

OPEN UNIVERSITY POSTGRADUATE MUSIC - A871

TMA04 Project

Eric Crouch - W1307318

September 2011 (Revised for online publication January 2013)

John Dowland, John Danyel, Daniel Bacheler;

the Issue of Attribution in Golden Age English Lute Music

CONTENTS

1) Introduction.....	1
2) Attribution.....	3
2.1) John Dowland.....	6
2.2) Daniel Bacheler.....	11
2.3) John Danyel.....	12
2.4) Competing Claims.....	13
3) Discussion.....	17
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	22

John Dowland, John Danyel, Daniel Bacheler; the Issue of Attribution¹ in Golden Age English Lute Music

1) Introduction²

The period between (approximately) 1540 and 1650 is often characterised as the “Golden Age of English Lute Music” (eg Bream 1993); in the words of Smith (2002 p 245) a “brief florescence” occurring at the same time as the rise and fall of the English madrigal and corresponding in time with the English Renaissance.

There are few English printed sources of solo lute music from this time. Instead the bulk of the music is found in manuscript form. There are 50 or so surviving manuscripts containing 2 - 3,000 separate pieces of music (Marriott 1978, Tayler 2005), a repertoire far more extensive than any other contemporaneous solo instrumental repertoire (Craig-McFeely 2000). That the lack of printed sources may have been related to the monopoly on music printing held by Tallis and Byrd is suggested by Nolde (1984) and by Oswell (2009). Nolde also points out that that though “less than ten per cent of the pieces in the English lute repertoire are found in printed books nearly all of the vocal music of the period appears in printed collections” (1984 p15). Tayler (2005, p7) is emphatic in blaming Byrd: “Since Byrd was in control of music printing from 1575-1596,

¹ Note: In this essay I have used the terms ‘attribution’ to refer to the determination made by scholars as to the identity of a composer, ‘ascription’ to refer to the way a composer is named in manuscripts and ‘inscription’ to refer to the text written on or under the stave in manuscripts.

² This project deals with music from the same historical period as I covered in my TMA02 essay on patronage. I use here some of the same references, and some of the introductory text (together with some comments on the content of Dd.2.11) has been rewritten from that essay.

and since he was very tenacious in regard to exercising that monopoly, it seems extremely likely that he actively prevented the publication of English lute music. It is, for instance, noteworthy that not even songs in which the lute served a purely accompanying role appeared in print until after his monopoly had expired.”

In looking at this repertoire it is necessary to consider the nature of the sources. Lumsden (1953) set out to catalogue and describe the known ‘Golden Age’ English sources of solo music for the lute, and Craig-McFeely (2000) consolidated and considerably extended this work. The manuscript sources include commonplace books (personal notebooks) of amateur and professional musicians and collections seemingly made for didactic purposes. Spring (2001) discusses these sources in detail including the nine collections of Matthew Holmes (an Oxford musician with an ecclesiastical position) that represent by far the largest source of English instrumental lute music (or indeed of any music from this time). Judging by the frequency with which particular pieces appear in different sources there seems to have been a core repertory of about 150 popular pieces (Nolde 1984).

2) Attribution

What do we know of the musicians who originated this music? The manuscript sources frequently ascribe particular pieces to individual musicians - or so it seems. An inspection of the recently published facsimile (with commentary) of one of the Matthew Holmes manuscripts, CUL Dd.2.11 (Robinson et al. 2010) which in my judgement is fairly representative of lute manuscripts of the period in the way the music is set out and labelled reveals that it contains 324 pieces of music written in tablature on ruled staves (to judge by the penmanship all by the same scribe, presumably Holmes himself). Each piece carries on from where the previous piece leaves off, sometimes on a new line, sometimes on the same line - a layout designed, no doubt, to be economical in the use of paper. The pieces are not titled but followed usually on the tablature stave itself, but sometimes below it, by a short inscription that is likely to include a title and/or a musician's name. These inscriptions are, by modern standards, cryptic and often abbreviated or otherwise incomplete, but it seems generally accepted in scholarly commentary that the musician named is the composer. Many pieces have no inscription, their ending marked only by a flourish of the pen, if that. To the modern eye it is often difficult to see where one piece ends and the next begins. A few of the pieces seem to be grouped by composer, but this is not consistent, and it is often not possible to draw conclusions about a piece from those surrounding it.

