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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background and Significance

William Byrd is considered one of the most influential composers of sixteenth-century Elizabethan England. A student of Thomas Tallis and a teacher of Thomas Morley, Thomas Tomkins, John Bull, Peter Philips, and Thomas Weelkes, Byrd had an influence on English music that “can be seen to have assumed almost Schoenbergian proportions.”¹ His fame as a singer, keyboard player, and composer was well established early on in his career, and he was held in high esteem by his English contemporaries throughout his life. Byrd composed well over five hundred works, including both sacred and secular polyphonic choral works and pieces for keyboard. The largest collection of his keyboard works, containing well over half of his known output, is found in The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book.²

In 1923, England was witness to the celebration of the tercentenary of Byrd’s death. Hugh Allen, director of the Royal College of Music, asked Gordon Jacob to arrange some of Byrd’s music for orchestra, to be performed at a festival in Oxford commemorating the anniversary.³ Musicological performance practice was in its infancy at this point in history, but the work of scholar Edmund Fellowes and others had shed much light on the music of the Elizabethans and Jacobeans.⁴ Jacob, a student at the

---

Royal College of Music at the time, was eager to contribute to the revival and quickly began to work on a piece for the festival.\(^5\)

In the 1920s, the most abundant resource for Byrd’s music was Breitkopf & Härtel’s edition of *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book*, published in 1899 in two volumes. This edition was the only published source of this music, and it was most probably this source that Jacob referenced in the preparation of his arrangement for the anniversary festival. From the sixty-nine entries attributed to Byrd in *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book*, Jacob chose three to arrange for symphony orchestra. From the first volume he selected “The Bells” (LXIX, pp. 274-279), and the second volume provided the other two pieces: “Pavana” (CLXXIV, pp. 226-227), and “The Earle of Oxfords Marche” (CCLIX, pp. 402-404).\(^6\) Jacob “freely transcribed” these three selections and the ensuing work, the *William Byrd Suite: Selected from The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book*, was first performed at the Royal College of Music on February 16, 1923, with Sir Adrian Boult conducting.\(^7\)

The *William Byrd Suite*, in its original incarnation as an orchestral piece, was well received by the English press and instantly became part of Boult’s repertoire. Boult again programmed the work in December of 1923 as the finale to a concert with the Scottish Orchestra.\(^8\) Jacob’s transcription was embraced once more, as exemplified in a review in the *Glasgow Herald*: “Perhaps there were some members of the audience who wondered what Byrd would have thought of it all. It may safely be suggested that

he would have been the most appreciative of all listeners.”\(^9\)

The orchestral version was performed at least once in the United States in the 1930s, by Sir John Barbirolli and the New York Philharmonic Orchestra, but has since fallen out of the repertoire.\(^{10}\)

In the year following the premiere of the *William Byrd Suite* for orchestra, Boult asked Jacob to score the work for British military band. This new version was to be included in a concert of massed bands in Wembley Stadium during the British Empire Exhibition of 1924.\(^{11}\) Never having written for band before, Jacob received help from an interesting source. During his third year at the Royal College of Music, Jacob studied composition with Ralph Vaughan Williams. In interviews over the years Jacob revealed his displeasure with having studied with Vaughan Williams, but was quick to acknowledge one valuable lesson he learned from his teacher: “Having just completed an orchestration of V.W.’s *English Folk Song Suite* [originally composed for band] I had been able to grasp the principles of scoring for band.”\(^{12}\) Jacob put these “principles” to good use, and in addition to the original three movements for orchestra, he chose three more from *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book*: “Jhon come kisse me now” from the first volume (X., pp. 47-53), and “The Maydens Song” (CXXVI, pp. 67-71) and “Wolseys Wilde” (CLVII, pp. 185-185) from the second volume.\(^{13}\) The resulting version of the *William Byrd Suite* for military band was premiered by Boult on May 29, 1924.

\(^{9}\) Ibid.  
\(^{12}\) Ibid.  
\(^{13}\) Battisti, *Winds of Change*, 20.
Coincidentally and perhaps appropriately, the program also included the first performances of Vaughan Williams’s *Toccata Marziale* and *Sea Songs*.\(^{14}\)

Since its premiere in 1924, the *William Byrd Suite* has held a place of distinction in the wind band repertoire. Jacob’s first work for band, the suite has been consistently identified as a vital part of the repertoire by conductors and scholars for over eighty years. The piece is often referred to as one of the “British Band Classics,” a group of works composed for military band by Jacob, Vaughan Williams, and Gustav Holst during the first three decades of the twentieth century.\(^{15}\) In fact, the *William Byrd Suite* was published by Boosey & Hawkes in 1924, the same year as three other significant members of the “British Band Classics”: Holst’s Second Suite in F and Vaughan Williams’s English Folk Song Suite and *Toccata Marziale*.\(^{16}\)

Frederick Fennell, founder of the Eastman Wind Ensemble and one of the most influential figures in the history of the wind band, wrote about the *William Byrd Suite* and recorded it three times over a thirty-year period. He called Jacob’s arrangement “one of the band’s most unusual scores, one of its great pieces, and one I cannot imagine would not be a primary part of every conductor’s repertory, a piece he would play with calculated frequency both as a study work and a performance vehicle. …It is, and long has been, a vital part of my repertory.”\(^{17}\) The piece has consistently appeared in the top thirty of every significant study to evaluate and identify important pieces in the wind band repertoire, including those by Acton Ostling, Jr., Robert Hornyak, Richard K.


\(^{16}\) Frederick Fennell, "William Byrd Suite," *The Instrumentalist* 30, no. 2 (September 1975): 35.

\(^{17}\) Ibid., 40.
Fiese, and Jay Gilbert. The wind version was an immediate success upon its premiere and Boosey & Hawkes soon thereafter asked Jacob to compose an original work for wind band. The resultant work, *An Original Suite*, was also written in 1924 and along with the *William Byrd Suite*, remains one of his most beloved works for wind band. Despite the great popularity of these two pieces, Jacob did not compose another piece for winds and percussion until twenty-seven years later. He returned to the wind band medium in 1951 when he wrote *Music for a Festival* for the Festival of Britain in Royal Festival Hall. Since then, Jacob would contribute several more pieces for wind band until his death in 1984. However, the *William Byrd Suite*, his first work for wind band, has arguably remained his most successful and popular.

**State of Research**

There exists a modest body of literature pertaining to Jacob’s *William Byrd Suite*. In fact, there is very little written about Gordon Jacob in general. Despite the small amount of information written about this work and composer, it is possible to gain insight by consulting the existent materials, particularly those of the past three decades. In addition to a biography and a handful of articles, there have been two doctoral dissertations that have shed some light on this topic, and the piece has been published on three separate occasions by Boosey & Hawkes. While some of these sources have attempted to provide an errata or an entirely new edition of the piece, none have

---

18 Battisti, *Winds of Change*, 121, 122, 124, 151. In Ostling’s 1978 study, the *William Byrd Suite* ranked an average of eighteenth by 95% of the panel. For Hornyak’s 1983 report, it was sixteenth. It ranked fifteenth in Fiese’s study in 1987. By the time of Gilbert’s 1992 project, it had dropped to twenty-eighth.

provided an adequate or complete solution to the problem of the numerous inconsistencies and discrepancies.

First published in 1924, the year of its premiere, the *William Byrd Suite* included only a condensed score of three staves and contained numerous errors and discrepancies in the parts. In the present study, “error” is used as a term denoting inconsistencies that were found through the comparison of editions, sources, errata, melodic contest, and harmonic analysis. “Editorial decision” is used to describe any change, subjective or objective, from the editions or sources. Despite the recognition of these errors over the years by conductors and scholars, this remains the same set of engraving plates that have been used to publish the parts in all subsequent editions. One of these secondary editions was published in 1960, and is identified as the “U.S. Edition 1960.” This edition included a full score for the first time, a great improvement over the condensed score that had been in existence for nearly forty years. However, the 1960 edition is not without its problems. Fennell identified the unfortunate circumstances under which this edition was created when he wrote that “the full score and new edition…was made from the parts and, like the Holst *Suite in E-flat*, it unfortunately incorporates their errors.”

Fennell’s 1975 *Instrumentalist* article simply entitled “The William Byrd Suite” is an attempt to correct these errors. The main goal of the article is to introduce the work to conductors and to address performance issues specific to each movement. Of interest to the present study is the inclusion of a supplemental section devoted to “Points of Correction.” While this errata is helpful and the first attempt by anyone to

---

correct the problems, it also introduces some errors and represents only a small percentage of the discrepancies and inconsistencies contained in the score or parts.

A more detailed analysis of the *William Byrd Suite* can be found in J. Alan Whiston’s doctoral dissertation *Gordon Jacob: A Biographical Sketch and Analysis of Four Selected Works for Band*, published in 1987. A sizable portion of Whiston’s study focuses on the *William Byrd Suite* and provides a great deal of information regarding form and design, melodic and rhythmic structure, texture and scoring techniques, and stylistic considerations and performance suggestions. However, Whiston did not address the errors, as that was not a vital component of his study.

