



**Spring, M. (2013) 'The bass viol in the mixed consort.' Galpin Society Conference. Oxford, UK. 25 - 29 July 2013.
Unpublished conference paper.**

ResearchSPAce

<http://researchspace.bathspa.ac.uk/>

Your access and use of this document is based on your acceptance of the ResearchSPAce Metadata and Data Policies, as well as applicable law:-

<https://researchspace.bathspa.ac.uk/policies.html>

Unless you accept the terms of these Policies in full, you do not have permission to download this document.

This cover sheet may not be removed from the document.

Please scroll down to view the document.

The Bass Viol in the Mixed Consort – Matthew Spring, Bath Spa University

Abstract

A glance at the only surviving printed part-book for the bass viol from the set mixed consort books of Thomas Morley (1599/1611) is rather a disappointment. In many pieces role for that instrument is limited to that of sustaining the bass line of the lute, especially in the repeated passages where the lute is given elaborate divisions. However the manuscript books for the Walsingham Consort Books and more particularly the Cambridge Consort Books associated with Mathew Holmes and Richard Reade reveal a more varied role. In some piece, and especially those of Richard Allison and Daniel Bacheler, the bass viol alternates with the bandora in providing a bass line for subgroupings among the remaining four instruments. As Sydney Beck pointed out in the 1959 introduction to his edition of Morley's Book, there are a few pieces, notably *Lachrimae Pavin* and *James, His Galliard* in the Cambridge Consort bass viol book that give alternative elaborate divisions for the bass viol. This paper explores the musical roles the bass viol is given in the surviving sources of mixed consort music, and considers how the bass viol player might supply simultaneous divisions to enliven the more mundane bass lines of much of the surviving repertoire.

1. Introduction

Any comprehensive consideration of the Tudor Viol needs to include the role of the instrument outside of its context within a whole consorts, or as solo instrument. Certainly from the 1570s the treble and bass viol developed roles within the English mixed consort as melodic instruments in an ensemble that, in its mature form, made a feature of contrasted timbres and textures. This in itself set it against the prevailing tradition of like consorts. Here the bass viol developed an independent role as a sustaining instrument that presaged to its wide usage as the bass line for continuo purposes. However anyone who has played the bass-viol in the mixed-consort of six as required for Morley's *The First Booke of Consort Lessons* (1599), might feel a little jealous of the other players. The lute part is often virtuosic in the extreme, the violin/treble viol has the lead melodic part, with some written-in divisions and sections in which the violin is used to answer and exchange ideas with the lute. The flute part is quite independent of all other parts, providing a foil to the main melody. The bandora and cittern parts though mainly functional in providing harmonic filler do get a degree of rhythmic interest in the repetition of chords, and moments of melodic interest in some places. Seemingly only the bass-viol player has a purely functional role in providing a simple continuous bass in unadorned long notes without even the small linking notes and repetitions of notes that the lute and Bandora have in their bass notes. Even this simple line is not entrusted to the bass viol alone as the line is often doubled an octave below by the bandora and by the lute at the unison. Morley's bass-viol book is the shortest in terms of pages, repeated passages are seldom written out and the part is quite restricted in range – normally from low F on the bottom string to Bb a whole tone below middle c – i.e. the notes of the bass clef stave plus one note below and above

(there is the odd exception as in the momentary). The low D is avoided at cadences when it could be used and the top string not used at all.

Slide A. Title-page of Morley's Lessons.

This leads to the central question of this paper - whether the bass viol player should do more and add his own divisions or variations to the written line. Should the bass viol player step out of this functional role and elaborate. This paper considers the evidence for this, it considers the three surviving sources and the role the bass viol takes within the repertoire as a whole. The manuscript books for the Walsingham Consort Books and more particularly the Cambridge Consort Books associated with Mathew Holmes and Richard Reade do reveal perhaps a more varied role. In some piece, and especially those of Richard Allison and to some extent Daniel Bacheler, the bass viol alternates with the bandora in providing a bass for subgroupings among the remaining four instruments. As Sydney Beck pointed out in the introduction to his 1959 edition of Morley's Book, there are a few pieces, notably *Lachrimae Pavin* and *James, His Galliard* in the Holmes consort bass viol book that give alternative elaborate divisions for the bass viol. This paper considers how the bass viol player might supply simultaneous divisions to enliven the more mundane bass lines of much of the surviving repertoire.

