Contents

1

Sources

THE seventeenth century produced some true monuments of music theory, of which Mersenne's *Harmonie universelle* (1636) and Kircher's *Musurgia universalis* (1650) are probably the best known. No such great books, however, were written in England. Although there were some learned tomes published, such as Butler's *The Principles of Musik in Singing and Setting* (1636) and, in the early years of the eighteenth century, the vast *Treatise of Musick* (1721) by the Scotsman Alexander Malcolm, writers in England generally had a rather different focus than did those on the Continent. The overwhelming majority of books dealt only with musical rudiments and the rules of composition, known collectively at the time as practical music. There was a strong predilection for simplicity and brevity which is amply demonstrated in the titles of the books themselves: Morley's *Plaine and Easie Introduction to Practical Musicke*, Bevin's *Briefe and Short Instruction of the Arte of Musicke*, Playford's *Breefe Introduction to the Skill of Musick*, and so on.[1]

The emphasis on *musica practica* in English theory was important in that it encouraged the rejection of old-fashioned rules in favour of those which were closer to techniques being used by contemporary musicians. It is perhaps partly for this reason that English theorists were instrumental in developing new ideas like key theory, whereas in Germany, for example, where there was a much stronger tradition of speculation, well into the eighteenth century there were theorists who sought to perpetuate the modes.[2] This willingness to accept new ideas makes the study of English theory particularly useful for examining new trends in music during the Baroque.

Where *musica speculativa* did exist in English treatises it was rarely Boethian in character. The last Englishman strongly to advocate number mysticism in music was Robert Fludd, in his *Utriusque cosmi* (Oppenheim, 1617) and

[1] The predominance of elementary instruction books in England is also noted by Barry Cooper in 'Englische Musiktheorie im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert', in Wilhelm Seidel and Barry Cooper, *Entstehung nationaler Traditionen: Frankreich–England* (Geschichte der Musiktheorie, 9; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1986), 145 and 154. Louis Chenette, on the other hand, perceives a shift away from practicality towards more mathematical and philosophical approaches in the middle of the 17th c. Although there certainly were more speculative works published in England towards the end of the century, this developmental view surely underemphasizes the continuing importance of practical instruction manuals in England into the 18th c. See Chenette, 'Music Theory in the British Isles during the Enlightenment' (Ph.D. diss., Ohio State University, 1967), 35–6.

[2] See Ch. 6 for further comments on this idea.

Monochordum mundi symphoniarum (Oppenheim, 1622), but, as Cooper notes, his works met with so little favour in England that they ended up being printed abroad because, in the case of the former book, 'English printers had asked for 500 pounds to cover printing costs . . . whereas in Germany it cost him nothing, and the publishers even sent him 16 copies of the work, plus 40 pounds in gold'.[3] Elsewhere, number mysticism was occasionally used to explain the importance of the harmonic triad,[4] and there are other fleeting references to the harmony of the spheres, such as this, on the scale, in Simpson's *Division-Viol* (1665):

> This Mysterious number of seven, leads me into a contemplation of the Universe, whose Creation is deliver'd unto our Capacity (not without some mystery) as begun and finished in seven dayes, which is thought to be figured long since by *Orpheus* his seven stringed Lyre. Within the Circumference of this great Universe, be seven Globes or Spherical Bodies in continual Motion, producing still new and various figures, according to their divers positions one to another. When with these I compare my seven Gradual Sounds, I cannot but admire the Resemblance of their Harmonies, the Concords of the one so exactly answering to the Aspects of the other; as an Unison to a Conjunction, an Octave to an Opposition; the middle Consonants in a Diapason, to the middle Aspects in an Orb; as a Third, Fifth, Sixth, in Musick, to a Trine, Quartile, Sextile in the Zodiack. And as these by moving into such and such Aspects transmit their Influences into Elementary Bodies; So those, by passing into such and such Concords, transmit into the Ear an Influence of Sound, which doth not only strike the sense, but even affect the very soul, stirring it up to a devout Contemplation of that Divine PRINCIPLE from whence all Harmony proceeds; and therefore very fitly applyed to sing and sound forth his Glory and Praise.[5]

But Simpson was much more characteristically down to earth when he came to write his *Compendium of Practical Musick* (1667), where he simply mentioned in his explanation of seven-note scales that 'to speak of the mystery of that number were to deviate from the business in hand'.[6]

English theorists tended to avoid *musica mundana* not only because of their emphasis on practical music, but also because they were influenced by the new empirical approach of the pioneers of the scientific revolution.[7] They began to perform experiments to investigate the nature of sound production, theories of consonance and dissonance, problems of temperament, and so on, from the middle of the century under the auspices of the newly formed Royal Society. It was this scientific movement, rather than the harmony of the spheres, which became thought of as speculative music theory in seventeenth-century

[3] Cooper, 'Englische Musiktheorie', 154–5.

[4] This is discussed in more detail in Ch. 4.

[5] *The Division-Viol or the Art of Playing Ex Tempore upon a Ground by Christopher Simpson*, facs. of 2nd edn., ed. Natalie Dolmetsch (London: J. Curwen, 1955), 23–4.

[6] Christopher Simpson, *A Compendium of Practical Music in Five Parts*, ed. Phillip J. Lord (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970), 1.

[7] Chenette examines in some detail the philosophical influences on English theorists during the century following the Restoration in 'Music Theory', 33–70.

England. Noticeably, such writings were kept strictly separate from 'practical' music in theory books, nowhere more obviously so than in Malcolm's *Treatise*, where the first half of his 608 pages contain no musical notation at all, the letter names only being introduced on p. 255, where he has to 'anticipate a little upon that Part where I am to explain the *Art* of *writing Musick*'.[8]

The philosopher Francis Bacon was the first to encourage the empirical investigation of the nature of sound, and, in his posthumously published *Sylva sylvarum* of 1627, he was critical of previous types of musical speculation: 'Musick in the Practice, hath been well pursued, and in good Variety; but in the Theory, and especially in the yielding of the Causes of the Practick, very weakly; being reduced into certain Mystical subtilties, and not much truth.'[9] Nevertheless, Bacon's ideas were slow to gain popularity, and the next theoretical work of this sort to appear in England—William Viscount Brouncker's translation of Descartes's *Compendium musicae* from 1618—was only published in 1653. Descartes had dealt with several aspects of practical music (many of which were rather old-fashioned),[10] but he was also a strong advocate of mathematical approaches to music, and discussed divisions of the octave in detail. In addition, Descartes's translator, Brouncker—who in 1662 became the first president of the Royal Society—included in the book his own complex method for tempering the scale using logarithms.[11]

It was temperament that was to prove the greatest area of interest for English speculative theorists throughout the rest of the seventeenth century and into the eighteenth. Every theorist who addressed the scientific side of music described monochord division and most put forward more or less practical solutions to the problem of tuning the scale: John Birchensha, whose manuscript calculations are preserved in GB-Lbl Add. MS 4388 (*c.*1665); Francis North, in his *Philosophical Essay of Musick* (1677); Thomas Salmon in *A Proposal to Perform Musick in Perfect and Mathematical Proportions* (1688) and later letters written to the Royal Society (1705–6); William Holder in his *Treatise of the Natural Grounds and Principles of Harmony* (1694); Malcolm in his *Treatise* of 1721; and William Jackson in *A Preliminary Discourse to a Scheme Demonstrating the Perfection and Harmony of Sounds* (1726).

Many writers also followed Bacon in exploring the nature of sound and sound production. They discussed the now generally accepted idea of sound

[8] Alexander Malcolm, *A Treatise of Musick* (Edinburgh, 1721), 254–5.

[9] Francis Bacon, *Sylva sylvarum* (London, 1627), 29.

[10] For details of the approach taken by Descartes in his *Compendium musicae* in relation to his later writings, see H. Floris Cohen, *Quantifying Music: The Science of Music at the First Stage of the Scientific Revolution, 1580–1650* (Dordrecht, Boston, and Lancaster: D. Reidel, 1984), 161–6. See also Bertrand Augst, 'Descartes's Compendium on Music', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 26 (1965), 119–32.

