome to the Puritans. But no one can have failed to notice the threefold iteration of the clause 'to all believers', first by d, then by c, and finally by both sides in amalgamation (*TD*, bars 113–17). Byrd cannot have expected this to have been heard as anything other than an undisguised affirmation of the anti-Calvinist tenet that, in Hooker's words, '*all that believe* are saved'.[113]

Though none alludes to anything as contentious, other polychoral passages in the Great Services are no less striking. In the *TD*, the segregation of c and d depicts wellnigh theatrically not only the two heavenly choirs' exchanges of 'Holy, holy' (bars 22–4) Byrd had set these similarly in his own Short Service, as had Sheppard in his First Service), but also two of the three celestial cohorts mentioned in vv. 7–9, the 'glorious company of the Apostles' and the 'noble army of Martyrs' (bars 41–8). Perhaps it was because only a paired chorus was at his disposal that Byrd conveniently forgot to include the third cohort, the 'goodly fellowship of the Prophets', mentioned in v. 8: this glaring omission—which is crudely rectified in the Worcester T part by a double iteration of the c rejoinder—is otherwise inexplicable.

The later sections of Byrd's *Cr* that deal with Christ's incarnation, passion and resurrection consist of polychoral exchanges ranging from *tautophrasis* ('And was crucified [also for] us / under Pontius Pilate', bars 47–52) to ruffled, overlapping and freely adapted dialogue ('And the third day he rose again', bars 56–61). Here the double-choir writing not only heightens the expression of its own text, but also acts as a foil to the

113 *Of the lavves of ecclesiasticall politie. The fift booke* (London: John Windet, 1597; STC 13712.5), 92; emphasis Hooker's. The whole of Hooker's article 45 (pp. 92–3) is devoted to this verse of the *TD*.

ensuing clause, 'according to the scriptures' (bars 61–3), where the at-last amalgamated chorus symbolizes the unanimity of Old Testament prophecy. The same image recurs later in the *Cr*, with the statement 'Who spake by the Prophets' (bars 91–3) issuing from an amalgam (combination 7^{a}) of the contrasting high- and low-voice ensembles (combination 8^{a}) that, in a series of fittingly spirited polychoral exchanges, have just listed the attributes of the Holy Ghost. With the next article of faith, 'And I believe one Catholic and Apostolick Church', the removal of all c-d subdivisions takes the process of unification further still.

CONCLUSION

Our findings on Byrd's early liturgical works point to certain revisions to the currently accepted chronology. Given their corrupt and probably misleading sources, the English litanies attributed to Byrd cannot fairly be said to represent his earliest efforts at vernacular composition. That honour more likely goes to the fragmentary Peterhouse service, whose authenticity would be as plausible as that of the earliest Latin works attributed to him were it not that the unique source is of such late date. If Byrd did compose this service, its unmistakably Sheppardian form would corroborate the association with the older composer apparent from the collaborative setting (with William Mundy) of 'In exitu Israel', while its callow technique would accord with a date of *c*.1560, prior to his departure from London; certainly its unparalleled length suggests a milieu other than Lincoln Cathedral during Byrd's time there.

Probably the earliest of Byrd's vernacular church works to have survived in their original form are the four-part versions of the Second Preces, Ps. 114:1–6 and Ps. 55:1–7,17, works it is easy to imagine his having tailored for the Lincoln choir. The mattins and evensong movements of the Short Service likewise appear to be Lincoln works, being scored for one Ct part per side with gymels for T and Ct. The *Cr*, however, adds gymels for B and M, and although Byrd did not go as far as to call for two Ct parts per side his extravagantly varied scorings in this movement suggest he was catering to the greater expertise of the Chapel Royal. It was apparently for this unrivalled choir that his similarly elaborate setting of Ps. 54 was composed, and five-part adaptations were made of his other psalms, their preces, and (perhaps) the Three Minims Service.

This chronology postulates simpler versions, written for Lincoln and now lost, of the First Preces, Ps. 47 and the Three Minims Service. Because their associated psalm is based,

in the Edwardian manner, on Sarum tone 8/i, the First Preces may indeed be reckoned originally to have antedated the Second Preces, whose two associated psalms in the full idiom are instead freely composed. Though the Three Minims Service has been thought to antedate the Short Service, its rough workmanship seems less likely the result of inexperience than of a forced reworking, and in its handling of *tautophrasis* it reveals considerably more independence from Tallis than do the *V*, *TD* and *Bs* of Byrd's Short Service. A lost, earlier version scored in the Lincoln manner may therefore have been roughly contemporary with the Short Service's evening canticles.

The influence of Tallis on the Preces and the Short and Three Minims services, and the probability that those works were conceived for the modest choral resources of Lincoln Cathedral, may amount to the firmest indication we have that a master-pupil relationship existed between the two composers before Byrd returned to London in 1572. Tallis's liturgical works may consistently have served as examples throughout the Lincoln years, but Byrd's individuality quickly asserted itself in richer textures, suppler counterpoint, the use of harmonic colourings and contrasts for their own sake, the supplanting of formulaic repetition with pervasive variation, a more literary application of the technique of *tautophrasis*, and a growing sense that polyphony was capable of rhetorical expressiveness.

Monson's verdict[1]—that each of these pieces offers 'its own individual testimony to Byrd's consistently imaginative and creative approach'—has been fully borne out in the present investigation. Less certain is his view that the vernacular liturgical genres represent 'the most determinedly simple aesthetic [Byrd] ever explored': arguably, they may have been less constraining than the consort song, where successive verses of text were restricted to a single, unyielding musical strophe. Certainly Byrd seems to have enthusiastically embraced the medium of chordal composition and the Reformation

---

1 BE 10a, p. xi.

principle of one note per syllable, bringing them to a new state of plasticity in which nothing else, not even a plainchant *cantus firmus*, could refuse to bend to his unique musical will.

The chronology of the early anthems is to some extent apparent from their primary Elizabethan sources, but Byrd's increasingly flexible application of fugal principles suggests a more refined ordering. While the earliest of these pieces reveals Byrd at his most reliant on Tallis, the rest of them noticeably develop a rhetorical use of harmony (the *auxesis* figure) also evident in the Short Service. Byrd's freedom to choose his own texts may have led him to enshrine in the anthem OLordMTS the arcane legal doctrine of the king's two bodies, whereby he could irrefutably declare his allegiance to Elizabeth's body politic without bringing his own Catholic conscience into conflict with her Protestant body natural. This explanation for the anthem's otherwise unknown text remains necessarily hypothetical, but other avenues for exploring Byrd's mind on his professional Protestant music-making have yet to be identified.

During the time Byrd seems to have been most active at court (i.e. prior to his departure for Essex in 1594 or '95), he may confidently be said to have composed only six full anthems. HowLSME may well be the earliest, judging by its sometimes clumsy word-setting, and by its dependence on Tallis's composition that was eventually published as the motet 'O sacrum convivium'. HelpUOG, with its still unyielding *fuga* but more expressive harmony, may have been written not long after, followed in turn by OLordMTS (with its contrapuntally virtuosic gloss on Tallis) and the increasingly flexible PreventUOL, AriseOL (soon yoked to HelpUOG) and OGodWOO. Two dubious full anthems that have been tentatively assigned to the earliest part of Byrd's career need not be: SaveMOG is almost certainly the work of the minor composer Richard Coste, while the strange combination of advanced style and immature technique in OutOTD gives more credibility to the conflicting attribution to (an albeit young) Orlando Gibbons.

Conclusions about Byrd's works in the verse idiom rest on two principal observations. The first is that psalmodic and freely composed metrical texts were an approved and regular form of supplementing the BCP offices, and as a result of this the early verse anthem was properly a strophic genre *per se*. The second is that the early verse repertory followed clearly discernible lines of descent, the familial features being the key of Gamut flat and the featuring of the Ct voice. The $\hat{1}\,\hat{3}\,\hat{4}\,\hat{5}$ motto from Richard Farrant's 'When as we sat in Babylon' may be traced through William Mundy's 'The Secret Sins' to Byrd's Verse Service, and thence to a host of later verse canticles. Mundy's 'Ah, helpless wretch' spawned a line of cousins in the order AlackWILB, BeholdOGTS and Bull's 'Deliver me, O God'. Despite the existence of a lute intabulation of AlackWILB, there are absolutely no grounds for supposing any of this repertory to have originated as consort music. That place goes to ChristR and three interrelated anthems employing the kind of anti-liturgical antiphony here dubbed 'psittacine'.

Byrd's three late full anthems, long recognized as a group, can be shown in terms of key, scoring and melodic construction to have formed part of his ultimate vernacular project, at the centre of which was, of course, The Great Service. Owing to its impressive scale and style, the service has sometimes been taken for a *pièce d'occasion* written to honour some undetermined royal event. In view of its exceedingly sophisticated polyphonic language, however, and the scrupulous care Byrd lavished on setting its texts, it seems scarcely a less personal composition than his Catholic swan-song, the *Gradualia*. Moreover, through its undisguised endorsement of anti-Puritanism and anti-Calvinism, Byrd endeared—if not actually allied—himself to a nascent faction of Anglicanism whose motto was to worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness. As that faction, under the banners of Arminianism and Laudianism, increasingly distanced itself from the iconophobic first generation of English Protestants, it could look to the richly symbolic Great Service for the ultimate musical expression of its ideals.

DESCRIPTIVE LIST OF CITED MSS

Bibliographical abbreviations

Bamford	Daniel Bamford, 'John Barnard's *First Book of Selected Church Musick*: Genesis, Production and Influence', 3 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of York, 2009), vols 1–2
Brett	Philip Brett, 'Edward Paston (1550–1630): A Norfolk Gentleman and His Musical Collection', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 4 (1964), 51–69
Cheverton	Ian Cheverton, 'English Church Music of the Early Restoration Period, 1660–*c*.1676', 3 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, 1984), vol. 2
Clark1	John Bunker Clark, 'Adrian Batten and John Barnard: Colleagues and Collaborators', *Musica disciplina*, 22 (1968), 207–29
Clark2	John Bunker Clark, *Transposition in Seventeenth-Century English Organ Accompaniments and the Transposing Organ* (Detroit: Information Coordinators, 1974)
Crosby	Brian Crosby, 'The Choral Foundation of Durham Cathedral, *c*.1350–*c*.1650', 2 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Durham, 1992), vol. 1
Dexter	Keri Dexter, 'Unmasking "Thomas Tudway": A New Identity for a Seventeenth-Century Windsor Copyist', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 32 (1999), 89-117
Edwards	Warwick Edwards, 'The Sources of Elizabethan Consort Music', 2 vols (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1974), vol. 1
Fellowes	Edmund Fellowes, TCM appendix vol. with supplementary notes (London: Oxford University Press, 1948)
Fenlon & Milsom	Iain Fenlon and John Milsom, '"Ruled Paper Imprinted": Music Paper and Patents in Sixteenth-Century England' *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 37 (1984), 139–63
Ford	Ford, Wyn K., 'An English Liturgical Partbook of the 17th Century', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 12 (1959), 144–60; for addenda and corrigenda see Morehen, 82–3
Heawood	Edward Heawood, 'Sources of Early English Paper-Supply II: The Sixteenth Century', *The Library*, 4th series, 10 (1929–30), 427–54
Hughes	Anselm Hughes, *Catalogue of the Musical Manuscripts at Peterhouse, Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953); for addenda and corrigenda see Morehen, 140–43
le Huray	Peter le Huray, 'The Chirk Castle Partbooks', *Early Music History*, 2 (1982), 17–42
Milsom1	John Milsom, 'Sacred Songs in the Chamber' in *English Choral Practice, 1400–1650*, ed. John Morehen (Cambridge, 1995), 161–79
Milsom2	John Milsom, *Christ Church Library Music Catalogue*, <library.chch.ox.ac.uk/music/>
Monson	Craig Monson, *Voices and Viols in England, 1600–1650: The Sources and the Music* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1982)
Morehen	John Morehen, 'The Sources of English Cathedral Music, *c*.1617–*c*.1644', 3 vols (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1969), vols 1–2

Reynolds	William Reynolds, 'Chirk Castle Organ and Organbook: An Insight into Performance Practice Involving a Seventeenth-Century "Transposing" Organ', *Journal of the British Institute of Organ Studies*, 21 (1997), 28–55
Shay & Thompson	Robert Shay and Robert Thompson, *Purcell Manuscripts: The Principal Musical Sources* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
Smith	Alan G. Smith, 'Elizabethan Church Music at Ludlow', *Music & Letters*, 49 (1968), 108–121

MSS listed by library sigla

BEm MS 751 (organ-book copied at Winchester *c*.1675–86 by John Reading and Daniel Roseingrave)

Clark2, 54–5, 105–14

Cfm MS 88 (score-book in the hand of Henry Purcell, *c*.1680)

Shay & Thompson, 33–47

Robert Thompson, 'Purcell's Great Autographs' in *Purcell Studies*, ed. Curtis Price (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 6–34 (16–20)

Cfm MS 117 (score-book in the hand of William Isaack, copied 1677–*c*.1684)

Shay & Thompson, 47–64

Ckc MSS Rowe 10–17 (part-books from Norwich Cathedral, *c*.1660–70)

	c	d
M	14	10
Ct	15	11
T	16	12
B	17	13

Cheverton, 309–13

Holographs of Richard Ayleward, with subsequent additions of pre- and post-Restoration repertory.