To illustrate the inscriptions found I list here the first twenty from the beginning of the manuscript (original spelling and capitalisation preserved, with comments based on the editors' attributions in brackets):

1. [No inscription] (a Galliard)
2. *preludiu* (a Preludium)
3. *Francisco* (stylistically an Almain)
4. *Alfonso* (stylistically a Pavan, presumed to be by Alfonso Ferrabosco)
5. *Galliard to the flatt pauen* (by John Johnson)
6. [No inscription] (Pavan by John Johnson)
7. [No inscription] (Galliard by John Johnson)
8. [No inscription] (Passymeasures Pavan by John Johnson)
9. *De La Courte* (Pavan by John Johnson)
10. *My Hart is surely sett*
11. *Go fro my window go*
12. *Duke of Millanes Dump*
13. *A Ground A Holb* (Divisions on a Ground, for bandora, Anthony Holborne)³
14. *Curranta for Mr E murcott / F Pilkington*
15. *A Holburn* (Galliard for bandora)
16. *Mrs E Murcots Delight* . fr Pilkington
17. *A Holburne* (Galliard)
18. *Paven Dolorosa Ri Allison*

³ The determination that this piece was written for the bandora is made solely on the grounds that the tablature does not make sense in lute tuning, but suits the known tuning of the bandora.

19. *Mrs Elizabeth Murcotts Fr Pilkington* (Galliard)

20. *Mr T Wagstaffe Content of Desier. F Pilk*

The editors, in their accompanying notes express a large number of judgements about the attribution of pieces in this manuscript. For example differences in spelling are accepted ('Holburn', 'Holburne', 'Holb' are all taken to refer to Anthony Holborne) and attributions based on concordance with the same pieces found in other manuscripts are accepted, an example being several pieces with no named composer that are attributed to John Johnson. The inscription 'Jo Johnson' does appear elsewhere in the Manuscript, supporting the idea that Holmes did include Johnson's work. On the other hand some possible attributions are rejected; the third piece in the manuscript, by 'Francisco' might be thought to be by Francesco da Milano, an important continental musician frequently represented in manuscripts (including elsewhere in this one), but this is rejected on stylistic grounds. The task of ascribing the pieces to individual composers in this way is made somewhat easier by the fact that there is a fairly small group of musicians whose names appear most frequently in all the English manuscripts. Smith (2002) lists ten names as the most important composers of this music, though much of it is anonymous and, as Craig-McFeely points out (2000) there is a long list of less frequently appearing composer's names. Of the 324 pieces in Dd.2.11 19 have been attributed to recognizable continental composers, 150 or so (allowing for uncertain attributions) to composers in Smith's list, 28 to

miscellaneous other composers and the remaining third or so of the pieces are anonymous.

2.1) John Dowland

Our knowledge of the musicians represented in these manuscripts is quite limited even for some of Smith's ten. John Dowland (1563 - 1626) is, judging from his representation in manuscripts, the most prolific. In Dd.2.11 there are 38 pieces attributed by Robinson et al (2010) to Dowland on the basis of ascriptions and concordances and five more that are given as possible Dowland works - three of the pieces are versions of the *Lachrimae Pavan*, regarded as his most popular work. We know more of Dowland's life than most from the detailed biography by Diana Poulton (1982); nevertheless there many gaps in our knowledge of the man and his work and many unanswered questions. Poulton is also responsible (with Basil Lam) for an authoritative collection of his solo lute works (Poulton and Lam, 2001).

The contrasting work of Poulton (Poulton and Lam, 2001)⁴ and Tayler (2005) on the attribution of works to Dowland provides a good exemplar, illustrating the extent to which different scholars each pursuing careful study of the same sources can reach differing conclusions and drawing attention to some of the pitfalls in this field.