2. The Books and the Commentators

There are five surviving sets of English Mixed Consort Music, the two editions of Morley's *The First Booke* (1599 and 1611), Rosseter's single edition of *Lessons for Consort* (1609) and the Holmes and Walsingham manuscripts sets.¹ None of the five sets are complete in themselves, though through shared repertoire and a number of other sources that contain consort parts, complete parts for a good number can be assembled. The Holmes set may be the remnants of two sets as it is so often inconsistent within the pieces. Of the five sets only three have bass-viol parts, Morley's 1599 set (GB-Lbl K. I. i. 21); the Walsingham set (Brynmor Jones Library, Hull University, MS DDHO/20/3) and the Cambridge set (GB-CU Dd. 5. 20). Though rather different Leighton's *Tearcs and Lamentations of a Sorrowfull Soul* (1614) gives parts for the consort of six for a number of its items; and Richard Allison's *Psalmes of David in Meeter ... to be plaide upon the Lute, Orpharyon, Citterne or Basse Violl, severally or altogether* (1599) includes most of the instruments and the flute and treble viol could play from the vocal parts. The Walsingham books are dated 1588 and Holmes set must date from around the late 1580s to the mid 1590s. The published sets are 1599/11 and 1609 with Leighton's the last in 1614.

Many significant musicologists have studied the mixed consort repertoire and commented on its significance in the transition from renaissance to baroque. Morley's set was known of by Burney in the 18th century, who attempted a reconstruction of some pieces, and by Chappell in the 19th. In the 20th century Franck Bridge and Canon Galpin also attempted a reconstructions. However it was Sidney Beck's work in the 1930s that lead eventually to the New York Publication Library edition of 1959. Others who worked on the genre were

¹ Spring, M. *The Lute in Britain* (OUP, 2001), 173.

Richard Newton and Thurston Dart. However the work of Ian Harwood in the 1960s then Lyle Nordstrum and Warwick Edwards in the 1970s significantly improved our knowledge of the area with a number of articles and editions. Ian Harwood revived his interest in the genre from the 1990s and was working on a new book on the subject of the mixed consort up to his death in 2010– a work that is to be published with the help of David Van Edwards.

3. Morley's First Booke

Morley's *First Booke* of 1599 is arguably the most influential of the surviving mixed consort sources, and the most complete. The appearance of the 1611 reprint, eight years after Morley's death, in a 'newly corrected and enlarged' edition published by John Brown, argues strongly for its commercial success. Morley was at pains to say in his 1599 introduction how carefully he had prepared the edition and though he does not acknowledge other composers he says he has kept the composers 'best interests at heart, whose works that I might not abase in devoting them a meane patron, now abvse the workers in ioyning them discords for the their true descant.' In the title page he mentions that 'a Gentle-man, had funded the 'cost and charges' 'for his private pleasure, and for others his frendes which delight in Musicke'. Who this patron might be has never been agreed upon though Richard Allison has frequently been suggested. The first edition contains 23 pieces, five of which were by Allison, and the 1611 edition a further two new pieces, both by Allison. Was Allison the gentleman patron of the first edition and the moving force behind the second? He above all others was responsible for developing the genre, producing most of the extended pieces with varied instrumental combinations, and it is believed on good foundation was the guiding force behind Bacheler's 16 year-old efforts in the Walsingham books. If so why did he not advertise his efforts better? Morley is usually given the credit for the totality of the arrangements, but this seems odd given that he was no plucked specialist and must have relied on others for this aspect of the work.

Morley places the larger and more difficult pieces among the first 12 in his book, then progresses to the simpler and more popular. The two Allison pieces added to the 1611 edition as nos. 24 and 25 (The Batchelor's Delight and Response Pavin). In these pieces and in a number of others Allison pieces (De Trombe, Allisons Knell, Go from my window), the possibilities of pitting different groupings of instruments answering each other are exploited. Here the bass viol player has a real chance of being heard and is not doubled by other instruments, though the bass viol players gets little in the way of running divisions of rhythmic repetition of notes.

Slide B. Morley's dedication from Beck's Edition

However the real interest in how the bass viol player should approach his part lies in Morley's Dedication to the Lord Mayor of London (1589-99), Sir Stephen Soame In it he says with reference to the London Waits:

'But as the ancient custome is of this most honourable and renowned Cittie hath beene ever, to retaine and maintane excellent and expert Musitians, to adorne your Honors fauors, Feast and solemne meetings: to those your Lordships Waits, after

the commending these my labors to your Honorable patronage: I recommend the same to your seruants carefull and skilfull handling: that the wants of exquisite harmony apparent being left unsupplied, for breuitie of Proportions, may be executed by their melodious additions, purposing hereafter to giue them more testimonie of my love towards them. '

Here Morley seems to be giving the expert musicians of the City Waits and such skilled professionals licence to add 'exquisite harmony' and 'melodious additions' to his arrangements. On this last point he also says touching his arrangements 'they be not curious: for that men may by diligence make use of them: and the exquisite Musitians may adde in the handling of them to his greater commendation.' Thus saying that he has not made them too tricky, so that they can be accessible by diligence to those less able, but that the experts can freely add more to them.