Ckc MS Rowe 316 (Cantus part-book, begun *c*.1560–70)

Edwards, 101–2 · Fenlon & Milsom, 146–7, 158 · Milsom1, 169

Cambridge Music Manuscripts, 900–1700, ed. Iain Fenlon (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 134–7

Cp S.18b (olim G.V.30 and O.6.29; Ctc, MS music additions to BCP printed in 1634)

Companion to *Och* Gibbs 12.

Hughes, 49–51 · Morehen, 147–9

Cp MSS 33–4, 38–9, 47–9 ('Former Set', *c*.1635–40)

	c	d
M	34 [479]	47 [475]
Ct1	49 [480]	39 [476]
Ct2	–	48 [477]
T	–	–
B	33 [481]	38 [478]

Photocopies held in *Cu* are referenced in brackets; underlined shelfmarks were assigned when the part-books were restored in 2010.

Crosby, 290–332 · Hughes, 7–47 · Morehen, 119–44, 150–200

Cp MSS 35–7, 42–5 ('Latter Set', *c*.1635–40)

	c	d
M	45 [489]	44 [485]
Ct	–	42 [486]
T	43 [490]	35 [487]
B	36 [491]	37 [488]

Photocopies held in *Cu* are referenced in brackets.

Clark1, 215–16 · Crosby, 290–332 · Hughes, 7–47 · Morehen, 119–44, 150–200

Cp MS 46 (compilation of organ parts in various hands, *c*.1635–40)

Photocopy held in *Cu*: 493.

Clark1, 215–16 · Clark2, 67–8, 177–9 · Hughes, 48–9 · Morehen, 144–7, 150–200

Cpc MSS 6.1–6 (copied at Windsor, *c*.1638–40)

	c	d
M	–	6.4 [6.1]
Ct1	–	6.1 [6.2]
Ct2	–	–
T	6.3 [6.4]	6.2 [6.3]
B	6.5 [6.6]	6.6 [6.5]

The bracketed shelfmarks are those erroneously given in SECM

Dexter, 93–101, 110–11

Nicholas Heppel, introductory notes to *The Pembroke Choir Books and Other Music Manuscripts from Pembroke College, Cambridge*, microfilm (Marlborough: Adam Matthew Publications, 1995)

Cq G.4.17 (Td, MS music additions to BCP printed in 1636)

Discovered in 2013, this part-book was copied for the chapel of Queens' College Cambridge and contains services (the movements being ordered liturgically in the manner of certain Durham MSS), responsorial music and anthems.

Cu MS Ely 4 (organ-book copied *c*.1663 by John Ferrabosco)

Cheverton, 259, 262, 314–15, 452–3 · Clark2, 64–5 166–70

The likelihood that this MS was copied in 1662–3 is suggested by the record in June 1663 of a payment of £10 to Ferrabosco for copying music, while William Child, whose doctorate was conferred in the following month, is still styled 'Mr' in the MS.

Cu MS Ely 28 (T part-book, begun in the mid seventeenth century, copyists unidentified)

Cheverton, 315–20

CAh MS Mus. 30 (1–4) (part-books copied for Edward Paston, *c*.1600)

Brett, 69

DRc MS A1 (organ-book copied chiefly by William Smith *c*.1635 and Henry Palmer 1638–9)

Clark2, 61–4, 134–9 · Crosby, 256–8, 264–5 · Morehen, 22–6

DRc MS A2 (compilation of organ parts copied *c*.1620–*c*.1640, indexed and paginated after 1660)

Clark2, 61–4, 139–44 · Crosby, 258–9, 266–7, 271 · Morehen, 8–15

DRc MS A5 (organ-book copied by Henry Palmer 1638–9 and John Foster after 1660)

Clark2, 61–4, 152–5 · Crosby, 261–2, 264–6 · Morehen, 31–6

DRc MS A6 (organ-book copied by Henry Palmer 1638–9)

Clark2, 61–4, 156–9 · Crosby, 262–6 · Morehen, 27–30

DRc MSS C2, 3, 7 (first fascicle), 14 (verse anthems for festal days, copied in the early 1530s chiefly by Toby Brooking)

	c	d
M	–	–
Ct1	C7	C2
Ct2	–	C3
T	C14	–
B	–	–

Crosby, 244–50 · Morehen 72–6

See also *Y* MS M29(S).

DRc MSS C4–6, 7 (second fascicle), 9, 10 (anthems for general use, copied *c*.1625–30 chiefly by John Todd and Toby Brooking)

	c	d
M	–	–
Ct1	C7	C6
Ct2	C5	C4
T	C10	C9
B	–	–

Crosby, 224–34 · Morehen, 59–67

DRc MS C8 (Ctd in the hand of John Todd, copied ?1629–30)

Crosby, 242–4, 271–2 · Morehen, 91–7

The sole survivor from a set containing short services and perhaps identifiable with archival references to copying work by Todd and Toby Brooking in 1629–30.

DRc MS C11 (Td, anthems, copied in the 1630s chiefly by Toby Brooking, possibly for the use of the Dean of Durham)

Crosby, 254 · Morehen, 77–9

DRc MS C13 (Td, services, copied in the late 1630s, possibly for the use of the Dean of Durham)

Crosby, 254 · Morehen, 91–7

DRc MS C16 (Bd, anthems, copied in the 1630s chiefly by Toby Brooking in the late 1630s)

Crosby, 254 · Morehen, 80–82

DRc MS C18 (Bd, verse services and liturgical music, begun 1627 by John Todd and continued by other copyists, including Toby Brooking)

Crosby, 234–6, 271 · Morehen, 68–71

DRc MSS E4–11 (liturgical music for festal days; copied *c*.1630 chiefly by John Todd [d volumes] and Toby Brooking [c volumes])

	c	d
M	E5 [E4]	E4 [E9]
Ct1	E7 [E5]	–
Ct2	E8 [E6]	E6 [E10]
T	E10 [E7]	E9 [E11]
B	E11 [E8]	–

The bracketed shelfmarks are those erroneously given in TCM 2 and BE 10a–b

Crosby, 237–42 · Morehen, 46–50

DRc MS E11a (the Clumber MS, individual collection of liturgical music, Ct1c, 1630s)

Crosby, 254–6 · Fellowes, 9–10 · Morehen, 51–8

GL MS 93 (Bd, *c*.1640–41)

John Morehen, 'The Gloucester Cathedral Bassus Part-Book MS 93', *Music & Letters*, 62 (1981), 189–96

Lbl Add. MS 15117 (the Swarland lute-book, *c*.1616)

See above, pp. 202–3

Lbl Add. MS 15166 (early Elizabethan M part-book containing anthems and metrical psalms)

Fenlon & Milsom, 145–7, 161

Lbl Add. MSS 17786–91 (domestic part-books of Oxford provenance, *c*.1610–20)

Monson, 159–80

Lbl Add. MSS 17792–6 (John Merro's first set of part-books, *c*.1620–30)

Edwards, 226, 228–30 · Monson, 143–8, 154–6

Lbl Add. MS 22597 (domestic T part-book, late 1570s?–1580s)

Edwards, 138–40 · Fenlon & Milsom, 154–5, 161

Copied on printed music paper that is elsewhere unknown and possibly predates the patent for such papers Elizabeth granted to Tallis and Byrd in 1575.

Lbl Add. MS 29247 (lute-book copied for Edward Paston, *c*.1600)

Brett, 69

Lbl Add. MS 29289 (Ctd part-book copied after 1629)

Clark1, 216 · Morehen, 433–41

Sarah Boyer, 'The Manchester Altus Partbook MS 340 Cr 71', *Music & Letters*, 72 (1991), 197–213 (197)

Though it contains mostly sixteenth-century compositions, the part-book includes a Cr signed 'ABatten 1629', possibly holograph. The predominance of Batten/Barnard repertory and the unusual rastration (nine staves per page) have been taken to suggest a St Paul's Cathedral provenance.

Lbl Add. MS 29427 (A part-book copied *c*.1612–17 by Thomas Myriell)

Monson, 6–15, 45–7

Lbl Add. MSS 29366–8 (part-books possibly of Cambridge provenance, *c*.1620–30)

Monson, 124–32

Lbl Add. MSS 29372–7 (Thomas Myriell's part-books entitled *Tristitiae remedium*, title pages dated 1616)

Monson, 17–29, 50–53

Donna M. di Grazia, 'New Perspectives on Thomas Myriell's *Tristitiae remedium* and Add. MS. 29427', *Early Music*, 38 (2010), 101–12

Lbl Add. MSS 30085–7 (John Bishop's scores of Barnard's *First Book*, copied in the mid nineteenth century)

Bamford, 351–5

Lbl Add. MS 30478 (Tc, copied for Durham Cathedral 1664)

Crosby, 227, 250 · Ford

Lbl Add. MS 30479 (Tc, copied for Durham Cathedral 1670)

Crosby, 227, 250 · Ford

Lbl Add. MSS 30480–84 (Elizabethan church part-books with domestic additions, begun *c*. 1560–70)

Edwards, 121–6 · Fenlon & Milsom, 146–7, 161 · Milsom1, 169–70

Lbl Add. MS 30485 (keyboard-book possibly in the hand of Thomas Weelkes, copied *c.* 1590–*c.*1610)

Fenlon & Milsom, 153, 161–2

MB 55, pp. xvi–xix

Lbl Add. MS 31390 (table-book dated 1578)

Edwards, 90–97

Lbl Add. MS 31853 (map of Hampshire drawn by John Norden, 1595)

Heawood, 430

Lbl Add. MS 31992 (lute intabulations copied for Edward Paston, *c.*1600)

Brett, 56–7, 69

Lbl Add. MS 34191 (late Henrician T part-book)

John Aplin, 'The Survival of Plainsong in Anglican Music: Some Early English Te-Deum Settings', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 32 (1979), 247–75 (252)

Lbl Add. MSS 37402–6 (James Pearson's part-books, untexted, *c.*1600)

Monson, 209–26

Lbl Add. MS 39572 (score-book of anthems dated 1768)

No bibliography available

Lbl MSS Egerton 2009, 20011–12 (part-books copied for Edward Paston, *c.*1600)

Brett, 60

Lbl MS Egerton 2403 (Thomas Wenman's MS)

See above, p. 183 n. 146

Lbl MS Harley 4142 (word-book copied at Windsor *c.*1643–4 by Zacharie Irishe)

Dexter, 105–6, 116–17

Lbl MS Harley 6159 (William Smith's unfinished *Visitation of Lancashire*, 1598)

Heawood, 430

Lbl MS Harley 6346 (word-book copied after 1660 for the Chapel Royal)

Morehen, 418

An enlarged transcript of, and in the same hand as, *Ob* MS Rawl. Poet. 23, see below.