In 1991, the third edition of the *William Byrd Suite* was published by Boosey & Hawkes. This so-called “Corrected Edition 1991” was an attempt to reconcile those errors identified by Fennell and integrate his supplementary part for timpani. Unfortunately, this edition does not incorporate all of Fennell’s suggestions, few as they may be, and the score does not include the new timpani part. Even though the title of this edition, the current one available today, implies that it is a corrected edition, it actually introduces other errors and creates additional problems.

Eric Wetherell presented an in-depth view of Jacob’s life in *Gordon Jacob: A Centenary Biography*, published by Thames in 1995. Wetherell, a conductor, composer, scholar, and one-time student of Jacob’s, provided the first broad study of the composer. At only 112 pages, the book presents the important events and accomplishments of Jacob’s career and personal life, while mentioning his works only in view of the chronology. It is an important addition to Jacob research, and provides the basis for subsequent research into the biography and music of the composer.
Another important resource is Clarence L. Weeks’s doctoral dissertation entitled Gordon Jacob’s “William Byrd Suite”: A Corrected Edition. Completed in 1997, the edition is an attempt to create a replacement for the “Corrected Edition 1991.” To accomplish this, Weeks compared all published editions and errata. An unfortunate aspect of this study is Weeks’s intentional disregard for the Byrd source material, a vital aspect of the present edition. Additionally, the lack of editorial indications makes this resource an interesting but imperfect and ultimately unwieldy resource.

It is highly probable that Jacob consulted the 1899 Breitkopf & Härtel publication of The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book, edited by Maitland and Squire. Since Jacob used this as the basis for his arrangement of Byrd’s music, it should be considered as the source material for the William Byrd Suite. This collection has been used by scholars and performers for over a century. Though it represents a remarkable feat of scholarship, especially in consideration of the time in which it was published, it was subsequently revised and edited in 1979 by Blanche Winogron. This revised edition of The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book corrects errors by the original editors and applies a modern understanding of the performance period to the music.

Since Edmund Fellowes’s seminal scholarship on early English music in the first half of the twentieth century, there has been a large amount of research in the areas of biography, authenticity, and performance practice. The earliest example is the introduction and notes included in Maitland’s and Squire’s edition of The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book. Another important contribution is Fellowes’s own William Byrd, first published in 1936. A more recent bio-bibliographical work is John Harley’s 1997 William Byrd: Gentleman of the Chapel Royal. Other works focus mainly on the music of Byrd,
including Alan Brown’s editions of some of the keyboard works, as well as his co-editorship, along with Richard Turbet, of *Byrd Studies*, published in 1992. The other significant offering in this area is Oliver Neighbour’s *The Consort and Keyboard Music of William Byrd* of 1978. In addition to the value of the background information and origin of the source material, the work of these scholars has also contributed to the editorial process of the present edition of the *William Byrd Suite*.

**Need and Purpose**

Despite being recognized as one of the most important compositions in the twentieth-century wind band repertoire, the *William Byrd Suite* presents many obstacles for the conductor and ensemble members. Ever since initial publication in 1924, the piece has contained many errors of pitch, articulation, rhythm, dynamics, and phrase completion that appear in the score as well as the parts, sometimes independently of each other. Although the work was reissued by Boosey & Hawkes in 1960 and 1991, many of the original errors remained intact. The sheer amount of errors causes great difficulties for the musicians involved in the rehearsal process, slowing efficiency and resulting in a frustrating impediment to a quality performance. These difficulties, along with an explosion of quality music written for the wind band in the past century, have discouraged conductors from programming the work. It would seem that the *William Byrd Suite*, once an undeniable staple of the wind band, is in danger of being neglected and forgotten. In order to encourage that this important piece remains in the repertoire, a new edition is warranted, one that will ensure performance and study by subsequent generations of musicians.
The primary purpose of this study was the creation of a critical edition of Jacob’s *William Byrd Suite* that eliminates errors of extant editions, incorporates modern instrumentation, and considers the source material. Since 1975, when Fennell published his article on the piece, there have been a few attempts to correct the numerous errors contained in the score and parts, including the errata produced by Fennell, the “Corrected Edition 1991” published by Boosey & Hawkes, and the doctoral dissertation by Weeks. As with any attempt to make evident the errors in an existing piece of music, these sources were created with the goal of increasing the clarity of the composer’s intent and the efficiency of rehearsal to encourage repeated performances by future musicians. However, none of these errata or editions has adequately addressed the mistakes, particularly in regard to pitch error and articulation inconsistency.

Many of the “British Band Classics” that were originally published in the 1920s by Boosey & Hawkes have recently been treated to new editions by respected scholars in the field. The first of these, Colin Matthews’s editions of Holst’s First Suite in E-flat, Op. 28 No. 1 and Second Suite in F, Op. 28 No. 2, were published in 1984. These revised editions by Matthews have been embraced by conductors and have supplanted the original published editions from earlier in the century. Another masterpiece, *Toccata Marziale* by Ralph Vaughan Williams, was released in a new edition by Frank Battisti in 2005. All three of these editions went back to the autograph manuscript to clarify issues of pitch, articulation, rhythm, and instrumentation that were contained in earlier editions published in the 1920s. Like the current published edition of the *William Byrd Suite*, the early editions of these pieces had many of the same problems, and their new editions
are a vital part of the repertoire. It would seem that a new critical edition of the *William Byrd Suite* would also be a much-welcomed addition.

A new edition that resolves errors and clearly identifies editorial decisions will be of great use to the conductor who chooses to program this masterwork. In addition, a carefully-conceived part for baritone saxophone by the author and an updated timpani part by Fennell may enhance the decision to study, rehearse, and perform the piece, providing tasteful and interesting parts for these players. These additional parts remain supplemental and the original part for timpani is also included. By making the editorial choices clear, the edition can be performed with the original instrumentation or with the additions and performance suggestions of the editor, resulting in flexibility and choice for the conductor.

Another key aspect of the study was the consideration of the source material in the editorial process. The 1979 Dover revised edition of *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book*, edited by Blanche Winogron, has been valuable to this study. Close scrutiny has helped resolve any issues that were created as a result of errors in the 1899 Breitkopf & Härtel edition that Jacob may have used as the basis for the *William Byrd Suite*.

All of the above portions of the study have resulted in a critical edition of Jacob’s *William Byrd Suite* that may be of tremendous value to the wind band repertoire. As a replacement for older, error-ridden editions of the work, this new edition will help to ensure its rightful place among the masterpieces of the twentieth century. Conductors and players will no longer have to deal with the problems created in rehearsal and performance by the enormous amount of mistakes in both the score and parts. A new edition that resolves these errors has the potential to increase rehearsal efficiency and
allow for performances with increased accuracy and clarity. It is hoped that through this new edition of the *William Byrd Suite*, this masterpiece will remain a staple of the wind band repertoire and be introduced and performed by future generations of musicians.

An anticipated peripheral benefit of this new and accessible edition will be renewed interest in the music of Gordon Jacob. While very popular in the middle and late twentieth century, Jacob’s works have generally fallen to a secondary role in the music of the wind band. Many young conductors and performers have never performed the *William Byrd Suite*, let alone the dozen or so additional pieces that he composed for the wind band. This new edition has the potential to generate genuine and deserved curiosity into Jacob’s contributions to the repertoire, introduce his music to a new generation, and provide an opportunity for musicians to perform the music of William Byrd.
CHAPTER 2

SOURCES, EDITIONS, AND ERRATA

*The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book*

The source for the *William Byrd Suite* is *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book*, an early seventeenth-century collection of transcribed works for the virginal. The virginal is a smaller version of the harpsichord, with only one set of strings and jacks and one keyboard. Another important distinction is that the strings run at right angles to the keys, making necessary the rectangular shape and shallow depth of the box that contains the strings. These instruments were used primarily as “practice instruments and for domestic music-making.”\(^2^1\) However, it would be incorrect to assume that the music contained in *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book* was intended only for amateurs and home entertainment, as it was customary in England to use the term “virginal” to “denote all quilled keyboard instruments well into the seventeenth century.”\(^2^2\)

Housed in the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge for over two centuries, *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book* is an anthology of nearly 300 works for keyboard by many of the leading composers of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. It remains the largest extant collection of keyboard music from the late sixteenth century and is without a doubt the largest contemporary collection of pieces attributed to Byrd. The collection features transcriptions of madrigals, contrapuntal fantasias, dances, preludes, descriptive pieces, and many sets of variations, all notated in the same handwriting that


\(^{22}\) Ibid.
has long been believed to belong to Francis Tregian.\textsuperscript{23} Although the authenticity of Tregian’s authorship has recently come into controversy, no satisfactory resolution has been presented.\textsuperscript{24} From c. 1609 until 1617, Tregian was imprisoned in the Fleet Prison in London on charges of recusancy.\textsuperscript{25} Although he died a debtor, he possessed hundreds of books from which he presumably copied the pieces found in \textit{The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book}.\textsuperscript{26} The final entry in the manuscript, Jan Sweelinck’s \textit{Ut, re, mi, fa, sol, la}, is dated 1612. From that date, the history of the book is unknown for over a century, perhaps exchanging a variety of hands after Tregian’s death in 1617.\textsuperscript{27}