[11] Walker felt that Brouncker's calculations made little sense, but Gouk has subsequently been able to interpret them. See D. P. Walker, *Studies in Musical Science in the Late Renaissance* (Studies of the Warburg Institute, 37; London: The Warburg Institute; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 117, and Penelope Gouk, *Music, Science and Natural Magic in Seventeenth-Century England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999), 142–3.

as vibration, described the phenomena of the overtone series and sympathetic vibration, they explored the nature of consonance and dissonance, carried out experiments into the causes of echoes, and put forward theories to explain the working of the ear. Morland's *Tuba Stentoro-Phonica* of 1672, in which he described his invention in 1670 of a series of large trumpet-like instruments designed to make it possible to communicate over long distances, demonstrates not only the eagerness of these pioneers in the science of music, but also the way in which even *musica speculativa* in seventeenth-century England was aimed at practical application. Morland listed several uses he saw for this new instrument, such as to give orders during storms at sea, to a whole fleet of ships at once, or, indeed on land to a whole army; and, only shortly after the disaster of 1666, 'in case of great Fires, where usually all people are in a hurry, the Officers and Commanders may by this Instrument so govern the Assistants, as to prevent disorder and confusion, and consequently may save a Town or City from perishing'.[12]

As mentioned in the Preface, scientific writings have not been considered in this book except where they were influential to, or influenced by, more traditional music theories: the emphasis here is firmly placed on practical rather than speculative music. The various non-technical musical topics addressed by English theorists during the period have also not been addressed, since they clearly fall outside the realm of theory proper. They are, however, worth considering briefly here. Seventeenth-century England witnessed the beginnings of music biography, chiefly in the writings of the amateurs Anthony Wood and Roger North,[13] and there are also many entertaining references made to musical life in the Restoration in the diaries of Pepys and John Evelyn.[14] By the early eighteenth century a number of English writers had turned their attentions towards music history, as demonstrated in the chronicles appended by Thomas Tudway to his set of manuscripts copied for the Harley family between 1715 and 1720, and in North's *Memoires of Musick* (1728).[15] An interesting and

[12] Samuel Morland, *Tuba Stentoro-Phonica* (London, 1671), 13–14.

[13] For Wood see Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses: an Exact History of Writers and Bishops who have had their Education in the University of Oxford; to which are added the Fasti, or Annals of the said University*, ed. Philip Bliss, 4 vols. (London: Rivington, 1813–20), and *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, Antiquary, of Oxford, 1632–1695, Described by Himself*, ed. Andrew Clark, 5 vols. (Oxford Historical Society, 19, 21, 26, 30, and 40; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891–1900); for North see his *Memoires of Musick* in *Roger North's The Musicall Grammarian, 1728*, ed. Mary Chan and Jamie C. Kassler (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

[14] Printed in modern edition as *The Diary of Samuel Pepys: A New and Complete Transcription*, ed. R. C. Latham and W. Matthews, 11 vols. (London: Bell and Hyman, 1970–83); *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. John Bowle (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1983).

[15] Tudway's history occurs as a series of introductions to London, British Library, Harleian MSS 7337–7342; it is discussed and parts are reproduced in Christopher Hogwood, 'Thomas Tudway's History of Music', in Christopher Hogwood and Richard Luckett (eds.), *Music in Eighteenth-Century England: Essays in Memory of Charles Cudworth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 19–47. A transcription of the complete prefaces occurs in Ian Spink, *Restoration Cathedral Music* (Oxford Studies in British Church Music; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 434–49. For North see *The Musicall Grammarian*, ed. Chan and Kassler.

thoroughly researched companion to these essays is provided by the last section of Malcolm's treatise, entitled '*Of the* ANCIENT MUSICK', which recounts the history of music theory.[16] Although these authors often exhibited the progressivist approach typical of the period—one that tends to see worth in the past only inasmuch as it fostered development towards the 'perfection' of the present—North in particular seems to have been one of the earliest historiographers to question this view of history. He was not only sometimes critical of music and musicians in his own times (above all those whom he felt valued virtuosity above musical content), he also warned that 'gentlemen must put off their *anno domini*, and all that is their acquaintance, and put on the time and garb of the age they are to deal in' when considering historical matters.[17]

There were two main points of focus for musical debate in the period:[18] in the middle and latter part of the seventeenth century there were published a vast number of pamphlets and sermons arguing either for or against the use of music in church. These were, of course, fuelled largely by Puritanical views that only metrical psalm-settings were appropriate for worship. Given the nature of the rest of their books, it is not surprising that those music theorists who addressed the issue, such as Butler and Mace,[19] found many Christian benefits in music. The other principal subject for polemicists was opera, and, in particular in England, the issue of whether works should be all-sung or part-spoken. Many writers adhered to Peter Motteux's view that 'our English genius will not relish that perpetual Singing',[20] and that recitative was unnatural, but North—significantly writing after the decline of English 'dramatick' opera—was quick to point out that such works consequently lacked dramatic coherence:

> singing and speaking doe not agree in an opera; that is musick and drama, will not be tyed together, one may be made to subserve, so that it shall be clear which is preferred, as songs and interludes of musick in plays are well, being auxiliarys of the principall designe; so as you are not called away from the alteration of the main [design]. But to doe as our way hath bin, to joyne two capitall enterteinements together, that is an intire play and musicall opera, either may be good apart, but so put together, one must needs be fastidious. And I challeng anyone that hath attended them, to say, if their favourite party were not reigning upon the stage, they were not uneasy, or rather impatient till the other was done. I know for my owne part I went for the musick, and tho I could not blame the play, I hated it, becaus it stood in the way of my diversion. It's possible

[16] *A Treatise of Musick*, 451–608.

[17] *Roger North on Music: Being a Selection from his Essays Written during the Years c.1695–1728*, ed. John Wilson (London: Novello, 1959), 284. It is notable also that a small number of English theorists, such as Thomas Ravenscroft and Thomas Mace, actively preferred the music and methods of past ages over those of the present.

[18] These are covered in more detail in Rosamond McGuinness, 'Writings about Music', in *The Seventeenth Century*, ed. Ian Spink (The Blackwell History of Music in Britain, 3; Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 417–20.

[19] Charles Butler, *The Principles of Musik in Singing and Setting* (London, 1636), 98–119; Thomas Mace, *Musick's Monument* (London, 1676), 7–8.

[20] Peter Motteux, *The Gentleman's Journal*, January 1691/2, 5.

some untunable people, might have the same respect for the play, and then the musick must needs be cartwheels. Therefore an opera will have the whole stage, and not share with the drama.[21]

There was sufficient interest in operatic debates in England in the first decade of the eighteenth century, when Italian opera was becoming popular, for a translation of Raguenet's *Parallèle des Italiens et des Français en ce qui regarde la musique et les opéras*, originally from 1702 and part of his pamphlet war with Jean Laurent Le Cerf de la Viéville, to have been published in 1709, together with the anonymous translator's own *Critical Discourse upon opera's in England*.[22]

Rudiments Manuals

Of the one hundred or so music treatises written in England between the late 1580s and the end of the second decade of the eighteenth century, more than two-thirds—some sixty-nine—could be described as having been principally designed for the musical amateur. These are divided into twenty-seven rudiments manuals, which taught the absolute beginner musical basics, and forty-two instruction books aimed at the student instrumentalist. In contrast, publications suitable for the more erudite reader number only twelve or so, and of these a quarter were translations of treatises written on the Continent.

Elementary theory books probably began to dominate the English market as a result of the thriving musical life in England during the last forty years of the sixteenth century. In the early 1570s music's popularity was demonstrated in a flurry of publications, mainly for the lute and cittern, but the disastrous results of awarding a monopoly of music printing to the already overworked Byrd and Tallis meant that virtually nothing appeared in print between 1575 and 1587. Tallis, who had died in 1585, was succeeded by the enthusiastic Thomas East. As Dart writes, 'By the end of 1593 East had been working as a printer-publisher for six years. During this period the output of new music books from his press was greater than that of all the previous eighty years of the century added together.'[23] East had established a healthy market for his books and it is not surprising that many printers took advantage of this when the Byrd–East patent expired in 1596. Among them was one William Barley, who in that year managed to produce not only *A New Booke of Tabliture* for plucked instruments such as the lute, pandora, and orpharion, to which he appended some basic instructions for playing each instrument, but also *The*

[21] Mary Chan and David Kassler, *Roger North's Cursory Notes of Musicke (c. 1698–c. 1703): A Physical, Psychological and Critical Theory* (Kensington, Australia: Unisearch, 1986), 230–1.

[22] François Raguenet, *A Comparison between the French and Italian Musick and Opera's*, ed. Charles Cudworth (facs. edn., Farnborough: Gregg International, 1968).

[23] Thurston Dart, foreword to Thomas Morley, *A Plain and Easy Introduction to Practical Music*, ed. Alec R. Harman (London: Dent and Sons, 1952), p. xix. See also D. W. Krummel, *English Music Printing, 1553–1700* (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1975), 19–20.