⁴ I use Poulton's name alone in referring to this work as Lam states that his role was confined to preparing the staff notation versions and helping with the preparation of the final text.

Taylor (ibid p.31) suggests that, for Poulton, the Matthew Holmes manuscripts provide the core repertory for her edition. It is therefore instructive to look at how a few of the pieces in Dd.2.11 that are ascribed to Dowland are described therein and some of the commentary made by the editors. The first five are as follows:

- 1) *Galliard* (no.27), the inscription reading *Dowland's Galliarde*; essentially the same piece as no.222 in the same collection, which is unlabelled. The piece is found in two other sources as *A Galliarde by Dowla* and *Doulants Galliarde*.
- 2) *Melancholy Galliard* (no.40) described as: *Dowl. Mellancoly Galliard* and found untitled in one other source.
- 3) *Dr Case's Pavan* (no.47) described as: *Do.: Cases Pauen. J: Dowland* and not found elsewhere.
- 4) *Mrs. White's Nothing* (no.63) *Mrs Whites Nothingse Jo Dowlande Bachelor of Musicke*, not found elsewhere.
- 5) *Monsieur's Almain* (no.87), Untitled, found in one Manuscript as *Almande Monsieur Johan Douland Angl* and another as *Mounsers almane*. This piece is not included as a Dowland work by Poulton (Poulton and Lam 2001)⁵.

⁵ This piece is better known in a version (Mounsiers Almaine) in the printed collection by Dowland's son Robert, *A Varietie of Lute Lessons* (Dowland, accessed 13 August 2011) where it is given as a piece by Daniel Bacheler; see below for a further reference to this piece.

Poulton (ibid) provides considerable detail in her commentary on the pieces in her collection as do Robinson et al (2010) but in both works Holmes's ascriptions appear to be taken at face value. However in her biographical work on Dowland Poulton (1982) does discuss some of the difficulties inherent in accepting the ascriptions in manuscripts. She points out that only three pieces survive in what appears to be Dowland's own handwriting and only six to which he added his signature; there are also nine printed compositions in Robert Dowland's *A Varietie of Lute Lessons* (Dowland, R., accessed 13 August 2011). She comments that manuscript scribes may sometimes have produced erroneous versions from "an ill-remembered hearing of a performance" or that "an inaccurate copy was in circulation and passed from hand to hand..." and that "the copyist frequently relied on his own memory for composers' names and the titles of the pieces" (1982, p.96). In the same work she lists sources she regards as containing authoritative versions of works by Dowland (p.478) and says (p. 96) "little will be said about most of the foreign books and manuscripts since, with two exceptions only, they contain no works that cannot be found in more reliable sources at home".

Taylor (2005) takes explicit exception to this last point. He comments (pp.41-2) that Dowland spent much of his life abroad (some of it employed in the court of the King of Denmark), wrote much of his music abroad, and also stated with pride that his music had been published in the most important cities [abroad].

Tayler thinks, therefore that foreign sources should be regarded as potentially as important as English sources. However his view on this matter is more than mere opinion. He considers the relative importance of the lute solo in comparison to other contemporaneous genres, commenting that Byrd (the greatest of the English virginalists) avoided writing for the lute and that this, when taken with his apparent refusal to print lute music suggests that he may have disdained the instrument. According to Smith (2002, p37) the lute was, by the late 15th century “the preferred instrument of Renaissance persons of quality” a comment that carries the hint that it may have been an instrument favoured by amateurs as much as professional players. Tayler states: “What emerges is a situation in which music was arranged and composed for solo lute. Music that was enjoyed by a wide variety of skilled amateurs. The best and most powerful composers, however, did not attach great importance to the genre; they preferred vocal music, songs to the lute or to the consort, and consort music. In other words, they preferred to write in genres which allowed greater contrapuntal freedom (2005 p.7). Thus Tayler is suggesting that Dowland regarded his lute songs (his *First Booke of Songs or Ayres...*, published in 1597, *Second Booke of Songs or Ayres....* in 1600, *Third and Last Booke of Songs or Aires*, 1603 and *A Pilgrim’s Solace*, 1612) and consort music (notably *Lachrimae or Seaven Teares...*, 1604) as his most important works (details of Dowland’s works from Poulton 1982 pp.505-508). Further, he suggests of lute pieces that “.....amateur players, seeking the best and most fashionable pieces for