By 1740, the large folio of \textit{The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book} was bound in red Turkish leather and guilt and had come into the possession of a Dr. Pepusch.\textsuperscript{28} This is presumably the German composer and theorist Johann Christoph Pepusch, who moved to England sometime after 1697 and remained there for the rest of his life.\textsuperscript{29} The Scottish music publisher Robert Bremner purchased the book for ten guineas at the sale of Pepusch’s collection in 1762, and subsequently passed it on to Lord Fitzwilliam by 1783.\textsuperscript{30} In 1816, Richard, Viscount Fitzwilliam, founded the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge University and donated the manuscript to the museum’s collection, where it

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{24} Ruby Reid Thompson, “Francis Tregian the Younger as Music Copyist: A Legend and an Alternative View,” \textit{Music & Letters}, 82, no. 1 (February 2001): 1; David J. Smith, “A Legend?: Francis Tregian the Younger as Music Copyist” \textit{Musical Times} 143, no. 1879 (Summer 2002): 15.
\item \textsuperscript{25} John Alexander Fuller Maitland and William Barclay Squire, “Introduction and Notes” to \textit{The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book: Edited from the Original Manuscript with an Introduction and Notes} (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1899), viii. A recusant was an English Roman Catholic who refused to attend services of the Church of England and thereby committed a statutory offense.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Ibid., viii.
\item \textsuperscript{30} Maitland and Squire, “Introduction and Notes,” v.
\end{itemize}
acquired the erroneous title of *Queen Elizabeth’s Virginal Book* and faded into obscurity.\(^\text{31}\)

In the process of preparing the Fitzwilliam Museum’s music catalog, the music critic of the *London Times*, John Alexander Fuller Maitland, rediscovered *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book*.\(^\text{32}\) A modern edition of the collection was produced in 1899 by Breitkopf & Härtel. Edited by Maitland and William Barclay Squire, critic, editor, and music librarian of the British Museum, this publication made available the music of the English virginalists in modern notation for the first time. Maitland and Squire applied the latest understanding of notation and performance practice of the late Renaissance to the publication. The wide distribution of this edition allowed early twentieth-century scholars and composers to easily access the music. While it cannot be confirmed, it was most likely this edition that Jacob referenced when arranging his setting of Byrd’s music. Jacob would again return to *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book* in 1970 for the source material for his *Giles Farnaby Suite* for band.

Dover Publications issued a revised copy of *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book* in 1979 and 1980. Edited by Blanche Winogron, this updated edition of the 1899 Maitland and Squire publication offered a critical reexamination of the entire collection. Winogron returned to the manuscript and discovered several misreadings and misinterpretations by the original editors, no doubt a reflection of the current state of research available to

---


\(^{32}\) Blanche Winogron, “Preface to the Revised Dover Edition,” in *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book: Edited from the Original Manuscript with an Introduction and Notes* by J. A. Fuller Maitland and W. Barclay Squire (New York: Dover Publications, 1979), iii. Winogron surmises that Maitland was inspired to become an early music enthusiast “by his first acquaintance with the great body of virginal music in the Fitzwilliam Museum uncovered in the process of preparing that institution’s music catalog, completed in 1887.”
them at the end of the nineteenth century. In addition, she also uncovered errors originating with the original seventeenth-century scribe of the manuscript and the 1899 printing process. Instead of issuing a completely new version, Dover Publications instead used the Breitkopf and Härtel plates and incorporated Winogron’s findings and editorial decisions. This 1979 edition is important because it allows the researcher to evaluate Jacob’s reliance on and divergence from the original manuscript while incorporating the corrections that were unknown to him at the time of the transcription.

The words “freely transcribed by” precede Jacob’s name on the title page of the William Byrd Suite. It is unknown if this was the composer’s choice or the publisher’s, but it would seem to indicate that the piece uses The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book as a departure point and not as the definitive source for material. In the description of the procedural methods for his 1997 dissertation and corrected edition, Weeks disregarded the importance of The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book, stating that the original source “was not analyzed in depth because it was clear that Jacob did not adhere completely to either the form or harmonic structure of the original.” However, in the process of creating the present edition, this author discovered quite the contrary. While it is true and obvious that Jacob’s transcription deviates from the source in the areas of instrumentation and embellishment, a note-by-note comparison of the William Byrd Suite to The Fitzwilliam Virginal reveals the dependence of the former on the latter. Weeks’s assertion that Jacob did not “adhere completely” is true only in the absolute sense: there are a few occasions when the form differs, but rare are the instances when Jacob is flexible with
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33 Ibid.
the melody or harmony of the original. The majority of Jacob’s transcription is faithful to
the original, and the few deviations tend to be borne out of practicality of the
performance medium and proportion to the work as a whole. The following discussion
addresses those few major differences.

For the wind transcription of the *William Byrd Suite*, Jacob altered the key
schemes, note values, and/or form of each of the six movements from the Byrd source
material. All six movements are scored a whole step lower than the source. The key
scheme of the movements as contained in *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book* are G major –
A minor – G major – G major – C major – C major. In Jacob’s transcription, the keys are
F major – G minor – F major – F major – B-flat major – B-flat major.35 Jacob most
probably lowered the tonal areas by a whole step in order to provide keys that are more
friendly and related to the overtone series of many of the instruments in the wind band.
Jacob also altered the rhythmic and metric notation of each movement to adapt the
older time signatures and tempos to modern standards. Note values in “The Earle of
Oxford’s Marche” were cut in half, as the comparison of the two versions show in figure
1. This alteration of note values occurs in all six movements, with the exception of “Jhon
come kisse me now.” Jacob’s transcription of this movement uses the same values as
the Byrd source.

35 In the orchestral version, “The Earle of Oxford’s Marche” is written in the original key and note
values. It is unknown if all the movements follow this scheme, as only six measures of the orchestral
version were available, found in Wetherell, *Gordon Jacob*, illustration 8.
The final large-scale adjustment that Jacob made with the source material was the alteration of form in a few instances. “The Earle of Oxford’s Marche” has been changed only slightly, with the exclusion of only one measure, and the “Pavana” is identical in form. However, with “Jhon come kisse me now,” Jacob omits several of the variations, creating a truncated version of the movement. He ultimately left out eight of the variations: the fifth and eighth through fourteenth variations. “The Mayden’s Song” is also significantly altered in form, as Jacob chose to omit a large portion of the second half of Byrd’s original. The form of “Wolsey’s Wilde” is identical to the version contained in The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book, but “The Bells” has been changed. The most notable omissions include the second, fifth, seventh, and eighth variations. Interestingly, despite these reductions of the source material, the William Byrd Suite is by no means unbalanced and there is no impression of incompletion, a tribute to Jacob’s skill as an arranger.

Because the comparison of Byrd’s original material to Jacob’s transcription for wind band reveals a close relationship, it follows that The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book is an important source for any editorial study. Since the 1899 Breitkopf & Härtel edition was the only one available to Jacob save for the manuscript, it seems perfectly logical that
he used this source as the basis for the musical material. The 1899 edition is a valuable resource, and the 1979 edition applied only a handful of corrections that affect the source material, many of which Jacob had already corrected intuitively during the transcription process. The fact that the melodic and harmonic content of the *William Byrd Suite* is nearly identical to the original source leads one to believe that it was the composer’s intention to adhere to *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book*. Any melodic or harmonic derivation from the source could represent the “free transcription” process, or be the result of error on the part of the transcriber, copier, or publisher. Following this logic, the result of the present study is due in part to the careful consideration of *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book* in comparison to all other published editions.

**Autograph Manuscript and Orchestral Version**

In creating a new edition of any music, the editor’s first step should be the consultation of all extant materials, including consideration of the autograph manuscript of the score or any surviving sketches. Regrettably, correspondence with several parties has revealed the unfortunate fact that the manuscript of the *William Byrd Suite* is lost, with little chance for recovery. The manuscript is not among the materials still in possession of his widow, Margaret Jacob Hyatt, nor his daughter, Ruth Jacob, who both still reside in England.\(^\text{36}\) A search into the location of the manuscript did not result in its being found among the collections of Jacob’s biographer, the British Museum, the British Library, the Royal Military School of Music at Kneller Hall, or Boosey & Hawkes.\(^\text{37}\) It is perhaps appropriate that just as none of Byrd’s autograph manuscripts
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\(^\text{36}\) Ruth Jacob, e-mail message to author, February 22, 2006.

