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This dissertation examines scribal practice in English music manuscripts of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, with one scribe, John Baldwin (d.1615), as its point of reference and centre of interest.

Baldwin is known to be the copyist of three manuscripts: British Library, R.M.24.d.2, also known as his Commonplace Book, the source Oxford, Christ Church 979-83, and the keyboard source My Ladye Nevells Booke. He also contributed to several others. His copying methods are assessed and compared with those used in sources concordant with his manuscripts, by means of studies of the various types of music — texted vocal, textless vocal and instrumental, and keyboard — found in these sources.

Chapter 1 is a survey of the sources in question. It places particular emphasis on Baldwin's manuscripts, and discusses their structure, apparent purpose, and place in his copying output. Chapter 2 examines scribal practice with regard to manuscript accidentals. Various types of procedure are described and their incidence discussed; and scribal performance in this area is compared throughout Baldwin's manuscripts and their concordant sources. The same approach is applied to text underlay in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 examines Baldwin's textless copying, and discusses related topics such as surviving texted versions of pieces which Baldwin copied in textless form. In Chapter 5, conclusions drawn from these studies are brought to bear on two related problems of major importance: the identification of 'directional' evidence and the establishment of manuscript inter-relationships. The evidence produced by these studies suggests that in substantial areas of manuscript copying, scribal performance is directly dependent on individual habit, and that this should place considerable restrictions on the range of directional evidence when associative variants are sought. The dissertation concludes with a study of the lute arrangements of certain vocal pieces found in the manuscripts of Baldwin and other scribes, and an examination of Baldwin's Nevell hand, most extensively and importantly represented in My Ladye Nevells Booke.

The second volume consists of a supporting body of transcriptions, including Baldwin unica from his two manuscripts of vocal music, and the handful of pieces (not necessarily unica) which these manuscripts share.
This dissertation does not exceed the regulation length, including footnotes, appendices, and bibliography, but excluding musical transcriptions and examples. It is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration.
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I once did hold it as our Statists doe,
A basenesse to write faire; and laboured much
How to forget that learning: but Sir now,
It did me Yeomans service:

*Hamlet.*
Ne infrarsis Domine fa bis/ne infrarsis Domine fa bis/ex ne ultra memineris

iniquitas nostra/ iniquitas

respice/ populus tuis omnes nos/ populus tuis poecri/ om ne nos poecri

om ne nos poecri/ om ne nos. Civitas sancti tu

civitas sancti tu i facta est Deserta/ Deserta Deser

Platy One.
Plate Two R.M.24.d.2, f.76. Title at top of page is wrong, since only two (crossed out) lines of the piece appear here. Both piece and title follow on f.76v.
Plate Three: My Ladye Nevells Booke, f.15.
To scholars of sixteenth-century English music, John Baldwin is a familiar figure in indexes and footnotes. Stylistic studies of composers mention his role as transmitter of some of the music in question; editions of music list his procedures at relevant places. Two of his manuscripts have formed the subject of articles, and the few known facts about his life have been assembled. Parallel to this form of discussion and investigation there has grown up a more recent tradition, of (primarily) dissertations which concentrate on scribal techniques and manuscript inter-relationships.

This dissertation, the first to be devoted to Baldwin, brings both types of approach to bear on his work: it aims, firstly, to bring him into a prominence which represents both the sum total and the logical conclusion of his many peripheral appearances in previous discussions, and secondly, to examine various theories that have been formulated about scribes and sources, with explicit and detailed reference to one copyist.

The first chapter takes the form of an introduction to the field under discussion. Baldwin's copying output is enumerated, discussed and placed in context. Chapters 2 and 3 are studies of scribal procedure with regard to manuscript accidentals and text underlay respectively, with Baldwin's own practices at the centre of the discussion. The music on which these studies concentrate is the group of Byrd's Cantiones Sacrae, published in 1589 and 1591, chosen because these vocal pieces form the only substantial repertoire in Baldwin's copying output which also appears in an authoritative printed edition against which scribal performance can be measured. However, the discussion is also extended, where necessary, to take in Baldwin's non-Byrd output. Chapter 4 examines the copying methods used in the important corpus of textless music in Baldwin's manuscripts, and compares them with those in concordant sources.

The discussions in these chapters arrive at certain conclusions of their own, but their main function is expository and analytical: aspects of
scribal practice are identified, recorded and discussed. Larger questions of their function as evidence follow in Chapter 5, in which theories about the identification of inter-source relationships -- and their practical implications for Baldwin's manuscripts and their concordances -- are examined in the light of the information gathered in the previous three chapters.

The two final chapters deal with subjects which for various reasons stand apart from the main discussion. Some of the vocal music studied in Chapters 2 and 3 was also transcribed for the lute; Chapter 6 studies the relevant sources, and the methods of adaptation used in an interesting repertoire which scholars have tended to overlook in favour of 'genuine' lute compositions. Chapter 7 discusses Baldwin's 'Nevell hand', with particular emphasis on the most extended surviving example of it, the keyboard manuscript My Ladye Nevells Booke. It also compares Baldwin's copying procedures for keyboard music with those which he used for vocal and instrumental music.

The discussion is illustrated at various points with music examples in modern notation, photographs of pages from original manuscript sources, and photocopies, taken from microfilm, of parts of a piece as it appears in the original source. In order to provide these examples with a larger context and a more sustained form, certain transcriptions are appended in a separate volume. They fall into two categories: Baldwin unica from the two manuscripts of vocal music, and the handful of pieces (not necessarily unica) which these manuscripts share. The first category is represented by reason of its value as unica, and for the interest attached to a (typical?) scribal performance -- by no means an infallible one -- for which no control exists; the second category is represented in order to highlight the resemblances and differences in Baldwin's copying of the same piece in two different sources.

In view of the nature and the aims of this dissertation, the appendix does not present either a transcription of the entire contents of Baldwin's manuscripts, or an edited version of any of the music. A complete transcription of Baldwin's unica would run to well over a thousand pages;
and this scale would not produce a corresponding increase in significant evidence, since the readings as a whole transmit an extensive duplication and reiteration of a limited range of features, divergences and errors. Furthermore, a study of a scribe's techniques is concerned not only with what he copied (which can, in Baldwin's case, be found in the text or critical apparatus of various editions), but equally with how he copied, and the necessarily visual nature of much of what is discussed cannot be transferred to a modern setting in any way that would retain its value and authenticity. A group of transcriptions can partially illuminate what is being discussed -- and is included for that reason -- but its role remains limited; the only complete solution would be to supply the manuscript itself, or a photocopy of it. In order to give a clear picture of Baldwin's scribal methods, his readings must be presented as he copied them, unaltered. A study whose centre of interest is the music will edit it in an attempt to get at 'the truth' of the music, but a study whose centre of interest is the scribe must stop short of that stage, and ground itself in the raw material of editions, in order to preserve 'the truth' about that scribe. In the case of Baldwin, the scribe was also a composer; but a stylistic appraisal of his music (carried out to a certain extent elsewhere)\(^3\) has no place in an examination of him as scribe. The handful of his own compositions which is scattered throughout his two main vocal sources should be assessed, like the rest of the music in them, simply as 'copy'; and they cannot provide any independent information about Baldwin as a scribe, since there is no evidence that his compositional activities in any way influenced his scribal ones. A scribe who was also a composer might be expected to provide particularly clear and careful copy for his own pieces, but Baldwin's pieces show no difference, in their copying techniques, from any of the others.

This dissertation, then, has two main aims: to analyse and (where possible) explain the visible evidence of scribal procedure; and to deal with the abstract questions of what sort of evidence this constitutes, and of whether and how it can be incorporated into the assessment of

manuscript inter-relationships. Its function is that of an analytical commentary, a companion and guide to manuscripts which must be observed in their original state. Transcriptions can purport to convey the quality of a text, and editions to combine the 'best' of the texts available, but only a study of the visible evidence can illuminate the options which were open to a scribe, and the problems which faced him. And it is this evidence which matters most of all, since on the scribe's choices of option, on his solutions to his problems, the whole theory of 'good texts' and 'bad texts' is founded.

Moreover, since one particular scribe stands at the centre of this study, it takes its shape and its direction from following his achievement: Baldwin's copying, and that of sources concordant with his ones, are emphasized, in a process which consciously cuts across the ground of several other possible approaches. The most important identified scribe in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century English music deserves no less.
John Baldwin\(^1\) died in 1615. His date of birth is unknown: in contrast to the considerable body of evidence concerning his copying methods, the record of his life and career is fragmentary. Burney\(^2\) and Hawkins\(^3\) both describe him as 'a singing-man of [at] Windsor', but no more specific version of this description appears until Ernest Brennecke's article,\(^4\) which states that Baldwin 'was admitted a lay clerk, a singer of tenor parts, at St George's Chapel, Windsor, in 1575'. There appears to be no evidence whatsoever for this piece of information, since the Chapel records for 1575 have deteriorated to the point of illegibility, and have been in this state since well before 1952, the year in which Brennecke's article was published. There are, however, records in later years, 1586 being the earliest, of his being paid for copying music at Windsor.\(^5\) Nevertheless Brennecke's date found its way into Bray's summary of Baldwin's career,\(^6\) and also (probably via that summary) into the article on Baldwin in the new edition of Grove.\(^7\) Apart from this dubious first date, the other known facts about Baldwin's life and career are more reliable, and are reproduced here so that the reader may refer to them during later discussions.

---

1. Variously spelt Baldwin, Baldwine, Baldwinne, Baldwyn, Baudewyn, Bawdwine.
5. Baldwin is mentioned in the Treasurer's Rolls, St. George's Chapel, Windsor, WR XV.59.13,15,16,17: see further details in Appendix 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1586-7</td>
<td>First record of Baldwin at Windsor, Treasurer's Rolls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588-91</td>
<td>Copying music at Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591, 25 July</td>
<td>Date of poem in R.M.24.d.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591, 11 September</td>
<td>My Ladye Nevells Booke completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591, 22 September</td>
<td>at Elvetham pageant [?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591, 24 December</td>
<td>Date attached to Sermone blando (R.M.24.d.2, no.109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593/4, 3 February</td>
<td>Promised place in Chapel Royal, to await vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593/4, 23 March</td>
<td>Sworn into membership of Chapel Royal, without pay, to await tenor vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596, 28 March</td>
<td>Last mention in a document at St George's Chapel, Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598, 20 August</td>
<td>Appointed to full place at Chapel Royal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600/1, 3 March</td>
<td>First appearance as signatory to a document at Chapel Royal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606/7, 6 January</td>
<td>Last appearance as signatory to a document at Chapel Royal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615, 28 August</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the help of these known dates it is possible to put together a fragmentary picture of Baldwin's career. The Nevell keyboard manuscript bears the colophon:

```
finished and ended the leventh of September in the year of our Lord God 1591 & in the 33 yeare of the raigne of our sofferaine ladie Elizabeth by the grace of God queene of Englande etc, by me Jo.Baldwine of Windsore. Laudes deo.
```

By the 22nd of September, if Brennecke's hypothesis is correct, Baldwin

---

was at the Elvetham estate in Hampshire. Here the visiting queen was entertained by Lord Hertford with 'pageantry, poetry and music', including a song, *In the merry month of May*, whose music Brennecke suggests was composed by Baldwin. A setting of the text is to be found at no.192 of his Commonplace Book. After the Elvetham visit, if it took place, Baldwin must have returned to Windsor and continued there, since his name appears as signatory to a document in May 1594 and witness to another one in March 1596. But he was not paid for copying in the year 1591-2, and the following year these duties were taken over by a Mr Leonard. So Baldwin may have left St George's Chapel as early as 1592, and, although no longer a member, retained his links with the institution for at least another four years. May 1594 is also the date appended to Wylkynson's 13-part canononic Credo in R.M.24.d.2; as Bray points out, it is almost certainly copied straight from the Eton Choirbook. Eton and Windsor are near to each other, and a musician of Baldwin's standing is likely to have gained access to the manuscript.

As Brennecke and Bray have noted, Baldwin was promised a place at the Chapel Royal, which he gained on the death of Robert Tallentire in 1598. Baldwin then remained a Gentleman of the Chapel until his own death in 1615.

Three manuscripts are entirely in Baldwin's hand, and he contributed to three others. His manuscript Oxford, Christ Church 979-83 (hereafter ChCh 979-83), of which the Tenor book is missing, is thought to have been copied between c.1580 and c.1600. In fact Bray posits a date as late as 'after 1603' for one of the pieces, since its rubric refers to the composer, John Mundy, as 'organist of the kyngs [my emphasis] free chapell of

9. ibid, p.34.
10. WR XV 2 165, WR VI B 2: see Appendix two.
windsore'. However, as Bray notes elsewhere, it seems that even during Elizabeth's reign the chapel was sometimes described in this way, so the question must be left open. The five part-books (Superius, Discantus, Contratenor, Sexta Pars and Bassus) are oblong, measuring approximately 6" (15cm) by 8" (20cm); they have the initials IB (John Baldwin?) stamped on their covers, and they are in good condition. They are copied on printed manuscript paper, with watermarks 'of common sixteenth-century types, mostly consisting of a hand with flowers or a vase with fruit.' The manuscript contains 172 pieces (Bray reaches a total of 169 in his index, since he gives to three of them the designation a and b), most of it vocal and sacred. There is a small group of textless and instrumental pieces at the end of the manuscript.

Baldwin's Commonplace Book, London, British Library, R.M.24.d.2, is an even larger manuscript with 209 items in all (although Bray gives 203 for the reason given above). It measures approximately 11" by 8", with watermarks similar to Heawood 2873 and 2874. The binding is probably eighteenth-century. The source consists of a large number of texted and textless English pieces, both sacred and secular, plus groups of Italian madrigals, English musical puzzles and proportion exercises. Although there are more items in this manuscript than there are in ChCh 979-83, many of them are extracts, whereas ChCh 979-83 presents entire pieces.

The third manuscript which Baldwin copied in its entirety is the

-------------------
keyboard manuscript *My Ladye Nevells Booke*.\(^{18}\) Dr Burney, writing in 1776, describes it thus:

> It is a thick quarto, very splendidly bound and gilt, with the family arms beautifully emblazoned and illuminated on the first page, and the initials HN at the lowest left hand corner. The music is all written in large, bold characters, with great neatness, on four staved paper, of six lines... The notes, both white and black, are of the lozenge form, like those of the printed music of the same period.\(^{19}\)

The manuscript carries a date: 11th September, 1591 (see the colophon quoted earlier). It was presented to Queen Elizabeth some time before 1600, since she is recorded as having passed it on to Lord North, who was treasurer of her household from 1598-1600. It then passed through the hands of several owners, including Burney, and eventually returned to the Nevill\(^{20}\) family during the nineteenth century. It is still in their possession, the only one of Baldwin's manuscripts which is not deposited in an institutional library. It will be discussed in detail in Chapter 7.

The remaining manuscripts under discussion are those with which Baldwin was associated, and to which he made a contribution. The first of these is the Forrest-Heyther collection of masses, now in the Bodleian Library.\(^{21}\) These part-books contain eighteen masses by Taverner, Burton, Marbecke, Fayrfax, Rasar, Aston, Ashwell, Norman, Sheppard, Tye and Alwood. For a detailed and convincing account of the books' structure and probable origins the reader is referred to John Bergsagel's article on the subject, 'The Date and Provenance of the Forrest-Heyther Collection of Tudor Masses';\(^{22}\) the aspect of them which is of most interest and relevance to this study is the fact that they were completed by Baldwin. The first

---

18. The *Pseudo Ladye Nevells Booke*, London, British Library, Add.MS.30485, was thought for some time to be made up of extracts taken from the Nevell manuscript, until Fellowes pointed out the substantial textual differences between the sources: see E. F. Fellowes, 'My Ladye Nevells Booke', *Music and Letters*, 30 (1949), 1-7 (pp.6-7).

19. Burney, *General History*, II, 79-80. Burney would have had ample time to observe the physical details of the manuscript, and its contents as well, since he owned it for part of his life.

20. Modern spelling.


eleven masses were copied in an unidentified hand, and the remaining seven in the hand of William Forrest, described by Anthony à Wood as 'a priest . . . [who] was well skill'd in music and poetry'. However Forrest died around 1581, leaving the last book (e.381) incomplete from the Agnus Dei of Mass no.15 onwards, and Baldwin finished that section and copied the last three masses into the book. This is the likely course of events, although, as Bergsagel notes, it is possible that this last group of masses was inaccurately copied or met with some accident, and that Baldwin replaced rather than completed the section. Here Baldwin uses his 'Nevell hand', which is a very stylized note script with lozenge-shaped note-heads; his underlay hand varies little from source to source.

Bergsagel contends that the books passed into Baldwin's possession after Forrest's death c.1581. It is possible that he had an established reputation as a good scribe with antiquarian interests, and that Forrest himself, or some other person, asked him to take charge of the books. When Baldwin himself died, in 1615, the books came into the possession of William Heyther; both men were Gentlemen of the Chapel Royal. Heyther joined the Chapel in March, 1615, and Baldwin died in August of that year.

The second of the three manuscripts with which Baldwin is associated is the set of part-books in Christ Church library, Oxford, known as Christ Church 984-8 (hereafter ChCh 984-8). This anthology, which survives with all its books intact, was probably both owned and compiled during the 1580's by one Robert Dow, whose source announces its owner on the title-page of each part-book with the legend, 'Sum Roberti Dowi'. He has been identified by Philip Brett as the Robert Dow who was a fellow of All Souls, Oxford, from 1577 until his death in November, 1588 — a cultivated

25. A detailed discussion of Baldwin's copying projects in the 'Nevell hand', including his Forrest-Heyther contribution, follows in Chapter 7.
and learned man, as the inclusion of many interesting Latin inscriptions in the manuscript testifies.\textsuperscript{28} The books have attracted much interest on account of their extensive repertoire of 'songs', but they also form an important concordance for a good deal of the sacred music which Baldwin included in his anthologies.

There are 133 pieces in Dow's anthology; this total does not correspond to the numbering in the manuscript, which is not to be relied upon. Of these, two are copied by Baldwin in his Nevell hand. They are nos.53 and 54 — *O bone Iesu* and *Vestigia mea* by Parsons and Giles respectively — and they mark an important division in the manuscript, for the section up to no.54 consists entirely of sacred Latin vocal music, while the pieces from no.55 until the end of the manuscript are vernacular, secular or instrumental, or combinations of these. Brett treats the manuscript as bipartite in structure, but Warwick Edwards goes further and suggests 'three main sections... [which] were probably copied concurrently as they are each separated by a number of pages of blank staves'.\textsuperscript{29}

Baldwin's contribution comes at the end of the first section, and is followed by a blank page and two cut pages; then comes no.55, White's *Lorde who shall dwell in thy tabernacle*, an English-texted piece which opens the new section. (There is a marked emphasis on White in this source: the first, Latin section also opens with music by him.) The location of Baldwin's contribution is readily understandable: it would have been a straightforward matter to insert two pieces at this point. The blank pages make it clear that this is the end of a section, and they may have been intended as a point of demarcation, or to accommodate later insertions, or both.

The other outside contribution, the copying of nos.99 and 100 in an unidentified later hand, occurs at the next hiatus in the manuscript, the

\textsuperscript{28} For examples of these, see M. C. Boyd, *Elizabethan Music and Musical Criticism* (Philadelphia, 1940, 2nd edn., 1962), pp.312-17.

beginning of the third section after no.100. Apart from these distinctive contributions the manuscript is copied in one music hand and two underlay hands: the very artistic italic copy-book script in which 'Sum Roberti Dowi' is written, and a secretary script. According to Warwick Edwards the two hands are, respectively, those of Dow and his secretary: Dow copied section A with all the motets, the instrumental pieces and the Latin glosses and tags, and 'entrusted his secretary with anything that was not in Italian or Latin'. However it is possible that both hands are Dow's, since the secretary script can be seen in certain business letters that he may have written himself. Certainly the two hands are noticeably integrated: there are even examples of an item's being shared between them. Nevertheless Edwards' theory is still a valid one, since the relationship between the hands indicates a degree of close contact commensurate with that between Dow and his secretary.

The possible circumstances under which Baldwin made his contribution to Dow's part-books will be discussed in detail in Chapter 7, as part of the examination of the Nevell hand.

The last manuscript to be mentioned here has a possible connection with Baldwin. Christ Church 45 (late 16th century) is a source copied in table-book form, containing 40 extracts from larger pieces. Joseph Kerman has suggested that the hand which added an extract from Byrd's *Infelix ego* to the contents at no.37 was Baldwin's. There are undoubtedly resemblances between the clefs, accidentals and underlay hand of the Christ Church 45 contribution and manifestations of these in ChCh 979-83, while the note formation resembles a scaled-down version of Baldwin's Nevell hand. However the fact that the hand as a whole is so much smaller than anything else in Baldwin's surviving output makes it difficult to

30. ibid, p.110.
31. I am indebted to Dr David Mateer for this information.
32. Nos.127-9 in book 985 have titles and underlay in secretary script and ascriptions in italic script, although the latter could have been added afterwards. Several other textless pieces have the title in secretary script and the ascription in italic script -- never vice versa.
conclude with certainty that the extract was copied by him. The theory, although very plausible, must remain a theory only.

These are the manuscripts which Baldwin copied or with which he appears to have been associated. The question of internal structure in the three sources which are exclusively his has received a certain amount of attention, mainly from Roger Bray. In his articles on ChCh 979-83 and R.M.24.d.2, he suggests several layers of structure for each manuscript. For the details of these layers the reader is referred to Bray's writings on the subject, but some of their implications can be examined here.

R.M.24.d.2 will be examined first. This substantial source (numerically larger than ChCh 979-83, although it presents a number of extracts, whereas ChCh 979-83 presents entire pieces) is copied into a book whose gatherings, as Bray points out, do not correspond to any of its sections. Therefore it was probably bound up empty in preparation for copying, and the first 92 folios (out of 188) were also pre-ruled for the purpose. It is not clear what length of time separated these procedures from the copying. The bar-lines, for instance, may have been pre-ruled only in an immediate sense, although as their close spacing causes quite serious problems when it comes to accommodating the notes (problems which will be discussed in Chapter 4 of this study) one suspects that Baldwin would have altered their spacing if he could, and that therefore he must have prepared a single large amount of paper in this way. Among the folios are scattered several dates, and there are also certain pieces of implied evidence to be gleaned from the ascriptions (which will be discussed shortly).

Bray divides the source into three sections, basically on the grounds of repertoire, suggesting a first section, A, from nos.1 to 74, a

36. Indicated on the list of contents of this manuscript -- see Appendix 1.
section B from nos. 75 to 123, and a section C from nos. 124 to 203. Section A consists of madrigals and sacred pieces, while section B, in Bray's words, 'consists largely of two- and three-part music of a secular nature or intended for performance in the chamber'; and section C 'consists largely of three-part sections of antiphons by earlier composers'. This is true enough, but as the list of contents shows, the second of these divisions presents a 'cleaner', less problematic break than the first. It is true that the interpolation in a later hand highlights a gap in the copying, and that there is a change from sacred to secular at no. 75. Against this, one could advance the observation that Bray's division cuts right across an English cell, and also that yet further grounds for division are provided by the discontinuation of bar-lines at no. 80, which Bray does not select as a point of division.

There is little doubt that Baldwin did not copy this manuscript in a strictly linear and consecutive fashion, but copied music into different parts of it at different times, perhaps working in a linear fashion on different parts of it simultaneously. For example, there is evidence of the gradual nature of the undertaking in the copying of pieces from Byrd's Cantiones Sacrae of 1589 and 1591: the first, scored, part of the manuscript contains pieces from the 1589 print only, and pieces from the 1591 print do not appear until later on, in the part of the source which is copied in choirbook layout. From this it would appear that the pieces in the early, scored part of the source were copied between 1589 and the appearance of the next print — with more material for copying — in 1591, although this is not necessarily the 'inescapable conclusion', since pre-print manuscript copies of Byrd's pieces appear to have been in circulation, and Baldwin's ChCh 979–83 Byrd texts are likely to have been derived from them (along with those in manuscripts such as Add. 47844, dated 1581, and ChCh 984–8, begun in 1581). But it does provide evidence that some of the copying was possibly done in a linear fashion.

-----------------------------
38. ibid, p. 148.
39. Nos. 73 and 74 — see list of contents.
40. Bray, 'Baldwin's Commonplace Book . . .', p. 146.
On the other hand, the poem at the end of the manuscript is dated 1591, but pieces appear earlier on with dates such as 1600 and 1606 (and these are likely to be dates of copying rather than of composition). Baldwin must have written and copied this poem -- intended to stand as a conclusion -- long before he completed the whole copying project.

Elsewhere in the manuscript there are individual clues for which Bray provides a plausible interpretation: one example is the ascription after no.95, A duo . . . of 38 proporcions by Giles, which reads:

mr giles mr of the children of Windsor then and now mr of the children of the chappell also

From the word 'then' onwards, the writing is smaller. This looks like an altered or expanded ascription, which would suggest, in Bray's words, that 'it must have been copied before 1597 (when Giles moved to the Chapel Royal thus necessitating Baldwin's extra note about the composer)', a note which was then added later. In instances such as these Bray is a reliable guide, but when it comes to assessing the date of larger sections his reasoning is sometimes obscure. For example, his dating of nos.1 to 69 -- almost the whole of the first of his suggested three sections -- is between c.1588 and 1591, although, as has already been noted, there is no reason to tie the Byrd Cantiones Sacrae to the period immediately around 1589.

Another example concerns the case of Dolorosi martir, one of the cell of Marenzio's madrigals situated near the beginning of the manuscript. This piece was published in Marenzio's first book of 1580; the others are taken from book 2 (1581) and the set for 4, 5 and 6 voices of 1588. This set was 'remarkable in Marenzio's output in that it was never reprinted so we can be sure that Baldwin was working from the genuine 1588 Italian edition'.

In order to grasp the way in which Dolorosi martir fits into Bray's argument it is necessary to examine the following passage.

41. ibid, p.147.
42. ibid, pp.145-6.
On the other hand, the poem at the end of the manuscript is dated 1591, but pieces appear earlier on with dates such as 1600 and 1606 (and these are likely to be dates of copying rather than of composition). Baldwin must have written and copied this poem — intended to stand as a conclusion — long before he completed the whole copying project.

Elsewhere in the manuscript there are individual clues for which Bray provides a plausible interpretation: one example is the ascription after no. 95, *A duo ... of 38 proporcions* by Giles, which reads:

```
Mr Giles Mr of the children of Windsor then and now Mr of the
children of the chappell also
```

From the word 'then' onwards, the writing is smaller. This looks like an altered or expanded ascription, which would suggest, in Bray's words, that 'it must have been copied before 1597 (when Giles moved to the Chapel Royal thus necessitating Baldwin's extra note about the composer)', a note which was then added later. In instances such as these Bray is a reliable guide, but when it comes to assessing the date of larger sections his reasoning is sometimes obscure. For example, his dating of nos. 1 to 69 — almost the whole of the first of his suggested three sections — is between c. 1588 and 1591, although, as has already been noted, there is no reason to tie the *Byrd Cantiones Sacrae* to the period immediately around 1589.

Another example concerns the case of *Dolorosi martir*, one of the cell of Marenzio's madrigals situated near the beginning of the manuscript. This piece was published in Marenzio's first book of 1580; the others are taken from book 2 (1581) and the set for 4, 5 and 6 voices of 1588. This set was 'remarkable in Marenzio's output in that it was never reprinted so we can be sure that Baldwin was working from the genuine 1588 Italian edition'.

In order to grasp the way in which *Dolorosi martir* fits into Bray's argument it is necessary to examine the following passage.

41. ibid, p. 147.
42. ibid, pp. 145-6.
Dolorosi martir was not printed in Yonge's first book of Musica Transalpina (1588) nor in Watson's anthology of 1590 [The first sett, of Italian Madrigals Englished], though between them these two anthologies contain nearly all the works from Marenzio's first book. It was eventually published in 1597 (Yonge's second set) and, since we shall see how early Baldwin copied it, we can see how far ahead of his English contemporaries Baldwin was. It has been noted by Kerman in connection with Yonge's second set that 'the care with which Yonge referred to earlier anthologies is shown by his inclusion, at last, of Dolorosi martir, effectively completing the presentation of Marenzio's [Book] 1 à 5 to English audiences.' With nearly all of Marenzio's first book available by 1590, it does not take too much to ascribe the same motives to Baldwin. In Baldwin's case he is completing the set for his own study and satisfaction. This implies (a) that he possessed Yonge and Watson, and (b) that he copied at least No.17 [i.e., Dolorosi martir] after the appearance of Watson in 1590. 43

What Bray is saying here is that Baldwin copied Dolorosi martir as deliberate policy in 1590, when he saw that neither Yonge (1588) or Watson (1590) had included it in their anthologies. The copying could indeed have taken place under these circumstances, but it is a considerable step to ascribe such relatively complicated motives to a copyist, to the exclusion of any alternative theories. Baldwin might well have been moved by a particular liking for the madrigal as much as by any ideas of preservation; also, the latter theory ties the copying to 1590 or thereafter, whereas in fact there is no reason why Baldwin could not have copied the piece before (even substantially before) that date. After all, if he copied one piece out of the original edition of the 1588 set, he may have had access to other Italian editions, such as the 1580 book in which Dolorosi martir first appeared.

On the basis of this specific hypothesis Bray links the copying of this piece, no.17, to the rest of the pieces up to no.67: '... we are left with 1590-91 for the copying of at least nos.17-67.' 44 These pieces, as we have seen, include the Byrd Cantiones Sacrae which may well have been copied before the appearance of the first print in 1589. So in fact the

43. ibid, p.146.
44. ibid, p.146.
dating of quite a large section of the manuscript is based upon certain smaller conclusions which are not necessarily to be trusted. And in general, while some clues may be soluble on an individual basis, there is not enough evidence for definite conclusions about the large-scale organization of the manuscript.

The situation with regard to ChCh 979-83 is somewhat different. Its repertoire is more homogeneous; it gives a stronger impression of having been copied in a few, large sections; and, unlike R.M.24.d.2, it contains very few dates — only one, in fact. In his article on the source, Bray makes a very plausible case for its division into three sections or layers, the first division being on grounds of physical appearance and the second on grounds of repertoire. Again the reader is referred to the article itself for the details of his arguments in context, but his main contention is that the section from nos.90 to 155 is the section that was copied first. He divides the manuscript thus:

1. Nos.1 to 89
2. Nos.90 to 155
3. Nos.156 to the end

The first of these divisions, that between nos.1 to 89 and nos.90 to 155 or 156, has several pieces of evidence to support it. A glance at the relevant opening in each of the books (no.89 ends on the left-hand page and no.90 begins on the right) shows a contrast in Baldwin's underlay hand that alone would be sufficient to suggest that the two pieces had been copied at different times: that of no.90 is somewhat rougher and less clear, and more of an uncompromising secretary script than that used in nos.1 to 89. It continues thus in a gradually modifying form until about no.112 when it begins to take on the clearer and more refined character of nos.1 to 89.

Bray's theory is that the books originally started at what is now no.90 (Iusti autem by Sheppard), since in every case that page looks considerably more worn than the others (because the books were still

45. Bray, 'The Part-Books ...'.
unbound, presumably). Also, three out of the surviving five books have the name 'Mr Shepperd' at the top of the page in the centre, which suggests that the books were at first intended to start with his music and a general emphasis on him (an emphasis discernible elsewhere in the manuscript). It may also suggest that originally all the pieces were intended to carry their composer's name in this position, but that this practice was abandoned in favour of an ascription at the end of each piece, probably because Baldwin discovered that he was going to have occasion to start new pieces half-way down the page, and ascriptions at the end were neater for the purpose.

As well as the physical appearance of all the pages at no.90, Bray cites the evidence of the contemporary index (to be found at the beginning of the *Bassus* book 983), which places Sheppard first, and another index which was begun but never completed (in the *Superius* book 979), which also places him first. Another possible piece of evidence is provided by the *Sexta pars* book (982), which officially starts with no.93, but which also contains, apart from a short insertion, the sixth voice for no.68 (Byrd's *Cunctis diebus*) stuck in at the beginning. This extra part was originally copied into the *Discantus* book, but then apparently Baldwin decided to recopy it and insert it into the *Sexta pars*. This, as Bray points out, is 'where it should have been all the time', and, as he convincingly argues, the reason why it was not put here originally is probably that the *Sexta pars* book was already in existence, containing its part of all the six-part music from no.93 onwards (and perhaps complete as far as the end despite the change of repertoire), and so the piece had to be inserted.

There is also the evidence of the underlay hand with its mysterious break to a rougher style — most clearly discernible around no.112. It would appear that Baldwin's hand became neater as he went along — an indication that scribal hands did not all evolve in the same way: some apparently grew more untidy with frequent use, but Baldwin's seems to have grown more elegant as he grew more experienced.

---

46. ibid, p.192.
The last section of the manuscript, nos. 156 to the end, Bray describes as an 'appendix'. It is divisible from the rest of the manuscript on the grounds of its repertoire, which is largely secular, textless and/or instrumental (though with one or two exceptions as the list of contents shows), but it is not obviously divisible on any other grounds. Given this, no. 156, John Mundy's *Dum transisset Sabbatum*, should perhaps belong to the second rather than the third section, since it is both texted and sacred.

The dating of these part-books is an extremely difficult matter. According to Bray, 'The evidence indicates that Baldwin probably began these books c. 1580 while he was still at Windsor, and that he copied most of nos. 90-155, 1-89, and 156-end in that order before c. 1600. He then added a few pieces in gaps, such as no. 89a (1600) and no. 53 (after 1603).'

In fact there is really no conclusive evidence for this dating, but it is an acceptable theory in the absence of more certain information. There are several areas of potential evidence from which it can be constructed: actual dates (of which there is only one) in the manuscript; the inclusion of certain pieces which may themselves be tied to a date (perhaps the 1589 and 1591 Cantiones Sacrae, but probably not, as has been suggested); and biographical information about the composers, either drawn from the ascriptions or known from elsewhere.

The first of these can be quickly disposed of: the date 1600, appended to Byrd's *Canon* (no. 89a -- Bray's numbering -- in book 981 only), is the only one in the manuscript and is not particularly helpful, as it belongs to a later insertion. The inclusion of some of the 1589 and 1591 Cantiones Sacrae is also inconclusive evidence. The pieces probably pre-date the prints, but it is not clear by how long a time-span; theoretically they could have been composed as early as shortly after 1575, the year in which Byrd collected together his early compositions and issued them in a

---
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joint edition of *Cantiones Sacrae* with Tallis. So it would be unwise to treat them as conclusive evidence for a copying date of around 1589-91.

The biographical background provides a little information, all of it based on deduction and none of it certain. As Bray notes, Byrd is described as 'one of the organistes' (after no.143 in the earlier section 2) and simply as 'organiste' (after no.12 in the later section 1). Byrd and Tallis were joint organists in the Chapel Royal for a time, and so the second ascription may date from after Tallis's death in 1585.

John Mundy is described as 'organist of the kyngs free chappell of windsore', but also as 'of her maiesties standinge chappell of windsore' (after nos.53 and 167 respectively); bearing in mind the likely chronology of the sections this could make no.53 (and perhaps its surrounding section) much later -- post-1603, in fact. Bray observes that 'When Baldwin describes John Mundy as being of the 'kyngs' chapel, the description should be taken seriously'; and indeed it would probably be fair to Baldwin to make a distinction here and contend that while his attributions have occasionally been faulted, the details of the ascriptions seem careful enough. However in this particular case it is Bray himself who removes the possibility of a watertight conclusion with his later finding that this description of the Chapel was sometimes used during Elizabeth's reign.

