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The keyboard works of the English virginalist Peter Philips have been little studied in comparison with his more famous contemporaries, William Byrd, John Bull and Jan Pieterszoon Sweelinck. While Philips left comparatively fewer keyboard works than these composers, his music contains very unique attributes. This study compiles the latest research of Philips’ life as well as an analysis of representative works showing many of the individual and uncommon features to be found in Philips’ works for keyboard.

Pieces from all genres of Philips’ keyboard output are represented and discussed, including Pavanes and Galliards, Fantasias and Intabulations of madrigals. Musical examples of each of these works are provided. A description of the instruments needed for the performance of the music and an illustration of the rare type of keyboard instrument required in the *Pavana and Galliarda Dolorosa* is included. A discussion of Philips’ style, particularly regarding ornamentation, is included with a comparison to the works of his contemporaries.
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INTRODUCTION

Peter Philips (1561-1628) is one the least studied of the English composers active during the Elizabethan and Jacobean eras. This lack of interest is surprising given the large output of works left by this master. Focus has rather been aimed at composers such as William Byrd, John Bull, Thomas Tallis and John Dowland. Until recently, knowledge of Philips’ keyboard works was almost completely limited to the handful of compositions contained in the *Fitzwilliam Virginal Book* (FWVB). However, in 1999, *Musica Britannica*¹ published all the known keyboard compositions by Philips in a critical modern edition, thereby allowing access to all of his music for the first time. Because less than half of Philips’ music is contained in the FWVB,² this edition is a welcome resource. Regardless, this resource has prompted very little study on behalf of this once esteemed composer, particularly his keyboard music.

Although little studied in modern times, during his own lifetime Philips was highly regarded by his contemporaries as both organist and composer of motets and madrigals.³ He was perhaps the most international composer of this period. Not until Johann Jakob Froberger (1616-1667) do we find a more traveled musician, or one so well versed in the musical styles and idioms of other countries. On the continent he published at least seventy-five Italian madrigals and numerous collections of sacred music. Arrangements of his music were also made by other composers. While his keyboard works were never printed, the publications of his sacred and secular vocal music alone make him one of the most published composers in Europe at the time.

² Ibid., xvii.
BIOGRAPHY

Peter Philips was born in 1561. Although the place of his birth is unknown, according to city documents, he was raised in London.⁴ The only information about his early keyboard studies appears in a letter written in 1609 by Louis de Groote who mentions “a famous musician William Byrd, who was the master of Peter Philips,” suggesting that perhaps the young Philips was taught by Byrd before he left England in 1582.⁵ As a young man his name appears as a choirboy at St. Paul’s Cathedral in London. He was therefore a pupil of Sebastian Westcote, and as such, would likely have lived with his master and received thorough musical training. This type of training would have included daily voice and keyboard lessons, possibly viol or lute lessons, composition and theory, as well as rehearsals with the choir. Philips may also have been a member of one of the “children’s companies,” traveling troupes of boys who put on plays and were the chief rivals of Shakespeare’s company. The two most outstanding of these children’s companies were drawn from the Chapel Royal⁶ and St. Paul’s respectively. Known as the Children of the Chapel, of the Queen’s Revels, and of Blackfriars for those drawn from the Chapel Royal, and the Children of St. Paul’s for those drawn from St. Paul’s, these two troupes drew large crowds of admirers and supporters. The boys chosen for these companies were selected primarily for their musical ability, both vocal and instrumental, and were subjected to yet more rigorous daily training.⁷ Although there is no proof that Philips was in fact a member of the Children of St. Paul’s, in light of the fact that Master Westcote was highly regarded as a

---

⁵ Smith, *Musica Britannica*, v. 75, xxiii.
⁶ Ibid. xii. It should be noted that John Bull joined the Children of the Chapel Royal in 1574. It is not known whether Bull and Philips would have had occasion to meet at this early date, but Philips’ potential involvement in the Children’s Company make it a possibility. At any rate, they would have been subject to the same type of musical training.
producer of spoken dramas which included both vocal and instrumental music,\textsuperscript{8} Philips’ membership in this organization would seem to be an entirely plausible scenario.

Master Westcote was a devout Catholic, and on more than one occasion had actions taken against him by Queen Elizabeth. Fortunately for him, the Queen tended to be lenient toward musicians and he was spared the repercussions many of his fellow Catholics faced.\textsuperscript{9} It was presumably as a result of the influence of Westcote that Philips became Catholic.\textsuperscript{10} Upon Westcote’s death in 1582, Philips left England for the Continent, both to escape the continuing and growing persecution of Catholics, and because he wanted to study music in Italy.\textsuperscript{11} On his way, he stopped in Douai at the English Catholic College, an institution founded in 1568 by the Spanish as a resistance to the Reformation. It was here that Philips met a fellow English Catholic, Francis Tregian, who would have a profound bearing on his future regard as a keyboard composer. Tregian, the possible scribe\textsuperscript{12} of the \textit{Fitzwilliam Virginal Book}, entered the college in the year of its founding.\textsuperscript{13} Although Philips remained at the college only a matter of months, this brief meeting must have had an impact, particularly on Tregian who, some twenty-five years later, would include many of Philips’ known keyboard compositions in the \textit{Fitzwilliam Virginal Book}.

By October 1582, Philips had reached Italy. After a few days at the English College in Rome, he entered the service of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, an ardent supporter of the arts.

\textsuperscript{8} Gibson, \textit{Peter Philips’ Keyboard Music}, 2.
\textsuperscript{9} Ibid., 3.
\textsuperscript{10} Smith, \textit{Musica Britannica}, v. 75, xxii.
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., xxii.
\textsuperscript{12} There remains considerable debate over the identity of the scribe of the FWVB. Francis Tregian (The Elder, 1548-1608) is the one mentioned here. His son, also Francis Tregian (The Younger, 1574-1619) was likewise an acquaintance of Philips in the Low Countries and may also have been the scribe of the manuscript. Both Tregians spent many years in prison for recusancy and other political reasons.
\textsuperscript{13} Gibson, \textit{Peter Philips’ Keyboard Music}, 5. It is no coincidence that the FWVB was heavily slanted toward Catholic composers, given the Tregian family’s stance regarding the Protestant Reformation.
Philips remained with his patron in Rome for three years until 1585, serving at the same time as organist at the English Jesuit College. It is during this time that Philips would likely have had the occasion to meet three of the most famous composers in Italy, Luca Marenzio, Giulio Caccini and Alessandro Striggio, composers whose works he would later use as models for his own compositions, both keyboard and vocal. In September 1585, Philips left the employment of Cardinal Farnese to join the service of a fellow Englishman, Thomas Lord Paget. Paget, who had recently arrived in Rome, was a spy for Philip II of Spain. Philips traveled with Paget to Spain (at which point he may have been introduced to the works of Cabezón), spent a year and a half in Paris, and journeyed through Italy and the Low Countries until Paget’s death in Brussels in 1590. Philips composed his *Pavana* and *Galliarda Paget*\(^{14}\) in his honor.

Upon Paget’s death, Philips left Brussels and traveled to Antwerp. In 1591, Antwerp publisher Pierre Phalèse (the Younger) published Philips’ first set of Italian madrigals, *Melodia Olympiap*, and in May of the same year Philips married Cornelia de Mompère at the Vrouwekathedraal in Antwerp. They had a daughter, Leonora, who was baptized on 7 June 1592. Unfortunately, Cornelia died a month after giving birth leaving Leonora to be raised by her maternal grandmother. Five days before Christmas in 1599, Leonora died at age seven. Philips never remarried. He may have been earning a living by teaching children to play the virginals since there is no evidence that Philips held an official post at this time. In 1593 Philips took leave of his students “to sie and heare an excellent ma[n] of his faculties in Amsterdam.” There can be little doubt that this man was Jan Pieterszoon Sweelinck, regarded as one of the greatest organists in all of Europe. Nothing is known of their meeting, but it surely had a lasting effect on both men. Sweelinck obviously thought highly enough of Philips to honor him by

composing a set of variations on Philips Pavan of 1580. On his journey back to Antwerp late in 1593, Philips fell ill and stopped in the little town of Middelburg to recuperate. While there, a suspicious Englishman, Roger Walton, accused him of treason and an attempted assassination of Queen Elizabeth of England. Philips was promptly thrown in jail, but being fluent in Latin, he served as his own lawyer, defended himself, and was soon exonerated and released. By Christmas 1593 Philips had returned to Antwerp. Soon after his arrival, Phalèse printed the second edition of Melodia Olympia (1594) and, in 1596, the Primo Libro de Madrigali a sei voci.

In 1597 Philips moved to Brussels, entering the service of Archduke Albert, Governor-General of the Low Countries. He was employed as one of the organists at the Chapel Royal, becoming principal organist soon after. In 1599, Albert married Isabella of Spain, daughter of Phillip II, at which point Philips was given the title Organist to their Serene Highnesses the Archduke Albert and Isabella. He held this post until his death in 1628.