Lbl MS Harley 7337 (score-book in the hand of Thomas Tudway jr, dated 1715)

Edward Turnbull, 'Thomas Tudway and the Harleian Collection', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 8 (1955), 203–7

Lbl MS Harley 7578 (miscellanea, including an Elizabethan domestic part-book possibly of Durham provenance)

John Milsom, 'A Tallis Fantasia', *The Musical Times*, 126 (1985), 658–62 (658)

Lbl MS Lansdowne 116 (material relating to the BCP and its official supplements, with corrections in the hand of William Cecil)

William Keatinge Clay, *Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer Set Forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1847), 516, 556–7

Lbl MS Lansdowne 254 (papers of Sir Anthony Browne)

Marie Axton, 'The Influence of Edmund Plowden's Succession Treatise', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 37 (1974), 209–26 (212)

Lbl MS Royal 17.A.xvii (metrical psalms by Sir Thomas Smith, 1549–50)

Beth Quitslund, *The Reformation in Rhyme: Sternhold, Hopkins and the English Metrical Psalter, 1547–1603* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 277

Lbl MS Royal Appendix 58 (lute-book, *c*.1530)

Julia Craig-McFeely, 'English Lute Manuscripts and Scribes 1530–1630' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1993), appendix 1

Lbl MSS Royal Appendix 74–6 (the Lumley books, Edwardian part-books containing vernacular sacred music, *c*.1550)

RRMR 65, pp. ix–x

Lbl MS R.M. 23.l.4 (Benjamin Cosyn's virginal book, supplemented with scores in Cosyn's hand, and dating from *c*.1624, of six services 'for the King's Royal Chapel')

Pamela Willetts, 'Benjamin Cosyn: Sources and Circumstances' in *Sundry Sorts of Music Books*, ed. Chris Banks, Arthur Searle and Malcolm Turner (London: The British Library, 1993), 129–45

The scores appear to be replacements for originals Cosyn added to the MS during his time as organist of Dulwich College (i.e. 1622–4).

Lbl MS R.M. 24.d.2 (John Baldwin's commonplace book)

See above, pp. 281–3

Lcm MSS 1045–51 (John Barnard's MS part-books, covers dated 22 August 1625)

	c	d
M	1048	1045
Ct	1049	1046
T	1050	1047
B	1051	–

Bamford, 35–132

Some contents copied prior to binding, other material added gradually, perhaps up to *c*.1640; four hands, including that of Adrian Batten; principal scribe not positively identified, but most likely Barnard himself. An index to the lost Bc volume is present in *Ob* MS Tenbury 791. The foliation given here is that reported by Bamford and Morehen, not that used in SECM and BE.

Lcm MS 2041 (M part-book copied for Edward Paston, *c*.1600)

Brett, 69

Lcm MS 2089 (lute-book copied for Edward Paston, *c*.1600)

Brett, 56–7, 69

Llp MS 764 (Bc part-book of London provenance, *c*.1639)

Morehen, 408–16

Companion to *Ob* MS Mus. e. 40, see below.

NYp MSS Drexel 4180–85 (John Merro's first set of part-books, *c*.1620–30)

Edwards, 224–5, 228–30 · Monson, 133–43, 149–53

NYp MS Drexel 4302 (the Sambrooke MS; score copied by Francis Tregian, perhaps 1613–19)

Edwards, 217, 262

NYp MS Drexel 5469 (organ-book copied by Henry Loosemore, organist of King's College Cambridge, *c*.1627–30)

Clark2, 66, 173–7 · Morehen, 201–13

Thurston Dart, 'Henry Loosemore's Organ-Book', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 3 (1960), 143–51

NYp MS Mus. Res. *MNZ (Chirk) (the Chirk Castle part-books, *c*.1630–35)

le Huray · Reynolds

See also *Och* MS Mus. 6.

Ob MS Douce e. 16 (William Herbert's transcript, *c*.1777, of the lost 1577 edition of *The paradyse of daynty deuises*)

Steven W. May, 'William Hunnis and the 1577 Paradise of Dainty Devices', *Studies in Bibliography*, 28 (1975), 63–80 (64–8)

Ob MS Mus. d. 162 (Bd from New College Oxford, perhaps begun before the Civil War)

Morehen, 497, 503

Ob MSS Mus. e. 23–5 (Ct, T and B part-books from New College Oxford, *c*.1660–1800)

Morehen, 497

Ob MS Mus. e. 40 (Bc part-book of London provenance, inscription dated 20 March 1639)

BE 11, p. 200

Companion to *Llp* MS 764, see above.

Ob MSS Mus. f. 20–24 (Thomas Hamond's part-books, dated 1630–50)

Monson, 77–108, 116–17

Ob MSS Mus. Sch. d. 212–16 (copied 1632–9 by Richard Nicolson)

Monson, 193–207

Ob MSS Mus. Sch. d. 233–6 (domestic part-books, *c*.1620–30)

SECM, 5

Ob MS Mus. Sch. e. 381 (Sx member of the Forrest-Heyther part-books)

John D. Bergsagel, 'The Date and Provenance of the Forrest-Heyther Collection of Tudor Masses', *Music & Letters*, 44 (1963), 240–48 (245–6)

In the early seventeenth century, the Ct1 part of SingJ was added on ff. 55v–56r to complement the five other parts in *Ob* MSS Mus. Sch. d. 212–16.

Ob MSS Mus. Sch. e. 420–22 (the Wanley books; Edwardian part-books containing vernacular sacred music, *c*.1548–50)

RRMR 99, pp. xii–xiv

Ob MS Mus. Sch. e. 423 (John Petre's part-book, containing mostly Ct parts and copied by his servant John Bentley *c*.1577–after 1586)

David Mateer, 'William Byrd, John Petre and Oxford, Bodleian MS Mus. Sch. e. 423', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 29 (1996), 21–46 (37)

Ob MS Rawl. Poet. 23 (anthem word-book copied 1635 for the Chapel Royal)

Morehen, 417–30

The exemplar for *Lbl* MS Harley 6346 (see above), which is in the same hand.

Ob MSS Tenbury 341–4 (part-books copied for Edward Paston, *c*.1600)

Brett, 57–8, 69

Ob MS Tenbury 389 (Ct, mid 1580s, with additions in another hand dating perhaps from as late as *c*.1610)

Edwards, 127–33 · Fenlon & Milsom, 147–9, 163

Joseph Kerman, 'Byrd's Motets: Chronology and Canon', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 14 (1961), 359–82 (367–9)

Companion to the McGhie part-book (see below)

Ob MS Tenbury 791 (organ-book copied by Adrian Batten *c*.1635)

Bamford, 94–8, 266–78 · Clark1, 207–15 · Clark2, 71, 184–201 · Morehen, 215–43

Ob MSS Tenbury 807–11 (domestic part-books, *c*.1620)

Monson, 70–75

Ob MS Tenbury 1382 (Tc, dated 1617)

John Morehen, 'The Southwell Minster Tenor Part-Book in the Library of St Michael's College, Tenbury (MS 1382), *Music & Latters*, 50 (1969), 352–64

Roger Bowers, 'Ecclesiastical or Domestic? Criteria for the Identification of the Initial Destinations of William Byrd's Music to Religious Vernacular Texts' in *William Byrd: A Research and Information Guide*, ed. Richard Turbet, 3rd edn (New York: Routledge, 2012), 134–60

MS 1382 is the oldest surviving seventeenth-century anthem book. A prefatory inscription dated 1617 explains that the MS belonged to a set consisting of eight part-books and an organ-book, and that this set was 'bestowed on the quire of the Collegiate Church of Southwell of the bountiful and friendly gift of Mr Jarvas Jones of Oxford'. Unlike other institutional MSS from the period, therefore, which were the work of staff copyists, this was a presentation MS.

Doubts about the part-book's institutional credentials were first raised by Morehen (p. 363), who noted that the part-name abbreviations B, T, A, M, Q and S, found in the table of contents, and the oblong format were much more characteristic of domestic than institutional MSS. He furthermore took the word 'bestowed' to imply the gift of an existing set of part-books as opposed to a specially commissioned one. These arguments were enough to satisfy Bowers (p. 142) that MS 1382 was of domestic provenance.

To be sure, the presence of domestic part-names in the contents table can mean only that the set was at some point used in a domestic context. But those part-names were added in a later hand, as headings of six columns indicating (none too accurately) which voices are allotted solo passages in the verse anthems. Whereas the original scribe's gridlines were neatly ruled, those of the added columns were drawn freehand. This is one of several indications that MS 1382 was an institutional volume appropriated for domestic use, and not *vice versa*.

Given the basic structural differences between institutional and domestic part-book sets, it would scarcely have been practicable for Jones to 'bestow' on the Southwell choir a set of part-books originally intended for domestic use. We know from the inscription that the set consisted of eight volumes. Yet that number could not have been arrived at simply by adding two volumes to the six already present in a customary domestic set because that set's Q and Sx volumes would have lacked the four-voice items, and its Sx volume the five-voice items also. No domestic set would have been compatible with the extensive duplication of parts required under the ecclesiastical double-choir system.

Notwithstanding the domestic characteristics of MS 1382, institutional ones predominate. The part-book contains two settings of the English Litany, no music has been entered in consort format, no items are in the C3 clef, the Latin pieces are all adapted to English words, and it is clear from the single surviving voice part that the scoring of Byrd's 'Nos enim pro peccatis' (1589ii/26) was adjusted to suit an ecclesiastical choir with two Ct parts (see p. 126 above). All these circumstances agree with the designation 'tenor cantoris' present on the front flyleaf and unmistakably in the hand of the original and principal scribe.

Ob MS Tenbury 1464 (B part-book, *c*.1575)

Fellowes, 8 · Milsom1, 167–8

Ob MSS Tenbury 1469–71 (part-books copied for Edward Paston, *c*.1600)

Brett, 69 · Fellowes, 8–9

Ob MS Wood E. 64 (unpublished writings of Anthonay à Wood)

Life of Mr William Whittingham, Dean of Durham, from a MS in Antony Wood's Collection, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London: Camden Society, 1870), 22–3

Och Gibbs 12 (Md, MS music additions to BCP printed in 1634)

Companion to *Cp* S.18b, see above.

Milsom2 · Morehen, 147–9

Och MS Mus. 6 (organ-book copied *c*.1630–35)

Clark2, 55–6, 115–18 · le Huray · Milsom2 · Reynolds

Contains accompaniments to thirty-nine of the sixty-five complete compositions in the principal layer of the Chirk Castle part-books *NYp* MSS Mus. Res. *MNZ (Chirk), which see above. The organ-book and the part-books are in the same hand.