In Beck's edition are places where the bass does have a small degree of variation and elaboration in the repeat sections (e.g., octave displacement in the repeats of De la Trombe – Lord of Oxenford's March) which he includes as small notes. These are Beck's ideas though they are to some extent based on comparative sources. Thus the alternative octaves in De la Trombe are found in the Holmes set.

Slide C. Pages from De la Trombe – Beck's editorial alterations.

4. Rosseter's Lessons for Consort

Slide D. Title Page – Lessons for Consort

Rosseter's set has survived the least well and there is no bass viol book. His book is the last to appear (1609) and was dedicated to Sir Willaim Gasycoyne of Sedbury Hall, who maintained a household with musicians 'such as can lively express them'. Yet in 1609 he became responsible for the troupe which received a royal patent under the name 'The Children of the Queen's Revel's and it is fitting to think that he would have taught his boys to perform mixed-consort music from the books. Unlike Morley, Rosseter is careful to attribute composers' names to his pieces. There is no reason to believe that the bass part book would have contained anything but an unelaborated functional bass-viol part.

5. Leighton and Allison

Slide E – Allison's Psalms table-book format

Allison's 1599 *Psalms of Dauid in meter*, requires only a bandora part to make them, like 18 of Leighton's set, performable by a mixed consort, as they were published with lute and cittern parts. Here the bass viol would take the bottom part, the treble viol with top with the flute on the alto. The title page allowed that 'The Plaine Song being the common tunne and plaide vpon the Lute, Orpharion, Citterne or Base Violl, seuerally or altogether, the singing part to be either Tenor or Treble to the instrument, according to the nature of the voice, of for foure voices.' Leighton is explicit on this point 'Cantus with the treble violl', 'Altus with the flute', and Bassus with a Basse Violl'. The bass part as expected is simply the vocal bass without any attempt at idiomatic instrumental writing.

Why Allison did not include a bandora part may be to do with the format. Even with the table book format there is really very little space to get 4 vocal parts plus tablatures onto the page. Squeezing in another tablature part may have been too much for the page. It also suggests that the consort was not always quite as fixed as we might think it.

Slide F – Leighton's Teares page in table book format

6. Walsingham Bass Viol Book

Slide G – Title-page from Walsingham bass viol book

Happily there is a bass viol book from the Walsingham set. Quite possibly this is the earliest of all the sets to be started as a couple of pieces are dated 1588. Through the work of Anne Batchelor it has been shown that the hand is that of Walsingham's page the 15 year-old Daniel Bachelor and the supposition is that it was compiled as part of Bachelor's musical education under watchful eye of Richard Allison – a musician most probably employed in the Walsingham household or at least brought in to supervise young Daniel's education. The book is superbly executed with a logical title-page that shows it was a finished copy. Of the 34 pieces listed at the front 2 are missing (25, 26) though space has been allowed for them. Both in some of Bachelor's pieces and those of Allison the bass has moments of real interest. For instance the repeated fs of the final part of piece 2 Sir Francis Waslingham's Goodnight by Bachelor are given to bass viol alone under the combination of flute, lute and cittern.

Slide H Walsingham bass viol – page show pieces 1 and 2.

7. The Holmes/Oxford set

The set of consort books in the hand to Mathew Holmes are the most instructive in understanding the development of the mixed consort genre. In the work done by Ian Harwood before he died (and communicated to me by Stewart McCoy) Ian developed the idea that the books that survive as parts of two sets – thus the bass viol and recorder were part of one set and the lute book and cittern part of another. The books were part of the music activities undertaken by Holmes, Reade and possibly others on behalf of the Christ Church boys to prepare them for possible employment as musicians after their voices had broken and they needed to find their way in the world. As they stand the books are something of jumble and may well include the work of boys as part of the operation.

The English duet repertoire is closely related to that of the mixed consort. In this set we have pieces that are clearly little removed from the treble and ground divisions. Many pieces exist in versions for both combinations, and many of the sources that contain duets (Dd.3.18, Marsh, Folger, and Trumbull manuscripts in particular) also have lute consort parts. Nordstrom put forward the plausible theory that the duet treble of the 1560s and 70s gave rise to the consort lesson. (Lyle Nordstrom, 'The English Lute Duet', 5-22.) Since his work it has become clear that the activities of John and Edward Johnson were almost closely involved in the developing the mixed consort out of the lute duet. Thus

in this first stage of the development of the genre the potential monotony of the ground was relieved by alternative instrumentation. The Marsh MS contains bandora grounds. Further instruments could join in - the bass viol on the bass line and the treble viol with a melody on top. Dd.5.20 has a good number of basic grounds some of which work with the trebles in Dd.3.18 (Green Garters) others do not (Callinoe). Some seem to correct but are in the wrong key (New Hunts Up) – however they are so simple the bass viol player may have been able to transpose them to fit without having it written out again. These grounds are the most basic of all the material and were perhaps the starting point for beginners. Green Garters is an example of a treble and bass ground – in Holmes with a part for lute, bass and recorder.