If there is any substance in the comparison between the two ascriptions mentioned earlier, then the one after no.12 dates its copying at 1585 or thereafter. And since it occurs in the second section to be copied, after a substantial first one, then four or five years seems a reasonable period to allot, albeit tentatively, to the copying of the first section. Thus by means of much speculation, a starting-point of around 1580 can be reached.

53. ibid, p.196.
Bray has since revised his dating of the source, for several reasons. One is that there are no pieces by Nathaniel Giles in the source, which might suggest that the bulk of it was copied before Giles arrived at St. George's Chapel in 1586. Mundy is thought to have arrived around 1581,\(^55\) 'Yet the Mundy pieces are nevertheless later additions [to ChCh 979-83], and so it would seem that the greater part of this source had already been compiled well before c.1581 when Mundy's arrival at Windsor prompted Baldwin to add some of his music to the manuscript.'\(^56\) This statement rests on two main assumptions: firstly, that the Mundy pieces are later additions -- and, in spite of the fact that they occur at the ends of gatherings, it has not been demonstrated conclusively that they are; and secondly, that Baldwin himself was already at Windsor when Mundy arrived in about 1581. This is impossible to prove, since the Chapel records for the relevant years around that period are illegible.

Bray's other argument in favour of re-dating the source is that since it is bound with a copy of the 1575 *Cantiones Sacrae*, and is the same size as the print, it may have been produced at the same time and intended to complement it.\(^57\) This new dating is neither more nor less plausible than the previous one, and should not be considered to have replaced it. If it were to be accepted, it would possibly but not necessarily push forward the dating of R.M.24.d.2 to about 1580 onwards, bearing in mind the possibility that Baldwin turned to the latter source almost immediately after completing the bulk of ChCh 979-83, some of which he drew on for extracts.\(^58\)

There are no obvious divisions in *My Ladye Nevells Booke*. Although there is no definite evidence, it seems likely that this was a copying project undertaken under somewhat different circumstances from those of the other sources discussed so far: the anthology was to be a presentation volume for 'Ladye Nevell'. The identity of this Lady has been the subject


\(^{56}\) Bray, 'John Baldwin', p.58.

\(^{57}\) ibid., pp.58-9.

\(^{58}\) Bray, 'Baldwin's Commonplace Book . . .', p.148.
of two different hypotheses: Fellowes suggested that she was Lady Rachel Nevell, of the Kent branch of the Nevell family, and Dart suggested that she was one of the Billingbere Nevells of Berkshire.\textsuperscript{59} Given these special circumstances, it is unlikely that Baldwin would have had the leisure to compile it gradually, in a series of layers. Even if there were no formal deadline for its completion, it must nevertheless have been commissioned from him, thus making it a very different production from his own Commonplace Book which he could compile over a period of years, laying it aside and returning to it as he wished. It is likely, then, that it was a single, intensive project undertaken over a period of several months, or perhaps a little longer.

\textit{My Ladye Nevells Booke} raises the question of the function of these manuscripts, and that of others -- both comparable and contrasting -- which were copied during this period. It is cited by Boyd as an instance of Byrd's pre-eminence among composers of Baldwin's time: 'The copyist John Baldwin included only compositions by Byrd in his MS volume for virginals, \textit{My Ladye Nevells Booke}, 1591.'\textsuperscript{60} Byrd's pre-eminence is certainly not in dispute, but Boyd's statement invites the reader to place a misleading construction on the circumstances of the copying, and, indeed, on the function of the source. Neighbour's view that it was 'copied on the composer's behalf'\textsuperscript{61} is likely to be nearer to the truth: the manuscript's exclusive concentration on Byrd probably had nothing to do with Baldwin's choice. From this point of view the Nevell manuscript is exceptional among Baldwin's surviving sources: in his other manuscripts (excluding, of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{60} M. C. Boyd, \textit{Elizabethan Music and Musical Criticism}, p.81.
\end{itemize}
course, his Forrest-Heyther contribution) his choices of composer are very much in evidence.

It is not certain whether the Christ Church set was simply some kind of presentation anthology or whether singers actually performed from it. The evidence to support the former theory can be found in the handsome appearance of the books and their good condition, plus one or two examples of the copying of a piece in a position which would make performance difficult: for example, a Sexta pars part in a Discantus book. However these misplacements seem to have been corrected at a later stage in the copying by inserting the piece where it should have been in the first place, and it is Bray's view that Baldwin 'was not much concerned with setting out the music in a manner suitable for performance, but that almost immediately performance of at least some of the music was considered.'

Certainly Baldwin was used to copying music for performance: the Treasurer's Rolls for St.George's Chapel, Windsor, show that from 1586-7 and 1588-91 he was paid not only his stipend but also 'pro scriptione sacrarum cantionem'. Presumably he kept the Chapel supplied with manuscripts from which to sing. Also, it is likely that a good deal of the repertoire of ChCh 979-83 was familiar to the St.George's Chapel singing-men: the older pieces by composers such as Tallis, Sheppard and Redford may have been copied by Baldwin from a source in use in the Chapel, and dating from the Reformation or before. Of the more modern pieces, some were written by composers based at St.George's Chapel (John Mundy, Johnson and Baldwin himself), or else at the Chapel Royal and the Royal Household (Fayrfax, Van Wilder, Baldwin again, White, Ferrabosco, Parsons, Tallis, Sheppard, Redford, Damon, Byrd, William Mundy).

So this music may well have been in circulation in the Chapels, and sung there regularly. From a political point of view there would have been few obstacles to its performance. It seems to have been no secret even at

63. St.George's Chapel, Windsor, MSS.XV.59.13, XV.59.15, XV.59.16 and XV.59.17: see Appendix two.
the time that Queen Elizabeth I was 'fond of pomp and ceremony', as Fellowes put it, and enjoyed a good deal more of it in her Chapel services than was permitted elsewhere. This may have included Latin polyphony.

There are not many Latin motets which could have been performed liturgically within the Anglican service -- those that could may have taken the place of an English anthem .... Any objections which there were could not have been on liturgical or musical grounds, only on the pretext of their being in a language unknown to the general congregation. If it could be shown that the singers and the congregation did understand the language, then there would have been no obstacles. This was the argument employed by the collegiate foundations, and conceivably by the chapels royal. In this context Latin motets may have been performed there.

In theory there seems to be no reason why these books could not have been used for performance, but in fact their general condition suggests that they seldom were, if ever; they probably comprised, in Benham's words, 'a kind of private musical treasury'.

Another Baldwin source which is perhaps even more obviously of this type is R.M.24.d.2, his Commonplace Book. Again, it may sometimes have been used for performance, but certain features make this even less likely than in the case of ChCh 979-83. For example, much of the music included is represented only by extracts. Perhaps in these cases Baldwin was interested by a particular piece or wished to have it represented in his collection, but was not concerned to present it in full. At the time of copying, some of the pieces were probably already present, and complete, in his Christ Church source, which textual comparison suggests he drew on for extracts. By including extracts of these and others Baldwin could cover more ground than in his other anthology. Although the wide variety

67. See the discussion of the relationship between these sources in Chapter 5.
of (often short) pieces suggests the dictates of personal taste associated with a private commonplace book, there are signs that Baldwin intended the manuscript to be seen by others besides himself. The poem at the end, which makes quite clear his concern to pass on these works to posterity, and the wide-ranging repertoire — inclusion of pieces being apparently more important than their completeness — give the source something of the qualities of a showpiece. In a way the Christ Church anthology is a more sober and dignified monument to antiquarianism.

A substantial number of other manuscripts is involved in this survey of Baldwin's scribal practices. They are noted and described in lists and sections, as they occur, during the following chapters, but in this general discussion of types of manuscript they deserve an introductory mention.

Concordances for the music which Baldwin copied are found in a wide range of sources. The older music which he preserves, from the generation of Fayrfax and Taverner, is found in part-books dating from the mid-16th century and earlier. One set of these, now known as Cambridge, Peterhouse MSS.471-4, is thought to have been 'copied for a large secular religious establishment, and ... probably compiled by a youngish member of its musical staff, such as a talented lay-clerk'.68 The Contratenor and Bassus part-books now preserved in Cambridge University Library and St.John's College, Cambridge69 may have come from a comparable set, as may the Medius book acquired by Lord Harley for his library in the eighteenth century.70

Among the variety of later sources concordant with Baldwin's work are several manuscripts from the Paston collection. There are no less than forty extant sources in the Paston group, some of them sets of books, and there may originally have been more. In his article on the collector

69. Cambridge University Library MS.Dd.xiii.27; Cambridge, St.John's College MS.234, 1540's.
70. London, British Museum MS.Harley 1709, 1520's.
Edward Paston (1550-1630), Philip Brett suggests that these manuscripts were produced by a team of several copyists, at least one of whom appears to have been a servant of Paston's -- possibly his secretary. He copied several lute-books for Paston, as well as some vocal part-books. Brett has identified three hands or hand groups at work in the other Paston vocal sources.

Since the copyists were apparently all in Paston's employ the manuscripts, rightly or wrongly, have been taken to reflect his tastes in music. There is a strong emphasis on Byrd's works, but otherwise the bias is conservative, old-fashioned and even retrospective: Continental motets, madrigals and chansons, and some sacred works by Tallis, Taverner and Fayrfax. The Continental pieces were perhaps copied from prints which Paston may well have owned; he may likewise have possessed the three volumes of the Cantiones Sacrae. If Paston did exercise a firm control over what was copied into the books, then they reveal him to have been something of a conservative, but with a taste for Continental music and a great admiration for Byrd. Brett suggests that his musical tastes 'were formed in the late 1560's and the 1570's, when he seems to have come into contact with the leading English composers working in London.' Brett also suggests that Paston himself was a lutenist, and cites a short poem in the collection which commends him for 'musicke'.

Some pieces appear in several different Paston sources; and even within one source, a piece may be copied in more than one key. As Brett concludes,

... many pieces were provided with transposed versions which enabled them to be played or sung by different combinations of instruments and voices; and we may conjecture that Paston wished to have a similar selection of music available at each of his three houses. A look at the manuscripts themselves suggests a

72. The repertoire of some Paston lute sources is further discussed in Chapter 6.
74. ibid, p.193.
slightly different reason. They are clearly and often beautifully written, but they are by no means always accurate or even complete, and few of them show signs of having been used by performers. It almost seems as though the scribes copied out the same pieces over and over again to fill out partbooks that might never be examined. One wonders whether Paston eventually became more concerned with the size of the collection than with the growth of the musical repertory it contained.\footnote{ibid, p.203.}

One of the sources to come out of this 'copying workshop' was probably a presentation volume from Paston to his neighbour Sir John Petre, since its covers bear his name.\footnote{ibid, pp.196-7.}

Two other manuscripts, non-Paston ones in this case, have initials stamped on their bindings: Tenbury 389 and its companion book the James manuscript carry the initials 'T. E.'. They have not so far been traced to any family, but they could be part of a presentation set of this type (although not a particularly neat one). Otherwise the initials might be those of the copyist. The initials 'W. B.' appear elsewhere in the source, and Fellowes took these to indicate a close connection with Thomas Este and William Byrd,\footnote{E. H. Fellowes, William Byrd, pp.99-100, 109.} although Kerman later cast doubt on this idea by pointing out what an unauthoritative and unreliable Byrd source it is.\footnote{Kerman, 'Byrd's Motets •••', pp.366-7.}

The retrospective bias noted, among other features, in the Paston collection, is discernible in another important source of the 1580's, known as the Sadler part-books (Oxford, Bodleian Library MSS Mus.e.1-5). These books were copied by John Sadler (1513-c.1591), described as a 'teacher, translator and churchman' by David Mateer in his article on the subject.\footnote{D. G. Mateer, 'John Sadler and Oxford, Bodleian MSS Mus.e.1-5', Music and Letters, 60 (1979), pp.281-95.}

Sadler also copied another set of books, dated 1591, of which two survive -- they are known as Tenbury 1486 (Tenor) and the Willmott manuscript (Altus). The Bodleian set carries the date 1585, which Mateer suggests is the date of completion, not commencement.\footnote{See his article for supporting argument.}
The repertoire consists of 'a large quantity of Henrician music as well as works by more modern composers', and the manuscripts are beautifully illuminated with drawings of animals, flowers and grotesques, as well as mottoes and Biblical quotations. The presence of the last of these invites comparison with the Dow part-books, but while their inscriptions are mainly concerned with music and musicians and are laudatory or elegiac in tone, the Sadler inscriptions, as Mateer points out, are somewhat different in character. Examples of them are: 'Post tenebras spero lucem', and 'Domine, praeestolamur adventum tuum, ut cito veniam et dissoluas iugum captivitatis nostre'; there are also some English phrases, including one which reads, 'I will not sing shut in a cage'. Mateer suggests that these inscriptions and others reflect an 'underlying theme . . . of humiliation and persecution suffered in the name of one's faith.' If this is so -- and the theory is a plausible one -- then e.1-5 could be described as a 'recusant manuscript'.

The subject of recusancy has interesting and important connections with many of the manuscripts in this survey. Edward Paston was a Catholic; so was his neighbour and friend Sir John Petre; and so, of course, was William Byrd. All of them were uncompromising in their beliefs. Byrd was fined for recusancy every year for much of his adult life. Byrd was patronized by the Petre family and visited them at Ingatestone, their home in Essex; Sir John Petre might well have introduced Byrd and his music to Paston. And it is not difficult to see why there is so much of Byrd's music in the Paston sources: naturally Byrd would have held an appeal for Paston, since he was not only the greatest composer of his day but also known to be a Catholic, and connected (by patronage) to some great Catholic families. Paston's taste for pre-Reformation music and his admiration for Byrd may both have had their roots in his religious beliefs.

82. Mateer, 'John Sadler . . .', p.290.
However it is important to preserve a distinction between manuscripts which seem to be overtly or covertly recusant in tone, such as Sadler's e.1-5, and manuscripts which were simply Catholic in provenance, as the Paston sources were. There is nothing remotely subversive about the character or presentation of the Paston sources -- they simply concentrate to a great extent on music which emanated from a Catholic era, and later music composed by a Catholic in a Protestant era. Perhaps there is potential for a third category; how should Baldwin's and Dow's sources be classified? They are neither Catholic in provenance (so far as is known) nor recusant in tone, but they may be taken to show their scribes' appreciation of the quality of Latin church music. Whatever their religious convictions may have been, it is nevertheless possible that their motives for including Latin church music in their sources were entirely musical. Much fine Latin church music was still being written, and it 'found a ready private audience, even among Protestants,'84 It is natural that its admirers should include a professional musician such as Baldwin and an enthusiastic amateur such as Dow.

By the same premise, Baldwin's inclusion in his sources of pre-Reformation music by Fayrfax, Taverner and others may be considered to arise not, as one suspects in Paston's case, from a desire to commemorate an older, Catholic, order of things, but from a concern to preserve music for the sake of its intrinsic worth and its value to succeeding generations. The strongest piece of evidence to support this view is Baldwin's own poem, which appears at the end of the Commonplace Book (see Appendix 3). This sixty-line poem, rightly assessed by several writers as of poor literary quality, mentions several foreign composers who are not actually represented in R.M.24.d.2. In Bray's view, 'Perhaps Baldwin was lost for a rhyme, or perhaps he wanted to give the impression (like Morley) that he knew more music than was actually the case.'85

85. Bray, 'Baldwin's Commonplace Book ...', p.149.
After an uneasy start, the poem proceeds in Alexandrine couplets, a formal and latinate, not to say cumbersome, metre for a time in which poets were writing predominantly in flowing pentameter. It is instructive to view the poem in the context of the Elizabethan age's new-found confidence in English language and culture, and the belief that English writers could be compared favourably with the Classics. This tendency is seen at its most marked in the 'Comparatiue Discourse of our English Poets with the Greeke, Latine and Italian Poets', in Francis Meres' Palladis Tamia, Wits Treasury, a commonplace book published in 1598. 86

Meres persistently uses the construction 'As ... [a list of Classical writers], so ... [a list of English writers]'. Baldwin begins with a list of English composers, then moves on to a list of foreign ones. These he describes as 'All famus in there arte: there is of that no doute', but he goes on to say:

yet let not straingers bragg: nor they these soe commende:--'
for they maye now geve place: and sett them selves behynde:--'
an englishe man by name: will~m birde for his skill:--'
The second half of the poem is devoted entirely to Byrd and his unrivalled skill as a composer. Baldwin thinks highly of every piece that he has included:

A store housse of treasure: this booke maye be saiede:--'
of songes most excelente: and the beste that is made:--'
but a special place is undoubtedly reserved for Byrd, who heads the pantheon and surpasses all the rest. Some of Baldwin's lines convey a sense of living in a golden age:

famus men be abroade: and skilfull in the arte:--'
... ...'
but in ewropp is none: like to our englishe man:--'
and the following passage suggests his fear that it is an age that is going to end:

the rarest man hee is: in musicks worthye arte:--'
that now on earthe dothe live: I speake it from my harte:--'
or heere to fore hathe bene: or after him shall come:--'

none such I feare shall rise: that maye be calde his sonne:-'
Therefore it is important that future generations should be able to
evaluate Byrd's music, which will continue to speak for itself:

ney lett thy skill it selfe: thy worthie fame recorde:-'
to all posteritie: thy due deserte afforde:-'

The last nine lines provide further evidence of the possibility of a
close friendship between the two men. But since Baldwin casts his thoughts
in the form of a poem, one must also take into account the conventions of
poetry, and in this respect the lines may be seen as analogous to an
'envoy', the convention whereby a poet takes leave of his poem before
sending it on its journey into the world and the future. In this case,
however, Baldwin takes leave not of his poem or of his commonplace book,
but of Byrd, which suggests that it is the survival of Byrd's music, not his
own book, which concerns him, and that he is aware of his subsidiary role
in copying this music for posterity. His inclusion of older works in his
'store housse of treasure' indicates that he viewed them as glories of a
previous age, and it was perhaps in the same spirit that he undertook the
completion of the Forrest-Heyther part-books.

As well as Byrd's works there is a great deal of other music which
Baldwin elected to preserve for posterity. What is this music and why did
he choose it? The lines

A store housse of treasure: this booke maye be saiede:--'
of songses most excelente: and the beste that is made:--'

and

as herein you shall finde: if you will speake the truth:--'
there is here no badd songe: but the best can be hadd:--'
suggest that he wanted to include a wide variety of music, and that he was
consciously applying (his own) criteria of excellence. Both of his vocal
sources, R.M.24.d.2 in particular, present a mixture of sacred and secular
music. The juxtaposition of Italian madrigals and English sacred pieces in
R.M.24.d.2 can be seen as part of a phenomenon which Price describes as
'typical of manuscript compilation from the middle of the sixteenth
century onwards ... both symptom and cause of a developing musical
literacy, one encouraged by the fusion of moral and religious necessities
with social ambition and with the Italianate enthusiasms of the time.\textsuperscript{87}

This explanation seems to be as applicable to a private commonplace book as to manuscripts intended for public view.

The madrigals themselves are an interesting selection: Italian prints were much copied in England at this time, but Baldwin chose only twelve for his R.M.24.d.2 collection, and Kerman regards them as 'some of the most esoteric pieces published by Marenzio in his first few years as a composer ... In general, however, [other] Elizabethan collectors seem to have been less fastidious, and were more likely to avoid Italian compositions if they were experimental and sophisticated.\textsuperscript{88} Kerman also observes that manuscripts of the type to which R.M.24.d.2 belongs contain many more Italian madrigals than English ones.\textsuperscript{89}

Baldwin also includes several pieces by emigré composers who had moved to England. Ferrabosco (Italian), Damon, Gerarde and Philip van Wilder (all Flemish) are represented; so is Lassus, although he is not known to have visited England, and in any case Baldwin mistakenly attributes the piece to a 'mr dowglas' (possibly Patrick Douglas, a Scottish composer of whom nothing is known). Van Wilder's piece \textit{Aspice Domine} (ChCh 979-83, no.6) was one of his works which enjoyed a measure of popularity after his death in 1553: Baldwin and Sadler both copied it thirty or so years later. This has been interpreted as 'a comparatively short-lived popularity lasting perhaps a generation after van Wilder's death and rendering his music widely available to a second generation of scribes to whom his name meant little, but who were content to transmit (though in ever-dwindling quantities) the music handed down to them.'\textsuperscript{90}

The pieces by foreign and emigré composers, however, are substantially outnumbered by English works. Their composers range from well-known names such as Tallis and Byrd to some which are now a good deal

\textsuperscript{87} Price, Patrons and Musicians, p.199.
\textsuperscript{88} Kerman, \textit{The Elizabethan Madrigal} (New York, 1962), p.46.
\textsuperscript{89} ibid, p.45.
\textsuperscript{90} David Humphreys, 'Philip van Wilder: A Study of his Work and its Sources', \textit{Soundings}, 9 (1979-80), 13-36 (p.18).
more obscure, such as Byrchley, Thorne, Digon and Moorecocke. A large number of John Sheppard's works — over thirty — survive in ChCh 979-83: Baldwin must have had a great admiration for Sheppard, unless he was pragmatically making use of a large Sheppard source, with no other motivation. It is interesting, though, that Sheppard had died as long ago as 1560; an examination of the list of contents of ChCh 979-83 shows just how heavy the retrospective representation is, although the mixture is leavened with more up-to-date pieces by Parsons, White and John Mundy.

Another interesting feature is the inclusion of Baldwin's own compositions in his sources: four in ChCh 979-83 and twenty in R.M.24.d.2. Many of the latter occur in the group of 'musical puzzles' and proportion exercises which he copied into R.M.24.d.2, but there are also some textless/instrumental compositions. Although Baldwin forebore to include his own name among the pantheon of English composers mentioned at the beginning of the poem, the fact that he included no less than twenty of his works in the source suggests that he did not see himself as a mere dilettante composer.

The puzzles and proportion exercises mentioned above serve to point up the difference between ChCh 979-83 and R.M.24.d.2. Because there are so many concordances between the two sources it is easy to assume a fairly simple relationship between them, but one should not lose sight of the different spirit and motivation behind the compilation of each. The major part of ChCh 979-83 consists of sacred vocal music, much of it old and perhaps outdated at the time of copying, lovingly and even reverently assembled and copied. The much greater variety and partly secular content of R.M.24.d.2 — and its group of puzzles and proportion exercises — evince a lighter spirit, and may be seen to illustrate the subtle distinction between a personally chosen anthology and a commonplace book.

91. See definition and discussion of this category of piece in Chapter 4.
Baldwin's manuscript ChCh 979-83 includes eighteen motets from the two editions of Byrd's Cantiones Sacrae: nine from each of the 1589 and 1591 prints. These motets form a useful basis for a study of Baldwin's transmission of accidentals, for the important reason that they appear in an authoritative printed edition as well as in manuscripts. The prints of 1589 and 1591 are generally believed (though not known for certain) to have been supervised by the composer himself, and among sacred music of this period they constitute a rare and valuable standard beside which the scribal approach may be assessed.

The Cantiones Sacrae which Baldwin copied occur in ChCh 979-83 in the following order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Concordances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Apparebit in finem</td>
<td>CSII D,X,389,341,423,17792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Levemus corda nostra</td>
<td>CSII X,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Memento Domine</td>
<td>CSI B,341,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>O Domine adiuva me</td>
<td>CSI D,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Domine exaudi</td>
<td>CSII D,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Vide Domine afflictionem</td>
<td>CSI X,389,341,369,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Exsurge Domine quare obdormis?</td>
<td>CSII D,X,389,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Circumdederunt me dolores</td>
<td>CSII X,389,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Domine praestolamur</td>
<td>CSI D,X,389,341,423,S,32377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Ne irascaris Domine</td>
<td>CSI D,B,X,389,W,341,369,423,S,32377,29372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Tribulationes civitatum</td>
<td>CSI D,B,X,389,W,341,369,423,S,47844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. This theory rests upon Byrd's statement, in the preface to his 1589 volume, that faulty copies of his motets were in circulation, and the implication therein, that he would have taken particular care to ensure that his publication was authoritative.
61. Aspice Domine de sede

68. Cunctis diebus

69. Tristitia et anxietas

138. Infelix ego

142. Descendit de caelis

143. Afflicti pro peccatis

CSI  B,X,389,341,423,S

CSII B(part),W,807,423,32377

CSI  D,B,X,389,341,369,423,17792

CSII B,X,W,389,341,807,423,45,30810

CSII  807,423

CSII  807,423

Key to Sources

D  ChCh 984-8

B  R.M.24.d.2

X  Chelmsford, Essex D/DP Z6/1 (carries date 1591)

389  Tenbury, St.Michael's College MS 389/James MS (late 16th cent.)

W  Willmott MS/Ten.1486 (late 16th cent.)

341  Ten.341-4 (early 17th cent.)

349  Ten.349-53 (early 17th cent.)

359  Ten.359-63 (early 17th cent.)

369  Ten.369-73 (early 17th cent.)

423  Oxford, Mus.Sch.MS e.423 (late 16th cent.)

S  Oxford, Mus.Sch.MS e.1-5 (carries date 1585)

32377  British Library, Add.32377 (carries date 1584)

807  Ten.807-11 (early 17th cent.)

17792  British Library, Add.17792-6 (early 17th cent.)

29372  British Library, Add.29372-7 (dated 1616)

45  ChCh 45 (late 16th cent.)

30810  British Library, Add.30810-5 (late 16th cent.)

47844  British Library, Add.MS 47844 (dated 1581)

CSI  Cantiones Sacrae, 1589

CSII  Cantiones Sacrae, 1591

One or two of these motets have further concordances in more or less peripheral manuscripts such as the lute-book Add.29247; these have not been included in this survey. (The lute sources will be discussed separately in Chapter 6.)
Of the eighteen motets in ChCh 979-83, the Chelmsford source transmits eleven, and Ten.389/James and Ten.341-4 ten each. Dow's ChCh 984-8 has nine, Baldwin's R.M.24.d.2 has seven, Ten.369-73 has six, Willmott/Ten.1486 has five, and Ten.807-11 has four.

It is essential first to create and define some terms of reference. A preplaced accidental is an accidental which is separated, by one or more notes, from the note to which it is intended to apply. Occasionally an accidental is placed at the end of a line to indicate that the first note on the following line will require an accidental, but in these cases the accidental is always preplaced plus applied, that is, the note is given both a preplaced accidental and an accidental applied in the normal way. There appear to be no exceptions to this procedure. Of all the procedures connected with the placement of accidentals -- other than routine application -- this is perhaps the one for which the motives are most easily perceived: it is equivalent to the 'catchword' in printed literary works. A distanced accidental is one which is set back from the note as if to alert the singer, but which is not technically preplaced as there are no intervening notes. Cautionary accidentals, sometimes called redundant accidentals, are extra reminders: for instance, a flat sign will remind a singer that a particular note is natural or flat, if the general context requires that it be frequently sharpened. If the passage in question includes repeated notes, a single cautionary accidental is usually supplied. A final category is the preplaced cautionary accidental, which combines the two characteristics.

2. Ten.389 is listed by Bray as having twelve, but he has failed to notice that the setting of Domine exaudi in Ten.389 is a unicum: Domine exaudi . . . et clamor meus (see Kerman, 'Byrd's Motets . . .', p.368).
3. Accidentals with an intended retrospective application have sometimes been noted in certain sixteenth and seventeenth century sources, but they are not in evidence in the manuscripts with which this analysis is concerned.
Preplaced accidental: ChCh 979–83, Byrd, Tribulationes civitatum, Contratenor.
Preplaced plus applied accidental: ChCh 984–8, Parsons, O bone Iesu, Superius.

Distanced accidental: ChCh 979–83, Damon, Omnis caro gramen sit, Sextus.


Fig. 1

Various methods of cancelling accidentals are found in the readings of the Cantiones Sacrae. The most straightforward one is the use of a sharp sign followed by a flat sign, or vice versa. Sources which use this method are Baldwin’s ChCh 979–83 and R.M.24.d.2, Dow’s ChCh 984–8, Ten.341–4,
Ten.369-73 and the printed editions. Among the other types of cancellation sign the one which is most frequently found is \( \text{\textcopyright} \), which occurs in ChCh 979-83, R.M.24.d.2, ChCh 984-8, Ten.341-4 and Willmott/Ten.1486. Baldwin uses a further sign of his own: \( \text{\textcopyright} \) (Domine praestolamur); and Dow uses \( \text{\textcopyright} \) in O Domine adiuva me. The sign \( \text{\textcopyright} \) is found in Sadler's manuscripts, e.1-5 and Willmott/Ten.1486. These special signs are apparently the preserve of scribes -- the printed editions use only flat-sharp/sharp-flat cancellation.

It is now appropriate to consider the incidence of the various types of procedure already described. The following tables show the transmission of routine accidentals in the printed and manuscript readings of O quam gloriosum, Ne irascaris Domine and Tribulationes civitatem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sup</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Ten</th>
<th>Bass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>979-83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.d.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>984-8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389/J</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341-4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369-73</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/1486</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349-53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359-63</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17792-6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig.2
Ne irascaris Domine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sup</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Ten</th>
<th>Bass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>979-83</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.d.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>984-8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389/J</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341-4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/1486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29372 (Latin)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(English)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig.3

Tribulationes civitatum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sup</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Ten</th>
<th>Bass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>979-83</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.d.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>984-8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389/J</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341-4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369-73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/1486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig.4
The three motets presented in these tables are those for which Baldwin's readings have the greatest number of concordances. Not all of the manuscripts, however, can be examined on the same terms, since several are incomplete. Baldwin's own ChCh 979-83 is seriously affected by the lack of its Tenor book, while the position is much worse with regard to sources such as Ten.389/James, e.423 and Chelmsford, all of which present only one or two part-books. The tabular division of each motet into its five voice-parts is intended to counteract this problem, and to make it possible to compare like with like.

The accidentals which are recorded in the tables are routine accidentals, including cancellations. This means that they are located immediately before the note in question, or above it, or beneath it, or preplaced, or distanced; but they are definitely required by the musical text, as opposed to being cautionary accidentals which duplicate the key-signature, or stress the naturalness of a C or the sharpness of an E in the absence of a key-signature. Cancellations are accidentals of this type which contradict a previous one not more than a few notes after it has occurred; if, however, the two accidentals are separated by some distance then it is less easy to distinguish between a cancellation and a cautionary accidental. In any case, the sources generally either cancel an accidental almost immediately or not at all.

Prominent in the latter category are the printed editions, which, if they give an accidental which contradicts the key-signature, often leave the key-signature to cancel it automatically. This comparatively modern approach (not used in conjunction with bar-lines, however) is not, as a rule, echoed in the manuscript sources, which tend to cancel accidentals assiduously whatever the circumstances.

Tables such as these can provide quite a lot of purely numerical information. Firstly, it is striking that the Bass parts of all three motets provide markedly fewer accidentals than the other parts -- an indication, presumably, of the developing harmonic role of the bass line in this repertoire. It is also noticeable that there is considerably less variation in the sources over figures for this voice-part than for the
The tables also show that on several occasions a manuscript total actually exceeds that of the printed edition. This often happens because (as mentioned above) the manuscript source provides a cancellation which the print does not carry.

A certain amount of variation occurs between sources. While some manuscript figures match the printed total, others exceed it or fall short of it. The scribes do not behave consistently on this point: for example, Dow may provide fewer accidentals than the print in one voice-part, but more in another. And Ten.341-4 can reproduce the printed total exactly in Tribulationes civitatum, but not in Ne irascaris Domine. This is an example of one scribe's inconsistency within the repertoire; it can also be seen, however, in one scribe's approach to a single piece. The tables show three examples of such 'double presentation': Baldwin's ChCh 979-83 and R.M.24.d.2 share all three motets; Sadler's e.1-5 and Willmott/Ten.1486 share Tribulationes civitatum and Ne irascaris Domine; and Thomas Myriell presents a Latin and an English version of Ne irascaris Domine in Add.29372-7. Differences over accidentals are discernible between all of these pairs of settings.

Tables of this kind provide much general information about the transmission of routine accidentals, but are unable to indicate which accidentals are transmitted. When this information is sought in the body of evidence provided by the manuscripts themselves, a multitude of examples emerges, among which it is possible to isolate and define a number of representative patterns — that is, fixed formulae in which accidentals are concentrated.

These formulae include the 'inverted turn', an example of which is given below,

4. The latter version is entitled O Lord, turn thy wrath.
and the series of two or more repeated notes. Although these formulae occur many times throughout the repertoire, Baldwin's and Dow's manuscripts and the prints are the only sources whose representation is substantial enough to provide any indications, however slight, about policy. The printed editions tend towards consistency and fullness of transmission on repeated notes (i.e., an accidental for each note), but inconsistency on inverted turns (which may carry as many as three accidentals, or as few as one). Baldwin shows a similar approach. Dow tends to provide only one accidental for the first of the repeated notes, and a transmission of inverted turns which is both inconsistent and seldom as full as that of the other two sources. At bar 83 Medius of Vide Domine afflictionem, the scribe of Ten.389 sharpens only the second and third of three repeated C's — an exceptional procedure in the context, but probably not a significant one in view of the general scribal inconsistency in this area.

The placement of accidentals — both routine and cautionary — takes several different forms. Most of them are placed immediately before the note to which they apply; and occasionally they are placed above or below the note, or set back from it slightly, but they have the same immediate application. Some, however, are preplaced by several notes. This procedure seems to be especially popular with certain scribes, although it is difficult to draw firm conclusions about this since the representation of voice-parts among the manuscripts is so unequal. On the evidence of the Cantiones Sacrae, Baldwin (ChCh 979-83, R.M.24.d.2), Dow (ChCh 984-8) and Sadler (e.1-5, Willmott/Ten.1486) all use frequent preplacement, and the print never uses it. The manuscript sources, furthermore, extend this policy into motets other than the Cantiones Sacrae. Between these extremes, other sources use it occasionally in those
of their part-books which survive.

The following table shows the number of preplaced accidentals found in the readings of Tribulationes civitatum, a motet of substantial length which is transmitted by several sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribulationes civitatum</th>
<th>Sup</th>
<th>Med</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Ten</th>
<th>Bass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>979-83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.d.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>984-8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/1486</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.1-5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369-73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps the most striking feature of this set of figures is the group of identical totals in Baldwin's and Dow's readings, for preplacement in the Medius part. However the seven accidentals involved are not the same ones in each source. This is true of other identical figures in the table, even when the sources are the work of the same scribe. It seems likely, therefore, that scribes were not particularly motivated to copy preplacement from each other (although this may sometimes have occurred), but that other factors were involved.

One of the most important of these factors was probably space. It is noticeable that the sources Ten.341-4 and Ten.369-73, which are both copied in a very spacious style, show comparatively few instances of preplacement in these motets. And Baldwin's own R.M.24.d.2, much of which has a very cramped layout due to inadequately spaced pre-ruled bar-lines, has a large number of preplaced accidentals, as well as many placed above and below
the notes. The evidence of Dow's manuscript layout in ChCh 984-8 would suggest that the accidentals were inserted at a late stage in the copying, and that for the most part they were preplaced when there was no room to apply them routinely.

Although various examples of preplacement, and placement above and below the note, may be attributed to pressure on space, there still remain some sources in which preplacement occurs without these constraints. Baldwin's ChCh 979-83 and Sadler's Willmott/Ten.1486 both have quite a spacious layout, but use frequent preplacement none the less. Sadler even preplaces cancellations, and also distances many accidentals which have an immediate application. Two possible reasons suggest themselves: firstly, that accidentals which were preplaced or distanced performed some recognized function — now no longer apparent — associated with their effect on a whole series of notes, or perhaps with solmization procedure; and secondly, that they were largely a matter of scribal choice, and intended to alert the singer in advance to the occurrence of a sharpened or flattened note.