Och MS Mus. 16 (scores in the hand of Henry Aldrich, copied *c*.1685–1702)

Milsom2

Och MS Mus. 21 (score-book begun perhaps in the 1620s, the first layer being a principal source for the consort anthems of Orlando Gibbons)

Milsom2

Och MS Mus. 37 (miscellanea, bound *c*.1700)

Milsom2

Och MSS Mus. 56–60 (*c*.1612–20)

Milsom2 · Monson, 59–69

John Aplin, 'Sir Henry Fanshawe and Two Sets of Early Seventeenth-Century Part-Books at Christ Church, Oxford', *Music & Letters*, 57 (1976), 11–24

Och MSS Mus. 61–6 (domestic part-books partly in the hand of Thomas Myriell, *c*.1620)

Milsom2 · Monson, 29–31, 54–5

Och MSS Mus. 979–83 (John Baldwin's Part-books, *c*.1575–81)

Fenlon & Milsom, 143, 149, 162 · Milsom2

Roger Bray, 'The Part-Books Oxford, Christ Church, MSS 979–983: An Index and Commentary', *Musica Disciplina*, 25 (1971), 179–97

Och MSS Mus. 984–8 (Robert Dow's part-books, *c*.1581–1588)

Milsom1, 165–6 · Milsom2

David Mateer, 'Oxford, Christ Church Music MSS 984–8: An Index and Commentary', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 20 (1986–7), 1–18

John Milsom, *The Dow Partbooks: Introduction and Indexes* (Oxford: DIAMM Publications, 2010)

Och MS Mus. 1001 (organ-book copied *c*.1620)

Clark2, 60–61, 131–4 · Milsom2 · Morehen, 464–72

The date *c*.1640 has been given for this MS, chiefly on the grounds of its considerable number of concordances (nearly 60%) with John Barnard's *First Book*, published in 1641. None of the contents was necessarily composed later than *c*.1620, however, and Giles, whose doctorate was not conferred until 1622, was styled 'Mr' by the original scribe, the honorific 'Dr' being added in a later hand to the one anthem by which he is represented, 'O Give thanks' (ff. 71r–70v). The distinctive watermark of grapes with fleur-de-lis (GRP.046.1) has been traced to a document dated 1613: see Daniel W. Mosser and Ernest W. Sullivan II, with Len Hatfield and David H. Radcliffe, *The Thomas L. Gravell Watermark Archive, 1996–*, <www.gravell.org>, accessed 13 January 2014.

Och MS Mus. 1012 (Bc part-book, copied 1669 or later, containing services and anthems)

Milsom2

Och MS Mus. 1148 (Bd part-book, copied *c*.1630, containing preces, responses and liturgical psalms)

Milsom2

Och MSS Mus. 1220–24 (first layer, *c*.1643–4)

	c	d
M	–	–
Ct	–	1220
T	1222	1221
B	1224	1223

Dexter, 104–5, 113–15 · Milsom2

Och MS Mus. 1227 (organ-book copied *c*.1750–60 for Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford, by William Walond sr)

Milsom2

Peter Ward Jones and Donald Burrows, 'An Inventory of Mid-Eighteenth-Century Oxford Musical Hands', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 35 (2002), 61–139 (63, 90)

Oj box 235 (fragmentary B part, *c*.1600; provenance uncertain)

John Morehen, 'A Fragmentary Bass Manuscript in St John's College Library, Oxford', *Music & Letters*, 53 (1972), 56–8

Oj MS 180 (Bd part-book copied for the Chapel Royal by John Stevens, *c*.1635)

Morehen, 391–407

Oj MS 181 (Bd part-book copied for the Chapel Royal by John Stevens, *c*.1635)

Morehen, 391–407

SHR LB/15/1/226 (Tr part-book, *c*.1570–*c*.1610)

Olim ref. 356 Box 519/2.

Smith, 117–18 · Milsom1, 169 n. 21 · Morehen, 498–9

SHR LB/15/1/228 (T part-book, *c*.1616)

Olim ref. 356 Box 519/4.

Smith, 119 · Milsom1, 169 n. 21 · Morehen, 500

SHR LB/15/1/229 (B part-book, *c*.1625–40)

Olim ref. 356 Box 519/5.

Smith, 120–21 · Milsom1, 169 n. 21 · Morehen, 501

Ws MS V. a. 412 (domestic T part-book, *c*.1625)

SECM, 6

WO MS A.3.3 (collection of T parts in various seventeenth- and eighteenth-century hands)

See above, p. 270

WRch MSS 1 and 3 (Ctd and Tc part-books, begun between 1660 and 1665)

Cheverton, 424–8

Y MS H4 (York Minster chapter acts)

See above, p. 272

Y MSS M1/1–8(S) (the Bing-Gostling part-books, *c*.1675)

Harold Watkins Shaw, *A Study of the Bing-Gostling Part Books in the Library of York Minster, Together with a Systematic Catalogue* (Croydon: Royal School of Church Music for the Church Music Society, 1986)

Y MSS M13/1–5(S) (service-books apparently copied by John Todd at York Minster *c*. 1598; copying unfinished)

	c	d
M	–	M13/1
Ct1	–	M13/2
Ct2	–	–
T	–	M13/4
B	M13/3	M13/5

See above, pp. 272–81

Y MS M29(S) (the Dunnington-Jefferson MS, Bd of Durham provenance, late 1630s)

Crosby, 250–54 · Fellowes, 10–12 · Ford

In the same hand as *DRc* MSS C2, 3, 7 (i), 14, and combining some but not all of the anthems from those MSS with preces and psalms from *DRc* MSS E4–11, plus certain further anthems not otherwise represented in Durham sources. Perhaps copied for the personal use of Prebendary John Cosin (as in the *Cp* Caroline part-books, the anthems are grouped into the triple categories of praise, prayer and penitence).

Privately owned MSS

Hellwis-Gell MS (Ctd)

This orphaned part-book containing liturgical music and anthems first came to light in November 2011 when its anonymous owner permitted digital images to be made and circulated by Michael Fleming. The name 'Hellwis-Gell', used here for convenience, derives from compositions by two otherwise unknown composers included in the MS. The principal scribe's cursive script suggests a mid seventeenth-century date, possibly as late as the 1660s, although all the identifiable contents are by pre-Restoration composers.

McGhie MS (S, mid 1580s, with additions in another hand dating perhaps from as late as *c.* 1610)

Companion to *Ob* MS Tenbury 389 (see above). In BE 11 (p. 202) and elsewhere, this part-book has been mistakenly named after Mr Michael James, to whom it was for some time on loan from its owner, Mr David McGhie of Wimborne Minster, Dorset: see Richard Charteris, 'Ferrabosco Catalogue' (letter), *Music & Letters*, 66 (1985), 196–8 (198).

BIBLIOGRAPHY A:

BIBLES, PSALTERS, LITURGIES AND OTHER PRAYER BOOKS, WITH AND WITHOUT MUSIC

1. Latin

Primary

Hore intemerate beatissime virginis Marie secundum vsum Saru[m] (London: Richard Pynson, 1497; STC 15886)

Hore presentes ad vsum Sarum (Paris: Philippe Pigouchet, 1502; STC 15897)

Antiphonale ad vsu[m] ecclesie Sa[rum] (Paris: Wolfgang Hopyl, 1519; STC 15790)

Graduale ad consuetudine[m] Sarum (Paris: Wolfgang Hopyl, 1508; STC 15862)

Processionale ad vsum insignis ac preclare ecclesie Sar[um] (Paris: Wolfgang Hopyl, 1519; STC 16235)

Secondary

Breviarium ad usum insignis ecclesiae Sarum, ed. Francis Procter and Christopher Wordsworth, 3 vols (Cambridge: Almae Matris Academiae, 1879–86)

Breviarium ad usum insignis ecclesie Eboracensis, ed. Stephen Willoughby Lawley, 2 vols (Durham: Surtees Society, 1880–83)

The Hereford Breviary, ed. Walter H. Frere and Langton E. G. Brown, 3 vols (London: Henry Bradshaw Society, 1904–15)

Liber usualis (Tournai: Desclée, 1961)

2. Vernacular and bilingual primers

A goodly prymer in englyshe (London: John Byddell, 1535; STC 15988)

The primer, set foorth by the Kynges maiestie and his clergie (London: Richard Grafton, 1545; STC 16034)

The primer, or, Office of the Blessed Virgin Marie in Latin and English, according to the reformed Latin, and vvith lyke graces priuileged, ed. Richard Verstegen (Antwerp: Arnold Conings, 1599; STC 16094)

3. The BCP and Related Liturgies

Primary

An exhortacion vnto praier … Also a letanie with suffrages, edns with monophonic music (London: Richard Grafton, 1544; STC 10622, 10621.7 and 10622)

The booke of the common prayer (London: Edward Whitchurch, 1549; STC 16267)

Merbecke, John, *The Book of Common Prayer Noted* (London: Richard Grafton, 1550; STC 16441)

A fourme to be vsed in common prayer twise a weeke … during this tyme of mortalitie and other afflictions (London: Richard Jugge and John Cawood, 1563; STC 16505)

A fourme of Prayer, with thankes geuyng, to be vsed euery yeere, the 17. of Nouember, beyng the day of the Queenes Maiesties entrie to her raigne (London: Richard Jugge, 1576; STC 16479)

A fourme of prayer with thankes giuing, to be vsed of all the Queenes Maiesties louing subiects euery yeere, the 17. of Nouember, being the daye of the her Highnesse entry to her kingdome (London: Christopher Barker, 1580 and 1590; STC 16481 and 16482)

An order of prayer and thankesgiuing, for the preseruation of her Maiestie and the realme, from the traiterous and bloodie practises of the Pope, and his adherents (London: Christopher Barker, 1586; STC 16517)

Edmund Bunny, *Certaine prayers and other godly exercises, for the seuenteenth of Nouember* (London: Christopher Barker, 1585; STC 4089)

Certaine praiers collected out of a fourme of godly meditations, set foorth by her Maiesties authoritie in the great mortalitie (London: the deputies of Christopher Barker, 1593; STC 16524)

A fourme of prayer with thankesgiuing, to bee vsed of all the Kings Maiesties louing subiects euery yeere, the 24. of March: being the day of his highnesse entry to this kingdome (London: Robert Barker, 1604; STC 16483)

Secondary

Clay, William Keatinge (ed.), *Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer Set Forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1847)

Ketley, Joseph (ed.), *The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549, and A.D. 1552* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844)

4. The Bible in English

Coverdale's Bible (1535; STC 2063)

Matthew's Bible (1537; STC 2066)

The Great Bible (1539; STC 2068)

The Geneva Bible (1560; STC 2093)

The Bishops' Bible (1568; STC 2099)

The Nevv Testament of Iesus Christ, translated faithfully into English (Rheims: John Fogny, 1582; STC 2884)

The Second Tome of the holie Bible faithfully translated into English (Douai: Laurence Kellam, 1610; STC 2207)

5. Monophonic metrical psalters, biblical paraphrases, etc.

Girolamo Savonarola, *An exposition after the maner of a co[n]templacyon vpon ye .li. psalme, called Miserere mei Deus* (London: John Byddell, 1534; STC 21789.3)

Miles Coverdale, *Goostly psalmes and spirituall songes drawen out of the holy Scripture* (London: John Gough, 1535; STC 5892)

Thomas Sternhold, *Certayne psalmes chose[n] out of the Psalter of Dauid, and drawe[n] into Englishe metre* (London: Edward Whitchurch, 1549; STC 2419)

William Hunnis, *Certayne psalmes chosen out of the psalter of Dauid, and drawen furth into Englysh meter* (London: John Harrington, 1550; STC 2727)

Christopher Tye, *The Actes of the Apostles, translated into Englyshe metre* (London: William Seres, 1553; STC 2984)

Thomas Sternhold, John Hopkins, et al, *The whole booke of Psalmes collected into Englysh metre* (London: John Day, 1562 etc.; STC 2430, 2432 et seq.)