In the second stage of development (around 1575?), bi-partite and tri-partite dances were found to be more suitable, as the parts then had two or three sections of different material instead of one, and the lute could vary the sections by playing the duet treble like single-line divisions on the repeats of each section. Further expansion of the ensemble occurred with the addition of the cittern to supplement the harmonic framework supplied by the bandora, and the flute to play an inner part sounding an octave higher than written. The use of the flute in this way was known in France as early as the 1530s, and may well have been known in England. The lute then made the crucial move from doubling the soprano line in its upper part to playing a second inner line. In its mature form the music of the mixed consort can then be divided into four parts. The soprano line is taken by the treble viol and the bass by the bass viol. Inner parts are taken by the flute and the lute (with its own supporting harmonies on the opening statements of the multi-partite dances, and divisions on the repeats). The cittern and bandora add rhythm and harmonic support, with the bandora doubling the bass an octave below with its bottom line.

Characteristic of the mature style of mixed consort piece is the contrasting of different instrumental groupings. This is especially so in the last section of some pavans and galliards where the lute and violin/viol often answer each other in 'reporting style' (e.g. Nordstrom's contention is that this answering or echoing between pairs or groups of instruments is then mimicked in the equal duet.) Thus the answering devices of so many equal duets developed out of the imitation found in mixed consort music. Possible examples of consort lessons being re-arranged as equal lute duets are 'Duncomb's Galliard', 'Squires Galliard' and the 'De La Tromba Pavan'. Where pieces exist in arrangements for several different genres the process of interactive development is difficult to disentangle and may only be guessed. Examples of this are Johnson's 'Flat Pavan' and Allison's 'De la Tromba Pavan', which exist in versions for solo lute, duet lutes, and for mixed consort. These final sections in answering style then gave rise in the later 1580s to the varied combinations of groupings found only in the pieces of Allison, and few of those by Batchelor and Read and typified by Allison's 'De la Trombe', and 'Go from my Window'. In this last the bandora and bass viol alternate and exchange phrases under the division exchanges between lute and treble viol.

Among the pieces in Holmes's consort books there are quite a number for which parts are absent for one or more of the instruments, and in several pieces,

e.g. 'Alysons Pauen', only the lute part survives. It has been suggested that not all the pieces were for the full consort of six. The lute book (Dd.3.18) contains some 60 possible consort parts in addition to the duet trebles. As no lute book survives from the other sets, apart from the Bodleian Rosseter fragments, and consort lute parts from solo sources are few and often poor, this book is of vital importance to our knowledge of mixed consort music. The book supplies lute parts to many of the pieces in the other collections, and the models for those that have to be reconstructed. Apart from the consort lute parts with no other surviving parts, there are pieces that may be duos or trios, and some lute parts that are simply repeated in the manuscript. Though we suppose the Oxford group that Holmes was involved with after 1588 was normally for lute, cittern, bass viol, recorder, violin and bandora, there are indications in the music which suggest the group may have varied from time to time (use of the flute).

The Holmes consort books contain the greatest diversity of piece types. The most frequently attributed composer is Richard Reade. Reade's attributions in Dd.3.18 includes 24 consort pieces, and 4 duets which, from comments in the book, appear to be intended for a trio of three wire-strung instruments (orphanions are mentioned), doubled by viols. Though no third tablature exists to expand these duets into trios the third part may have been included in the lost bandora book. (Nordstrum, 'The Cambridge Consort Books', 95.) Reade received his Bachelor of Music degree on July 7th 1592. As he is never given this title by Holmes, it has been suggested that all the consort pieces attributed to him, and indeed most of Holmes's consort collection, were put together in the years 1588-1592. (Nordstrom, 'The Cambridge Consort Books', 77.) Certainly it seems that Holmes's meeting with Reade, together with the fact that Reade was evidently prepared to supply music for a mixed consort, was the spur that got the Oxford mixed consort project launched.