\(^\text{37}\) Craig Kirchhoff, e-mail message to the author, March 2, 2006; Frank Korach, e-mail message to the author, March 2, 2006; Pam Smith, e-mail message to the author, March 6, 2006; Steve Cork, e-mail message to the author, March 8, 2006; Timothy Reynish, e-mail message to the author, March 22,
survived, neither does there seem to be an autograph manuscript of the William Byrd Suite.\textsuperscript{38}

The editor’s next step should be to consult any version or arrangement that precedes the edition in question. Since Jacob’s original version of the suite was three movements written for orchestra, this 1923 version would be valuable to the current study. Unfortunately, the orchestral version has fallen out of the repertoire and could not be located by this author. Several inquiries into publishing companies, libraries both here and abroad, and Jacob’s relatives failed to locate the orchestral version. The only evidence of this version was found in Wetherell’s biography of Jacob. Wetherell includes a photograph of one page of the orchestral score, mm. 74-79 of “The Earle of Oxford’s Marche.” However, when contacted by the author, Wetherell could not recall where he had obtained the photograph and did not possess a copy himself. Without the manuscript and the orchestral version, the source material and all other editions and errata had to be consulted in order to generate an educated attempt at Jacob’s intent and create a new edition.

Published Editions and Errata

The William Byrd Suite was first published in 1924 by Boosey & Hawkes. As was standard practice at the time, the original publication included only a condensed score of three staves. Despite the recognition of errors in the score and parts over the years by conductors and scholars, this remained the same set of engraving plates that have been used to publish the parts in all subsequent editions.

\textsuperscript{38} Neighbour, \textit{The Consort and Keyboard Music of William Byrd}, 20.
Jacob’s transcription for winds was originally conceived for the combined forces of several bands for an outdoor performance in Wembley Stadium. Being a combination of a handful of British bands, this massed band would have reflected the instrumentation of the British military bands standard at the time. This instrumentation was similar to that of its trans-Atlantic cousin, the American symphonic band, with a few exceptions. The standard instrumentation of the British military band of the 1920s did not include alto clarinet, bass clarinet, or baritone saxophone, which were common in the symphonic bands of the United States at the time. Jacob wrote of these instrumentation differences in his book on composition, *The Composer and His Art*, published in 1958. When comparing the two ensembles and their differences in instrumentation, he wrote,

The bass of the [British] military band is so weak in the woodwind department, the bassoon being the only truly bass instrument in that section, that the euphonium is kept busy providing a bass in passages which do not require 16-ft. tone. …We shall see that the American symphonic band is much more lavishly supplied with bass instruments than our bands are over here [in England]. …The bass line is richer by far than in our bands, as a comparison of the lists of instruments shows. The whole outfit makes a fine array and an imposing sound.

Since the manuscript is presumably lost, the specific instrumentation of the *William Byrd Suite* cannot be verified with complete certainty. However, one contemporary source can be consulted to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion of the original instrumentation. Vaughan Williams’s *Toccata Marziale* and *Sea Songs* were also premiered on May 29, 1924, on the same concert as the *William Byrd Suite*. Fortunately, the manuscript score of *Toccata Marziale* is still in existence. An inventory of the parts for *Toccata Marziale* reveals an instrumentation of flute/piccolo, E-flat
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39 Frederick Fennell, *Time and the Winds* (Kenosha, WI: G. Leblanc), 35.
clarinet, oboe, solo & ripieno clarinets, clarinet 2, clarinet 3, E-flat (alto) saxophone, B-flat (tenor) saxophone, bassoon, F horn 1 & 2, F horn 3 & 4, B-flat cornet 1, B-flat cornet 2, B-flat trumpet 1 & 2, trombone 1 & 2, bass trombone, euphonium, basses (tuba), timpani, side (snare) drum & triangle, and cymbals & bass drum.\textsuperscript{41} Since both of these pieces were composed for the same ensemble and occasion, it is highly likely that Jacob’s instrumentation for the \textit{William Byrd Suite} would have been very similar, if not an exact match, to that of \textit{Toccata Marziale}.

For the first thirty-six years of its existence, the \textit{William Byrd Suite} was only available in its original 1924 publication by Boosey & Hawkes. The published score was a three-line condensed score with very little specific information, and the parts reflected the instrumentation of the British military band, which excluded the low single-reed woodwinds common to American symphonic bands. Wind conductors in the United States during this time were very concerned with developing a standard instrumentation for the symphonic band, as evidenced by the work of the College Band Directors National Association and American Bandmasters Association.\textsuperscript{42} Several “ideal” instrumentation schemes were developed, but all included alto clarinet, bass clarinet, and baritone saxophone. The suite’s difference in instrumentation may have precluded many performances in the United States, or at the very least forced enterprising conductors to create new parts for the low single-reed instruments. A new edition that reflected the instrumentation of the American symphonic band would have been a most welcome addition to the repertoire during this time.

\textsuperscript{41} Frank L. Battisti, Notes to \textit{Toccata Marziale} by Ralph Vaughan Williams (New York: Boosey & Hawkes), ii.

\textsuperscript{42} Frank Battisti, The Twentieth Century American Wind Band/Ensemble: History, Development, and Literature (Fort Lauderdale, FL: Meredith Music Publications), 23.
This fact most assuredly helped to influence Boosey & Hawkes to publish a new edition with expanded instrumentation. However, another event in the 1950s may also have encouraged the new edition for American bands: the first commercial recording of the *William Byrd Suite*. Fennell and the Eastman Wind Ensemble recorded the suite in November of 1958 as part of the now-legendary Mercury “Living Presence” series. It was included on the 1959 release, *British Band Classics, Vol. 2.* Fennell had already performed the work several times at the Eastman School of Music since the 1941-42 season, including four times with the Eastman Symphony Band and five times with the Eastman Wind Ensemble. However, the Mercury recordings had a much broader impact than any concert possibly could, and the recording of the *William Byrd Suite* exposed the work to an international audience for the first time. Coincidentally, Boosey & Hawkes brought out the new edition for American bands the following year.

This new edition is easily identified by the inscription “U.S. Edition 1960,” found in the bottom left hand corner of the first page. This label is appropriate, as it was the first published edition in the United States. This special designation is also indicative of a slight variation in instrumentation as well as the fact that wind band repertoire was in a relative state of dormancy in England until the 1970s and 1980s, and new editions and compositions were not in great demand.

While most of the parts of the new “U.S. Edition 1960” were simply reprints from the original printing plates of the 1924 edition, there were new parts for E-flat alto and B-flat bass clarinets included. Close examination of these parts reveal that they were created specially for the new American edition. The E-flat alto clarinet part is simply the original E-flat alto saxophone part, with the instrument name replaced on the part. The alto clarinet’s location in the score also betrays its spurious nature because it shares the same staff line as the alto saxophone, placing it below the clarinet family and thus out of normal score order. The authenticity of the B-flat bass clarinet part is more difficult to discern from the original parts, but Weeks observed variations in the style and size of engraving.\textsuperscript{46} Weeks also noted that the bass clarinet part was an amalgamation of the first and second bassoon parts, alternating between the two to adapt to the playing range of the bass clarinet.\textsuperscript{47} Curiously, this edition intended for the instrumentation of American bands did not include a baritone saxophone part, a vital part of American instrumentation.

In addition to the new parts for alto and bass clarinet, the 1960 edition of the \textit{William Byrd Suite} also included a full score for the first time. This score was obviously created for the new edition, as it seamlessly incorporates the new parts for alto and bass clarinets. There is no indication that Jacob was even involved in the process for the new edition, and oftentimes parts and scores were prepared for publication by copyists. Perhaps due to the lack of Jacob’s supervision, the 1960 edition is an imperfect resource. Fennell identified the unfortunate circumstances under which this

\textsuperscript{46} Weeks, “Gordon Jacob’s \textit{William Byrd Suite},” 175-176.  
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 175.
edition was created when he wrote that “the full score and new edition...was made from
the parts and, like the Holst Suite in E-flat, it unfortunately incorporates their errors.”

It was Fennell who first attempted to rectify these issues in his 1975
*Instrumentalist* article entitled simply “The William Byrd Suite.” This article, which
provides a brief history and performance guide, has been reprinted twice, in *Basic Band
Repertory* of 1980, and *The Conductor’s Anthology*, published in 1993. The main goal of
the article is to introduce the work to conductors and to address performance issues
specific to each movement. Of interest to the present study is the inclusion of a
supplemental section devoted to “Points of Correction.” Fennell listed nearly fifty errors,
in addition to his identification of 118 instances of missing slurs in the intended snare
drum drags. While this errata is helpful and the first attempt by anyone to correct the
problems, it also introduces some errors and only represents a fraction of the issues
contained in the score or parts.

Despite the incompleteness of Fennell’s errata, Boosey & Hawkes issued
another edition of the *William Byrd Suite* that attempted to include his corrections.
However, the “Corrected Edition 1991” integrates only nineteen of Fennell’s suggestions
from his article. Upon closer inspection, it is apparent that this so-called “corrected
edition” is in actuality the original engraving of the 1924 parts and 1960 full score with
Fennell’s suggestions included through the use of what looks like correction liquid and
ink. Furthermore, on the bottom of the first page of the full score, the conductor is
informed that a timpani part added by Fennell is provided in the set. Unfortunately, this
part is not reflected in the score, leaving the conductor to write it in over the preexisting
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part or leave the player to his or her own devices. While the intent of this edition, the most current one available today, is to provide a corrected version of the piece, it actually introduces more errors and creates additional problems.