The first of these theories is particularly problematic. It is certainly plausible that one accidental could have been intended to apply to several notes, although in some cases this appears considerably less likely than in others. It is equally plausible that more or less idiosyncratic systems associated with solmization could have persisted in manuscript sources, even though they do not appear in the printed editions of 1589 and 1591. Scribal use of preplacement is so variable, however, that it is difficult to see how the latter practice could have been applied in any uniform way; and the presence of preplaced accidentals in contemporary keyboard sources, where solmization procedures could surely have had no

5. For further discussion of the problem of space in this manuscript, see Chapter 4.
6. Dow's flats are considerably darker in colour than his sharps, but this difference in colour could simply be the result of the way in which the pen was held (his sharps often lean heavily to the side). There is no evidence that, for example, flats were inserted earlier than sharps, since they too are preplaced, and under the same conditions.
7. See Chapter 7.
place, casts further doubt upon the idea.

The second theory — that preplacement and distancing are instances of 'scribal concern' and techniques to alert the singer — is a plausible one if the customs of twentieth-century notation and performance practice are disregarded. There seems to be no doubt that accidentals which were preplaced, distanced or placed above and below were visually and musically acceptable to sixteenth-century performers: Thomas East (the printer of the Cantiones Sacrae of 1589 and 1591), working with movable type and with every facility to place accidentals exactly where he wanted them, rather than where he had to put them, nevertheless chose to place many above and below the notes instead of immediately before them. So there is no obstacle to the theory that this was a standard — and useful — method of helping the performer. It is even possible that both reasons for preplacement could have operated in different cases, given that scribes were not accountable to each other.

The last type of accidental to be discussed is the cautionary accidental. The only scribes who use these accidentals with any frequency are Baldwin and Dow. Baldwin provides 94 examples in the course of his eighteen readings in ChCh 979-83, and 35 in R.M.24.d.2, which presents considerably fewer of the Cantiones Sacrae. Dow provides 17 cautionary accidentals in the course of nine readings, the same number as the prints give in eighteen readings. Only a handful of cautionary accidentals are present in all the other sources put together.

Although Baldwin and Dow both use cautionary accidentals regularly, they do not use them in the same places with sufficient frequency to suggest a clear textual link on these grounds. On certain occasions, however, several different sources do agree over a cautionary accidental, including sources which do not provide many of this type. The accidental involved is very often a low-lying or high-lying flat. This type of cautionary accidental appears to serve as a confirmation or extension of the key-signature. Often the key-signature of a Bass part will consist of one (low) B flat, and B flats which occur an octave higher will be given a cautionary accidental. Sometimes the same scribe will notate another voice
part differently: if it contains a large number of high notes, he may give two flats in the key-signature, and no cautionary accidentals. Variations and combinations of these procedures occur frequently enough to indicate that the use of key-signatures, and that of high- and low-lying cautionary accidentals, are closely linked.

Occasionally, however, cautionary accidentals of this type occur when there is no key-signature; alternatively, they may duplicate a high or low flat which does appear in the signature. These cautionary accidentals should be seen as confirmatory in intention: the fact that they even appear in sources which do not use many cautionary accidentals suggests that scribes considered particular care to be necessary at each end of a performer's range. 8

Preplaced cautionary accidentals hardly ever appear in most sources: Baldwin is the only scribe to use them at all frequently. They could be seen as indicating maximum concern on the part of the scribe. It seems clear that most scribes, and Thomas East the printer, used cautionary accidentals occasionally as the inclination took them,9 but seldom recognized the necessity for them except in certain well-defined cases of high- or low-lying notes; Baldwin, however, considered them necessary everywhere on the stave, and provided more of them than any other scribe.

8. Don Harran has suggested that the use of the cautionary accidental is linked to musica ficta; see his article, 'New Evidence for Musica Ficta: the Cautionary Sign', in Journal of the American Musicological Society, 29 (1976), 77-98. However, his observations are drawn from continental motets of the 1540's; and there is no firm evidence that the use of cautionary accidentals was governed by these conventions in English copying of the late century.

9. The evidence on this point is not strong enough to suggest that any scribe deliberately reproduced a cautionary accidental from his exemplar. It might seem to be so from the cases in which several sources converge over a cautionary high or low flat in the Bass part, but such convergences are often contradicted by comparison of readings of other voice-parts.
Conclusions

The purpose of this chapter has been to outline and discuss the various aspects of scribal method with regard to accidentals. An authoritative standard beside which the manuscript readings may be assessed is provided by the printed editions, all of whose accidentals are assumed to carry the composer's approval.10

Comparison of the readings of these motets has shown that the printed editions do not always provide the fullest transmission of accidentals on purely numerical grounds. They do, however, provide the most internally consistent performance where most aspects of transmission are concerned. Key-signatures are used and observed in a comparatively modern fashion, with the exception of cautionary accidentals placed high and low on the stave. Apart from this exception, it is the manuscript sources which tend to venture (sometimes extensively) into procedures such as preplacement, cancellation and the provision of cautionary accidentals. Even after certain obvious mistakes have been discounted, for example Baldwin's R.M.24.d.2 reading of Aspice Domine de sede which on the final beat gives an F in the Bass part and an F sharp in the Medius, many of the manuscript sources show inconsistent and unpredictable practice over accidentals — and this includes inconsistency between two sources copied by one scribe. Because the sources are inconsistent individually, they are often at variance with each other. While it is possible that the scribes' exemplars were equally diverse, it is also possible that their flexible interpretation of practice with regard to accidentals may have done a great deal to obscure actual inter-source relationships.

There is, therefore, a certain division between scribal and printed practices in this area. It should be noted, however, that even the prints show some inconsistent treatment of accidentals, particularly where 'inverted turn' figures are concerned. The resulting overall implication is that procedures were far from standardized. They will be investigated in

10. Corrections of underlay (see Chapter 3) and accidentals, in the form of cancel slips and alterations by hand, are present in the prints, but mere...
Chapter 5, with a view to determining the extent to which the information that they provide can be used to establish textual links.
Chapter Three

SCRIBAL PRACTICE WITH REGARD TO TEXT UNDERLAY

An examination of text underlay is the next stage in this study of scribal practice in late sixteenth-century sources. Very little substantial discussion of this subject is to be found in recent writings on English sixteenth-century polyphony. Two writers who do give it more than passing mention are Peter Le Huray, who discusses the problems which it poses for modern interpreters, and H. K. Andrews, who states:

An investigation of word underlaying in sixteenth-century polyphony is a difficult undertaking. In most of the sixteenth-century part-books, printed or manuscript, the position of the words and syllables below the notes gives only an approximate idea of how they are to be fitted to the music; 'slurs', showing the number of notes intended to be sung to a particular syllable are extremely rare in part-books before the seventeenth century; ligatures only apply to the longer note values; there are few definite and accurate guides to help the singer or editor. Matters are made even more difficult by the fact that composers seem to have been very negligent in their underlaying of the text. Repeats of words were commonly indicated merely by an 'ij' sign, and sometimes when the text was well known, the opening words only were given.

This chapter will concentrate upon an illustration and discussion of the problems and inconsistencies which are given their clearest description in Andrews' statement; and also upon a discussion of the various methods used by scribes to clarify their intentions in their distribution of underlay. For the sake of consistency the analysis will once again focus upon the selection of eighteen Cantiones Sacrae which formed the basis of Chapter 2; and the sources will be the same as those examined in that chapter.

-----------------------------
Various technical features are to be found in the distribution of underlay, in addition to the simple copying of words underneath the notes. One of these devices is the use of a bracket sign (Andrews' 'slur') to link together two, three and even four notes which are to be sung to the same syllable. This sign takes two forms: ∨ and ≅. The former is more common, although most sources in which these signs appear with any frequency use both (an exception being Ten.807-11 which uses only ∨, occasionally in a somewhat rudimentary form).

The sources in which these signs occur most frequently are Baldwin's ChCh 979–83, Dow's ChCh 984–8, e.423 and Ten.807-11, all of which employ them regularly; e.423 even uses them during repeat signs. They occur to a lesser extent in Ten.341–4, Ten.389, e.1–5, Willmott and Ten.1486. The Chelmsford Bass book presents a handful, nearly all of which occur in one motet (Tribulationes civitatum), and Ten.369–73 presents none at all. It is interesting that the last two of these sources, Chelmsford and Ten.369–73, are notable for the high degree of approximation in their general placement of underlay (although Ten.369–73 can redeem itself on occasion). By contrast, Ten.807-11, less elegantly but more accurately copied, includes a large number of these signs. Frequently their use leads to somewhat 'mannered' results: that is, a process which Andrews describes as 'the off-beat inception of a syllable' or 'word-bonding'.

![Fig.1 Ten.807-11, Bass.](image)

Ten.807-11 presents the most striking example of the widespread use of this device, although Baldwin and Dow do use it to a lesser extent, as the following example will show.

3. ibid, p.277.
In this passage Baldwin and Dow, each using the sign which he tends to favour, give differing syncopated variants. Chelmsford and Ten.369-73 simply give repeat signs. Sadler's e.1-5 gives a reading which is the same as Dow's, although he has relied on distribution of underlay alone to make his intentions clear.

This sign is occasionally used wrongly: an example occurs in the Ten.341-4 reading of *Infelix ego* (Sextus, bars 34-35), and is not corrected.

Another technique, which can be placed in the same category as the connecting bracket, is the connecting stroke. If the underlay has somehow got out of step with the notes (perhaps because of a particularly long word which it was easier to accommodate on the stave than underneath it), then the careful scribe may make his intentions clearer by drawing a stroke between the note and the syllable which should be connected. This
device occurs in ChCh 984-8, Chelmsford, e.1-5, Ten.341-4, and especially Ten.389, where strokes are even used to separate words from each other during a cramped passage of underlay. Again these strokes can occasionally be used wrongly, and there is an example of this in the Ten.341-4 Contratenor reading of Tribulationes civitatum.

A further technique, which occurs in Baldwin's ChCh 979-83 only, corresponds to the idea of a 'preplaced plus applied' accidental, discussed in the previous chapter. It is a relatively rare feature, and occurs on only two occasions in the readings of his Cantiones Sacrae: once in Leveamus corda nostra (Medius, bars 67-68) and once in Domine exaudi (Superius, bar 85). In both cases a change of line is involved (and in Domine exaudi a change of page); and in both cases Baldwin provides the next syllable at the end of the line, although there is no note for it, and then provides it again, with its note, on the following line. Again, this is analogous to the printer's catchword. In the context of Baldwin's practice this could be interpreted as a sign of his thoroughness, although it might simply be a mistake.

These special techniques, it should be noted, are comparatively rare occurrences, while the general placement of underlay is, of course, constant. This placement varies a good deal from source to source, as far as precision is concerned. In view of the dangers attached to a twentieth-century judgement on such matters, the term 'precision' rather than 'accuracy' will be used, although it is surely reasonable to suppose that cases of a word or syllable placed precisely between two notes of music were as much of a hindrance to a sixteenth-century performer as they would be today.

The most precise placement of underlay is to be found in the printed editions of 1589 and 1591. Perhaps because Thomas East was also a printer of madrigals, which had complicated and often fast-moving vocal parts, his placement of underlay in these motets is at all times unambiguous, and at some points particularly careful.

In neither manuscript nor printed sources, of course, could music and text be inserted simultaneously: one had to come first, and the other had
to be adjusted to fit it. Since East was working with movable type, he perhaps had a greater degree of control over the situation than the scribes had. In the manuscript sources, the question of priority — music first or text first — is a very important factor (though not the only one) in the precision of underlay placement. In certain manuscript sources with very inexact placement of underlay, notably Chelmsford and Ten.369-73, the undisturbed flow of the text hand suggests very strongly that the underlay was copied first, and that little attempt was made to match it to the notes. When these manuscripts occasionally provide startlingly precise underlay for the duration of a short phrase or so, the effect is comparable to the intermittent and largely random coming-together of two normally separate and independent courses.

By contrast, scribes such as Baldwin (in ChCh 979-83) and Dow provide a much more exact matching of notes with underlay. This is largely because in both cases the size of the letters and the size of the note-heads are almost exactly the same, whereas in the Chelmsford and Tenbury manuscripts the text size is smaller than the note-head size. Therefore it was much easier for Baldwin and Dow to preserve an evenly-flowing text which was nevertheless closely related to the progress of the notes.

In one case the cramped layout of the source is directly responsible for the imprecise distribution of underlay. Baldwin's R.M.24.d.2 contains brief, texted extracts from Cunctis diebus and Infelix ego — the only Cantiones Sacrae pieces in this source to be provided with text. The cramped copying conditions of this section of Baldwin's manuscript, resulting from the pre-ruled bar-lines, preclude anything but the most general and cursory indication of underlay. There are a few examples of Baldwin's changing a phrase of several words into a one-word melisma, which in one case incorporates several rests, but this was probably done because space was so limited, rather than for aesthetic or musical reasons.

As well as actual words of text, there is another major part of the fabric of underlay: the use of repeat signs. The actual signs employed vary between sources, but there are several main types. The most common is the sign /, which occasionally occurs as / and in Sadler's hand tends to
be more upright, thus: /\ . Sources which employ this sign are Ten.389/James, Ten.341-4, Ten.369-73, Ten.807-11, e.423 and Chelmsford. The sign 'ij' occurs in the printed editions and in Dow's source. Baldwin has his own sign, \% , for his Christ Church source, though on a few occasions, and in his R.M.24.d.2, he also uses /\ . Sadler uses both /\ and \% in his Willmott manuscript, and \% in his e.1-5 set.

Text repetition governed by repeat signs varies from a single word (the reiterated word 'Jerusalem' in Ne irascaris Domine is a good example) to several phrases of text. In some cases the repeat sign covers only the first part of the phrase, and the scribe fills in the rest. In many cases the repeat sign is accompanied at the start by the opening syllable(s) or word(s) of the phrase, and then finishes with the final syllable of the final word. This helpful device is notably absent from the prints, and also apparently from the Chelmsford and Sadler manuscripts. Its use is widespread in Baldwin's sources and in Ten.389/James; it also occurs to a slightly lesser extent in Dow, and occasionally in Ten.341-4 and Ten.369-73.

With repeat signs, as with words of text, there is a certain amount of variation in placement. A distinction should be made between a repeat sign which is placed differently in one source from all the others -- that is, placed quite clearly under a different note -- and a repeat sign which is simply inexactely matched to the notes, and thus ambiguously placed in relation to other readings. The former type of variant could conceivably have its origin in the scribe's exemplar, and could thus be directional; the latter type would be more likely to be a 'local' scribal feature, although it would still be possible for a scribe to transmit an ambiguity rather than try to solve it, which would thus make it directional as well.

An example of a straightforward directional variant in this area might be the Ten.389/James reading of Domine praestolamur, in which there is a whole series of repeat signs which run completely counter to the distribution of text found in every other source. As far as ambiguity of placement is concerned, the printing methods used in the 1589 and 1591 editions ensure complete clarity in this detail as in every other, while
some of the manuscript sources — notably Chelmsford and Ten.369-73 — provide many instances of inexact placement of underlay.

The ambiguity produced by the inexact placement of a repeat sign concerns the starting-point of the phrase to which it applies, and the finishing-point of the previous phrase (which may be texted or may itself carry a repeat sign). Within the phrase for which no text is given, ambiguity over the actual distribution of the implied text may be almost unavoidable, although Dow and the scribe of e.423 sometimes include connecting strokes and brackets during these phrases (but not in the same places). In the vast majority of cases where there are more notes than syllables, there is no way of determining what sort of distribution was envisaged or practised. In this sense, repeat signs are merely 'tokens' of a kind, and there is a point beyond which discussion of their placement cannot proceed any further.

It is possible that there is a connection between the use of repeat signs and the puzzling blank spaces which occur in the underlay of some readings. The sources vary a good deal on this point: there is an example of a blank space in one of the prints (Domine exaudi, Contratenor, bars 45-47), something so unusual that it may well be a mistake; and a passage where Baldwin provides clear instructions for underlay that leave the last phrase blank (Cunctis diebus, Superius, bars 100-103 — see below), which is similarly exceptional in the context of his practice.

Sources such as Ten.341-4 and Ten.369-73, however, provide frequent and lengthy blank spaces. It may be that these are versions of repeat signs — that the scribe intended the phrase of text to be repeated, but did not
always take the trouble to specify this by means of a sign. If the blank space had been considered a serious omission by a scribe copying it down from another source, he might well have tried to remedy matters by filling it in with text, but the large number of blank spaces present in the sources suggests that they were not considered to be serious omissions.

The idea of filling a gap with text raises the separate but related issue of the splitting of melismata, the chief practitioners of which are Baldwin and Dow. This splitting of melismata into several shorter phrases becomes evident when their sources are compared with the prints — an unreliable procedure, since both manuscripts probably pre-dated them. Nevertheless, while the possibility cannot be ruled out that some earlier exemplar was responsible for the splitting and that neither Baldwin nor Dow initiated any of it, two points must be borne in mind: firstly, that any pre-print exemplars must originally have derived from the composer himself and would be unlikely to be less melismatic than the eventual print; and secondly, the large majority of Baldwin's and Dow's variants in this category find no agreement among the readings of the other surviving sources. There are a few cases where there seems to be an established manuscript variant from the printed edition, but they are heavily outnumbered by variants which occur only in Baldwin's and Dow's sources. Furthermore, these sources themselves show a measure of individual independence: sometimes they agree, sometimes only one of them splits a particular melisma, and sometimes they select the same place but give differing variants.

In the following example, from Domine exaudi, they and e.423 provide a rest instead of the word 'et', a shared variant that may indicate a pre-print version of this motet.

---

4. When one of the two sources mentioned gives a blank space, the other either does so as well or gives a repeat sign. On one occasion in Tribulationes civitatum (bar 60 Superius), Ten.341-4 gives 'et' followed by /: and Ten.369-73 gives 'et' followed by a blank space. There are other examples in the motet readings of this similarity of procedure.
It should be noted that alteration of rhythm and alteration of underlay are two different features. A rhythmic variant entails an underlay variant, but it is possible to have an underlay variant without a rhythmic variant. Both types occur so often in Baldwin's and Dow's readings that Dow's source, at least, has been described as 'little short of corrupt'. Interestingly enough, the tendency of these variants is not exclusively towards the division of a melisma into several phrases, but occasionally includes the expansion of several words or phrases into one. In the following example, both Baldwin and Dow provide a version which is more melismatic than the print.

Another interesting aspect of this practice is that to some extent it does co-exist with the extensive use of repeat signs, even in the same motet. It might seem likely that a scribe who had a considerable interest in splitting up and filling in melismata would not have been content to leave repeat signs as they were, without filling them in as well. Admittedly there does seem to be a tendency, in some motets, for the extensive use of regat signs to counteract widespread alteration —

---

examples are *Levemus corda nostra* and *Cunctis diebus*. However, motets such as *Domine praestolamur*, in which both techniques are to be found, demonstrate that they are not incompatible; and Dow's Contratenor reading of *Ne irascaris Domine* has nothing but repeat signs for its final twenty bars: that is, soon after the final phrase of text is introduced, the repeat signs take over.  

The underlaying of melismata is an area in which printed and manuscript sources differ markedly. While the printed underlay is clearly and unambiguously set out under the melisma, with printed word and musical phrase ending at the same point, the scribes of manuscript sources often simply write out the whole word at the beginning of the melisma -- a procedure which, if interpreted according to the conventions found elsewhere in text underlay, would mean that most of every melisma would be sung to the final syllable of the word in question. In fact scribal behaviour is not consistent on this point, since some scribes occasionally show themselves quite capable of delaying the penultimate and final syllables of the word. However it would seem likely that it is the printed layout which reflects the composer's intentions here (although the pre-print manuscript sources may possibly reflect his earlier procedures). If Byrd had wanted the word to be given in full at the beginning of each melisma, it would have been perfectly easy for the printer to set up his type in this way.

It would be somewhat hazardous to try to tie either approach closely to manuscript function: the printed edition was clearly designed to be sung from if desired; to argue, however, that its melisma underlay was spaced so that it could be used for performance would be to write off the whole corpus of manuscript sources, with their very different approach, as performing copies. Therefore the most that can be said is that this is another area in which scribal practice is much less consistent than

6. *Ne irascaris*, incidentally, is a particularly interesting motet from the point of view of repeat signs, as there is a great deal of text repetition, especially towards the end of the piece.

7. This policy can also be clearly seen in the Tallis-Byrd volume of *Cantiones Sacrae* (1575), printed by Thomas Vautrollier.
printed practice.

Ligatures occur intermittently throughout most of the Cantiones Sacrae, and are a prominent feature of the three Cantus Firmus responds, Aspice Domine de sede, Afflicti pro peccatis and Descendit de coelis. Since their placement is directly related to the distribution of the syllables of the underlay, it is worth investigating how the manuscript sources treat them.

A complicated picture emerges. Firstly, there is a group of ligatures upon which all the sources are in agreement. The manuscript ligatures, however, tend to be both longer and more frequent than the printed ones — that is to say, while agreeing with the printed ligatures (which link two semibreves together) they often extend them to include one or more additional semibreves, and they frequently provide extra ligatures which do not appear in the prints. 8

There is, therefore, a 'nucleus' of agreement over the printed ligatures, both among manuscripts copied before the appearance of the print (for example, Dow's ChCh 984-8), and among post-print manuscripts such as the Paston sources (for example, the Chelmsford Bass book). But as far as the additional, manuscript, ligatures are concerned, there is a great deal of variation in practice, with each source providing its own unique ligatures. There is no certainty that any of them derive from an authoritative pre-print source. It seems more likely that the scribes respected Byrd's ligatures but gave free rein to their fancy in supplying additional ones. Their motives for this may have derived from the strong manuscript tradition which they inherited (and which one can observe being dismantled by printers such as East); or they may have been prompted, since ligatures were becoming less common, to include them for their decorative and antiquarian interest.

This theory is applicable to post-print as well as pre-print manuscripts. One of the most assiduous providers of ligatures is Ten.341-4,

8. Not all of the scribes do this to the same extent: Baldwin seldom provides additional ligatures, in contrast to Dow, the scribe of Ten.389/James, and others.
which in several respects appears to be a print-derived source. There was nothing to prevent scribes from adding further ligatures even if they were copying straight from the prints, if their motives were those suggested above. An exception, however, is Ten.807-11, almost certainly a print-derived manuscript, which echoes the print faithfully in both the number and placement of its ligatures.

The printed editions invariably use a square-note ligature sign, but in the manuscript sources another type of sign occurs as well: \( \equiv \). Baldwin and Dow do not use it very often, but it does occur in the manuscripts which make fewer concessions towards penmanship, for example Ten.389/James, Chelmsford and Sadler's e.1-5. All the scribes tend to use a more archaic notation for a Cantus Firmus part with a large number of ligatures. Non-Cantus Firmus ligatures are concentrated in the outer parts of a motet, especially the Bass with its frequent long notes.

Several technical features of underlay are confined to the print, and to Ten.807-11, the manuscript which follows it most closely. Commas are not a feature of the manuscripts, but they do occur in the print — particularly in Tribulationes civitatum (1589) where there is a sudden spate of them. Question marks occur in the print, and can also be found occasionally in Ten.807-11 (for example, in its reading of Infelix ego). Sometimes the print replaces its 'ij' signs with '\&c'.

All the sources use a certain amount of abbreviation. This device is clearly employed to save space, and occurs more frequently in the manuscripts than in the prints because of the relative irregularity of handwriting. Such abbreviations as are found in the prints tend to be omissions of the letters \( m \) and \( n \), for example 'c\(\text{\textasciitilde}\)tenebrati s\(\text{\textasciitilde}\)t' for 'contenebrati sunt'. In the Contratenor parts of Cunctis diebus there is also 's\(\text{\textasciitilde}\)pitern' for 'sempiternus'.

The manuscript sources use many abbreviations — indeed the abbreviations are a staple feature of handwritten underlay. A common one is 'd\(\text{\textasciitilde}n\)e' for 'Domine'; others are 'n\(\text{\textasciitilde}r\)i' for 'nostri', plus the examples which occur in the print. In general these abbreviations can appear anywhere on the line, although on one or two occasions in ChCh 979-83 there is a
particular concentration of abbreviations at the end of a line, suggesting that on these occasions at least Baldwin copied the notes first, and then had to cramp his underlay in order to accommodate them.

Much variation of spelling occurs in both the printed and manuscript sources of these motets. Three main categories of variant emerge: clear mistakes and misprints; superficial variants; and variants which reveal a misunderstanding of vocabulary or grammar on the part of the scribe or type-setter.

In the first category, a few misprints occur in the printed editions. In the 1589 edition there are several misprints in Tribulationes civitatum, including 'me' for 'nos' at bar 82 (Medius), and 'nostam' (bar 99, Tenor) and 'onstram' (bar 154, Bass) for 'nostram'. In the 1591 edition there is a misprint in Infelix ego: the word 'ie' is given for 'ei' (bar 93, Sextus).

A particularly interesting misprint, which occurs in the last line of Domine praestolamur (1589 edition), has actually been altered. The last phrase of the motet reads thus: '& libera populum tuum'. In the printed Superius part, the closing phrase, '& libera tu----ae' seems to have been changed to '& libera po----ij----u', although the alteration is difficult to read. This alteration occurs in all the copies of the 1589 print which I have been able to check: Cambridge, University Library (two copies); Cambridge, Trinity College Library; London, British Library; and Oxford, Christ Church College Library. It looks like a neat hand correction made as the copies left the press.

Isolated mistakes in the manuscript sources include such examples as 'civitatum' for 'civitatum' (Ten.369-73), 'defeimus' for 'defecimus' (Ten.341-4), 'hebitudo' for 'hebitudo' (Ten.341-4) and 'montes' for 'montes' (Ten.341-4 again). All of these occur only once in the reading, and are counteracted by spelling elsewhere in the underlay.9

9. 'Demitte' for 'dimitte' in Ten.807-11 could be a grammatical variant (meaning 'to send down' as opposed to 'to send away') but since it only occurs in one of the five part-books it is more likely to be an error.
Some variants, however, occur frequently enough in a single reading to be termed a genuine alternative spelling or spelling variant. In quite a few cases it is reasonably clear that the spelling variant is superficial. Examples are 'occulos' for 'oculos' and 'inclina' for 'inclina' (both from the print), 'celorum' for 'coelorum' (Ten.389/James) and 'nostre' for 'nostrae' (frequent in all manuscript sources). 'Tardarae' for 'tardare' (Ten.341-4) might seem to be an error, but the scribe may simply have introduced an extreme example of the oe/ae/e variation noted above.

As well as spelling variants which are either isolated cases or else used systematically, there is a certain amount of alternation and contrast of spellings, ranging from variation in the large scale — that is, the use of a particular spelling in one part but not in another — to what appears to be the deliberate alternation of spellings within one part. In Baldwin's reading of Ne irascaris Domine, the word 'nostrae' is divided thus among the four surviving parts: 'nostre' (Superius, Bassus); 'nostrae' (Medius); alternation of the two spellings (Contratenor). In Tribulationes civitatum, at the word 'mentis', both Ten.341-4 and e.1-5 provide 'mentes' (several times) in the Medius only. In Descendit de coelis, at 'universae fabricae', the print's alternation of the endings sae/se and cae/ce appears almost to have the air of deliberate policy, and Ten.807-11 resembles it in this respect. The single part-book, e.423, is inconsistent within the phrase, giving 'universae fabricae'. Consistency of spelling was apparently not an important issue for the 16th century scribe.

The last category of variant consists of actual grammatical variants or errors. In Domine praestolamur, at the phrase 'et dissolvas iugum captivitatis nostrae', the print gives 'nostram' in the Contratenor. A mistake, no doubt, but a different kind of mistake from a variant such as 'nostae'. In Tribulationes civitatum, four sources — Ten.341-4, Ten.369-73 (both Paston), Willmott/Ten.1486 and e.1-5 (both Sadler) — give 'ipse montes' instead of 'ipsi montes'. The complete phrase is 'ipsi montes nolunt recipere fugam nostram'; as the adjective must be plural, not singular, 'ipse' is incorrect. In Vide Domine afflictionem several sources give 'conversam' instead of 'conversum' in the phrase 'gaudium cordis nostri conversum est in luctum'. To give 'conversam' is to put the participle in
the wrong gender. In *Aspice Domine de sede* the Chelmsford scribe gives 'de sancta tuo' instead of 'de sanctuario tuo'. And in *Apparebit in finem* at the phrase 'si moram fecerit' the same scribe gives 'si non moram fecerit'. In the following phrase he gives the correct version, so he may have realized his mistake, but he does not go back to correct it.

Few scribal corrections, indeed, are to be found in any area of text underlay. It is difficult, if not impossible, to establish whether this is because they were not noticed or because most scribes did not consider them important. Baldwin, however, does attend to the matter on several occasions: when he erroneously adds the word 'nostram' in *Aspice Domine de sede* (bar 53 Contratenor) he goes so far as to surround it with strokes, clearly in order to indicate that it is superfluous; and on another occasion (*Exsurge Domine*, bar 55 *Superius*, see Fig. 7, below) he changes the final letter of 'nostra' from something which was possibly 'e' to the correct 'a'.

![Fig. 7 Byrd, Exsurge Domine, Superius.](image)

**Fig. 7** Byrd, Exsurge Domine, Superius.

**Conclusions**

As in Chapter 2, scribal performance in the *Cantiones Sacrae* has received particular emphasis because it is measurable against an authoritative standard, but it is also reliably representative of a wider context. Baldwin's underlay procedures are the same for the *Cantiones* and for non-Byrd pieces, with one interesting exception: underlay repeat signs are much more frequent in his readings of the *Cantiones* than in his readings of non-Byrd pieces. The reason for this is not obvious, but one
may speculate that it is closely linked to the Cantiones Sacrae themselves, and to the form in which they were presented, both in the printed editions and in the pre-print exemplars available to Baldwin and other scribes. The East prints are notable for their regular use of repeat signs — a feature which might well have been carried over from the composer's original copies — and Baldwin was apparently not tempted to interfere with them too greatly. Non-Byrd music was another matter, and Baldwin's interest in text-splitting and the filling-in of melismata (although one may doubt whether it was originated by him in every case) results in different policy.

How can the many aspects of observed practice in text underlay be brought to bear on the question of inter-source relationships? It has already been noted that, in the case of motets in which one part consists entirely of ligatures, there are more or less as many different readings of this part as there are surviving sources which present it. If scribes can perform so idiosyncratically in this particular area — and it seems impossible that every one of their combinations of ligatures could have an authoritative derivation — does this indicate that variations between them in other areas might also have an 'accidental' nature?

The evidence with regard to spelling variants does not supply any strongly conclusive links between sources. There are a good many cases in which several manuscript sources give a particular spelling which differs from the printed spelling, but in these cases the word in question is something like coelum/celum, or passae/passe, with what seem to have been established alternative spellings. There are also cases where one source out of several provides a variant such as 'vecito venias' for 'ut cito venias' (Add.32377 in Domine praestolamur). The problem, therefore, is that when several manuscripts share a spelling variant it is not a sufficiently idiosyncratic variant to reveal them as conclusively related; and on the occasions when a thoroughly unusual spelling variant is present it occurs only in one isolated source. It may, of course, be the case that one scribe

10. See the discussion, in Chapter 7, of Baldwin's and Forrest's copying procedure in the Forrest-Heyther part-books.
did indeed copy a spelling such as 'celum' from another of the sources in question (or their common source), along with everything else that he copied. But from this standpoint it is not sufficiently conclusive as directional evidence.

As far as distribution of underlay is concerned, the most notable feature of practice in this area is the extent to which resemblances and divergences can co-exist in one pair of readings. In Vide Domine afflictionem, for example, the Ten.341-4 and Ten.369-73 readings are almost identical with one another (and also, incidentally, with the print, although that is a secondary factor in this case). Time after time, they give repeat signs in exactly the same places,11 or share a particular distribution of underlay. Yet on one or two occasions the readings unexpectedly diverge. An example of this is given below.

Fig. 8 Byrd, Vide Domine afflictionem, Tenor.

What is at issue here is a constant and marked resemblance tempered by an occasional divergence.

When a pair of readings is expanded to several readings, the same type of divergence may occur in a multiplied form. The following example records the readings of several different manuscripts for a comparatively brief passage from Domine praestolamur.

11. In the case of repeat signs, the frequent repetition of textual phrases in these motets provides scope for a much greater amount of divergence between these two sources than actually occurs.
These readings show a small-scale network of similarities and divergences. There are two possible ways of interpreting the evidence illustrated above. The first is to decide that each of these variants represents a version, with its own descent from its own exemplar. The second is to decide that there were fewer exemplars available than there are readings on show, and that the divergences between these readings stem from the fact that the exemplars were not reproduced exactly. While the first of these interpretations may well be correct, there is also a strong case for the second.

The reasons for a lack of exactness, if such it be, cannot be definitely determined, but two main reasons are possible: either the scribes tried to copy underlay distribution exactly, and failed, or they did not think it necessary to do so. This would produce a flexibility and variability which could theoretically obtain throughout the whole area of underlay distribution, although in the examples shown (and there are others of the
same type) they can be seen operating with regard to cadential phrases (Fig.8) and at places where there is repetition of single words or short phrases (Fig.9).\(^{12}\) It is conceivable that in these situations in particular the accurate reproduction of an exemplar was not of prime importance.

A further piece of evidence to reinforce this theory is provided by Sadler's two sources, e.1-5 and Willmott/Ten.1486. It would seem likely that Sadler copied the shared Byrd content of these manuscripts from his earlier compilation (MS e.1-5, dated 1585) into his later one (Willmott/Ten.1486, dated 1591), or at least that he copied them both from a common exemplar; a number of general and detailed similarities between the two sources support this contention. Nevertheless, as well as the sharing of certain notable distributions of underlay, there are various divergences at other points. The following example should illustrate this.

![Fig.10 Byrd, Ne irascaris Domine, Contratenor.](image)

Here Sadler's two sources are linked by a variant which is small in relation to the whole but important in its context; Sadler gives 'deserta, deserta' while all the other sources give 'deserta facta est'; but it will be noticed that Sadler distributes it differently in each source. This is surely not evidence that Sadler used two exemplars which differed over this comparatively small detail, but rather an indication of differences in his own copies. Whether they emanate from what might be termed 'carelessness' -- that is, an intention to copy exactly, which was not

\(^{12}\) Another interesting example of the second type is Ne irascaris Domine, with its many short reiterations. It will be noticed that in cases such as these the placement of repeat signs is similarly variable, and of as much importance to the argument as the distribution of written-out words.
carried out — or the belief that these differences did not really matter, or indeed were quite legitimate, is an interesting question, but it does not affect Sadler's final result.