Conclusion

The Holmes consort books like those of Bachelier and possibly also Rosseter are associated with teaching. It seems that the mixed consort was seen as a suitable genre in which to involve boys in the playing, coping and even composing of music. Yet we know that the music was played in great houses and by professional waits and it may be that we have rather one-sided a false picture of the parts as they have come down to us. Perhaps we should take Morley at his word and regard them as a template on which more advanced and able players could freely elaborate. There are many instances in the more developed pieces where simultaneous divisions among the between lute, treble and or flute occur. In Italy the 'Bastada' tradition developed from this. An able bass player should feel free to vary and elaborate his part within the genre. It has been suggested that some of the bass viol lessons later in the Holmes bass viol book do just that. However these pieces – like *Lacrimae* and *James* – may just a likely be practice divisions to be played alone. They were well known bass lines and exist as such in many sources. Yet they are also a clue to how to develop the sorts of elaboration skills that good players would have been able to employ in the context of an experienced and professional group.

Example 8 – Dr James his pavan. – bass viol part -

Conclusion

Dd.3.18 contains 109 compositions including 36 duet trebles and is a unique survival in that it was started specifically as 'a book of trebles'. Nordstrom suggests that Dd.3.18 was started earlier than the solo books in Holmes's hand as a collection of duet trebles, and that it was continually added to over a period of some 20 years (Lyle Nordstrom, 'The Cambridge Consort Books', *JLSA*, v (1972), 73). Nordstrom divides the book into 12 sections, six of which contain trebles. The 12 sections are divided into those that contain mostly: consort lute parts; a mixture of duet trebles and consort parts; solos; equal duets; pieces for three orpharions. Most of the duet trebles in the opening section of the manuscript are either by John Johnson or are attributed to him by Nordstrom. Most of the trebles lack grounds, probably because they were so simple and well known. Some treble grounds are found in the bass viol book of the set and could be played with the trebles. The last sections with trebles include pieces by Cutting and Danyel. Many of the trebles in Dd.3.18 are unique. Of those for which concordances can be found, the Dd.3.18 versions are generally the most complete, and sometimes contain sections which are either absent or incorrect in other sources.

The lute book from the mixed consort set (Dd.3.18) contains, along with pieces for consort, a sizeable collection of trebles to be played over some form of ground, including most of the Johnson duets that appear in the Marsh MS. It also contains five possible lute solos and music for an unusual consort of three orpharions (possibly together with three viols). (Nordstrom, *op. cit.*). Twenty-four consort pieces plus the four orpharion trios are attributed to Richard Reade, who joined the singing men at Christ Church in 1588, the same year as Holmes. Reade took his Oxford B.A. degree in 1592, and remained a singing man until his death in 1616/7. (Harwood, *op. cit.*). One of Reade's pieces is titled 'Mr. Dr James, Deane of Christ Church, his Paven'. (Dd.3.18, f.12^A; Dd.5.20, f.7^A; Dd 5.21, f.6v.) He also left a bass viol to Martha, the wife or daughter of William Gris, an Oxford Stationer who for a while was the College Library keeper. (Harwood, 'The origins', 38.)

One possible scenario from the information we have is that he had a practitioner's interest in the instrument and its music. Thus Holmes's books have all the hallmarks of the professional, but the collection exists as a result of amateur enthusiasm. Holmes began Dd.3.18 with a collection of treble and bass

grounds fashionable in the 1570s and 80s. This would have been before 1588, when he took up his post at Christ Church. On finding a congenial group among the singing men and other persons close to the College, a mixed consort was started, resulting in consort parts being added to Dd.3.18. In the consort Read might have played the viol, and was certainly able to compose instrumental music and arrange it for the group. During these same years 1588-1597, the mixed consort books, the solo cittern book, and the first and longest lute book, Dd.2.11, were compiled. (Poulton believes a substantial part was written before 1591. (See John Dowland). On moving to Westminster in 1597 no mixed consort was available, so Holmes returned to collecting duets in Dd.3.18 and solo music in Dd.5.78.3 and Dd.9.33. This last manuscript also contains two prayers to be said by Holmes in his capacity as Abbey Precentor for sick and dying parishioners. One of the prayers is dated 28 February 1600. (Dd.9.33 back flyleaf). The first concerns Davie Wier, who was buried at St Margaret's on 18 March 1600/1. The second is for William Hooper, who was buried on 15 April 1601 at Westminster. (See Harwood, 'The Origins', 42-6.) The title of Francis Cutting's piece 'Sir Fooke [Fulke] Greville' (f.18) could not have applied until after 25 July 1603 when Greville became a knight of the Bath, suggesting that Dd.9.33 was still being added to at this date. (Poulton, John Dowland) The last book, Nn.6.36, contains music that is clearly later in style, and was worked on while Holmes was old and ailing. Thus Holmes collects music for his own uses and hence they are kept together.