Matthew Parker, *The vvhole Psalter translated into English metre* (London: John Day [1567]; STC 2729)

William Hunnis, *A hyue full of hunnye contayning the firste booke of Moses, called Genesis. Turned into English meetre* (London: Thomas Marsh, 1578; STC 13974)

———, *Seuen sobs of a sorrowfull soule for sinne … A Handfull of honisuckles … The poore Widowes Mite … Comfortable Dialogs betweene Christ and a Sinner* (London: Henry Denham, 1583 etc.; STC 13975 et seq.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY B:

EDITIONS OF MUSIC

1. Byrd's publications

All London: Thomas East, unless otherwise stated

1575 *Cantiones, quae ab argumento sacrae vocantur* (London: Thomas Vautrollier; STC 23666)
1588 *Psalmes, sonets, & songs of sadnes and pietie* (STC 4253.3)
1589i *Songs of sundrie natures* (STC 4256)
1589ii *Liber primus sacrarum cantionum* (STC 4247)
1591 *Liber secundus sacrarum cantionum* (STC 4248)
1605 *Gradualia ... Lib. primus* (1610 reissue; STC 4244)
1607 *Gradualia ... Liber secundus* (STC 4244.5)
1611 *Psalmes, songs and sonnets* (London: Thomas Snodham; STC 4255)

2. Other primary sources of polyphonic music

The whole psalmes in foure partes, whiche may be song to al musicall instrumentes (London: John Day, 1563; STC 2431)

Mornyng and euenyng prayer and communion, set forthe in foure partes, to be song in churches (London: John Day, 1565; STC 6419); this publication is also known as *Certain Notes*, from title pages Day printed in 1560

Richard Allison, *The Psalmes of Dauid in meter* (London: William Barley, 1599; STC 2497)

Richard Allison, *An howres recreation in musicke apt for instrumentes and voyces* (London: John Windet, 1606; STC 356)

Michael East, *The third set of bookes* (London: Thomas Snodham, 1610; STC 7462)

Sir William Leighton, *The teares or lamentacions of a sorrovvfull soule* (London: William Stansby, 1614; STC 15434)

Michael East, *The fovrth set of bookes* (London: Thomas Snodham, 1618; STC 7463)

Michael East, *The sixt set of bookes* (London: Thomas Snodham, 1624; STC 7466)

John Barnard (ed.), *The First Book of Selected Church Musick* (London: Edward Griffin, 1641)

Thomas Tomkins, *Musica Deo Sacra*, ed. Nathaniel Tomkins (London: William Godbid, 1668)

3. Series

The Collected Vocal Works of William Byrd (WB), ed. Edmund Fellowes (London: Stainer & Bell)

10 *English Liturgical Music* (1948)

The Byrd Edition (BE) (London: Stainer & Bell)

1	*Cantiones*, ed. Craig Monson (1977)	=1575
2	*Cantiones sacrae I*, ed. Alan Brown (1988)	=1589ii
3	*Cantiones sacrae II*, ed. Alan Brown (1981)	=1591
4	*The Masses*, ed. Philip Brett (1981)	

5,6a–b	*Gradualia I*, ed. Philip Brett (1989–93)	=1605
7a–b	*Gradualia II*, ed. Philip Brett (1997)	=1607
8	*Latin Motets I*, ed. Warwick Edwards (1984)	
9	*Latin Motets II*, ed. Warwick Edwards (2000)	
10a–b	*The English Services*, ed. Craig Monson (1980–82)	
11	*The English Anthems*, ed. Craig Monson (1983)	
12	*Psalmes, sonets & songs*, ed. Jeremy L. Smith (2004)	=1588
13	*Songs of sundrie natures*, ed. David Mateer (2004)	=1589i
14	*Psalmes, songs and sonnets*, ed. John Morehen (1987)	=1611
15	*Consort Songs for Voice and Viols*, ed. Philip Brett (1970)	
16	*Madrigals, Songs and Canons*, ed Philip Brett (1976)	
17	*Consort Music*, ed. Kenneth Elliott (1971)	

Early English Church Music (EECM) (London: Stainer & Bell)

2	*William Mundy: Latin Antiphons and Psalms*, ed. Frank Ll. Harrison (1963)
3	*Orlando Gibbons I: Verse Anthems*, ed. David Wulstan (1964)
5	*Thomas Tomkins: Musica Deo Sacra I*, ed. Bernard Rose (1965)
9	*Thomas Tomkins: Musica Deo Sacra II*, ed. Bernard Rose (1968)
11	Sir William Leighton: The Tears or Lamentations of a Sorrowful Soul ed. Cecil Hill (1970)
12	*Thomas Tallis: English Sacred Music I: Anthems*, ed. Leonard Ellinwood, rev. Paul Doe (1973)
13	*Thomas Tallis: English Sacred Music II: Service Music*, ed. Leonard Ellinwood, rev. Paul Doe (1974)
14	*Thomas Tomkins: Musica Deo Sacra III*, ed. Bernard Rose (1973)
19	*Christopher Tye I: English Sacred Music*, ed. John Morehen (1977)
21	*Orlando Gibbons II: Full Anthems, Hymns and Fragmentary Verse Anthems*, ed. David Wulstan (1978)
23	*Nathaniel Giles: Anthems*, ed. John Bunker Clark (1979)
37	*Thomas Tomkins: Musica Deo Sacra V*, ed. Bernard Rose (1991)
38	*Thomas Morley I: English Anthems; Liturgical Music*, ed. John Morehen (1991)
39	*Thomas Tomkins: Musica Deo Sacra VI*, ed. Bernard Rose (1992)
41	*Thomas Morley II: Services*, ed. John Morehen (1998)
48	*The The Gyffard Partbooks: I*, ed. David Mateer (2007)

Monuments and Masters of the Renaissance (MMR) (New York: Broude Bros.)

4	*Philip Van Wilder: Collected Works*, ed. Jane A. Bernstein, 2 vols (1991)

Musica britannica (MB) (London: Stainer & Bell)

1	*The Mulliner Book*, ed. John Caldwell (2nd edn, 2011)
5	*Thomas Tomkins: Keyboard Music*, ed. Stephen D. Tuttle (1955)
15	*Music of Scotland, 1500–1700*, ed. Kenneth Elliott (1957)
22	*Consort Songs*, ed. Philip Brett (1967)
23	*Thomas Weelkes: Collected Anthems*, ed. David Brown, Walter Collins, and Peter le Huray (1966)
27	*William Byrd: Keyboard Music*, ed. Alan Brown (3rd edn, 1999)
55	*Elizabethan Keyboard Music*, ed. Alan Brown (1989)

Recent Researches in the Music of the Renaissance (RRMR) (Madison: A-R Editions)

65 *The Tudor Church Music of the Lumley Books*, ed. Judith Blezzard (1985)
99 *The Wanley Manuscripts, part I*, ed. James Wrightson (1995)
100 *The Wanley Manuscripts, part II*, ed. James Wrightson (1995)
113 *Matthew Jeffries: Consort, Full and Verse Anthems*, ed. John Cannell (1998)
116 *Savonarolan Laudas, Motets and Anthems*, ed. Patrick Macey (1999)
133 *Lassus: Sacrae Cantiones* (Nuremberg, 1562), ed. James Erb (2002)

Tudor Church Music (TCM), ed. Percy Buck, Edmund H. Fellowes, Alick Ramsbotham and Sylvia Townsend Warner (London: Oxford University Press)

2 *William Byrd* (1922)
4 *Orlando Gibbons* (1925)
5 *Robert White* (1926)
6 *Thomas Tallis* (1928)
8 *Thomas Tomkins: Services* (1928)

Tudor Church Music Octavo Edition (TCMO), all ed. Edmund H. Fellowes unless otherwise stated (London/Oxford: Oxford University Press):

8 William Byrd, The Third Service (*M, ND*) (undated)
8 (revised) William Byrd, The Third Service (*M, ND*), ed. Anthony Greening (1983)
22 William Byrd, The Great Service (*V, TD, Bs, Ks, Cr, M, ND*) (1923)
24 William Byrd, Second Service (*M, ND*) (1923)
33 Richard Farrant, Short Service (*M, ND*) (undated)
54 John Farrant, Short Service (*TD, J, M, ND*) (1928)
60 Richard Farrant, 'Hide not thou thy face' and 'Call to remembrance', ed. Alick Ramsbotham (1930)
62 Richard Farrant, Short Service (*TD, Bs*) (1930)
91 (revised) John Bull, 'Almighty God, who by the leading of a star', ed. Timothy Symons (1998)
95 (revised) Thomas Caustun, Service for Children (*M, ND*), ed. Peter le Huray and David Willcocks (1963)

4. Anthologies

An Anthology of English Church Music, ed. David Wulstan (London: J. & W. Chester, 1971)

Anthems for Men's Voices, Vol. 2: Tenors and Basses, ed. Peter le Huray, Nicholas Temperley, Peter Tranchell and David Willcocks (London: Oxford University Press, 1962)

Cathedral Music, ed. William Boyce, 3 vols (London: printed for the editor, 1760–73)

The Choral Responses and Litanies of the United Church of England and Ireland, ed. John Jebb, vol. 1 (London: George Bell, 1847), vol. 2 (London: Robert Cocks, 1857)

5. Individual publications

Amner, John, 'Christ rising', ed. Anthony Greening (London: Oxford University Press, 1968)

————, 'O Lord, of whom I do depend', ed. Anthony Greening (Croydon: The Royal School of Church Music, 1973)

Batten, Adrian, Evening Canticles from the Short Service (*M*, *ND*), ed. David Evans (Swansea: Cathedral Press, 2001)

Byrd, William, 'Exalt thyself, O God', ed. Peter James (Oxford: Oxenford Imprint, 1981)

Coste, Richard, 'He that hath my commandments', ed Clifford Bartlett and Brian Clark, *Early Music Review*, 41 (June 1998), 11–12 (transcription), *Annual Byrd Newsletter*, 4 (1998), 12 (critical commentary)

Farrant, Richard, 'When as we sat in Babylon', ed. Robert Reeve in *An Anthology of English Church Music*, 41–8

Holmes, John, 'All laud and praise' and 'O how happy a thing it is', reconstructed by Ian Payne (Leicester: EditioPrinceps Publications, 2011)

Mundy, William, First Service (*M*, *ND*), ed. S. Royle Shore (London: Novello & Co., 1912)

————, Service for Trebles (*TD*, *Bs*), ed. David Evans (Bangor: Cathedral Press)

Parsons, Robert, 'Deliver me from mine enemies' ed. Philippe Oboussier (London: Novello, 1957)

Tomkins, John, 'The king shall rejoice', ed. Maurice Bevan (London: Cathedral Music, 1978)

Tomkins, Thomas, 'Know you not', ed. Peter James in *An Anthology of English Church Music*, 116–34

————, Fifth Service (*M*, *ND*), ed. Bernard Rose (London: Oxford University Press, 1959)

————, *Five Consort Anthems*, ed. David Pinto and Ross W. Duffin (London: Fretwork Editions, 1994)

Weelkes, Thomas, 'Christ rising', ed. David Brown (London: Novello, 1973)

————, Evening Service for Trebles (*M*, *ND*), ed. Peter le Huray (London: Stainer & Bell, 1962)

————, Ninth Service (*M*, *ND*), ed. David Wulstan (Oxford: Oxenford Imprint, 1979)

Wilson, Thomas, 'Prevent us, O Lord', ed. John Morehen (Glen Rock, NJ: J. Fischer, 1969)