their lutebooks, acquired 'Dowland' pieces from professional players or teachers who had at best only a tenuous connection with the composer. What they got was for other reasons than transmission not likely to have been fashioned entirely by Dowland himself." (2005 pp.8-9) The implication is that many "Dowland" pieces found in manuscripts may be versions transformed by simplifying them and placing them in the fashionable English style of the time (which, he suggests, included adding decorative divisions). Tayler supports this by suggesting a process of identifying piece that are definitely or probably by Dowland (ie in his handwriting, verified by his signature or found in printed collections), a process that, he thinks, leads to new appreciation of Dowland's style (these pieces being elegant in manner, contrapuntal in construction and difficult to play). The next step is to use this better understanding of his style to pass judgement on other "Dowland" pieces. This process supports the inclusion of some pieces from foreign books that Poulton regards as less likely to be by Dowland.

Robinson et al (2010), in their facsimile edition of Dd.2.10 are careful to set out detailed information about the pieces therein, including concordances, but it would seem that their purpose, as one might expect of a scholarly facsimile edition, is a representation of the document as it is found rather than a detailed commentary on Holmes's ascriptions.

2.2) Daniel Bacheler

Another musician who was a slightly later contemporary of Dowland and well represented in English manuscripts is Daniel Bacheler (c.1571-1619). That we have biographical information about Bacheler seems to have depended on a Leeds schoolteacher, Anne Batchelor, deciding to investigate her family history (Haynes, 1991; Batchelor, 1988). She was able to discover the outline of his life; born of a yeoman farmer in Aston Clinton in Buckinghamshire, apprenticed to a lutenist at 7, entering the service of the Walsingham family and later royal service as a Groom of the Privy Chamber in the court of Queen Anne. Bacheler's lute music has not yet appeared in an available modern edition, a point made by Morrongiello (2004) who may be currently preparing one, having collated his music for a D.Phil. thesis (2005a).⁶ One source of Bacheler's music is the manuscript known as the Cherbury Lute Book, a collection made (partly in his own hand) by Edward Herbert the first Baron Cherbury (Spring 2001, Smith 2002). Herbert lived in Paris as a young man and was later English ambassador there (Blair 2011) and much of the music in the manuscript is of French origin, Bacheler being one of the few English composers represented (Spring 2001, p. 234). This manuscript, another of the richest sources of solo lute music, is found in the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge and has not yet been published in a modern facsimile edition, nor is there a complete modern edition of the music. However the manuscript has been much studied because of the quality of the

⁶ Which I regret I have not yet been able to access.

music it contains and one of the issues of controversy is the identity of the composer of some of the English pieces. There are six pieces that are inscribed 'Daniel Bacheler', 'Mr. Dan Bach,' 'Mr.DB.', or 'Mr. Dan. Bacheler' that are generally accepted as being by Daniel Bacheler, but ten others described as being by 'Mr. Daniel' and one described as by 'Sr. Danielli Inglese' that is followed by two others described as 'del medesimo' (by the same composer) (Rooley, 1971). Rooley suggests that these may be pieces by John Danyel (1564 - c1625).

2.3) John Danyel

Danyel was a musician whose attributed output consists of a small number of lute songs and lute solos that are of high quality. He was a student at Oxford at the time Matthew Holmes was there, hence much of his known music appears in Holmes's collections. He was later in the service of the Grene family in Little Milton, Oxfordshire and later still (by 1612) a musician in the Royal Household. His book of songs was dedicated to Ann Grene, daughter of his patron and one of his lute solos was *Mrs. Ann Grene Hir Leves Bee Grene*, a set of variations on 'Browning' or 'The Leaves be Green' (Scott 1971) that not only puns on her name but is also constructed so that each variation begins in the tonality of A and ends in G.