An alternative theory is that the consort manuscripts were not for his own use, and that he compiled them for some long standing patron or institution. It has been suggested by Ward and privately by others that the ensemble books might have been connected to the instrumental tuition of the choir-boys, as the music is quite easy, with the exception of the lute part. Possibly there was someone in the Cathedral with instrumental skills and who was a good lutenist who used the consort books and duets in Dd.3.18 for teaching purposes, and who paid (or had the College pay) Holmes, who was clearly a good and practiced scribe as shown in the legal documents he drew up, to produce instrumental for him and the boys. But why then did Holmes still continue to produce the solo books after his move to London? Perhaps the individual thought so highly of Holmes's work and the fact that he could now collect more cosmopolitan court connected lute music that he continued to pay Holmes to produce books and send them to him in Oxford. Though now with the use of viols the call for new consort music was not present. Personally I find this idea unconvincing.

5. Richard Reade his Oxford Circle

From Anthony as Wood we know Reade studied the musical faculty 22 years, got his BA and was admitted the same day (7 July 1592) 'He hath composed certain church services, and other matters for instruments, which are scattered in several books.' Most probably he would have been a boy chorister somewhere,

born c1557-63. A number of new facts about Reade and his Oxford associates have come to light in the work that Michael Fleming has done investigating wills and probates of Oxford musicians and instruments makers. This information is to be published in the forthcoming Galpin Journal but he is happy that it can be quoted at this meeting.

To go over what we know of Reade from his will and probate.

Will dated 19th March 1616; signed 'By me Ric. Read'

In a will of average length, Reade left a gown and '3 to his sister 'Jone', wife of George Harding of Cranfield, County of Bedford; to Dr Goodwin (Dean of Christ Church) he left one piece of gold (for a ring); to the singingmen and the 'rest of Quier' at Christ Church

3. Also 'Item I give unto Martha Gryse one Base violl Wh

shee hath now in keeping'. After various of the bequests, the residue was to go to his sole executor and nephew Geoge Harding M. A. Rede also made his 'loving friends Mr Strong and Mr William Gryse' the overseers of his will. Witnesses of the will were Jarvase Jones, John Strong, Giles Yorke and William ?Rabyn (E, F, K, S)

Probate inventory dated 14 April 1617. Richard Read, 'Bachelor of Musicke and lately Yeoman Beedle of Law' of All Saints parish

'In the study of his bookes and instruments vli.; a presse xxs.; 2 gownes in it; iijli.; 2 trunks and 2 chests xvs. ...' 'In Giles Yorkes custody a table and frame and forme ijs vjd.' Total Å

229©4©0 (appraised by D.Edwards, J.Lichfield)

Probate of John Mathew 'singingman' at Christ Church College and whose probate inventory was proved on 23 September 1602. He had 'a paire of virginals', as did most singing men at Christ Church, but also had 'songbooks' which was relatively unusual and eleven lutes valued together at Å3 6s 8d., and a 'chest of viols' valued at Å

4. The eleven lutes average out at around 6s each and these were cheap lutes for the time. Either he was a dealer or had responsibilities of teaching the choristers at Christ Church, a practice which, at comparable establishments, has been well documented by Ian Payne. The choristers may also have used the viols to perform in public. (Woodfield, 212©219).

Robert Mallet: Manciple of St Edmund Hall, goods inventoried on 2 July 1612. In his 'workhouse' (workshop) was some furniture, and 4 orharions, 5 citternes wherof one in a case, 2 citternes unfinisht, a flatback lute & case, 2 chists, working tooles, with divers lumber', together valued with the furniture at Å

5 4s 4d. One of the appraisers of Mallet's inventory was Richard Reade. Incidentally there was a John Reade who was manciple of Lincoln College whose will is dated April 1613.

Could it be then that Mathew with his 11 lutes and chest of viols was the teacher of instruments, that Reade was the arranger and supplier of the music: that Holmes was the scribe, and that Mallet and York were on hand for the making and repairing of instruments. That the Cambridge/Oxford consort books were generated specifically for the discharging the organist's responsibility for teaching instrumental music, through the age-old tradition of delegating the responsibility to deputies. However I wonder also if it possible that Holmes did have a part in the arranging process. The cittern part is clearly at variance to the other parts so often and sometimes the lute part also that I wonder if Reade passed these parts over to another. If it was Holmes who was the plucked string expert and the moving force in the consort, and did some instrumental teaching of the boys, this might explain why they are kept together. Homes might well have kept them all as his books for teaching - something he might have wished to do at Westminster. This brings us back to the idea that the books were Holmes's collection for teaching. The solo books especially have personal touches - Dowland's signature, the prayers, legal documents - which could also suggest this.