The most recent resource is Weeks’s doctoral dissertation entitled “Gordon Jacob’s *William Byrd Suite: A Corrected Edition.*” The purpose of Weeks’s edition initially resembles the present study in its attempt to create a new edition that resolves issues for the performer. While Weeks’s excellent work approaches the closest thing to creating a usable edition, unfortunately it is lacking in a few respects. The most crucial problem with Weeks’s edition is that it incorporates editorial choices of articulation that create new issues of clarity for the music. Another oversight is the intentional disregard for the source of Jacob’s transcription, *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book.* In addition, Weeks’s resultant score does not clearly reflect his editorial choices and thus assumes that those decisions should be accepted by the performer. A scholarly edition should make editorial decisions obvious and indicate the source of those choices, providing an opportunity for the musician to make an informed decision regarding each debatable aspect of the performance.
CHAPTER 3

EDITORIAL PROCESS

Editorial Philosophy

Once all editions and errata were consulted, the editorial process began. In order to successfully create a critical edition that represents a cohesive and consistent approach to editorial decision making, the overarching philosophy of the project needed to be developed. The editor had to decide whether the function of this new edition would be that of a corrected, interpretive, or critical edition. A corrected edition implies that all errors have been changed to eliminate the errors of the publisher, while an interpretive edition would be prepared to guide the musician based on the interpretation of important performers. Both of these approaches to editing are valid and respected philosophical options, but neither type typically includes a clear indication of those choices made by the editor. Such indications can help the performer to realize those decisions which were made in regard to the preparation of the edition. The flexibility of editorial notation enables the performer to exercise responsibility in the interpretation and performance of the work. A critical edition employs these editorial marks and provides a resource that lessens the impact of the editor, granting ultimate decision making power to the performer.

Through the course of the examination of the sources, including The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book and all published editions of the William Byrd Suite, it was decided that the critical edition approach would be the most appropriate. This critical edition attempts to create a text that resolves discrepancies introduced by a number of sources.  

Inconsistencies were found in all editions, and preexisting errata were not without problems. Since the autograph manuscript has not survived, it was difficult to verify the source of apparent errors. Errors could be the result of the copyist, the publisher, the editor, or even the composer. The composer is often overlooked as a source of inaccuracy by editors that choose to represent the composer’s wishes, no matter how clear the error or inconsistency appears. Rather than presume that the composer is without fault, the present editor considered any question that was seemingly introduced by the composer by looking at each issue with a multi-faceted approach. This perspective took into account Jacob’s dependence on the source material, the accuracy of the various publications, melodic and harmonic context, and contemporary instrumentation.

Another important philosophical issue is derived from the fact that the William Byrd Suite is one composer’s reading of another’s. The source material is not just that of Gordon Jacob’s, but originates with William Byrd’s pieces contained in The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book. During the process of editing, the author had to decide where Jacob’s and Byrd’s intentions were parallel and where they diverged. A note-by-note comparison of Byrd’s music as recorded in The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book to the “Corrected Edition 1991” of the William Byrd Suite revealed Jacob’s dependence on the source material. As mentioned earlier in chapter 2, despite the differences in scoring and variation of form, there is a close relationship with the melodic, harmonic, and rhythmic characteristics of Byrd’s pieces and Jacob’s transcription. Any deviation by Jacob from the Byrd source material would have to be carefully scrutinized to evaluate validity and appropriateness. While the goal of this edition is not to restore the music to
Byrd’s intentions, the source material is an important aspect of the editorial process and cannot be ignored. The result is an attempt to represent Gordon Jacob as William Byrd in a twentieth-century setting, without trying to restore the music to its sixteenth-century state.

Since the autograph manuscript is lost, most of the errors contained in the published editions of the *William Byrd Suite* are presumed to be a result of copyist, and therefore publisher, error. As a student in 1924, Jacob was most likely doing all of his own work as a copyist. However, his music may have been distorted during the typesetting process. While many composers supervise this process and have final approval of the product before it is released to the public, this may not have been the case with the initial publication of the *William Byrd Suite* in 1924. In addition, subsequent publications may have been issued without any input from Jacob. By the 1950s, it can be safely assumed that Jacob was no longer copying his own parts, a situation with which he was not entirely pleased. A letter dated October 9, 1954 from Jacob to Boosey & Hawkes regarding the *Sinfonietta No. 3* for orchestra reveals the composer’s frustration with the work of the copyists responsible for the parts. He wrote:

> I am sorry to say that the parts are very bad *and must on no account be used again*. …I know that the set of parts you had made has cost a lot of money and I sympathise [sic] with the copyists. But I could see for myself that the parts were going to give a lot of trouble. …In my early days when I did copying work I often had to work at high pressure, as copyists often do, but it was always tidy and legible. I am very sorry about all this but my work was very nearly wrecked and in all my long experience as composer and orchestrator I have never been through a more harassing and nerve-wracking time.  
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This letter implies the likelihood that Jacob did not have much supervision, if any, over the publication process for the “U.S. Edition 1960” of the *William Byrd Suite*, and that

most of the work was done by Boosey & Hawkes copyists. This is the first edition that provided a full score, but since it was created by a copyist and based on the parts from the 1924 edition, the score’s accuracy cannot be adequately confirmed.

An additional philosophy emerged during the editorial process. Much of the editorial work dealt with inconsistency of articulation. Many passages contained unison melodic or rhythmic gestures that presented two or more articulation approaches. The nature of these passages demanded that the note grouping be uniform for the sake of clarity. The solution involved choosing which of the possible articulation schemes was appropriate and changing the other parts to match. Perhaps the most difficult of these articulation issues involved those with slurring indications, where some voices had extended slurs and others were more segmented. In almost every instance, the articulation configuration that involved shorter segments of slurring was chosen in order to facilitate clarity. Like the consonant in spoken language, tongued articulation enables clearer enunciation of the musical gesture. Articulation, like bowing, can have a tremendous impact on clarity and therefore, on the transmission of the composer’s message.

Due to the abundance of articulation inconsistencies, it was determined that no obvious articulation philosophy is evident in the original edition. This observation led the editor to approach any questionable articulation passage as an open question. Like any alteration or suggestion in the present edition, changes in articulation by the editor are clearly marked with editorial indications so that the conductor can decide which option to choose.
It would be misleading to claim that all of the editorial decisions in this edition are an attempt to achieve a literal reflection of Jacob’s intent. Since there is no autograph manuscript, there will always be the question of authenticity to any of the changes. In addition, some editorial intervention could more adequately be described as performance or interpretative suggestions, especially in respect to articulation and dynamic changes. Any change that did not find its origin in the various texts could be termed interpretation. These decisions were made for the sake of clarity; conductors may choose to follow the editorial markings or ignore them. Considering this fact, it may be more appropriate to call the present edition a “critical performance” edition.

Editorial Decisions and Indications

With the editorial philosophy established, the actual process of editing commenced. This critical edition was engraved using Sibelius 4 notation software. Among the many advantages of using this notation software is the “dynamic parts” feature. This feature enables the user to create a set of parts that automatically synchronize with any changes made in the score. Another advantage of using any notation software is the simplicity of indicating editorial changes and suggestions within the score, creating a flexible text that puts decision making in the hands of the performer. This critical edition resolves discrepancies and errors and presents any changes in notation adopted by modern editors, exemplified by Daniel N. Leeson and Neal Zaslaw in the Neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Werke editions of the Mozart wind
serenades. The two editorial marks most often employed in this critical edition of the *William Byrd Suite* are the bracket and the broken line, as shown in figure 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Graphic Representation</th>
<th>Indication and Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bracket</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>Changes in pitch, articulation such as <em>staccato</em> or <em>tenuto</em>, dynamics, and various other aspects including phrase completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Line</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Note grouping or phrasing suggestions (the original indication is still intact as the standard solid line)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Editorial notation and indication for the *William Byrd Suite* critical edition.

In addition to these markings, there were a few passages that included the use of *ossia* indications. This allowed for the editorial decision, represented by the *ossia* passage, to be utilized without changing the integrity of the original gesture. The *ossia* was used only in those instances where there was not satisfactory evidence to permanently change a passage in question, but enough to offer an option to the performer.