Pathway to Musicke, which, according to the title-page, contained 'sundrie familiar and easie Rules for the readie and true understanding of the *Scale, or Gamma-ut: wherein is exactlie shewed by plaine deffinitions, the principles of this Arte, brieflie laid open by way of questions and answers, for the better instruction of the learner*'. Although it was by no means as comprehensive as the first exhaustive book designed to give instruction to musical novices—Morley's *Plaine and Easie Introduction to Practical Musicke*, published the following year—the *Pathway* was more clearly aimed at a specific and lucrative market of would-be amateur performers who wished to acquire the minimum skills necessary for them to be able to participate in one of the most popular pastimes of the era. In this sense the *Pathway to Musicke* set the trend for English theory during the following century.

Morley's *Plaine and Easie Introduction* deservedly enjoyed a much higher reputation than did the *Pathway*, and it was rather different in scope and content. As Dart writes, it was 'clearly the result of many years spent in reading, in research, and in planning the form such a work should take'.[24] Morley succeeded in producing an entertaining instruction manual which enabled the novice to learn rules of music and notation sufficient for him to become a competent composer.[25] He dealt first with musical rudiments—the gamut, hexachords, solmization, and mensural notation—then with note-against-note writing in two and three parts on a cantus firmus and with canon, and lastly with more advanced rules of composition and instruction for composing fifth-species counterpoint on a cantus firmus.

The book is in dialogue format throughout, which, as Cooper notes, makes for 'a rather long-winded text',[26] but one which is less formal and more lighthearted than many. Nevertheless, Morley in some respects failed in his aim to give a 'Plaine and Easie' introduction, for—although for the most part he kept non-essential information separate from the main text in lengthy annotations at the end of each section—he quoted extensively the sources of and background to his material. For this reason the book will be considered again under scholarly writings, below. This is also a publication which belongs firmly in the sixteenth century, treating such subjects as the mensural modes and hexachords in depth, and assuming composition above a plainsong to be fundamental. It is therefore perhaps surprising that, with the exception of two books which focused on particular aspects of composition—Campion's *A New Way of Making Fowre Parts in Counterpoint* (*c*.1613), which importantly outlined a new composition method in which chords were derived from the bass rather than the tenor, and Bevin's *A Briefe and Short Instruction of the Arte*

[24] Dart in Morley, *Plain and Easy Introduction*, ed. Harman, p. xxiii.

[25] For a discussion of the way in which Morley's *Introduction* reflects changes in educational practice in the latter half of the 16th c. in England, see Jane Flynn, 'The Education of Choristers in England during the Sixteenth Century', in John Morehen (ed.), *English Choral Practice 1400–1650* (Cambridge Studies in Performance Practice; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 180–99, *passim*.

[26] 'Englische Musiktheorie', 160.

of Musicke (1631), which gave little more than a series of examples of canon—and two manuscript treatises which were presumably intended only for specific pupils, Ravenscroft's *Treatise of Musick* (*c*.1607) and Coperario's *Rules how to Compose* (*c*.1613), only one other instruction manual was produced before the middle of the seventeenth century, and this book, Butler's *Principles of Musik* from 1636 (discussed below), reached well beyond what the musical amateur would have needed to know.

Until about 1610 printed collections of music remained popular, and several, like Barley's *New Booke of Tabliture* mentioned above, included rudimentary instructions. Such books as Thomas Robinson's *The Schoole of Musicke* (1603), for lute, his *New Citharen Lessons* (1609), and Robert Dowland's *Varietie of Lute-Lessons*—which included a translation of Besard's 'Necessarie Observations belonging to the Lute, and Lute-Playing' plus additional 'observations' by John Dowland from 1610—continued the trend to produce brief information on instrumental technique for the inexperienced player. After the first decade of the seventeenth century, however, music printing again declined, this time due to problems in establishing the ownership of the publishing monopoly. It was only in the latter years of the Commonwealth, by which time the monopoly had been abolished, that a new marketing opportunity was spotted by the publisher John Playford. Since public music-making had been banned, music in the home was thriving once again, and Playford set about providing the amateur musician with popular tunes for the most readily available instruments: the lyra viol, in *A Musicall Banquet* (1651) and *Musick's Recreation on the Viol* (1661); the cittern in *Musick's Delight on the Cithren* (1666), and both it and the gittern in *A Booke of New Lessons for the Cithern and Gittern* (1652); the harpsichord in *Musicks Hand-maid* (1663); and the violin in *Apollo's Banquet* from about 1669. All these books included the same sorts of elementary instructions to the player as had the earlier anthologies. As McGuinness writes, they also 'reflect the way certain instruments came into fashion during the century',[27] and by the turn of the century Playford's successors, principally John Walsh and John Young, were publishing similar collections for violin, harpsichord, recorder or flute, and hautboy.

Lord comments that 'the publication of instruction books was a means of creating and encouraging an interest in music and thereby increasing the public demand for the sale of printed music',[28] and this is almost certainly what Playford had in mind when he produced his *Breefe Introduction to the Skill of Musick* in 1654. The four or five pages usually appended at the front of collections of instrumental pieces contained only the most basic information to allow the customer to use the book. This usually comprised: rules for reading the notation system used, which itself was generally some sort of tablature,

[27] McGuinness, 'Writings about Music', 415.
[28] In Simpson, *Compendium*, p. xxxii.

thus obviating the need for the amateur to learn staff notation (though some books did introduce the reader to the gamut); rudimentary technical advice about holding the instrument, tuning in the case of stringed instruments, fingerings, and so on; a page or so on note values and metre; and some instruction on the most common ornaments in use for that instrument.[29]

Although such information might enable the novice to make sense of and play the music he or she had purchased—though often this can only barely have been the case—it could hardly have satisfied the amateur who wanted properly to understand the rudiments of music. By this time Morley's *Plaine and Easie Introduction* was not only out of date, but, according to Playford himself, '*very rare & scarce to be attaind*'.[30] He therefore set about filling the gap with his *Introduction to the Skill of Musick*.

Like Barley, Playford knew exactly how to manipulate his customers: while providing for their needs, he made sure that they would continue buying his books by constantly updating them, though often in only minute ways, so that effectively he never produced the same book twice. This was true of many of his music books,[31] but applies most notably to the *Introduction*. As the most successful example of its type in the period, it was altered some fifteen times and went through nineteen numbered editions and twenty-three separate issues, outlasting both Playford himself and his son Henry, since it appeared for the last time in 1730. Details of the changes to its contents are given in Appendix C.

The basic structure of Playford's *Introduction* remained unchanged despite its many incarnations. There were three sections: the first introduced the reader to the rudiments of staff notation, the gamut, solmization, note values, metre, notational signs, and mode (from 1697 replaced by key); the second was an instruction manual for the bass viol and treble violin; the third directions for simple composition, including rules for consonance and dissonance, progressions and part-writing and, in later years, imitation and fugal writing.

The book's main drawback was that, although it covered most aspects of *musica practica* that the amateur student might wish to learn about, its consituent parts were drawn from a range of sources, and therefore were often unsystematic and lacked coherence. The rudiments Playford wrote himself, though they were revised by Purcell for the 1694 edition and again, anonymously, in 1697; Playford was also responsible for the bass viol and treble

[29] Three performance manuals were considerably more detailed than this: Simpson's *The Division-Viol* (1659), the manuscript treatise now known as the Burwell Lute Tutor (*c.*1670), and Mace's *Musick's Monument* (1676).

[30] John Playford, *An Introduction to the Skill of Musick* (London, 1655), preface. Cooper is of the opinion that Morley's book was not yet obsolete, but Zimmerman's view is that, in the period when Playford produced the *Introduction*, 'the need to reestablish a general pedagogical basis for the fundamentals of music was urgent'. See Cooper, 'Englische Musiktheorie', 160; and John Playford, *An Introduction to the Skill of Musick: New Introduction, Glossary and Index*, ed. Franklin B. Zimmerman (New York: Da Capo, 1972), 12 and 15.