The clear link between this music and the Grene family helps tie this music specifically to Danyel - supporting evidence includes Danyel's songs, some of which set words by his brother, the poet Samuel Danyel and other of his manuscript solo pieces bear the inscriptions 'John Daniell', 'Jhon Danniell', 'Jo Daniell' and in one case 'J Da'. Danyel's song *Eyes look no more* sets words from Samuel Danyel's sonnet sequence *Rosamond* to a tune in pavan form quite similar Dowland's *Flow my Tears*, which appears also as the instrumental pavan *Lachrimae*. Two solo lute versions of the pavan, *Rosa* and *Rosamund* appear in manuscripts, the second closer to the song, but with no ascription but the first clearly labelled 'Jo. Daniell' (Scott 1971). The second version is followed in the manuscript by the pavan ascribed to 'J Da' and it appears this may be the basis for its attribution to Danyel (Shepherd 1998).

2.4) Competing Claims

However, what are we to make of Rooley's (1971) suggestion that 'Mr. Daniel' in the Cherbury Lute Book is John Danyel rather than Daniel Bacheler? Rooley picks through the evidence for and against - the only concordance that helps is against Danyel, a comparison of Cherbury's style of naming composers throughout the manuscript favours Danyel, biographical evidence suggests an association between Cherbury and Danyel, and evidence based on style is difficult to support because we have so few definite pieces by Danyel. Rooley's piece was written before the Anne Batchelor's (1988) paper on the life of her

ancestor and among the suggestions he was able to make to explain his findings was that John Danyel and Daniel Bacheler may have been the same person. We now know that is not the case, but this particular confusion of identity does appear elsewhere among extant lute sources in relation to the piece mentioned earlier as a possible Dowland work, *Monsieur's Almain*. This is also found in the printed collection by Robert Dowland, *A Varietie of Lute Lessons* (Dowland, accessed 13 August 2011) where it is given as a piece by Daniel Bacheler. However the Manuscript source Add.3056,ff.15v-17r (one of the Matthew Holmes manuscripts) (Shepherd 1998, Rooley 1971) clearly attributes it to 'John Daniell' and this version is very similar to the 'Bacheler' version in *Varietie* (to the extent that several of the divisions are identical). Rooley (ibid.) comments that Holmes would have been unlikely to make an error over Danyel, that it is rare to find divisions in common between different composer's versions of the same piece but that one would normally trust an ascription in a printed source.

Morrongiello is clearly of the view that the disputed pieces in Cherbury are by Bacheler. He has published tablature transcriptions of *pauana del medesimo* (2004b), *Prelude mr. Daniel Bacheler* (2005b), *Courante mr. Daniel* (2006a), *Prelude mr. Daniel* (2006b), another *Prelude mr. Daniel* (2007) and *Almaine Daniel* (2008) as being by Bacheler. In discussion (2004a) he points out that many of the pieces he identifies with Bacheler have been emended (and improved) by a later hand and he makes the case for these emendations having

been made by Bacheler himself (though this causes some difficulty with the presumed dating of the Manuscript). He further speculates that Bacheler may have been Cherbury's lute tutor. My supposition is that this might be an example of a manuscript containing 'simplified' versions for an amateur player (as Cherbury was) that were later emended to make them more musically satisfactory and therefore more difficult to play as he improved as a player (though there is no direct evidence for this).

My final example of issues relating to attribution is perhaps rather an insubstantial one, but it is what led me to pursue this topic in the first place, and it links John Danyel with John Dowland. It concerns *Lachrimae* one of Dowland's most important works, which Tayler (2005) discusses in detail. Tayler claims that there is no lute solo version of *Lachrimae* that can definitely be attributed to Dowland (though he regards the related piece *Galliard to Lachrimae* as one of the few definite Dowland lute solos) and that Poulton (Poulton and Lam 2001) may be wrong in suggesting that *Lachrimae* was originally written in G minor. Tayler's view is that versions in A, including that found in Dd.2.11 may have predated versions in G. However, without wishing to doubt Tayler, when I played through a transcription of the version in A from Dd.2.11, I was struck by elements in the way it was constructed, especially in the varied repeats, that reminded me of John Danyel's *Rosa*. Here, for example, is a short section from the repeated first strain of each piece (all rendered into notation in A minor for

ease of comparison) where the descending shape of the phrase in the first bar conveys the resemblance:

The image displays three staves of musical notation in 4/4 time, illustrating a comparison of melodic phrases. The first staff, labeled 'Rosa', shows a melodic line starting with a descending eighth-note pattern. The second staff, 'Lachrimae, A minor version', shows a similar descending eighth-note pattern in a different key. The third staff, 'Lachrimae, G minor transposed', shows the same pattern transposed to G minor. The notation includes treble clefs, a key signature of one sharp (F#), and various rhythmic values such as eighth and sixteenth notes, rests, and slurs.

Similar rather small points of resemblance are found elsewhere that raised in my mind at least the possibility that the Holmes version in A might have been the work of John Danyel.

[The sources from which I made these transcriptions are:

Rosa, Shepherd (1998),

Lachrimae in A, Robinson et al (2010),

Lachrimae in G, Poulton and Lam (2001).]

3) Discussion

In this project I have been looking at a section of an extensive repertoire that is found largely in manuscripts with only a few printed sources. There is extant (and it has to be accepted that an unknown proportion of the recorded repertoire of this music may have been lost) a core repertoire of about 150 pieces, some of which appear repeatedly in differing versions. There seem to have been a small number of popular composers together with a number of 'lesser' names and a large number of unscribed pieces. The repertoire may have been geared predominantly towards amateurs, the music having been popular among the nobility and the gentry. The manuscript collections were made by a variety of individuals, their purposes not always clear and there is a lack of clarity about the scribes and their sources. In looking at this repertoire from the vantage point of the 21st century there may be a tendency to think in terms of the modern concepts of the composer and the musical work. We have fairly limited biographical information about some of the musicians, but it seems clear that most of those best represented in the manuscripts were musicians in the service of royalty or the nobility (Spring, 2001; Smith, 2002). They may therefore have regarded themselves as 'jobbing' musicians whose duty was to provide music for their patrons to hear or play themselves rather than composers creating lasting works of art. On the other hand Dowland who (Tayler 2005) seemingly regarded his songs and consort music as more important than his lute solos nevertheless protested in his *First Booke of Songes* of 1597 that his lute pieces had been 'lately

printed without my knowledge, false and imperfect' (Poulton 1982, p48). As one of the most popular composers of the day (so it seems) he may therefore have felt he had the right to insist that reproduced versions of his work should reflect his intentions. However this may be a modern way of construing his words and Tayler (2005) suggests Dowland may be using a "standard Elizabethan disclaimer for unauthorized publications" and that "the 'imperfect copies' complaint was a common excuse for authors to go into print" (pp40-41). It also does raise the question whether at this time and in relation to this particular repertory there was any concept of the 'musical work' in the way we think about it today and whether we can today consider that there are musical works encapsulated by these texts. Looking at these manuscripts we see fairly short pieces with simple structure. The pavan, for example, usually has three strains most often with decorated repeats in the form of divisions and it is common to find sets of variations on popular tunes. Some tunes and themes are found repeatedly in different pieces; perhaps different musicians would play their own version of a particular piece decorated with divisions of their own devising. How much of this would have been improvised is unclear, and the extent to which some of the manuscript collections were made as examples of how the music might be played rather than definitive versions of the music is also unclear. If the musical work might not be fully determined by the tablature wherein does it lie?

Scruton (1999) has a fairly straightforward idea about what we understand a musical work to be; it is what we hear, or are intended to hear in a sequence of sounds. So, for Scruton, a musical work might only appear (perhaps as a reconstruction) when a modern lutenist plays from an ancient manuscript. Ingarden (reported by Berger, 1988) developed his view on the basis that we generally believe that the musical work is different from, and exists independently of, its performances, the mental states of its composer and listeners, and the score. But how can a thing exist which is neither real (whether physical as it is different from its performances, or mental as it is different from the listener's conscious experiences) nor ideal (unchangeable and existing outside time like a mathematical concept since it was created at a particular time)? It is not clear that Ingarden actually answers this, but his view does seem to me to capture the idea that we do perhaps have an idea of, for example, *Lachrimae* as a work, separate from a particular performance or arrangement and would support the idea that the manuscripts under discussion do contain representations of musical works. Whether the difference of view expressed here has any practical consequences is unclear.