Through the course of the analysis and comparison of the published editions and the original source material, there were a total of 2865 editorial decisions identified. The designation “editorial decision” is used rather than the term “error” to denote that not every change or suggestion is the result of irrefutable evidence. The term also implies
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52 Daniel N. Leeson and Neal Zaslaw, Preface to Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Serenade in B-flat major “*Gran Partita*” KV 361 (370a) by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (Basel, Germany: Bärenreiter Kassel, 1979), vi.
that not every issue required a change: some editing involved the decision not to make any corrections or suggestions. Each movement contains significant editorial adjustments, the smallest amount found in the “Pavana”, with 233, and by far the most contained in “The Earle of Oxford’s Marche”, with 901. The editorial category with the largest amount of changes or suggestions is articulation, of which there were 2208 editorial decisions. Phrase completion was addressed the least, with forty occurrences. To provide a note-for-note explanation of every correction or editorial decision is not within the scope of this section or project; the details of the editing changes are illustrated by the inclusion of the complete critical edition score in chapter 4. However, the following discussion does offer a glimpse into the editorial decisions by comparing passages from the “Corrected Edition 1991,” The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book, and the present critical edition. It was decided to use the 1991 edition as the comparison because of the fact that this is the edition currently available to conductors. The demonstrative examples and discussions are organized according to the type of musical decision: pitch, rhythm, dynamics, articulation, and phrase completion.

Pitch

Perhaps the most obvious error to detect was that of pitch discrepancy. Overall, the entire piece contained 135 pitches that required editorial consideration. Some errors were clear and others required more investigation. In every instance, the pitch in question was compared with the Byrd source material, the 1924 condensed score, the subsequent editions, and extant errata. When none of these sources provided an answer, a decision had to be made by the editor through stylistic and contextual analysis of the passage. A few examples of pitch alteration follow.
An example of edited pitch can be found in m. 16 of “Jhon come kisse me now.” In the published editions, the bass clarinet contains an error on beat 2, where it has a written D, a whole step too high when compared to the bassoon and bass trombone, who have a concert B-flat. Another editorial decision involved the addition of a low concert F on beat 4 of m. 16 in the bass trombone part. This is an example of phrase completion, of which there will be more examples provided. Figure 3 shows the passage as it appears in the new edition, with the corrections and suggested additional pitch. With the exception of the bass trombone note, the other change requires no editorial marks, as the correction is corroborated with the condensed score.

Some pitch changes were determined based on the context in which they occurred. These contexts included harmonic structure, melodic patterns, and repetition of gesture. An example of this type of editorial decision is found in “Wolsey’s Wilde.” Figure 4 illustrates mm. 9-10 as they occur in the published edition. As figure 5 shows,
the first, third, and fifth pitch of the fourth clarinet in the new edition have been altered to follow the direction of the other accompanimental figures.

Figure 4. Gordon Jacob, *William Byrd Suite*, “Wolsey’s Wilde” mm. 9-10, “Corrected Edition 1991.” Accompanimental figure in cl. 4 does not match contour of other voices. © COPYRIGHT 1924 BY BOOSEY & CO. LTD. Reproduced by kind permission of Boosey & Hawkes Music Publishers Ltd.

Figure 5. Gordon Jacob, *William Byrd Suite*, “Wolsey’s Wilde” mm. 9-10, critical edition. Alteration of cl. 4 to match accompanimental gesture. © COPYRIGHT 1924 BY BOOSEY & CO. LTD. Reproduced by kind permission of Boosey & Hawkes Music Publishers Ltd.

Another interesting editorial decision regarding pitch emerged during the comparison with *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book* source material. This pitch issue occurs
in the second measure of “The Earle of Oxford’s Marche.” The various stages of this problem are illustrated in the following three figures. Figure 6 shows the passage as it appears in the published editions. The bass clarinet, bassoon 2, and tuba all play a concert F on beat 2 which functions as a pedal F to the C major chord built above. Figure 7 displays the corresponding passage in Byrd’s source material, where the bass line moves to the root of C major on beat 2. Finally, figure 8 demonstrates the revised passage in the new edition, which mirrors the bass line movement of the original Byrd version. This editorial decision provides the root motion to establish the C major chord on beat 2 of the second measure.

Figure 7. William Byrd, “The Earle of Oxfords Marche,” m. 1, from *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book*. Bass root movement outlines move to D major (analogous to C major in the Jacob).

![Figure 7. William Byrd, “The Earle of Oxfords Marche,” m. 1, from *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book*. Bass root movement outlines move to D major (analogous to C major in the Jacob).](image)


![Figure 8. Gordon Jacob, *William Byrd Suite*, “The Earle of Oxford’s Marche,” mm. 1-2, critical edition. Adjusted bass voice movement to reflect the Byrd material.](image)

*Rhythm*

There are occasional lapses of rhythmic consistency in the “Corrected Edition 1991”. There were 154 instances of rhythm or duration that were addressed in the editorial process. The first example demonstrates an issue of duration, a common
occurrence throughout the work. On the left side of figure 9 is a passage from m. 32 of “The Earle of Oxford’s Marche.” In this excerpt, the E-flat clarinet and B-flat clarinet 1-3 only have an eighth note rhythm notated on beat 2 in the published edition. In the new edition, all durations have been changed to a quarter note to match the length of the other voices.

Figure 9. Gordon Jacob, William Byrd Suite, “The Earle of Oxford’s Marche,” m. 32, “Corrected Edition 1991” (left) and critical edition (right). Duration of b. 2 in E-flat clarinet, clarinet 1-3 altered to match other voices. © COPYRIGHT 1924 BY BOOSEY & CO. LTD. Reproduced by kind permission of Boosey & Hawkes Music Publishers Ltd.

Another rhythmic issue is evident in figure 10, excerpted from “Jhon come kisse me now.” This passage is an example of a variant rhythmic value that was found in The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book. This rhythm was not present in either the condensed or full scores of the published editions, but was isolated to the source material. Rather than alter the rhythm permanently, the editor provided an *ossia* passage that could then be chosen by the conductor. The *ossia* option continues the dotted quarter-eighth rhythm.
Once again, it is difficult to know for sure why Jacob would have diverged from the source. By providing an *ossia* passage, the rhythm can be played either way.

Figure 10. Gordon Jacob, *William Byrd Suite*, “Jhon come kisse me now,” m. 21, critical edition. Addition of *ossia* passage to illustrate rhythmic variation from Byrd source material. © COPYRIGHT 1924 BY BOOSEY & CO. LTD. Reproduced by kind permission of Boosey & Hawkes Music Publishers Ltd.

As mentioned earlier, there were some editorial decisions that ultimately resulted in no change for the new edition. One of these examples occurs in mm. 57-60 of “Jhon come kisse me now.” The original source material’s parallel passage, m. 93, shows that Byrd maintains the theme’s dotted rhythmic organization in this variation, as shown in figure 11. In the corresponding passage in the *William Byrd Suite*, Jacob apparently chose to alter the rhythmic values to even eighth notes, eliminating the lilt of the dotted rhythm theme. After a great deal of consideration, it was decided to keep the rhythm the way Jacob intended, with an editorial note identifying the rhythm in the source material. This is illustrated in figure 12.
Figure 11. William Byrd, “Jhon come kisse me now,” m. 93, from *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book*. Original rhythmic values.
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Figure 12. Gordon Jacob, *William Byrd Suite*, “Jhon come kisse me now,” mm. 57-58, critical edition. Jacob’s rhythmic alteration maintained, with editorial note identifying original rhythm from Byrd. © COPYRIGHT 1924 BY BOOSEY & CO. LTD. Reproduced by kind permission of Boosey & Hawkes Music Publishers Ltd.
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The final example of editorial decisions of a rhythmic nature is actually a compound issue that occurs in “The Bells.” In the published editions, m. 57 features a duet by the flute and clarinet 1. Figure 13 shows how this passage appears in the “Corrected Edition 1991,” with the clarinet playing an augmented variation of the flute melody. The rhythmic and melodic organization of the clarinet line foreshadows the content of mm. 59-62, where both flute and clarinet play in unison at the octave.
However, the condensed score shows only the flute rhythm and melody at m. 57, as does the analogous passage in *The Fitzwilliam Virginal*. It seems that the clarinet gesture was an error during the copying process of the full score; therefore, the clarinet has been changed to match the flute in the new edition, as detailed in figure 14.
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Figure 14. Gordon Jacob, *William Byrd Suite*, “The Bells,” m. 57, critical edition. Cl. 1 changed to match fl. © COPYRIGHT 1924 BY BOOSEY & CO. LTD. Reproduced by kind permission of Boosey & Hawkes Music Publishers Ltd.
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**Dynamics**

Several passages required clarification of dynamic indications. Most often, a dynamic is present in most of the voices in a unison melody or rhythm, but for unexplained reasons has been left out of others. The excerpt on the left of figure 15,
from “The Earle of Oxford’s Marche,” shows a *sforzando* dynamic indication on most of the parts that contain an accented dotted quarter note. However, the piccolo, flute, oboes, E-flat clarinet, and clarinet 1 parts have left the *sforzando* out. It would seem logical that all parts should include this dynamic, and the new edition has included it for all voices, as shown in the excerpt on the right of figure 15.

Another editorial decision that dealt with dynamic alteration is shown in figures 16 and 17, taken from “The Bells.” The first example shows mm. 51-52 as they appear in the published editions. The *fortissimo* dynamic is positioned on beat 1 of m. 52 for every voice. However, an analysis of the melodic context suggests that the *forte* may be more appropriate when placed on the last eighth note of the previous measure for some voices, including the cornet. This repositioning places the dynamic at the beginning of the phrase, as illustrated in figure 17. Although there is no evidence to suggest that this was Jacob’s plan, it would seem appropriate to follow the phrasing to shape the dynamic, rather than organizing the dynamic vertically.