Philips’ next two publications were books of madrigals, the Madrigali a Otto Voci in 1598, and his second and final collection of madrigals, the Secondo Libro de Madrigali a sei voci in 1603, both published by Phalèse, the latter being dedicated to Archduke Albert and Isabella. No new works were published between 1603 and 1609. While almost nothing is known of Philips’ life during these years, it is clear that he began his studies for the priesthood beginning around 1604 or 1605, and that Petrus Philippi, beneficiatus nostrae dioecesis was ordained on 24 March 1609. After this date there are no secular works, vocal or instrumental, known to have been composed by Philips. Because of his new office, Philips seems to have dedicated his time purely to the composition of sacred music from his ordination until the end of his life.
The years between 1611 and 1616 were compositionally very productive years for Philips. Five major publications were brought forth by Phalèse, all collections of sacred vocal music: the *Cantiones Sacrae for Five Voices* (1611), *Cantiones Sacrae for Eight Voices* (1613), *Gemmulae Sacrae* (1613), *Les Rossignols Spirituels* (published in Valencia, 1616), and the *Delitiae Sacrae* (1616).

In 1621 Archduke Albert died. Philips took part in the funeral months later in 1622, marching in the assembly at the head of the fifteen Chapellains de la Chapelle de la Court. Jacques Francquart’s *Pompa funebris* contains engravings of the event complete with names of the participants. The seventh plate, which shows the chaplains, depicts Philips with a long face, high forehead, a prominent nose, flowing mustache, and a pointed beard.¹⁵ In 1628, at the age of 67, Philips died in Brussels. Nothing is known of the circumstances of his death, nor is there any documentation of the funeral or place of burial.

---

¹⁵ This engraving is reproduced in *Musica Britannica*, v. 29, xxii.
THE KEYBOARD WORKS

Instruments

All of Peter Philips keyboard works were written for the various types of plucked keyboard instruments of his day. The modern piano is not only undesirable for the performance of his works, but in some cases unsuitable to faithfully render this music without significant rewriting. Therefore, a brief description of the instruments available to Philips is appropriate. Because Peter Philips was among the most widely traveled musicians of his time, certainly plucked keyboard instruments from the English, French and Italian traditions would be appropriate for performance of his music. However, it is the Flemish instruments, those of the Ruckers family in particular, that likely would have been the most familiar to Philips himself, and those on which much of his keyboard output would most likely have been heard. Most of Philips’ music for keyboard instruments was composed after his arrival in Antwerp, the Ruckers family home. Likewise, most all of Philips’ works were published by the Phalèse firm which was located in Antwerp and therefore disseminated their publications most quickly and easily to the people in and around that area, thereby promoting Philips’ works to those who often owned instruments of the Ruckers family.16 In addition, Johannes Ruckers was made organ and harpsichord builder to the court in Brussels in 1614, meaning that Philips would certainly have known Ruckers’ instruments well through first-hand experience, as well as possible professional contact with the Ruckers firm regarding building and installation of new instruments. The most common harpsichord built by the Ruckers family was the single manual instrument. For the most part these instruments had a range of C/E-d’’, although upper limits of f’’ were common as well as the possibility of the bass range extended to G/B. These instruments were mostly built

16 While none of Philips’ keyboard works were published, nonetheless Philips’ fame was partly established through Phalèse’ printing of his vocal works.
with two sets of strings, one at unison pitch (8’) and the other sounding an octave higher (4’). In terms of sheer numbers, virginals would have been the predominant instrument encountered in the homes of the common people. As a rule, virginals were single strung and played only at one pitch. However, a smaller child instrument which played at four foot pitch could be housed inside the larger mother instrument. By taking the child out and placing it on top of the mother, one could obtain both the eight foot and four foot sounds either individually or simultaneously. Virginals of the Ruckers family would have either been of the muselar (keyboard on the right) or spinet (keyboard on the left) versions which may or may not have had a child instrument enclosed. The mother instruments were offered in several sizes, from large instruments sounding at normal pitch, to quints sounding a fifth higher and the smallest at four foot pitch. The quints and four foot instruments were not large enough to house a child. The range was four octaves from C/E-c”’. While possibly somewhat more affordable than harpsichords, they were also more or less space-efficient, depending on which of the various sizes one wished to obtain or could afford. These were truly the instruments of the Dutch bourgeois, a fact which is echoed by the many Dutch paintings of the era in which virginals are an important presence. In addition to the Ruckers, members of the Grouwels family were highly regarded as makers of plucked keyboards. The surviving short/broken octave instrument that is required in the Pavana and Galliarda Dolorosa will be discussed below, and was likely built by one of the members of this family. One may assume that there may have been many instruments produced by the Grouwels, most of which have not survived.

Mention should also be made of the clavichord. While possibly less common than the virginal, the clavichord was nonetheless present in Flanders, and was widely used in the home, especially in Italy and England. In general, the clavichords built during Philips’ era would have
mostly followed the Italian model. The keyboard range was most often C/E-c''' and would have
been fretted and double strung in brass and/or iron.

The Music

Peter Philips left only thirty-two works for keyboard instruments. While this number is
comparatively fewer than his more famous contemporaries Bull, Byrd and Sweelinck, these
pieces are mostly of high quality and a number of them exhibit unusual and original features.
Noticeably absent are the types of works common to the English composers of the day,
specifically variations and works based on the hexachord and other solfège pieces. Regardless,
Philips is the fourth most represented composer in the FWVB with nineteen of his thirty-two
pieces being included in this compilation. Only William Byrd (69 pieces), John Bull (38 pieces)
and Giles Farnaby (46 pieces) are more represented.

The keyboard music of Peter Philips can be classified into three major categories: dances
and fantasias for virginal,\(^\text{17}\) intabulations, ornamented keyboard versions mostly of vocal music,
and liturgical organ works. It is selections from the first two categories that will be dealt with in
this paper. The following is a list of Philips’ complete keyboard works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dances and Fantasias</th>
<th>Intabulations of Vocal Music</th>
<th>Liturgical Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavana and Galliarda Dolorosa</td>
<td>Amarilli (Caccini)</td>
<td>Benedicam Dominum (Vecchi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galliarda [in a]</td>
<td>Bon jour mon Coeur (Lasso)</td>
<td>Veni Sancte Spiritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavana (1580)</td>
<td>Chi farà fed’al cielo [I]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galliarda [I]</td>
<td>(Striggio)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavana and Galliarda [I]</td>
<td>Chi farà fed’al cielo [II]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passamezzo</td>
<td>(Striggio)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galliarda Passamezzo [II]</td>
<td>Deggio dunque partire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almande (Tregian)</td>
<td>(Marenzio)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piper’s Galliard [I] (Dowland)</td>
<td>Ecco l’Aurora (Marenzio)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piper’s Galliard [II] (Dowland)</td>
<td>Fece da voi partita (Philips)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavana Anglica (Tomkins)</td>
<td>Margot, labourez les vignes (Lasso)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galliarda [in G]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Le Rossignol (Lasso)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasia [in F]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tirsi morir volea (Marenzio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasia [in G]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasia [in d]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{17}\) The term “virginal” is used here in the original English sense, meaning any plucked keyboard instrument,
i.e…harpsichord, virginal, or spinet.
Judging from the number of sources of Philips’ keyboard works, his music was well known and widely disseminated by the middle of the 17th century. Eleven sources exist, all containing only portions of Philips’ total output, and exhibit various levels of scribal competence. There is no source known to be in Philips’ own hand. The notation of accidentals in the sources is remarkably inconsistent, not only between the sources, but even within individual sources.

According to Maitland and Squire, the editors of the *Fitzwilliam Virginal Book*, the notation of accidentals in particular was very much an evolving process and no firm and fast rules as to their placement in the music can be clearly ascertained. In the sources, the first accidental in a measure did not necessarily govern all the notes of the same pitch in that measure, as in modern practice. Likewise, it cannot be assumed that accidentals will be placed next to every note that should be affected, as was commonly the case in music composed during the 17th and 18th centuries. The most significant problem regarding accidentals relates to whether altered notes remain altered throughout the measure. Numerous examples can be found in which a note in an ascending figure is raised, yet the same note in a descending figure which follows in the same measure contains no sharp. While many of these omissions can be easily rectified, especially involving leading tones at cadences, omissions of accidentals within passagework are much more problematic. Lute tablature proves very helpful in resolving some of this ambiguity, but lute parts exist only in two pieces, the *Pavana and Galliarda Dolorosa* and the *Pavane (1580)*.

Nevertheless, it is occasionally possible to extrapolate from these two lute sources readings for various other similar passages in the remaining works. Since the sources often disagree as to the use of accidentals, and there is no definitive reading of Philips’ works, judgments must often be made based on conjecture.