[31] Zimmerman, for example, notes that *The English Dancing Master* and *Apollo's Banquet* also ran to many editions; see Playford, *Introduction*, ed. Zimmerman, 8.

violin instructions; but the rules for composition were taken initially from Campion's *A New Way of Making Fowre Parts in Counterpoint*, then replaced in 1683 by a new section which had been inexpertly cobbled together by Playford from a variety of sources,[32] and which was subsequently substantially rewritten by Purcell for the 1694 edition. Extracts from various other sources, such as an anonymous translation of most of the preface to Caccini's *Le nuove musiche* (included from 1664 to 1694) and Edward Lowe's *Order of Performing the Divine Service* (included from 1674 to 1687 and again from 1700), were also appended in some editions. The lack of method in the *Introduction* is demonstrated by the fact that information was frequently duplicated. In the second edition, from 1655, for example, the rudiments of pitch and its notation were explained three times—in Playford's own rudiments, Simpson's 'Exposition of the Gamut', and Campion's preface to *A New Way of Making Fowre Parts in Counterpoint*; and from 1664 until it was removed by Purcell in 1694 the composition rules began with a page from Elway Bevin's *Briefe and Short Instruction of the Arte of Musicke* in which the intervals and concords were explained, despite the fact that the composition rules proper began with precisely the same material.

Playford's *Introduction* nevertheless had a higher profile than the other main rudiments manual from the second half of the seventeenth century, *A Compendium of Practical Musick*, published by Christopher Simpson in 1667.[33] Simpson's book was clearly popular and influential, but it went through only eight editions in comparison with Playford's twenty-three issues.[34] Quite possibly this is due only to the fact that Playford was such a master salesman—and it is noticeable that there were no significant revisions made to the *Compendium*—for Simpson's is obviously the better book. Most importantly, it portrays the careful planning of a gifted teacher: as Lord writes, 'the treatment throughout is systematic, proceeding from the simple to the complex'.[35] Thus the book begins with 'The Rudiments of Song', with contents largely similar to those in Playford's rudiments; it progresses to 'The Principles of Composition', in which intervals, progressions, cadences, and basic rules for two- to eight-part composition are given; next the slightly more complicated topic of 'The Use of Discords' is dealt with, covering not only passing dissonance and suspensions (rather briefly), but also the scientific divisions of the octave (which Simpson himself admitted in his preface were 'things superfluous');[36] the fourth and

[32] Details of these sources are given in Lillian M. Ruff, 'A Survey of John Playford's "Introduction to the Skill of Musick" ', *Consort*, 22 (1965), 36–48 at 43–4, and in App. D. Oddly, Zimmerman feels that in this revision 'faults seem few indeed, and the treatise as a whole strikes one as well-conceived and carefully executed'; see Playford, *Introduction*, ed. Zimmerman, 18.

[33] The first of the five parts of the *Compendium* was in fact published two years earlier as *The Principles of Practical Musick*.

[34] In addition to the 1667 edition it appeared in 1678, 1706, 1714, 1727, 1732, and again in an undated version from the late 18th century. Lord considers there to have been nine editions, since he counts the *Principles of Practical Musick* as the first; see *Compendium*, pp. xx–xxi.

[35] Ibid., p. xxxi.

[36] Ibid., p. xlv.

fifth parts, 'The Form of Figurate Descant' and 'The Contrivance of Canon', treat the more advanced aspects of composition: fifth-species counterpoint, imitation, and fugal or canonic writing. Simpson's *Compendium* was ideal for the beginner: it assumed no prior knowledge, omitted almost all unnecessary and obsolete information, and gradually built up a store of knowledge to enable the student to attempt the most complex types of composition of the day. Its superiority over Playford's *Introduction* is demonstrated by comparing the treatment of imitative writing in the two books: whereas Purcell in the twelfth edition of the *Introduction* was reduced to giving little more than a series of examples for the bewildered reader to examine, Simpson was able to give step-by-step instructions to teach the novice how to compose both imitation and canon.[37]

The *Introduction* and *Compendium* seem to have dominated the market for rudiments manuals well into the eighteenth century. There were several manuscript treatises dealing with the same subject matter, but these can have had little impact on the public at large.[38] Basic material of a more detailed sort than that covered in the instrumental treatises was printed in a number of singing tutors, *Synopsis of Vocal Musick* (1680), *A New and Easie Method to Learn to Sing by Book* (1686), Porter's *Plain and Easie Directions for Psalm-Singing* (1700), Hall's *The Psalm-singers Compleat Companion* (1708), and Daniel Robinson's *An Essay upon Vocal Musick* (1715).[39] There were also two chapters on musical rudiments included within books with broader scope, John Newton's *The English Academy* (1677) and Curson's *The Theory of Sciences Illustrated* (1702), but these were almost entirely plagiarized from either Playford or Simpson or both. The first comprehensive attempts to supersede Playford's and Simpson's rules of composition were not made until 1730 in Pepusch's *A Treatise on Harmony*.

A new type of performance treatise, the thoroughbass manual, began to appear in the last quarter of the seventeenth century. The earliest English example of such instructions, Penny's *Art of Composition, or Directions to Play the Thorow Bass* from 1670, is now lost,[40] but the rules Matthew Locke appended to the beginning of his keyboard collection of 1673, *Melothesia*, survive, as do Blow's manuscript *Rules for Playing of a Thorough Bass*, which

[37] Compare Playford, *Introduction* (1694), 106–14, 117–28, and 133–43, against Simpson, *Compendium*, ed. Lord, 70–5 and 80–97. See also below, Ch. 7.

[38] These include 'A Collection of Rules in Musicke from the most knowing Masters in that Science' copied by Silas Taylor and containing, among other works, Birchensha's '6 Rules of Composition' (GB-Lbl Add. MS 4910, fos. 39–61); and Arthur Bedford's 'Observations concerning Musick made Anno Domini 1705 or -06' copied by John Hawkins in GB-Lbl Add. MS 4917, fos. 1–63.

[39] Singing tutors from this period did not generally address aspects of singing technique as such, so, with one notable exception—Pietro Reggio's recently rediscovered *Art of Singing* (Oxford, 1677)—they have therefore been considered here in the same category as rudiments manuals.

[40] See Thurston Dart, 'A Hand-List of English Instrumental Music Printed before 1681', *Galpin Society Journal*, 8 (1955), 13–26 at 25.

may have been roughly contemporaneous. They were followed by a short section on theorbo realizations in Mace's *Musick's Monument*, an English translation of Matteis's *False Consonances of Musick* for guitar, published in 1682, and a number of works in the early eighteenth century: the anonymous 'Rules for Playing a Through Bass', included in *A Collection of Lessons and Aires* ([1702]), which relate to Keller's *Compleat Method for attaining to Play a Thorough Bass*, published posthumously in 1707; Captain Prencourt's *Tract of the Continued or thro-base*, from about 1710, copied and annotated by Roger North; B[aillie]'s *Introduction to the Knowledge and Practice of Thoro'Bass* from 1717; and Edward Finch's manuscript treatise from around 1725, which derives from Keller's *Compleat Method*. Although these treatises, like other instrumental instruction manuals, were intended to give practical hints for performance, they had largely different content. Rudimentary knowledge of notation, pitch, and metre was assumed, so that authors could focus on the mechanics of continuo realization. Rather than concentrating on rules to allow the player to decode figured bass, their main purpose lay in teaching the rudiments of harmony, and it is clear that the player was expected to be able to improvise his own harmonization of a given bass line with little or no figuring. Such emphasis on practical application of what often appear to be rather dry harmonic rules makes thoroughbass manuals particularly valuable sources to compare against traditional composition treatises.

Scholarly Writings

A group of treatises which runs parallel to those intended to instruct musical novices comprises those works which addressed seventeenth-century music theory from a more scholarly viewpoint. Although the boundary between the two categories was sometimes blurred (and is certainly not intended here to be rigid), the books in this class were both aimed at a different readership than were the rudiments and performance manuals, and, for the most part, were written by a difference class of author.[41] The basic instruction books were almost all the work of professional musicians, most of whom are known to have been actively involved in teaching: Simpson, for example, educated the sons of Sir Robert Bolles, Birchensha gave lessons to Pepys in 1662, and Keller was a well-known harpsichord teacher. The heavy involvement of most rudiments writers in English musical life during the seventeenth century meant that they must have had a thorough understanding of modern trends and styles: Morley, Coperario, Campion, Locke, Simpson, Mace, Blow, Purcell, and the immigrants Matteis and Keller were all well-known performers, composers, or both; and even those involved only in publishing music, such as Barley and Playford, may well have been competent musicians.

[41] General biographical information on most British theorists is given in *Companion to Baroque Music*, ed. Julie Ann Sadie (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1990), 272–313.