6. Unpublished

Sheppard, John, First Service (*V*, *TD*, *Bs*, *Cr*, *M*, *ND*) and Second Service (*V*, *TD*, *Bs*, *Cr*, *M*, *ND*), edn in Stefan Scot, 'The Vernacular Music of John Sheppard: An Introduction, Edition and Commentary' (unpublished masters thesis, University of Exeter, 1991)

Smith, Edward, Preces and Psalm for All Saints, edn in Simon Anderson, 'Music by Members of the Choral Foundation of Durham Cathedral in the Seventeenth Century', 2 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Durham, 1999), vol. 2, pp. 170–80

7. Web editions

Parsons, Robert, First Service (*V*, *TD*, *Bs*, *Ks*, *Cr*, *M*, *ND*), ed. George Steel, <www.millertheatre.com/parsons/english.html>, accessed 29 September 2013

————, Second Service (*V*, *TD*, *Bs*, *Ks*, *Cr*, *M*, *ND*), ed. Ralph W. Buxton, <www.millertheatre.com/parsons/english.html>, accessed 29 September 2013

8. Facsimile

English Song 1600–1675: 1. British Library Manuscripts, Part I, ed. Elise Bickford Jorgens (New York and London: Garland, 1986)

BIBLIOGRAPHY C:

LITERATURE

[Alfield, Thomas], *A true reporte of the death & martyrdome of M. Campion Iesuite and preiste, & M. Sherwin, & M. Bryan preistes, at Tiborne the first of December 1581* (publisher unidentified, [1582]; STC 4537)

Andrews, Herbert Kennedy, 'Printed Sources of William Byrd's "Psalmes, Sonets and Songs"', *Music & Letters*, 44 (1963), 5–20

Anon. ('I. R.') (ed.), *The countrie mans comfort. Or Religious recreations fitte for all well disposed persons. Which was printed in the yeere of our Lord 1588. And since corrected, amended, and enlarged by the same author* (London: M. Dawson, 1637; STC 20961)

Anon. (John Case?), *The Praise of Musicke* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1586; STC 20184)

Anon. (Peter Smart?), *A briefe, but true historicall Narration of some notorious Acts and Speeches of Mr. Iohn Cosens, and some other of his companions contracted into Articles*, included in *The vanitie & downe-fall of superstitious popish ceremonies: or, A sermon preached in the cathedrall church of Durham by one Mr. Peter Smart, a praebend there, Iuly 27. 1628* (Edinburgh: the heirs of Robert Charteris, 1628; STC 22640.3)

Aplin, John, 'The Survival of Plainsong in Anglican Music: Some Early English Te-Deum Settings', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 32 (1979), 247–75

———, '"The Fourth Kind of Faburden": The Identity of an English Four-Part Style', *Music & Letters*, 61 (1980), 245–65

———, 'Sir Henry Fanshawe and Two Sets of Early Seventeenth-Century Part-Books at Christ Church, Oxford', *Music & Letters*, 57 (1976), 11–24

Arber, Edward (ed.), *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554–1640*, vol. 2 (London: privately printed, 1875)

Aristotle, *The 'Art' of Rhetoric*, ed. and transl. John Henry Freese (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926)

Ashbee, Andrew (ed.), *Records of English Court Music*, vol. 4 (Snodland: the editor, 1991)

———, and John Harley (eds), *The Cheque Books of the Chapel Royal, with Additional Material from the Manuscripts of William Lovegrove and Marmaduke Alford*, 2 vols (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000)

Austern, Linda Phyllis, '"For Musicke is the Handmaid of the Lord": Women, Psalms, and Domestic Music-Making in Early Modern England' in *Psalms in the Early Modern World*, ed. Austern, Kari Boyd McBride and David L. Orvis (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 77–114

Axton, Marie, 'The Influence of Edmund Plowden's Succession Treatise', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 37 (1974)

———, *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977)

Bacon, Francis, *Sylua syluarum: or A naturall historie In ten centuries* (London: J. H. for William Lee, 1627; STC 1168)

Baker, J. H., 'Saunders, Sir Edward (1506–1576)', 'Browne, Sir Anthony (1509/10–1567)', 'Rastell, William (1508–1565)' and 'Carus, Thomas (*c*.1510–1571)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, 2008), <www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24692>, .../3666>, .../23151>, .../4825>, accessed 23 March 2014

Bamford, Daniel, 'John Barnard's *First Book of Selected Church Musick*: Genesis, Production and Influence', 3 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of York, 2009)

———, 'The Music of York Minster, *c*.1616–*c*.1625: A Study of the Music Manuscripts *GB-Y* M13/1–5(S)' (unpublished masters thesis, University of York, 2004)

Bartel, Dietrich, *Musica poetica: Musical-Rhetorical Figures in German Baroque Music* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1997)

Benham, Hugh, *John Taverner: His Life and Music* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003)

Bentley, Thomas, *The monument of matrones conteining seuen seuerall lamps of virginitie, or distinct treatises*, 3 vols (London: Henry Denham, 1582; STC 1892–4)

Bergsagel, John D., 'The Date and Provenance of the Forrest-Heyther Collection of Tudor Masses', *Music & Letters*, 44 (1963), 240–48

Beza, Theodore, *A shorte learned and pithie treatize of the plague*, transl. John Stockwood (London: Thomas Dawson, 1580; STC 2046)

Bicknell, Stephen, *The History of the English Organ* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Bowers, Roger, 'Ecclesiastical or Domestic? Criteria for the Identification of the Initial Destinations of William Byrd's Music to Religious Vernacular Texts' in *William Byrd: A Research and Information Guide*, ed. Richard Turbet, 3rd edn (New York: Routledge, 2012), 134–60

———, letter (untitled), *Early Music Review*, 42 (July 1998), 27

———, 'The Liturgy of the Cathedral and Its Music, *c*.1075–1642' in *A History of Canterbury Cathedral*, ed. Patrick Collinson, Nigel Ramsay and Margaret Sparks (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 408–50

———, 'Music and Worship to 1640', in *A History of Lincoln Minster*, ed. Dorothy Owen (Cambridge, 1994), 47–76

Boyer, Sarah, 'The Manchester Altus Partbook MS 340 Cr 71', Music & Letters, 72 (1991), 197–213

Brasbridge, Thomas, *The poore mans ieuuel, that is to say, A treatise of the pestilence* (London: for George Byshop, 1578 etc.; STC 3549 et seq.)

Bray, Roger, 'British Library, R. M. 24 d 2 (John Baldwin's Commonplace Book): An Index and Commentary', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 12 (1974), 137–51

———, 'The Part-Books Oxford, Christ Church, MSS 979–983: An Index and Commentary', *Musica Disciplina*, 25 (1971), 179–97

———, 'William Byrd's English Psalms' in *Psalms in the Early Modern World*, ed. Linda Phyllis Austern, Kari Boyd McBride and David L. Orvis (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 61–75

Brett, Philip, 'The English Consort Song, 1570–1625', *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, 88 (1961–2), 73–88

———, 'The Songs of William Byrd' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1965)

———, 'Word-Setting in the Songs of Byrd', *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, 98 (1971–2), 47–64

Brooks, Christopher W., 'Gerard, Sir Gilbert (d. 1593)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, 2008), <www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10552>, accessed 24 March 2012

Brown, Rawdon, *Calendar of State Papers ... Venice*, vol. 6, part 1 (London: Longman, 1877)

Burmeister, Joachim, *Musical Poetics*, ed. and transl. Benito Rivera (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993)

Butler, Charles, *The principles of musik, in singing and setting vvith the two-fold use thereof, ecclesiasticall and civil* (London: John Haviland, 1636; STC 4196)

Butler, Gregory G., 'Music and Rhetoric in Early Seventeenth-Century English Sources', *The Musical Quarterly*, 66 (1980), 53–64

Caldwell, John, *The Oxford History of English Music*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991)

Calvin, John, *The Psalmes of Dauid and others. With M. Iohn Caluins commentaries*, transl. Arthur Golding, 2 vols (London: Thomas East and Henry Middleton, 1571; STC 4395)

Campbell, Sydney, and W. L. Sumner, 'The Organs and Organists of St George's Chapel, Windsor Castle', *The Organ*, 45 (1966), 145–56

Carver, Anthony F., *Cori spezzati: The Development of Sacred Polychoral Music to the Time of Schütz* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988)

Cheverton, Ian, 'English Church Music of the Early Restoration Period, 1660–*c.* 1676' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, 1984)

Clark, John Bunker, *Transposition in Seventeenth-Century English Organ Accompaniments and the Transposing Organ* (Detroit: Information Coordinators, 1974)

Clifford, James (ed.), *The Divine Services and Anthems*, 1st edn (London: William Godbid, 1663)

———, *The Divine Services and Anthems*, 2nd edn (London: William Godbid, 1664)

Clogy, Alexander, *Memoir of the Life and Episcopate of Dr William Bedell*, ed. W. Walker Wilkins (London: Wertheim, Macintosh & Hunt, 1862)

Cole, Suzanne, *Thomas Tallis and His Music in Victorian England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008)

———, 'Who Is the Father? Changing Perceptions of Tallis and Byrd in Late Nineteenth-Century England', *Music & Letters*, 89 (2008), 212–26

Collinson, Patrick, 'Windows in a Woman's Soul: Questions about the Religion of Queen Elizabeth I' in Collinson, *Elizabethans* (London: Hambledon & London, 2003), 87–118

Cooper, Charles Henry, and Thompson Cooper, *Athenae cantabrigienses,* 2 vols (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Macmillan, 1858–61)

Craig-McFeely, Julia, 'English Lute Manuscripts and Scribes 1530–1630' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1993)

Crompton, Richard, *L'authoritie et iurisdiction des courts de la Maiestie de la Roygne: nouelment collect & compose* (London: Charles Yetsweirt, 1594; STC 6050)

Crosby, Brian, 'The Choral Foundation of Durham Cathedral, *c.*1350–*c.*1650', 2 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Durham, 1992)

Daniel, Ralph T. and Peter le Huray (compilers), *The Sources of English Church Music, 1549–1660* (London: Stainer & Bell, 1972)

Dart Thurston, 'Henry Loosemore's Organ-Book', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 3 (1960), 143–51

Dasent, John Roche (ed.), *Acts of the Privy Council of England, Vol. XXIV 1592–3* (London: HMSO, 1901)

Dexter, Keri, 'Unmasking "Thomas Tudway": A New Identity for a Seventeenth-Century Windsor Copyist', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 32 (1999), 89–117

di Grazia, Donna M., 'New Perspectives on Thomas Myriell's Tristitiae remedium and Add. MS. 29427', *Early Music*, 38 (2010), 101–12

Doe, Paul, *Tallis*, 2nd edn (London, 1976)

Dubinski, Roman B., *English Religious Poetry Printed 1477–1640* (Waterloo, Ontario: North Waterloo Academic Press, 1996)

Edwards, Arthur C., *John Petre: Essays on the Life and Background of John, 1st Lord Petre, 1549–1613* (London: Regency Press, 1975)

Edwards, Richard (ed.), *The paradyse of daynty deuises* (London: Henry Disle, 1576; STC 7516) and later edns

Edwards, Warwick, 'The Sources of Elizabethan Consort Music', 2 vols (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1974)

Elders, Willem, *Symbolic Scores: Studies in the Music of the Renaissance* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994)

England and Wales, Sovereign (1558–1603: Elizabeth I), *Iniunctions geuen by the Quenes Maiestie* (London: Richard Jugge and John Cawood, 1559; STC 10099.5)

———, *Orders, thought meete by her Maiestie, and her priuie Councell, to be executed throughout the counties of this realme, in such townes, villages, and other places, as are, or may be hereafter infected with the plague* (London: Christopher Barker; STC 9187.9)

Fellowes, Edmund, *English Cathedral Music from Edward VI to Edward VII* (London: Methuen, 1941)