---

18 See Appendix I for a list of sources.
19 Fuller Maitland, Barclay Squire, eds., *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book*, XIII.
The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book is one of the more problematic of the sources in its omission and inconsistency in the use of accidentals. The Maitland-Squire edition has nonetheless been used in this study, primarily because its scribe, Francis Tregian, was likely more closely linked to Philips than any of the other sources.

The Dances and Fantasias

Pavanes and galliards are the most frequently encountered pieces in the English virginal literature. Pavanes and galliards were almost universally composed in three distinct sections called strains. Each strain commonly had a written out ornamented repeat called a repartendum, or division. Pavanes and galliards were most often paired together with the galliard usually being based on the same harmonic and melodic outline as the pavane. The three strain construction provided a perfect vehicle to explore change in melodic and harmonic content. As a rule, the three strains are based on differing melodic ideas and most commonly modulate between and within strains. This modulation is, in fact, one of the traits typical of these dances. Most frequently, the first strain did not modulate – the strain would cadence in the tonal center in which it began. The second strain would then begin in a different tonal center (most often the IV or V) and cadence in something other than where it began. The third strain, likewise, would begin in yet a different tonal center and modulate back to the home tone to close. Modulatory writing such as this is clearly seen in the pavanes and galliards of Byrd. For example, Byrd’s First Pavane from My Ladye Nevell’s Booke demonstrates this practice of modulation:

Figure 1. General harmonic outline of William Byrd’s First Pavane from My Ladye Nevell’s Booke.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain 1</th>
<th>Strain 2</th>
<th>Strain 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tonal center:</td>
<td>c-C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are exceptions to this rule. Byrd’s Earle of Salisbury Pavane and Galliard in Parthenia each have two sections and contain no written out divisions. Likewise, the galliard of an undedicated pavane and galliard pair in the FWVB (CLXV), also by Byrd, has four sections.
The structure of the strains themselves typically consists of a through-composed melody, most often in the uppermost part, accompanied by the other voices. The accompaniment often makes extensive use of imitation, either of newly composed countermelodic material, fragments of the melody, or both. This imitation is one of the hallmarks of the period, and of the keyboard pavanes and galliards in particular.

While pavanes and galliards were relatively strict in form and structure, fantasias were very free types of compositions in these. Thomas Morley, in *A Plain and Easy Introduction to Practical Music*, says of the fantasia:

> The most principle and chiefest kind of music which is made without a ditty is the Fantasy, that is when a musician taketh a point at his pleasure and wresteth and turneth it as he list, making either much or little of it according as shall seem best in his own conceit. In this may more art be shown than in any other music because the composer is tied to nothing, but that he may add, diminish, and alter at his pleasure. And this kind will bear any allowances whatsoever tolerable in other music except changing the air and leaving the key, which in Fantasie may never be suffered. Other things you may use at your pleasure, as binding with discords, quick motions, slow motions, Proportions, and what you list.21

According to Morley, within the very free framework of the fantasy, certain compositional devices can be used and are often found. The use of augmentation, diminution, retrograde and inversion are all encountered, for example, in the fantasias of Sweelinck. Being a predecessor of the later fugue, these pieces also inherently rely on extensive use of imitation. Fantasias were most commonly through-composed with no clear division of sections. They were likewise in one tonality throughout and based on one subject.

At first glance Philips’ examples of these types of compositions appear to be rather standard. The pavanes and galliards are composed in typical three-part construction, each with a written out division. The fantasias are in one through-composed section in one tonality.

---

However, a closer examination reveals a number of traits which are peculiar to Philips. Some of these traits are found nowhere else in the literature, and some of them may have been adopted by his colleagues as well as later generations of composers. These unique traits will be discussed in the context of the following representative works.

*Pavana* (1580)

The *Pavana of 1580* is perhaps Philips’ best known composition for keyboard. In the margin of the *Fitzwilliam Virginal Book* is written, in Tregian’s hand, “the first one Philips made.” There were at least six different versions for various assortments of instruments and even voices on the continent. It was widely known in England as a consort piece in arrangement for a broken consort of treble viol, flute, bass viol, cittern, lute and pandora from Thomas Morley’s *First Book of Consort Lessons*. There is also an anonymous five-part version in the Kassel Manuscript 40/125 and at least six versions for solo lute or cittern. Additionally, Sweelinck composed a set of keyboard variations on it, the *Pavana Philippi*. The famous Dutch organist may have become acquainted with the piece through one of the widely circulated manuscripts. He may also have obtained a personal copy from Philips himself upon their meeting in Amsterdam in 1593. Nevertheless, Sweelinck’s variations give us an enlightening view of the two composers’ individual styles of composition.

The *Pavana* consists of the typical three part construction, with each strain containing a written out *repartendum*, or division. The first two strains of the *Pavana* are in many ways very standard examples of the composition of this type of dance. There are, nevertheless, several features that are unique and deserve comment. First is the use of cross relations. Cross relations, in which an unaltered and altered version (most often sharped) of the same note appear in close

---


23 See Appendix II for a list of sources for lute and cittern versions of this piece.
proximity in different voices, are common to all music of this period. Cross relations are of two varieties, simultaneous and successive. As their names suggest, a simultaneous cross relation is an occurrence of the unaltered and altered notes at the same time, successive cross relations happen in succession. The opening strain and repartendum of the Pavana demonstrate both types. The first measure contains a somewhat subtle but very beautiful example of a successive cross relation in which a lower neighbor F# in the soprano (m.1, b.2) is resolved normally to G, which is then quickly replaced by an F natural in the alto (Ex. 1).

Example 1. Cross relation to begin the Pavana.

While the use of cross relations is again, not unusual, the placement of this initial example is. Cross relations are most commonly found in cadential formulas in which contrary moving voices give rise to these clashes. This particular example occurs in the opening measure, far removed from any cadence.

The repartendum which follows retains the opening cross relation, but goes even further. Philips heightens the tension of the normal 4-3 cadential suspensions in the opening statement by adding two more much less subtle cross relations, the first an example of simultaneous cross relation, the second a successive cross relation. These examples occur in measures 9 and 15 respectively, with C naturals in the right hand against C sharps in the left hand (Ex. 2).
Example 2. Examples of simultaneous and successive cross relations in the *repartendum* of the first strain.

Another notable feature of the first strain and its corresponding *repartendum* is the almost complete avoidance of imitation. Only the opening statement of the melody in the original strain (Ex. 3) and one instance in the *repartendum* (Ex. 4) are treated in imitation. Typical of the form of these dances, this first strain does not modulate, beginning and ending on G.

Example 3. Imitation of the opening melody in the *Pavana*.

Example 4. Imitation in the *repartendum* of the first strain.
Unlike the first strain, the second strain contains more imitation, occurring primarily between the soprano and alto (Ex. 5).

Example 5. Use of imitation beginning the second strain.

\[ \text{mm. 19-22} \]

This second strain also does not modulate, which would normally be expected, beginning and ending on the V, D. The *repartendum* of the second strain, however, rather than cadencing on D, is elided with the beginning of the third strain (Ex. 6).\(^{24}\)

Example 6. Elision of the second strain to the beginning of the third.

\[ \text{m. 33} \]

\(^{24}\) The cadential G major chord is in fact the end of the second section *repartendum*, not the beginning of the C section, as it is labeled in the Maitland-Squire edition of the FWVB.
As in the first two strains, the third strain of the *Pavana* does not modulate, beginning and ending on G. However, this strain is stylistically the most curious and unique of this piece, and one of the most unusual in the virginal literature. A *cantus firmus* type melody in whole notes in the treble is underpinned by steady, block chords in the other voices (Ex. 7).

Example 7. Opening of the *cantus firmus* melody and block chord accompaniment.

This melody appears to be original as no known examples of it have been found elsewhere in the literature. Likewise, the composition of this type of melody in a pavane is most unusual and is one of the few examples of it.\(^{25}\) The *cantus firmus* breaks off one measure before the cadence, keeping it from stifling the intended harmonic progression (Ex. 8).

Example 8. Ending of *cantus firmus* melody.

---

\(^{25}\) A *Pavana* of Thomas Morley in the FWVB also displays a *cantus firmus* type melody in the third section. FWVB, vol. 2, 209.
The *repartendum* of the third strain displays a very unusual type of division. Division is typically characterized by the use of imitation between parts, or by florid passagework in one hand against block chords in large note values in the other. However, the *cantus firmus* and the left hand three- and four-part chords remain essentially unchanged in the *repartendum* and the alto voice is the only voice that is involved in division until the final cadential pattern. The alto is transformed into something of a countermelody in constant eighth notes to the *cantus firmus*. Attention, then, is drawn to the quicker moving countermelody, thereby changing the *cantus firmus* to harmonic background rather than primary melody (Ex. 9). The point at which the *cantus firmus* breaks off in the original third strain and is overtaken by a traditional cadential figure, is now (m. 49), in the *repartendum*, ornamented by sixteenth note figuration, making use of both sequence and imitation (Ex. 10).

Example 9. Countermelodic material in the third strain *repartendum*.