If this interpretation of the evidence is correct, it has important implications for the establishment of inter-source relationships. It would appear that in order to draw a connection between sources on the grounds of underlay practice, it would be necessary either to identify a shared variant which is sufficiently substantial and idiosyncratic to be unequivocal even when weighed against other divergences, or else to demonstrate a constant, underlying resemblance and unity of direction which would also over-ride such divergences. The latter approach can be successfully used to some extent in the case of the printed editions and certain Paston manuscripts (although, among these, Ten.341–4 fits slightly less easily into the pattern), but the large pre-print anthologies are more resistant to such treatment. It might be possible to arrive at some conclusions through a careful combination of underlay evidence with several other types of evidence, such as that of manuscript accidentals, although these types may themselves be unreliable. It is almost certain, however, that the evidence pertaining to text underlay cannot be trusted to give reliable results when studied in isolation.
Baldwin's manuscripts contain a considerable number of textless pieces, most of them copied into his Commonplace Book, R.M.24.d.2. Some of these are vocal pieces which have been copied in without their texts: an example is Byrd's *O quam gloriosum*, which is number 66 in R.M.24.d.2. In the case of some others there is indirect evidence to suggest that they were instrumental pieces which could also be sung to sol-fa: an example is Tye's *Amavit*, which is textless in all surviving readings, and which has as one of its most important sources the manuscript Add.31390, described on the title-page as 'A booke of In nomines and other solfainge songes'. There is also a group of pieces which are unique to Baldwin's sources, and which may originally have carried a text which he omitted to copy. In view of the incompleteness of the evidence as to the function of such pieces as these, it is perhaps most appropriate to describe them as a 'textless/instrumental' repertoire.

The two Baldwin manuscripts which contain this textless/instrumental music are ChCh 979-83 and R.M.24.d.2. The following table (see next page) shows the structure, and types of music, found in the latter manuscript.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Labeled: Mostly foreign pieces: Marenzio madrigals, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Textless English pieces: some unica, some with concordances (also three mass excerpts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Labeled: Later hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Labeled: Texted English pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Labeled: Textless (except for no. 91) English pieces: mostly musical puzzles and proportion exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Texted English pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1
In order to examine this particular area of Baldwin's copying practice, it is necessary to establish clearly in which parts of the manuscripts it occurs. R.M.24.d.2, as the previous table shows, can be divided into six basic sections. Three of these sections — C, D and F — are outside the present discussion, either because their contents are texted, or (as in the case of C) because Baldwin was not the copyist. Sections A, B and E, however, contain textless/instrumental pieces copied by Baldwin, and form the basis of this discussion. With ChCh 979-83 the situation is less complicated: there is a straightforward division between the 161 texted pieces and the 11 textless/instrumental pieces, nearly all of which occur towards the end of the manuscript.

Despite the substantial number of textless/instrumental pieces in Baldwin's sources, there are relatively few textless concordances for them in other manuscripts. There are several reasons for this. First, since many of Baldwin's textless pieces belong to the vocal repertoire, their concordances tend to be texted. Indeed, Baldwin himself presents some of them, in a texted form, in ChCh 979-83. Thus, while a comparison of his textless readings with other, texted readings — and perhaps particularly his own texted readings — would (at least in theory) have useful aspects, it would be an unequal one. In practice discrepancies seldom occur.

A second and related reason concerns the pieces not known from texted sources. A number of these may well be genuine instrumental pieces, but since they survive only in Baldwin's Commonplace Book, it is not possible to confirm this. These categories — textless pieces with texted concordances, and textless unica — account for a large proportion of the pieces in R.M.24.d.2. The few that remain, however, do occur in textless readings other than Baldwin's, either because they probably are genuine instrumental works, or because they are presented by a completely textless source which is comparable to the textless parts of R.M.24.d.2. These textless sources will be underlined in the list of concordances which follows, although the manuscripts RCM 2089, Add.29246, Add.29247, Dd.2.11, and Hirsch 1353, which are lute-books, will be excluded from the list. Since they probably have more in common with each other than with their 'non-lute' concordances, they will be examined as a group in Chapter 6.
20. Golder
   In nomine

22. Byrd
   Peccantem me

23. Byrd
   Aspice Domine quia facta

24. Byrd
   Attollite portas

25. Ferrabosco
   Vias tuas

26. Giles
   Vestigia mea

27. Giles
   Tibi soli

28. Byrd
   My soule opprest

29. Byrd
   Domine quis habitabit

30. Tye
   Amavit

31. Byrd
   Memento Domine

32. Byrd
   Tristicia

33. Byrd
   Sed tu Domine

34. Ferrabosco
   Ultimi me

35. Ferrabosco
   Salva me

36. Ferrabosco
   Christe redemptor

37. White
   Deus misereator

38. White
   Lactantur et uxor

39. W. Mundy
   Adolescentulus

40. W. Mundy
   Tribulacio

41. J. Mundy
   Judica me Deus

42. Sheppard
   Heo dies

45. Tallis
   Loquebantur variis linguis

46. J. Mundy
   In nomine

47. J. Mundy
   In nomine

48. J. Mundy
   In nomine
49. J. Mundy  In nomine
50. Morley  Gaude Maria virgo
51. Morley  Virgo prudentissima
52. Byrd  Ne irascaris Domine
53. Byrd  Civitas
54. Byrd  Tribulaciones
55. Byrd  Timor
56. Byrd  Nos anim
57. Byrd  Omnipotens
58. Byrd  Memor esto
59. Byrd  Ne perdas
60. Byrd  Eripe me
61. Taverner  /No words/
62. Parsons  Libera me Domine
63. Parsons  Dies illa ... dum veneris
64. Byrd  Aspice Domine /de sede/
65. Byrd  Respite Domine
66. Byrd  O quam gloriosum
67. Byrd  Benedictio
68. Bull  Deus omnipotens
69. Bull  I ame feeble
70. Byrd  in thee 0 lorde
70a. Byrd  that we shulde
70b. Byrd  the holy church
70c. Byrd  that we beinge
71. Sheppard  that we beinge
72. Baldwin  In nomine
72a. Byrd  And ye childe
72b. Byrd  yt we should be
90. Baldwin  a duo
111. Canon  /3/ kuries of 3 voc
112. Preston  O lux
113. Ferrabosco  Ut re mi fa  41156, Dd.2.11, Hirsch 1353
114. Baldwin  A fancie
115. Bevin  a browning of 3 voc
116. Baldwin  a browninge of 3 voc
118. Baldwin  upon in nomine
119. Baldwin  Coockow
121. Bull  [no words]

Christ Church 979-83

89a. Byrd  Canon (in 981 only)
157. Byrd  [no words]
158. Parsons  [no words]
159. Damon  [no words]
160. Taverner  Quemadmodum (no further words)
161. Baldwin  Redime me Domine
162. Baldwin  Pater noster
163. Aston  Aston's Maske
164. Baldwin  Fancy
165. Bevin  Browning  B
169. Baldwin  Coockow as I me walked  B

N.B: Items bracketed together are sections of the same motet, and concordances which are listed opposite the first one apply also to the second (and third).

List of manuscript abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>R.M.24.d.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>ChCh 979-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Cantiones Sacrae 1575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>Cantiones Sacrae 1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dd.2.11</td>
<td>Cambridge, University Library MS Dd.2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dd.5.20-21</td>
<td>Cambridge, University Library MS Dd.5.20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>ChCh 984-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUR</td>
<td>Durham Cathedral Library MSS E.4-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>Psalmses, Sonets and Songes of Sadnes and Piete, 1588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Willmott MS and Ten.1486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Chelmsford, Essex MS D/DP 26/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17786</td>
<td>London, British Library Additional MS 17786-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17792</td>
<td>Add.17792-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22597</td>
<td>Add.22597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23624</td>
<td>Add.23624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29246</td>
<td>Add.29246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29247</td>
<td>Add.29247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29372</td>
<td>Add.29372-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30480</td>
<td>Add.30480-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30513</td>
<td>Add.30513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30810</td>
<td>Add.30810-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31390</td>
<td>Add.31390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32377</td>
<td>Add.32377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47844</td>
<td>Add.47844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Ten.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>Ten.341-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>Ten.349-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>Ten.359-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>Ten.369-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>Ten.389/James MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382</td>
<td>Ten.1382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1464</td>
<td>Ten.1464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1469</td>
<td>Ten.1469-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ChCh 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>ChCh 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>ChCh 439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>Oxford, Mus.Sch.e.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.M.24.h.11</td>
<td>London, British Library R.M.24.h.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mad.Soc.G.21-6</td>
<td>Madrigal Society MS G.21-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirsch 1353</td>
<td>London, British Library Hirsch MS 1353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4180</td>
<td>New York, Drexel MS 4180-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2
As the list indicates, textless concordances for this repertoire are not numerous. They are particularly scarce in the category of established, texted motets -- for example, Byrd's *Ne irascaris Domine* and other items from the *Cantiones Sacrae* of 1589 -- which Baldwin, for his own reasons, presents in textless form in R.M.24.d.2. Few other scribes omit the text of these motets; and Baldwin, after all, presents them texted elsewhere.¹ His textless readings of them contain no unusual features apart from the omission of words. Four apparently instrumental pieces, however, deserve special attention: Ferrabosco's *Ut re mi fa sol la* (R.M.24.d.2, no.30), Parsons' *A Songe called Trumpetts/Cante cantate/Lusti gallant* (ChCh 979-83, no.158), Tye's *Amavit* (R.M.24.d.2, no.30), and an untitled instrumental piece by Byrd (ChCh 979-83, no.157). The last two pieces in this group exist not only in their original instrumental versions, but also with texts adapted to them. Tye's piece carries an English text, *I lift my heart to thee*, in several sources, while Byrd's untitled instrumental piece appears as the motet *Laudate pueri Dominum* in the *Cantiones Sacrae* of 1575, and in various other manuscripts. The relationship between these textless and texted versions will be examined later in this chapter.

Some general features and problems of the textless/instrumental style

There are noticeably fewer accidentals in the textless/instrumental pieces than in the vocal ones studied in Chapters 2 and 3. One of them, Parsons' *A Songe called Trumpetts*, is completely diatonic, although the scribe of Dd.5.20-21 inserts two cautionary accidentals in its bass part. The reason for this paucity of accidentals is not easy to determine, but it may lie more within the nature of the music than within the circumstances of its copying and circulation. For example, if there were a generally accepted notion, among scribes, of an instrumental style which was relatively plain and diatonic (as compared with, for example, Byrd's motets), then they might be less likely to add modernizing accidentals to

¹. In ChCh 979-83.
As the list indicates, textless concordances for this repertoire are not numerous. They are particularly scarce in the category of established, texted motets -- for example, Byrd's Ne irascaris Domine and other items from the Cantiones Sacrae of 1589 -- which Baldwin, for his own reasons, presents in textless form in R.M.24.d.2. Few other scribes omit the text of these motets; and Baldwin, after all, presents them texted elsewhere.¹ His textless readings of them contain no unusual features apart from the omission of words. Four apparently instrumental pieces, however, deserve special attention: Ferrabosco's Ut re mi fa sol la (R.M.24.d.2, no.30), Parsons' A Songe called Trumpetts/Cante cantate/Lusti gallant (ChCh 979-83, no.158), Tye's Amavit (R.M.24.d.2, no.30), and an untitled instrumental piece by Byrd (ChCh 979-83, no.157). The last two pieces in this group exist not only in their original instrumental versions, but also with texts adapted to them. Tye's piece carries an English text, I lift my heart to thee, in several sources, while Byrd's untitled instrumental piece appears as the motet Laudate pueri Dominum in the Cantiones Sacrae of 1575, and in various other manuscripts. The relationship between these textless and texted versions will be examined later in this chapter.

Some general features and problems of the textless/instrumental style

There are noticeably fewer accidentals in the textless/instrumental pieces than in the vocal ones studied in Chapters 2 and 3. One of them, Parsons' A Songe called Trumpetts, is completely diatonic, although the scribe of Dd.5.20-21 inserts two cautionary accidentals in its bass part. The reason for this paucity of accidentals is not easy to determine, but it may lie more within the nature of the music than within the circumstances of its copying and circulation. For example, if there were a generally accepted notion, among scribes, of an instrumental style which was relatively plain and diatonic (as compared with, for example, Byrd's motets), then they might be less likely to add modernizing accidentals to

¹ In ChCh 979-83.
the music that they copied. Nor do extra accidentals seem to have accrued when an instrumental composition was converted into a texted vocal piece.

Could it be that in textless/instrumental music a greater number of accidentals was left to the discretion of the performer? This question will probably have to remain speculative for lack of evidence. It would in any case be very difficult to prove such a theory, given that some scribes of vocal music perform inconsistently in the type of situation where one might expect accidentals to be spontaneously applied, sometimes providing them and sometimes not doing so. The only way to establish a fundamental difference between vocal and textless/instrumental copying would be to show that the latter never provides this type of accidental, which is not the case.

The placement of accidentals is apparently governed by similar conventions to those applied to vocal music. Most accidentals are placed immediately before the note in question, although placement above and below the stave is common, even in manuscripts with a spacious layout; there are a few cases of preplaced cautionary accidentals; and Baldwin again provides evidence of extra care in the form of accidentals which are preplaced plus applied, always at a change of line.

The nature of the music being copied has a direct bearing on relationships between readings. In vocal music, most divergences between manuscripts concern accidentals and underlay, as has already been shown. In the textless/instrumental music, accidentals are few, whilst underlay is non-existent. Such errors and divergences as do occur are usually connected with the musical line. An example can be found in Parsons' Songe called Trumpetts. At a certain 'trumpet call' phrase in the Altus part, Baldwin copies it twice, but then adds the word 'bis' (twice) to the second one -- that is, he corrects what he saw as a mistake.
However, in order to fit with the other parts the phrase should only occur twice, not three times as Baldwin directs. It is likely that he copied this piece from Add. 31390, or shared a source with it, since the latter manuscript presents the phrase three times without any apparent recognition that this was an error. In a piece such as the Songe, with its fairly restricted range and repetitive phrases (the 'trumpet call' idea recurs frequently), a scribe could easily become confused and make an error. In most textless pieces, however, errors may have crept in because it was sometimes difficult to keep track of the musical strands without the benefit of a textual underpinning.

The textless/instrumental readings show some note-splitting and amalgamation relative to each other. In the case of Byrd's Fantasia/Laudate pueri Dominum the evidence points to an original instrumental version (in ChCh 979-83), and a printed version (in the Cantiones Sacrae of 1575) which can be seen to have undergone some specific modifications for the purpose of adapting a text. These alterations, most of which are simple and straightforward, will be examined later in this chapter.

In the case of Tye's Amavit, there are five existing versions. The earliest of these is to be found in Add. 30513, the 'Mulliner' keyboard source. Secondly there is Add. 31390, which is also an isolated version. The third version is supplied by a group of sources which are in agreement with each other in all except a few details: R.M. 24.d.2, Add. 47844, e.423, Add. 22597, Ten. 341-4, Ten. 369-73 and Ten. 1464. The fourth — to an English
text — is supplied by Ten.1382² and Add.29372-7 (the latter source being also known as the Myriell books). The fifth version is in the Chelmsford Bass book, which provides an instance of independent note-splitting towards the end of the piece (there is almost no splitting or amalgamation in the Bass part). The two sources which diverge most noticeably against the large group are the Mulliner book and Add.31390.

Some of the Mulliner variants take the form of embellishments of a type which might be expected in a keyboard source.

![Fig.4 Amavit, Medius bars 65-7.](image_url)

Others, however, are not consistent with such an approach, since they involve amalgamation of notes, which would work against the instrument's limited carrying power.

![Fig.5 Amavit, Contratenor bars 19-21.](image_url)

Although a few cases of amalgamation occur in Add.31390, its tendency is to

---

split notes relative to the rest of the group.

\[ \text{Fig. 6} \quad \text{Amavit, Medius bars 25–7.} \]

In the case of Tye's Amavit, and, to a lesser extent, Parsons' Songe called Trumpetts, the question arises as to the possible existence of an original text. The Parsons composition has three titles in its various sources: A Songe called Trumpetts, Cante cantate and Lusti gallant. Two of these are obviously secular and the third carries a slight suggestion of debased Latin, so it is unlikely that a text for this piece will come to light. Tye's Amavit, on the other hand, could well have had a text derived from one of the Versus alleluiaici in the Sarum Gradual:

\[
\text{Amavit eum Dominus et ornavit eum, stola gloriae induit eum. Alleluia.}
\]

which is itself freely compiled from Ecclesiasticus Chapters 44 and 45. It would be possible to fit this text to the instrumental piece, although it is not easy to discern how it would lie. The Chelmsford Bass book and Ten.341 provide the clearest indication that a Latin text for this piece did exist at one time. Although their readings are textless, the words 'Amavit eum Dominus' are underlaid to the first phrase. The opening ligature in Chelmsford\(^3\) mars the correspondence between musical and texted phrase, which is otherwise precise; if the piece was indeed sung to a text, this ligature cannot have been respected (see below).

\[ \text{3. Note the retention of the ligature, which could have had no function in the reading as it stands. Ligatures are present even in completely textless sources such as Add.31390, which suggests that interpretation of its usage had strayed quite far from original principles.} \]
The Myriell part-books, Add.29372-7, the Southwell Tenor Book, Ten.1382, and ChCh 56-60 all provide an English text:

I lift my heart to thee, my God most just/ now suffer me to pour out my plaints/ my sins alas are so enlarged, that when I look up, lo I am cast down/ my humble suit then for mercy is/ mercy, good Lord, mercy I crave/ let me thy mercy have. 

Although these settings are by no means identical (and they also represent different parts of the whole), they are broadly independent of the other readings, and are shaped by the requirements of the adaptation to an English text. They all add (slightly differing) three-bar extensions at the end of the piece, to accommodate the word 'Amen'. It is difficult to gauge the quality of the Ten.1382 adaptation, since only the Tenor part survives, but the Myriell and Christ Church settings are on the whole successful, despite a few phrases which might seem awkward (see example below).

There is little information available as to the performing media for these pieces. The title-page of Add.31390 reads, simply, 'A booke of In

4. Spelling modernized; Ten.1382 omits the word 'lo'.

Fig.7 Tye, Amavit, Chelmsford, Essex D/DP Z6/1.

Fig.8 Bass, bars 34-6.
nomines & other solfainge songes of v: vi: viij: and viij: parts for voyces or instrumentes'. A consort of strings seems the most likely medium, especially for Ferrabosco's Ut re mi fa sol la and the Byrd and Tye pieces, although the Parsons Songe called Trumpetts could conceivably have been intended for some kind of wind, brass or mixed consort, judging by the title and the spirit of the piece.

Several twentieth-century commentators have remarked upon the apparent existence of a solmization tradition for textless music of this type, and it is implied by the contemporary theorist Thomas Morley in his *Plaine and Easie Introduction to Practicall Musicke*:

> But I see not what passions or motions [the motet] can stir up being sung as most men do commonly sing it, that is leaving out the ditty and singing only the bare note, as it were a music made only for instruments...

Since the title-page of Add.31390 states its purpose unequivocally, it must be assumed that solmization was one of its uses. The part-book e.423 is headed firmly 'Contratenor', 'Tenor' or 'Medius' on every page, although the middle section of the manuscript contains a group of what are clearly consort pieces. In addition, two of the other manuscripts, Add.32377 and Add.29257, contain items entitled 'A solfainge songe' in their lists of contents. It seems likely that the solmization of certain textless music continued into the seventeenth century. However, a transition to the instrumental style which was eventually to put an end to this practice was taking place while this repertoire was being copied, during the last years of the sixteenth century. During this transition, according to Oliver Neighbour, 'Singers accustomed to the exceptional range and wide skips of English vocal writing would have been prepared to follow the composers quite a long way, if only for the sake of the exercise'.

7. For a discussion of the structure of this manuscript, see Edwards, 'The Sources . . . ', pp.111-18.
certainly have been necessary in the repertoire under discussion: John Mundy's *In nomine* (R.M.24.d.2, no.49) and Bull's *Deus omnipotens* (R.M.24.d.2, no.68) both have a Bass range of an octave and a sixth, whilst many of the pieces show a striking angularity of melodic line. For other reasons, too, solmization must have come a poor second to instrumental performance, particularly in pieces such as Parsons' *Songe called Trumpetta* with its fast tripla section (stipulated and copied with notable precision by all the scribes involved).

**Baldwin and the textless/instrumental style**

Amongst the sources of this textless/instrumental repertoire, ChCh 979-83 and R.M.24.d.2 are exceptional in that they are in the hand of the same copyist.

The two sources are most clearly differentiated from each other in that R.M.24.d.2 uses pre-ruled bar-lines. R.M.24.d.2 is one of the very few English score-books to survive from this period. Its first eighty-five pieces are in score, with bar-lines ruled from top to bottom and the music moving from verso to recto across first the upper and then the lower half of the opening. After item no.80 (Gore's *Dicant nunc Judei*, f.92) the bar-lines stop, and thereafter Baldwin changes to a modified choir-book format — that is, instead of a system of five or six parts travelling across the opening, he gives one part, complete, on each side of the opening, and if there are three parts, he divides the second one between the bottom of the left-hand page and the top of the right-hand page. This method is well adapted to, and no doubt expressly designed for, the


presentation of pieces in a small number of parts; that it begins at the onset of a large number of duos, three-part pieces, small-scale musical puzzles and proportion exercises is probably no accident, for all of these could conceivably have been set out in the previous copying style. The choir-book format continues until the end of the manuscript.

Throughout the first section of the manuscript (nos.1-80), the ruled bar-lines constitute a serious constraint, since they produce bars which are generally too short for Baldwin's requirements. The bars result — either inadvertently or deliberately — in a copying style which is at best compact, and at worst exceedingly cramped. Notes are kept as small as possible, accidentals are placed wherever there is room for them, and some bar-lines are even bent in order to accommodate the full number of notes, another bar-line, curved outwards, being superimposed on the pre-ruled one (see Plate 2).

The problem caused by the pre-ruled bar-lines is a straightforward one: there is simply not enough space in each bar. It would seem that the change-over to a choir-book format after no.80 could only be beneficial. The absence of bar-lines must be an advantage where the musical puzzles are concerned, since their space requirements are somewhat peculiar and erratic; the other pieces too benefit from a generally more spacious layout. Despite this, however, different constraints arise from the choir-book format. Now that, for example, three parts are given separately on an opening, rather than in score, problems arise from the need to co-ordinate the separate parts, and from Baldwin's apparent desire to fit the whole piece into one opening whenever possible. The short pieces cause no difficulty; nor are there problems with the longest ones, since Baldwin spreads them into two or more openings. He does, however, try to fit some pieces in the middle range into one opening, with unsatisfactory results. In score format, no piece had to end at a particular point, although occasionally Baldwin might decide that it was possible to finish a piece on a particular page, by cramming a couple of extra bars into the margin. In choir-book format, the removal of bar-lines ostensibly provided more space for each 'bar-unit', but with the pressure to fit the whole piece into the opening the style remained as cramped as if the bar-lines had been there after all. So in fact Baldwin exchanged one set of problems for
another.

With shorter pieces, the three parts normally fit into an opening with comparative ease. In these cases Baldwin makes sure that the parts are clearly separated from one another by leaving blank, staveless gaps between them. Curiously enough, he does this even for the longer piece where space is at a premium. This commonly results in three densely-copied parts separated by wide gaps. The staves cannot have been pre-ruled (except perhaps in an immediate sense) since the position of the gaps varies. The reason may be connected with visual considerations: Baldwin may have liked a strong demarcation between the three parts. There is evidence that he liked uniformity in their appearance, since in cases where one part contains fewer notes than the others (for example, a series of long notes which the other parts decorate) these are often deliberately spaced far apart so that each of the three parts occupies the same number of staves.

The question of space may have influenced Baldwin's procedure in an important area: the barring of the music. In his article 'Early Scores in Manuscript',11 Lowinsky investigates various English and continental score-books dating from the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. One of his main conclusions is that these score-books are regularly barred, and that 'all sixteenth-century manuscript scores of vocal music without exception take the breve as bar unit'.12 He includes R.M.24.d.2, quoting Denis Stevens on whose information he relies, and states that 'usually the measurement [in R.M.24.d.2] is a breve per bar'.13 However, the way in which bar-lines are used in R.M.24.d.2 is highly uncharacteristic and worthy of a more detailed summary than this. Lowinsky's description does apply, in the main, to the opening cell of fifteen Marenzio madrigals (nos.3-17), but does not adequately summarise the barring in the rest of the group. Of the eighty-five pieces in question, some fifty-five are irregularly barred; eighteen are regularly barred in triple time (three semibreves per bar);

12. ibid, p.170.
13. ibid, p.156.
another.

With shorter pieces, the three parts normally fit into an opening with comparative ease. In these cases Baldwin makes sure that the parts are clearly separated from one another by leaving blank, staveless gaps between them. Curiously enough, he does this even for the longer piece where space is at a premium. This commonly results in three densely-copied parts separated by wide gaps. The staves cannot have been pre-ruled (except perhaps in an immediate sense) since the position of the gaps varies. The reason may be connected with visual considerations: Baldwin may have liked a strong demarcation between the three parts. There is evidence that he liked uniformity in their appearance, since in cases where one part contains fewer notes than the others (for example, a series of long notes which the other parts decorate) these are often deliberately spaced far apart so that each of the three parts occupies the same number of staves.

The question of space may have influenced Baldwin's procedure in an important area: the barring of the music. In his article 'Early Scores in Manuscript',11 Lowinsky investigates various English and continental score-books dating from the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. One of his main conclusions is that these score-books are regularly barred, and that 'all sixteenth-century manuscript scores of vocal music without exception take the breve as bar unit'.12 He includes R.M.24.d.2, quoting Denis Stevens on whose information he relies, and states that 'usually the measurement [in R.M.24.d.2] is a breve per bar'.13 However, the way in which bar-lines are used in R.M.24.d.2 is highly uncharacteristic and worthy of a more detailed summary than this. Lowinsky's description does apply, in the main, to the opening cell of fifteen Marenzio madrigals (nos.3-17), but does not adequately summarise the barring in the rest of the group. Of the eighty-five pieces in question, some fifty-five are irregularly barred; eighteen are regularly barred in triple time (three semibreves per bar);

12. ibid, p.170.
13. ibid, p.156.
and twelve are regularly barred in duple or quadruple time (two or four semibreves per bar).

There are certain variations within the 'irregularly barred' category: some pieces are regularly barred in all except the first or final bar, which is lengthened or shortened by one articulated beat (i.e. not an 'adjusted' final beat, as often occurs in music of this type); some pieces are barred in a basic duple or triple time with frequent interpolations of bars in other metres.

In the pieces which are regularly barred in triple time, it seems likely from the awkwardness with which the cadential stresses are distributed that the copying procedure forced some pieces into this metre. It is pretty clear that Baldwin unhesitatingly made use of whatever space was available to him in each bar, although he retained the semibreve as his lowest common denominator.

Among the eighteen pieces which are regularly barred in triple time, most incorporate a cantus firmus which Baldwin divides into groups of three semibreves. However, an irregularly divided cantus firmus is a feature of many of the fifty-five irregularly barred pieces, and in some of them (notably no.61, a short but intricate piece by Taverner) the bar length varies continuously between two, three, four, five and even six semibreves per bar. Curiously enough, it is perhaps such extreme examples which go furthest towards providing an explanation of Baldwin's copying procedure. Baldwin, for reasons which we are never likely to know, had provided himself with a whole series of bars which were too short — although they were not absolutely uniform in length, and he could take advantage of an occasional one which was longer than the others. He was also working for quite a lot of the time on pieces written around a cantus firmus, which he may have viewed as flexible. Therefore the fluidity of his rhythmic distribution was primarily a necessary adaptation to conditions which he could not escape. For much of the time he maintained a basic division into three beats — which fitted comfortably into the average length of his bars — but if there was an opportunity to insert more beats he did so. It should not be assumed that he looked upon these bar-lines as
playing any metrical role: it is more likely that he used the standard sixteenth-century ⌚ sign to signify a basic tactus, rather than a rhythm -- a pulse directing the music along a steady course which remained unaffected by the divisions imposed upon it (see Plate 2).

Thus Baldwin's R.M.24.d.2 does not fit into the picture, drawn by Lowinsky, of sixteenth-century scores which are regularly barred -- and correctly barred, in modern terms. Instead of ruling bar-lines to fit the music -- as other copyists were then doing -- Baldwin apparently fitted the music to the bar-lines. Within his own conventions Baldwin handles bar-lines carefully: he occasionally bends bar-lines in moments of extreme difficulty, as we have seen; and any actual discrepancy in bar length between two simultaneously-sounding parts is a relatively rare occurrence, the result, doubtless, of a copying slip rather than a careless approach towards rhythm. However a piece in which all parts apparently have the same number of beats per bar may actually conceal a passage of misalignment, which generally resolves itself sooner or later. Thus, while Baldwin rarely makes a 'visual' mistake, this concern for appearances does not always protect him from 'internal' copying errors, such as that which occurs in his R.M.24.d.2 reading of Parsons' Libera me Domine.\textsuperscript{14} This strongly suggests that he was copying from single part-books into score, and that for much of the time he did not read his scores vertically as he copied them. That he occasionally checked his work, however, is evident from a copying mishap in his R.M.24.d.2 reading of Tallis's Loquebantur variis linguis (f.59).\textsuperscript{15} Here Baldwin began to copy the Bass part a second time, but gave up after realizing his mistake.

The comparison of ChCh 979-83, which is unbarred throughout, with R.M.24.d.2, in which much of the textless/instrumental repertoire is barred, shows clearly that barring a manuscript under these circumstances does not necessarily make copying simpler or more straightforward. Nor are the bar-lines the result of a strong sense of tactus -- although one of Lowinsky's main observations with regard to continental barred manuscripts was that

\textsuperscript{14} See transcriptions in volume two.

\textsuperscript{15} See transcriptions in volume two.
their barring serves and reinforces the tactus, Baldwin's distribution of a piece often pursues a course quite independent of it.

Baldwin's R.M.24.d.2 is not the only manuscript in this study in which problems of space occur. Add.31390 is a table-book, with the second type of problem mentioned in connection with R.M.24.d.2 -- namely the need to fit a whole piece on to a double page, in this case so that the players or singers could all sit round it and read their parts. In fact the scribe of Add.31390 copes somewhat more successfully than Baldwin with the problem of limited space, because he manages to preserve a greater uniformity of note size,\(^{16}\) so that the appearance of the layout is exceedingly compact but rarely very cramped. Indeed some of the parts fit so neatly into the limited space allotted to them that their copying must have been extremely well thought out. At the other end of the scale is Add.41156-8, in which the layout seems almost exaggeratedly spacious at times. Most of the other manuscripts come somewhere between these two extremes.

**Manuscript and printed readings of 'Laudate pueri Dominum'**

Byrd converted his untitled six-part instrumental composition into a texted piece 'by the simple expedient of adapting some miscellaneous psalm verses to its various constituent phrases'.\(^{17}\) In this form he included it in the 1575 edition of Cantiones Sacrae. The text is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Laudate pueri Dominum, laudate nomen Domini.}
\text{Sit nomen Domini benedictum ex hoc nunc et usque in seculum.}
\text{Auxilium meum a Domino, qui fecit coelum et terram.}
\text{Benefac Domine, bonis et rectis corde.}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{16}\) Baldwin's disadvantage in this respect is another result of the copying conditions of R.M.24.d.2 -- he has few problems with uniformity of note size in ChCh 979-83.

\(^{17}\) Joseph Kerman, The Masses and Motets of William Byrd, p.37. The question of priority can be determined with some certainty: while the evidence of manuscript dates is not sufficiently conclusive on this point, musical considerations provide confirmation that a pre-existing instrumental piece was adapted to a text; see Kerman, 'Byrd's Motets: Chronology and Canon', p.361 and note.
In the printed version some quite substantial musical changes have been made, not all of them necessarily dictated by the words. Therefore there is very definitely a 'texted version' and an 'instrumental version'. In actual fact the picture is slightly more complicated: ChCh 979-83 presents the instrumental version, and Drexel 4810-5, Ten.1382, Add.17792, Add.17796 and CS 1575 present the texted version, but Add.47844, the single (Contratenor in this case) part-book, and Add.17786-91, both of which are textless sources, actually present the printed version. So there is not a strict dichotomy between textless and texted (or printed) sources. To complicate things further, the Ten.1382 version, while musically the same as the print, has an English text:

Behold now praise the Lord all ye servants of the Lord, ye that by night stand in the house of the Lord [in the courts of the house of our God]. Lift up your hands in the sanctuary, lift up your hands and praise the Lord [ever praise the Lord]. The Lord that made heaven and earth give thee blessing out of Sion.18

Thus there is a group of sources -- the printed edition, Ten.1382, Add.17786-91, Add.17792, Add.17796, Add.47844 and Drexel 4180-5 -- all of which present the same version (although two of them omit the text), and a solitary source -- Baldwin's ChCh 979-83 -- which presents the original, instrumental version. Baldwin's access to this version could imply that he copied it before the texted version appeared in 1575. However, this is not the only possible explanation, for if the copy of CS 1575 which is bound up with ChCh 979-83 has been associated with it throughout the manuscript's existence, then it is possible that Baldwin deliberately included the instrumental version for the purpose of contrast.

As mentioned earlier, the musical differences between the instrumental and printed versions extend further than the exigencies of adaptation to a text would warrant.

-------------------
18. Spelling modernized; as the square brackets indicate, the scribe twice changes the text of the underlay during a repeated phrase. The English text does not lie very easily -- it seems very much a later marriage of text and music.
Fig. 9 Medius bars 22-3.

Fig. 9, above, is an example of a minor change which adds some (perhaps characteristically vocal) interest to a phrase, without significantly affecting the distribution of underlay: the first two beats of bar 23 become a short melisma rather than a long note. Several more substantial changes occur: the Tenor part is largely rewritten, with several instrumental phrases omitted and new ones inserted during rests.

Fig. 10 Superius bars 48-50.

Together with some rewriting in the Superius part (see Fig. 10, above) this represents an attempt not so much at adaptation as improvement, and the result is certainly greater interest and intensity in what had previously been somewhat routine writing.

The sources which present this altered version are in basic agreement over the musical line (as distinct from that of the instrumental version), but they sometimes differ from each other in details such as note-splitting and amalgamation. As far as text underlay is concerned, only two manuscript readings provide a Latin text for comparison with the printed edition. Their distribution of underlay is by no means identical, either to
each other or to the print.

According to Warwick Edwards, the Add.17786-91 part-books contain 'careless mistakes . . . and probably some editorial interference',\(^\text{19}\) and are 'quite a hazardous source to work with'.\(^\text{20}\) Some of this criticism must also apply to the Drexel source, whose reading of this piece is closely associated with that of Add.17786-91. Both sources provide highly inexact placement of underlay, but in the case of *Laudate pueri Dominum*, unusually for this survey, a comparison with the printed edition does not throw this aspect into relief. In the investigation of vocal music carried out in previous chapters, the contrast between printed and manuscript sources was always clear and sometimes very marked, since the print provided exact placement of underlay and some scribes did not. With *Laudate pueri Dominum*, however, the relationship is altered, since the print itself is inexact in some of its placement of underlay.

The 1575 collection of *Cantiones Sacrae* was printed by Thomas Vautrollier (d.1587). His work has been favourably compared with that of Thomas East, who was responsible for the next two sets of *Cantiones*, published in 1589 and 1591. H. K. Andrews describes Vautrollier's books as 'very beautifully set and printed', and goes on to say that they 'make East's work, even at its best, look amateurish and slipshod'.\(^\text{21}\) However, although Vautrollier's books may look better than East's, they are in fact considerably less accurate as far as underlay is concerned. Although the broad outline of the distribution is never in any doubt, in the small scale there are several examples of a slight ambiguity which is completely

\(^\text{19.}\) Edwards, 'The Sources . . .', p.214.
\(^\text{20.}\) ibid, p.213.
\(^\text{21.}\) Andrews, 'The Printed Part-Books of Byrd's Vocal Music', The Library, 5th series, 19 (1964), 1-10 (p.3). Interestingly enough, the eighteenth-century copyist, John Alcock (1715-1806), found the Vautrollier print unsatisfactory, although he does not say why. In a note at the beginning of his score-book Add.23264, which includes the piece, he states that he 'wrote them from the single Parts (which were very incorrectly set and printed) published by Mr Tallis and Mr Byrd in the year 1575'. The scribe of another eighteenth-century score-book, R.M.24.h.11, fills in the print's repeat signs (with sometimes faulty Latin); and both scribes smooth out the syncopated touches in the printed underlay.
absent from East's work. Furthermore, Vautrollier's edition often suggests a somewhat 'mannered' or syncopated underlay which is certainly not present to the same extent in the later motets of 1589 and 1591. It would seem likely that changing tastes over the intervening fourteen years, and the growth of madrigal printing, with which East was much occupied, led to a demand for greater exactness in the placement of underlay syllables.