Articulation

The largest amount of corrections or suggestions dealt with issues of articulation. There were significant decisions in every movement, with a substantial amount occurring in “The Earle of Oxford’s Marche.” Of the 690 articulation decisions in this movement alone, many were found in the snare drum part. Fennell identified this problem in his 1975 article, but the corrections were never applied to the “Corrected Edition 1991.” He suggested the addition of a slur over each notated rudimental “drag,” demonstrated in figure 18. These have been applied to the new edition, most notably in the first movement.
There are some incidences where articulation is not consistent in a passage of two or more parts that contain similar gestures. The following passage is a good example of the ambiguities of articulation present in the *William Byrd Suite*. As the excerpt on the left of figure 19 demonstrates, the bass clarinet, bassoon, and tuba all display a slurred indication over the entire figure, while the trombones have a very different articulation that includes accents on the last sixteenth notes. The resulting effect of this passage would be a lack of clarity. The editorial changes indicated in the excerpt on the right are shown by the bracketed indication and would assist in creating articulation consistency and thus a clarity of pitch and style. Also of note is the addition of an accent on the first note of the tuba passage to match the other voices.
Another example of articulation inconsistency is demonstrated in figure 20. The following excerpt is taken from the “Pavana.” In every published edition of this passage, the articulation from beat 4 of measure 13 to beat 1 of measure 14 differs between cornet 2 and trombone 2. To correct this ambiguity, or to at least provide the conductor with a performance choice, the editor has placed a broken slur line in the trombone part to indicate the editorial suggestion.
Phrase Completion

Phrase completion refers to those situations where a melodic gesture appears in two or more voices but one of the voices is missing a portion of the melody. Consultation with the published editions and the source material usually uncovered no reason for these incomplete melodies. Some of the incomplete phrases are missing only one note, and other instances have a significant part of the melody missing. In almost every case, the voice that contained the incomplete melody has rests in place of the missing melodic material. The present edition adds the missing material to facilitate completion of the melody without excluding any existent material.

One of the minor occurrences of phrase completion is demonstrated in figure 21, mm. 55-56 of “The Earle of Oxford’s Marche.” The published score shows that the flutes, piccolo included, do not complete the phrase in m. 56, even though they follow the melodic gesture found in the oboes and E-flat clarinet. It would seem logical to match the other voices rather than to create a change of timbre. Again, the decision is placed in the conductor’s hands, as the phrase completion is noted by the bracketed material.
A more substantial example of phrase completion can also be found in “The Earle of Oxford’s Marche.” The “Corrected Edition 1991” full score shows that the euphonium is in unison with E-flat clarinet, oboes, cornets, and trumpets for the majority of mm. 73-80. Inexplicably, the euphonium drops out of m. 77 and the first beat of m. 78, resting for three beats before rejoining the other voices in unison. Just as the previous example suggests, this could alter the clarity of the passage, changing the color of the passage for three beats. The present edition restores the integrity of the phrase by including the addition of the melodic material, as illustrated in figure 22. With the use of the brackets around the added material, the editorial decision is obvious and the conductor can choose to follow it or leave it out.
Organization of the Parts

In the preparation of this edition, it was decided to change the order of some of the instruments and add a few supplemental parts. For the sake of practicality and tradition, the E-flat clarinet, bassoons, and F horns were repositioned in the score. A new part was crafted for baritone saxophone, and the 1957 supplemental timpani part by Fennell was added to the score. In addition, the E-flat alto clarinet and B-flat bass clarinet parts were marked as optional supplemental parts, as these were not included in the original 1924 edition for British military band. The first part of this section will discuss the reordering in greater detail, the second portion will introduce the supplemental parts, and the final part will contain a discussion about “authentic” performance of this masterpiece.

The rehearsal markings in the score of the published editions use numbers that are unrelated to the measure numbers. For instance, the placement of rehearsal 1 in “The Earle of Oxford's Marche” is at measure 17. In the new edition, rehearsal letters are used in place of numbers to avoid confusion between measure and rehearsal numbers. It was also decided to retain the format of the published edition’s page layout.
in terms of the number of measures per page. This should facilitate speed of
comparison between the previous editions and the present one.

In the published editions of the *William Byrd Suite*, the top line of the score
merely indicates “Fls.” This label actually stands for both piccolo and flute, although the
first time the piccolo designation is used in the full score is the sixtieth measure of the
fourth movement, “The Mayden’s Song.” A look at the piccolo and flute parts in the
“Corrected Edition 1991” shows that the flute and piccolo remain in unison at the octave
for the majority of the piece, with occasional division. When the parts do split, it is most
often the flute that plays while the piccolo remains *tacet*. For this edition, it was decided
to represent the piccolo and flute parts on separate lines in the score since they are
both frequently used.

Another change of score order involved the E-flat clarinet and bassoons.
Regarding the positioning of the E-flat clarinet in the *William Byrd Suite*, Whiston asked
Jacob why it was listed directly above the oboes instead of just above the clarinets.
Jacob replied that he didn’t know and that he preferred that it be bracketed with the
other clarinets, “where it should be. I mean, they’re a family, aren’t they?”

To reflect Jacob’s preference and to preserve the integrity of the clarinet family, this edition lists
the clarinet family in the following order, determined by range: E-flat clarinet, B-flat
clarinet 1, B-flat clarinet 2, B-flat clarinet 3, B-flat clarinet 4, E-flat alto clarinet, and B-flat
bass clarinet. In the published editions, the position of the bassoon is below the tenor
saxophone. More so than any other instrument, the bassoon appears to have the least
stable tradition of positioning in band scores. It can appear with the other double reed
instruments, or below the clarinets, or at the very bottom of the woodwind section. It

was decided in this edition to place the bassoons directly below the bass clarinet, due to the parts being similar.

The “U.S. Edition 1960” and “Corrected Edition 1991” full scores list four parts for B-flat clarinet: Solo, 1, 2, and 3. It is now standard procedure to list these parts as 1, 2, 3, and 4, an organization employed by the new edition. Both published full scores also contain the E-flat alto clarinet and E-flat alto saxophone on the same line, since both parts are identical. Due to the fact that the E-flat alto clarinet is a spurious part added for the “U.S. Edition 1960,” this part has been separated from the E-flat alto saxophone and marked “optional.” The B-flat bass clarinet, also an addition to the 1960 edition, has also received this same designation. It is up to the conductor to choose whether these timbres should be included.

The final adjustment to score order involved the upper voices of the brass family. In the published editions, the F horns are listed above the cornets and trumpets. This edition places the instruments in the following order: B-flat cornet 1, B-flat cornet 2, B-flat trumpet 1, B-flat trumpet 2, F horn 1 & 2, F horn 3 & 4. Like the bassoon’s position, the horn and trumpet order varies depending on the score, composer, and the compositional period. The present edition’s order more closely resembles the score order of brass in modern band scores, with the trumpets appearing above the horns. One other change involved the trumpet parts. The published editions show the trumpets on one staff, and occasional overlaps and complexity make it difficult to discern the pitches. For this edition, the trumpet parts were given individual staves in the score and their own parts to enable easier reading by the conductor and players.
No previous edition of the *William Byrd Suite* includes a part for baritone saxophone. This fact is not unusual when considering that other contemporary works published by Boosey & Hawkes did not contain a baritone saxophone part, likely a reflection of the British military band instrumentation of the 1920s. Two of these pieces, Holst’s Second Suite in F and Vaughan Williams’s *Toccata Marziale*, have had baritone saxophone parts added in new editions issued within the past twenty-five years. These editions, by Colin Matthews and Frank Battisti respectively, have introduced baritone saxophone parts that are indicated as optional, to be used at the discretion of the conductor. In the spirit of these excellent editions, and to provide a unique and characteristic part for an ensemble’s baritone saxophone player, the present author created a new part. The part does not introduce any new material or harmony but instead is a conglomeration of the bass clarinet, bassoon, and tuba parts. For the majority of the time, the baritone saxophone part functions as another member of the low single reed family, with occasional excursions to bolster the low brass. As with the Matthews and Battisti editions, this part is clearly identified as optional and its use remains at the conductor’s discretion.

Prior to his 1958 recording of the *William Byrd Suite* with the Eastman Wind Ensemble, Fennell created a new part for timpani. Inscribed “for Pete Tanner and The Eastman Symphonic Wind Ensemble, 5 November 1957 – F. Fennell,” this new part reflects the capabilities of the instrument and players typical at the middle of the twentieth century. The part is much more active and involves tuning adjustments within movements as well as throughout the piece. The present author obtained a

---

photocopy of Fennell’s manuscript timpani part and included this in the score, in addition to the original part by Jacob. Like the baritone saxophone part, Fennell’s timpani part has been indicated as an option that the conductor may exercise to replace the original. Both the original and the Fennell timpani parts are shown in the score, placing the ultimate choice in the conductor’s hands.