In contrast, the more scholarly works tended to be written by non-professionals: Butler and Salmon were priests, Roger North was a country gentleman and retired lawyer, and Malcolm was a mathematician. The approaches taken by these authors were consequently somewhat different than those of the practising musicians, but this should not be taken to imply that they avoided *musica practica*. On the contrary, for the most part, this was the main focus of their works. Some, in fact, assumed little or no prior knowledge on the part of their readers—in particular Butler and Malcolm—but they sought to give their students far more than the rudimentary information they might require to become practising amateurs. They were therefore able to discuss in greater depth topics such as the medieval origins of the gamut and solmization, the division of the octave into the ancient Greek enharmonic, chromatic, and diatonic scales, intervallic and metrical proportions, and so on. Such authors demonstrated impressive knowledge of classical Greek and Latin authors, and especially of the most significant music treatises of their own and previous centuries. It is in this respect that Morley's *Introduction* went far beyond the rudimentary and might be classed as scholarly, for he frequently cited such authors as Boethius, Glareanus, Gaffurius, Zarlino, and Ornithoparcus. For the non-musician Butler, it was Morley himself, Calvisius, and Zarlino who provided much of the material he required for the more technical parts of his *Principles of Musik in Singing and Setting* (1636).[42] Malcolm, meanwhile, admitting to having but 'small Knowledge' of music,[43] instead sought the help of a friend to write his chapter on composition.[44]

Two sources often referred to by the more scholarly English theorists, Ornithoparcus' *Micrologus* (1517) and Descartes's *Compendium musicae* (1618), together with Alstedt's *Templum musicum* (1610), which seems to have been less influential, appeared in English translation during the seventeenth century, in 1609, 1653, and 1664 respectively. In part the publication of these treatises in English rather than Latin may demonstrate the extent to which music was gaining in popularity outside the highest echelons of society, but the fact that publishers saw a need to make them available is probably also indicative of the generally small number of scholarly publications being produced in England at the time.

The reliance on classical sources for material generally made the more scholarly books conservative, though it is unlikely that their authors overtly intended them to be so. This could not be said of the first of several polemical works published during the seventeenth century which dealt with a single aspect of practical music. In his *Briefe Discourse of the True (but neglected) Use of Charact'ring the Degrees by their Perfection, Imperfection and Diminution in Measurable Musicke* (1614), Thomas Ravenscroft aimed to

[42] For details of Butler's acknowledged and uncredited sources, and those of Morley, see App. D.

[43] *A Treatise of Musick*, 450.

[44] 'The 13 *Ch*. of the following Book was communicated to me by a Friend, whose Modesty forbids me to name [him]'; ibid., p. xxii.

restore mensural notation which, by the time he wrote, was essentially obsolete. Clearly underlying his work, however, is his dislike of the modern trend towards making music more accessible to non-professionals whom, he says, Ornithoparcus entitles 'the *Musitians* of *Musitians*, *per excellentiam*, who being ignorant of all things in our *Art*, yet brag of their *generall Knowledge*'.[45] The other major campaign of the period was more forward-looking. Salmon's *Essay to the Advancement of Musick* (1672), in which he propounded a new system of fixed clefs and the abolition of solmization, was, typically for the period, designed to simplify the rudiments of pitch, which he saw as a '*confused Chaos of impertinent Characters and insignificant Signs*'.[46] It provoked Matthew Locke, vehemently opposed to what Salmon was suggesting, to start a now famous pamphlet war, explored in detail in Chapter 3 below.

The writings of Roger North stand somewhat apart from those of his contemporaries. North was an enthusiastic gentleman amateur, but he lacked formal musical education. Compared with the work of those theorists who had been brought up with the traditional training of future professionals, the writings of the self-taught North are profoundly different. The most extreme view that North held was that all notes within the chromatic scale should be considered as consonant. He could be eccentric, but the fact that he was not weighed down by out-moded theories also made his writings refreshingly modern: he was, for instance, probably the first English theorist to explore the possible principles underlying triadic inversion.[47] His often rambling thoughts on music, written over most of his adult life, cover many aspects of practical music, as well as music biography and history, mentioned above; they are tied together by his constantly (in the modern sense) speculative tone. As Cooper writes, it is likely that, had any of his ideas been published, they would have been highly influential.[48]

Relationships between Treatises

In the introduction to his *False Consonances of Musick* (1682), Nicola Matteis complained to the reader:

> a certain Lutenist has had y^e^ confidence to call himselfe y^e^ Author of this Book when y^e^ truth of it is that I presented a Copy of it to a Person of Condition which was Transported by my self to the French Lute[.] [H]ow this Lutenist came by the

[45] Thomas Ravenscroft, *A Briefe Discourse of the True (but neglected) use of Charact'ring the Degrees by their Perfection, Imperfection and Diminution in Measurable Musicke* (London, 1614), Apologie.

[46] Birchensha, in Thomas Salmon, *An Essay to the Advancement of Musick* (London, 1672), preface, p. [i].

[47] For further comment see Jamie C. Kassler, in the introduction to Chan and Kassler, *Cursory Notes of Musicke*, 13–14, and below, Ch. 4.

[48] Cooper, 'Englische Musiktheorie', 174.

Copy of it I know not but he has got it & has y^e^ face to entitle himself to y^e^ Composition.[49]

Today it seems quite understandable for Matteis to have been angry that his material had been stolen, but in voicing his displeasure he was in something of a minority, for plagiarism of this sort seems to have been a more or less accepted part of seventeenth-century publishing. Many music treatises from the period were derived entirely or in part from other writers' ideas. Because theory books in England were predominantly those which gave rudimentary information to the reader, they inevitably had much in common with one another, but direct quotation was sufficiently frequent for it to be clear that similarities between these manuals were often more than coincidental.

Appendix D lists those sources of material which have been identified for each author.[50] The tables not only elucidate the relationships between particular books, they can also be a useful means by which to isolate those works which appear to have been especially influential during the period. It is not surprising that the most frequently quoted books were those which were probably the most easily available, principally Playford's *Introduction* and Simpson's *Compendium*. Regular reference was also made to the other complete compendia of the period, Morley's *Plaine and Easie Introduction* and Butler's *Principles of Musik*.

Interestingly, these source books were themselves dependent on one another to an extent. It has already been noted that Morley and Butler took much of their information from classical authors of antiquity and from closer to their own time, and that, for Butler, such sources included Morley himself. In the sections of his book which gave instruction on the more complex elements of composition, such as discords, progressions, syncopation, cadences, and imitation, Butler, the non-musician, seems to have derived his material from a comparison of Morley's book with that of Calvisius. He frequently cited both authors' relevant advice, and referred readers to either work for more information. Simpson, too, though he was a far more original teacher, must have valued Morley's *Introduction*: he first recommended it as a source for learning fifth-species counterpoint in his annotations of Campion's *Art of Setting or Composing of Musick in Parts*, in the 1655 edition of Playford's *Introduction*. In his own *Compendium* he reproduced the example of the use of the 6/5 chord at a cadence given by 'our excellent and worthy countryman,

[49] Nicola Matteis, *The False Consonances of Music. Facsimile Edition from Glasgow Euing Music Collection B.e.20*, ed. James Tyler (Monaco: Editions Chanterelles, 1980), fo. a3^v^. As Tyler notes, the lute treatise may be one now held in Glasgow University Library, which uses several of Matteis's examples of figured basses, realized in tablature. Following Garnsey, Tyler cites it as GB-Ge MS Euing R.d.43, but this is actually a photocopy of the original manuscript, GB-Ge MS Euing 25; see ibid., p. iv, and also Sylvia Garnsey, 'The Use of Hand-plucked Instruments in the Continuo Body: Nicola Matteis', *Music and Letters*, 47 (1966), 135–40.

[50] Such an attempt cannot, of course, be exhaustive: it merely includes those passages that I have been able to recognize, together with those mentioned by other authors.

Mr. Morley', and quoted his rule for writing canon, though he also demonstrated his more modern approach by criticizing Morley's calculation of intervals from the tenor not bass.

It is in Playford's *Introduction* that we find most reliance on the writings of others which, given that the overriding character of the book is its amalgamation of a wide range of sources, is not surprising. In the 1654 edition Playford claimed overall authorship of the rudiments section of the book, but did credit Butler for his account of the Greek moods. Nevertheless, he omitted to mention that he had taken his exercises for learning the melodic intervals and most of his chapter on the metrical moods from Morley. In later editions he was more inclined to mention Morley by name, recommending him together with Campion's *Art of Setting* for 'further Discourse' on the concords and discords in the 1658 edition,[51] and mentioning his account of the modes in the 1672 edition. He was also happy to advertise Simpson's *Division Viol* in the bass viol instructions in the 1660 edition, since he felt Simpson to be 'a more Able and Knowing Master on this Instrument' than himself, and he therefore avoided giving any information on techniques of viol playing. In subsequent editions, however, he changed his mind, and did include such a section of his own.