The following example is from the printed Tenor part of *Laudate pueri Dominum*; the Drexel reading is included for comparison.

![Figure 11](image1.png)

Fig. 11 Square brackets indicate slightly unclear reading.

While the Drexel reading may not be a conscious regularization, it certainly does not follow Vautrollier in its placement of the last syllable of 'Domini'. Examples of this type of placement occur throughout the 1575 *Cantiones*, including the Tallis pieces: the following example is from the Superius part of his *Salvator mundi*.

![Figure 12](image2.png)

Fig. 12 Tallis, *Salvator mundi*, CS 1575, Superius.

And later in the same part Vautrollier groups the first four syllables of 'auxiliare' together without attempting to align them to the four notes in question.

![Figure 13](image3.png)

Fig. 13 Tallis, *Salvator mundi*, same reading.

Although the result is not 'wrong', it is initially confusing, and cannot
have been helpful to the singer. The 'ij' repeat sign which follows it is delayed and placed squarely under the middle of the phrase. One could not imagine either of these examples occurring in East's work, a sample of which is shown in Fig.14.

![Fig.14](image)

East leaves the singer in no doubt as to which syllables apply to which notes, and uses hyphens to convey his intentions precisely. As this example shows, his typesetting is not infallible (see the mis-spelling at the end of the line), but his underlay is consistently more precisely placed than Vautrollier's (with the exception of the latter's syncopated touches). Unfortunately it is not possible to make a closer comparison between Vautrollier and East, interesting as it would have been, since East understandably did not duplicate the earlier printer's work.

**Conclusions**

A study of the textless/instrumental repertoire in Baldwin's manuscripts, and of its concordances, is necessarily largely a study of one particular source, R.M.24.d.2. Nevertheless, an examination of Baldwin's textless style in ChCh 979-83, and the textless style of other scribes, does much to provide a frame of reference within which the exceptional nature of R.M.24.d.2 is most clearly visible. Only in the table-book Add.31390 are comparable scribal problems encountered -- and they are perhaps more successfully overcome.

The question of 'good' texts and 'bad' texts of these readings is not one that can be pursued very far. There are a few examples of a reading which diverges markedly from the others for a specific technical reason: Mulliner's attempt, in Add.30513, to transcribe Tye's Amavit for keyboard,
which Stevens considers not wholly successful, and the readings of Thomas Myriell (Add.29372-7) and the scribe of Ten.1382 in which they fit the same piece to an English text, also with moderate success.

There is also a category (not a very extensive one) of obvious musical errors. However most of the musical variants in these readings are concerned with what could be termed 'articulation', as they usually involve the splitting up of a note or the amalgamation of two notes to produce one. In a piece such as Tye's *Amavit*, these variants may have their origin in a lost text -- perhaps even more than one lost text, since there are two main categories which provide variants relative to each other: Add.31390, and the rest of the sources (excluding, for obvious reasons, the Mulliner keyboard source and the pair of English settings). It remains the case, however, that they are functional variants (perhaps tied to immediate performance requirements) rather than aspects which would be likely to produce a hierarchy of readings.

In this chapter it has been possible for the first time to make comparisons across genres, in view of the fact that much of the textless/instrumental music in Baldwin's R.M.24.d.2 appears elsewhere in texted form. The evidence is that Baldwin changes none of his general policies when copying this music without text -- the frequency and placement of accidentals are not noticeably altered, and neither are techniques of extra care. In 'genuine' instrumental music accidentals seem to be fewer in number in all the sources, but this is probably a feature of instrumental musical style rather than of instrumental copying style. And text underlay -- a major source of variation between manuscripts -- is of course absent in these pieces. The striking similarity between note size, spacing of notes, stemming of notes, rests, etc., in Baldwin's textless/instrumental copying and in his texted vocal copying suggests that he was in the habit of writing out the music of vocal pieces first, and adding the words afterwards. Certainly the instances in which the correspondence goes awry would bear this out, since they tend to involve cramming of words rather than notes.

A further comparison across genres is supplied by Byrd's six-part instrumental piece and its adaptation to a text. It cannot be conclusively proved that the composer himself was responsible for the adaptation of his piece (though the printed version must have had his blessing, at any rate), or that Baldwin's instrumental version carries complete authority. Yet despite those reservations, a comparison of the two versions surely provides fairly reliable information as to what Byrd himself considered to be improvements, and what he considered to be suitable procedure for the adaptation of an instrumental piece for vocal performance.

Lastly, there appears to be some evidence that typesetting procedures developed and changed during the years between the Cantiones Sacrae of 1575 and those of 1589 and 1591. With the growing popularity of fast, intricate vocal pieces such as madrigals, the inexact placement of underlay syllables and the principle of centralization (observable in various aspects of many music manuscripts of the period) gave way to the very different practices of printers such as East.

23. Including keyboard sources -- see discussion of this aspect of My Ladye Nevells Booke in Chapter 7.
Chapter Five

BALDWIN: THE CENTRAL FIGURE?

The second, third and fourth chapters of this dissertation have dealt essentially in observation of the external features of texts -- Baldwin's and others -- and the scribal reasons and procedures which they apparently involve. The purpose of this chapter is to bring these observations to bear upon a complicated problem: the question of the relationship between sources.

It has been written of John Baldwin that he was apparently 'directly or indirectly involved in every major secular source of Elizabethan Latin music extant today'.¹ In her dissertation, 'The Survival of Latin Church Music by English Composers, 1485-1610', May Hofman devotes a large section to a discussion of apparent links between Baldwin's manuscripts and those of other scribes, and to her theory that he occupied a central and even controlling position in a scribal 'network' concentrated in London and its surrounding counties, although his influence did not extend to a group of sources produced in Norfolk. She suggests links between Baldwin's manuscripts and other major anthologies such as Dow's ChCh 984-8 and Oxford Mus.Sch.e.423; she also suggests that Baldwin's manuscripts were connected with the Paston group of sources. A link with Sadler is also mentioned -- but only a partial link, since Sadler appears to have had access to the Norfolk-based sources of older music which Baldwin did not use.

The basis of this theory of links is her contention that Baldwin was responsible for circulating 'a large and varied set of sources, probably bearing the date 1581² among other music copyists. The detailed nature of this set of sources is left undefined, but Bray suggests³ that it must have included a 'proper' source originating from the Chapel Royal or St.

². ibid, p.119.
George's Chapel, Windsor, and a non-liturgical source, dated 1581, which included among other things some pieces by Byrd which were later published in his Cantiones Sacrae of 1589 and 1591. Hofman argues that Baldwin must have drawn on this set himself for the compilation of ChCh 979-83, and again, intermittently, for the compilation of R.M.24.d.2. She suggests moreover that this 'bundle of sources' circulated widely among other copyists:

The common set of manuscripts circulated by Elizabethan copyists implies that our knowledge of Elizabethan music in Latin, and of its popularity in its own time, is limited, with few exceptions, to the music contained either in Baldwin's sources or the few independent sources circulating in Norfolk.  

In support of her hypothesis that most of Baldwin's contemporaries were copying from his sources, Hofman advances evidence of direct connections: she points out that several manuscripts give prominence to the date 1581; that two share physical resemblances — ChCh 979-83 and Ten.389/James MS; and that all have certain patterns of contents in common. Hofman proposes, moreover, indirect connections between the Baldwin sources and several other manuscripts not in their immediate circle.

Hofman believes that the date 1581 must have been prominently displayed in Baldwin's bundle of sources. Her grounds for this assumption are several: the Dow manuscript, ChCh 984-8, carries the date 1581 on its title page (and has a certain connection with Baldwin since two of its items are actually in his hand), whilst in the single Contratenor part-book Add.47844 the date 1581 appears six times.

The idea that in both manuscripts the date 1581 denotes the archetypal source is, however, questionable. In the case of Dow there is no good reason why 1581 should not be accepted for what it is: a starting-date, recorded on the title-page. In Add.47844, on the other hand, 1581 surely indicates the date that this manuscript was copied; it cannot be the date

4. Hofman, 'The Survival of Latin Church Music . . .', pp.119-20. The term 'sources' in this context evidently means the sources from which Baldwin copied rather than the ones which he produced.

5. And, according to Hofman (p.77 of her thesis), after Byrd's Ne irascaris Domine (no.9 in MS), although I have not been able to trace it.
of composition since one of the pieces is by Sheppard. Add.47844, a modest-sized source of 22 pieces, was most probably completed in the space of a year or so. It is possible, though not very plausible, that the scribe copied the date of his exemplar on to his manuscript. Even supposing that he wished to identify it, there were other, more straightforward ways of doing so. To postulate manuscript inter-relationships, evidence of firmer quality must surely be sought.

The physical resemblance noted by Hofman concerns the manuscripts Ten.389 (Contratenor) and the James manuscript (Superius), which are the only surviving books from a set. The most usual style of ascription in these books is, for example, 'finis quod mr Byrd', but at the end of one of them are two ascriptions which bear a distinct resemblance to Baldwin's fuller ascription style. They occur on the last page of the Superius book, p.224; the (apparently contemporary) numbering stops after p.179. The pieces in question are both entitled Miserere, and at the end of each are the words '(quod) mr more of the Queenes Chappell'. This style of ascription is confined to these examples in the Superius book, and does not occur anywhere in the Contratenor book. The possibility that these examples of it show a link with Baldwin is strengthened by the fact that this source, and ChCh 979-83, share the transmission of three motets found nowhere else, namely Sheppard's Libera nos, Parsons' Peccantem me quotidian and Redford's Sint lumbi vestri.

There are three ways in which this evidence can be interpreted. Firstly, a possibility which would fit Hofman's theory is that the scribe copied this style of ascription from Baldwin's exemplars when they came into his possession. This would presuppose that the detailed and elegant style of ascription so characteristic of Baldwin's manuscripts existed in some form in his exemplars, and was not his own addition to his copies; in which case it is somewhat curious that none of the other scribes using those exemplars adopted it.

Another possible explanation is that Baldwin himself copied those pieces into Ten.389 and the James source. An italic hand is used for the titles of the two pieces, and a secretary hand is used for the ascriptions.
Both of these types of hand occur in Baldwin's copying and there are slight, if inconclusive, resemblances. Baldwin's known contribution to another manuscript (nos.53 and 54 in Dow's ChCh 984-8) offers few points of comparison, since the underlay hand is his stylized italic one, the note formation being in his Nevell style. The Tenbury pieces are unlikely to be in Baldwin's hand, however, since the note formation incorporates a different shape of semibreve from that of any proven Baldwin source.

Finally, it is possible that the Ten.389/James scribe had seen one of Baldwin's copies rather than one of his exemplars. The composer in question, 'mr more', is not represented in any surviving Baldwin source, which suggests that the Ten.389/James scribe was either copying the general ascription style only, or else had access to a Baldwin source which is no longer extant. The 'More' in question is possibly William More (?1490-?1565), composer and royal harper during three reigns, whose only surviving compositions are listed as a 4-part textless setting of _Levavi oculos_ (in Add.30480-4 and the 18th century Add.31226) and one part of a 5-part setting of _Ad Dominum contribularem_ (in BM Harley 7578). A 'John Moore' is also mentioned as Clerk of the Check in the Cheque-Book of the Chapel Royal. He died on 20th October, 1581.

There is one date in Ten.389/James: the date 1573, at the end of White's _Tota pulchra es_. This date could represent either the composition or copying date of the piece (White died the following year). Supposing that the Tenbury scribe were superimposing Baldwin's style of ascription on his own copy, does this date provide any evidence as to when he might have had access to Baldwin's sources? If the date 1573 represents the copying date of the piece, then the two ascriptions at the end of the manuscript may date from somewhat later -- perhaps the late 1570's. Thus the Tenbury/James copying project could have been contemporaneous with ChCh 979-83, and the Tenbury scribe might have seen the latter source while it was in preparation. If, however, the date 1573 records the composition date of the

piece in question, this could push the compilation date of Ten.389/James considerably further forward, into the 1580's or beyond; in this case the scribe could have seen the completed manuscript of ChCh 979-83. 8

The third major reason, according to Hofman, for identifying Baldwin as a major figure and circulator of sources, is based on the evidence of shared patterns of contents. Elizabethan manuscripts contain an enormous number of shared items, and this, together with the many different permutations of patterns of contents, suggests that we are dealing with a situation in which there were fewer exemplars than transcripts -- in other words, a few circulated sources spawned many interconnected copies.

The contratenor part-book, Oxford Mus.Sch.e.423 9 shares every motet in Baldwin's section of the Byrd Cantiones Sacrae (18 pieces), and contains some which Baldwin does not include. In e.423, according to Hofman, 'it is clear that Baldwin's sources have been copied at some stage'; 10 this is based on her observation that 'Comparing 979-83 with e.423, we find a striking number of concordances in the same order.' 11 This assertion requires qualification, since among both the Byrd groups and other pieces, the two manuscripts show a striking number of shared associations of pieces (including three pairs in reverse order) but no actual examples of shared groupings of pieces in precisely the same order.

Figures 1 and 2 (see following pages) illustrate two views of the Byrd concordances between ChCh 979-83, e.423, ChCh 984-8, and the prints of 1589 and 1591. In Fig.1, the pieces in ChCh 979-83 are presented in order, and in Fig.2, those in e.423. There are three reverse pairings between the sources; otherwise there are some shared associations: for example, Infelix ego, Descendit de caelis and Afflicti pro peccatis are numbered 138, 142 and 143 in Baldwin's source, and 1(58), 4(61) and 3(60) in e.423 (the scribe of

---

8. Completed, that is, apart from a few later insertions such as Byrd's Canon (1600).
9. Bray dates it simply as 'late 16th century' ('The Part-Books ... ', p.182).
11. ibid, p.55.
this manuscript begins the numbering over again at *Infelix ego*, for the six-part pieces).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ChCh 979-83</th>
<th>e.423</th>
<th>ChCh 984-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O quam gloriosum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparebit in finem</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levemus corda nostra</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memento Domine</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Domine aidiua me</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domine exaudi</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vide Domine afflictionem</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exsurge Domine</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumdederunt me dolores</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domine praestolamur</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne irascaris Domine</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribulationes civitatum</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspice Domine de sede</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunctis diebus</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2(59)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tristitia et anxietas</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infelix ego</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1(58)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descendit de caelis</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4(61)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afflictii pro peccatis</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>3(60)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig.1*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>e.423</th>
<th>ChCh979-83</th>
<th>ChCh984-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspice Domine de sede</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne irascaris Domine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domine praestolamur</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levemus corda nostra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Domine adiuva me</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memento Domine</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tristitia et anxietas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domine exaudi</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribulationes civitatum</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O quam gloriosum</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparebit in finem</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exsurge Domine</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumdederunt me dolores</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vide Domine afflictionem</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infelix ego</td>
<td>1(58)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunctis diebus</td>
<td>2(59)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afflictii pro peccatis</td>
<td>3(60)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descendit de caelis</td>
<td>4(61)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig.2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ChCh984-8</th>
<th>ChCh979-83</th>
<th>e.423</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ne irascaris Domine</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Domine adiuva me</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribulationes civitatum</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domine exaudi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domine praestolamur</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribulatio proxima</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O quam gloriosum</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tristitia et anxietas</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparebit in finem</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audivi vocem</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In resurrectione tua</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac cum servo tuo</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deus venerunt gentes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domine tu iurasti</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exsurge Domine</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effuderunt sanguinem</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precamur sancte Domine</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laetentur caeli</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facti sumus</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miserere mei Deus</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3

As Fig. 3 shows, ChCh 984–8 and e.423 both contain several additional pieces, some of them from the two prints, which do not appear in Baldwin’s manuscript. Dow’s anthology also contains one Byrd piece, *Fac cum servo tuo*, which neither of the other sources provides.

Several interesting points emerge from these tables. Firstly, it is important to differentiate between the two types of patterning that are most noticeable. When there is a resemblance of order, or -- as happens several times between ChCh 979–83 and e.423 -- a reversal of order, then the chances are high that one source has been copied from another or that both have been copied from a common source. When a piece carries the same
number in two manuscripts, it is an even more suggestive coincidence, but paradoxically it is one from which no reliable conclusions can be drawn. This is because the Byrd contents of all these manuscripts take the form of cells interspersed with a lot of other music, which varies from manuscript to manuscript. Thus one could only infer an intentionality from this parity of numbering by supposing that one scribe was so anxious to reproduce the numbering of the other source, for its own sake, that he achieved it intermittently despite the disparity of contents — a theory which seems unlikely and in any case could never be proved. Therefore in a case such as the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ChCh984–8</th>
<th>e.423</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apparebit in finem</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audivi vocem</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4

the pairing of the two items is potentially more significant than their numbering.

As the third table shows, the concordances between Dow and Baldwin tend on the whole to precede those between Dow and e.423; the later section of Dow is devoted to English pieces and has a large number of concordances with e.423. In Hofman's view, 'e.423 gradually seems to take over from 979–83 as Dow's manuscript progresses.'

The evidence examined so far has been external evidence: similarities in the ordering of motets in manuscripts, and a small-scale physical resemblance between Ten.389 and Baldwin's sources. The next stage of the investigation must take into account the internal evidence provided by the manuscript readings. Does it support the hypothetical source relationships suggested by the concordances, or does it point in different directions?

In the case of ChCh 979–83 and e.423, whose resemblances and reversals of ordering are charted in Figures 1 and 2, a comparison of their readings brings little evidence of textual connections. Certain accidentals are

common to both, to be sure, but many are not. The placing of ligatures differs a good deal, and underlay is very diverse. The e.423 scribe seldom preplaces accidentals, and never cancels them, while Baldwin, as his readings show, makes frequent use of both methods. 13

Fig. 5 Byrd, Leveamus corda nostra, Contratenor.

In the above example, Baldwin and e.423 agree on the first two accidentals in this phrase, but e.423 provides a further one, as does the printed edition of 1591.

13. See Chapter 2, above.
In this example, Baldwin provides all three accidentals of an 'inverted turn' figure, while e.423 provides only one. The print of 1589 provides two.

In only two minor respects do ChCh 979-83 and e.423 show common characteristics: firstly, among the small number of preplaced accidentals in the e.423 readings are a couple of cases in which a change of line is involved and the accidental is 'preplaced plus applied'. The two scribes do not use this technique in the same places: it seems to have been a practice reserved exclusively for a change of line, and usually changes of line fell in different places for different scribes. Its use does not necessarily point to a direct link between Baldwin and e.423, since Baldwin did not monopolize the practice: it occurs, for example, in Sadler's manuscripts, which Hofman suggests were derived partly from sources not used by Baldwin.

Secondly, there are several cases in which both Baldwin and e.423 supply a cautionary flat on a particularly high or low note. There seems to have been a specific reason for this (discussed in Chapter 2, above), which distinguishes it from cautionary accidentals elsewhere on the stave.

---

14. An example is Domine exaudi, bar 82, in which the first accidental is preplaced plus applied.

15. Examples are Ne irascaris Domine, bar 54 1st Alto, Cunctis diebus, bar 47 2nd Tenor, and Tribulationes civitatum, bar 74 1st Tenor.
However, the sources which provide cautionary accidentals outside the stave are not only Baldwin's, but Dow's manuscript, e.423, two Paston sources (Ten.341-4 and Ten.369-73), two non-Paston sources (Add.32377 and Ten.807-11) and the printed editions, so the existence of this kind of accidental cannot be regarded as a conclusive textual link between Baldwin and e.423.

The Dow anthology, ChCh 984-8, occupies an interesting position in relation to ChCh 979-83 and e.423. As Chapters 2 and 3 have shown, there are noticeable resemblances between the scribal methods of Baldwin and Dow, in the Byrd texts that they share. There is less evidence of textual links between Dow and e.423, however — indeed, the latter source is closer to the prints in many details. In Miserere mei Deus, for example (no.52 in Dow and no.54 in e.423), the e.423 and 1591 readings are closer to each other than either is to Dow's version: they agree on the single ligature (not found in Dow), the placing of 'ij' repeat signs in the underlay (with e.423 providing an extra one at the end of the reading), and they agree on the repeated accidental (a B natural) at the beginning of this Tenor part, which Dow does not supply.

There is one further complicating factor in this situation: both the Dow source and e.423 include several further pieces from each printed edition which do not appear in Baldwin's manuscripts (see Fig.3). It is surely more than likely, given Baldwin's attitude to Byrd expressed elsewhere, that if these items from the Cantiones Sacrae had been available to him in a set of sources which he was circulating, he would

have copied them himself. It would seem, therefore, that the inclusion of these 'extra' pieces (even though e.423 includes a handful which are not provided by either of the other two sources) might draw Dow and e.423 together to the exclusion of ChCh 979-83.

The evidence of the texts would support this contention, to some degree. The motets in question are Tribulatio proxima, In resurrectione tua, Deus venerunt gentes, Domine tu iurasti, Effuderunt sanguinem, Precamur sancte Domine, Laetentur caeli, Facti sumus and Miserere mei Deus, which has already been discussed. The two sources show certain similarities of procedure over transmission of accidentals, transmission and placement of repeat signs in underlay, and the use of additional signs such as \( \checkmark \) under two or more notes which share the same syllable of underlay. With regard to the first of these elements the similarity is general rather than marked: the two sources share most of their accidentals, but each source provides several (perhaps one or two per piece or less) which the other source does not provide. Repeat signs in the underlay of a piece are often numerically the same in each of the two readings, but differently distributed. In most cases the phrase in question is a short one, repeated several times. In the cases where there is more of a discrepancy between the readings, it is generally because e.423 provides a greater number of repeat signs than Dow. This would support the theory that Dow was generally interested in providing as full a text as possible — an interest that extended to filling in repeat signs as well as melismata. As far as additional signs are concerned, there tends to be a 'nucleus of resemblance': that is, the sources often share one \( \checkmark \) sign in exactly the same place, but otherwise they do not agree with each other, although each may provide several further ones in the same reading.

The situation is therefore a complex one, and as suggested earlier, the main problem is that the two categories of evidence do not support or

17. He may, of course, have copied them into a source which has not survived.
18. See David Mateer, 'A Comparative Study and Critical Transcription of the Latin Church Music of Robert White' (unpub. PhD dissertation, Queen's University, Belfast, 1976), for a discussion of this theory.
confirm each other. On one hand, the evidence of grouping patterns, illustrated in Fig. 3, would appear to indicate that there must be some kind of link; in both sources the pieces are associated with each other. The actual texts, however, are less persuasive in their evidence. Of these two kinds of evidence, it would seem that we can only admit the implications of the former -- which would certainly seem to be present -- if we bring to the latter the supposition that one of the scribes was altering the common exemplar, or that one of the scribes was copying from the other with an equal degree of freedom. The one thing which might solve this problem would be a third surviving source which reconciled or at least bridged the textual differences between the readings that we have. And its absence should remind us of how unsatisfactory the evidence of concordances can be, since it tends to over-emphasize the significance of links between manuscripts which originally may well have been part of a group of several more.

Because of this incomplete survival of sources, a stemmatic representation of the relationship between surviving ones will have to rely upon a combination of the evidence of the texts and the implications of the concordances. Both of these categories of evidence suggest a separate descent for ChCh 979-83 and e.423, in the case of Byrd. The inclusion in e.423 of motets from Byrd's Cantiones Sacrae which do not appear in Baldwin's sources is a separative factor, and among the motets which are common to both there are enough variants of substance to suggest that more than one pre-print exemplar was available. The fact that the motets which the scribe of e.423 copied were apparently not available to Baldwin might well suggest that they did not appear in time for his copying project. This would support the dating of ChCh 979-83 at around the year 1580 for its completion. The resemblances between e.423 and the prints could suggest a possible post-print date for that source; however, several items from the prints are missing from e.423, and the absence of these pieces from a source which seems deliberately comprehensive suggests that they 'were composed for the occasion [i.e. publication] and never circulated in manuscript at all', 19 and that e.423 pre-dates the 1589

As far as the Dow manuscript is concerned, there is some evidence of textual connections between it and e.423 in the 'additional' Byrd pieces which they both include. Since there are also resemblances to Baldwin's texts in the motets which are common to both, it is possible that Dow and Baldwin shared a source during the early part of Dow's copying project, and that Dow then acquired another one which was (or would later be?) available to the scribe of e.423, and which contained the pieces not copied by Baldwin. This leaves e.423 in an independent position throughout, since even in the pieces common to all three sources its readings tend to be closer to the prints' than those of either Baldwin or Dow; the explanation for this may be that the e.423 scribe had access to a source which was more closely related to the texts that the prints would eventually carry. These points are summarized in a tentative stemma in Fig. 8.

![Fig. 8](image)

None of the patterns of contents in this discussion bears any relation to the numbering of items which the printed editions were eventually to transmit. The evidence is that when Byrd came to publish the Cantiones Sacrae he organized them according to tonality; there appears to be no other significance behind their organization, and no reason why they should have reflected their final layout at an earlier stage in their

-------------------
circulation. The manuscript Ten.807-11 presents the six-part section of the 1591 edition in the same order as it is printed; its strikingly pronounced and consistent agreement with the printed edition on all details is also strong evidence that it was copied from it. Other manuscripts which present pieces from the Cantiones Sacrae with few variants and numbering which reflects the printed order are various sources in the Paston group.\textsuperscript{22} One of these sources, Ten.379-84, contains a rubric over Cunctis diebus which reads 'C.S.No.30', as if the copyist had the 1591 edition in front of him. Fig.9 represents the group of sources which show signs of having been derived from the prints. They are given in the form of a list rather than a stemma, since the similarity of many of these Paston manuscripts makes it difficult to establish a chronological order for them.

Cantiones Sacrae, 1589 and 1591
Ten.807-11
D/DP Z6/1
RCM 2035
RCM 2036
RCM 2089
Add.29246
Add.29247
Ten.340
Ten.341-4
Ten.349-53
Ten.359-63
Ten.369-73
Ten.374-8
Ten.379-84
Add.30810-5
Mad.Soc.G27

Fig.9

There are a few remaining sources which are pre-print and should be added to the tentative stemma in Fig.8. They are Sadler's sources Oxford Mus.Sch.e.1-5 and Willmott/Ten.1486, Ten.389/James MS, 'Hugh Geare's' source Add.32377 which carries the dates 1584, 1585, 1588 and 1589 at the back of the manuscript,23 and Add.47844 with its dates of 1581.

The first of these sources, Sadler's e.1-5, is clearly linked to his later source, Willmott/Ten.1486, in its Byrd texts. MSS e.1-5 contain four motets from the 1589 print, but pre-date the print (at least in part, and probably completely) since the first book carries the date 1585. Willmott/Ten.1486 contains nine motets drawn from both prints, of which it shares two with e.1-5, and is dated 1591. Despite this late dating for Willmott/Ten.1486, it does not look as if Sadler's readings are derived

23. Until now, only the first two of these dates have been alluded to in descriptions of this source.
from the prints. They are closer to Baldwin's texts; and in the two motets which they share (Ne irascaris Domine and Tribulationes civitatum) they show sufficiently detailed similarities to suggest that Sadler looked no further than his earlier source for an exemplar.

Two sources are especially problematic. Ten.389/James presents highly individual readings of the Cantiones Sacrae that are difficult to link conclusively with any of the lines of descent discussed so far. Add.47844 is equally difficult to place, principally because it transmits only one of the Cantiones Sacrae (Ne irascaris Domine); its reading is textless and does not depart from the standard transmission of accidentals, so there are no definite signs of a link with any other manuscript. It has no place then in a stemma concerned with transmission of Byrd, although on other grounds Hofman links it with Baldwin's hypothetical bundle of sources (see discussion above).

Another source involved is Add.32377, which, as mentioned earlier, carries four dates on the back page, along with the name 'Hugh Geare', the word 'Dorset' and various other scribbles. This source transmits two of the Cantiones Sacrae, Ne irascaris Domine and Domine Praestolamur, and its versions are problematic for several reasons. The relationship of notes to underlay strongly suggests that the underlay was copied first, and that notes were subsequently fitted to it with limited success. If this is indeed so, it implies that little can be reliably deduced from the rare occasions on which Add.32377 matches another manuscript reading in a particular detail of underlay. In any case, for much of the time the exceedingly imprecise relationship between note and underlay in this source sets it apart from what the other manuscripts transmit, although in its placement of repeat signs in underlay it occasionally bears slight resemblance to Dow's practice. It is also difficult to draw conclusions from its transmission of accidentals, since it provides fewer of them than the other sources involved. In the absence of firmer evidence of links, it can only be tentatively associated with Dow's source for the moment.

The stemma outlined in Fig.8 (see above) can now be developed somewhat further to accommodate the sources discussed above.
The position which e.423 occupies in this diagram is perhaps misleading. Although it stands in opposition to a group of manuscripts derived from source A, only two scribes are represented in that group: Baldwin with his two manuscripts, and Sadler, who probably copied the Byrd content of one of his manuscripts from the other. Ten.389/James and Add.47844 might be 'corrupt' — that is, much altered — transcripts of A or B, or they could derive from a further source not accommodated in this stemma.

Perhaps the greatest problem involved in the attempt to link manuscripts such as these to predecessors, or indeed to any other manuscript in the stemma, is caused by horizontal transmission — the tendency of scribes such as Baldwin, Dow and all the others discussed here to make use of several different exemplars for their copying projects (though not for a single work). This means that there is very rarely a case of straightforward descent, a manuscript copied wholesale; thus it is of the utmost importance to preserve a sectional approach when dealing with these manuscripts and trying to identify the exemplars from which they
For example, the manuscript Ten.389/James has certain noticeable concordances with Baldwin's ChCh 979-83: as we have seen, Sheppard's Libera nos, Parsons' Peccantem me quotidie and Redford's Sint lumbi vestri appear only in these two sources. Yet in the Byrd texts of Ten.389/James the scribe gives no sign of having had access to sources used by Baldwin; the differences between them, the most notable of which is the provision in Ten.389 of the accidental which produces an augmented chord in Ne irascaris Domine and which does not occur in Baldwin's source, could only be explained as alteration on the part of the Tenbury scribe by means of elaborate and ultimately profitless speculation. Yet if the two strands are considered separately there is no reason why their implications should not be considered valid. The alternative choice is to speculate that one of these manuscripts is a complete transcript of an exemplar which contained both of these repertoires and which has not survived -- and as yet there is no certain evidence for such a phenomenon.

The preceding discussion took as its starting-point a theory about Baldwin based on the evidence of concordance patterns. The textual evidence does not appear to fit this theory neatly, so a tentative stemma was built on a compromise between the two types of evidence. It is now time, however, to explore the validity of such an exercise, and to discuss some basic questions about evidence, using an expanded range of material. Byrd's motets -- whether pieces from the Cantiones Sacrae of 1589 and 1591 or pieces unpublished during his lifetime -- form only a part of the repertoire transmitted by the manuscripts under examination. Although they found their way into many sources, there is an even larger corpus of non-Byrd texts which is widely distributed among surviving manuscripts. Again Hofman suggests that Baldwin was the central figure in the circulation of this music among copyists, citing the evidence of concordances and patterns of contents.
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24. Bar 95 Superius; Ten.389 is the only manuscript source to provide this accidental.
The first of these, the question of concordances, has a somewhat limited application. From the number of pieces which turn up again and again in different Elizabethan sources, it would seem that a scribal 'pool' or network, while it cannot be conclusively proved, is a reasonable assumption. However a concordance between manuscripts, when several other sources contain the same piece, cannot in itself imply anything more than the most basic of links; while an 'exclusive concordance' -- that is, a piece shared by only two sources -- is so greatly affected by the potential existence of manuscripts now lost that its significance should never be over-estimated.

Similarities such as pairings and reverse pairings in the ordering of contents, however, point much more directly and forcibly to a link between manuscripts. There are several examples of this among the non-Byrd texts. Baldwin's ChCh 979-83 shares associations and pairings of non-Byrd contents with Sadler's Mus.Sch.MSS e.1-5, Ten.389/James, Chelmsford MS D/DP Z6/1 (a Paston manuscript) and Add.31390. The pronounced similarities of ordering between ChCh 979-83 and e.423 do not extend into the area of non-Byrd texts, of which they have relatively few in common.

A comparison between the readings of these motets reveals the same tension between concordance-based evidence and textual evidence, as was observed in the case of the Byrd texts. This tension is present, to some degree, whenever Baldwin and another source share a motet, and it is most acute when Baldwin and another source share (or reverse) an actual pairing of motets, or when they are the only sources which transmit a particular piece.

Examples of the former kind of problem are numerous. Sheppard's Deus misereatur appears in ChCh 979-83, Add.17792-6 and the single part-book Add.32377. It is an 'isolated' concordance: that is, it is separated by some distance from any other piece which the sources have in common, and is thus not as significant as the sharing of a cell. A comparison of the texts in question shows that the two inner parts found in each reading (980, 981, 17793, 17794) are apparently quite unrelated and derived from different sources (Add.32377 provides the top part and is therefore not involved in
the problem). The Superius and Bassus voices do correspond in the two readings, with some discrepancies: ligatures differ; Baldwin gives 'vutum' instead of 'vultum' in 983, and 17796 adds an E flat to a key-signature of B flat which otherwise corresponds to Baldwin's throughout.

Van Wilder's *Aspice Domine* provides another example of the conflict between the two kinds of evidence. It appears in ChCh 979-83, Add.31390 (the textless table-book) and Add.22597 (a single Tenor part-book). The Add.31390 reading gives only a section of the piece. This section differs from the corresponding Baldwin text in many details: the sources share an accidental in the sharpened last 'chord', but Add.31390 provides an extra one just prior to it; there are many more ligatures in the Add.31390 reading than in Baldwin's; and most striking of all, there are many rhythmic differences between the readings. These rhythmic differences are problematic because many of them are not obviously directional, and since there is no authoritative standard, it is not possible to establish that the variants all occur on one side. Baldwin's ChCh 979-83 has a text and Add.31390 has not; Add.31390 splits semibreves into minims and amalgamates pairs of minims into semibreves, relative to Baldwin's reading, although the process could conceivably be looked at from the opposite point of view. At this stage of the investigation, two theories are equally plausible: that Add.31390 transmits a vocal piece, derived from a source which Baldwin shared, which the scribe altered for instrumental performance; and that Baldwin took a textless piece, altered it and added a text to it.

However, there is one type of rhythmic variant present which could be viewed as directional. In Add.31390, there are one or two cases in which the scribe gives rests where Baldwin gives dots. The obvious explanation -- that the scribe of Add.31390 was catering for his players' comfort in performance -- is not sufficient here, since the nature of some of his other procedures (such as the provision of a long note where Baldwin gives several short ones) makes it clear that the comfort of the players was not his only consideration. But it is further corroborated by the fact that Baldwin would have no reason to change a rest into a dot, and thus expand a note which was already accommodating its allotted syllable quite
satisfactorily. Therefore he could not have been altering the music in order to fit words to it.