Example 10. Imitation and sequence at the close of the *Pavana*. 
The beauty of the *Pavana of 1580* is in its simplicity. Compared to other pavenes of the time, especially those of Byrd and Bull, Philips’ use of counterpoint and imitation is quite sparse. In fact, the bass lines of the three original strains are completely unchanged in their respective *repartendum*, and the tenor is even slightly simplified, meaning that there is no imitation in these parts. Division takes place almost exclusively in the soprano. The texture is also thinner on the whole than the above mentioned composers, mostly being in four parts, often only in three. Those few examples in five parts are simply the filling out of chordal harmony. Another atypical compositional trait also present in this early work is the lack of modulation within and between strains. This simple approach to harmony and melody is noticeably different than other composers of the period.

*Pavana and Galliarda Doloroso. Treg[ian]*

Upon Philips’ return to Antwerp from a meeting with Sweelinck in Amsterdam in 1593, he stopped in the town of Middelburg. Besides recuperating from an illness, Philips may have gone there intentionally to visit the workshop of the well known harpsichord and virginal builders Johannes and Lodewijk Grouwels, father and son, who had in that same year (1593) moved to Middelburg from Antwerp. Philips may have known that the Grouwels’ built a type of virginal with a unique feature in the bass octave of the keyboard. During this time, it was customary that virginals (and most harpsichords) had a range from C/E to c’’’ with a short octave in the bass. The use of a chromatic octave in the bass was extremely rare. The Grouwels, however, possibly through Italian influence, gave their instruments a combination of the two, the broken/short octave (Illus. 1). A virginal built by Johannes Grouwels in 1580 displays this

---

26 There are a number of surviving instruments of Italian design that also have this type of keyboard arrangement. See Frank Hubbard, *Three Centuries of Harpsichord Making*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), 36.
uncommon feature.\textsuperscript{27} This information is significant because, while imprisoned in the Hague after his arrest in Middelburg, Philips composed the \textit{Pavana and Galliarda Dolorosa}, the only pieces in the English virginal literature to require the use of a short/broken octave instrument.\textsuperscript{28}


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Short Octave</th>
<th>Short/Broken Octave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The title of the \textit{Pavana Dolorosa Treg\[ian\]} contains in it a seemingly insignificant reference to Francis Tregian - Treg. Normally, one would assume that this reference is simply a dedication to an esteemed friend or colleague, one of the type which occurs so frequently throughout the FWVB. However, this simple addendum to the actual title proves to be more troublesome than it first appears when we take into consideration what is stated under the title: “set by Peter Philips.” Might this infer that Tregian, not Philips, had composed this piece, and Philips simply arranged it for keyboard? The matter is further complicated by the fact that the critical commentary to this piece in the Maitland-Squire edition states that the words “set by” are not in the original Fitzwilliam manuscript, though no reference is given as to where this phrase originates. What is not stated in the commentary is that the inscription ‘Treg’ appears in no other source, only the FWVB. This information likely indicates that the \textit{Pavana and Galliarda Dolorosa} is an original composition by Philips and the inscription ‘Treg’ is possibly a dedication. Another interesting facet to the composition of this piece is that it is within the realm

\textsuperscript{27} This instrument still exists in the Musical Instrument Museum in Brussels.

\textsuperscript{28} The source \textit{Kr} contains the phrase ‘composta in prigione,’ ‘supporting the date in FWVB of 1593.
of possibility that Tregian himself owned one of these unique instruments by Grouwels. It is known that, while imprisoned in the Fleet Prison, where he was jailed for political reasons, Tregian was allowed his creature comforts, including his virginals. Because Tregian spent much time in the Low Countries, and Antwerp in particular in the early years of the 17th century, it is possible that he could have acquired one of Grouwels’ instruments. Regardless of the circumstances surrounding its composition, Philips’ imagination has created one of the great masterpieces of English keyboard music.

The *Pavana Dolorosa* begins with a low tessitura C major chord, immediately portraying a sense of melancholy and sadness as well as any minor key. The first strain, like the first two strains of the *Pavana* (1580), is very standard in its style. Typically, the opening melodic motive is treated briefly in imitation between the alto and soprano voices in mm.1-3, as are the bass and tenor parts (Ex. 11). This use of imitation in the opening melody, however, is the only occurrence of imitation in the strain.

Example 11. Imitation in the opening phrase of the *Pavana Dolorosa*.

Also like the *Pavana* (1580) the harmonic language of this opening strain is quite simple, never venturing far from the home tone of C. *Gruppos*, written out trills, highlight the arrival points on G (mm. 5-6, original barring) and the final cadence on C (mm. 9-10, original barring). In the *repartendum*, as in the original strain, the initial motive is treated in imitation, with fragments of imitation presented throughout the section. Again similar to the *Pavana* (1580), this imitation
occurs only in the soprano and alto parts, with the tenor and bass parts remaining virtually identical to the original strain (Ex. 12).

Example 12. Imitation between soprano and alto parts in repartendum of the first strain.

The repartendum closes with a passage in parallel thirds in the right hand alone, a type of figure not often found in Philips’ works, though common in Sweelinck and Bull (Ex. 13).

Example 13. Passage in parallel thirds to end first repartendum.

The second strain displays several curious features that point to Philips’ unique approach to the structure of these dances. First is the choice of tonal center. As pointed out previously, in pieces in a major mode, such as this, the most common relationship between the first and second strains is a move to the IV or V. The major mode pavanes and galliards of Byrd, for example, never have strains beginning in a minor mode. Therefore it is quite unusual for Philips to set this
second strain in the minor mode on A. Another unique feature of this relationship is that Philips does not begin with the tonic chord (i). Instead he gives us the V in the new tone, an E major chord. While not unknown, beginning a strain on a chord other than the tonic is quite rare. The result of the previous strain cadencing on C, followed by an E major chord which then resolves to the minor mode on A is a chromatic line, G-G♯-A. Perhaps Philips is giving the listener a foreshortened version of things to come in the third strain (Ex. 14).


![Example 14 (Chromatic relationship)](image)

Although this strain begins on the V, it nevertheless resolves immediately to the minor mode on A, essentially functioning as the dominant. Because the close of this section is likewise on A, this section should be considered non-modulating.

Another curious aspect of the structure of this second strain is the formulation of melody. A smooth, through-composed melodic line undergirded by imitative accompaniment generally characterizes the setting of these dances during this period, yet this section essentially has no melody. Instead, this entire strain is based on the repetition and juxtaposition of two motives. The first motive, which is stated three times, can clearly be seen in the second measure of the strain (m. 28, original barring). This wavering figure is then repeated an octave higher (mm. 30-31, original barring) and again in D (mm. 33-34, original barring)(Ex. 15).
Example 15. Imitation of first motive of the second strain.

At this point, a second motive is presented in the soprano. It, too, is presented three times, but this motive is treated in imitation in the tenor and bass parts two beats later. The result of this imitation is an augmented fifth chord. This particular interval is encountered occasionally in the vocal works of the day, particularly those of Thomas Weelkes, but its appearance in keyboard music is quite rare and certainly not to the extent to which Philips makes use of it in this section. The second and third occurrences of this motive can be found in measures 37-38 and 39-40 respectively. A foreshortened version is also present in measures 40-41 in the tenor (Ex. 16).
Example 16. Imitation of the second motive.

The *repartendum* of the second strain consists mainly of scalar material, alternating between the hands. Each of the three repetitions of the first motive contains division consisting of ascending and descending scales played by one hand. The first division of the motive occurs in the left hand in measures 45-47, the second primarily in the right hand in measures 48-50 and the third returns to the left hand in measures 49-50. The harmonic support of these divisions is provided by chords in the opposite hand (Ex. 17).

Example 17. Division of the first motive.
The second motive is begun in the soprano, and immediately moves into scales and passagework, flaunting itself over the imitated motive which is heard only in the bass. The previously harsh dissonances are now somewhat softened by the right hand figuration, although these scales give rise to numerous cross relations (Ex. 18).

Example 18. Division of the second motive.

mm. 53-61

The third strain, like the first strain, begins with imitation. Rather than being long note values, however, quarter and dotted quarter note rhythms comprise the subject in the soprano which is imitated one beat later in the tenor. Again, this strain does not begin on the tonal center C, but on F which quickly moves to C. After the initial imitation in soprano and tenor, the melody is
through-composed with accompaniment below in standard pavane fashion for the next five measures (Ex. 19).

Example 19. Imitation at the beginning of the third strain.

Following this melody is an extended chromatic passage 12 measures in length. Chromatic writing such as this passage is not uncommon in the music of the time. What is uncommon is the final five measures of this passage which close out the strain. Beginning in measure 81, the chromatic line is heard in the tenor with the countersubject in the alto. At the same time, the left hand has a total of seven octave to tenth interval pairs. While tenths are not at all uncommon in music of this period, the extent to which Philips uses these intervals is found nowhere else in the English literature of the time. The performance of this passage is only possible with the use of a short octave instrument. The left hand part in measures 81-84 may then be played simply consecutive octaves (Ex. 20).  