In 1683 Playford seems to have made a rather hasty decision to replace Campion's *Art of Setting* with his own section on the rules of composition, and he apologized at the end of this scrappy treatise that '(being streightened for Time) I could not so Methodically put it into that order I intended'.[52] It was presumably because he was so hurried that, despite his claim that 'in the whole, you will meet many Examples not to be found in other Books',[53] the chapter comprises little more than other writers' musical illustrations. Those sources which have been identified by Ruff include Morley, Campion, Coperario, Bevin, Butler, Simpson's *Compendium* and *Division-Viol*, and Locke's *Melothesia*.[54] The only author Playford mentioned was Morley, who it was, he explained, who forbade the use of the sixth and fifth together.[55] Purcell removed most of the older examples for his revised edition of the *Introduction* in 1694, but neverthless sources as old as Coperario continued to appear in the editions of the *Introduction* published in the eighteenth century.

The influence of the treatises by Morley, Butler, Simpson, and Playford on other writers during the seventeenth century was considerable. It can be seen most clearly in a group of particularly blatant plagiarisms which contain no original material whatsoever. Two of these were books in which music was covered as one of the 'Seven Liberal Arts', together with arithmetic, astronomy,

[51] The reference to Morley was omitted in the 1660 edition, presumably because here, and subsequently, Playford reproduced Campion's treatise as the third part of his *Introduction* and therefore did not wish to direct readers elsewhere.

[52] Playford, *Introduction* (1683), 45.

[53] Ibid.

[54] See Ruff, 'A Survey of Playford's "Introduction" ', 36–48, and below, App. D.

[55] Playford, 'A Brief Introduction to the Art of Descant', in *Introduction* (1683), 28.

geometry, grammar, logic, and rhetoric; they were published respectively by John Newton in 1677 and Henry Curson in 1702. Neither author could have claimed to be an informed musician, and both did no more than extract rudimentary information from Playford, together with Butler in the case of Newton, and Simpson for Curson. They did not really attempt to hide their sources: Newton began by referring the reader to Playford (though he did not mention Butler) before he gave his 'short view of the altogether';[56] and Curson made frequent reference to both his source books, mainly at points where he wished to avoid covering the rudiments of music in any detail. For example, his explanation of horizontal intervals stopped after he introduced thirds, at which point he simply noted 'More Examples of Leaping and Skipping in General may be seen in Mr *Simpson*'s Compendium of Musick; and Mr. *Playford*'s Introduction to the Skill of Musick'. He wrote similarly after his short section on keys 'For more large Instructions and Examples of the Melancholy and Chearful Keys see Mr. *Playford*'s Introduction to the Skill of Musick'.[57] It is characteristic of both works not only that the plagiarizers quickly tired of the subject in hand, but also that their compilation of material from different books resulted in confusion, contradiction, and repetition. Newton, for instance, juxtaposed Playford's reduction of the six solmization syllables to four with Butler's seven-syllable system without pointing out that they were mutually exclusive.[58] Curson, meanwhile, took his definition of the consonances from Playford, but in mentioning that Simpson referred to them as third, fifth, sixth, and octave, rather than Playford's unison, third, fifth, and sixth, missed Playford's list of discords, meaning that the discords were given only in a later diagram, without explanation.[59]

A similarly poor-quality publication was Thomas Davidson's '. . . *Brief Introduction of Musick*, As is taught in the Musick-Schole of ABERDENE', appended at the beginning of John Forbes's *Cantus, Songs and Fancies* of 1662. Whether or not the rules given in this introduction were used in the Aberdeen music school, as presented in this book, they are little more than a set of quotations from Morley's *Introduction*, frequently taken out of context and thus rendered meaningless. All that Davidson's introduction did not take from Morley was his inclusion of a Guidonian hand and his division of the gamut into just 'Base and Alt', rather than the traditional three parts of English theory, though he retained the three registers given in Morley's gamut diagram.[60] In attempting to be brief, Davidson often gave explanations that

[56] John Newton, *The English Academy: or, a Brief Introduction to the Seven Liberal Arts* (London, 1677), 89.

[57] Henry Curson, *The Theory of Sciences Illustrated; or the Grounds and Principles of the Seven Liberal Arts* (London, 1702), 142 and 149.

[58] *The English Academy*, 93.

[59] *The Theory of Sciences Illustrated*, 153–5.

[60] *Cantus, Songs and Fancies. To Thre, Foure, or Five Partes, both apt for Voices and Viols. With a Brief Introduction of Musick, As is taught in the Musick-Schole of Aberdene by T[homas] D[avidson], Mr. of Musick* (Aberdeen, 1662), [1] and [3].

were incomplete, so that, for example, he introduced the three hexachords and their solmization terms, but did not describe how to move from one hexachord to another through mutation, nor for what purpose the syllables were used. He reproduced Morley's diagram of concords and discords, but defined only the former, and, in any case, notated all the songs in his book only in monophonic form, so need not have mentioned intervals at all. Even had this introduction been well written, it seems difficult to believe that its material would still have been in regular use in a music school some sixty-five years after the printing of Morley's book.[61]

There was, of course, a wide range of books available to these seventeenth-century plagiarizers and the variety of sources seems occasionally to have led them to include information not entirely appropriate to the subject of their own publications. Francis Timbrell's *Divine Musick Scholars Guide* (*c.*1725) was a book of psalms, hymns, and anthems which, according to its title-page, was 'intended for the use & benefit of all true Lovers of Divine Musick'. At the beginning of the book Timbrell appended the familiar set of rudiments 'for young practitioners to learn to sing True by the Notes', which he took mainly from Playford, though the sections on note values, rests, and metre are from Thomas Brown's *Compleat Musick-Master* of 1722. Timbrell must also have had a copy of *The Harpsicord Master*, however, since he included Purcell's explanation of the stave, leger lines, accidentals, and repeat signs, plus his diagram of a keyboard and his directions for harpsichord fingering. The only justification Timbrell seems to have been able to give for incorporating such instructions in a book of sacred vocal music is found again on the title-page of the book, where he claimed—almost certainly contrary to Purcell's intentions—that the rules were appropriate not only for spinnet and harpsichord, but also organ.

Rather better was Samuel Porter's *Plain and Easie Directions for Psalm-singing* (1700) which, though it owed much to Playford, tended to paraphrase him rather than quoting directly, and gave different instructions at several points, most noticeably in the section on note values and metre. Porter seems to have been a competent teacher who wrote his manual with copies of several editions of Playford's *Introduction* to hand,[62] but did not need to rely on it entirely. His only questionable judgement was the decision to include material from the new chapter on ornamentation in the thirteenth edition of Playford, despite his admission that 'To Grace a Note is not very proper in a whole Congregation'.[63] He tended to borrow Playford's examples and diagrams—such as his gamut diagram, his table of '*All the notes in the* Gam-ut *reduced to the two Cliffs used in this Book*, viz. Bass *and* Treble', and his examples of melodic intervals—rather

[61] Cooper points out that Davidson's introduction is rather old-fashioned, but does not notice that Morley was Davidson's source; see 'Englische Musiktheorie', 169–70.

[62] Although most correspondences with Playford are from the thirteenth edition of the *Introduction*, several (as noted in App. D) are from the twelfth or previous editions.

[63] Samuel Porter, *Plain and Easie Directions for Psalm-singing* (London, 1700), 21.

than his words. Nevertheless, the relationship between the two books was sometimes close, as can be seen from a comparison of their explanations of key:

Porter, *Plain and Easie Directions*

All Tunes may be reduced to two *Keys*, the one *flat*, and the other *sharp*; and that without either *Flat* or *Sharp* at the beginning of the five Lines.