How does the third text fit into this problem? Add.22597 is a textless Tenor part-book, which corresponds, unfortunately, to the missing Tenor book of ChCh 979-83. Therefore no comparison is possible between it and Baldwin's source. However it differs greatly from the corresponding part in Add.31390, although they have a common lack of text. The differences, again, are rhythmic. Therefore, although this triangle of sources would seem to exhibit a more extreme application of the term than anything W. W. Greg could have had in mind when he coined the phrase 'the ambiguity of three texts',25 it is at least possible to speculate that Add.22597, if its other books had survived, would have carried a reading similar to Baldwin's, though textless, and that if there was alteration of a common source, it was carried out by the scribe of Add.31390.

A theory can thus be constructed which connects ChCh 979-83 and Add.31390 to a common source and therefore to each other, despite the significant differences in their readings of Van Wilder's piece. Several problems, however, remain unsolved. The scribe of Add.31390 transmits the rhythm of o·do instead of the coloration (e·d) which occurs in both the ChCh 979-83 and Add.22597 readings; but he provides far more ligatures than either ChCh 979-83 or (in the Tenor part) Add.22597. In the first instance the 31390 scribe appears to be modernizing an archaic feature (unless ChCh 979-83 and Add.22597 imposed their coloration, which seems unlikely); but his transmission of so many ligatures is puzzling, since they were not only beginning to be considered archaic, but they would also seem to be quite useless in a reading without text. Perhaps the 31390 scribe transmitted them all faithfully from his exemplar, and Baldwin and the 22597 scribe excised some of them.

How do the texts of these sources compare in the case of shared (or reversed) patterns of contents? According to Hofman,

A positive connection with ChCh 979-83 occurs at the beginning

of Add.31390 with the copying of two responds by Sheppard in the reverse order from their position in ChCh 979-83. Dr. Bray has suggested they were copied from a common source. The same is probably true of Mundy's Domine non est exaltatum which precedes the responds in Add.31390.

The Sheppard pieces in question are [Filiae] Ierusalem venite and [Dum transisset] Sabbatum. They are nos.149 and 150 in ChCh 979-83, and they occur in reverse order at the beginning of Add.31390. These pieces are exclusive concordances, not present in any other source. Comparison of their texts turns up the same type of results in each case: one or two rhythmic variants, one or two differences over accidentals, and differences over ligatures -- in [Dum transisset] Sabbatum Add.31390 gives more ligatures than 981, but the position is reversed with regard to 982. There are no major melodic differences, but there are persistent discrepancies over smaller details.

With William Mundy's Domine non est exaltatum the differences are more substantial. The piece is copied near to the Sheppard responds in Add.31390, but further away in ChCh 979-83, at no.130. It is also transmitted by Add.17792-6 and New York, Drexel 4180-5. From a comparison of the texts, it looks as if two independent versions of the piece are extant. The following figure shows the opening phrase of the motet as it appears in the four sources.

Baldwin gives one version, and the other three sources give another. To complicate matters, the Drexel source and Add.17792-6 each expand the phrase on one occasion — the Tenor part — to include the word 'est', which is duly set to a pair of crotchets as it is in Baldwin's version. However, Add.31390 does not do this.

To complicate matters still further, Baldwin in his book 980 clearly had a problem with the opening phrase: he left the word 'est' out of the underlay by mistake and had to insert it; and the same thing happened with the syllable 'ta' in 'exaltatum'. The musical phrase, however, shows no sign of any disturbance.

The evidence of the texts would suggest either that there were two versions, each with a separate descent, or else that the common source transmitted the version which survives in the group of three manuscripts,
and that Baldwin altered the opening phrase in each part to accommodate the word 'est'. Both the Baldwin reading and the Add.31390 reading would fit into this theory, but it does not explain the problem of how Drexel and Add.17792-6 came to transmit the other version in their Tenor parts.

In fact it seems most unlikely that two scribes could have transmitted such an anomaly independently, so one was probably directly and uncritically derived from the other. The two readings are indeed very similar, transmitting almost identical ligatures, accidentals and underlay repeat signs, with no melodic variants. Both show signs of difficulty over the accommodation of notes, due to the underlay having been copied first. Despite these close resemblances, they are probably not the work of the same scribe, as one or two slight differences of procedure indicate. There is one variant which is possibly directional: a melisma in Drexel 4185 which is filled in at the same point in Add.17796. The latter reading may thus have been a more or less straight copy from the former.

In spite of this it remains unclear as to how even one scribe could have produced such an anomaly in the first place. There is a case (although perhaps not a strong one) for arguing that the original common source carried the version copied by Baldwin, and that the Drexel scribe copied it wrongly in five cases out of six. His copy was then perpetuated wholesale by the scribe of Add.17792-6. In order to accommodate Add.31390 into this theory, it might be argued that it also derived from this branch of the descent, since its scribe is more likely to have ignored one anomalous Tenor phrase, when copying, than to have ignored it six times over in the common source; but this would mean radically re-dating Add.31390, which has always been considered a much earlier source than either Drexel or Add.17792-6. So in fact the gulf between Add.31390 and the two other manuscripts is every bit as great as the gulf between the two versions.

In other areas of the texts under discussion, discrepancies are present, but generally less problematic. There are some rhythmic differences, plus one or two differences over notes. These include mistakes in both Drexel and Add.31390; and the latter source transmits a
phrase in the Sextus part which was copied a third too high. There are also discrepancies between ChCh 979-83 and Drexel in their distribution of underlay.

Before proceeding to general conclusions about these problems, some more comparisons of non-Byrd texts should be considered.

Taverner's *splendor glorie* appears in Baldwin's ChCh 979-83 and R.M.24.d.2, ascribed in the former manuscript to 'mr:iohn:tavnar:et:doc:tye' and in the latter to 'mr tavernar' alone. It is also transmitted by Sadler's e.1-5 and the Chelmsford Bass part-book. Sadler's source shares several associations of non-Byrd texts with ChCh 979-83, and two pairings: Tallis's *Incipit lamentatione* and *De lamentatione* are paired in both manuscripts -- although it is not too surprising (or significant) that they should be found together; and Fayrfax's *Ave Dei patris filia* is followed immediately by Taverner's *Gaude plurimum* in both manuscripts. In Baldwin's source the next motet to be copied is Taverner's *Ave Dei patris filia*, and in e.1-5 Johnson's *Ave Dei patris filia* (not copied by Baldwin) appears in the group as well, emphasising that it is the pairing and grouping of settings which is of primary importance in this context, and also that Sadler's sources may have been partially independent from Baldwin's.

Baldwin's ChCh 979-83 and the Chelmsford Bass book, as noted by Hofman, also share a pairing of motets: Taverner's *splendor gloriae* and Wood's *Exsurge Domine* are copied next to each other in both sources.

Do the texts of *splendor gloriae* support this evidence of close connections? Firstly, they suggest unity within Baldwin's own output: there are strong resemblances between his ChCh 979-83 and R.M.24.d.2 texts, despite the fact that he mutilated the piece in order to make a three-part extract for the latter manuscript. There are a few discrepancies: R.M.24.d.2 provides several high-lying cautionary flats which are omitted by ChCh 979-83, but ChCh 979-83 doubles the flat in its key-signature. The choice of clef varies between the sources in some sections of the top part. There is slightly less coloration in R.M.24.d.2 than in ChCh 979-83, and one or

two differences in the distribution of underlay. However these would seem to be minor discrepancies in view of the basic similarity of the texts.

The Sadler source, e.1-5, shares its key-signatures, coloration and some ligatures with Baldwin's readings, but differs, along with Chelmsford, from Baldwin over a passage of underlay distribution. Since Baldwin's reading is the only one which contains a repeated phrase, and he splits a note relative to e.1-5 and Chelmsford, it would appear that in this case it was Baldwin who altered his exemplar. All three sources differ from each other over ligatures, and Chelmsford omits a phrase -- apparently deliberately, since the scribe ends the section there. This puzzling variant could probably only be explained if the readings from the other Chelmsford books had survived as well.

Wood's *Exsurge Domine* is next to the Taverner piece in both ChCh 979-83 and Chelmsford, so its textual evidence is particularly important. The two Baldwin sources disagree over one accidental and one ligature, and also over the distribution of text under a melisma: ChCh 979-83 gives the word 'celebrent' once, treated melismatically, and R.M.24.d.2 gives it twice, treated syllabically. Both Baldwin and the Chelmsford scribe spell the title *Exurge Domine*, and they preserve reasonably close textual readings: they share some but not all ligatures; they share two accidentals, and Baldwin gives one further one; and they show one or two discrepancies in the spelling and distribution of underlay.

According to Hofman, Dow, like Sadler, was only partially dependent on Baldwin's sources: in ChCh 979-83 'Nos.9-20 ... and Nos.54-78 [are] particularly rich in concordances with Dow', although 'There are large sections of 984-8 with no concordances at all with Baldwin's set'. Two pieces, however, are apparently confined to Baldwin's and Dow's sources: White's *Portio mea* and William Mundy's *Sive vigilem sive dormiam*. They do not occur next to each other in either source: it is the exclusive nature of the concordance, rather than the placing of the motets, which appears significant. A textual comparison of *Portio mea* reveals basic resemblances
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over accidentals, and in the number of repeat signs used in the underlay, although they are differently distributed in each source. The texts differ over ligatures, although on one occasion Baldwin gives one when Dow gives a √ sign to draw together two semibreves over the same syllable.

The two sources give slightly more divergent readings of William Mundy's Sive vigilem sive dormiam. There are one or two discrepancies over accidentals and ligatures, and one or two melodic differences over ornamental phrases. The readings occasionally share a √ sign, although the underlay is otherwise not always identical. Dow splits a phrase relative to Baldwin's reading, giving 'sonum tubae, tubae' where Baldwin gives 'sonum tube, sonum tube' (see Fig. 13 below). He is also readier than Baldwin to use repeat signs in underlay. On one occasion he splits a note relative to Baldwin's, in order — apparently — to produce a distribution of underlay which differs from Baldwin's.

Fig. 13 ChCh 979-83 (involves change of line)
ChCh 984-8

Dow's note-splitting, which seems more likely to be a corruption of the
original than the amalgamation of two notes into one in Baldwin's text, probably arose from a mistake on his part -- a mis-reading or miscalculation of the number of notes to be allocated to 'diem'.

Another case in which the concordance-based evidence is strong concerns a pair of motets which are exclusive to ChCh 979-83 and Ten.389/James. The latter manuscript was discussed earlier in this chapter in connection with a physical resemblance between it and ChCh 979-83: an ascription, at the end of the Superius book, which resembles Baldwin's own ascription style. The motets in question are White's \textit{Tota pulchra es} and Parsons' \textit{Domine quis habitabit}, which are located next to each other in ChCh 979-83 but not in Ten.389/James. Their texts show differences over ligatures and repeat signs and some marked differences over accidentals, together with a few minor rhythmic variants.

\textbf{Conclusions}

One of the major theories concerning Baldwin's career as a copyist is Hofman's contention, already quoted, that he was 'directly or indirectly involved in every major secular source of Elizabethan Latin music extant today',\textsuperscript{30} through his circulation of his sources among other scribes. This contention is based upon the evidence arising from observed patterns of contents in the surviving manuscripts, as well as 'the existence of unusual concordances, identity of handwriting and the date and provenance of the manuscripts'.\textsuperscript{31} Hofman goes on to observe,

\begin{quote}
I am aware that the use of methods of textual criticism might produce contrary evidence about the association of manuscripts, although I do not know any case where this has happened. What I have tried to do is concentrate on a kind of evidence overlooked by the textual method, and, as long as the limitations are clear, I believe the kind of evidence I have used to be valid, and the conclusions drawn from it legitimate ones.\textsuperscript{32}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{30} Hofman, 'The Survival of Latin Church Music . . .', p.119.
\textsuperscript{31} ibid, p.1.
\textsuperscript{32} ibid, pp.1-2.
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The textual evidence, in its turn, consists of every possible visible aspect of the actual musical text: clefs, key-signatures, accidentals, underlay distribution, ligatures, the use of special signs of any kind, and melodic and rhythmic variants. The manuscripts under investigation rarely include what might be termed a clear 'directional variant', that is, one which shows unequivocally that one text is derived from another, but it is nevertheless possible to assess them in terms of associative variants, which draw two or more manuscripts together. In every case where this type of assessment has been applied to an inter-source relationship proposed by Hofman, the result implies some degree of contradiction between the two categories of evidence.

It may be possible to arrive at an understanding of this problem by looking more closely at the textual variants involved, in an effort to determine how far they can co-exist with manuscript links. Some types of variant could perhaps be relegated to the 'non-evidential' category. As Greg observes, '... whereas, in major matters, a scribe will, as a rule, follow his exemplar, in the minor points of spelling and grammatical form he will be largely led by his own fancy.' If this example were to be cautiously transferred to the present context, 'non-evidential' variants might occur in areas such as the distribution and spelling of underlay, the placement of ligatures, and the style of clefs and key-signatures, in all of which matters some scribes might reasonably be supposed to have personal tastes and systems which could over-ride the claims of the exemplar from which they were copying. In non-Byrd texts the placement of ligatures, for example, is almost never reproduced exactly from one source to another, a rare exception being the Ten.341-4 reading of Tallis's printed [Dum transisset] Sabbatum, which follows the printed version precisely, in contrast to all the other manuscript sources which transmit this piece. The placement of ligatures seems to have had a great deal to do with scribal 'fancy'.

In the case of manuscript accidentals the non-Byrd readings imply, not personal systems, but rather a lack of any system at all. This confusing
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situation is undoubtedly exacerbated by the absence (with a few exceptions such as the one quoted above) of a printed edition or authoritative pre-print copies to provide a central influence. In all of the readings there are constant, slight differences over accidentals, even in texts which are basically similar in other respects. One theory which has been proposed suggests that some scribes may have omitted accidentals, but intended the singers to supply them using the conventions of musica ficta. Bray summarizes musica ficta contexts as follows:

1. Singers would generally make points of imitation consistent
2. They would be expected to perfect melodic tritones; to listen for harmonic tritones and generally perfect them too
3. They would be expected to alter difficult leaps and extraordinary chords unless told to perform them as such
4. They would be normally expected to flatten upper auxiliaries and sharpen lower ones
5. They would be expected to sharpen the 3rd at both passing and final cadences
6. They would be expected to be aware of the harmonic context so as to distinguish real leading notes from apparent ones
7. The false relation was not enough to cast doubt on a sharpened leading note.

These procedures are quoted by Penelope Rapson, who makes two broad assumptions about scribal practice in this area: firstly, that 'each scribe sought to copy his exemplar faithfully', and secondly, that 'every copyist fully understood the conventions of musica ficta operating in his source'. She infers from them that 'any manuscripts, which do not transmit a sharp ... nonetheless intended one. To these manuscripts, therefore, musica ficta must apply.' Rapson makes allowance for scribes who 'wilfully alter the texts of their exemplars during copying', and for the case of a copyist who 'may sometimes misconstrue the conventions of

---
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musica ficta operating in his source', but argues that their incidence is negligible.

The problem with this theory is that it attempts to impose a single explanation on a phenomenon which may in fact have various causes, none of which can be identified with certainty. Even if it is assumed that all scribes shared an equal degree of musical literacy and motivation, which is to say the least unlikely, it is still possible for a competent scribe not to notice an accidental, or to notice it but then to omit it by mistake. The end result will be an omission which looks like all the other omissions, but the cause of it -- and them -- will be untraceable. When the evidence is 'locked up' in this way, it is surely unjustifiable to claim that one type of cause occurs only to a negligible degree.

In any case, the evidence of the non-Byrd texts indicates that the scribes do not behave consistently on this point. Some of them, Baldwin included, are capable of omitting an accidental in a musica ficta context, and then supplying it in an identical context soon afterwards. The internal inconsistency of these sources would suggest, firstly, that scribes were basically unsystematic in their approach to accidentals (the evidence of the transitional nature of the key-signature and the occasions on which it is duplicated in the text would bear out), and secondly, that there may be consequent implications for the textual relationship between manuscripts, in the sense that differences over accidentals may perhaps be less important than they appear (the two Baldwin sources, which are evidently close but nevertheless differ occasionally over accidentals, would support this).

By means of this reasoning, it is possible to postulate a non-evidential nature for every category of textual variant between the manuscripts in question, and thus to reconcile them with the evidence suggested by concordances and patterns of contents. The most important points to emerge from the investigation are that these categories of evidence do conflict with each other, and that it is necessary to
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reconcile them.

It is also necessary to recognize that there is a hierarchy of significant elements within the concordance-based evidence itself. It is neither a useful nor a reliable procedure to draw a firm connection between two sources which are the only ones to transmit a particular motet, when it is impossible to ascertain how many other readings of it might originally have existed. Resemblances between patterns of contents, on the other hand, are likely to be unequivocal: thus, if two manuscripts share a pattern of contents, but the actual texts reveal numerous differences over accidentals, placement of underlay, and rhythmic or melodic details, it will be necessary to make a fresh assessment of these features and their weight as evidence -- in other words, to re-define the nature of directional evidence in this music. Directly related to this question are implications -- markedly present in the evidence of the texts -- about the way in which scribes treated the various elements of their copy, implications which will have to be incorporated into the process of establishing inter-source relationships.
Chapter Six

THE LUTE SOURCES

The following chapter takes Baldwin as its starting-point, but will not focus directly on his work. Instead, it will take as its subject a 'side-issue' resulting from previous consideration of Baldwin's manuscripts and their concordances.

During the study of Baldwin's scribal practice as it related to motets from Byrd's Cantiones Sacrae and to textless/instrumental music, a large number of concordant manuscripts required to be investigated, some of them lute sources. A variety of instructive results could be obtained by relating vocal sources to each other, but the lute sources seemed to require special treatment in order to yield their information in the best possible way. The lute arrangement of any one piece was usually heavily outnumbered by vocal or instrumental versions; thus while it might be of some limited interest to compare them, as an exclusive approach it was fragmented and unsatisfactory, and needed to be supplemented by detailed consideration of the lute sources as a group.

The following table (see next page) lists the pieces in Baldwin's manuscripts which are arranged for lute, with their sources. The letters C and B represent ChCh 979-83 and R.M.24.d.2.
Byrd | Apparebit in finem | C, 29247, 2089
---|---|---
Byrd | Memento Domine | C, B, 29247
Tallis | [Dum transisset] Sabbatum | C, 29247
Byrd | Vide Domine afflictionem | C, 29247, 2089
Fayrfax | Ave Dei patris filia | C, B, 29246
Taverner | Gaude plurimum | C, B, 29246
Byrd | Ne irascaris Domine | C, B, 29247
Byrd | Tribulationes civitatum | C, B, 29247, 2089
Tallis | Domine quis habitabit | C, 29247
Tallis | Gaude gloriosa | C, B, 29246
Taverner | Mass: Gloria tibi trinitas | C, B, 29246
Byrd | Infelix ego | C, 29246, 29247, 340
White | Lamentations | C, 29246
Byrd | Aspice Domine quia facta | B, 29247, 2089, 340
Byrd | Attollite portas | B, 29247, 2089, 340
Mundy | Vox patris | B, 29246
Ferrabosco | Ut re mi fa sol la | B, Dd.2.11, Hirsch
Byrd | Peccavi super numerum | C, 29247
Tallis | Salvator mundi | C, 29247
Tallis | Salve intemerata | C, B, 29246
Byrd | Aspice Domine de sede | C, B, 2089
Byrd | Tristitia et anxietas | C, B, 2089

Key to Sources

29246 | BM Add.29246 (early 17th cent.)
29247 | BM Add.29247 (early 17th cent.)
2089 | RCM 2089 (early 17th cent.)
340 | Ten.340 (early 17th cent.)
Dd.2.11 | Cambridge UL MS Dd 2.11 (16th cent.)
Hirsch | BM Hirsch M.1353 (c.1590)

Fig.1
The Sources

Six lute sources are involved: four in Italian and two in French tablature. The former all belong to the Paston group of manuscripts and are copied in the Paston 'lute hand'.¹ They are Add.29246, Add.29247, Ten.340 and RCM 2089. The latter are two manuscripts of which the scribe or scribal group is not known: Cambridge, University Library Dd.2.11, and BM Hirsch MS 1353.

It is a somewhat peculiar, but welcome, result of placing one scribe's idiosyncratic repertoire at the centre of a study of lute arrangements, that it turns up two very different types of manuscript. For the group of Paston sources and the pair of London and Cambridge sources could hardly be more different, both in appearance and in the type of music that they contain. The four Paston sources are copied in an extremely regular, clear Italian tablature, with well-formed, rounded figures placed so that the lines of the stave cut through them, and with equally clear rhythmic indications in mensural notation, placed above the stave. The London and Cambridge sources, on the other hand, are in French tablature which, though reasonably clear, is much less obviously painstaking. These sources use letters, which sit on the line or just above it, and are in general quite legible. Rhythmic indications above the stave are provided by means of stems without note-heads, and, like the rest of the tablature, make for relatively easy reading, but without any great concessions to precision or regularity. There are several corrected mistakes in the Hirsch reading, including crossed out and inserted bars.

A contrast is also perceptible in the repertoire which these sources transmit. Both the London and Cambridge sources are substantial (and in the case of Dd.2.11, quite large) collections of what could be termed 'genuine' lute music — that is, pieces which were conceived specifically for the lute or a related instrument — or music which has at least an instrumental origin. Both manuscripts have a connection with Baldwin's repertoire at this point: they each contain a lute version of the

Ferrabosco fantasia Ut re mi fa sol la. The Paston group of manuscripts reflects quite a different tradition, namely the vocal one. They are made up entirely of transcriptions of motets, madrigals, chansons and song accompaniments by English and continental composers. Within this group there are further differences of repertoire which deserve mention.

The Paston source Add.29246 contains a large number of transcriptions of motet extracts, with Fayrfax and especially Taverner well represented. The source falls broadly into three sections: a large group of mainly sacred pieces by English composers; a similar-sized group of sacred pieces by foreign composers, with one or two English pieces among them; and lastly a group dominated by Byrd and White, with an emphasis on groups of settings (e.g. of In nomine). By contrast, Add.29247 starts with a cell of continental pieces — and this trend continues, with continental pieces (many of them secular, including chansons) outnumbering the English pieces.

If the two sources are examined as a pair, the dominant presence of Byrd becomes apparent. In Add.29246 he has pride of place even among other well-represented composers such as Tallis and Taverner, and he is the main English presence in the heavily continental source Add.29247. He is also the only English composer to be represented by any substantial amount of secular music, although Add.29246 contains a handful of fantasias by Damon and White. Edward Paston is known to have been a lutenist, so we may suppose that these lute-books reflect his preferences with particular exactness. It has been suggested that he was a collector of conservative tastes with a strong preference for Byrd's music, and these manuscripts tend to reinforce such an impression. The compilation of four (and there may have been more) lute-books which rely almost entirely on a transferred vocal repertoire must surely indicate that Paston preferred arrangements of the motets he knew to the repertoire of solo lute compositions, and that even within this range he was a man of strongly-defined and perhaps conservative tastes (witness, as an example of the former, the marked

3. ibid, pp.51-52.
presence of Byrd, and of the latter the inclusion of Fayrfax and Taverner in Add.29246).

The repertoire of Ten.340 is made up of arrangements of vocal pieces (nearly all of them sacred) by continental composers such as Victoria, 'Alfonsus', 'Criquillon' and 'Merulus', interspersed with a few pieces by Byrd. RCM 2089 carries much the same sort of repertoire of continental sacred pieces, this time with a slightly larger proportion of secular ones, and with Tallis as well as Byrd providing an occasional English presence.

From this brief survey of the four Paston repertoires it can be seen that Add.29247, Ten.340 and RCM 2089 are all fairly similar in content, with Add.29246 and its English repertoire standing slightly apart from them. Nevertheless all four manuscripts are noticeably linked by their preservation of vocal pieces to the exclusion of any other type (an exception being the handful of fantasia arrangements in Add.29246). This feature is somewhat problematic, because lute transcriptions of vocal originals are -- perhaps understandably -- not popular with historians of the instrument and its repertoire, and the researcher trying to make a special study of these pieces often has to contend with their systematic omission from surveys of the subject. Nevertheless, if considered on their own terms they contain much that is of interest, which it is the aim of this chapter to illustrate in an investigation of the methods that were used to adapt them from their originals.

The Arrangements

The lute arrangements of the pieces in Baldwin's manuscripts make up a complex and interesting picture. The first and most important aspect to be examined concerns the scribes involved. The London and Cambridge manuscripts in which the Ferrabosco piece appears were copied by scribes who have not been identified, although David Lumsden suggests that the Cambridge manuscript was copied, along with another large Cambridge lute-
presence of Byrd, and of the latter the inclusion of Fayrfax and Taverner in Add.29246).

The repertoire of Ten.340 is made up of arrangements of vocal pieces (nearly all of them sacred) by continental composers such as Victoria, 'Alfonsus', 'Criquillon' and 'Merulus', interspersed with a few pieces by Byrd. RCM 2089 carries much the same sort of repertoire of continental sacred pieces, this time with a slightly larger proportion of secular ones, and with Tallis as well as Byrd providing an occasional English presence.

From this brief survey of the four Paston repertoires it can be seen that Add.29247, Ten.340 and RCM 2089 are all fairly similar in content, with Add.29246 and its English repertoire standing slightly apart from them. Nevertheless all four manuscripts are noticeably linked by their preservation of vocal pieces to the exclusion of any other type (an exception being the handful of fantasia arrangements in Add.29246). This feature is somewhat problematic, because lute transcriptions of vocal originals are -- perhaps understandably -- not popular with historians of the instrument and its repertoire, and the researcher trying to make a special study of these pieces often has to contend with their systematic omission from surveys of the subject. Nevertheless, if considered on their own terms they contain much that is of interest, which it is the aim of this chapter to illustrate in an investigation of the methods that were used to adapt them from their originals.

The Arrangements

The lute arrangements of the pieces in Baldwin's manuscripts make up a complex and interesting picture. The first and most important aspect to be examined concerns the scribes involved. The London and Cambridge manuscripts in which the Ferrabosco piece appears were copied by scribes who have not been identified, although David Lumsden suggests that the Cambridge manuscript was copied, along with another large Cambridge lute-
book, by a local professional scribe. The four Paston manuscripts, which contain all the other pieces in question, are copied in what has become known as the 'Paston lute hand'. Philip Brett identifies the scribe as one of Paston's servants, on the evidence of a note on a fly-leaf in RCM 2089:

Wllm Corbett. I pray bynd this book in yellow lether duble fillytd w t sylver, my m r his Ovell and his name uppon it, the leaves be sprinkld w t green & greene silk strings; look to fould it very even and cutt it as little as may be.5

(There are several other surviving manuscripts in the Paston lute hand: Ten.341–4 and Chelmsford, Essex Record Office MS D/DP Z6/1, vocal sources both of which have already been discussed in this survey, and Add.31992, another lute-book which may date from slightly earlier than the four under examination, and whose repertoire places it outside the scope of the present study.)

Thus there are probably three scribes in the picture, but two types of tablature and two types of copying. Both of the manuscripts in French tablature -- the London and Cambridge sources -- employ a system of 'constant rhythmic instruction', in which every note is represented above the stave by a stem, with or without tail(s), and groups of notes are 'run together' thus:

![Fig.2 Hirsch M.1353.](image)

By contrast, the Paston manuscripts employ a system of 'rhythmic instruction by implication', which looks less cluttered but is in fact slightly more complicated. With this system, a given rhythmic sign is assumed to apply not only to the note immediately below it but to every

subsequent note until it is replaced by another sign. The system is used in conjunction with mensural rhythm signs, which came into use in the last years of the sixteenth century and are borrowed from ordinary notation.

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{d} & \text{j} & \text{j} \\
3 & 2 & 2 \text{-} 2 \text{-} 3
\end{array}
\]

Fig.3 Ten.340.

A system which relies on implication is more open to possible ambiguity than one which specifies a value for each note, and there are one or two ambiguous moments in the Paston readings. An example occurs in the Add.29247 arrangement of Byrd's Ne irascaris Domine, half way through the first section of the piece.

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c}
\text{d} & \text{j} & \text{3} & \text{0} & \text{2} & \text{2} & \text{2} \\
3 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 4 & 2 & 2 & 2
\end{array}
\]

Fig.4 Byrd, Ne irascaris Domine, Add. 29247, tablature and transcription.

In this example there is a clear first bar followed by the system of implication already mentioned. The rhythm of bar 70 is \( \text{JJJ} \), with the crotchet sign in operation until the appearance of the minim sign at the end of the bar. The following bar, however, presents a problem initially, in that there are three units to be accounted for but no indication of how they are to be accented rhythmically. When the bar itself is transcribed
from tablature into notation the solution becomes clear, since the bar consists of a cadential formula (involving a suspension) which can only 'take' one rhythm. The scribe was probably aware of this and cut this corner deliberately. However, if this was indeed his attitude it may have led him into carelessness a couple of bars later, at bar 73. The rhythm of this bar, as the transcription should illustrate, is by no means obvious, yet there are no rhythmic indications above the stave. In cases like this, only reference to the vocal original will provide the transcriber with the answer.

In the last bar of the example, the system of implication takes over again: the first two units are implied to be crotchets, since the third unit is given as a minim. This example of a problematic bar with no rhythmic indications shows up particularly clearly because it is in close proximity to a bar which does not have them but does not need them. The latter is very much an exceptional case: there are several other examples in Paston readings of problematic, rhythm-less bars in more ordinary contexts. In cases where two Paston sources present virtually identical arrangements of the same motet, there are sometimes small variants in the rhythmic indications that they provide. None of these variants is of great significance: they simply involve the provision, in one source, of a sign which was evident from the context in the other. An example is given below.

6. In the discussions of the Paston lute-books, the words 'arranger' and 'scribe' will be used interchangeably; it is not possible to ascertain whether the tasks of arranging and copying were undertaken independently.
One source provides an 'extra' sign relative to the other; and examples of this are more or less equally divided between the two sources, neither one appearing to be more obviously careful about its rhythmic indications.

Ambiguous or problematic passages would seem less likely to occur with the system of rhythmic indication used in the London and Cambridge manuscripts. But the evidence suggests that it is possible to make mistakes, particularly when adding tails to stems. A slip of this kind occurs in the Hirsch (London) reading of Ut re mi fa sol la.

Different types of barring are found in these sources. The Hirsch source gives bar-lines after every four crotchets, and the Cambridge source after every two crotchets. The Paston sources use an unvarying system of one semibreve per bar.

In the case of the Paston readings, the bar-lines involve an additional feature: the use of ties across bar-lines. Two interesting examples occur in the Ten.340 reading of Infelix ego.

In the first example two ties are involved, represented by the use of dots. The metre is two minims per bar, and minim signs are there to provide
additional clarification. The use of pause signs frequently (though not invariably) goes with the use of ties, as though it were a means of extra emphasis which was usually added but occasionally forgotten.

Fig.7 Byrd, Infelix ego, Ten.340.

In the second example a similar passage occurs, but this time, in addition to the dots and pause signs, the lengthened note is indicated by deliberately doubling its value in the sign above the stave, so that the sign will operate for the first half of the following bar. As a method of indicating a tie it is not to be relied upon to the exclusion of all others, since it will be noted that in the first bar of the example the semibreve must stand for the value of that bar alone, and it is the dots and the pause sign which must indicate the tie in that particular instance.

Another important feature of both examples is the nature of the music being represented by the tablature — and herein may lie an explanation of the Paston scribe's somewhat unusual use of ties.

In 'genuine' solo lute music, such syncopation as does occur can generally be quite comfortably accommodated in the tablature designed for it (with the use of devices such as horizontal strokes to indicate the duration of held notes). But when syncopation is combined with homophony — as it very often is in 'expressive' motets of the period — then the scribe making a lute arrangement of a vocal original is confronted with an unusual problem which it may require unusual methods to solve. It was not a problem for the scribes of Hirsch M.1353 and Cambridge Dd.2.11, because of their different repertoire; it was the result of this particular type of arrangement, combined with the use of regular bar-lines, and it tested the ingenuity of the Paston arranger on several occasions.
All the manuscript readings in question use normal lute tuning — that is, an intervallic structure of 44344 working from the lowest course upwards. There are some examples of fairly high fretting: the London and Cambridge sources both go as far as 'y' (which represented both 'i' and 'j' in the Elizabethan alphabet), and the Paston sources go slightly higher with frets up to 10 (the numerical equivalent of 'k'). These are fairly modest limits in the context, with some contemporary sources using frets as high as 'p'.

In the manuscript readings under discussion, the highest frets are seldom used; it is noticeable that when they occur in the Paston sources they tend to occur in a concentrated group lasting for one or two bars or more, rather than as isolated examples. Thus we encounter the somewhat puzzling occurrence of a passage tabulated entirely in high frets for no apparent reason, which subsequently returns to a lower level. Whether this arose from a particular impulse towards flamboyance on the part of the scribe it is difficult to say, but it seems more likely than that he had a particular sound quality in mind.

The practice of 'double fretting', classified by Lumsden as a scribal error,\(^7\) occurs quite often in all the sources. This happens when a particular fret is duplicated by a redundant letter or number on another course. We should be cautious about dismissing this procedure too readily as a scribal error, since — in the Paston sources especially — it happens with noticeable frequency in otherwise careful readings, and, even more strikingly, it appears always to happen when one of the frets in question is on an open string.

\[2 \quad 2
\]
\[5 \quad 5
\]
\[0 \quad \ast \quad 2
\]

Fig. 8 RCM 2089.

\(^7\) Lumsden, 'Sources of English Lute Music', p.92.
The Paston scribe was a thoughtful and careful copyist who regularly went to the trouble of changing a fret for a reiterated note, and all the evidence of his scribal procedure suggests that this 'double fretting' was deliberate, and intended to reinforce an open string.

Rests occur relatively infrequently in lute copying, but the Paston scribe sometimes includes, in his transcriptions, rests that are notated in the vocal originals. This is probably more a result of his wholesale transferral of vocal copy than of his views on the duration of chords. He indicates a minim rest in the same way as it would be indicated in vocal music, by means of a small stroke pointing down from the line. Two types of sign occur in the Paston readings: \( \text{\textbar} \) denotes a repeat section and is used in the three Paston arrangements of Byrd's \textit{Attollite portas} (Ten.340, RCM 2089 and Add.29247) although none of them provides the motet's second-time ending; a rhythm sign with a stroke through it thus, \( \text{\textfrac{1}{2}} \), denotes a correction and is intended to double its crotchet value and represent a minim sign.

Two instances of scribal correction occur in the Hirsch reading of Ferrabosco's \textit{Ut re mi fa sol la}. One bar is scored out, having been copied twice by mistake. At another point an omitted bar is inserted in the margin, linked to the place it should occupy by the use of the sign \( \text{\textfrac{1}{2}} \). Generally, however, scribal errors are relatively rare in all the sources under consideration. Such errors as do occur are mainly rhythmic: they disrupt the music for a bar or so but are usually ironed out subsequently. Examples of actual wrong notes -- for example a letter or figure being placed on the wrong line -- are rare.

In the London and Cambridge readings of the Ferrabosco piece there are two cases of an omission which amounts to a mistake. This piece is a fantasia, based, as its title suggests, on the hexachord, and the shape of the rising and falling sixth is sometimes given without embellishment and sometimes merely traceable through the counterpoint. In each of the following examples (see below), constructed from the tablature of the London and Cambridge readings, the scribes omit a key note (given here in brackets) which is present in the original instrumental piece; the notes
of the hexachord are ringed in this transcription of the lute arrangement. It can be seen that on each of the occasions the scribes leave out a particular note, and that the omissions are particularly unfortunate since they destroy the shape of the hexachord. (The London and Cambridge readings, incidentally, differ on other points.)

