to the dissemination of repertory. I had spent some time studying Italian music in print,

Cathedral, produced between 1660 and c.1700. (All tables are appended to the end of this PDF file.) I will consider each of these institutions individually for a few moments, describing briefly the major figures involved in copying music manuscripts.

The early set of six Chapel Royal partbooks, British Library Royal Music 27.a.1-3, 5, 6, and 8, contain service music and anthems, and uniquely among Restoration sources utilize parchment (or vellum) instead of paper. They were first described properly by Watkins Shaw in a 1959 article, and Margaret Laurie furthered our understanding of them in a 1980 study, which included a description of two additional books, 27.a.7 and 27.a.4, listed separately in the table and connected in some respects to the main six. As their extant condition shows, these books resulted from cannibalization; in other words, once they became unusable copyists dismantled them, preserving leaves in good condition and binding them into new books. This allowed Shaw and Laurie to identify several layers of activity, including the work of two principal early copyists: William Tucker and Edward Braddock.

Assisting in our understanding of the Chapel Royal partbooks, the Lord Chamberlain's calendar (see Table II) preserves a "Catalogue of Severall Services & Anthems" transcribed into "his Maties" books from 1670 to 1676. In terms of a reliable account of the Restoration Chapel Royal's repertory, we have nothing earlier, and fortunately this list, unlike a later one, provides titles and composers' names, facilitating comparison with the partbooks themselves. Since the "Catalogue" indicates that William Holder, subdean of the Chapel (the second-ranking cleric), received payment for "transcribing"—subdeans were consistently paid for copying in the Chapel

making music alongside figures like Humfrey, Blow, and eventually Purcell. As a member of the Chapel in high standing, Tucker was entrusted with the important work of copying, as were his successors, Edward Braddock, also a Gentleman from 1660; and John Church, appointed to the Chapel in 1697. Church was perhaps the most prolific English copyist of the early eighteenth century and a highly influential figure in shaping repertory. [SLIDES]

Turning to Westminster Abbey, the extant seventeenth-century sources present a fragmentary picture of what must have been extensive copying activities. Three partbooks survive with partial seventeenth-century material: the two books of Triforium Set I and the one book of Triforium Set II, described in Table I. Like the main Chapel Royal set, these Abbey books came into their present state in the eighteenth century, partly built from earlier layers. The copying of Tucker, Braddock, and Church also figures prominently in Abbey sources (there was considerable overlap between the musical establishments of the Chapel and the Abbey), and I can add to this group Stephen Bing, another major copyist from the period. Unlike at the Chapel, copyists at the Abbey were paid directly for their work, and there are several recorded payments in the Abbey treasurers' books that correspond to the extant partbooks. The early layers, in Bing's hand, in

The contents of Triforium Set I suggest that the Abbey maintained newer works in a distinct set of books. Tucker copied nearly all of the early layers here—over seventy anthems and services—receiving a £20 payment in 1677. This activity focused on verse anthems, with Blow, Humfrey, and not surprisingly Tucker the most heavily represented. Perhaps most importantly, Tucker included six early anthems by Purcell, all of which must have been in use by 1677, when Purcell was seventeen or eighteen. (These are listed in Table III.) When Robert Thompson and I were examining these books in 1994, we discovered a small bit of Purcell's handwriting, correcting Tucker's copy of Purcell's Let God arise in the alto partbook, a rare instance of one of

(among other clerical appointments), and an industrious and influential copyist. Table IV provides an overview of Gostling's London copying. Beginning with his appointment to the Chapel Royal in 1679, he began to preserve important sacred works—emphasizing those actually performed at the Chapel[4]—in his personal scorebooks, first in the so-called "Gostling Manuscript," which survives at the University of Texas at Austin, and subsequently in a second scorebook, now at the Newberry Library in Chicago, providing authoritative readings of works ranging from Humfrey to William Croft. Gostling also came into possession of a set of eight partbooks owned by the aforementioned Westminster Abbey copyist, Stephen Bing, after Bing's death in 1681. These survive at York Minster, as MSS M1S. Apparently an extensive personal collection of file copies, Bing worked from his exemplars in creating actual performing materials. Robert Ford has shown how the Bing partbooks—sometimes called the Bing-Gostling partbooks, since Gostling added newer items to them—represent the nexus of the London repertory: of the nineteen services and sixty-five anthems in the Chapel Royal "Catalogue" (referring to Table II), all the services and fifty-one of the anthems are in the Bing partbooks; of the over 100 items in Tucker's and Bing's hands in the Abbey books, only one is not in the Bing partbooks.