---

29 See the illustration of the short/broken octave keyboard on page 20.
Example 20. Left hand octave-tenth intervals played as octaves.

The *repartendum* of the third strain makes extensive use of imitation with scales replacing the original melody (Ex. 21).

Example 21. Imitation between hands in *repartendum* of third strain.

Upon arrival at the chromatic passage, the soprano retains its ascending half note line this time with the bass in counterpoint. Particularly noteworthy in the division of the chromatic passage is the extensive use of sequence. For example, in measure 103 the left hand ascending and descending scale is treated in sequence in the next measure. The left hand pattern changes in
measure 105 and is likewise treated in sequence in the following measure. The quick passagework is then passed to the right hand, which treats its material in sequence for the next three measures. The left hand octave-tenth intervals are strengthened by the addition of extra chord tones. The effect of this constant use of sequence and the broadening of the harmonic support creates the sense of building a crescendo to the final cadence (Ex. 22).

Example 22. Use of sequence in division of second motive.
Like Philips’ two other paired galliards (Pagget, Passamezzo), the Galliarda Dolorosa derives its melodic and harmonic content from the Pavane. As stated earlier, this type of thematic relationship was not new in Philips’ time and exists in the majority of the pavane and galliard pairs contained in the FWVB. After researching these relationships, Charles van der Borren could state that:

…the galliard borrows elements from the pavane which precedes it in a little less than four-fifths of the examples. Most frequently these elements are very trifling, and in certain cases there is even doubt as to whether there have really been borrowings; when these exist, they consist of scarcely perceptible fragments of the upper melody, or of the bass of the opening pavan.30

The extent to which Philips incorporates the existing melody and harmony is unprecedented and it is in his perfection of this technique that Philips sets himself apart from his contemporaries. As an example, compare the beginnings of original strains in the Pavana with those in the Galliarda (Ex. 23).

---

Example 23. Comparison of strains in *Pavana* and *Galliarda Dolorosa*.

*Pavana, 1st strain*

*Galliarda, 1st strain*

*Pavana, 2nd strain*

*Galliarda, 2nd strain*

*Pavana, 3rd strain*

*Galliarda, 3rd strain*
While the music in the *Galliarda* is closely based on that found in the *Pavana*, it is important to note that certain portions of each strain in the *Pavana* are missing in the *Galliarda*. The reason for this omission is unclear. Because harmony must often be simplified in quick tempos, perhaps Philips deemed these passages harmonically too complex to adequately render in a manner that was logical in triple meter.\(^{31}\) Seemingly at odds with this statement is the setting of the chromatic passage in the third strain. In the *Pavana*, the alternating left hand octaves and tenths were long note values creating a rich and broad pallet of sound. This same figure in the *Galliarda* is in quick quarter notes, giving the close of the piece an urgent and almost breathless quality (Ex. 24). This section is repeated literally, without division, in the final *repartendum*.\(^{32}\)

Example 24. Chromatic motive in third strain.

---

\(^{31}\) The passages of note which are omitted in the *Galliarda*, are found in the *Pavana*: 1\(^{st}\) strain, mm. 6-8; 2\(^{nd}\) strain, mm. 32-41, beat 3 (entire second motive); 3\(^{rd}\) strain, mm. 71-73 (all original barrings).

\(^{32}\) One source, *Kr*, does provide divisions of this passage in the *repartendum.*
The Pavana and Galliarda Dolorosa is one of the largest and most complex pairs of these dances in the virginal literature. It again displays the uncommon features found in the Pavana (1580), the lack of modulation within and between strains, and the relatively limited use of imitation. Other, more curious traits are also observed, such as the use of repeated motives instead of melody as the framework of the second strain of the Pavana. The frequent use of sequence is likewise unique, as is the extended use of the short octave configuration found in the third strains of both the Pavana and Galliarda. This piece is rarely heard today because of the instrument required to perform it. Yet, because of these unique attributes, I believe this piece alone should secure Philips’ fame as a keyboard composer.

*Fantasia [in F]*

The Fantasia [in F] is dated 1582 in the FWVB, making it likely the first composition by Philips after his arrival in Italy. Similar to the ricercar, the fantasia was a precursor to the fugue. In fact, the two were so similar their names were often used interchangeably. Technically speaking, the chief difference between the two is that the ricercar in general had several clearly defined sections, each with its own subject (and often countersubject), and the last section often combined all of the previously used subjects (and possibly countersubjects). The fantasia was most often through-composed based on one subject, making use of the various compositional devices mentioned by Morley: augmentation, diminution, retrograde and inversion. The following chart gives typical examples of these forms.

---

33 See Morley’s quote above, pp. 11-12.
Figure 2. Typical forms of the keyboard ricercar and fantasia.

Ricercar: (in clearly defined sections)

Subject 1 (countersubject) || Subject 2 (cs) || Subject 3 (cs) || Subject 4 (cs) || Subjects 1, 2, 3, 4 ||

Fantasia: (through-composed)

Subject 1 -- may be treated in augmentation, diminution, retrograde, inversion ||

Based on this observation, the Fantasia [in F] appears to be in the mold of a typical fantasia. There are no apparent beginnings and endings of sections, and other subjects are not readily visible. Upon closer examination, however, the form of this Fantasia is far from conventional.

The Fantasia [in F] opens in customary fashion, a solo statement of a subject which is then passed to each voice in turn (Ex. 25). There is no clearly defined, recurring countersubject associated with the subject.

Example 25. Opening statements of subject in Fantasia [in F].

This subject, a descending line beginning on F, and a slightly altered version are heard a total of nine times before the section closes with a perfect cadence on F at measure 31. Though not apparent at first, this cadence on F is essentially the dividing line between the opening strain and its subsequent unexpected division, since measures 33 through 67 are clearly a division of the first 31 measures (Ex. 26).
The division is crafted in typical fashion with sixteenth and eighth note passages which serve as passing notes or simply filling out of the longer note values. Whereas the opening section cadenced clearly on F (m. 31), this cadence in the division is avoided and a second subject is given. This new subject is most readily recognized by its standard canzona-like rhythm, half-quarter-quarter. The first entrance is actually at the end of the division of the previous section, beginning with the tenor in measure 66. Striking use of *stretto*, or overlapping entrances, characterizes this second subject which is presented, like the opening subject, nine times in the space of nine measures (Ex. 27).
At the conclusion of the statements of the second subject, a long improvisatory section without subject takes over beginning in measure 76. This type of writing is very reminiscent of the style of the early toccata, for example, particularly those of Giovanni Gabrieli. This free composition remains until the end of the work. Curiously, the first subject returns for two statements near the close of the piece, in measures 106-109 in the tenor, and an ornamented version in measure 112 which ends the piece (Ex. 28).

Example 28. Final statements of the first subject to end the *Fantasia in F*.

mm. 106-114
In the *Fantasia [in F]* Philips seems intent on proving Morley’s point that fantasias are very free pieces in terms of structure. Rather than using the four traditional means of subject variation (augmentation, diminution, retrograde and inversion), Philips instead makes use of four distinct types of composition. The initial subject statements (mm. 1-31) are clearly in the style of a typical fantasia. However, the use of division (mm. 32-65) is standard in dance music.\(^3^4\) The presence of a second subject is not impossible in the fantasia but is more a trait of the ricercar, as is the return of the initial subject at the end of the piece. As mentioned above, the free composition which comprises nearly one-third of the piece (mm. 77-114) is stylistically very similar to the toccata style sweeping Italy in the late 16\(^{th}\) century. Compare Philips’ model of this *Fantasia* to those listed previously.

Figure 3. Formal structure of Philips’ *Fantasia [in F]*.

Subject 1 (no recurring cs) | Division of previous ||Subject 2 – free composition (toccata) – Subject 1 (2 statements)||

In addition to its form, the *Fantasia [in F]* also displays a few other unusual features. First, the overall tessitura is quite low. The extremes of register in the treble are avoided and extremes of register in the bass are present throughout. Related to this trait is a second unusual feature, the thickness of texture. Five and six voice chords are standard and are especially common in the lower tessitura. This density of writing is known to this author to this extent only in the works of John Bull, and to a lesser extent Sweelinck. Lastly is the choice of tonal center. Willi Apel states that the key of F was as common in Italy as it was uncommon in England.\(^3^5\) Examination of the FWVB reveals that of the 297 pieces it contains, only 17, counting paired

---

\(^3^4\) The author knows of no other example in the virginal literature that shows a division of a contrapuntal section.

pavanes and galliards as separate pieces, are composed in F with a flat.\textsuperscript{36} According to Apel, the choice of tonal center possibly lends justification to this piece being composed in Italy, or at the very least Philips’ familiarity with Italian keyboard literature.\textsuperscript{37} Regardless of why Philips chose to set this \textit{Fantasia} in F with a flat, the aural aspect of this tonal center is certainly a significant factor in making this, in the author’s opinion, one of the most beautiful and serene of Philips’ keyboard works.