Fig. 9 Transcription of R.M.24.d.2 and Hirsch M.1353.
A spare texture seems to be a basic requirement for lute arrangements, and if it can be achieved without unduly emaciating the texture, so much the better. The Paston lute source Add.29246 includes three extracts from Taverner's *Gaude plurimum*, all of them taken from sections which originally had a two- or three-part texture — in other words the most lightly-scored sections of the original. The arranger had probably decided that the spare texture of these sections would be particularly suitable for arrangement into lute pieces. An extract from Fayrfax's *Ave Dei patris filia* in the same manuscript is taken from the first 14 measures, which are scored for three voices.

The Taverner and Fayrfax pieces, and Taverner's mass *Gloria tibi trinitas*, are all of a similar kind. Byrd's *Cantiones Sacrae* are somewhat different. The Paston versions were evidently intended to accompany a
voice, since each lacks its upper part, but even without these, some further reductions in texture were effected. The manuscripts in question are Ten.340, RCM 2089 and Add.29247; Add.29246 does not contain any arrangements of complete motets from the Cantiones Sacrae.

Two of these manuscripts — Add.29247 and RCM 2089 — are less obviously incomplete than Ten.340. For example, the motet Aspice Domine quia facta est is scored for six voices in pairs: Superius and Medius forming the top layer, two Contratenor voices forming the middle layer, and the Tenor and Bass forming the lowest layer. The two categories of arrangement — Ten.340, and the other two manuscripts which agree with each other — provide two different approaches towards selection from these three layers. Ten.340, with a very plain, low-placed arrangement, completely omits the top two voices and provides what would seem to be a deliberately simple representation from the lower two layers. It was probably intended to accompany at least one voice, and possibly a duet. The arrangement preserved in the other two manuscripts is less obviously incomplete, and could conceivably be an adequately-textured piece for solo lute. However its systematic omission of the Medius part suggests that it, too, may have served as an accompaniment.

How much reduction of texture was required? The usual texture of these arrangements — presumably one that was felt to be 'comfortable' to play — is a basic three-part texture with occasional use of four-part chords. For the purposes of these arrangements one and sometimes two of the upper voices of the originals are omitted. Allowing for the possibility that at any given point, two voices in the original may be singing the same note, there is enough 'room' left in the lute texture to accommodate part-writing and imitation. A comparison of (largely identical) readings from RCM 2089

8. In the introduction to his edition of Cantiones Sacrae (1575), Craig Monson appears to confuse two of these manuscripts: 'The versions of the motets in the Paston lute-books (British Library, Additional MS 29247 and Tenbury MS 3089) ... were clearly conceived as accompaniments, since they are incomplete as they stand. The missing parts (either or both Superius parts) were presumably contained in companion books, now lost.' Cantiones Sacrae (1575), The Byrd Edition, gen. ed. Philip Brett, vol.1 (London, 1977), p.xiii.
and Add.29247 with the vocal original in each case reveals a thorough and consistent inclusion of passing-notes and other features, which itself implies a full and careful reflection of imitative points. (The word 'implies' is used because the ambiguities of lute tablature render any reconstruction of the music a subjective task at best. The modern transcriber's work consists largely of the quantitative method of breaking down a bar into its smallest units, and then comparing it with the original to see if everything is accommodated in the arrangement. Only then can questions such as that of note duration be considered.)

In these Paston readings of the Cantiones Sacrae the parts which the arranger has chosen to incorporate are, on the whole, represented accurately as well as thoroughly. There is occasional note-splitting, which the arranger may have considered necessary at certain points to sustain the sound of the instrument. There are also some interesting cases of divergence, which mainly consist of the addition and omission of notes.

The addition of notes which are not present in the original is quite frequent in some readings, for example the RCM 2089 and Add.29247 readings of Attollite portas and the Ten.340 reading of Infelix ego. The 'extra' note is apparently always part of a chord, rather than a passing-note, and since it always has the effect of filling out the chord it probably arises from textural considerations. Sometimes it belongs to the missing part, although when this is the case it is usually transposed to a lower register, which places it in the middle of the texture rather than on top. It is possible that the arranger intended the accompaniment to be full enough to stand on its own if necessary, or he may even have wanted to make the chord more complete visually, even though the extra note would be duplicated by the voice in performance. The following example of an 'extra' note is taken from the Ten.340 reading of Attollite portas.
There are one or two examples of changed notes; they concern cases where the bass-line includes a low F, which lies outside the range of the lute in this particular tuning. In these cases the note is transposed up an octave.

Whereas 'extra' notes are clearly bound up with chordal sound, the question of omitted notes involves part-writing, and may throw some light on the methods used by the arranger. In the following example (see below), in which the omitted note is indicated by an arrow, it can be seen that by leaving out the second of the two G's the arranger has cut short the 1st Contratenor part before the end of its phrase.
Fig. 12 Byrd, Aspice Domine de sede, Transcription of original printed motet and tablature of Add.29247.

There would have been no obstacle to the inclusion of the second G in the chord at the beginning of the second bar; was the arranger trying to avoid a surfeit of G's? Whatever the explanation, this type of procedure may provide us with a clue to the arranger's methods, for his practice of
pursuing a part for several bars and then suddenly abandoning it strongly suggests that he was working from a score. It would surely have been the easiest and most practicable method — indeed, it is difficult to imagine how the arrangement could have been made any other way. It would have been a score that he or someone else had made, since *Aspice Domine quia facta* was issued in printed part-books. However it is not likely to have been Baldwin's score in R.M.24.d.2, since the two versions differ in several places over accidentals. It seems likely that if the arranger had been working with a part-book in front of him the impulse to preserve the integrity of a particular phrase would be strong; if, on the other hand, he were working from a score, then ideas of texture and sound would probably dominate to a much greater extent, and certain notes within the texture might be treated as dispensable regardless of their function within a musical phrase.

Omissions and additions of notes also occur in the Ten.340 reading of *Infelix ego*, which draws on the four middle and lower parts of the six original ones. The arranger is able to accommodate them comfortably with the help of the duplicated notes and textural gaps of the original. Since the first 21 bars of the motet are scored for the upper three voices only, the lute has single-line texture for the whole of this passage. When the three lower voices enter at bar 22, the lute skilfully adds them to its single line in a manner typical of these arrangements.
pursuing a part for several bars and then suddenly abandoning it strongly suggests that he was working from a score. It would surely have been the easiest and most practicable method — indeed, it is difficult to imagine how the arrangement could have been made any other way. It would have been a score that he or someone else had made, since Aspice Domine quia facta was issued in printed part-books. However it is not likely to have been Baldwin's score in R.M.24.d.2, since the two versions differ in several places over accidentals. It seems likely that if the arranger had been working with a part-book in front of him the impulse to preserve the integrity of a particular phrase would be strong; if, on the other hand, he were working from a score, then ideas of texture and sound would probably dominate to a much greater extent, and certain notes within the texture might be treated as dispensable regardless of their function within a musical phrase.

Omissions and additions of notes also occur in the Ten.340 reading of Infelix ego, which draws on the four middle and lower parts of the six original ones. The arranger is able to accommodate them comfortably with the help of the duplicated notes and textural gaps of the original. Since the first 21 bars of the motet are scored for the upper three voices only, the lute has single-line texture for the whole of this passage. When the three lower voices enter at bar 22, the lute skilfully adds them to its single line in a manner typical of these arrangements.
It will be seen from this example that the lute version lies a tone higher than the original. There are several examples of transposition among the Paston lute pieces. In Add.29246, for example, the first extract from Taverner's Gaude plurimum is given at pitch, but the second and third are both copied a 5th lower than the original. This may well have been because in both of these extracts the original carries a high-lying top line, and if the pieces were indeed to be performed as solo songs with lute accompaniment, they would have been more comfortable to perform at a lower pitch.

It is not certain whether the contrast in keys indicates a different tuning for the lute, although Warren inclines to this view and suggests a tuning of E A d f♯ b e′ for the Add.29246 extract from Fayrfax's Ave Dei.
patris filia.⁹ Although this is a possible explanation, there is no evidence for it in the form of manuscript directions for re-tuning. The motive, in any case, must have been connected with performance practice, and strengthens the theory that where the Paston manuscripts were concerned voices had to be catered for as well.

The RCM 2089 and Add.29247 readings of the Byrd motets show a handful of rhythmic divergences from the original. Sometimes these are clearly straightforward slips, and sometimes they may be deliberate simplifications: an example of the latter might be the plain reading of an originally dotted figure. Very occasionally an ornament is added, as in Fig.14 (see below). These figures are additions, not replacements: there is no evidence to suggest that the arranger attempted to smooth out figures which might have seemed characteristically vocal.

Fig. 14 Byrd, *Attollite portas*, Transcription of original printed motet and tablature of RCM 2089.
Conclusions

There can be little doubt that the lute sources studied in this chapter are most usefully considered as a separate group. The discussion, which has necessarily involved the vocal originals from which the arrangements were made, has highlighted the considerable differences between the lute sources and the vocal manuscripts in the rest of this study.

The twentieth-century observer of scribal procedure is confronted at the outset by pronounced visual differences, the importance of which should not be underestimated. Lumsden rightly draws attention to the lute sources' strict imposition of bar-lines, a feature which, although present in keyboard manuscripts and beginning to appear in certain vocal manuscripts, was still far from widespread. In the lute sources, part of the scribe's work could be said to operate at one remove from the reader. When a vocal manuscript from the same period is studied, most or all of a scribe's characteristics and idiosyncrasies are immediately apparent, without any need for an intermediate stage of interpretation. With a lute source, however, much less of the information is available immediately— it may be apparent that a scribe is careless in the sense of being untidy, but only a very accomplished reader of tablature could see that he is careless in his transcriptions without further interpretative work. This is perhaps the reason why the lute tablatures in this survey seem less interesting at first glance— the scribal characteristics which stand out in vocal sources are, in a sense, 'locked up' in the tablature.

Given these differences between lute sources and vocal sources, the Paston lute-books are somewhat exceptional in that they have certain links with vocal sources: their scribe (or scribes) also copied vocal manuscripts (Chelmsford, Essex Record Office MS D/DP Z6/1, Ten.341-4), and their repertoire is almost completely vocal and called for transcription techniques which were probably quite specialized. Within this Paston group Add.29246 tends to stand apart from the other three on account of its different repertoire, but it should be emphasized that it is similar to

10. Lumsden, 'Sources of English Lute Music', p.84.
them in arrangement procedure. All four sources show marked signs of having been intended as accompaniments; Ten.340, RCM 2089 and Add.29247 even provide three bars, at the opening of *Attollite portas*, which may have formed the accompaniment to an introductory vocal phrase, or which may have been a solo introduction in an attempt to make the piece sound more like a lute song.

Some elements of the realization of part-writing in the tablature suggest that the scribes who arranged the vocal originals were working from scores. It is true that very few scores survive from this period, to reinforce such a theory. On the other hand, if the Paston scribes did use scores it is hardly surprising that they have not been preserved, since they were likely to have been rough working copies, perhaps assembled specially for the purpose, and in no sense presentation or performing scores.

Despite the limited evidence available, it would seem that idiosyncratic scribal performance with regard to accidentals was not carried over into these lute arrangements. The Paston arrangements largely reflect the accidentals found in Paston vocal readings of the same pieces, whatever the origin of those accidentals may have been. If it is postulated (as it has been elsewhere in this study) that manuscript accidentals were a matter of individual and variable practice, then the process of translating musical notes into lute tablature seems to have acted as a deterrent to 'scribal fancy' in this area.
The last chapter in this dissertation is concerned with the areas of Baldwin's copying output which have not yet been discussed in detail. The keyboard source My Ladye Nevells Booke, and the contributions to the Forrest-Heyther part-books and to Dow's ChCh 984-8, are all copied in the same style, which has been termed, for convenience, Baldwin's 'Nevell hand'.

The Forrest-Heyther part-books, as a major source of Tudor masses, and My Ladye Nevells Booke, as the earliest major source of Byrd's keyboard music, have both received scholarly attention on these terms, including discussion of the possible sources from which they were copied. In both cases the conclusions are -- and there seems no reason to question them -- that Baldwin had access to texts which were authoritative, if not actual holographs.

Aspects which have received less attention, however, are the position of these projects in Baldwin's own copying output, and their relationship, as manuscripts, to the manuscripts which he copied in a different style. Do the Nevell book (keyboard) and the Forrest-Heyther contribution (vocal) resemble each other at all? Did Baldwin have to adapt his copying style to the exigencies of keyboard music, and if so, how? Is his Nevell book physically like other surviving sources of Byrd's keyboard music, bearing in mind that it is almost the earliest of them all?
The Forrest-Heyther Contribution

The Forrest-Heyther source, Oxford, Mus.Sch.e.376-81,\(^1\) is a set of six part-books containing eighteen Tudor masses, plus an insertion at the end of the last book (e.381) which provides parts to three English anthems. The first eleven masses are in a 'good, clear but unknown first hand';\(^2\) masses 12-18 are in the hand of William Forrest, petty canon of Cardinal College (later Christ Church), Oxford, and later chaplain to Queen Mary;\(^3\) however MS e.381, from the middle of mass no.15 to the end of mass no.18, is copied by Baldwin, whilst the anthems in the same book are copied in a later hand which Bergsagel suggests is that of William Heather, who gave the books to the music school at Oxford in 1627.\(^4\) Leaving aside this later addition, the discussion centres on Baldwin's contribution to the manuscript, its resemblances to and differences from the work of the two earlier copyists, and its place in the wider context of Baldwin's own copying output.

The contents of Forrest-Heyther are listed in the following table, with Baldwin's copying contribution (in e.381) bracketed.

\[-----------------------------
2. ibid, p.244.
3. ibid, p.245.
4. ibid, pp.245-6.
\]
1. Taverner Gloria tibi trinitas
2. Burton Ut re mi fa sol la
3. Marbecke Per arma iustitiae
4. Fayrfax Regali
5. Fayrfax Albanus
6. Rasar Christe Jesu
7. Aston Te Deum
8. Fayrfax O bone Jesu
9. Fayrfax Tecum principium
10. Ashwell Jesu Christe
11. Norman Resurrexit Dominus
12. Taverner Corona spinea
13. Ashwell Ave Maria
14. Aston Videte manus meas
15. Taverner O Michael
16. Sheppard Cantate
17. Tye Euge bone
18. Alwood Praise him praiseworthy

Baldwin's contribution begins during the Agnus Dei section of mass no.15, Taverner's mass O Michael; since it starts on the right-hand side of an opening while Forrest's last page occupies the left-hand side, it is possible to see at a glance how Baldwin's copying style fits into the context of the manuscript (see Fig.2). The most striking aspect of Baldwin's and Forrest's note formation, despite Forrest's thicker nib, is their similarity. Forrest's notes are lozenge-shaped, with very upright stems placed at the centre of the note-head; they themselves bear a strong resemblance to the note formation of the first, unknown hand (see Fig.2), although the edges of Forrest's note-heads are not quite so sharply defined.
The Forrest-Heyther Part-Books: The First Hant
The Forrest–Heyther Part-Books: Forrest’s Hand; Baldwin’s Hand takes over.

Fig. 2 (cont.)
When Baldwin's note formation is compared with the other two types present in the manuscript, there is a relative uniformity in their appearance. Furthermore, Dow's ChCh 984-8, the anthology into which Baldwin copied two pieces, also uses this type of note formation during the section which precedes Baldwin's contribution in his 'Nevell hand'. It is also apparent, from the evidence of his other surviving sources, that Baldwin was not in the habit of using this kind of note formation for his copying of vocal music. It is clear, therefore, that he used this style deliberately, in order to achieve continuity with the other hands involved. His underlay hand, however, does not undergo any change: it is evident that, despite some surface modifications which are discernible over a span of copying — notably in certain sections of ChCh 979-83 — he had only one underlay hand.

The implications of Baldwin's choice of hand are several. Firstly, he may have selected it from his 'repertoire' of scribal hands because it closely matched the hands in the sources to which he was contributing. Alternatively, he may have developed this hand specifically for one or other of these projects, modelling it closely on the hand(s) already present in the manuscript, and subsequently used it again for the Nevell source. In order to be certain of either of these possibilities a precise chronology of the three copying projects would have to be established.

Unfortunately only one of the projects carries a date: 1591 at the end of the Nevell source. The Forrest–Heyther source, as Bergsagel notes, apparently came into Baldwin's possession after Forrest died, c.1581, and remained in his possession until his own death in 1615. Baldwin could thus have completed the manuscript at any time within a possible margin of about thirty-four years. The contribution to Dow's anthology probably involves a much shorter possible time-span, and Hofman suggests that it took place in the late 1580's soon after Dow's death:

Two pieces at the end [sic] of the manuscript are in a different

5. See Chapter 1.
6. In the case of both Dow and Forrest–Heyther the manuscript as a whole is dated, but Baldwin's contribution is not.
style and hand from Dow's, and this fact may be indicative that Dow left his manuscript unfinished at his death. 8

The two pieces copied by Baldwin 9 are in fact placed nearly half-way through the manuscript, and they conclude the Latin section which thereafter gives way to English-texted, secular and instrumental music. There can be little doubt that this later section of music is Dow's work as well, so the question that remains is whether Dow left gaps in his anthology which were partially filled, after his death, by Baldwin (and another, later hand at nos.99 and 100), or whether Dow lent the books to Baldwin during his lifetime, inviting him to round off the Latin section, and then continued to work on them after Baldwin had given them back. If the former is the case, Baldwin's contribution could have been added at any time after 1588, but probably within a few years of that date. If the latter is the case, then the books were probably lent to Baldwin some time during the 1580's. Neither theory, however, can be definitely adopted.

The basic question, therefore, remains open. The Nevell source is dated 1591 and we can be reasonably certain that this copying project took place within quite narrow time limits just before this date. However the other two examples of this copying hand cannot be pinned down to an exact date. As a copying hand it was elegant and probably more laborious to produce than the hand used in Baldwin's own vocal sources: for these reasons it was a suitable hand to use for the Dow and Forrest-Heyther contributions, which are short, and the Nevell book, which was to be an important presentation anthology. Unfortunately it is impossible to establish whether it actually originated with the Forrest-Heyther source, as an imitation of the two copying hands already there.

Having discussed the visual aspect of this copying style, Baldwin's contributions can now be assessed in more specifically musical terms. A comparison between his scribal procedures and those of the other copyists of Forrest-Heyther shows few differences in the transmission and placement of accidentals, since they are not plentiful in the sixth parts

9. Parsons' O bone Iesu and Giles' Vestigia mea.
of these Tudor masses. All three scribes provide key/stave signatures on occasion, and preplace some accidentals. In the music copied by the first two hands, this preplacement looks like a matter of convenience: the uniformity of size and spacing of notes (in the unknown hand particularly) suggest that accidentals were not included at this stage of the copying, but were added later, wherever there was space. This is not so obviously the case with Baldwin's preplacement, although it remains a possibility. However, although Baldwin's notes are uniform in size, the spacing between them is a good deal more irregular, which suggests that accidentals were accommodated at the same time as the notes were copied.

The differences between scribal approaches to underlay are more marked. In the underlay transmitted by the first (unknown) scribe, each line of text occurs only once, which produces highly melismatic underlay in the Sanctus and Agnus Dei sections. Both Forrest and Baldwin split up these melismatic lines, producing repeated phrases which are sometimes written out and sometimes indicated by repeat signs. Baldwin's practice of splitting melismata into short repeated phrases has earned him the reputation of a modernizing scribe, so it is interesting to note that in this case he was merely reflecting the procedure of an earlier scribe who had copied these masses around the middle of the century. Forrest even splits and repeats phrases during the heavily-texted Gloria and Credo sections of the masses, as does Baldwin.

All three scribes are usually accurate in spelling, although the first hand does give 'goriam' for 'gloriam' on the very first page of the source, and Baldwin gives 'Angnus' (Dei) in mass no.16. They are all precise in their placement of underlay as well.

The sources which enabled Baldwin to complete these books have not survived. The four masses which he copied do not appear in any surviving
contemporary manuscript\(^{13}\) from which he could have copied them. The most likely possibility is that Baldwin inherited Forrest's exemplars along with the books themselves, and that these exemplars were subsequently discarded and lost. They appear from this standpoint to have preserved a unique repertoire, for while the first section of the manuscript has some concordances with contemporary sources, the masses which Forrest copied only turn up in a small handful of much later sources (Paston's RCM 2035, Ten.342 and Add.29246) in extract form. However the problem may well be one of incomplete survival of sources: the Forrest-Heyther books and their concordances, with their repertoire of masses, belong to the category of source most likely to have suffered destruction at the hands of Protestants, for the same reasons as those which led a Catholic collector like Paston to preserve extracts from any which survived.

The Dow Contribution

For Baldwin's contribution of two pieces to Dow's anthology, however, concordances can be found. The pieces in question, Parsons' *O bone Iesu* and Giles' *Vestigia mea*, also appear in ChCh 979-83 and R.M.24.d.2 respectively. They are copied into Dow's source as nos.53 and 54; *O bone Iesu* is no.54 in ChCh 979-83 (again, the similarity of numbering must be countered by the fact that the piece follows widely differing preceding sections in each source) and *Vestigia mea* is no.26 in R.M.24.d.2.

The two readings of Parsons' *O bone Iesu* are very close to each other. The transmission of accidentals is almost identical: one occasion when they do not match concerns a passage of repeated B naturals, in which the Dow reading provides sharp signs for all the notes and the ChCh 979-83 reading for all except one. This could easily be a slip on Baldwin's part. Distribution of underlay is almost always the same, apart from the occasional use of a $\vee$ sign in one source and not another, which produces a different emphasis within one word. There is only one underlay.

\(^{13}\) Extracts from Taverner's mass *O Michael* appear in the 18th century manuscript Add.11586, compiled by Dr Burney.
repeat sign (they are not numerous in Baldwin's copying outside his Byrd texts), which occurs in exactly the same place in both versions — surely a strong indication that they have a common origin.

One interesting difference concerns the copying of ligatures: in the ChCh 979-83 reading there are both breve and semibreve ligatures, but the Dow reading only includes the breve ones among these. This is the only discrepancy of note between two readings which are otherwise almost indistinguishable from each other.

The situation is somewhat different with regard to the readings of Vestigia mea in ChCh 984-8 and R.M.24.d.2. Here the readings have a more problematic relationship, partly because the R.M.24.d.2 version is textless, which removes an important source of comparative evidence, and also because there are substantial discrepancies between such details as the readings provide. The fact that the R.M.24.d.2 reading is textless does not in itself constitute an argument against the two versions' having derived from a common source, since all the music in this section of the manuscript is textless as a matter of course; the other textual discrepancies, however, are more significant.

They consist, firstly, of a number of differences over the transmission of accidentals. Some of these belong to the category of cautionary accidentals, already present in the key/stave signature, which appear in the Dow reading but not in R.M.24.d.2. This is readily explicable: Baldwin was pressed for space in this section of R.M.24.d.2, because of its cramped layout, and it is quite understandable that he should have dispensed with accidentals such as these when it was already difficult to place the others. There are further differences, however, over routine accidentals, with each source providing a few which the other does not. Furthermore, the R.M.24.d.2 reading omits a whole phrase from the Contratenor part as it appears in the Dow contribution.

How were these readings copied, and were they copied from each other? If they were, then their discrepancies could help to establish their chronological relationship. Baldwin's ChCh 979-83 reading of O bone Iesu probably preceded his reading in Dow, since he is more likely to have
dispensed with semibreve ligatures than to have added them, in the course of re-copying the piece. Similarly, the gap in the R.M.24.d.2 reading of *Vestigia mea* would suggest that the other version (in Dow) came first. However both of the readings could have come from a common source -- one of Baldwin's 'bundle of sources' -- without being directly transcribed from each other. In the case of *Vestigia mea* there may even have been more than one source, which might explain the differences over accidentals. However in that case it would be the more surprising that the piece does not turn up in any other surviving manuscripts of the period.

As it is, the fact that this piece appears in only two surviving sources, each being copied by Baldwin, constitutes strong evidence that it was never a part of the hypothetical circulated 'bundle of sources': a copy (or copies) probably came into Baldwin's hands directly from the composer, Giles, who was after all a colleague of Baldwin's at Windsor during the late 1580's.

If this theory is correct, it intensifies the problem of discrepancies between the two versions, because it removes any hypothetical intermediate stages during which alteration of the original could have crept in. The composer and the scribe were probably the only people involved in the process, and yet the two resulting copies differ -- differ, moreover, in an even-handed manner, with no monopoly of 'extra' accidentals on the part of either version. A possible reason for this might be that Giles revised his own piece -- yet it does not seem likely that revision would have taken this form. Another possibility -- admittedly speculative, but plausible -- is that Giles left most of the accidentals out or did not intend them, and that Baldwin added them at his own discretion; Baldwin was unable to copy one transcript from another because he no longer had Dow's anthology in his possession when he came to copy *Vestigia mea* into R.M.24.d.2, so he made a somewhat different choice of accidentals the second time. Alternatively, the two readings may simply constitute another example of the habitually inconsistent scribal treatment of accidentals already discussed in this study.
Baldwin's use of the 'Nevell hand', hitherto observed in short contributions to other manuscripts, can be seen at its fullest and most extended in the Nevell source itself. The physical aspects of this source have been described by Hilda Andrews and E. H. Fellowes, and the quality of its texts assessed by Alan Brown. The main focus of the considerable interest which it has attracted since it was first published in 1926, has been its value as a keyboard source and as a source of Byrd's music, one which he himself is thought to have overseen. In a study devoted to John Baldwin, however, the emphasis must be somewhat different. Since Baldwin's surviving manuscripts, with the exception of this one, contain predominantly vocal music, the main questions are: did Baldwin have to adapt his copying methods to music for this different medium, and if so, how? And in what ways can his methods be related to and compared with those used by the scribes of the major keyboard sources of the period?

The Nevell source consists entirely of music by Byrd. Therefore its major concordances (although it predates them all) are keyboard sources which transmit Byrd's music in some quantity. They are the Weelkes manuscript (Add.30485), Will Forster's Virginal Book (R.M.24.d.3) and the Fitzwilliam Virginal Book (Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, Music MS 468).

The first of these, Add.30485, is sometimes called the 'pseudo-Nevell' book, since for some years it was mistaken for Baldwin's source owing to a note on its title-page which reads: 'Extracts from Virginal Book, Lady Nevil's: Tallis, Byrd, Bull, etc.' There is in fact no historical or textual

connection between the manuscripts, although they share thirteen pieces. Alan Brown has convincingly suggested that the copyist of the source is likely to have been Thomas Weelkes. Attempts to date the manuscript have been tentative, but a completion date of 1601 or 1602 is a possibility. It contains 36 pieces by Byrd, and music by other composers.

Will Forster's Virginal Book is signed and dated '31 Januarie 1624. Will. Forster.' It contains 80 pieces, of which 42 are by Byrd. Thurston Dart has suggested that Forster had access to Byrd's papers, after the composer's death in July, 1623.

According to the published research to date, the Fitzwilliam Virginal Book was compiled by Francis Tregian the younger during his imprisonment in the fleet for recusancy, from 1609-19. The source Egerton 3665 and the 'Sambrooke' manuscript have both been traced to his authorship. The Fitzwilliam book contains nearly three hundred pieces, including about 70 pieces by Byrd.

All of these manuscripts contain a substantial amount of Byrd's keyboard music, much of it concordant with what Baldwin copied, and none of them is separated by more than twenty-five years or so from the completion of the Nevell project in 1591. Outside this main group, for different reasons, stand various other sources: the only source of Byrd's keyboard music to pre-date Nevell — the manuscript ChCh 371 (c.1570) which contains two of his Miserere settings; a group of sources which provide only small numbers of pieces by Byrd, and which in most cases were copied well into the seventeenth century, many years after Baldwin completed the Nevell source; and the only printed English keyboard source of the period, Parthenia, or the Maydenhead of the first music that ever was printed for

---

the Virginalls (1612).

It is instructive to compare My Ladye Nevella Booke, as a source, with other types of source found among these manuscripts. As Alan Brown remarks,\(^22\) it is the only surviving source which was apparently a presentation copy for an aristocratic patron, although other extant sources are associated with a name, examples being Priscilla Bunbury's Virginal Book and Elizabeth Rogers' Virginal Book.\(^23\)

Another distinguishing feature of Baldwin's source is that of all these manuscripts it is the only one for which there is any evidence that the scribe had little to do with choosing the music copied. This is, of course, necessarily a matter of conjecture, but it is highly unlikely that Baldwin, the scribe, made a present of this manuscript to 'Ladye Nevell'. He must have compiled it at someone else's instigation, probably the composer's; and if that was the case, the composer surely supervised what was selected for inclusion in the book. The probability that the compiler of Nevell was carrying out someone else's orders is greater than for any of the other sources, even Parthenia. Some of them, indeed, are clearly commonplace books. The Weelkes manuscript Add.30485 is of this type, as Alan Brown has noted,\(^24\) and so also is the Fitzwilliam book in its way, though it is an unusually lavish one.\(^25\)

Baldwin is not alone in being a copyist of vocal as well as keyboard music: the other extant manuscripts in Tregian's hand contain texted madrigals and motets, while Weelkes, as a composer of vocal music, was clearly involved in writing it down at some stage. Despite this common factor, however, Baldwin's keyboard manuscript is copied in an unusual and

---

23. This book, dated 1656, includes a piece entitled 'When the King enjoyes his owne againe' -- an oblique reference to the hope of an eventual Restoration?
distinctive hand compared with those found in the other keyboard sources, including the print (which was produced by line engraving, not type). There is a complete lack of evidence as to why Baldwin’s keyboard script should be so different from the others: if an earlier keyboard manuscript influenced him, it has not survived; nor does his manuscript seem to have influenced later styles, although there is no evidence that it disappeared into complete obscurity as soon as it was presented to the Nevill family. The difference between his markedly more angular shapes and other scripts is, in any case, a cosmetic one, since as the following discussion should demonstrate, the principles which governed his keyboard copying and that of the other scribes were basically similar.

In her 'Historical note' on the Nevell source, Hilda Andrews comments:

The prevailing fashion of written music, shown at its best in the notation of My Ladye Nevells Booke, abounds in evidence of the transitional nature of the period.\(^26\)

As she observes,\(^27\) this transitional nature is particularly apparent in the use of bar-lines and of accidentals.

At the time of the completion of the Nevell source (1591) the use of barring was largely confined to lute and keyboard sources, and Baldwin’s own commonplace book, R.M.24.d.2, is exceptional among vocal and instrumental sources of the period in its partial use of a score-book format. The barring found in the keyboard sources, including Baldwin’s Nevell book, belongs to the period between its introduction and its eventual application in a consistent manner on the part of all copyists. This transitional period appears to have lasted about a hundred years. Denis Stevens remarks of the use of bar-lines in the Mulliner Book (the compilation of which he dates from c.1547 to c.1559):

... there is no principle, and ... nothing is to be gained by pursuing the matter further. Notation in England was at that time suffering from growing pains.\(^28\)

\(^{26}\) Andrews, My Ladye Nevells Booke of Virginal Music, p.xxix.
\(^{27}\) ibid, pp.xxx–xxxi.
Yet well into the seventeenth century regular barring was far from universal among keyboard sources. Benjamin Cosyn, in his virginal book (dated 1620), seems to have understood and applied the principles according to which modern barring is used; and an instance of irregularity such as the example below, from the Fitzwilliam Virginal Book, may well be connected with the deliberate emphasis of cross-rhythms.

![Musical notation]

Fig.3 Fitzwilliam Virginal Book.

However ChCh 431 -- compiled, according to Alan Brown, between c.1625 and c.1635 -- uses bars which are very variable in length. Nor does the transitional period show a steady progression from one method to another: a source such as Add.30486, c.1600, is regularly barred while the printed edition Parthenia of 1612 is not.

The irregularity itself occurs in two forms. The first could be summed up by Stevens' phrase, 'no principle': passages in which the number of beats per bar varies continuously. An example is given in Fig.4.

---

29. As in the case of R.M.24.d.2 (see Chapter 4), this inconsistency is interesting in view of the fact that Lowinsky found complete regularity of barring in a collection of sixteenth-century continental scores -- see his 'Early Scores in Manuscript', Journal of the American Musicological Society, 13 (1960), pp.126-71.
A more common type of inconsistency concerns the halving and doubling of the number of beats per bar. Hilda Andrews describes this practice as being "of common occurrence in florid repetitions and quickly moving semiquaver variations, following slow sections in semibreves and minims" — in other words, a means of pointing up contrast. Its use is not quite as systematic as this implies, since an alternation between two different bar lengths can still occur even when a florid (or slow) passage is well established. Nor is it connected to inflexible bar size: Baldwin's R.M.24.d.2 with its pre-ruled bar-lines appears to have no parallel among the keyboard sources.

The keyboard sources, in short, show a good deal of variation on this point, not necessarily connected to the order in which they were produced. Some of them achieve something close to modern usage of the barring system; others, including the Nevell source and the print, show a more irregular division of the musical flow. All, however, respect the basic musical pulse — it is rare for a bar-line to cut through a minim beat.

There is as yet no clear relationship in these sources between barring and the use of accidentals. The latter are given the unsystematic, transitional treatment that they receive in the vocal sources: key/stave signatures (some of them very idiosyncratic, such as the signature of one C# in Elizabeth Rogers' Virginal Book of 1656) are often duplicated in the

---

33. The same kind of approach is discernible in Baldwin's R.M.24.d.2; see the discussion of that source in Chapter 4.
text, and accidentals appear to operate only in an immediate sense, although as Hilda Andrews remarks, 'this rule seems to be but casually observed'.

Accidentals are preplaced, distanced or placed under the note in many of the keyboard sources. Indeed they are presented in exactly the same way as in contemporary vocal sources, and the same priorities are apparent. Much emphasis is placed on the first accidental after a change of line, by preplacing it at the end of the previous line and then applying it immediately before the note in question. It was clearly important to give advance warning of this accidental -- not just for a scribe such as Baldwin, who copied vocal music and could have transferred this technique to keyboard music, but also for William Hole who engraved Parthenia (or the copyist of the sources from which he worked). In the keyboard sources, as in the vocal sources, there appears to be a variety of motivations behind preplacement. Some sources, such as the Weelkes book (Add.30485), show marked signs of the notes having been copied first, after which the accidentals were added wherever there was room for them. Others, such as the Nevell book, provide some preplacement in spite of a reasonably spacious layout: preplacement which is apparently deliberate rather than merely dictated by convenience, and which may therefore have been prompted by a desire to give the player advance warning of accidentals. There is also a 'hybrid' form, represented by sources such as Will Forster's book, Benjamin Cosyn's book, and the sources ChCh 431 and Add.30486, in which the layout is spacious and accidentals are seldom preplaced or placed under notes except during quaver and semiquaver runs. Here the copying of notes may well have preceded the copying of accidentals, but there was usually plenty of room, and problems only occurred at running passages.

One possible motivation raised in connection with preplacement in vocal music -- the theory that it was connected in some way with solmization procedures -- can be discounted. It is hardly likely that solmization was envisaged as an alternative method of performance for this music. Furthermore, the fact that preplacement in keyboard sources

manifests itself in exactly the same way as in contemporary vocal sources must raise serious doubts as to the plausibility of this explanation for preplacement in vocal music.

The placement of notes in keyboard sources falls into two distinct types: alignment (however approximate), and centralization. The latter practice is seen most clearly in Baldwin's Nevell texts, and an example is given below.