Ian Payne's work on instrumental teaching provision at English Cathedral Churches makes it clear that the sixteenth-century letters patent of some cathedral organists included responsibility for the teaching of choristers, and perhaps other boys from the grammar schools, to play musical instruments. By the late sixteenth century this responsibility was often delegated to specially qualified lay clerks.(Ian Payne, *Provision and Practice of Sacred Music at Cambridge Colleges and Selected Cathedrals c.1547-c.1646*) (New York and London, 1993), 134. There is some evidence that at Ely lutes and other plucked instruments were involved. The will of Edward Watson (1587) an Ely lay clerk and since 1580, and possibly also the choristers teacher of instruments includes 'al my books for the Citteren, virginalls, bandora or lute'. At Christ Church Holmes, as precentor, had responsibility for all the singing; but another individual, the informant, was responsible for their general instruction, which included learning instruments. One of those who had this role while Holmes was at Christ Church was the singingman John Mathew. (My thanks to Ian Harwood for passing this information on to me.) Mathew's 1602 probate inventory included eleven lutes valued at together at £3 6s 8d, and a chest of viols at (Michael Fleming, 'Some points arising from a survey of wills and inventories'

Notes & Queries (Galpin, 2000), liii. These were cheap lutes even for the time and surely must have been being used for pedagogical purposes.

7. Uses of Mixed Consort Music

From its origins in the great houses of England, music for mixed ensembles was taken up by bands of town waits. It has been assumed that the mixed consort music for the Norwich royal progress of 1578 involved the Norwich waits. There were only five Norwich waits at the time, but with Edward Johnson they would have been six including a known lute player. When Edward Jefferies, one of the senior Norwich waits, died in 1617, he bequeathed most of the instruments necessary for the consort. Only the cittern was not mentioned in his will. (D. Lasocki, 'Professional Recorder Players in England, 1540-1740', Ph.D. diss. (University of Iowa, 1983), i, 237; ii, 734-5.) The waits most associated with the mixed consort were the London Waits, whom Morley had in mind when publishing his *First Booke*. The work is dedicated to the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of the City of London. London Waits were available for private hire, and also performed in the play houses. (Beck, *op. cit.*, 3, 22.) They played for some of the court events in January 1600/1, which must have included the first performance of Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night*, Holman, *op. cit.*, 138.) Yet the private households were also mentioned by Morley in reference to gentleman sponsor. The book's title-page states that it was printed 'at the coast & charges of a Gentle-man, for his private pleasure, and for divers others his frendes which delight in Musicke.' The reprinting of Morley's collection in 1611 shows that the set of books achieved a degree of commercial success. One can reasonably suggest that there would have been provincial town waits who followed London fashions by adapting themselves into a mixed consort band, and thus would have wanted to buy Morley's books.

Discussion of the musical activities of the London Waits in plays leads to the use of the mixed consort by English theatre companies. There is mention of the exporting of the consort abroad through theatre companies. Beck's thesis is that, as theatre companies proliferated, and as more public theatre houses were opened, companies relied less on musical actors like Will Kemp and Robert Armin, and more on professional musicians who organised themselves into a 'house band' playing as a mixed consort. (Beck, *op. cit.*)

There is little surviving evidence to support this idea, and some actors certainly continued to play instruments.

While the employment of music and musicians in the Elizabethan and Jacobean theatre was expected by the audience, the amount varied greatly. The private theatres - like Blackfriars with a tradition of boy players - normally used more music than the public companies, and one report mentions a mixed consort of sorts heard at the Blackfriars in 1602 © though there is nothing to suggest

that it was made up of children in this instance.

Holman, *op. cit.*, Schools like St Paul's taught boys to play and sing, and their skills were widely used. In 1609 Philip Rosseter published his *Lessons for Consort*, and became responsible for the troupe which received a royal patent in that year under the name of 'The Children of the Queen's Revels'. (John Jeffreys, *The Life and Works of Philip Rosseter*)(Wendover, 1990), 27. He combined being a royal lutenist (from 1604 to his death in 1623) with an interest in this company in its many manifestations until around 1620. It would be fitting to imagine that Rosseter would have taught his boys to perform mixed consort music from his books, and there are a number of references that link mixed consorts with children. John H. Long, *Shakespeare's Use of Music*, (Gainseville, 1961), 32. The Headmaster of the English College of St Omer, Pas de Calais (1600-17), included mixed consorts when describing the musical activities of the school. One must also register that the young Daniel Bacher (16) spent time in his youth concerning himself with mixed consort music. And surely he must have played what he arranged and composed.