\textit{Intabulations of Vocal Music}

Examples of intabulation date back as early as the Robertsbridge fragment in the 14\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{38} The majority of examples of this type of writing come from Germany, as there are more early keyboard music sources in Germany than in any other country.\textsuperscript{39} The largest and most important of the early sources is the manuscript volume known as the \textit{Buxheim Organ Book}, written probably between 1460 and 1470. This volume contains 222 keyboard arrangements of vocal \textit{chansons} and motets by German, French, Italian and English composers. Also important is the tablature book by Hans Kotter (c. 1485-1541) which contains intabulations of polyphonic vocal music of Hofheimer, Isaac and Josquin. The first printed examples of keyboard intabulations of secular vocal music come from Rome, the \textit{Frottole intabulate da sonare organii}, published by Andrea Antico in 1517.

Intabulations were a very popular type of composition throughout the 15\textsuperscript{th} and 16\textsuperscript{th} centuries. Many of these early examples of intabulation mentioned above were very simple arrangements, often consisting of only a reduction of the vocal parts with little or no

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{36} One of these being by a non-Englishman, the \textit{Ut, re, mi, fa, sol, la} of Sweelinck.
\item \textsuperscript{37} There was much debate, especially among theorists, during this period as to whether pieces set in F with a flat constituted the Lydian mode or transposed Ionian. It is not the author’s intention to belabor the theoretical arguments. The reader is referred especially to Heinrich Glareanus, \textit{Dodecachordon}, trans. Clement Miller (American Institute of Musicology, 1965), and Gioseffo Zarlino, \textit{Dimostrazione harmoniche} (Venice, 1571).
\item \textsuperscript{38} Apel, \textit{History of Keyboard Music to 1700}, 288-289.
\item \textsuperscript{39} The information on early keyboard sources in this paragraph is taken from \textit{Early German Keyboard Music, vol. 1}, ed. by Howard Ferguson, (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), 6-7.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
ornamentation. When present, the ornamentation was primarily made up of simple scales and passing tones, and was very limited in its tessitura. Extremes of register are virtually never encountered. Antonio de Cabézon (c. 1510-1566) was the most notable composer to write intabulations prior to Philips. Cabézon’s intabulations were truly florid in nature with often complex ornamentation decorating the existing vocal parts. However, by the end of the 16th century, the practice of intabulation had essentially died out. In fact, there are no examples of this type of composition by English composers, who instead preferred the variation form. It is therefore surprising to find that Philips not only wrote intabulations, but that nearly half of his known works (14 of the 32) are of this variety. Of these fourteen intabulations, nine are contained in the Fitzwilliam Virginal Book and represent the only examples of this style of composition present in this source.

The sources of the vocal models used by Philips in his intabulations are the madrigal books published in the 1580’s and 1590’s by Phalèse. These publications were almost exclusively made up of compositions by Italian composers. At the end of the sixteenth century, Antwerp was the largest and perhaps most international city north of the Alps. Commerce in Antwerp, the “Venice of the North,” was primarily controlled by wealthy foreign merchants and aristocrats, and the popularity of Italian composers may have been due in large part to the great numbers of these merchants and bankers of Italian birth who would have provided the market for Phalèse’s prints. In this light, it must be considered a possibility that, although Philips’ intabulations were never published, the original purpose of these compositions may have been to capitalize on the success of the madrigalists. This notion seems not to have been considered before. It has been stated that there would have been no market for pieces such as this among the general public because only the elite wealthy were educated enough to play these works, and

---

40 Smith, Musica Britannica, v. 75, xxiv.
therefore these intabulations may have been intended only for circulation between friends and colleagues.\textsuperscript{41} However, a large percentage of the population was musically literate. In addition, they had the instruments at their disposal to perform these pieces, as noted earlier, a fact attested to by the large number of Dutch paintings from the period depicting numerous types of keyboard instruments.

When compared with their respective vocal counterparts, one quickly sees that the intabulations are an exercise in late sixteenth century ornamentation, equal to, or perhaps more enlightening even than any treatise. There are numerous Italian treatises and musical works contemporary with Philips which contain very florid ornamentation of the type Philips explores in his intabulations.\textsuperscript{42} It is not known how Philips may have so readily encountered and absorbed this new style of ornamentation. His initial exposure may have come from his time in Rome (1582-1585). He may also have had opportunity to collect many of these ornamentation treatises on his return trips to that country in the service of Thomas Lord Paget, and he most likely would have heard this style of playing from the many Italians living in Antwerp during his time there (1590-97). The style of ornamentation used by Philips in his intabulations is directly related to many of these sources rather than the typical English division style. Inherent in this new Italian type of division (known by the Italians variously as \textit{passegiati} or \textit{diminuire}) is incredible virtuosity, a varied use of rhythm and the more and more acceptable use of sequential patterns. In Philips’ intabulations, very few measures occur that are not completely filled with fast moving notes. Whereas the English often introduced new melodic material in their divisions, and used them frequently in imitation, this Italian style of ornamentation is not based

\textsuperscript{41} Gibson, \textit{Peter Philips’ Keyboard Music}, 166.
\textsuperscript{42} See Appendix III for a list of primary sources.
on any melodic quality *per se*. They are, rather, flashes of brilliance. They impress with their virtuosity rather than the intricate weaving of motives.

The expert way in which melodic and harmonic content of the original is retained, yet a sense of drive or repose captured in the delicately weaving shapes and gestures or sudden exuberant flourishes, are hallmarks of the style in Philips’ intabulations. These gestures were the ornaments of the time, and skilled performers were expected to be able to improvise such displays, although perhaps not to the quantity and quality of Philips. Fortunately we can compare them since all of Philips’ intabulations are based on prints published by Phalèse. These prints are brought together in the complete keyboard works of Philips published in *Musica Britannica*, and they provide an invaluable insight into the compositional technique of Philips.\(^{43}\)

*Tirsi. Di Luca Marenzio*

*Tirsi - Prima Parte*

The intabulation of Marenzio’s madrigal *Tirsi morir volea* is Philips’ largest work of this kind. Because of its scope, this piece gives many examples of the type of ornamental writing found in the other intabulations.

Luca Marenzio was a popular composer in the Netherlands at the end of the sixteenth century.\(^{44}\) The number of publications containing Marenzio’s works indicates the high regard for him in Antwerp at the time in which Philips was there, and the demand for his music was high enough that Phalèse found it worthwhile to reprint the first five books of Marenzio’s five-part madrigals in 1593. These prints are likely the way in which Philips became acquainted with his madrigals. Although there are no dates given for Philips’ intabulations of Marenzio’s madrigals, they most likely date from the mid-1590s.

---

\(^{43}\) Smith, *Musica Britannica*, v. 75.
\(^{44}\) Ibid., xxiv.
Philips’ treatment of this madrigal, as with all of his intabulations, can be characterized by the division of long notes in the original with fast moving notes filling in intervals in the intabulation. In general, the important melodic notes of the vocal version are kept in the intabulation regardless of the figuration. By far, the most common figures used in this work are ascending and descending scales, sometimes used in combination, winding their way to their final destination. These figures are evident from the very beginning of the piece. In the original madrigal, the soprano line descends by a fifth. In the intabulation, this opening statement is transformed into a descending scale by leaping from the opening b’ up to e” and then winding its way down the scale to the e an octave below (Ex. 29).

Example 29. Comparison of original vocal setting and Philips’ intabulation at beginning of Tirsi.
In spite of the seemingly infinite moving notes, Philips occasionally gives a moment of respite in which only the original vocal parts are set. These moments occur at the beginning of a new line of text and repetition of the text, such as at the downbeat of measures 35 and 41, at the text “Che teco bramo di morir anch’io.” After four unadorned half notes, passaggi immediately return (Ex. 30).

Example 30. Setting of vocal parts only at measures 35 and 41.

A similar approach can be found at measure 48. This last stopping point is interrupted not by sixteenth notes, but rather by triplets which introduce brief melodic motives passed between the voices in imitation before closing (Ex. 31).

Example 31. Triplet figures used in imitation to close the prima parte.
Once again, scales are the predominant feature of the ornamentation. The overall structure of the melody forms the skeleton on which the ornamental drapery is hung while the bass line in particular often goes measures at a time virtually identical to the original vocal model. Another aspect of the ornamentation in this section is the proliferation of *gruppos*. Examples of this ornament are readily visible, and Philips in several cases even uses consecutive statements of this ornament to build momentum throughout a given harmonic progression, such as in measures 2-3 and 4-5 (Ex. 32). These *gruppos* are even used in sequence, creating a drive and intensity into a cadential figure (Ex. 33).