Of course, the study of this music has come to the fore as a result of the revival of interest in early music that took hold in the second half of the twentieth century (Haskell, 1997) and modern performance of this repertoire, especially in the form of CD issues has become quite popular (Goodwin 2001) utilising modern

reproductions of 16th century lutes (eg Barber and Harris, 2011) in an attempt, apparently, to recreate the original works. Taruskin (1998) has suggested it is a mistake to believe that the performance of ancient music can be authentically recreated because the available evidence about how early performance would have sounded is so limited and so he suggests (1996) that we though we can analyse music of the Classical period and later as text (and therefore derive the musical work from the score) earlier music can be better understood as 'act', so that we appreciate the musical work from the act of its recreation.

The implication here may be that some aspects of these musical works may be for ever inaccessible. In the same way some of the questions of attribution that I have been discussing may also remain inaccessible. A review of the available literature suggests that our knowledge and understanding of this repertoire has been improving over time with further discoveries and analysis and that there may be scope for further advance. The work of Batchelor (1988) shows that we may continue to find more biographical information about these musicians, recent initiatives by libraries to digitise manuscripts and the modern publication of facsimiles such as Dd.2.11, together with modern editions of the music are making this material more accessible to analysis⁷. Tayler's (2005) work - whether or not further scholarship supports his opposition to Poulton's (1982, 2001) views - suggests there may be more scope for drawing conclusions from a

⁷ An additional importance that attaches to modern facsimiles is illustrated by the comment of Robinson et al. (2010, Introduction pp.7-8) that the physical condition of the manuscript has deteriorated in recent years because of the handling it has received from scholars during the 20th century.

better understanding of style. This point is reflected by Robinson et al (2010, Introduction p.7) who comment that many of the anonymous pieces in Dd.2.11 are comparable in quality with the pieces that do bear ascriptions and that concealed among them may be works by known composers such as Dowland, Cutting, Holborne or Johnson, though their more conservative approach is to hope that further manuscripts may be discovered with concordances that bear ascriptions. That such discoveries can still be made is illustrated by the discovery of the Harrach manuscripts in Austria in 2004, a source of some previously unknown music by Sylvius Leopold Weiss (Crawford 2007).

5039 words.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barber, S. & S. Harris, (2011). *Stephen Barber & Sandi Harris Lutemakers*. [Webpage]. Available from: <http://www.lutesandguitars.co.uk> [accessed 17 August 2011]

Batchelor, A, (1988). Daniel Bacheler: The Right Perfect Musician. *The Lute*, **XXVIII** p. 3 - 12.

Berger, K., (1988). [Untitled] Review. *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, **41** (3), p. 558-565.

Blair, B., (2011). Herbert, First Baron Cherbury. [Webpage]. *A Repository of Historical Texts*, Available from: <http://bob.fooquru.org/content/bio/EdwardHerbertCherbury.html> [accessed 15 August 2011].

Bream, J., (1993). *The Golden Age of English Lute Music* . [CD]. BMG Music.

Craig-McFeely, J.M., (2000). *English Lute Manuscripts and Scribes 1530-1630*. [Online Book]. Available from: <http://www.ramesescats.co.uk/thesis/> [accessed 11 April 2011]

Crawford, T., (2007). The Harrach Lute Manuscripts and the Complete Works of S. L. Weiss. *Journal of the Lute Society of America*, **XL** p. 1 - 43.