Of the names associated with the mixed consort, Reade and Bacher are of importance as composers, and Morley and Rosseter as arrangers, although both these last two may have composed some pieces directly for the consort. Reade is the most prolific, but his music is confined almost entirely to Holmes's manuscripts. One of Reade's pavan appears in Kassel 4 MS Mus.125. One senses that his interest was peripheral, and was maintained only while the Oxford consort was in existence. Only the lute part exists for a number of his consort pieces, suggesting that the Oxford group had other part-books which do not survive. These pieces are identifiable as consort parts, as they have diminutions without supporting harmonies in the repeat sections. While the violin part does not exist for any of Reade's pieces, many of them suggest possible contrapuntal imitation between lute and violin so as to make reconstruction plausible. (Nordstrom, 'The Cambridge Consort Books', 77-9.)

Richard Reade's primary interest was not the arrangement of existing music by others, as with Morley and Rosseter, and his music includes only two arrangements of popular tunes. Instead he concentrated on producing pavans, galliards, allmains and jiggs, most simply identified by number, rather than given a title. It is likely that many of Reade consort pieces are arrangements or adaptations of his own music to fit the Oxford consort. The many harmonic discrepancies between the cittern and the lute parts show that in many pieces the cittern part was developed from the bass line in isolation. This fact, plus the rather half finished nature of many of his lute parts and the clumsiness of his recorder line, suggests that the music was assembled quickly from a variety of sources to suit the mixed consort at hand, then used and discarded soon afterwards without really being sorted out. Pavan 9 is connected to the lute duet 'Drewries accorde', and one of his allmains is based on a piece attributed in Dd.2.11 to Anthony Holborne. Perhaps most interesting of Reade's pieces is a long five part fancy based on the theme of Dowland's most popular solo lute

fantasia (Varietie, no.7) in which, almost uniquely, the cittern is given one of the five independent parts. (See Example con.5) The bandora, violin and bass viol parts are not present, but can be reconstructed. The bass line can be found from the lute part and given to the bass viol, the bandora filling out the harmony and doubling the bass line an octave below when appropriate. The violin part is more difficult to reconstruct as it is independent, and the leading part to the consort. To do this a full score must be produced and a part composed that is melodically interesting, fills out the harmony, and is responsive to the contrapuntal imitation in other parts.

While clearly there are differences in the approach in different pieces, Reade's method in pavan 6, for which uniquely we have the model in the 5th part version, was to only properly use the top part and the bass, and some but not all of the second part. A two part lute texture is evolved using material from both top parts. The lute follows the treble and bass at the outset except were it becomes uncomfortably high, but in the second and third sections where there is answering between the top two parts, the lute changes role and takes the second part plus the bass. From the sketched a lute part is developed with fuller chords (for the most part) and highly worked divisions on repeats [©] divisions that often appear to clash with other parts. An altogether new third part is then evolved for the recorder/flute it may on occasion take elements from the tenor and quintus parts (as at the beginning) but seems most newly composed. This part aims to provide the missing note of the triad at all important points, after looking at the violin and lute, and to provide rhythmic interest. The part that emerges often seems oddly disjointed and un-melodic, with occasional wide leaps. It uses the very same written range as the violin, mainly the octave g to g but also down to middle, and is often, on paper, the highest sounding part. The cittern and we suppose the bandora was then written from the bass part in isolation. This is clear from the many misjudgments that the cittern arranger makes in chords [©] believing that bass is playing the root of the chord when it is actually sounding a first inversion and visa versa, and minor/major disagreements. There are few corrections to the cittern part and the mistakes in some pieces would, if played uncorrected, sound dire.

A question that then emerges is to wonder if the violin part played anything different in the repeats or like recorder/flute, and bass (except in *Lacrimae*) just played the same thing twice. A good number of pieces have no lute divisions, did the violin take over here? More importantly in so many piece the lute and violin have short answering phrases (reports) in quick succession, either over one chord or two changing chords. In the lute part these tromba-like effects are ornamented or repeated at double speed in the repeat sections. Surely the violin would have participated in this (even if not written down) and like *De la Tromba* would have played divisions in these sections. Another problem already hinted at is that the lute part sometimes can etch out a minor chord in the divisions. Is this just lute blues or are the other parts supposed to take account of this and alter in the repeats.

Intro to area – writings on the subject in general.

1. Development of genre – from lute duo – to entertainment music.
2. Look at the books that survive. Also Leighton.
3. Roles of the bass viol. 2 choirs – 3 single line – 3 plucked. But in complicated Allison pieces – choirs break up – (treble viol, flute, cittern and bandora – lute, flute, cittern bass viol) – echoing of treble viol with lute – bass viol and bandora. Blending of timbles Diminutions for treble viol and flute in Morley's Lessons, and flute in Rosseter in Allison pieces.
4. Possible divisions as an option.
5. Larger view – new role as the bass in a varied consort of instruments – e.g. lutes and voices – lute song and madrigals etc., sacred music – variety of genres.
6. Discuss differences between versions in Morley and Dd. 5.20.