Example 32. Extended use of *gruppos* in *seconda parte*.
Example 33. *Gruppos* used in sequence.

mm. 9-13

While the ornamentation in general is not sequential, Philips does at times seem to be somewhat redundant in his approach. An example of this redundancy is encountered in the writing of the repetitive five note scales in measures 24-25 (Ex. 34).

Example 34. Five note pattern used in imitation.

Like the first section of this madrigal, a textual change prompts Philips to set only the vocal parts for a brief time, as if to highlight it. Beginning in measure 47, at the phrase “*Ed io, mi vita,* *moro,*” all ornamental filigree disappears for the first statement of this phrase. As if to heighten the intensity, the next two statements in measures 50-53 are ornamented (Ex. 35).
Example 35. Statements of the text “Ed io, mi vita, moro” which close the seconda parte.

The third parte is by far the shortest of the sections. Consisting of a mere thirty measures in the keyboard part, it is roughly half as long as the previous two partes, at 52 and 56 measures respectively. More than the previous partes, the third parte is built primarily on running flourishes in the right hand and a very simple left hand. The division of scalar material between the hands, common in the previous two sections, is not present here. Once again, in measures 15 through 17, at the text “Che per ancho morir tornaro in vita,” Philips stops all motion and gives strictly the vocal parts for three measures (Ex. 36). The final cadential pattern in the vocal music is doubled in length by a downpouring of scales and passage work in the right hand (Ex. 37).
Example 36. Setting of only vocal parts at the text “Che per ancho morir tornaro in vita.”

Example 37. Scalar figures to close the intabulation.
STYLE AND INFLUENCE

Discussion of one particular composer’s style and its relation to and influence on other composers is often a tenuous and subjective quest. Nowhere is this more evident than in the case of Peter Philips. To understand Philips’ style and its relation to his contemporaries, it is important to know who the most influential people in Philips’ circle were, and their styles.

Being from England, it can be assumed that Philips’ first musical exposure was to English music and probably through English teachers. It was in England that Philips’ first sowed the seeds of a musician’s life. It was in England where he was a choirboy at St. Paul’s and received his earliest musical training. And it was in England that he would have met many of the most famous composers of the day, especially William Byrd, with whom he may have studied. If it is in fact true that Philips knew and studied with William Byrd, the most admired keyboard composer in all of England, then it can be naturally assumed that there would be some model of influence, some musical idiosyncrasies borrowed and perhaps molded and adapted by Philips that can be traced to Byrd. In England too, Italian music was extremely popular, particularly vocal music. It is possible that an interest in Italian madrigals and sacred music, in addition to religious persecution, prompted Philips to leave England and journey to Rome. This idea is all the more plausible considering Philips’ enormous output of Italian madrigals, as well as his sacred music. While in Rome he would possibly have become intimately acquainted with the vocal music of composers such as Caccini, Striggio, Marenzio. He may also have become acquainted with the new musical trends, particularly those of ornamentation, while in Rome. Likewise, Philips’ life in northern Europe offered him at least two colleagues with whom he could share ideas, namely his fellow Englishman John Bull, and Sweelinck. All of these constitute the players in this
study, any and all of who could lend stylistic influence to Philips. If there were any influences, their musical residue would surely be found in the keyboard music of Peter Philips.

In comparing Philips’ music to that of his contemporaries, one quickly finds that there is more than one general style associated with his keyboard works. On one hand there are the dances so popular in the early Italian and English virginal literature – the pavane and galliard. On the other hand, the intabulations are often more fanciful than the dances and seem to be intent on delighting the ear rather than moving the soul. For this reason, the two types of pieces should not be represented together in an analysis of style, but rather examined as two contrasting genres.

_The Pavanes and Galliards_

Taking the English pavanes and galliards as a point of departure, a comparison between these types of pieces by Byrd, Bull and Philips reveals particular characteristics which are similar among the composers and those which are unique to each. In the most general observation, the three composers generally set their pavane and galliard pairs with the traditional three strains and most often provide a written out division for each. Phrase length based on the number of beats within a strain is almost always regular, being made up multiples of four or eight whole notes. The most common scenario is that sections consist of four, eight or sixteen whole notes. In these particular traits the three composers are so similar as to be considered the same.

As for the differences, the most apparent relate to the use of modulation between and within the original strains, the sharing, or lack of sharing of melodic and harmonic content between the pavanes and galliards and the style of division employed by each composer. Both Byrd and Bull employ modulation as a means of variety and interest both within individual strains as well as between strains. Most often the first strain did not modulate. The second strain
would begin on a different tonal center and then modulate to another. The third strain would again begin on yet a different tonal center and modulate back to the original tonal center. As a rule, Byrd does not unify his pavane and galliard pairs and he appears to have intentionally avoided this idea. The pavane and galliard pairs by Bull often give only a slight hint that the dances are related. Bull takes license in the setting of his galliards, often beginning a given strain in the galliard based on that found in the corresponding strain of the pavane. Before it is ended, however, dramatic changes in both harmonic and melodic content take place. The end result of this process creates a galliard which is almost unrecognizable from its pavane and has only loose ties to it. Conversely, Philips’ treatment of this principle is to take the existing pavane material and alter it in the galliard in such a way that it is clearly recognizable but metrically different than its corresponding pavane. In this structural detail it is possible to say that Philips was less experimental than his contemporaries. While there might be some merit to this assertion, there are nonetheless, several traits which would seem to indicate otherwise.

The most important difference between these composers is in their respective styles of division. Peter Philips left only two original pavane and galliard pairs (*Paget* and *Dolorosa*) and the *Pavane* of 1580 with which to compare to his contemporaries. Although much less prolific in this genre than either Byrd or Bull, nonetheless, similarities and differences in their styles of division can be ascertained. The pavanes and galliards by Byrd are among the most finely wrought of all Elizabethan music for keyboards. In them are tuneful and memorable melodies, inventive yet natural divisions, judicious use of dissonance, whimsical rhythmic changes and above all, exquisite counterpoint. In a word, Byrd’s pavanes and galliards could be said to be supremely refined. These individual processes can be evaluated further within the

---

45 The *Pavana and Galliarda Passamezzo* is not included here because, since they are based on a recurring harmonic pattern and bass line, these pieces, and those by Byrd and Bull, are variations and do not represent a typical pavane or galliard.
sections and use of division. Byrd’s use of division flows out of the Renaissance tradition: often, one hand will play the figuration and the other will accompany it in longer note values. These divisions also flow smoothly in terms of rhythm, most often in sixteenth notes. There are certainly longer note values, especially eighth notes, on harmonically important beats, but aside from their harmonic importance, they are used chiefly to allow a particular melodic pattern to be performed in a natural way and allow it reach the next harmonic goal, such as a scale. Rarely are there note values smaller than sixteenths. Another trait stemming from the Renaissance is the lack of sequence, especially those at the level of the smallest note value. While sequences do exist in the keyboard music of Byrd, they most often happen at the motivic level, not at the sixteenth note level, in which case they are really imitations, not sequences. This lack of sequence allows Byrd to often avoid dissonance on strong beats. Where dissonance does occur, it typically is because of a cross relation as a result of contrary moving parts, and generally on a weak beat or subdivision of a beat. The cross relation is virtually never played together (simultaneous), but one part may hold the harmonically true note and afterwards the melodically altered note will be heard (successive). Byrd offers an abundance of imitation to his division of the motives. Skillful use of imitation is one of the hallmarks of Byrd’s keyboard music. As stated, Byrd uses imitation at the motivic level, but this device is employed primarily in the original sections, not in the divisions. In the divisions, imitation happens more at the entrances of important counter-melodic ideas, or incipits of motives, and is passed between the voices.

The pavane and galliard in the hands of John Bull are no less impressive, but in a much different way. In some respects, the style of Bull might be considered the antithesis of that of Byrd. The differences between Byrd and Bull can be most clearly seen in their respective practices of division. Bull’s use of division, for example, is more extroverted and less refined.
Whereas Byrd might be considered a more cerebral composer, Bull’s works are the most virtuosic of the English keyboard music of this period. Similar to Byrd, Bull’s division technique at the smallest note level contains very little use of sequence. Bull, however, seems intent on proving his skills as a virtuoso much more than Byrd and he accomplishes this virtuosity in several ways. The most obvious can be seen simply by looking at the page. Bull’s works, and the division sections of the pavanes and galliards in particular, are littered with thirty-second note runs, scales and various other decorative figures. In addition to these fast passages, thick textures and full chords, particularly in the bass range are extremely common. Broken chord figuration and repeated note passages, as well as passages containing runs of parallel thirds and sixths between the hands, are not only dissimilar to Byrd, but are in many ways indistinguishable from Sweelinck. Rather than one hand accompanying the other’s division, both hands take an active and often simultaneous role. Rhythmic variety is a seemingly constant and important trait in these sections as well. Constantly changing note values gives Bull’s division sections a breathless and restless quality. Variety and virtuosity, in fact, seem to be the chief aims of Bull’s music.