The conductor who seeks an “authentic” performance of the William Byrd Suite based on instrumentation can succeed by taking advantage of the flexibility of this new edition. In order to return to the instrumentation for which Jacob transcribed the work, the E-flat alto clarinet, B-flat bass clarinet, baritone saxophone, and “Fennell” timpani parts may be omitted. Leaving out these optional parts will not alter the melodic or harmonic content of the music. The remaining parts can be played with one player per part with a minimum of thirty players.

Another aspect of “authentic” performance can be achieved by using B-flat cornets to play the cornet parts. The wide popularity of the modern trumpet has led to usage of that instrument for both trumpet and cornet parts in the performance of older music that makes a distinction. Trumpet players rarely use cornets to play these parts, even in those cases where both cornets and trumpets are asked for by the composer. It is helpful to return to Battisti’s critical edition of Vaughan Williams’s Toccata Marziale to observe a contemporary perspective on the issue. In the reproduction of the first page of the autograph manuscript score, Vaughan Williams marks an asterisk by the trumpet parts, which are notated directly below the cornets. The corresponding note on the bottom of the page reads, “[Note.] The Trumpet part is essential, and must be played on
cornet if trumpets are not available. It must be of equal strength with cornets."\(^{55}\) This statement is a reflection of the time: cornets were more popular than trumpets, especially in the British military bands of the time, and were used as a substitution when trumpets were not available. Eighty years later, the situation has reversed, but the differences between the instruments have not. Kent Kennan and Donald Grantham distinguished those differences when they wrote that “the trumpet and the cornet must not be thought of as being one and the same instrument. Although the tube lengths of the two instruments are the same, the shape of the cornet is different. The most important physical difference is the relative position of the conical and cylindrical portions of the tubing.”\(^ {56}\) Considering both Vaughan Williams’s request and Kennan and Grantham’s assertions, the conductor who chooses to use both cornets and trumpets will note the advantages of the timbral contrast that they create.

Interestingly, those conductors who wish to utilize the optional parts included in this edition will also be serving as the composer’s advocate. Although Jacob scored the work for British military band in 1924, he appreciated the instrumentation of the American symphonic band. Mentioned before, by 1955 Jacob noted the advantages of the woodwind bass voice of the American symphonic band in *The Composer and His Art*. Later in his career, Jacob would score works that included the expanded low single reeds instrumentation. Perhaps this serves as justification for the addition of these optional instruments. Again, the choice has been placed in the conductor’s hands.


CHAPTER 4

CRITICAL EDITION OF THE WILLIAM BYRD SUITE

The following chapter contains the culmination of the process described in chapters 2 and 3: the full score of the new critical edition. Page setup is nearly identical to the published score to enable easy reference and comparison between the “Corrected Edition 1991” and the new critical edition.

This critical edition addresses 2865 issues of pitch, rhythm, dynamics, articulation, and phrase completion contained in the “Corrected Edition 1991,” published by Boosey & Hawkes. While the majority of the editorial decisions dealt with instances of errors, many changes are editorial suggestions for the sake of clarity.

The 1960 supplemental parts for alto clarinet and bass clarinet have been clearly identified. Other optional parts include the 1957 timpani part by Fennell and a new part for baritone saxophone by the author. Conductors who seek an “authentic” performance of this work can leave out all optional parts and perform the work with as few as thirty players.

The strength of this edition comes from its flexibility. All editorial decisions are indicated with the use of brackets, broken lines, ossia passages, or editorial notes. It is wished that this flexibility and clarity encourages conductors to revisit this much-deserved masterpiece.

Figure 23. Gordon Jacob, William Byrd Suite, “The Earle of Oxford’s Marche,” full score, critical edition. Adapted from the original publication, © COPYRIGHT 1924 BY BOOSEY & CO. LTD.
In the course of searching for the autograph manuscript of the William Byrd Suite, the author corresponded with a variety of persons. The following letters were written in response to the author as part of this process. They are repeated here, in chronological order, to demonstrate the exhaustion of resources in attempting to find the primary source material.

The first person contacted was Ruth Jacob, the daughter of Jacob and his second wife, Margaret Jacob Hyatt:

From: Ruth Jacob  
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2006  
To: Andrew Trachsel  
CC: Margaret Jacob  
Subject: Re: William Byrd Suite autograph

Dear Andy

Thanks for contacting me. I'll copy this to my mother. If anyone knows where the manuscript is, she does – although it's a long shot, considering how long ago it was written, and how poorly manuscripts were protected back then.

Best wishes
Ruth

Ruth forwarded this message to her mother, whose reply is contained in the next message:

From: Ruth Jacob  
Sent: Sunday, February 26, 2006  
To: Andrew Trachsel  
Subject: Re: William Byrd Suite autograph

Andy

I have received this message from my mother to you:

It's not among my few original ms'. You could try the British Library, but I don't hold out much hope. So sorry not to bw [sic] able to help you. It looks as if the errors will have to remain. Margaret Jacob
Unfortunately, none of Jacob’s surviving family members are in possession of the manuscript. The next attempt to search for the manuscript was with Boosey & Hawkes. Craig Kirchhoff, Director of Bands at the University of Minnesota and series advisor for Boosey & Hawkes Windependence, and Frank Korach of Boosey & Hawkes were contacted regarding the manuscript. This correspondence also sought interest for publication of the proposed project. Both of their responses are included:

Date: Thu, 2 Mar 2006
From: Craig Kirchhoff
To: Andrew Trachsel
Cc: Frank Korach
Subject: Re: William Byrd edition

Andrew,
The Jacob is certainly on our list to re-do. I cannot guarantee a time-table for when this will come up, but it will certainly be within the next three years. I agree with you that a critical edition would be a welcome addition to the repertoire. I have no idea regarding the autograph, but I would suggest that you contact Frank Korach at Boosey & Hawkes to see if he might have any information that might lead to it. I have copied Frank above so you can have direct access to his e-mail address.

Best,
ck

Date: Thu, 2 Mar 2006
From: Frank Korach
To: Andrew Trachsel
Subject: Re: William Byrd edition

Dear Andrew,
We do not have in our archives a copy of the manuscript of the manuscript. Unfortunately many of the Gordon Jacob early manuscripts are lost. I suggest that you contact the British Museum. The British Museum does house some Gordon Jacob manuscripts but I am not certain this is one of them. If they do have it in their possession I can then grant permission for them to make a copy for your use at your University Library.

With kind regards,
Frank

Upon Mr. Korach’s recommendation, the author contacted the archivists at the British Museum music collection. Once again, the manuscript was not located:

Date: Mon, 6 Mar 2006
From: Libraries and Archives
To: Andrew Trachsel
Subject: Gordon Jacob, British composer

Dear Mr Trachsel

You need to contact the Music Reading Room at the British Library (formerly the British Museum Library). The web address is www.bl.uk and the e-mail address is music-collections@bl.uk

Yours sincerely

Pam Smith
The Paul Hamlyn Library

Correspondence with Eric Wetherell, Jacob’s biographer, ended in the same result:

From: Eric Wetherell
Sent: Wednesday, March 22, 2006
To: [author]
Subject: RE: Gordon Jacob and William Byrd Suite

Dear Mr. Trachsel

Thank you for your e-mail and I am glad you like the book. It was written more than ten years ago so I’m afraid I have no recollection now of where the page from the William Byrd Suite came from.57

Are you sure you spoke with Mrs Jacob? She has a large number of Jacob’s Mss still in the house where they lived and I can only assume I got the page from her. Just to be certain, she has remarried and she is now Mrs Margaret Jacob Hyatt, 1 Audley Road, Saffron Waldon, Essex CB11 3HW tel 01799 500248. I don’t have her e-mail address.

Best of luck in your researches.

57 Wetherell is referring to a passage of the orchestral version of the William Byrd Suite that was reprinted in his Gordon Jacob: A Centenary Biography.
Yours sincerely
Eric Wetherell

The British wind conductor Timothy Reynish suggested the author contact Kneller Hall the Royal Military School of Music. Reynish also hinted that the band from Kneller Hall was a participant in the May 1924 premiere. An inquiry into this idea resulted in the following message:

Date: Mon, 24 Apr 2006
From: HQ DCAMUS-E1 Registry
To: [author]
Subject: [No Subject]

Dear Mr Trachsel,

Thank you for your email addressed to Kneller Hall HQ DCAMUS-PSO, which has finally appeared on my desk, hence the delay in this reply. I have now carried out a thorough search of our archives and music library in an attempt to locate the manuscript score of Gordon Jacob’s *William Byrd Suite*, but very much regret without success. We have the published full score, short score and band parts, but no manuscript of this composition.

Sorry not to be more helpful on this occasion.

Yours sincerely,
Major (Retd) Roger Swift

To date, the autograph manuscript has not been located. The discovery of the manuscript most assuredly would have a substantial impact on this present edition. The author is hopeful that one day it may be found, to facilitate another level of research and comparison that is currently out of reach.
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