Two decades later, the Bing partbooks once again proved a source of primary importance: Gostling relied heavily on them in his monumental task of preparing performing materials for the new St. Paul's, the choir of which opened for services in 1697. At St. Paul's, Gostling was both the subdean with the authority for choosing repertory—in fact this authority was specifically bestowed on him at St. Paul's by Bishop Henry Compton—and the high-ranking, musically

[4]Bruce Wood, Review of The Gostling Manuscriptn Early Music9 (1981), 118.

proficient churchman, who could be completely entrusted with copying duties. Gostling was paid a substantial £80 from the building accounts at St. Paul's in 1699 for "his Paines and Charge in Pricking Anthems for $y^e$ Service." It should come as no surprise, then, that Gostling's copying in the extant A1 and A2 partbooks, as well as a fragmentary St. Paul's organbook, now in the Fitzwilliam Museum (again see Table I, the section on St. Paul's sources), overlaps tremendously with materials he had at hand. Of the 150 items surviving in Gostling's hand in the St. Paul's books, only twelve do not derive from the Bing partbooks or the Texas scorebook.

An important factor in dating Gostling's copying is the fact that he began to mimic Bing's musical hand in the 1690s, retaining Bing's characteristic teardrop-shaped open notes, with some variance, throughout the remainder of his career. Let me illustrate this with three slides [SLIDES].

Other relationships exist among Gostling's later manuscripts and the St. Paul's sources (I refer now to items in Table IV): Bodleian Library, Oxford, Tenbury 1176-82, a set of file-copy partbooks, interestingly avoid duplication with the A2 set. Gostling seems to have envisioned 1176-82 as a retrospective set, taking items from earlier sources such as his Austin scorebook. In contrast, Tenbury 797-803, a second set of file-copies, relate closely to the Chicago scorebook. Both Tenbury sets substantially overlap with the B partbooks, extant at St. Paul's but not in Gostling's hand: presumably he provided exemplars from his personally owned file copies to his successor-copyists.

The process of manuscript production at St. Paul's—and in the London establishments generally—provides insights into the formation and maintenance of repertory in London. Copyists preserved certain works of the more distant past, though their commitment to older repertory became increasingly selective as time passed. They embraced newer compositions by prominent composers immediately; Blow and Croft appear to have been the most frequently performed composers at St. Paul's in the first decades of the eighteenth century, based on the number of their pieces copied. Copyists gave local figures (and themselves sometimes) their due, though lesser music did not show much staying power, as successive generations dismantled older books and repurposed sections of them for future use. In sum, copyists played roles distinct from composers but nonetheless enjoyed a place among the musical elite. Tucker, Braddock, Gostling, and Church became copyists for the London establishments only after accumulating significant records of musical achievement; undoubtedly, they understood their roles as tastemakers.

They also carefully nurtured England's manuscript culture. To be clear, there was no groundswell to try to establish London as a center for music printing in the seventeenth century, along the lines of Venice and an elite few other Italian and Northern European cities. And the Continental practice of publishing sets of masses and motets, in parts and via movable type, would, I believe, have struck English musicians and consumers of music—even thinking in terms of services and anthems—as foreign, in several respects. On the other hand, the practice of copying music grew in its importance in England over the last years of the seventeenth century, with the most prominent copyists increasingly embracing a calligraphic style that matched their musical accuracy. We see this in Gostling's adoption of features of Bing's

stylized hand, and especially in the fine work of Church, whom I have just touched on today. These copyists believed, it seems, they were creating musical materials that would stand the test of time, though could Edward Braddock ever thought his Chapel Royal copying would be in use for more than a century? I refer to Royal Music 27.a.4, in Table I, which came into its current state, made up of earlier leaves, in the nineteenth century. Performing from "ancient" copying must have connoted a powerful sense of tradition to the musicians and may even have contributed to the maintenance of performing practices and choral sound over a relatively long period.

Church and a few others also paved the way for the great era of engraved music in London, which would ultimately place it alongside, if not ahead, of the Continental printing capitals of the past. In a real sense, London's prominence in music engraving in the eighteenth century flowed directly from its manuscript culture and the copyists who brought their art to new levels of achievement in the last years of the seventeenth century.

## TABLE I (CONTINUED)

Manchester Central Library BRm340Cr71 (probable St, Paul's provenance): "Altus Cantoris" partbook, copied by a single hand ca. 1666-69, possibly produced immediately after the Great Fire. A St. Paul's provenance is implied by the inclusion of works by St. Paul's musicians Bryne, Fisher, and Jewett.

Manchester Central Library MS BRm370Bp35 (probable St. Paul's provenance): organbook in the hand of John