Philips treatment of rhythm in the divisions is very often reminiscent of Byrd. These sections are mostly rhythmically smooth, primarily in sixteenth and eighth notes. However, Bull-like virtuosity can be found, particularly in the use of thirty-second note scales and passages in the *Pavana Paget*. Generally speaking, Philips’ use of texture also inclines toward Byrd’s, with only rare use of thick chords and sonorities. Even the chromatic portion of the third section of the *Pavana Dolorosa* is written in only four voices, and at parts only three, but because of the range allowed by the use of the short/broken octave, the sonority of the low tenths does seem to be fuller. Though one hand may often accompany the other, passages in parallel thirds and
sixths between the hands are encountered, as are thirds and sixths performed by one hand, a trait
of Sweelinck. Use of imitation is limited and the use of sequence at the smallest note level is
also frequently encountered, stylistically different from both Bull and Byrd. Broken chord and
repeated note figurations are almost non-existent. For almost every similarity found between
these composers, a difference is also present. The following chart summarizes the relation
between the styles of these composers.

Figure 4. Similarities and Differences in the Style and Settings of Pavanes and Galliards by Philips, Byrd and Bull

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Philips</th>
<th>Byrd</th>
<th>Bull</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of sections in Pavane and Galliard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>usually 3</td>
<td>usually 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical relationship between sections</td>
<td>differ</td>
<td>differ</td>
<td>differ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulation within sections</td>
<td>primarily no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulation between sections</td>
<td>primarily no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrical structure in sections</td>
<td>regular</td>
<td>regular</td>
<td>regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisions</td>
<td>primarily written out</td>
<td>primarily written out</td>
<td>primarily written out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical similarity between Pavane and Galliard</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes, but often vague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style of division</td>
<td>one hand primarily accompanies the other; also simultaneous division</td>
<td>one hand primarily accompanies the other</td>
<td>both hands simultaneously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most common rhythm in divisions</td>
<td>mostly 16ths, occasional 32nds</td>
<td>16ths</td>
<td>variety – 8ths, 16ths and 32nds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of imitation and counterpoint</td>
<td>often not present</td>
<td>throughout</td>
<td>throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of sequence</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texture</td>
<td>primarily thin</td>
<td>primarily thin</td>
<td>primarily thick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated note patterns and broken chord figuration</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td>throughout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each of these composers was forward looking in his own way; Byrd, with the lack of connection between pavane and galliard; Philips, with the more varied use of ornamentation, rhythm and sequence. In the light of this study, it seems more likely that Philips, along with Byrd and Farnaby, provided the germs of inspiration for a budding virtuoso like Bull and, by extension, possibly Sweelinck. While Philips has not been considered before in this light, the analysis of style certainly reflects the possibility of this scenario.

The Intabulations

Though the practice of intabulating vocal music began in the 14th century, the culmination of this genre began with the arrival of Cabezón. Cabezón, the blind organist from Spain, travelled extensively throughout Europe, even to England, and was highly respected by his colleagues as a performer. Although most of his works were not published during his lifetime, it is likely that his fame led to the dissemination of his music around the continent and in England. One would think also that the Spanish political influence in the Low Countries might have played a part in this dissemination in that region. It may, therefore, be no accident that the flowering of the division style, particularly the settings of secular vocal music, occurred in England and the Low Countries shortly after Cabezón’s travels to those countries in 1554-1556.

Stylistically, the intabulations of Cabezón are much more florid and complex than in previous generations. Much use is made of imitation and, even at this early date, sequence. There is much variety in the use of rhythm. New motives are constantly devised and both hands take an active role in division, with each being an equal partner in many cases. This equality is particularly evident in the use of motives, which are often played in one hand and echoed in the other. There are examples of broken chord figuration and ornamentation. In fact, Philips’ style is very similar to the type of music being written by Cabezón a generation earlier.
The other influence comes from Italy. With regard to the intabulations, the Italians were not as forward looking as in their modern vocal and instrumental music and tended to retain the older Renaissance traditions of ornamentation. While somewhat more complex than those of the early 16th century, simple scales and other figures filling in intervals in the right hand accompanied by blocked chords in the left hand was customary. It was in the implementation of the new *seconda prattica*, particularly regarding melodic gestures and ornamentation that the Italians dominated. It is these features that constitute much of the stylistic material used by Philips, especially in his settings of the Italian madrigals. The most obvious of these traits is the frequent use of the *gruppo*. While these figures are used throughout the English keyboard literature of this time, particularly at cadential points, Philips’ use of this ornament is not confined to these places. These ornamental figures are just as likely to be found within a melodic phrase and serve as another means to connect stepwise notes, whereas the typical English practice was to use scalar figures. Flashes of Italian brilliance can also be found in the numerous instances of fast scales and passage work. These two features in particular call to mind the Italian violin and cornetto practices of ornamentation and point to Philips’ understanding and implementation of this new style. Because of Philips’ use of this type of writing, his madrigal intabulations are not hearkening back to an outdated type of music, but rather point to the adoption of the Italian principles of the *seconda prattica* and possibly the *stylus phantasticus* in the Low Countries, making his music among the most modern being composed at the time.
CONCLUSION

In summary, Peter Philips can be seen as a complete musician in terms of style in the keyboard works. His assemblage of stylistic facets of several composers and principles show that he was not just repeating the same ideas but changing and molding his expression of style.

In some respects, Peter Philips is a dichotomy. Several aspects of his style show him to be not only conventional, but even a traditionalist. In terms of the division style Philips implements in his dance music, it is very similar in many regards to the previous generation of Byrd. In the treatment of harmony and modulation, which is quite limited, he appears quite conservative. In the choice of type of music (Pavanes and Galliards, Fantasias) Philips is likewise conservative, and, in the use of the outdated practice of intabulation, could even be considered old fashioned.

However, there are several factors that make Philips’ keyboard music unique in comparison with his contemporaries, and some which could be viewed as progressive. Traditionally, the melody in a strain of a pavane or galliard was through-composed with imitative accompaniment. In Philips’ music, these roles in some instances seem to be reversed. Although imitation is found, Philips tends more toward through-composition of accompaniment with each voice having its specific line and function, removed from contrapuntal devices. Related to this is Philips’ use of motive as a structural unit from which to build the strains in a pavane. Imitation and repetition of a melodic motive as the predominant melody is a feature unique to Philips. Another uncommon feature is the prevalent use of sequence. Sequence was known and used by the virginalists, but almost completely in the working out of motivic relationships. The use of sequence at the smallest note level was exceedingly rare, with a strict reliance on the traditionally consonant and non-sequential Renaissance division style.
Particularly in the intabulations, however, Philips’ often makes use of sequential writing at the smallest note value, a feature which is commonplace in many of the new Italian sources of ornamentation being written at the time. In fact, the idea of dichotomy is nowhere more evident than in Philips’ intabulations. In Philips’ hands, this archaic form of music is preserved for us with the most current styles of improvisation and ornamentation.

A study of Peter Philips’ keyboard music reveals him to be a composer with his feet planted firmly in two worlds, the old and the new. Because of this apparent contradiction, his music as a whole cannot be classified as either conservative or progressive. However, the distinctive stylistic features contained in his music point clearly to Philips being a clever and skilled craftsman of melody, harmony and ornamentation, and one of the most unique composers of his generation.
APPENDIX A

LIST OF MANUSCRIPT SOURCES OF PETER PHILIPS’ KEYBOARD MUSIC


Ly  Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Lübbenau MS Lynar A I. Formerly attributed to Matthias Weckmann but based on handwriting that assertion has been refuted. Source most likely from the Netherlands copied between c. 1615-1620. Contains *Amarilli, Chi farà fed’al cielo [I], Ecco l’Aurora, Le Rossignol, Pavana and Galliarda Dolorosa*. See D. J. Smith, op. cit., i, pp.39-81; P. Dirksen, op. cit., p.656.


O2 Oxford, Christ Church Library, Mus. MS 1003. Contains *Almande Tr[egian] copied from O1*. 
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Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria di Torino, Raccolta Foà, MS 7. One volume of a series of sixteen which comprise the largest collection of keyboard music to survive from the early seventeenth century. Contains *Pavana Dolorosa (Galliarda missing), Pavana (1580)*, both listed as anonymous. See D. J. Smith, op. cit., i, pp.184-96; P. Dirksen, op. cit., p.661.
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LIST OF SOURCES FOR LUTE AND CITTERN VERSIONS OF PHILIPS’ *PAVANA* (1580)
Joachim van den Hove, *Florida* (Leyden, 1601).


Dublin College Library, Dublin, *Dallis Pupil's Lute Book* (1583).

*Robinson’s New Cittern Lessons*, (1609).

Johann Rudenius, *Flores Musicae* (Heidelberg: Voegelin, 1600).

Yale University Library, *Wickhambrook Lute Book* (no date).
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Giulio Caccini, *Le nuove musiche* (Florence, 1601).