———, TCM appendix vol. with supplementary notes (London: Oxford University Press, 1948)

———, *William Byrd*, 2nd edn (London: Oxford University Press, 1948)

Fenlon, Iain (ed.), *Cambridge Music Manuscripts, 900–1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 134–7

Fenlon, Iain, and John Milsom, '"Ruled Paper Imprinted": Music Paper and Patents in Sixteenth-Century England', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 37 (1984), 139–63

Fielde, John, *An admonition to the Parliament* (publisher unidentified, 1572; STC 10847)

Foster, Myles Birket, *Anthems and Anthem Composers* (London: Novello & Co., 1901)

Fraser, David, 'Sources of Texts for Byrd's 1611 *Psalmes*', *Early Music*, 38 (2010), 171–2

Frere, Walter H., and W. P. M. Kennedy (eds), *Visitation Articles and Injunctions, Vol. III, 1559–1575* (London: Longman, 1910)

Fry, John (ed.), *The Legend of Mary Queen of Scots* (London: Longman, 1810)

Gaskin, Hilary, 'Baldwin and the Nevell Hand' in *Byrd Studies*, ed. Alan Brown and Richard Turbet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 159–173

Gilman, Sander L., 'The Hymns of Johannes Agricola of Eisleben: A Literary Reappraisal', *The Modern Language Review*, 67 (1972), 364–89

Gissel, Siegfried, 'Die Tonart Ionicus connexus in der Motettensammlung "Opus melicum" von Friedrich Weissensee', *Musica Disciplina*, 52 (1998–2002), 57–137

Goodall, Archibald L., 'The Health of King James the Sixth of Scotland and First of England', *Medical History*, 1 (1957), 17–27

Gray, Walter, 'Some Aspects of Word Treatment in the Music of William Byrd', *Musical Quarterly*, 55 (1969), 45–64

Green, Mary Anne Everett (ed.), *Life of Mr William Whittingham, Dean of Durham, from a MS in Antony Wood's Collection* (London: Camden Society, 1870)

Greg, W. W., and E. Boswell (eds), *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company, Vol. 1: 1576–1602* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1930)

Griffiths, David, *A Catalogue of the Music Manuscripts in York Minster Library* (York: York Minster Library, 1981)

Grimshaw, Julian, '*Fuga* in Early Byrd', *Early Music*, 37 (2009), 251–65

———, 'Sixteenth-Century English *Fuga*: Sequential and Peak-Note Subjects', *The Musical Times*, 148/3 (Autumn 2007), 61–78

Harding, Thomas, *A confutation of a booke intituled An apologie of the Church of England* (Antwerp: John Laet, 1565; STC 12762)

Harding, Vanessa, *The Dead and the Living in Paris and London, 1500–1670* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Harley, John, 'Byrd's "Catholic" Anthems', *Annual Byrd Newsletter*, 8 (2002), 8–9

———, *William Byrd: Gentleman of the Chapel Royal* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997)
———, *The World of William Byrd: Musicians, Merchants and Magnates* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010)
Heawood, Edward, 'Sources of Early English Paper-Supply II: The Sixteenth Century', *The Library*, 4th series, 10 (1929–30), 427–54
Heppel, Nicholas, introductory notes to *The Pembroke Choir Books and Other Music Manuscripts from Pembroke College, Cambridge*, microfilm (Marlborough: Adam Matthew Publications, 1995)
Herissone, Rebecca, *'To Fill, Forbear or Adorne': The Organ Accompaniment of Restoration Sacred Music* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006)
Holland, Thomas, *Paneguris D. Elizabethae, Dei gratiâ Angliae, Franciae, & Hiberniae Reginae* (London: Joseph Barnes, 1601; STC 13597)
Holman, Peter, '"Evenly, Softly, and Sweetly Acchording to All": The Organ Accompaniment of English Consort Music' in *John Jenkins and His Time: Studies in English Consort Music*, ed. Andrew Ashbee and Peter Holman (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 353–82
Hooker, Richard, *Of the lavves of ecclesiasticall politie. The fift booke* (London: John Windet, 1597; STC 13712.5)
Hughes, Anselm, *Catalogue of the Musical Manuscripts at Peterhouse, Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953)
Irving, John, 'William Byrd and Thomas Tomkins's Offertory: (Re-)evaluating Text and Context', *Annual Byrd newsletter*, 5 (1999), 10–12
James, Peter, 'Sacred Music Omitted from *Musica Deo sacra*' in *Thomas Tomkins: The Last Elizabethan*, ed. Anthony Boden (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 285–300
———, 'The Significance of Byrd's Verse Compositions: A Reappraisal', *Annual Byrd Newsletter*, 7 (2001), 7–10
Jewel, John, *A defence of the Apologie of the Churche of Englande* (London: Henry Wykes, 1567; STC 14600.5)
Johnstone, Andrew, '"As it Was in the Beginning": Organ and Choir Pitch in Early Anglican Church Music', *Early Music*, 31 (2003), 506–25
———, 'Tallis's Service "of Five Parts Two In One" Re-evaluated' in *Canons and Canonic Techniques, 14th–16th Centuries: Theory, Practice and Reception History*, ed. Katelijne Schiltz and Bonnie J. Blackburn (Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2007), 381–405
Joiner, Mary, 'British Museum Add. MS 15117: A Commentary, Index and Bibliography', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 7 (1969), 51–109
Jungmann, Josef A., *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, transl. Francis A. Brunner, rev. ed. (London: Burns & Oats, 1959)
Kantorowicz, Ernst H., *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957)
Kaske, Carol V., 'Spenser's Equations of His Queen with Christ: Royal Supremacy and Royal Psalms' in *Psalms in the Early Modern World*, ed. Linda Phyllis Austern, Kari Boyd McBride and David L. Orvis (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), 191–218
Kerman, Joseph, 'Byrd's Motets: Chronology and Canon', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 14 (1961), 359–82
———, 'Byrd, Tallis, and the Art of Imitation', *Aspects of Medieval and Renaissance Music*, ed. Jan LaRue (New York, 1966), 519–37
———, *The Elizabethan Madrigal: A Comparative Study* (New York: American Musicological Society, 1962)
———, *The Masses and Motets of William Byrd* (London: Faber, 1981)
———, 'Music and Politics: The Case of William Byrd (1540–1623)', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 144 (2000), 275–87

———, 'Old and New in Byrd's Cantiones Sacrae' in *Essays on Opera and English Music in Honour of Sir Jack Westrup*, ed. F. W. Sternfeld, Nigel Fortune and Edward Olleson (Oxford: Blackwell, 1975), 25–43

———, 'On William Byrd's "Emendemus in melius"', *The Musical Quarterly*, 49 (1963), 431–49

———, '"Write All These Down": Notes on a Byrd Song' in *Byrd Studies*, ed. Alan Brown and Richard Turbet (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1992), 112–28

King, Ros, *The Works of Richard Edwards: Politics, Poetry and Performance in Sixteenth-Century England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001)

Kisby, Fiona, 'The Royal Household Chapel in Early-Tudor London, 1485–1547' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of London, 1996)

———, '"When the King Goeth a Procession": Chapel Ceremonies and Services, the Ritual Year, and Religious Reforms at the Early Tudor Court, 1485–1547', *The Journal of British Studies*, 40 (2001), 44–75

Lambarde, William, 'The Order of the Maundy made at Greenwich, March 19, 1572', *Archaeologia*, 1 (1770), 7–9

Langford, Anthony, 'Music for the English Prayer Book from Tallis to Tomkins' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Reading, 1969)

Legg, L. G. Wickham (ed.), 'A Relation of a Short Survey of the Western Counties made by a Lieutenant of the Military Company in Norwich in 1635', *Camden Third Series*, 52 (1936)

le Huray, Peter, 'The Chirk Castle Partbooks', *Early Music History*, 2 (1982), 17–42

———, *Music and the Reformation in England, 1549–1660* (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1967; repr. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978)

———, 'Some Thoughts about cantus firmus Composition; and a Plea for Byrd's *Christus resurgens*' in *Byrd Studies*, ed. Alan Brown and Richard Turbet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 1–23

———, 'Towards a Definitive Study of pre-Restoration Anglican Service Music', *Musica Disciplina*, 14 (1960), 167–95

Leslie, John, *A defence of the honour of the right highe, mightye and noble Princesse Marie Quene of Scotlande and dowager of France with a declaration aswell of her right, title & intereste to the succession of the crowne of Englande*, 1st edn (London: Eusebius Dicaeophile [actually Rheims: J. Foigny], 1569; STC 15505), later edns (1571 and 1584; STC 15506–7)

Lundberg, Mattias, *Tonus Peregrinus*: The History of a Psalm-tone and Its Use in Polyphonic Music (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011)

McCarthy, Kerry, '"Brought to Speake English with the Rest": Byrd's Motet Contrafacta', *The Musical Times*, 148/3 (Autumn 2007), 51–60

———, *Liturgy and Contemplation in Byrd's* Gradualia (New York and London: Routledge, 2007)

———, and John Harley, 'More Books from the Library of William Byrd', *The Musical Times*, 153/1 (Spring, 2012), 53–60

MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *The Later Reformation in England 1547–1603* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990)

McCullough, P. E., 'Carew, George (1497/8–1583)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, 2008), <www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4626>, accessed 24 March 2014

McGoldrick, James Edward, 'Rishton, Edward (1550–1585)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, 2008), <www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23670>, accessed 25 March 2012

Marotti, Arthur F., and Steven W. May, 'Two Lost Ballads of the Armada Thanksgiving Celebration', *English Literary Renaissance*, 41 (2011), 31–63

Mateer, David, 'Oxford, Christ Church Music MSS 984–8: An Index and Commentary', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 20 (1986–7), 1–18

———, 'William Byrd, John Petre and Oxford, Bodleian MS Mus. Sch. e. 423', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 29 (1996), 21–46

Maunsell, Andrew, *The first part of the catalogue of English printed bookes* (London: John Windet, 1595; STC 17669)

May, Steven W., 'William Hunnis and the 1577 *Paradise of Dainty Devices*', *Studies in Bibliography*, 28 (1975), 63–80

———, and William A. Ringler, Jr, *Elizabethan Poetry: A Bibliography and First-Line Index of English Verse, 1559–1603*, 3 vols (London: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004)

Milsom, John, 'Byrd, Sidney, and the Art of Melting', *Early Music*, 31 (2003), 437–49

———, 'Caustun's Contrafacta', *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 132 (2007), 1–31

———, *Christ Church Library Music Catalogue*, <library.chch.ox.ac.uk/music/>

———, 'Crecquillon, Clemens, and Four-Voice *Fuga*' in *Beyond Contemporary Fame: Reassessing the Art of Clemens non Papa and Thomas Crecquillon*, ed. Eric Jas (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), 293–345

———, *The Dow Partbooks: Introduction and Indexes* (Oxford: DIAMM Publications, 2010)

———, 'English Polyphonic Style in Transition: A Study of the Sacred Music of Thomas Tallis' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1983)

———, 'Sacred Songs in the Chamber' in *English Choral Practice, 1400–1650*, ed. John Morehen (Cambridge, 1995), 161–79

———, 'Songs, Carols and *Contrafacta* in the Early History of the Tudor Anthem', *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, 107 (1980–81), 34–45

———, 'A Tallis Fantasia', *The Musical Times*, 126 (1985), 658–62

Monson, Craig, 'Authenticity and Chronology in Byrd's Church Anthems', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 35 (1982), 280–305

———, 'Byrd, the Catholics, and the Motet: The Hearing Reopened' in *Hearing the Motet*, ed. Dolores Pesce (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 348–74