The flat *Key* for Melancholy, or soft and sweet Tunes is *Are*, because its natural Third above it, is a Minor, or imperfect Third. The sharp *Key* for Cheerful Tunes, is *C fa ut*, because its ascending Third, is a Major. Notwithstanding, (through the variety of Instruments, there are as many Keys as in *Musick*, as Notes, (*viz*.) Seven, or more, into which, either flat or sharp Tunes may be Transpos'd, having a respect to the Majority, or Minority of your ascending Third.[64]

Playford, *Introduction*

There are but two *Keys* in Musick, one *flat*, and the other *sharp*, which is sufficient to write down any *melancholy* or *chearful Song* whatever. The *melancholy* or *flat* Key, without either *flat* or *sharp* at the beginning, is *Are* or *Alamire*; the *sharp* or *chearful Key*, without *flat* or *sharp* at the beginning, is *C faut* or *C solfa*: These we call the two *Natural Keys*, because a Song may be set in either of them without the help of *Flats* or *Sharps*; which cannot be done in any other Key, but there must be either *Flats* or *Sharps* placed at the beginning of your five Rules or Lines.[65]

Elsewhere, however, Porter's instructions were sufficiently independent of Playford's *Introduction* for it to be difficult to distinguish between paraphrase and mere similarity of content. This is also true of Daniel Robinson's *Essay upon Vocal Musick* (1715). Two of his chapter headings are the same as those in the revised rudiments used from Playford's thirteenth edition onwards—'*Of tuning the* Voice', and '*Of the several* Keys *in Musick*'—but in general the parallels between the two books suggest only that Playford was an inspiration to Robinson, and the latter's rudiments are consistently more modern in approach than are even the latest versions of Playford's.

A rather different relationship exists between a group of books which clearly do share some material, but where it is not immediately clear which author was the plagiarizer. The best-known examples of this problem are Thomas Campion's *New Way of Making Fowre Parts in Counterpoint* and Giovanni Coperario's *Rules how to Compose*. Neither work can be dated exactly and they have much in common. Their similarities have been noted by Manfred Bukofzer in his introduction to the facsimile edition of Coperario's rules: they share several examples, notably two in the section warning against the progression from octave to sixth in similar motion and five of cadences; they both advocate composition from the bass, though this is much more explicit in Campion than it is in Coperario; and they both

[64] Ibid. 11. [65] Playford, *Introduction* (1697), 24.

include lists of two-part intervals used to form four-part chords.[66] Campion's book is far better organized than is Coperario's and his ideas more articulately expressed so it is easy to agree with Bukofzer that 'in general, [Campion's] is not the language of an imitator. His ideas are so highly original and radical that one is tempted to assume that only a musical amateur, such as Campion was, would rush in where theorists fear to tread, not fully realizing the revolutionary effect the ideas could have'.[67] Since the most closely related sections occur consecutively in Coperario's book, whereas they are from two separate parts of Campion's, it seems most likely that Coperario simply took passages from *A New Way of Making Fowre Parts in Counterpoint* and copied them side by side into his own book. Nevertheless, Bukofzer's point that Coperario's examples are consistently superior to Campion's and that this might in fact make Campion the plagiarizer, is also persuasive.[68] Walter R. Davis still favours Campion, chiefly because Campion dedicated his *New Way* to Prince Charles: 'the fact that Charles was Coperario's pupil makes it less likely that Campion would have presented him with a volume containing examples filched from his master and more likely that Campion had begun it for Coperario's use in instructing Charles and that Coperario took parts of it for the instruction of John Egerton, first Earl of Bridgewater, who owned the manuscript of the *Rules*'.[69]

The originality of the 'Rules for Playing a Thorough Bass' in *A Collection of Lessons and Aires for the Harpsicord or Spinett* in comparison with Gottfried Keller's *Compleat Method for Attaining to Play a Thorough Bass* is similarly difficult to determine. Again these works have no straightforward chronology: the *Collection of Lessons and Aires* has no date on the title-page, and there is no explanation given for the dating in RISM of 1702; meanwhile modern sources associate two different dates with the publication of Keller's *Compleat Method*, 1705 and 1707,[70] but, in any case, it was posthumous, Keller having died in 1704. On the basis of content, the *Compleat Method* would seem to be the source work. It is, as its title suggests, a far more detailed thoroughbass manual than are the instructions in *A Collection of Lessons and Aires*—for instance, in the 'Rules' only a bass line with added figures is given for each example, whereas Keller indicated something of the style of realization by

[66] Giovanni Coperario, *Rules how to Compose: A Facsimile Edition of a Manuscript from the Library of the Earl of Bridgewater (circa 1610) now in the Huntington Library, San Marino, California*, ed. Manfred F. Bukofzer (Los Angeles: Ernest E. Gottlieb, 1952), 18–20.

[67] Ibid. 19.

[68] Ibid. 20.

[69] Thomas Campion, *The Works of Thomas Campion: Complete Songs, Masques and Treatises, with a Selection of the Latin Verse*, ed. Walter R. Davis (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1967), 320.

[70] The former is given by Tilmouth and Sadie, the latter in the RISM citation for the book and by Arnold. See Michael Tilmouth, 'Keller, Gottfried', in *New Grove*, ix. 851; *Companion to Baroque Music*, ed. Sadie, 295; and F. T. Arnold, *The Art of Accompaniment from a Thorough-Bass: as Practised in the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries*, 2 vols. (London: The Holland Press, 1961; repr. New York: Dover, 1965), 247. The only newspaper reference to the book occurred in the *Post Man* for 14 Jan. 1707, and it is for this reason that the latter date has been adopted in this book.

including two parts plus figures. Indeed, the 'Rules' are rather incomplete, since they omit Keller's instructions on how to decide where to play root-position and first-inversion chords, and his realizations of common bass lines. The examples in the 'Rules' often differ from those in Keller's book, which tend to be longer. Many are nevertheless related, often beginning with the same intervals (sometimes transposed to a different pitch), or using the same notes for the progressions which are being illustrated. The disparity between the examples possibly suggests that the anonymous 'Rules' are in fact an earlier version of the *Compleat Method* by Keller, which he subsequently revised. It seems quite unlikely that a plagiarist would be happy to quote Keller's words but would seek to disguise his theft in the examples, though he could, of course, have felt he was 'improving' them. This does not, however, explain the incomplete state of the 'Rules', so the most likely hypothesis is perhaps that the 'Rules' derived originally from Keller's prototype of the *Compleat Method*, but that they were subsequently subjected to editing by a plagiarist.

It has already been mentioned that Alexander Malcolm, a mathematician rather than musician, admitted to having asked a friend to help him write the section on composition in his *Treatise*, and it is in the *Introduction to the Knowledge and Practice of Thoro'Bass*, also printed in Edinburgh, but in 1717, by one A.B. (conjecturally identifed as Alexander Baillie, or Alexander Bayne),[71] that we find possible clues to the origins of the section. Bound at the back of the Washington copy of this book is a short manuscript work entitled *Institutions of Musick* which, with the exception of the first page and a half, corresponds exactly with Malcolm's composition rules. This author is unequivocal in his claims to have been an original writer, and even complains about academic non-musicians like Malcolm, as well as inarticulate professionals:

> The Composition of Musick is a subject that hath been much treated of, but to very little Purpose, because the Authors generally who have wrote about Musick, have been either Masters of the Art, that were illiterate or at least very little acquainted with letters, and consequently ill qualified for communicateing their knowledge to others by the way of writeing, or they have been men of Learning, that knew very little of the Matter. Of all the Books that I could ever yet see upon this subject, I cannot say I have mett with ere a One that could be a tollerable help towards the attainment of this Art.[72]

Interestingly, several sections of the *Institutions*—and therefore Malcolm's *Treatise*—relate quite closely to passages in A.B.'s *Introduction*, notably the description of the scale and its constituent intervals, the scale harmonizations, and the discussions of the role of the major seventh in inducing modulation. This might suggest that the author of the *Institutions* was rather less original

[71] See the note at the front of the copy of the *Introduction* in the Library of Congress, Washington, and Graham Strahle, *An Early Music Dictionary: Musical Terms from British Sources 1500–1740* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 373 and 461.

[72] *Institutions of Musick* (*c*.1721), [1].

than he would have the reader believe, or that A.B. had a copy of the *Institutions* himself, or even that A.B. was the author of both works and was therefore the friend on whom Malcolm relied for his composition instructions.[73]

Another category of related material comprises the introductions to a wide variety of instrumental tutors published in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. For the most part these very basic pages of instructions were published anonymously and it is likely that they were provided by the compiler of the music collections with which they were printed, often the publisher himself. It must quickly have been realized that, even when one was producing books for many different instruments, there was some rudimentary information that would be needed in every volume—explanation of the gamut and staff notation or tablature, notational signs, note values and metre, for example—and that there was no need to rewrite this material for each new book. Thus we find verbatim copies of rudimentary instructions appearing in several of the instrumental collections of the period produced by each publisher. Rather surprisingly, this trend was not started by Playford, the great economist: although the verses for learning the gamut and positions of *mi* which he included in the first edition of his *Introduction to the Skill of Musick* had already appeared in *A Musicall Banquet* of 1651, and there are general connections between parts of these two books, the only publications which had close links were *A Booke of New Lessons for the Cithern and Gittern* (1652) and *Musick's Delight on the Cithren* (1666), and even there he stopped short of direct quotation.