![Fig.5 My Ladye Nevells Booke.](image)

The principle of centralization is as follows: whenever a pair or group of moving notes is heard against a held note, that note is placed in the centre, relative to the moving notes, rather than aligned with the first note of the group. This can take place on several different levels in the same bar, as the principle is put into operation with notes of different values. The effect is one of great visual symmetry, and to modern eyes it seems that artistic considerations predominate over musical ones. Nevertheless, a sixteenth-century player familiar with the method may not have found it any more difficult to read than the system of alignment.

The two methods of note placement co-exist in the keyboard sources. Benjamin Cosyn, like Baldwin, uses pronounced centralization; Francis Tregian also uses it, but not quite so conscientiously or precisely as Baldwin does. The scribe of Elizabeth Rogers' book uses alignment for the most part, but centralization for left-hand semibreves.
As Howard Ferguson has observed\textsuperscript{35}, the proportion signs most commonly found in the keyboard sources are $\frac{3}{2}$ and $\frac{2}{3}$ for simple and compound duple time; $\frac{3}{4}$, $\frac{2}{3}$ and $\frac{4}{3}$ for simple triple time; and 3 for brisk triple time. Baldwin occasionally gives a $\frac{3}{2}$ sign, presumably with the same intended meaning as $\frac{3}{2}$. In addition, the signs 3, 6, etc. divide the minim beat into three and six respectively, and signal a change to brisk compound time.

Other types of sign occur in the sources with varying degrees of frequency. Repeat signs at the end of sections occur regularly, and are generally indicated (although individual practice may be inconsistent on this point)\textsuperscript{36} by the use of dots either within, or on either side of, a double bar. The sections are often numbered, and Francis Tregian goes so far as to append the abbreviation Rep. (Reprise) to some of his written-out repeats or 'divisions'. One or two sources, including Add.30486 and the Nevell book, introduce extra stave lines for a high-lying or low-lying note or group of notes. Ornaments are very frequent, and although the more common double-stroke ones predominate, examples of single-stroke ornaments are to be found in several sources, including Benjamin Cosyn's book and the Nevell book.

Corrections in these manuscripts are achieved by erasing or crossing out the mistake. Baldwin is unusual in drawing the player's attention to an error and its correction; on f.145v there is the following annotation:

\begin{quote}
here is a falte, a pointe left out, w\textsuperscript{o} ye shall finde prickte, after the end of the next songe, upon the .148.leaf.
\end{quote}

and on f.148v:

\begin{quote}
this pointe bee longeth to the song before :-.145.leaf.
\end{quote}

However Baldwin's source is also exceptional for a more significant reason: many of its corrections were apparently made by somebody else.


Margaret Glyn has suggested that the corrector was Byrd himself, and although it will probably never be possible to ascertain this, it is a plausible theory. Since her reason for proposing it lies in the nature of the corrections themselves, it is worth investigating them.

Many of the corrections are in fact additions -- of accidentals, extra notes, and ornaments. Some are in the form of changes made to the layout and presentation of the notes: bar-lines are added; notes are tied together, or -- the reverse procedure -- a dot is altered to a repeated note. Only a minority of the corrections are clearly alterations of something that is wrong or inadequate: into this category come the deletion of notes, the addition and removal of bars on barred groups of notes, the placement of directs on a different line, the insertion of dots in a double bar or their removal from it. Also, on a few occasions, Baldwin had copied a note's stem but omitted the head, which the corrector filled in. Figs.6-8 illustrate some of these corrections.

![Fig.6 My Ladye Nevells Booke, Correction: added note in right hand.](image)

It seems unlikely that Baldwin himself was responsible for these corrections. The ink used for them is browner than that used for his text, and the inserted notes are written in a passable but not very good imitation of his hand. Moreover, Baldwin apparently did correct his own mistakes on occasion, and the two types of correction do not resemble each other. Apart from physical characteristics, however, the nature — one might say the 'spirit' — of these corrections has led Margaret Glyn and later writers to identify the composer as responsible:
It is seldom a matter of correcting what is entirely wrong, but of inserting subtle little improvements that only Byrd's brain would have thought of.\textsuperscript{38}

On the evidence of the corrections there seems no reason to question this. It should be noted, however, that it involves not one assumption but two: firstly, that the composer was responsible, and secondly, that his additions were themselves afterthoughts, and had not been present in his holographs. Nevertheless, on the evidence of the rest of Baldwin's output, it does seem unlikely that he could have made so many omissions. It is probable that he made some, and that the rest of the 'corrections' are genuine improvements on Byrd's part.

It appears to have been a relatively straightforward matter for Baldwin to adapt his copying practices to the exigencies of keyboard music. There are two notable differences between his usual style of layout and that required for the Nevell book: firstly, a six-line stave instead of a five-line stave (probably used at this time because keyboard melodies moved through a wider range more quickly than vocal ones); and secondly, the interplay of several parts in each stave which meant that several directs, rather than one, were required at the end of each line. Baldwin also had to insert keyboard fingerings,\textsuperscript{39} which are likely to have been provided by Byrd in the holographs.

On the whole, however, the differences are scarcely perceptible. Baldwin uses preplacement and cancellation of accidentals in the same way as in his vocal sources. On the question of alignment, the Nevell book cannot really be compared with the scored section of R.M.24.d.2, in view of the very different types of music in the two sources, the greater number of parts per line in the Nevell book, and the peculiarities and cramped layout of R.M.24.d.2.

\textsuperscript{38} ibid, p.39.

\textsuperscript{39} For a study of these, see Ton Koopman, '"My Ladye Nevells Booke" and Old Fingering', The English Harpsichord Magazine and Early Keyboard Instrument Review, 2 (1977), pp.5-10.
There is one instance where Baldwin seems to become confused as to which hand to use. On f.175 one of the notes, a semibreve, is copied in the hand which he used for his two vocal sources. This abrupt reminder of a substantial source of very different music, also in his hand, points up the astonishing variety to be found in his surviving scribal output. Baldwin used one hand for ChCh 979-83 and R.M.24.d.2, and another for the Nevell book and contributions to other manuscripts. Whatever source he copied, whether it were vocal or keyboard music, or -- as in Forrest-Heyther -- vocal music with his 'keyboard hand', the same priorities and considerations shine clearly through them all.
CONCLUSIONS

Baldwin's surviving sources, together with his contributions to other manuscripts, contain 421 pieces of vocal, instrumental and keyboard music.\(^1\) He was a copyist of wide-ranging tastes, including Italian madrigals, English secular songs and Taverner's mass *Gloria tibi trinitas* among his choices of copy, as well as many sacred pieces, including those by Windsor composers such as Mundy and Giles, which emanated from much nearer home. To him we owe the preservation (although in an unfortunately incomplete form) of a great deal of music by Sheppard, who holds an important position in ChCh 979-83 and whose name is recorded with a familiarity\(^2\) which betokens some degree of admiration and affection.

A scribe's reasons for choosing copy for his sources are seldom easy to formulate with certainty, when no written evidence about them survives. It has been suggested,\(^3\) for example, that Sheppard's music was very popular, and that this is why there is so much of it in ChCh 979-83. On the other hand, chance might have put Baldwin in possession of a substantial exemplar, perhaps even originating from the composer himself. 'Baldwin the singing-man of St George's searched out as many tenor motets as possible', writes Kerman,\(^4\) drawing attention to another possible criterion of choice.

From Baldwin's own poem at the end of R.M.24.d.2 it is clear that he considered the music that he copied to be good music, the best of its kind, and that he had an active desire to preserve it for posterity. It is questionable to what extent this concern can be termed 'antiquarian' in the generally accepted sense of the word, since Baldwin and his contemporaries by no means took it for granted that they should preserve music exactly as they found it. There seems no doubt, nevertheless, that Baldwin's motives stemmed from his admiration of the music itself. This stance becomes clearer when it is compared with other possible scribal motives, in which aesthetic admiration shades off into moral and emotional commitment. This

\(^{1}\) This total does not include his possible contribution to ChCh 45.
\(^{4}\) *Byrd's Motets: Chronology and Canon*, p.366.
type of attitude is discernible behind the Paston manuscripts, for instance, with their strongly conservative, Catholic content, and also behind John Sadler's part-books, which seem to combine a compiler's personal memorial to the composer Robert White with a veiled but deeply-felt lament for the Catholic faith. Nothing of this spirit seems to imbue Baldwin's work: the dignity of his sources is artistic, musical; the wide-ranging pursuit of excellence brings them closer in spirit to manuscripts such as e.423 and Dow's ChCh 984-8 than to the ones mentioned above.

On the opposite side of the argument, there is some evidence to indicate that a scribe might not always choose what he copied. Paston's suggested group of copyists is an obvious example, but even an independent copyist like Baldwin may have had little say in what was chosen to make up My Ladye Nevells Booke. His contribution to the Forrest-Heyther part-books was dictated by a previous copyist, and the copying for which he is recorded as having been paid at St George's Chapel may well not have been of pieces of his own choice. If ChCh 979-83 was originally intended for performance (though much about it indicates that it was never used in this way, at all events) it might have come into such a category as well.

Finally, a scribe's choice of copy must to some extent have been influenced by expediency. At the very least, he could only copy what was available to him; and for a scribe who was disposed to make extracts (as for example Baldwin in his Commonplace Book), certain types of piece were obviously more suitable than others -- perhaps the best type being the large multi-section works containing passages scored for a reduced number of voices.

The question of what a scribe copied is best considered with reference not only to the contents of his own manuscripts, but also to those of others, which, by showing what was available, provide a context for our view of the scribe, and, where the ordering of contents is concerned, offer potential evidence of manuscript links. The same is true for the question of how he copied, since other sources provide not only a context for the

5. See discussion of them in Mateer's article, 'John Sadler and Oxford, Bodleian MSS Mus.e.1-5', in Music and Letters, 60 (1979), 281-95.
study of his procedures, both habitual and exceptional, but also a means—
variable in its reliability—of ascertaining how he treated his copy,
and what his attitudes were to the various elements of which it was
composed. In such an area there are few certainties to cling to, but two
starting-points offer a valuable insight into the copying process.

One of these is the presence of an authoritative printed edition, the
Cantiones Sacrae of 1589 and 1591. A comparison between these prints and
manuscript sources has limitations that must be kept firmly in mind, since
1589 and 1591 were not the first occasions on which some of these pieces
appeared: there is the additional complicating factor of a possible early
composer's version from which descended some of the manuscript variations
from the print. Nevertheless, it is a reasonable assumption that any
discrepancies between the two versions were not great; and the risk of
them does not affect sources which are known or thought to be post-print
or print-derived.

The second starting-point is the survival of two concordant sources
copied by the same scribe. This phenomenon is not unique to Baldwin in the
present study: John Sadler's readings in Willmott/Ten.1486 and e.1-5 have
been discussed in the preceding pages. The advantage of knowing that two
sources are copied by the same scribe is that it is possible to speculate,
with more certainty than is allowable elsewhere, that their shared
contents were copied either from each other or from a common source. Thus,
when something, however precarious, is known about the mechanism of the
copying process, the characteristics of that process take on an added
significance. It becomes significant, for example, that a scribe's two
readings of the same piece differ over accidentals, underlay, and rhythmic
details, and that a scribe's two readings of his own piece show some of
these differences as well. 6

The unequivocal evidence of the texts has serious implications for
various recent theories, 7 which have sought to prove that more or less

6. See the discrepancies between the two readings of Baldwin's Coockow as
I me walked (transcriptions volume) -- slight, but present nevertheless.
7. See for example the discussion of Rapson's theories in Chapter 5.
strict systems are operating in areas such as manuscript accidentals. A scribe who is of major importance in the period — not in terms of professional influence, which can be surmised but not conclusively proved, but in terms of the quantity and variety of music which he transmitted — can be shown quite precisely to be providing an accidental in a certain type of context, and omitting it in an identical context on another occasion. He can be shown to distribute a particular word of text in a particular way in one reading, and a different way in another reading — and to spell it differently into the bargain.

Theories formulated in precise terms are not the only casualties in this process. More general observations such as Bray's 'each manuscript showed what it needed to show', are also called into question, since the basic inconsistency of so much detail in the texts would surely argue against a close connection with performance practice. Bray's statement takes no account of the fact that a manuscript might show something different every time, although he may be right in a (perhaps unintended) sense, in that performance practice must have accommodated itself to the vagaries of scribes.

What implications does the textual evidence have for the identification of inter-source relationships? Such relationships can be identified by two methods, both of which have limitations, and which cannot exist independently of each other. The concordance-based method, whose claims are advanced by Hofman, is useful for illuminating connections — based on patterns of contents — which are exceptionally striking and unequivocal; apart from these exceptions, however, the process is basically unreliable, owing to the incomplete survival of manuscripts. The evidence of the texts must be looked at as well, and here the problem arises of which evidence is directional evidence. Neither the concordance-based method, nor one which rests on associative variants drawn from a wide range of textual features, represents an adequate means of linking

manuscripts. Nor does the solution lie in the introduction of a replacement theory, for the textual evidence analysed in this dissertation invalidates the basic notion of a theory which will fit every case.

This may appear to be a negative conclusion, but it is a scientific one in that it falls in with the principle\textsuperscript{10} that no valid theory can be compatible with every possible result of observation. In a field where the available evidence is so limited, research must involve observation, conjecture and refutation; this dissertation has sought to emphasize evidence which upsets expectations and refutes conjectures (whether my own or those of others) as much as that which confirms the various theories and possibilities examined.

The lessons to be drawn from the study of this scribe and his contemporaries are that in every case -- for every piece, and every manuscript link -- it is necessary to combine the types of evidence available, and to take account of the ways in which they do and do not cohere; to acknowledge a hierarchy of evidence in every department, bearing in mind that these will vary with the sources; and to keep the context as wide as is possible and realistic, as only a wide span of evidence will eventually produce valid conclusions.

\textsuperscript{10} Articulated most fully in the work of Karl Popper: see, for example, Chapter 1 of his \textit{Conjectures and Refutations} (London, 1963, 2nd edn., 1965), especially pp.36-7, 51.
# Appendix One

## CONTENTS OF BALDWIN'S MANUSCRIPTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christ Church 979-83</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sheppard</td>
<td>Judica me Deus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sheppard</td>
<td>Beati omnes qui timent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sheppard</td>
<td>Deus misereatur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sheppard</td>
<td>Confitebor tibi Domine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Johnson</td>
<td>Domine in virtute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Van Wilder</td>
<td>Aspice Domine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sheppard</td>
<td>Laudem dicit Deo nostro 'for men'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Byrd</td>
<td>Domine Deus omnipotens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Byrd</td>
<td>O quam gloriosum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Byrd</td>
<td>Apparabit in finem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Stradbridge</td>
<td>Dum transisset Sabbatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Byrd</td>
<td>Audivi vocem dicentem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Byrd</td>
<td>Levensus corda nostra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Byrd</td>
<td>Peccavi super numerum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Byrd</td>
<td>Memento Domine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Byrd</td>
<td>O Domine adiuva me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Byrd</td>
<td>Domine exaudi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Byrd</td>
<td>Omne tempore benedic Dominum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Byrd</td>
<td>Ne perdas cum impiis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Byrd</td>
<td>Saeoris soleniis iuncta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Tallis</td>
<td>Dum transisset Sabbatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Taverner</td>
<td>Dum transisset Sabbatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Taverner</td>
<td>Dum transisset Sabbatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Sheppard</td>
<td>Spiritus sanctus procedens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Sheppard</td>
<td>Laudem dicit Deo nostro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Taverner</td>
<td>Te Deum laudamus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Tyte</td>
<td>Miserere mei Deus 'for men'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Hollander</td>
<td>Dum transisset Sabbatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Taverner and Tye</td>
<td>O splendor glorie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Wood</td>
<td>Exsurge Domine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Byrd</td>
<td>Vide Domine afflictionem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. J. Mundy</td>
<td>Edes nostra sancta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Composer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>W. Mundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Daemon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Tallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Tallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Tallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Ferrabosco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Tallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Fayrfax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Taverner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Taverner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Taverner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Taverner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Testassus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>J. Mundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Parsons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Parsons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>W. Mundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Tallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Anon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>W. Mundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>W. Mundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Tallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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71. White
Miserere mei Deus

72. W. Mundy
Memor esto verbi tui

73. W. Mundy
Sive vigilem sive dormiam

74. Parsons
Peccantem me quotidie

75. W. Mundy
Videte miraculum

76. Sheppard
[Christe qui lux es et dies]

77. W. Mundy
Veni Creator

78. Sheppard
[Christe qui lux es et dies]

79. Sheppard
[Eterne Rex altissimae]

80. Sheppard
[Jesus Salvator seculi, Redemptor]

81. Sheppard
[Deus tuorum militum]

82. Sheppard
[Christe Redemptor omnium]

83. Sheppard
[Deus tuorum militum]

84. Tallis
[Quod chorus vatum]

85. Tallis
[Ex Christus astrea]

86. Tallis
[Jesus Salvator seculi, Verbum]

87. Tallis
[Salvator mundi, Domine]

88. W. Mundy
[A solis ortus cardine]

89. Parsons
[Libera me] Domine de morte

89a. Byrd
Canon (981 only)

90. Sheppard
[Iusti autem] in perpetuum vivent

91. Sheppard
[Impetum] fecerunt unanimes

92. Sheppard
[Sancte Dei preciosae]

93. Tallis
[Homo] quidam fecit

94. Sheppard
[Non conturbetur] oor vestrum

95. Sheppard
[Christi Virgo] dilectissima

96. Sheppard
[Non conturbetur] oor vestrum

97. Sheppard
[Reges Tharsii] et insulae

98. Sheppard
[Sancte Dei preciosae]

99. Redford
[Sancte Dei preciosae]

100. White
Ad te levavi oculos

101. Ferrabosco
Da pacem

102. Anon
Ecce nunc benedicite

103. Anon
Ecce nunc benedicite

104. Damon
Predicabo laudes

105. Damon
Omnis caro gramen sit

106. Tallis
[Loquebantur variis linguis]

107. Sheppard
[Beata nobis gaudia]
108. Sheppard  

109. Sheppard  

110. Sheppard  

111. Sheppard  

112. Sheppard  

113. Sheppard  

114. Sheppard  

115. Sheppard  

116. Sheppard  

117. Sheppard  

118. Sheppard  

119. Tallis  

120. Tye  

121. Tye  

122. Tye  

123. White  

124. White  

125. W. Mundy  

126. White  

127. Parsons  

128. W. Mundy  

129. White  

130. W. Mundy  

131. White  

132. Parsons  

133. Taverner  

134. White  

135. W. Mundy  

136. W. Mundy  

137. W. Mundy  

138. Byrd  

139. Byrd  

140. Byrd  

141. Byrd  

142. Byrd  

143. Byrd  

144. Sheppard  

145. Sheppard
146. Sheppard
Haec dies quam fecit Dominus

147. Tallis
Videte miraculum

148. Gerard
Sive vigilem sive dormiam

149. Sheppard
Filiae Jerusalem venite

150. Sheppard
Dum transisset Sabbatum

151. Sheppard
Salvator mundi Domine

152. Sheppard
Jesus Salvator seculi, Verbum

153. Parsons
Iam Christus astra

154. Sheppard
Libera nos, salva nos

155. Sheppard
Libera nos, salva nos

156. J. Mundy
Dum transisset Sabbatum

157. Byrd
(No words)

158. Parsons
(No words)

159. Demon
(No words)

160. Taverner
Quemadmodum (no further words)

161. Baldwin
Redime me Domine

162. Baldwin
Pater noster

163. Aston
Aston's Maske

164. Baldwin
Fancy

165. Bevin
Browning

166. White
Christe qui lux es et dies

167a. Johnson
Laudes Deo dicam (982 only)

167b. J. Mundy
Lamentations (not in 982)

168a. Taverner
Ecce mater nostra (in 982 only)

168b. White
Lamentations Heth (not in 982)

169. Baldwin
Cuckow as I me walked

This list follows Bray's example in designating a piece by the title of its first verse. If a piece does not appear in all the part-books it is not given a new number, but is designated a or b. The numbering itself follows that in the manuscript, which is apparently in Baldwin's hand. The source is not foliated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ferrabosco</td>
<td>Miserere nostri Domine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Darnon</td>
<td>Miserere nostri Domine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Marenzio</td>
<td>Fuggito e' il sonno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Marenzio</td>
<td>Senza il mio vago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Marenzio</td>
<td>O giorno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Marenzio</td>
<td>Fiere silvestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Marenzio</td>
<td>Ecco che un'altra volta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Marenzio</td>
<td>E se di vero Amore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Marenzio</td>
<td>Com'ogni rio che d'acque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Marenzio</td>
<td>Valli riposte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Marenzio</td>
<td>Basti fin qui le pene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Marenzio</td>
<td>O fere stelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Marenzio</td>
<td>Se la mia vita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Marenzio</td>
<td>Fianglo ch'Amor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Marenzio</td>
<td>Affliger chi per voi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Marenzio</td>
<td>O voi che sospirati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Marenzio</td>
<td>Dolorosi martir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>De Monte</td>
<td>Super flumina babilonis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Taverner</td>
<td>In nomine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Golder</td>
<td>In nomine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
<td>Quomodo cantabimus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
<td>Peccantem me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
<td>Aspice Domine quaia facta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
<td>Attollite portas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Ferrabosco</td>
<td>Vias tuas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Giles</td>
<td>Vestigia mea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Giles</td>
<td>Tibi soli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
<td>My soule oppress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
<td>Domine quis habitabit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Tye</td>
<td>Amavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
<td>Memento Domine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
<td>Tristicia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
<td>Sed tu Domine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Ferrabosco</td>
<td>Ultimi me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Ferrabosco</td>
<td>Salva me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Ferrabosco(?)</td>
<td>Christe redemtor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37. White  
Deus misereator
38. White  
Letentur et ex
39. W. Mundy  
Adolescentulus
40. W. Mundy  
Tribulacio
41. J. Mundy  
Indica me Deus
42. Sheppard  
Hec dies
43. Taverner  
Et expecto
44. Taverner  
Osanna
45. Tallis  
Ioquebantur variis linguis
46. J. Mundy  
In nomine
47. J. Mundy  
In nomine
48. J. Mundy  
In nomine
49. J. Mundy  
In nomine
50. Morley  
Gaude Maria Virgo
51. Morley  
Virgo prudentissima
52. Byrd  
Ne irascaris Domine
53. Byrd  
Civitas
54. Byrd  
Tribulaciones
55. Byrd  
Timor
56. Byrd  
Nos enim
57. Byrd  
Omni tempore
58. Byrd  
Memor esto
59. Byrd  
Ne perdas
60. Byrd  
Eripe me
61. Taverner  
(No words)
62. Parsons  
Libera me Domine
63. Parsons  
Dies illa
64. Byrd  
Aspice Domine de sede
65. Byrd  
Respice Domine
66. Byrd  
O quam gloriosam
67. Byrd  
Benedictio
68. Bull  
Deus omnipotens
69. Bull  
I ame feeble
70. Byrd  
in thee O lorde
70a Byrd  
that we shulde
70b Byrd  
the holy church
70c Byrd  
that we beinge
71. Sheppard  
that we beinge
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72. Baldwin</td>
<td>In nomine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72a. Byrd</td>
<td>And ye childe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72b. Byrd</td>
<td>yt we should be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Later hand</td>
<td>If reson did rule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Later hand</td>
<td>The batcheler most joyfully</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Anon</td>
<td>If ye be meris and trye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Anon</td>
<td>Dicant nunc Judei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Byrhchley</td>
<td>Agnus Dei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Aston</td>
<td>Dicant nunc Judei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Johnson</td>
<td>Dicant nunc Judei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Gore</td>
<td>Dicant nunc Judei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Anon</td>
<td>Ego sum panis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Anon</td>
<td>Sancti spiritus Domine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Anon</td>
<td>Jesu Salvator mundi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Johnson</td>
<td>Laudes Deo dicam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Johnson</td>
<td>Dicant nunc Judei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Anon</td>
<td>Agnus Dei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Bar / ber</td>
<td>Agnus Dei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Anon</td>
<td>Agnus Dei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Anon</td>
<td>Agnus Dei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Baldwin</td>
<td>a duo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Taverner</td>
<td>In women is rest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Baldwin</td>
<td>a duo upon ut re mi fa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. T. Woodson</td>
<td>Upon ut re mee fa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Baldwin</td>
<td>a duo upon ut re mee fa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Giles</td>
<td>a duo of 38 proporcions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Anon</td>
<td>Exaudi me a duo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Anon</td>
<td>holde faste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Bedyngeham</td>
<td>Vide Domine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Anon</td>
<td>Parce Domine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Bedyngeham</td>
<td>Manus Dei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. Bedyngeham</td>
<td>Salva Jhesu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Anon</td>
<td>a duo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. Giles</td>
<td>In te Domine speravi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. Baldwin</td>
<td>Spes mea a duo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. Baldwin</td>
<td>In manus tuas Domine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. Anon</td>
<td>Libera nos / salva nos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>[Anon]</td>
<td>/Libera nos/ salva nos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Giles</td>
<td>Salvator mundi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>Sermone blando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Tye</td>
<td>Sit fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>[Anon]</td>
<td>/3/ Kiries of 3 voc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>O lux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Ferrabosco</td>
<td>Ut re mi fa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>A fancie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Bevin</td>
<td>a browning of 3 voc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>a browninge of 3 voc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>O lux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>Upon in nomine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>Coockow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>upon the plainsong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>(No words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>proportions to the minum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Byrd</td>
<td>[Three-part Mass]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Taverner</td>
<td>Gaude plurimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Taverner</td>
<td>Bundem igitur Iesum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Sheppard</td>
<td>Illustrissima omnium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>[Anon]</td>
<td>Genitum non factum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>J. Mundy</td>
<td>Dominus illuminacio mea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Exsurge Domine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>W. Mundy</td>
<td>Noli emulari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>W. Mundy</td>
<td>Vox Patris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>W. Mundy</td>
<td>Maria Virgo sanctissima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Giles</td>
<td>Quis est homo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Esto pater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Parsons</td>
<td>In manus tuas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Perfice illud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Taverner</td>
<td>Traditur militibus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>W. Mundy</td>
<td>Ex quibus personis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>W. Mundy</td>
<td>Adhesit pavimento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>W. Mundy</td>
<td>Surge propera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Taverner</td>
<td>Tam peccatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Verbi fui fulminibus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Taverner</td>
<td>Virgo pura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Parsons</td>
<td>Magnus es Domine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>[Fayrfax]</td>
<td>Rex amabilis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
146. Tye
Et cum pro nobis
147. Taverner
Iesu aspès penitentibus
148. Taverner
O splendor glorie
149. Taverner
Gloriosa Domine
150. Taverner
Prudens virgo taces
151. Taverner
Tu ad liberaundum
152. Taverner
Te angelorum domina
153. Sheppard
Ergo Sathan mors peccatum
154. Tye
Domine Deus celestis
155. Tye
Da illi Domine pectus tuo
156. Tye
In quo corrigitis
157. /\mon/
In corde meo abscondi
158. White
Manus tuae fecerunt me
159. /\mon/
Ut te laudare prevamus
160. /\mon/
Quare pro nobis
161. /\mon/
Maria plena virtute
162. /\mon/
Rex amabilis
163. Tallis
Gaudé gloria
164. Fayrfax
Ave summe eternitatis
165. Tallis
Gaudé Virgo Maria
166. Fayrfax
Ave Dei Patris Filia
167. Taverner
Gaudé Maria Virgo
168. Taverner
Gaudé Maria Iesu Mater
169. Sheppard
Inclina Domine aurem tuam
170. Tallis
Tu nimimum universas
171. Tallis
Anne materis sanctissima
172. Tallis
Per haec nos
173. Byrd
Alleluia confitemini
174. Byrd
Cunctis diebus
175. /\Byrd/
Infelix ego
176-9. Thorne
Stella celi
180-4. Thorne
Stells celi
185. Cooper
O crux gloriosa
186. Moorecooke
Gloria laus
187. Digon
Ad lapidis posicionem
188. Digon
Rex benedicte tuos
189. Henry VIII
Quam pulchra es
190. Baldwin
Iff reson did rule
191. Bevin
I had both monye & a frende
192. Baldwin  In the merie moeth of maye
193. Baldwin  Lorde whoe shall dwell
194. Giles     Out of the deep
195. Baldwin  Save me O God
196. Baldwin  Beholde how good
197. Baldwin  Three things ther be
198. Bevin    Lord whoe shall dwell
199. Bevin    By mirthe much sicknes
200. Sheppard What conforte at thy death
201. Marbeck  A virgine and mother
202. Sheppard Steven firste after Christe
203. Wylkynson  Jhesus autem transiens

This list of contents follows Bray's numbering in order to facilitate the detailed discussion of his theories in Chapter One of this study.

The source is foliated, in a more recent hand than Baldwin's.
My Ladye Nevells Booke

All pieces are by Byrd.

1. my ladye nevells grownde
2. Qui pases for my ladye nevell
3. the marche before the battell
4. the battell
5. the galliarde for the victorie
6. the barelye breake
7. a galliars gygge
8. the hunes upp
9. ut re mi fa sol la
10. the firste pavian
11. the galliarde to the same
12. the second pavian
13. the galliarde to the same
14. the third pavian
15. the galliarde to the same
16. the fourth pavian
17. the galliarde to the same
18. the fifth pavian
19. the galliarde to the same
20. the sixte pavian: Kinbrugh goodd
21. the galliarde to the same
22. the seventh pavian
23. the eighte pavian
24. the nynthe pavian
25. the galliarde to the same
26. A voluntarie for my ladye nevell
27. will yow walke the woodes soo wylde
28. the maidens songe
29. A lesson of voluntarie
30. the seconde grownde
31. have with yow to walsingame
32. all in a garden grine
33. lord willobies welcome home
34. the carmans whistle
35. hugh ashton's gromde
36. A fancie: for my ladye nev ell
37. sellingers rownde
38. mansers almaine
39. the tenthe pavian: mr. w. peter
40. the galliarde to the same
41. A fancie
42. A voluntarie
Appendix Two

ARCHIVAL MATERIAL RELATING TO BALDWIN,
ST GEORGE'S CHAPEL, WINDSOR

1575-6: records are mutilated; no mention of Baldwin discernible.

Between 1575-6 & 1586-7: gap in records.

1586-7 (WR XV 59 13): Baldwin paid 20/- (stipend), along with Sandland, Needeham, Newcombe, Wood, Rouse, Randall, Carleton, John Mundaye [Mundy], West. Baldwin paid 20/- 'pro scriptione sacrarum cantionum'. Mundy and Newcombe paid 20/- each for playing organ ('pulsanti organum / sufflatione organum').

1587-8 (WR XV 59 14): no mention of Baldwin.

1588-9 (WR XV 59 15): Baldwin paid 20/- (stipend) along with Needeham, Wood, Randall, Carleton, Mundy, West, Reve, Churchman, Woodson, Ballarget, Langford. Baldwin paid 20/- 'pro scriptione sacrarum cantionum'. Mundy and Newcombe again paid 20/- each for playing the organ.

1589-90 (WR XV 59 16): Baldwin paid 20/- (stipend) along with same clerks as previous year. Baldwin paid 20/- 'pro scriptione sacrarum cantionum'. Mundy and Newcombe again paid 20/- for playing organ, and Bell 20/- for repairing it.

1590-91 (WR XV 59 17): Robert Johnson [?] and Thomas Whyte [?] paid 20/- each (pension). Baldwin paid 20/- (stipend) along with same clerks as previous year, except for Ballarget who is paid separately on the same list. Baldwin paid 20/- again for copying; Mundy and Newcombe paid the same amount for organ playing, and Bell for organ repairs.

1591-2 (WR XV 59 18): Mutilated. The list of payment for services, however, is complete enough to show that Baldwin was not paid for any copying this year — and nobody else replaced him. Mundy is mentioned again for organ playing, assisted this time by John Rogers.

1592-3 (WR XV 59 19): No mention of Baldwin. Instead: '20/- . . . Leonardus pro scriptione sacrarum cantionum hoc anno, pro primo anno trium annorum sequentium [e]n gratia et concessione' (underlined words are in a lighter
ink). Mundy mentioned again for organ playing, assisted by John Rogers.

Two Later Records

WR XV 2 165: Bond from Thomas Ford of Islington, esq. to the Dean and Canons of the royal free Chapel of St George, Windsor, in six hundred pounds in the demise of the Rectory and parsonage of Iplepen. Signed and sealed, in the presence of Henr. Harys, John Baldwinne and William Micaker. 16 May, 1594.

Appendix Three

BALDWIN’S POEM IN R.M.24.d.2.

Reede here, behold and see: all that musicions bee:—’ anno‘1591’
what is in closde, heere in: declare I will begine:—’ iulij‘25’

A store housse of treasure: this booke maye be saiede:—’
of songes most excelente: and the beste that is made:—’
collected and chosen: out of the best autours:—’
bothe stranger and englishe borne: which be the best makers:—’
and skilfulst in musicke: the scyence to sett foorthe:—’
as herein you shall finde: if you will speake the truth:—'
there is here no badd songe: but the best can be hadd:—’
the cheefest from all men: yea there is not one badd:—’
and such sweete musicke: as dothe much delite yeelde:—’
bothe unto men at home: and birds abroade in fielde:—’
the autours for to name: I maye not here for gett:—’
but will them now downe put: and all in order sett:—’
I will begine with white: shepper, tye, and tallis:—’
parsons, gyles, mundie th,oulde: one of the queenes pallis:—’
mundie yonge, th,oulde mans sonne: and like wyse others moe:—’
there names would be to longe: therefore I let them goe:—’
yet must I speake of moe: even of straingers also:—’
and firste I must bringe in: alfonso delasse:—’ ferabosco:—’
a strainger borne hee was: in italie as I heere:—’
Italians saie of hime: in skill hee had no peere:—’
luca merensio: with others manie moe:—’
as philipp demonte: th,emperous man also:—’
and orlando by name: and eeeke trequillion:—’
cipriano rore: and also andreon:—’
All famus in there arte: there is of that no doute:—’
there workes no lesse declare: in everie place aboute:—’
yet let not straingers bragg: nor they these soe commende:—’
for they maye now geve place: and sett them selves behynde:—’
an englishe man, by name: will‘m birde for his skill:—’
which I should haue sett first: for soe it was my will:

whose greate skill and knowledge: doth excelle all at this tyme:

and farre to strange co[ntries]: abroade his skill dothe shyne:

famus men be abroade: and skilfull in the arte:

I doe confesse the same: and will not from it starte:

but in ewropp is none: like to our englishe man:

which doth so farre exceede: as trulie I it scan:

as ye can not finde out: his equale in all things:

throwghe out the world so wide: and so his fame now ringes:

With fingers and with penne: hee hath not now his peere:

for in this world so wide: is none can him come neere:

the rarest man hee is: in musicks worthye arte:

that now on earthe dothe liue: I speake it from my harte:

or heere to fore hathe bene: or after him shall come:

none such I feare shall rise: that maye be calde his sonne:

O famus man of skill: and judgemente greate profounde:

lett heaven and earth ringe out: thy worthye praise to sownde:

nay lett thy skill it selfe: thy worthie fame recorde:

to all posteritie: thy due deserte afforde:

and lett them all which heere: of thy greate skill then saie:

fare well fare well thou prince: of musicke now and aye:

fare well I saie fare well: fare well and heere I end:

fare well melodious birde: fare well sweete musicks frende:

all these things doe I speake: not for rewarde or bribe:

nor yet to flatter him: or sett him upp in pride:

nor for affeccion: or owght might moue there towe:

but even the truth reporte: and that make knowne to yowe:

Loe heere I end fare well: comittinge all to god:

who kepe us in his grace: and shilde us from his rodd:

finis: Jo: baldwine:
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