———, 'The Preces, Psalms, and Litanies of Byrd and Tallis: Another "Virtuous Contention in Love"', *Music Review*, 40 (1979), 257–71

———, review of *The Consort and Keyboard Music of William Byrd* by Oliver Neighbour, *Music & Letters*, 61 (1980), 100–106

———, 'Thomas Myriell's Manuscript Collection: One View of Musical Taste in Jacobean London', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 30 (1977), 419–65

———, 'Through a Glass Darkly: Byrd's Verse Service as Reflected in Manuscript Sources', *Musical Quarterly*, 67 (1981), 64–81

———, '"Throughout All Generations": Intimations of Influence in the Short Service Styles of Tallis, Byrd and Morley' in *Byrd Studies*, ed. Alan Brown and Richard Turbet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 83–111

———, *Voices and Viols in England, 1600–1650: The Sources and the Music* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1982)

Morehen, John, 'The "Burden of Proof": The Editor as Detective' in *English Choral Practice*, ed. Morehen (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995), 200–220

———, 'The English Anthem Text, 1549–1660', *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 117 (1992), 62–85

———, 'English Church Music' in *The Sixteenth Century*, ed. Roger Bray (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), 94–146

———, 'The English Consort and Verse Anthems', *Early Music*, 6 (1978), 381–5

———, 'A Fragmentary Bass Manuscript in St John's College Library, Oxford', *Music & Letters*, 53 (1972), 56–8

———, 'The Gloucester Cathedral Bassus Part-Book MS 93', *Music & Letters*, 62 (1981), 189–96

———, 'The Sources of English Cathedral Music, *c.*1617–*c.*1644' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1969)

———, 'The Southwell Minster Tenor Part-Book in the Library of St Michael's College, Tenbury (MS 1382), *Music & Letters*, 50 (1969), 352–64

Morley, Thomas, *A plaine and easie introduction to practicall musicke* (London: Peter Short, 1597; STC 18133)

Mosser, Daniel W., and Ernest W. Sullivan II, with Len Hatfield and David H. Radcliffe, *The Thomas L. Gravell Watermark Archive, 1996–*, <www.gravell.org>, accessed 13 January 2014

Neale, John Mason, *Essays on Liturgiology and Church History* (London: Saunders, Otley & Co., 1863)

Neighbour, Oliver, *The Consort and Keyboard Music of William Byrd* (London: Faber, 1978)

———, 'Music Manuscripts of George Iliffe from Stanford Hall, Leicestershire, Including a New Ascription to Byrd', *Music & Letters*, 88 (2007), 420–35

———, review of BE 10b, *Music & Letters*, 65 (1984), 309–13

Nichols, John, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, 2nd edn, 3 vols (London: John Nichols & Son, 1823), vol. 3

North, Thomas, 'Maundy Customs', *Transactions of the Leicestershire Architectural and Archaeological Society*, 2 (1860–64), 40–45

Palisca, Claude, '*Ut oratoria musica*: The Rhetorical Basis of Musical Mannerism', in Palisca, *Studies in the History of Italian Music and Music Theory* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 282–311

Parmiter, Geoffrey de C., 'Elizabethan Popish Recusancy in the Inns of Court', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Studies*, special supplement no. 11 (1976)

———, *Edmund Plowden: An Elizabethan Recusant Lawyer* (London: Catholic Record Society, 1987)

Parrott, Andrew, 'Grett and Solompne Singing: Instruments in English Church Music Before the Civil War', *Early Music*, 6 (1978), 182–7 (185–6)

Payne, Ian, *The Provision and Practice of Sacred Music at Cambridge Colleges and Selected Cathedrals* c.*1547–*c.*1646: A Comparative Study of the Archival Evidence* (New York: Garland, 1993)

———, 'The Will and Probate Inventory of John Holmes (d.1629): Instrumental Music at Salisbury and Winchester Cathedrals Revisited', *Antiquaries Journal*, 83 (2003), 369–96

Peacham, Henry (the elder), *The garden of eloquence conteining the most excellent ornaments, exornations, lightes, flowers, and formes of speech, commonly called the figures of rhetorike* (rev. edn, London: R. F. for H. Jackson, 1593; STC 19498)

Peacham, Henry (the younger), *The compleat gentleman fashioning him absolute in the most necessary & commendable qualities concerning minde or bodie that may be required in a noble gentleman* (London: F. Constable, 1622; STC 19502)

Peck, Dwight C., 'Government Suppression of Elizabethan Catholic Books: The Case of "Leicester's Commonwealth"', *The Library Quarterly*, 47 (1977), 163–77

Phillips, Peter, *English Sacred Music, 1549–1649* (Oxford: Gimell Books, 1991)

Pilgrim, Jack, 'The Music of York Minster Library', *The Musical Times*, 99 (1958), 100–101

Plowden, Edmund, *The Commentaries or Reports of Edmund Plowden ... Originally Written in French, and Now Faithfully Translated into English ...* (London: Catharine Lintot & Samuel Richardson, 1761)

Pollard, Alfred W., and Gilbert R. Redgrave (eds), *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475–1640*, 2nd edn, ed. William A. Jackson, Frederic S. Ferguson and Katharine F. Pantzer, 3 vols (London: Bibliographical Society, 1976–91)

Pritchard, Arnold, *Catholic Loyalism in Elizabethan England* (London: Scolar Press, 1979)

Puttenham, George, *The arte of English poesie* (London: Richard Field, 1589; STC 20519.5)

Quintilian, *The Orator's Education, Books 9–10*, ed. and transl. Donald A. Russell (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001)

Quitslund, Beth, *The Reformation in Rhyme: Sternhold, Hopkins and the English Metrical Psalter, 1547–1603* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008)

Ravenscroft, Thomas, *A briefe discourse of the true (but neglected) vse of charact'ring the degrees, by their perfection, imperfection, and diminution in measurable musicke, against the common practise and custome of these times* (London: Edward Allde, 1614; STC 20756)

Rees, Owen, 'The English Background to Byrd's Motets: Textual and Stylistic Models for Infelix ego' in *Byrd Studies*, ed. Alan Brown and Richard Turbet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 24–50

Reeve, Robert, 'The Life and Works of William Mundy', 2 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of London, 1980)

Reynolds, William, 'Chirk Castle Organ and Organbook: An Insight into Performance Practice Involving a Seventeenth-Century "Transposing" Organ', *Journal of the British Institute of Organ Studies*, 21 (1997), 28–55

Rhodes, John, *A briefe summe of the treason intended against the King & state, when they should haue been assembled in Parliament. Nouember. 5. 1605* (London: Edward Allde for Edward White, two edns, both 1606; STC 20960 and 20960.5)

Robinson, Brian, *Silver Pennies and Linen Towels: The Story of The Royal Maundy* (London: Spink & Son, 1992)

Rollins, Hyder E. (ed.), *The Paradise of Dainty Devices (1576–1606)* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927)

Rolls, Albert, *The Theory of the King's Two Bodies in the Age of Shakespeare* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2000)

Sander, Nicholas, *Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism ... Published A.D. 1585 with a Continuation of the History by the Rev. Edward Rishton ...*, ed. and transl. by David Lewis (London: Burns & Oates, 1877)

Scot, Stefan, 'Text and Context: The Provision of Music and Ceremonial in the Services of the First Book of Common Prayer' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Surrey, 1999)

———, 'The Prayer Book in Practice: Textual Anomalies and Their Implications in Tudor Musical Settings of the First Book of Common Prayer', *Brio*, 34 (1997), 81–9

———, 'The Vernacular Music of John Sheppard: An Introduction, Edition and Commentary' (unpublished masters thesis, University of Exeter, 1991)

Shaw, Harold Watkins, *A Study of the Bing-Gostling Part Books in the Library of York Minster, Together with a Systematic Catalogue* (Croydon: Royal School of Church Music for the Church Music Society, 1986)

———, 'William Byrd of Lincoln', *Music & Letters*, 48 (1967), 52–9

Shay, Robert, 'Purcell as Collector of "Ancient" Music: Fitzwilliam MS 88' in *Purcell Studies*, ed. Curtis Price (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 35–50

———, and Robert Thompson, *Purcell Manuscripts: The Principal Musical Sources* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Shrewsbury, J. F. D., *A History of Bubonic Plague in the British Isles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970)

Smith, Alan G., 'Elizabethan Church Music at Ludlow', *Music & Letters*, 49 (1968), 108–121

———, 'The Gentlemen and Children of the Chapel Royal of Elizabeth I: An Annotated Register', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 5 (1965), 13–46

———, 'The Practice of Music in English Cathedrals and Churches, and at the Court, During the Reign of Elizabeth I' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Birmingham, 1967)

Smith, Jeremy L., 'The Dilatory Space of 'While that the sun': Byrd, Tessier and the English Sequence', *Early Music*, 40 (2012), 671–85

———, 'Music and Late Elizabethan Politics: The Identities of Oriana and Diana', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 58 (2005), 507–58

———, 'William Byrd's Fall From Grace and his First Solo Publication of 1588: A Shostakovian "Response to Just Criticism"?', *Music and Politics*, 1 (2007), 1–29

Smith, Mike, '"Whom Music's lore delighteth": Words-and-Music in Byrd's *Ye Sacred Muses*', *Early Music*, 31 (2003), 425–35

Southwell, Robert, *An humble supplication to her Maiestie* (publisher unidentified, 1595 [*recte* 1600]; STC 22949.5)

Spink, Ian, *Restoration Cathedral Music, 1660–1714* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)

Spring, Matthew, *The Lute in Britain: A History of the Instrument and Its Music* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001)

Steele, Robert, *A Bibliography of Royal Proclamations of the Tudor and Stuart Sovereigns, Vol. 1: England and Wales* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910)

Sternfeld, Frederick W., *Music in Shakespearian Tragedy* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963)

Strong, Roy C., *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1977)

Sutton, Dana, introductory notes to *The Praise of Musicke*, <www.philological.bham.ac.uk/music3>, accessed 11 January 2013

Tanner, Joseph Robson, *Tudor Constitutional Documents, A.D. 1485–1603* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1922)

Temperley, Nicholas, *The Hymn Tune Index: A Census of English-Language Hymn Tunes in Printed Sources from 1535–1820* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)

———, *The Music of the English Parish Church*, 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979)

Thompson, Robert, 'Purcell's Great Autographs' in *Purcell Studies*, ed. Curtis Price (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 6–34

Turbet, Richard, 'Coste not Byrd', *Annual Byrd Newsletter*, 4 (1998), 8

———, letter 'Counting the Coste', *Musical Times*, 142 (2001), 3–4

———, 'Homage to Byrd in Tudor Verse Services', *The Musical Times*, 129 (1988), 485–90

———, 'Joyful Singing: Byrd's Music at a Royal Christening', *The Musical Times*, 145/1 (Spring 2004), 85–6

———, 'Postscript', *Annual Byrd Newsletter*, 1 (1995), 4

Turnbull Edward, 'Thomas Tudway and the Harleian Collection', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 8 (1955), 203–7

Vickers, Brian, 'Figures of Rhetoric/Figures of Music?', *Rhetorica*, 2 (1984), 1–44

Walker, Paul Mark, *Theories of Fugue from the Age of Josquin to the Age of Bach* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2000)

Ward Jones, Peter, and Donald Burrows, 'An Inventory of Mid-Eighteenth-Century Oxford Musical Hands', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 35 (2002), 61–139

Wilson, Ruth M., *Anglican Chant and Chanting in England, Scotland, and America 1660–1820* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996)

Woodfield, Ian, *The Early History of the Viol* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984)

Wulstan, David, *Tudor Music* (London: Dent, 1985)

Yates, Frances A., 'Queen Elizabeth as Astraea', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 10 (1947), 27–82