It was at the very end of the seventeenth century that most of the duplications began to occur, almost certainly because at this time there was an increase in the proportion of music books being produced by engraving, rather than printing from movable type. Since engraved plates were usually not destroyed after printing, they were available for reuse, often on several different occasions, to judge from the surviving books. The relationships between some twelve sets of instructions included in books for harpsichord, violin, flute, and hautboy are summarized in Fig. 1.1. It shows that two publications were used as fundamental sources, *The Harpsicord Master* (1697), which included posthumous publication by Walsh and Hare of rudiments by Henry Purcell (which can date from no later than November 1695), and *Nolens Volens* (1695), with anonymous instructions for violin published by Thomas Cross. *The Harpsicord Master*'s rules were reprinted in the two subsequent books of the same name, dating from 1700 and 1702 respectively, and also in *A Choice Collection of Lessons for the Harpsichord or Spinnet*, printed

[73] Chenette instead suggests that the 'friend' may have been Pepusch or someone acquainted with Pepusch's work, since Malcolm's and Pepusch's respective *Treatises* share some terminology: 'perfect' and 'imperfect' harmonies, and 'supposition'. However, Chenette concedes that the terms are used differently in the two works, and that some different harmonic rules are given. See Chenette, 'Music Theory', 288–9.

for Purcell's wife in 1699; the *Nolens Volens* directions appeared virtually unchanged (but re-engraved) as late as 1723 in *The Sixth Book of the Compleat Tutor to the Violin*.[74]

The Harpsicord Master's passage on time values and metre appeared again in about 1715 in another Walsh and Hare book, *The Compleat Tutor to the Hautboy*, which also took its explanation of notational signs from *Nolens Volens*. In fact Purcell's section on note values and metre, together with those on rests and notational signs, relate closely to those in a Walsh and Hare book of 1695, *The Compleat Flute-Master*. It is difficult to judge whether Purcell derived his rules from those in the flute tutor, or whether Walsh and Hare used material which Purcell had already finished for the contemporaneous book, but, since

[74] A minor alteration was made to the bowing instructions which may reflect changes in technique since the publication of the first book.

only the harpsichord instructions are attributed, it is tempting to assume that the original work was Purcell's. Matters are complicated by the fact that, when the directions in *The Compleat Flute-Master* were republished by Walsh and Hare for *The Fifth Book of the New Flute Master* in 1706, the rules on note values and metre were in fact clearly taken from *The Harpsicord Master*. Nevertheless, it was *The Compleat Flute-Master*'s page on note values and metre that was used for Walsh's *Self-Instructor on the Violin* in 1700, which in turn paraphrased much of *Nolens Volens*.

The major music publishers in London in the early eighteenth century must have been well acquainted with one another, and it is clear from notices such as that printed on the title-page to *Nolens Volens*, where both Young and Hare were advertised as sellers of a book published by Thomas Cross, that they relied on one another's products for their livelihoods. Nevertheless, it appears that there may have been at least some professional jealousy involved in what must have been a highly competitive business. In 1700, John Young published *A Choice Collection of Ayres for the Harpsichord or Spinett*. Despite his claim on the title-page that the 'very Plain & Easey Directions for Young Beginners' he appended to the book were 'Never Before Published', they are quite clearly an adaptation of Purcell's instructions in *The Harpsicord Master*. Moreover, although the plagiarizer seems to have set out with the intention of rewriting and rearranging the original rules, by p. [3] he was doing little more than quoting Purcell, with the addition of the odd typographical error.[75] Young had already used the plate on time values and metre from the *Choice Collection* in his own *Compleat Instructor to the Flute*, printed earlier in the same year, and it is odd that the flute tutor included more revisions to the following page on ornamentation and notational signs than did the *Choice Collection*, which remained much closer to Purcell.[76] The rules in the *Compleat Instructor* were used again in his later flute manual, *The Flute-Master Compleat* (1706).

Young used a different source for his *Compleat Tutor to the Violin, the Fifth Book* in 1727. Although again one or two changes were made, most was taken verbatim from *Nolens Volens*, yet he seems to have felt the need to revise the instructions on time values and metre. He claimed that '*the length of them* [the notes] *can by no means be better shown than has been already in Mr* Playford's *Introduction, for which reason I make use of his very Scheme and words*',[77] but in

[75] On p. [3] Purcell's comment about 'moderately' counting four was replaced by 'modestly', and in the section on fingering on p. [5] the player was instructed to use the fourth and fifth fingers of the left hand in an ascending scale, despite the fact that Purcell indicated that the third and fourth should be used, and the diagram given by Young retained those figures.

[76] *The Compleat Instructor to the Flute* was advertised in *The Post Boy* on 21 Mar. 1699, whereas a *Choice Collection*'s advertisement appeared on 21 Nov. 1699, which suggests that the flute manual preceded the keyboard book. This is confirmed by the fact that the plate common to both books has the correct page number for its position in *The Compleat Instructor to the Flute*, but is incorrect in *A Choice Collection of Ayres*. See Michael Tilmouth, 'A Calendar of References to Music in Newspapers published in London and the Provinces (1660–1719)', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 1 (1961), 27 and 30.

fact he quoted from Simpson's *Compendium* in part, seems to have written some of the material himself, and took his explanation of proportional time signatures from Thomas Brown's *The Compleat Musick-Master*.

This latter book, though on the whole it avoided direct quotation and was apparently original in places, is probably the best illustration of the way in which the instructions in collections of instrumental pieces were borrowed. As its title suggests, it aimed to be a complete guide, and contains sections on general rudiments aimed at the singer, plus directions for the viol, violin, flute, and hautboy, together with pieces for voice and all the given instruments. The section on vocal music relates closely to the rudiments in later editions of Playford; the directions for viol may have derived in part from the second section of his *Introduction*, together with some passages from Simpson's *Division-Viol*; the violin instructions paraphrase *Nolens Volens*;[78] the flute directions are from Young's *Compleat Instructor to the Flute*, though the passage on ornaments was taken from *The Compleat Flute Master*; and the section for the hautboy relates closely to *The Compleat Tutor to the Hautboy*,[79] with some references to *The Sprightly Companion* of 1695.

[77] *The Compleat Tutor to the Violin, the Fifth Book* (London, 1727), 5.

[78] Sharpe is of the opinion that the violin instructions paraphrase John Lenton, *The Gentleman's Diversion or the Violin Explained* (London, 1693), but they seem to me to have a much clearer link to *Nolens Volens*, as the following passages on ornamentation indicate: 'A *Beat* mark'd thus (*) proceeds from the Note, or half Note next below, by touching the said Note a little and then Beating down that Finger which is to stopt [*sic*] the Proper Note, thus if you would Grace *Bfabemi*, you must first touch *Alamire* open, and then Beat down *Bfabemi* with your forefinger' (*The Compleat Musick-Master*, p. 41). '. . . a Beat is from the natural Note, or half Note beneath the Note which must be so performed, and taken from the open strings as well as stops; . . . a Beat will require the fourth part of the Note, from the Note or half Note arising to the Key where the Note is, as you will see in the following Examples' (*The Gentleman's Diversion*, 12). 'The first of these Graces is called a *Beat* and marked thus (+) it must be heard a little before the proper Note is drawn with the Bow. As for example in playing *B-fa-be-mi* you must first touch *A-la-mi-re* Open, and then beat down *B-fa-be-mi* with your forefinger' (*Nolens Volens*, 6). See Claire Sharpe, 'An Annotated Bibliography of Early English Violin Tutors Published 1658–1731 including Re-issues and Subsequent Editions of Single Works', *Handbook for Studies in Eighteenth-Century English Music*, 10 (1999), 1–50, at 45.

[79] To my knowledge, only the third edition of *The Compleat Musick-Master*, dating from 1722, survives. According to Tilmouth, 'A Calendar of References', 56, an advertisement for it appeared in the edition of *The Weekly Review of the Affairs of France* for 12 Sept. 1704, so the book may first have been published in about 1705. (Sharpe dates it 1704 on the basis of the same advertisement; see 'An Annotated Bibliography', 34–5.) Since the incomplete date given on the title-page to *The Compleat Tutor to the Hautboy* is 171–, and it therefore can date from no earlier than 1710, it would appear that *The Compleat Musick-Master* predates it; however, the title-page to the third edition of Brown's publication states that it has 'additions', and, without a copy of the first two editions, one cannot judge which book was the source for the other.