Dowland, R, (1610). *Varietie of Lute-Lessons*. [Online Facsimile]. London;: Thomas Adams. Available from: <http://shipbrook.com/jeff/bookshelf/details.html?bookid=40> [accessed 13 August 2011]

Goodwin, C., (2001). *A Brief Introduction to the Lute*. [Webpage]. Available from: <http://www.lutesoc.co.uk/pages/about-the-lute> [accessed 17 August 2011]

Haskell, H., (1997). *The Early Music Revival: A History*. New edition. Mineola, N.Y.: Dover Publications Inc.

Haynes, S., (1991). Anne Batchelor: Daniel Bacheler: The Right Perfect Musician. *Lute News*, (18), p. 4.

Lumsden, D., (1953). The Sources of English Lute Music (1540-1620). [online]. *The Galpin Society Journal*, **6** July, p. 14 - 22. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/841713> [accessed 18 March 2011].

Marriott, D.F., Jr., (1978). *The Evolution and Practice of Lute Technique in England during the Elizabethan and Jacobean Periods*. MA California State University, Fullerton.

Morrongiello, C., (2004a). Notes from the Scriptorium of Daniel Bacheler. *Lute News*, **69** (April), p. 11 - 13.

Morrongiello, C. Ed., (2004b). Pavan by Daniel Bacheler. *Lute News (music supplement)*, **69** (April).

Morrongiello, C., (2005a). *Edward Collard (d. 1600) and Daniel Bacheler (d. 1619): A Critical Study and Edition of Their Lute Music. D.Phil. Oxford.*

Morrongiello, C. Ed., (2005b). A Prelude by Daniel Bacheler. *Lute News (music supplement)*, **76** (December).

Morrongiello, C. Ed., (2006a). A Courante by Daniel Bacheler. *Lute News (music supplement)*, **78** (June).

Morrongiello, C. Ed., (2006b). A Prelude by Daniel Bacheler. *Lute News (music supplement)*, **80** (December).

Morrongiello, C. Ed., (2007). A Prelude by Daniel Bacheler. *Lute News (music supplement)*, **83** (October).

Morrongiello, C. Ed., (2008). An Almain by Daniel Bacheler. *Lute News (music supplement)*, **84** (April).

Nolde, R. J., (1984). *English Renaissance Lute Practice as reflected in Robert Dowland's Varietie of Lute Lessons. M.Mus. Rice University, Houston, Texas.*

Oswell, M.L., (2009). *The Printed Lute Song: A Textual and Paratextual Study of Early Modern English Song Books. PhD University of North Carolina.*

Poulton, D., (1982). *John Dowland. Second edition. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.*

Poulton, D. & B. Lam, (2001). *The Collected Lute Music of John Dowland. Third Edition. Faber & Faber.*

Robinson, J.H., S. McCoy, C. Hartley, I. Harwood, ed. (2010). *The Matthew Holmes Manuscripts 1; CUL Dd.2.11. The Lute Society Facsimiles ed. Guildford UK: The Lute Society.*

Rooley, A., (1971). The Lute Solos and Duets of John Danyel. *The Lute Society Journal*, **XIII** p. 18 - 27.

Scott, D., (1971). John Danyel - His Life and Songs. *The Lute society Journal*, **XIII** p. 7 - 17.

Scruton, R., (1999). *The Aesthetics of Music. New Edition. Clarendon Press.*

Shepherd, M., (1998). *Complete Works of John Danyel: Volume 1, Lute Music. Lute Society Music Editions.*

Smith, D. A., (2002). *A History of the Lute from Antiquity to the Renaissance. Lexington, VA: Lute Soc of America Inc.*

Spring, M., (2001). *The Lute in Britain: A History of the Instrument and its Music (Early Music Series). Illustrated Edition. Oxford University Press, Oxford.*

Taruskin, R., (1988). The Pastness of the Present. In Kenyon, N, ed. *Authenticity and Early Music*. Oxford University Press, pp.136-207.

Taruskin, R., (1996). *Text and Act: Essays on Music and Performance*. Oxford University Press USA, New York.

Taylor, D., (2005). The solo lute music of John Dowland. [Online]. *Voices of Music.org*, Available from: <http://www.voicesofmusic.org/The%20Solo%20Lute%20Music%20of%20John%20Dowland.pdf> [accessed 4 August 2011].